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Abstract

This MA thesis research focuses on Gwich’in stories. It seeks to better understand how similar the versions of two stories are when each is parsed into units representing themes within the stories. Drawing in part on Lévi-Strauss’s structural study of myth and applying aspects of it to the Gwich’in stories discussed in this research, I will demonstrate that several versions of a story contain identical themes, though levels of detail vary. This occurs when (1) a story is told by the same storyteller at different times, and (2) when a story is told by two or more storytellers. While each version of a particular story may differ in the amount of detail, resulting in shorter and longer versions, my research shows that the main themes of a story are identical even when several storytellers narrate the same story or when the same storyteller tells a story more than once, but several years apart. There is a gap in the academic literature pertaining to Gwich’in stories. Recent projects have been conducted including Gwich’in stories focused on documenting narratives, but no one has investigated whether the content of those tales is actually identical. My research complements these projects by shedding light on a less studied aspect of Gwich’in storytelling.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

This MA thesis research project focuses on Gwich'in stories. The objective of this thesis is to evaluate (1) the degree of "sameness" between multiple versions of the same story when these versions are told by the same storyteller at different points in time; and (2) whether different versions of the same story are identical when told by two different storytellers. I use the term 'identical' to refer to the emerging themes of the analyzed stories. I consider a story identical when the same themes emerge, and those themes contain the same information. In this thesis, I am looking at stories that are considered part of the repertoire of Gwich'in stories (i.e. ancient Gwich'in stories that may include a moral or educational dimension, which may change according to the audience).

There is a gap in the academic literature pertaining to Gwich'in stories. This gap pertains specifically to (1) comparisons of different versions of the same story by the same storyteller, and (2) comparisons of different versions of the same story narrated by different storytellers regarding their sameness. Recent publications have focused on documenting Gwich'in stories (Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation 2009; Gwich'in Social and Cultural Institute 2007; Frank 1995; Rampart House: Stories Told by Our Elders 1993; Christian et al. 1985; McGary 1984; Peter 1976, 1975, 1974) and on "classroom/library storytelling" in a more western understanding of storytelling (Roney 2001; Livo 1986; Breneman 1983; Ross 1980; Baker 1977; Bauer 1977; Pellowski 1977; Tooze 1959; Shedlock 1952) – including how-to guides explaining how to choose a story or how to prepare for different audiences. Some of these publications also include resources for the aspiring storyteller, such as a history of the art of storytelling. My research complements these studies by looking into a less studied aspect of Gwich'in stories and storytelling.

Gwich’in is a Northern Dené language of the Na-Dene family spoken in several villages in Alaska and Canada. This thesis, however, will focus on Alaskan narrators only, since the only suitable recordings for my purposes were all from Alaska.
Gwich’in is one of the world’s many endangered languages. Over the past century, the number of fluent speakers has steadily decreased due to several factors: the arrival of explorers, missionaries and fur traders, the influence of the Hudson Bay Company, as well as the arrival of incomers during the gold rush in the late 19th century (Gabriel 1993; Mishler 1990; Burch 1979; Krech 1978; Osgood 1936). Today’s youth and young adults have at best a passive knowledge of the language; the generation of fluent Gwich’in speakers is already in their sixties or older\(^1\), and even fewer people speak the language, know stories and feel able to pass these stories on the way they heard them from their parents and grandparents. While many people belonging to the older generation heard

\(^1\) There are relatively few fluent Gwich’in speakers in the 40-60-year-old generation and even fewer younger than 40 years old.
stories as children, mostly in Gwich’in, few of them passed those stories on to their own
descendants (I. Roberts, personal communication, June 2014). Moreover, even when
stories were passed on to the next generation, English (rather than Gwich’in) was often
used to facilitate cross-generational communication.

The arrival of Europeans brought upon many changes in Gwich’in culture. Because
English was implemented as the main language spoken in schools, and especially because
using their native tongue often meant punishment, Gwich’in children soon lost the capacity
to speak their mother tongue due to isolation from their own people in the boarding
schools. The disappearance of the language slowly affects the culture, so that there is not
only a slow but steady loss of the language and the number of those who are able to speak
it, but also parts of the culture such as stories disappear over the course of time because
their meaning can simply no longer be transmitted. Even if stories are documented in
writing, or ideally, both in writing and as audio and video recordings, except for Lévi-
Strauss (1963) and his followers and Michael Krauss (1982), few people have looked at
stories that are available as multiple versions and compared those variations. It is my
objective to find out whether and how similar such stories are by comparing two versions
of each story. I will demonstrate that several versions of a story contain identical themes,
though levels of detail vary.

For that reason, I have chosen two recordings, each of Man in the Moon and The Old
Woman and the Brushman². Inspired by Lévi-Strauss’s Structural Study of Myth (1963), I
am examining how identical the information contained in the emerging themes of the same
story is, when (1) the versions are told by the same storyteller at different points in time,
and (2) when the versions are told by two or more different storytellers. I further want to
consider the idea that “stories must be told a certain way, and [that] they must not be
altered or revised by the teller,” a view expressed by Koyukon elder and honorary
doctorate degree holder Eliza Jones in an interview with Marjorie DeMartino for Alaska
Today (DeMartino 1985:51).

While the belief exists that stories should only be told in a certain way and no one
should alter them (DeMartino 1985:51), an idea that has not yet been researched with

² The Old Woman and the Brushman will henceforth be referred to as The Brushman.
Gwich’in speakers, others (Roney 2001; Cruikshank 1998; Baker 1977) believe that stories can change depending on the storyteller, the situation, and the desired effect a story is supposed to have. It was those conflicting views about storytelling as well as Lévi-Strauss’s discovery that similarities between myths may be ‘hidden’ in their structure that stimulated my research. This project contributes to the anthropological understanding of how stories are narrated by speakers of a native language such as Gwich’in, with a recognition that storytelling traditions do vary between cultures.

In the past, Gwich’in stories were mostly narrated in the circle of the nuclear family (I. Roberts; B. Stevens, personal communication, June 2014). Hearing and telling of such stories was considered an intimate occasion, it happened spontaneously, and was mostly kept within the immediate family. To this day, nothing about the idea of telling stories in the circle of nuclear families seems to have changed. Exceptions may include, but are not limited to, (1) performances in front of researchers, (2) public storytelling events, for example, as part of a conference or meeting and (3) spontaneous storytelling while out hunting or fishing.

The result is a data set encompassing two different stories told by three storytellers. The material used in this research belongs to the oral history collection in the archives of the Rasmuson Library at the University of Alaska Fairbanks recorded by Bridjette March and Craig Mishler in the 1970s, and by Lillian Garnett in the 1980s. Among the four stories discussed in this thesis are two versions of *Man in the Moon*, both told to Bridjette March, once by David Salmon and once by Moses Peters, both times in Chalkyitsik. Sarah Frank narrated *The Brushman* twice; the first time in Venetie, the second time in Arctic Village.

*Man in the Moon* is a story about a boy who is able to foresee the future and help his people in the search for food. *The Brushman* is a short narrative about a woman who bravely defends herself against a brushman, a feral individual and a widely known figure among many Athabascan peoples.

Since I could not locate any transcripts for *Man in the Moon*, I transcribed the English performances of the narrators and worked with those.

Craig Mishler recorded the first version of *The Brushman* in 1979, Lillian Garnett the

---

3 For a more detailed discussion of the brushman refer to page 50.
second version in 1984. Both versions are part of Craig Mishler’s book *Neerihjinjik* (1995) and the edited Gwich’in transcripts and an English translation by Lillian Garnett are also available in the book. I used the available transcripts in the book to re-transcribe the stories and create my own transcripts for the purpose of my analysis.

All transcripts for this research were created through using ELAN software. ELAN (EUDICO Linguistic Annotator) is a software that enables and helps, inter alia, creating, editing and visualizing multi-media data (Brugman and Russel 2004). It was developed at the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics in Nijmegen, the Netherlands. The use of this software enabled me to create my own transcripts and annotate not only the spoken text, but also a translation and background noise, and display it in a user-friendly manner serving as the basis of my analysis.

In this thesis I am only working with the English performances of David Salmon and Moses Peters and the English translations of Sarah Frank’s stories. However, Sarah’s Gwich’in recordings were used to listen how she uses her voice to tell the story, for instance, whether she uses pauses or a more quiet voice to dramatize her narration. The similarities and differences noted in the English versions of the texts I am analyzing may not be identical with the similarities and differences of the Gwich’in source texts. However, as Ron and Suzanne Scollon note, a comparison of Athabascan and English versions of a story may display “a striking parallelism,” for instance at times the English version may be almost a “line-by-line translation,” whereas at other times something marked “morphologically in one language may be marked intonationally in the other“ (Scollon 1981:107). Assuming that the performances of Moses Peters and David Salmon work similarly, my findings in the English versions of the stories I am analyzing in this thesis are relevant, but some of the findings might alter slightly from what I may have found had I analyzed the original versions.

1.1. Research Questions

Throughout my time researching the ways in which Gwich’in stories are narrated, the following research questions emerged:
1. What are the emerging themes in the versions of a story narrated by two different storytellers?
2. What are the emerging themes in the versions of a story narrated by the same storyteller at different times?
3. How identical are the themes and the information contained in the emerging themes of the same story told by different storytellers or told at different times by the same storyteller?

Keeping the aforementioned research questions in mind, we will begin our journey into the world of Gwich’in stories. Before I present my analysis of the two different stories and four respective texts though, I will give an overview of the theoretical approaches to narratives in general and I will discuss some key ideas. Further, I will introduce the Gwich’in people, discuss Native American storytelling, address oral tradition, shed some light on the brushman and give an insight into the thoughts and experiences of a linguist who was able to work with, and record narratives firsthand. Likewise, I will discuss transcription, translation and interpreting and their implications on this research. After presenting my analysis I will discuss its repercussions on my research questions and the implications of what I learned.
Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework

In this chapter I will provide a framework for my thesis. My research has been informed by the ideas of several scholars who proposed models and theories to analyze narratives. Those ideas were used to support the analysis of the two versions of *Man in the Moon* and *The Brushman*, respectively. However, none of the methodologies were applied in full; bits and pieces of each idea were used for the analysis of the stories discussed in this research. I will also discuss what made those methodologies interesting and applicable, and how far they informed my own research.

2.1. Claude Lévi-Strauss

French anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss almost singlehandedly founded and promoted the field of structural anthropology, which is, according to Barnard (2000:120) a theory focusing on pattern rather than “substance.” Structuralists believe that meaning emerges not from understanding things in isolation, but rather from the relationship those elements form to each other (Barnard 2000:120). Structuralism originated in the field of linguistics primarily after Saussure’s death but the idea was well known in other disciplines such as anthropology and literary criticism by the middle of the twentieth century (Matthews 2007). Structuralism, as Lévi-Strauss defines the term, “in its widest sense is all about pattern: how things which at first glance appear to be unrelated actually form part of a system of interrelating parts” (Barnard 2000:127). While in structuralist theory the sum of the different parts constitutes a whole, they are not equivalent to the whole. The whole is actually seen as being bigger than the sum of its parts, and those parts form relations to each other, based on binary pairs or opposites, which according to Lévi-Strauss is the basis of structure (ibid 2000:127). Lévi-Strauss was a key figure in developing the theory of structuralism and structural anthropology. French scholars of an earlier generation such as Émile Durkheim and Marcel Mauss guided his ideas. However, he was also influenced by ideas of the “Prague School of structural linguistics” and their interest in studying language synchronically rather than diachronically and the promotion of “the theory that linguistic meaning was built upon contrasts between sounds, or phonemes,” which presented Lévi-
Strauss with the idea of “binary contrasts,” a very important part of his structuralism (McGee 2008:324).

In *The Structural Study of Myth*, one of the most influential works in structural anthropology, Lévi-Strauss explores the seemingly contradictory situation present in mythology and argues that “myth is language: to be known, myth has to be told; it is a part of human speech” (1963:209). He discusses how anthropology should approach the study of myth and explains how it is possible that myths from different cultures all over the world can be at the same time so similar and so different. According to Klages (n.d.), Lévi-Strauss’s main argument is that similarities between myths are based on their “structural sameness,” while their content, characters and events may vary extensively. As Lévi-Strauss so aptly describes, the student of mythology is confronted with a basic paradox. In the telling of a myth, essentially anything is possible. Lévi-Strauss describes myths as unpredictable and completely arbitrary. On the one hand, anything could happen as a myth unfolds. On the other hand, he points out how astoundingly similar myths from different parts of the world seem to be when looking at their structure (ibid 1963:208).

While myth could be presumed a subdivision of language, Lévi-Strauss understands myth as a language on its own. Not only do we convey myths using language, myth also functions like a language. Explaining this idea, he refers to Saussure’s theory of any natural language consisting of both *langue* and *parole*. A language can be seen as a system of signs expressing ideas. This system of signs contains two parts, a part called *parole*, which is concerned with speech, and a part called *langue*, which is concerned with language. While *parole* refers to what comes out of people’s mouths, *langue* refers to the basic rules within a speech community.

Lévi-Strauss uses these concepts of *langue* and *parole* in order to explain how myth both resembles and differs from ordinary language. He states that “Saussure’s distinction between *langue* and *parole*, one being the structural side of language, the other the statistical aspect of it, language belonging to a revertible time, whereas parole is non-revertible” (Lévi-Strauss 1963:209).

Only when trying to translate a myth does it become clear that myth and poetry really cannot be treated as being the same. While a myth can still be understood even if it is poorly translated, poetry, on the other hand, can only be translated at risk of a serious
loss in translation, and therefore, at a loss in understanding and meaning (Lévi-Strauss 1963:210). Myth is able to maintain its capacities because myths are made up of “gross constituent units” or “mythemes,” which do not have a value on their own, they only receive their value through relationships they form to other mythemes (ibid 1963:211).

It is those units or mythemes, which are of interest for the scope of this research. Lévi-Strauss parses different versions of the Oedipus myth into mythemes and divides them into a chart, enabling him to represent and study the structure of a myth in different ways along a synchronic and diachronic axis (ibid 1963:212). The first, and for my own interests, most important step, consists of parsing the story “into the shortest possible sentences” (1963:211). Whereas Lévi-Strauss’s method for analyzing myths is much more complex than what I describe here, the ‘parsing’ step is the only part of his methodology I am using for my analysis. In other words, I am trying to analyze Man in the Moon and The Brushman into their meaningful units. A main difference with Lévi-Strauss, however, is the level at which my own analysis operates. Unlike Lévi-Strauss, I am not trying to identify the mythemes and the ‘deep structure’ of a myth4. What I am looking for are the broader ‘themes’ that organize Man in the Moon and The Brushman. Such themes represent not the smallest possible units within a story, but larger meaning-carrying units. They are best revealed in the process of discourse production, through what linguists call “intonation units.” Linguist Chafe describes an intonation unit as containing an “initial pause,” which is then followed by a period of vocalization (1987:24). Thus, in my analysis, a theme is a unit of meaning made of several intonation units taken together. It is those themes that then build the basis of my analysis and will be compared to the themes in the other version of the same story. Salmon’s version of Man in the Moon and Peters’s version of the same story will both be parsed into themes, which will then be compared to each other. I will do the same with Sarah Frank’s two versions of The Brushman. This methodology enables me to see whether the emerging themes of Salmon’s and Peters’s versions and Frank’s two versions contain the same information, and are thus identical.

4 See section 2.5 for a discussion of the meaning of myth.
Since only a limited number of recorded Gwich'in stories are available in either English, or in Gwich'in and English, and a limited number of narrators, a dataset consisting of two versions of each story was examined.

2.2. Dennis Tedlock

Dennis Tedlock, McNulty Professor of English and Research Professor of Anthropology, analyzes tape-recorded texts of Zuni and Quiche origin and attempts to give the sounds on the recorded tapes a visible image in the written format. Tedlock (1972) presents narratives from the Zuni as performances. He is not the first to realize the shortcomings in the translations of oral poetics, but he decides to do something about this deficiency so the English translations reflect the characteristics of the voices of the storytellers that were recorded in Zuni. To do so, he uses devices that enable him to convey qualities of spoken Zuni into a printed English format. For instance, Tedlock is able to convey loudness, pitch and pace of the spoken Zuni original into the written English format. Three different type sizes express the level of loudness; the level of pitch is conveyed by the use of superscript and subscript; and a repetition of certain segments of a word, for instance, consonants or dashes, express slowing down. Arranging the performance into verses, lines and spaces directly conveys pauses, and italicized words describe facial expressions, gestures and tone of voice.

Tedlock’s contribution to the field of storytelling consists in the way his English translations reflect the vocal characteristics of the people who performed the stories in Zuni. Quick (1999) compares Tedlock’s system of representing qualities of the sounds in the recordings to “musical scoring,” in which he uses “line breaks for pauses, dots in between lines for pauses of longer duration, capitals for loudness, smaller-than-average type for whispered or softly spoken words. Gestures, facial expressions, and significant audience responses were described in parentheticals and footnotes” (1999:96).

Paralinguistic features play a central role in Tedlock’s work with oral poetry and are used to improve the English translations of the oral poetry. Although there is always a considerable loss of meaning when translating from one language into another one, transferring meaning from an oral medium into a written format only adds to that loss.
However, Tedlock’s methodology enables him to convey the meaning of those Zuni performances in ways no one could before him.

Tedlock uses tape-recorded texts of Zuni and Quiché narratives, annotating the narrator’s paraverbal cues and then translates the narratives into English. He breaks the narratives into different lines wherever a shorter pause warrants such a break. Longer breaks are represented in different strophes, and even longer pauses are represented by even larger spaces than a normal strophe break (Tedlock 1972:xix-xx).

Instead of parsing my stories into different lines and strophes, I use intonation units to divide my stories into units representing how the narrators tell a story. As previously mentioned, an intonation unit consists of an “initial pause,” which is then followed by a period of vocalization (Chafe 1987:24). The intonation units discussed in this thesis may range from a single word to almost a whole sentence, depending on the storyteller. For instance, Moses Peters narrated parts of his story very fast, almost completing a whole sentence between breaths, while Sarah sometimes only said a single word in one intonation unit. Listening for pauses and breathing between utterances were my criteria for marking intonation units.

Like Tedlock, I use paraverbal features to describe the voice quality of the speakers, not because I want to represent the English and Gwich’in versions of a story more adequately, but because I use paraverbal cues to guide my analysis as to a speaker’s intention.

2.3. Dell Hymes

Linguist, anthropologist and folklorist Dell Hymes analyzes texts that were collected by others before him, for instance, by ethnographer Franz Boas (e.g., 1894), for recurring patterns in native language texts, which signify segments within the analyzed text. Those segments are then displayed in different lines, “and, where warranted by the structural features, separate stanzas” (Ruppert and Bernet 2001:27). Hymes shows how narratives of the Chinookan people are organized into lines, verses, stanzas, scenes and acts. According to Hymes, narratives can be organized into verses by looking for sets of discourse features, while verses can be subdivided into lines through distinct verbs. Verses are usually
organized in groups of three or five; those groups of three or five verses “constitute ‘stanzas’ and, where elaboration of stanzas is such as to require a distinction, ‘scenes’. In extended narratives, scenes themselves are organized in terms of a series of ‘acts’” (1977:431). Blommaert states that for Hymes, “the essence of narrative – what makes it poetic – is an implicit level of structure: the fact that stories are structured into lines, verses and stanzas, connected by a ‘grammar’ of narration (a set of features identifying and connecting parts of the story) and by implicit organizational patterns, pairs, triplets, quartets, etc.” (2006:234).

That Chinookan narratives are organized into the aforementioned units is important because it enables us to view such texts as forms of art—orally performed forms of art. Hymes states that “from the point of view of translation, interpretation, appreciation, the analysis gives a degree of control over matters of emphasis, tone, foregrounding, and the like” (Hymes 1977:448). Hymes describes his work in his own words as follows:

The work is structural in method, poetic in purpose. The structural method is no more than an application of the elementary principle of structural linguistics: look for co-variation in form and meaning. The poetic purpose is to come as close as possible to the intended shape of the text in order to grasp as much as possible of the meanings embodied in this shape. Much will still escape. The gestures, voices, tunes, pauses of the original performances cannot be recovered for most of the materials dealt with here. Still, much of structure persists and can be perceived. [2004:7]

Hymes is using pre-collected texts and analyzes them for the recurrence of certain elements such as particles, prefixes and affixes, which oftentimes go amiss in a translation. Those elements help him group a text into lines, verses, stanzas, scenes and acts. His meticulous analysis then helps him compare performances.

When working with the Gwich’in original performances of Sarah Frank’s narrations I find it helpful to look for recurring (formulaic) elements such as ts’á’ t’ēe and aii ts’á’ t’ēe (and then) because those elements seem to connect parts of the story and tend to be said at the beginning of an intonation unit, in between, or at the end of an intonation unit. One of those examples occurs when Sarah says
(1) ⁵
Ajj t'ee naa'in t'ii'ln
And.then brushman doing
'the brushman was doing that'

Many intonation units in Sarah Frank’s story either begin or end with, or contain one of the terms glossed as ‘and then’. However, as mentioned previously, they tend to go astray in translations and may be edited out of a final text.

Ethnopoetic theory is based on the idea that Native American poetry should be analyzed and represented in its original language and culture instead of in a western format (Quick 1999:95). Scholars such as Dell Hymes and Dennis Tedlock pioneered this field of studies since the middle of the twentieth century. The term “ethnopoetics” was first coined in the 1960s by Jerome Rothenberg who recognized a shortcoming in the translations of oral poetics, primarily in translations of Native American poetics (Quick 1999:95–96). Rothenberg and other scholars realized the inadequacies in the translations of Native American oral traditions and therefore sought a better means to represent the beauty of those poems on the printed page. Quick states that scholars advocating the ethnopoetic tradition would analyze the texts in their original language to better account for the ways in which those individual units function in the original context (1999:95). She further states that problems usually arose because the translators tried to adapt the Native American poems to a more English style, assuming that poetry is the same universally, when it is far from that (Quick 1999:96). The main objective of an ethnopoetic analysis is to represent poetry as it is presented in its original language, assuming that poetics is distinct in every culture (ibid 1999:97). While the translations were able to convey the literal meaning of the poems, they were not, however, able to convey the performance and deeper meanings. The performance is often the ritual associated with the story, which provides more depth of experience/insight.

Hymes and Tedlock are both working with the same understanding of an ethnopoetic theory that revolves around a translated text, which should represent poetry

⁵ This example is presented in three-line format; the first line shows the Gwich’in sentence, the second line a translation and the third line an English gloss.
as presented in its original languages; however, the way in which they apply their methods are completely different. While one works with written records, the other uses recordings for his analysis. However, both are able to capture the beauty of the original versions of Native American poetry and transmit them in another language.

Tedlock describes the flaw in Hymes’s approach in that the latter never actually hears the original performance, so that Hymes does not see the importance that underlies in determining pause. Quick states for Hymes it is important “to discover the principles behind the organization—in other words, one must consider why pauses are taken at certain intervals, even in tape-recorded texts” (1999:97). Repetitions occurring in a recurring pattern then make for the most important element in Hymes’s analysis. It is exactly those features that are most likely to be left out of translations because even if they may make sense in the original language, they may lose their meaning in another language. Moreover, translation is a very personal endeavor and each translator has their own criteria and may or may not translate a feature such as repetition. Further, it is also up to the translator whether they communicate their decisions regarding leaving out or adding certain cultural features, such as repetitions or formulaic notions.

2.4. Anthony Webster

Linguistic anthropologist Anthony Webster analyzes Navajo texts for repetition and heightened affective expressivity. Webster (2008) examines a Navajo Coyote narrative that had been told to Edward Sapir. Webster’s aim is to investigate repetition and how it is used rhetorically. He proposes that “while an overt linguistic form such as repetition may exist in differing verbal traditions, we should not expect it to function the same everywhere” (2008:442). In the course of the Coyote narrative, the storyteller uses different forms of repetition to structure his story. Among those forms of repetition are lexical pairings, syntactic pairings and parallelism pairings.

Working with Native American oral tradition may or may not reveal the use of repetition in the original version of the text, depending on the goal of an analysis. However, to see whether repetition really played a role in the narration, it is necessary to consider the original version. This usually involves re-transcribing an oral account because
unfortunately repetition and false starts are often removed from adjusted and printed versions of narratives. This is because in German or English stories aimed at an adult readership, repetition usually puts a bad light onto the narrator because they may not have been able to narrate the story properly due to distracting outside influences such as a recording device or the ethnographer. This is, of course, different when looking at stories addressed at a young readership, where repetition may be used to make a story easier to follow and remember. However, in Athabascan languages it is exactly those devices that might paint an interesting picture for a linguist, because they may reflect a change of thought that was carried out right in that instant, or a deliberate repetition.

Anthony Webster analyzes Navajo texts and looks for lexical pairings, for instance the repetition of one specific word at the beginning of a sentence. Syntactical pairings may refer to the first sentence of a paragraph always being identical, while the rest of a paragraph changes. And finally, parallelism can refer to the choice of “lexical, morphological, and other linguistic devices” (Webster 2008:443).

As with Hymes’s method that consists of looking for recurring elements within stories, Webster’s method aiming at finding pairings within a text, this method is mostly applicable for my own analysis as long as I am working with the Gwich’in originals. Looking at the English translations reveals different elements playing a similar and important role when looking at recurrence. While in the Gwich’in versions (formulaic) terms such as aii t’ee, ts’a’ t’ee, aii ts’aa’ (and then) and váráhnyàa and giíyahnyàa (they say) stand out, looking at the English texts reveals that most sentences begin either with ‘she’, referring to the old woman, while the brushman is mostly addressed with ‘the brushman’. Similarly, the English equivalents of váráhnyàa and giíyahnyàa (they say) are also used wherever the Gwich’in text displayed the use of one of the abovementioned two terms.

2.5. Rodney Frey

Ethnographer and cultural anthropologist Rodney Frey highlights some of the subtle processes behind the translations of Native American texts to demonstrate the many and important features in an “oral literature” based on the Crow story, “The Couple Befriended by the Moon” (1995:217). The narrative examined is transcribed relatively literally,
staying close to its original narration. Frey follows the basic formatting style used for other narratives in Stories that Make the World (1995), marking verses by numbers and scenes with capital letters, each scene containing several verses, “usually three, four, or occasionally five in number” (1995:217). He further marks “recurring series of pairings” such as “parings of scenes, verses, or actions,” and as I will do in my analysis, he made some modifications when re-transcribing to better represent certain features (Frey 1995:218). He also chose to use different English equivalents at times than those in the original text (Frey 1995:218).

Frey’s analysis of “The Couple Befriended by the Moon” has informed my research insofar as it was helpful to see how other researchers dealt with similar issues such as being presented with an already translated text but recognizing that certain changes were made. However, the similarities between our analyses are also limited because he uses verses and scenes to divide his story into units, while I am using intonation units.

Frey (1995) re-transcribes the story “The Couple Befriended by the Moon” in order to show the process behind the transcription and to highlight subtle but significant features of oral accounts, which oftentimes go astray either in the translation of a text, or by bringing an oral account onto paper. He marks verses by numbers and scenes with capital letters, each scene containing several verses. Further, he also marks recurring elements, but also allows for some changes in his re-transcription. He does so wherever he feels such a change would benefit the text.

I am providing my own transcripts of the English version of Man in the Moon and I re-transcribe The Brushman so that I can see in the case of the latter what modifications have been made between the oral version and the printed version in the book. I further annotate paraverbal features of the narrator’s voice to comment upon, for instance, the narrator’s intent. I am doing this because I want to find out whether the same story, and more specifically the themes of these stories, narrated by two different storytellers or at different times are identical. I am attempting to create my own translations to see whether the translation in the book and my own translations contain the same information. Finally, instead of using verses and scenes to annotate the text, I am writing the spoken text in intonation units, which, in my opinion, works best for my analysis.
Before providing some background information on the storytelling traditions in Athabascan cultures, I am going to discuss what the term *myth* means to me.

However, before discussing how I understand the term *myth*, I would like to emphasize that the discussion for a definition of myth has been ongoing for a very long time and still, no complete agreement is found. Myth is a complex issue, not only in anthropology, but in general. There are many working definitions, all of which have their limitations and none of them can be applied universally. For this reason, I chose to use an amalgamation that fits my purpose best. I am, however, aware, that depending on what kind of definition is used to define the term *myth*, different genres such as folktale, legend or parable, among others, will necessarily also result in a different definition.

Anthropologist Franz Boas discusses the resemblance of the Bella Coola legends to those of other Northwest Coast tribes as well as traditions of the Athabascan tribes and raises an interesting topic when talking about stories of native people such as the Bella Coola (1974:148). Stories carry a social value and may only be passed on through inheritance. However, what happens when a people such as the Bella Coola move away from their traditional lands and establish themselves in a new environment? Boas mentions that when “the Bella Coola settled on Bella Coola River, and were thrown into contact with the northern Coast tribes, the lack of a well-developed clan tradition must have been felt as a serious drawback,” and it was then that they started intermarrying with the Bella Bella and as a result, some of “the peculiar customs of the Coast tribes were first introduced among them” (1974:151). Furthermore, intermarriage with the Bella Bella then also introduced them to their clan traditions, and as a result, their stories. Only then were these stories passed on to the next generation and the Bella Coola were no longer without a clan tradition.

The social value of stories was implied by one of the narrators whose stories I am using for this research. Moses Peters mentions in the interview preceding his narration of *Man in the Moon* that his children may use this story when he has passed away. Even though none of the other storytellers make such a statement, it seems conceivable that the Gwich’in follow a similar system, in which stories may only be used when they were inherited. This then, of course, increases the social value of stories.
The confusion about the definition of myth is not a recent occurrence; it seems to have arisen with the idea of myth itself. There is even a disagreement over how to translate the term myth and whether it is more fitting to translate *muthos* with an equivalent like utterance (Tyrrell 1991), or if “speech” or “word” are better representing the true meaning of the term myth (Levin 1959). However, for my research the distinction between the meanings of the term itself are not so important. What is relevant is what the idea of myth encompasses, which is also a very complex issue.

Polish anthropologist Bronisław Malinowski made a very important contribution to the discussion of myth when he stated,

> Myth as it exists in a savage community, that is, in its living primitive form, is not merely a story told, but a reality lived. It is not of the nature of fiction, such as we read today in a novel, but it is a living reality, believed to have once happened in primeval times, and continuing ever since to influence the world and human destinies. [1948:78]

When working with storytellers, researchers are often told that the story they are about to hear is true. The fact that both Salmon and Peters mention a song that was sung whenever the position of the moon was an indicator for a good year regarding food security shows that even though *Man in the Moon* might be considered a myth, it is not just a story as such, but, as stated above, “a reality lived” (Malinowski 1948:78). Both narrators of *Man in the Moon* mentioned how they would sing that song when they were children, and that they would not sing it whenever the shape of the moon implied that the coming year would be harsh on the people. In that sense, *Man in the Moon* is at least to some extent “a reality lived” (ibid 1948:78).

There are definitions highlighting different kinds of meaning for the term myth. Looking at a book like *Theories of Myth: An Annotated Bibliography* (Sienkewicz 1997) will give a small insight into the many ideas discussed when debating the meaning of myth. Even finding a definition for the myths referring to one region can be problematic because the understanding of the term may have changed over time.

Barnard (1966) states that defining myth seems impossible because myth has an elusive meaning; however, he proposes that the reason behind the elusiveness of myths is
because they are subjective, and therefore, each person interpreting a myth will create their own meaning of the myth. It seems therefore fitting to have different meanings of the term myth available and that everyone trying to come to terms with a meaning can adjust the meaning of ‘myth’ insofar as it fits their purpose best. While the particulars of myth are culturally specific, so are the application and uses of myth in daily life.

When discussing myths it is important to acknowledge that finding one working definition for ‘myth’ that will work for each discipline, even just one field, will be impossible. Segal underlines this difficulty when stating,

Each discipline harbours multiple theories of myth. Strictly, theories of myth are theories of some much larger domain, with myth a mere subset. For example, anthropological theories of myth are theories of culture applied to the case of myth. Psychological theories of myth are theories of the mind. Sociological theories of myth are theories of society. There are no theories of myth itself, for there is no discipline of myth in itself. [2004:2]

Among the multiple definitions of myth are many which include gods as important detail distinguishing myth from other narrative genres, a topic that has been discussed, for instance, by Powell (2015) and Sienkewicz (1997). For example, Kerényi defines “mythology as the movement of tales about gods and heroes in which pictorial, meaningful, and musical aspects are prominent” (Sienkewicz 1997:49). While this idea of mythology or myth seems very prominent, it does either not fit my idea of myth, or, the stories in my dataset cannot be considered myths.

Other theories of myth also include a distinction between myth and other genres such as folktales and legends. For instance Bascom (1965) writes that folktale are considered fiction, while both myths and legends are regarded as truthful accounts. While both legends and myths are regarded as truthful, legends happened in the more recent past than myths (Bascom 1965:4). This definition does somehow cover the story Man in the Moon, as both storytellers discuss the existence of a song and a tradition of interpreting the appearance of the moon and the implications of a forward and backward bent moon on the food security of the people, implying the truthfulness of the story.
Fritz Graf (1996) highlights the distinct features of myths: not only do myths have loose relations with a text, but myths are also special in their ability to change and adapt continuously, while they are also extremely culturally relevant. This is another definition that fits my purpose well because it makes reference to the adaptability and cultural relevancy of myths.

Historian of religions Mircea Eliade sees myth as “an explanation, though, strictly, of the origin of a phenomenon and not just of its recurrence” (Segal 2004:54).

The short summaries above showing how certain people understand myth should make it clear that there are many ideas about the understanding of myth. Segal (2004) found a way to work around the problem of the many disciplines, theories and fields working with myths. Myths are perceived and understood differently in fields such as science, philosophy, religion, ritual, literature, psychology, structure and society. Yet, not only do the different disciplines have a different understanding of the idea of myth, but also whether that understanding has changed over the course of time. Even the different centuries have seen splits in opinion about myth. Segal states that in the nineteenth century, myth was all “about the physical world. Myth was assumed to be part of religion, which assumed to be the primitive counterpart to science, which in turn was assumed to be wholly modern” (Segal 2004:137). However, in the twentieth century, “theories have defiantly sought to preserve myth in the face of science” (ibid 2004:137).

Segal proposes that instead of giving myth a very narrow definition, which would ultimately lead to problems considering that so many disciplines and theories have their own ideas what the idea of myth might encompass, he suggests defining “myth as a story,” because even if the different disciplines will probably never agree on what kind of story a myth is, it is nonetheless, a story (2004:4). His reasoning is that if people were asked to name a myth, most people would remember “stories about Greek and Roman gods and heroes;” however, that leads to the next question, which would then ponder what the story is about (Segal 2004:5). Again, Segal has a simple answer: he proposes to say that myth is not just a story, but a story about something important (2004:5). He further suggests that when discussing the main actors within a myth, it is important to be open-minded, because otherwise finding a definition that works for several disciplines might be impossible. He proposes “the main figures be personalities – divine, human, or even animal” (2004:5).
next problem that arises is referring to the function of myth. As before, it would most likely be impossible to get the different traditions to agree on one statement. Segal therefore proposes “that myth accomplishes something significant for adherents” (2004:6). According to Segal, a myth is then a story about something significant that involves personalities—divine, human, or animal—that accomplishes something significant for its adherents (2004).

Finally, Segal also briefly mentions the topic of truth when stating that myths cannot just be grouped together and put into a pot labeled ‘fantasy’. He mentions that there are myths that should be taken as truth, while others may leave the listeners to make up their own minds (2004:139). Much of the information in myths is not about ‘truth’, but about coming to understand the wisdom contained within, which is characterized through the story.

As the discussion in the previous paragraphs has shown, the discussion about a definition for the term myth is far from over. Personally, I like Segal’s very broad understanding of myth and understand the term myth to refer to any story, whether unassailably true or fantastic, that has either happened in the distant past or, if not, is at least being told across generations, about something important that may inform future generations about an occurrence, a person, a thing that achieves something for the knowledge of the listeners. In that sense, whether a myth, true or fantastic, the story of Man in the Moon has taught the listeners of this story that the moon may affect earthly occurrences such as food security. Similarly, the fact that the brushman is known across vast parts of the Arctic, under different designators, may be an indicator that at some point, brushman, na’in, sasquatch, etc. were or are a real thing and have only recently become the material of stories.

Trying to classify the stories discussed in this research in a western system has shown the problems arising when attempting to do so. However, there are other systems that might simplify a categorization. The stories discussed in this research belong to the repertoire of traditional Gwich’in stories, which may be classified into several genres. While there are multiple genres of Gwich’in stories, there is no agreement about the

6 For a more detailed discussion of the different theories and disciplines discussing the problem of defining ‘myth’ refer to Segal (2004).
number of those genres. Similarly, there is no consensus about which stories belong to which genre. For instance, there are stories about the earliest days, stories about travelers and medicine people, another genre includes stories that discuss encounters with the Slavey or Eskimo, and then another one about stories from the most recent past, which describe the relationship and welcome extended towards the newcomers (Gwich’in Social and Cultural Institute 2007:xvi–xvii). McGary (1984) writes that the history of the world can be divided into two parts, one in which human beings and animals were seen as equals, the other one in which they are no longer equal. In her thesis, she classifies stories into those two categories. Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation and Shirleen Smith (2009), on the other hand, mention long-ago stories, which then are divided into several subgenres, as well as first and second generation stories, including travel and the arrival of newcomer stories and finally a category discussing today’s oral history. They divide stories of “long ago” into the following categories: the natural world, supernatural exploits, legendary figures, stories of heroic roles and archetypes and long-ago history (Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation 2009:2). In this classification, both Man in the Moon and The Brushman belong to the “long-ago” stories. Man in the Moon is part of the supernatural exploits genre, while The Brushman is part of the subcategory dealing with heroic roles and archetypes. However, it seems also possible that Man in the Moon could be classified as story about travelers and medicine people, since it includes the idea of the medicine man, which may not be stated openly though.

Regardless of their exact classification, both stories include aspects of supernatural powers and heroic roles, which often include several instances of they say, “denoting that they were passed down by generations of people prior to the specific individual from whom the speaker heard the story” (Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation 2009:3). Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation and Shirleen Smith explain them as follows:

Legendary narratives are generally secular or sacred, occur in the present world, feature human characters, and are often considered factual and historical [...]. Myths are usually sacred narratives that involve non-human characters, occur in an earlier world or a different world, and may be treasured as absolute truth [...]. Folktales are secular, commonly happening outside of any time or place, involve human and non-human characters, and
are regarded as fictional stories with entertainment or educational value [...]. In addition, Gwich’in include some “long-ago history,” such as Tl’oo Thal (Grass Pants), the story of first contact with whites, in yeenoo dai’ googwandak. These kinds of stories appear to be history that has been handed down repeatedly, coming to the elder narrating it not from a first-hand observer or as direct experience but through a chain of tellings, where the original observer may be far removed. [2009:3-4]

As one can see, there are several categories of traditional Gwich’in stories. However, the exact number and definition of genres is unclear. Gwich’in stories, however, are not the only Native American stories that can be classified into different genres. McKinley and Kari list five genres to categorize the oral tradition of the Ahtna: (1) yenida’a stories, stories of a mythic time when men and animals communicated, (2) major events in Ahtna history including stories about clan-origins, wars and well-known people, (3) stories discussing cultural practices and lifeways, such as houses and boats, (4) stories about songs and (5) stories discussing travel and place names (2010:ix–x). Krauss, on the other hand, names the following four genres for Eyak: legends, stories, history and cultural and personal accounts (Harry and Krauss 1982:18–19).

Lovick (2012) addresses an interesting topic in her essay on the narrative genres in Upper Tanana Athabascan discussing how the boundary between certain genres is not always as clear as it seems at first sight. She mentions that the reasons behind the difficulty of finding a classification system are multiple. Speakers’ opinions may differ as to what genre a specific story belongs to; whole groups may classify a traditional story as history, while the same story might be considered a myth in another group (Lovick 2012:1–2). Lovick further mentions distinct styles and explains that the use of rhetorical devices such as repetition may be an indicator for a genre, but a speaker may also use it to dramatize a personal narrative (ibid 2012:2). In my opinion, one of the most important points she makes is that finding indicators for a genre in one cultural group and trying to apply them to another group may lead to a flawed outcome (ibid 2012:2).

For the abovementioned difficulties of classifying stories, I like to think of both stories discussed in this research as true or fantastic stories that happened in the distant
past that have been told across generations, about something important, such as survival in the wilderness, that may inform future generations about an occurrence such as the moon eclipse, a person or a thing such as the brushman, that achieves something for the knowledge of the listeners. However, I do recognize that there are already-existing categories for stories such as the ones I am researching, but because of the aforementioned difficulties in categorizing them clearly, I like to think of them outside of that classification system because this system is of a cultural (western) origin apart from that in which the stories discussed in this thesis were created.
Chapter 3: Background

This chapter provides some background information on the Gwich’in people and storytelling in Athabascan cultures.

3.1. The Gwich’in of North America

The Gwich’in, sometimes also called Kutchin or Loucheux7 (pejorative: ‘cross-eyed’), are an Alaska Native and a Canadian First Nations people who inhabit a large region in northern North America between the Mackenzie Flats and Peel River in the east to the Yukon Flats and Chandalar River in the west. The name Gwich’in means “one who dwells” (McKennan 1965:14). They also commonly refer to themselves as Dinjii Zhuu, a term that oftentimes refers to all Native Americans. The first people to establish contact with the Gwich’in were explorers, missionaries and fur traders. Specifically, it was the Scottish explorer Sir Alexander Mackenzie who established the first contact with the Canadian Gwich’in in 1789 (Nelson 1986:13). Alexander Hunter Murray established the first contact with Alaskan Gwich’in sometime prior to 1847. However, until the Hudson’s Bay Company established posts at Fort Good Hope (1804), Fort McPherson (1840) and Fort Yukon (1847), contact between Gwich’in and Europeans remained scarce (Leechman 1954:5). Ever since the trading posts were established, European and American influence has been steadily increasing (Nelson 1986:13-14).

Missionaries also played an important role in the historical contact between the Gwich’in people and Europeans. However, it was not for many years after the aforementioned forts were built and transportation routes were established that British and French missionaries arrived (Mishler 1990:121). Even though Anglicans and Roman Catholics were competing for the conversion of the Gwich’in, they traveled together on several occasions resulting in “some highly charged and dramatic confrontations” between the missionaries (ibid 1990:121). Mishler states that the Anglicans won the competition for the conversion of the Gwich’in not only because they were the first ones to arrive and because they stayed longer than other missionaries, he also lists that “they were supported

_________________________
7 Spellings and names vary: Gwich’in, Gwitchin, but also Kutchin or Loucheux.
by the Hudson’s Bay Company Protestant infrastructure, which included sympathetic bilingual interpreters and (apparently) a large supply of tobacco” (1990:125). However, another factor contributing to the Anglican and American Episcopalian success is that they “encouraged Native ministry and Native lay readers,” a condition that strongly continues to the present (Mishler 1990:125).

Depending on different sources, the Gwich’in are divided into either eight or nine bands. The sources listing eight Gwich’in bands include arctic northern anthropologist Hall (1969), anthropologist Balikci (1963) and curator of anthropology and researcher of Athabascan people of Alaska, Osgood (1934, 1936). Anthropologists Nelson (1986) and Krech (1978), along with ethnographer McKennan (1935) list nine Gwich’in bands. The reason behind this confusion is that the ninth tribe, the Di’haii, have escaped previous mention due to their small number and because they were decimated through warfare with the Inupiat and subsequently merged with the Neets’aii Gwich’in (McKennan 1935:369). All of the aforementioned sources agree, however, that the Gwich’in can be divided into the following eight bands: (1) Yukon Flats, (2) Birch Creek, (3) Chandalar River, (4) Black River, (5) Crow River, (6) Upper Porcupine River, (7) Peel River and (8) Mackenzie Flats (Nelson 1986; Krech 1978; Hall 1969; Balikci 1963; McKennan 1935; Osgood 1934, 1936). On the Alaskan side, Gwich’in people live in Arctic Village, Beaver, Birch Creek, Chalkyitsik, Circle, Fort Yukon and Venetie. On the Canadian side of the border, Gwich’in people live in Old Crow, Aklavik, Fort McPherson, Inuvik and Tsiigehtchic. However, large parts of the Gwich’in population on both sides of the border have also moved to bigger cities.

In the past, the Gwich’in were organized into three exogamous and matrilineal clans (McKennan 1965; Balikci 1963; Osgood 1936). Osgood writes that in theory, those three clans were exogamous, but marriage within the clans was very frequent (Osgood 1936:107). He further states “descent reckoned through the female line” and that a member of any of the three clans could marry into one of the other two clans (ibid 1936:107). However, most Gwich’in are no longer familiar with the divisions and functions of this system, though many Elders preserve the memory of these clans.

The language of the Gwich’in can be broadly divided into two dialects: an Eastern (Canadian) and a Western (Alaskan) dialect (Krauss and Golla 1981). However, each settlement/band also has its own dialectical variations.
Changes in the life of the Gwich'in people started immediately after the first contact with Europeans: the arrival of incomers brought change in almost every aspect of Gwich'in life. Before and long after the arrival of the newcomers, the Gwich'in were a people who survived off the land. They lived a subsistence lifestyle, made their clothing and housing from materials taken from the land, and had trading relationships with other native peoples. The arrival of the incomers brought change in aspects of Gwich'in life such as diet, materials, money and religion.

While the influx of newcomers may be seen as having many positive effects on the people, there are also changes that have a negative outcome. For instance, alcohol, tobacco and diseases were introduced, which in a wider sense may be held responsible for the loss of language and culture. Schools were opened, which enforced a proper, by US American standards, education. In the past, parents, uncles and grandparents educated children indirectly, through examples derived from everyday activities, and taught them how to live off the land (P. Peter; I. Roberts; B. Stevens, personal communication, June 2014).

Knowledge was passed on by means of oral tradition. This knowledge was not taught at the US boarding schools, and so it was rapidly lost, along with language, through overt policies of assimilation. The Gwich'in have a very rich oral tradition that includes stories about almost every aspect of life. Stories that might seem trivial to outsiders may contain important moral and educational lessons for the Gwich’in. In the past, those stories were usually narrated in Gwich’in; however, with the implementation of English as the main language spoken in schools, and especially because using their native language often meant punishment, children soon lost the capacity to speak their own language due to isolation from their own people in the boarding schools.

In the first few years after contact, the Gwich’in language was still maintained and spoken by a large part of the Gwich’in population, but as time passed, fewer people learned the language. Consequently, stories were no longer narrated in Gwich’in and knowledge was often transmitted in English (P. Peter; I. Roberts; B. Stevens, personal communication, June 2014).
3.1.1. Language Revitalization

Having grown up in a society where storytelling, or at least my understanding of storytelling, was limited to children, I found that storytelling has a much more important status in oral societies than in literate ones. For instance, Beth Dementi-Leonard mentions that narrating a story is one of the ways in which “community language learning” takes place, one of the ways in which culture and language may be revitalized (1999:49). Additionally, stories may be used to transmit certain moral or educational values implicitly. William Schneider also mentions that stories may outlive the peoples they belong to because they mean something to a specific group of people and accomplish something for more than just one person (1995:192).

Taking Gwich’in classes and the occasional linguistics course, for example, Athabascan Linguistics with Gary Holton, enabled me to get a deeper understanding of the language situation in Alaska. Reading texts, for instance, by Michael Krauss deepened my understanding of language loss and endangered languages (1997; 1992; 1981; 1980). Further, talking to Gwich’in people like Paul Williams Sr., Bill Stevens, Irene Roberts, Pete Peter and Hishinlai’ Peter also made me aware that dealing with the effects of language loss is not a simple undertaking. While most of the indigenous peoples themselves see the need for action if they want their language and culture revitalized, taking even just a first step might lead to difficulties within the community because unfortunately, some people condemn any outsider influence (P. Williams Sr., personal communication, June 2014).

Assimilation of indigenous peoples into the mainstream American culture is an effect of the “English-only” policy implemented shortly after the arrival of explorers, fur traders and missionaries (Reyhner 1999:xii). With the implementation of English as the main language spoken in schools, and especially because using their native language was cause for punishment, Alaska Native children soon lost the capacity to speak their own language due to isolation from their own people in the boarding schools. This marked the beginning of the cultural and linguistic assimilation of the indigenous peoples into mainstream American culture.

As part of this linguistic and cultural assimilation people also gave up aspects of their traditional lifestyles, including their oral tradition. While some people try to pass parts of their knowledge on to the next generation, this can most likely no longer be done in
the native language. For instance, Irene Roberts told me that she tells stories to her children and grandchildren whenever she has the opportunity, but not even her own children are fluent in the language anymore, let alone her grandchildren. As a result, she narrates the story in short sections, first giving the Gwich’in version and then performing an English version of the same sequence, always explaining what she just said.

According to Littlebear, indigenous languages are slowly dying. He emphasizes, “It is the last and only time that we will have the opportunity to save them. We must continue to promote the successful programs throughout Alaska and Indian Country” (Cantoni-Harvey et al. 1996:xv, emphasis added). This quote nicely stresses the importance of indigenous efforts in the preservation, maintenance and revitalization of indigenous languages. Indeed, it was often non-natives terming the languages in question “dying and moribund,” and outsiders were also the ones deciding whether the efforts taken were successful or not (Dimenti-Leonard and Gilmore 1999:39). However, it was also predominantly non-natives implementing policies that were developed by other non-natives. The influence of incomers on education, religious views of the natives and the introduction of diseases resulted in the need for new policies. As a consequence of the reduction of the natives’ belief in their traditional culture, “language, cultural, and spiritual loss” was effectively induced (Dimenti-Leonard and Gilmore 1999:39). While in the past, most of the literature pertaining to “language planning, revitalization, and shift was written by non-indigenous scholars,” currently there is an increasing number of publications originating from “indigenous scholars” (Leonard 2007:18–19). Among the increasing number of indigenous scholars writing on the topic of language revitalization, language planning and language shift are Sikorski (2008), Leonard (2007), King (2003; 2001), Littlebear (1999), Warner (1999), Wong (1999) and Zepeda (1995). Some of the non-native scholars writing on the topic include Kealy (2014), Shaul (2014), Mihas (2013), Meek (2010), Henze and Davis (1999), Hinton and Ahlers (1999), Crawford (1997), Fishman (1991) and Cooper (1989).

---

8 For a more in-depth discussion of language revitalization efforts and storytelling refer to Leonard’s dissertation Deg Xinag Oral Traditions: Reconnecting Indigenous Language and Education through Traditional Narratives (2007).
3.2. Storytelling

Many authors claim that storytelling is a very old tradition and that it has been practiced as long as humans have walked this world. Among the authors who discussed this topic are Roney (2001), Norman (1990), Breneman (1983), Baker (1977) and Shedlock (1952). For instance, Baker mentions how “storytelling is older than history and is not bounded by one civilization, one continent, or one race” (1977:1). While stories may be different in different parts of the world or at different points in time, they may serve the same causes and basic needs regardless of where they are told (Baker 1977).

Storytelling is a form of art and communication that has existed since long before the beginning of civilization. Regardless of place, ethnicity and time, people have always told stories. Baker explains,

> The first written record of an activity that appears to be storytelling is found in an Egyptian papyrus called the Westcar Papyrus and tells how the sons of Cheops, the great builder of pyramids, entertained their father with stories. Those tales were recorded sometime between 2000 and 1300 B.C. [1977:2]

While stories might be distinctive in different parts of this world and from century to century, no matter where in this world we are, “storytelling has filled the same basic social and individual needs” (ibid 1977:1).

A long time ago, before writing systems were invented, storytelling was used to communicate, and this use of storytelling continued to be an important tool for communicating knowledge long after the invention of writing systems (Tooze 1959:15). The earliest storytellers were most likely curious beings, searching to understand the beginnings and in need of entertainment, and thus storytelling came to be. In ancient times, the storyteller had a very versatile role. The basic human need to communicate introduced the storyteller “as bringer of news, historian, disperser of culture, upholder of religion and morals, as well as entertainer” (Baker 1977:1). For a while, the status of the storyteller stayed the same and the stories became a combination of “legends, mythology, hero tales, and anonymous personal tales” and the status of the storyteller became even more grounded in society (ibid 1977:1). In the absence of a writing system, people had to
rely on oral narration to transmit any kind of information to each other. With the creation of writing systems in ancient and classical times, and the invention of printing following much later in 1450, people began to write stories down, and thus the importance of storytelling and the storyteller changed ever so slightly (Baker 1977:2). And although storytelling continues to be part of every society, its “role and its significance has fluctuated from one period to another” (Breneman 1983:5). While in the beginning storytelling was used as a form of communication to transmit any kind of information, later on certain aspects gained in importance. Among those aspects are, for instance, art, entertainment and business.

3.2.1. Storytelling in Native American Cultures

Explorers, fur traders and missionaries were among the earliest collectors of stories (e.g. Gabriel 1993; Mishler 1990; Burch 1979; Krech 1978; Osgood 1936). Most recently, indigenous storytellers working with linguists have produced an impressive collection of material; some of it is intended for use in classrooms or communities, while some of the material is more publicly available and documents oral literature and oral tradition in written form (Ruppert and Bernet 2001:1).

Storytelling, especially the telling of traditional stories (stories that have been told across generations) has long been practiced and is a well established means of communicating narratives among indigenous peoples. According to Kroeber, storytelling is completely different in Native American cultures than in western societies because Native Americans largely developed their cultures without writing, putting even more emphasis onto storytelling (2004:1). Although writing systems have been developed and illiteracy has disappeared widely, storytelling, as part of their oral tradition, still holds an important value for many Native Americans.

Norman (1990) states that for native people of the arctic and subarctic, folktales were always an important part of their culture. Several authors discuss topics linked to storytelling in Native American cultures. Among those authors are Ruppert and Bernet (2001), Norman (1990), McGary (1984), Harry and Krauss (1982), Rooth (1976) and

---

9 I acknowledge that storytelling may occur in other forms than in its oral form. However, for the scope of this thesis, I am only discussing oral narrated stories.
Jenness (1924). Among those topics, time, function and audience are mentioned frequently.

On the subject of time, Canadian anthropologist Jenness explains that storytelling occurred whenever several native people met, which was more likely to occur during one of the long winter nights than during the summer (1924:1).

Osgood, curator of anthropology and well known researcher of the Athabascan people of Alaska, also mentions time, listing that stories were mostly told at night, sometimes continuing into the early hours of the following morning (1936:105).

Ethnographer McKennan also collected an impressive amount of stories in his time, listing storytelling as one of the most important leisure time activities, practiced whenever two or more native people met, usually leading to a sort of contest between the men, making the one who could tell the most stories the winner (1965:49-50).

Rooth, a Swedish folklorist, dedicated a chapter in *The Importance of Storytelling* (1976) to time, an unquestionably important factor when discussing storytelling in the context of native cultures. She uses information gained from different native peoples across Alaska to inform readers about the time when stories were most likely narrated. She states that stories were most often told at night; however, fall and wintertime in general were also good times to narrate a story. She further mentions seasonal storytelling, meaning that not only were stories most likely told during the winter, but that certain stories were, for instance, believed to bring good luck in hunting and were told during that season specifically (Rooth 1976).

Linguist Krauss, who has done extensive work on Eyak since the 1960s, presents a small part of Anna Nelson Harry’s “storytelling art” in *In Honor of Eyak: The Art of Anna Nelson Harry* (1982:19). Krauss used recordings that were made of Anna Nelson Harry at different points in time. He mentions that comparing versions to one another is very interesting, not for the language used to narrate those stories, but for their content. He states that the content between versions often differs greatly, reflecting “the story of Anna’s life and Eyak history” (Harry and Krauss 1982:20). He further writes that especially the versions that were made later in her life included much more “personal meaning, wit, and wisdom that could only be Anna’s, and Eyak” (ibid 1982:20).
McGary, a former Alaska Native Language Center editor, who wrote a master’s thesis on Gwich’in stories, writes that Katherine Peter, who provided most of the transcriptions and translations McGary based her thesis on, confirmed that storytelling was an undertaking most likely to occur during the winter and that men were the most likely storytellers (1984:49).

Ethnologist, anthropologist and archaeologist De Laguna wrote that storytelling was used to pass time during long, cold winter nights, before lamps and electric light made it possible to work during those hours (De Laguna, Reynolds, and DeArmond 1995:73).

UAF English professors Ruppert and Bernet (2001), who dedicated a book to Athabascan and Eyak stories, state that in the southern and interior parts of Alaska and the Yukon Territory stories were told almost entirely during winter, naming early winter and midwinter specifically good times for distant-time stories (2001:2). However, they also mention how the rest of the year was by no means considered a bad time to tell stories, they state that specific times of the year might be predestined for one genre of story more so than another one. As examples they list that summer would be the time during which so-called mountain stories would exclusively be narrated, whereas personal narratives could be told at anytime (Ruppert and Bernet 2001:2).

The function of Athabascan storytelling is also an important topic because indigenous stories often have more than one function. Several of the abovementioned authors also had something to say on the functions arising in Athabascan storytelling.

Jenness (1924) witnessed storytelling as a favored leisure time activity, practiced whenever several people met. He mentions that in Alaska those stories and traditions were repeated so often in “semi-stereotyped forms” that soon not only aged men were able to recite them, but also younger ones (Jenness 1924:1). He further introduces the idea of real storytellers, calling them “‘raconteurs’,” describing them as those men who knew the old tales and traditions so well that they were invited into people’s homes to perform them; a performance often took several evenings to finish (Jenness 1924:1).

McKennan (1965:53) mentions “moral tales” as an efficient means to teach children correct conduct; stories were often told not just to entertain, but also to educate. These moral tales continued to be told and listened to by adults, reinforcing cultural norms for behavior.
Rooth came to the same conclusion: while stories may have been told for entertainment, storytelling often had other functions as well (1976:25). Rooth uses the name "purposely pedagogical stories" to refer to stories that were used to teach children a lesson, reciting a story from one of her contacts about a moose encounter, properly teaching children how to behave if they encountered a moose and had no means to escape (Rooth 1976:32–33). She goes even further in discussing stories told in connection with enculturation, dividing them into the following three categories: (1) explanatory stories, encompassing stories referring to "how certain features come into being, such as the colors of different animals, the length of the caribou's legs, the bent stems of the cones," (2) elucidating stories, consisting of stories explaining "the origin of the world and its present shape or impart important technical knowledge" and (3) initial stories, explaining "customs and artifacts" (ibid 1976:39–53).

McGary provides a whole list of functions for native stories. Among those functions she mentions: "moral and practical instruction; psychological integration; establishment of a sense of history and social identity; achievement of status for the storyteller; and intellectual entertainment and amusement" (1984:51).

Katherine Peter, Athabascan linguist and tradition bearer, gives a practical explanation stating how growing up hearing stories about hardship taught them to be prepared (McGary 1984:49).

De Laguna highlights the importance of storytelling in a culture without writing, where oral tradition was the only means to preserve the wisdom and knowledge of elders (1995:74). Communicating any knowledge in such a society had to be done orally, best also repeatedly due to the potentially ephemeral quality of a story or any kind of information in general.

And finally, Ruppert and Bernet state that as individual performances, oral narratives "engage cultural conversations, ongoing discourses, and group values" (2001:6). They see the stories in their work belonging in one of the three categories: for instance, a story may be told to entertain. If not, stories might be used to inform people about different topics, and finally, stories may also be told just for the act of telling them, emphasizing the importance and connection between "the human and the spiritual worlds" (Ruppert and Bernet 2001:6).
Audience response is another important factor when discussing Native American storytelling because an audience could have an enormous effect on the way a story is narrated. A story may be adapted and different moral and educational lessons may be pursued with one and the same story, adjusting to each different audience anew. However, there is also often a strict adherence to the particulars of a story to prevent its alteration between tellings and between generations.

Discussing narrative style and audience, Rooth explains that a narrator may change their style, enabling the teller to shorten stories and highlight the most important parts of those stories instead of telling the story in its full length (1976:59).

McGary also dedicated part of her thesis on Gwich’in stories to discuss the audience, emphasizing that by creating an unnatural setting for the recording event, an audience response or the interaction with the audience may be disrupted because either there is no one in the audience who knows the story, or the listeners are hesitant to disturb the recording (1984:72).

De Laguna also briefly discusses the influence of the audience, stressing that an audience does indeed have an effect on the telling. She states that even if the same narrator tells the same story more than once, the versions would still be different because the audience is never the same, even if the same people are technically listening, highlighting both the narrator’s and audience’s different attitudes (1995:74).

Cruikshank also discusses the audience and their influence on stories, stating that in Native American storytelling, there is a relationship between the storyteller and their audience, and that further, a listener may gain knowledge by hearing stories multiple times, enabling them to think about the meaning of a story differently each time a story is heard (1998:59).

Ruppert and Bernet also discuss the influence of the audience on the storyteller, stating that even if a storyteller’s audience may vary greatly, a narrator has to be able to resonate with their audience (2001:13).

Storytelling in Native American cultures is subject to a variety of factors involved that may affect the performance of a narrator, possibly allowing for multiple versions considered the same story even though the story is presented differently each time it is performed. Storytelling, as done by Native Americans may at times be done simply for...
entertainment; however, more often than not, stories are told with a lecturing undertone, educating the listeners by telling a story that includes fictitious elements, which demonstrate real life lessons.

3.2.2. Oral Tradition

Elsie Mather, a Yup’ik Elder, once nicely described the brevity of oral tradition: “When stories are written down, they lose a kind of fluidity. Words and phrases become fixed, more like objects. They also become the subjects of more interpretation, acquiring definite meanings through analysis” (1995:15). This quote introduces the problematic aspects of bringing oral traditions onto paper.

Ron and Suzanne Scollon mention several peculiarities in their discussion about stories they collected in Chipewyan. On the one hand, they were unable to record stories simply in the native language, they would always hear stories “in pairs,” referring to a Chipewyan and English version (Scollon 1988:26). On the other hand, narrators called storytelling teaching. As bearers of oral tradition, simply saying the words so that they could be first recorded and then in a later step analyzed made no sense at all (ibid 1988:26). They further discuss oral narratives as interaction between a storyteller and their audience, emphasizing the importance of an audience on the narration itself (ibid 1988:27).

Cruikshank cites Angela Sidney, a Tagish storyteller, when writing that oral tradition should be perceived as “social activity,” because meaning is created whenever something such as a story is told; the meaning is not part of the story, but of the interaction between the storyteller and the listeners, and therefore can change with each telling (1998:xv).

Former oral cultures, such as the peoples of Native Alaska nowadays, have not only written accounts of stories that were collected when missionaries and fur traders first came to Alaska, they also have their oral tradition, continuing to live on as long as there are people who are able to tell stories the way they learned them from their parents, grandparents and uncles.

However, an issue that has only recently come up, due to the disappearance of illiteracy within the native cultures, and primarily because of the creation of written records of those formerly only orally available stories, is that now these oral traditions are
written down, which may make them more readily available for comparison. While in the past, the same story may or may not have been exactly identical with another version, a written record will compellingly show whether those versions are actually identical.

Leonard discusses how “aspects of documentation, translation, and interpretation or analysis of oral tradition” affect oral tradition (2007:33). If several versions of a story exist, but only one of them is written down, people are inclined to believe that the one written version holds more importance than the other ones. It is also very likely that people unfamiliar with the wealth of stories in native cultures may simply assume that there are no other versions. Additionally, a storyteller may adjust their version depending on a range of factors such as audience, time or place. A different indigenous audience may trigger a storyteller to adjust their performance; however, bringing in a non-native audience, forcing a performer to narrate the story not in its natural language or setting is even more likely to evoke a variation in performance, which might then lead to questions regarding the authenticity of the story.

Creating a written format of an oral story will affect the ways in which that story can be analyzed. It is important to acknowledge the influence of transcribing, translating and interpreting on any text. While in the source language a text was performed orally, the process of transcription may have already changed parts of the text in case the spoken performance and the written duplicate are not exactly identical. Translation will inevitably change even more of the original text, especially if other than the performer of the source text creates the translation. If another person produces the new text, a whole new set of ideas enters the process. Among the authors who have worked in this field and who have dealt with problems as the aforementioned ones, are, for instance, Hymes (2004; 1977) and Tedlock (1999; 1985; 1983).

It is also important to recognize that taking a story from a spoken context and reproducing it in the same or in a different language in a written context will affect its appearance. As Sarris nicely states, it is important to have a holistic view of language and recognize “what might have been lost or gained in the transcription and editing of the speaker’s spoken words” (1993:99). In that sense it is important to be aware that for the scope of my thesis, similarities and differences noted in the English versions of the texts I am analyzing may not be identical with the similarities and differences of the Gwich’in
source texts. However, Ron and Suzanne Scollon make an interesting point when they explain that in what they call “translation sets,” a narrator would first tell them a story in Athabascan and then would tell them the same story in English, out of concern for the listeners’ understanding (1981:107). They further note that a comparison of the Athabascan and the English version of the story display “a striking parallelism,” for instance at times the English version may be almost a “line-by-line translation,” whereas at other times something that might be marked “morphologically in one language may be marked intonationally in the other” (Scollon 1981:107). Assuming that the performance of Moses Peters and David Salmon work similarly, my findings in the English versions of the stories I am analyzing in this thesis are relevant, but some of the findings might alter slightly from what I may have found had I analyzed the original versions.

Ruppert (1995) explores how storytellers can mediate the way they tell stories, using different styles to perform, sometimes adapting to the language and culture of their audience. He makes a compelling case discussing how narrating a story not in its original language will not, contrary to popular opinion, diminish the quality of the information in the narrative, but rather it allows a narrator to highlight different elements without actually changing the story.

Schneider (1995) also raises an important point discussing his work with Peter John. For Schneider, oral tradition is intricately linked to the storyteller. Without knowing the storyteller, there is no oral tradition because only by getting to know one another a listener really understands what a storyteller is saying. Schneider further states that the relationship between the narrator and their audience will determine the way a story is told (1995:195).

Tedlock refers to the relationship between a text and its interpretation as “dialectical,” whereby a storyteller will adapt a text only insofar as is necessary and “both respects the text and revises it” (1983:237). This may allow for minimal deviations between variants of the same story, leaving room for more or less detailed versions and slight alterations in presentation.
3.2.3. Similarities

Storytelling in Athabascan cultures such as in the Gwich'in nation and in western societies, for example in Europe or in the United States\(^{10}\), have several things in common, while in other aspects storytelling is rather different. Both storytelling traditions began under the same basic conditions. First, Athabascan storytelling tradition is based on a former and partially continuing oral culture. Similarly, before the invention of a writing system, stories, as well as any other kind of information had to be communicated orally in western societies, too. This situation was the norm for the vast majority of people even following the advent of writing due to widespread illiteracy—a situation that persisted into the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Second, in Athabascan cultures, storytelling was used as a means to communicate, meaning that much information was transmitted by means of stories. In the same way, storytelling enabled communication of any kind in western societies. Any kind of information, regardless of its content, was transmitted by means of a narrative. Third, both in Athabascan and western storytelling anyone is basically able to narrate a story; however, only very few people are born storytellers, people who can delight their audience and capture their attention with their performance. Fourth, in Athabascan cultures there are several different genres of stories that may be counted as traditional stories such as myths, legends, oral histories, folktales, parables, etc. Similarly, western societies have different genres of stories such as fairytales, folktales, myths, legends, etc. Fifth, moral or educational lessons could be part of a narrative in the Athabascan storytelling tradition. In the same way, stories in western societies used to include moral and educational lessons and sometimes still do. Finally, knowledge acquired from ancestors was passed on through stories in the Athabascan tradition. Likewise, oral narratives were used to transmit knowledge from forebears in western societies.

However, the invention of writing and the much later invention of printing in Europe in 1450 AD brought a shift upon the two traditions. Writing systems were invented in many places of the world a long time before Athabascan cultures were even discovered.

---

\(^{10}\) I am aware that storytelling even within Europe cannot be classified as one single tradition. However, for the scope of my thesis I am simply referring to those traditions as the storytelling traditions of western societies.
by Europeans. Thus, the importance of storytelling in western societies decreased and changed shortly after a writing system was introduced, though only among European elites, whereas storytelling and folklore persisted strongly among the long-illiterate commoners who comprised the vast majority of populations. Since Native American cultures were oral cultures much longer than most of the United States and Europe, their oral tradition is much more alive today and has preserved some of its original importance.

Several authors (Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, De Fina, and Nylund 2010; Kroeber 2004; Livo 1986; Baker 1977; Tooze 1959) discuss how in western societies, storytelling tradition may differ from the way stories are used, for instance, in the Gwich’in culture.

During the Georgetown roundtable on languages and linguistics, stories were described as being the means for human beings to “dream, plan, complain, endorse, entertain, teach, learn, and reminisce,” however, narratives are also used to give us “hope, enhance or mitigate disappointments, challenge or support moral order, and test out theories of the world at both personal and communal levels” (2010:1). This quote nicely highlights that narratives may be used for much more than storytelling in itself. Indeed, while those narratives are told in the form of stories, the content is the purpose, not the story itself—it’s the ideational ‘vehicle’.

Kroeber mentions in the introduction of his book on indigenous storytelling that for us, possibly referring to any non-indigenous culture, storytelling is primarily an instrument used in our search for entertainment, a way to amuse ourselves lightheartedly and sometimes to waste time (2004:6).

Livo states that the manner of narrating a story may be different in distinct cultures because storytelling has to agree with the “oral literature traditions of the culture” (1986:8). She lists the ways in which stories are introduced or ended, the amount of narrator and listener interaction, formality, as well as the “use of artifacts and ritual devices” as depending on the oral tradition of a culture (Livo 1986:8). Since storytelling in our European American society has mostly an entertaining function, it is acceptable and even desirable for children to interrupt and ask questions, whereas in other traditions, an interruption in the middle of a narration might be frowned upon.
Baker highlights that after the invention of printing, storytelling changed slightly. Before the invention of writing systems and printing, storytelling was used to transmit any kind of information, later, “the traditional prose tale, the story handed down from generation to generation either in writing or by word of mouth, became the stuff of storytelling” (1977:2). It is mostly these aforementioned prose tales, which may be enjoyed solely for the pleasure of doing so that are associated with storytelling in western societies. Educational or moral values may only play a secondary role in our stories even if those values may technically be transmitted through stories. However, the most important objective of listening to a story in our society is to enjoy a form of entertainment.

Finally, Tooze mentions how after first being introduced as man’s earliest means of communication, subsequently storytelling has transformed into a real form of art (1959:v). It is this form of art that nowadays is most important in western societies, while in traditional cultures11, storytelling may still be used to share traditional knowledge and pass on moral and educational values.

In conclusion, storytelling as understood in Native American cultures and in western societies does have some similar functions, namely that storytelling may be enjoyed as a form of art, a way to entertain ourselves. However, the storytelling traditions also differ from each other insofar as storytelling is used to pass on cultural, educational and moral values in traditional cultures, while this function has been mostly lost in the storytelling tradition of western societies.

---

11 I consider traditional cultures to be traditional when they retain traditions across more generations than others, relying on older traditions than others.
Chapter 4: Methodology

This research is a case study. It does not attempt to be representative of all possible manifestations of the stories I am analyzing, nor does it attempt to be representative of any stories not discussed in this research. The intent of this research is to provide the readers with a view of storytelling that has been little studied in the academic field discussing Gwich’in stories. I explore the idea of how similar two versions of a story are, by comparing the emerging themes of two versions to each other. Two versions of Man in the Moon are investigated by looking at the English performances of the two Gwich’in speakers and storytellers David Salmon and Moses Peters. I explore the same idea by looking at two versions of The Brushman by Sarah Frank that were recorded five years apart. The versions of these stories are then compared to each other and differences and similarities between individual themes of the two versions of the same story are noted. I anticipate that the two versions of Man in the Moon contain less identical themes than Sarah Frank’s two versions of The Brushman. This assumption is based on the premise that one story, Man in the Moon, is narrated by two different storytellers, whereas the same storyteller narrates The Brushman five years apart. While the time between the two narrations of Sarah Frank’s story should certainly not be de-emphasized, I am assuming that details such as the material of clothing is likely to stay the same when the same storyteller narrates a story at different points in time in contrast to when different storytellers tell the same story. I am making this assumption based on discussions with some of my Gwich’in contacts who mentioned that a story narrated by different people, especially when they are from different villages, may include different detail such as the material of clothing depending on the availability of animals in the closer vicinity of the villages (I. Roberts; B. Stevens, personal communication, June 2014).

The reason why those two specific stories were chosen for this research and not any other stories from the vast collection of stories of the Gwich’in nation is that I wanted to use already existing recordings, or that I would be able to record stories myself. I found that being able to work with already existing material was invaluable for this research. Finding suitable recordings and in some cases even transcriptions and translations has
been of vital importance for this thesis. Craig Mishler guided my research to the two versions of *The Brushman* in his book *Neerihiinjik* (1995), and a search of the oral history database in the Rasmuson Library revealed two versions of *Man in the Moon*. The oral history database contains many more recordings of Gwich’in stories; yet, for *Man in the Moon* there is not only a Gwich’in version, but also an English one. In addition, finding a story that was available as a recording in both Gwich’in and English, and searching for a story that was moreover performed by more than one person further limited my choice. Since *The Brushman* had already been transcribed and translated for a book I was able to use those adjusted transcriptions and translations from the book as a basis for my own transcription. In the case of *Man in the Moon*, I could not locate any transcriptions. Therefore, I decided to create a transcript of the English performances of both David Salmon and Moses Peters that would serve as basis for the analysis. The Gwich’in versions of *Man in the Moon* were not used for this research, even though they are available and part of the same recording.

The present thesis is limited by the language investigated, which presently only consists of an analysis of the English performances and translations of the texts. The results therefore only reflect the similarities and differences of the English themes in each story. However, I argue that the results of this thesis are valid, particularly because linguist Scollon mentions a striking parallelism when comparing the English and Chipewyan versions of stories he investigated (Scollon 1981:107). With my method of analyzing two versions of the same story by looking at the information contained in the themes of each story, I am able to show whether several versions of the same story contain identical information. An extension of my study could provide meaningful insight into how similar the same story is when an analysis is also provided of the Gwich’in versions and by comparing more versions to each other.

4.1. Collecting Stories

The interview I conducted with Dr. James Kari, an emeritus professor of linguistics, included semi-structured questions and was open-ended. This approach allowed the interviewee to explore topics from his own perspective, and most importantly allowed him
to guide me towards his own examples, but still enabled me to control the direction of the interview.

I wanted to find out (1) whether he remembers hearing the same story from the same storyteller more than once, (2) whether he heard the same story from different storytellers, (3) whether he thinks it is possible that a storyteller is able to tell a story the same way each time they narrate it, (4) what influence he thinks non-native listeners have on the way a story is narrated, (5) whether he thinks the gender of the storyteller plays a role, (6) whether he has told stories himself, (7) what he thinks would happen if a person would recount a story inaccurately, (8) whether it is even possible to tell a story inaccurately and finally, (9) what role translators have in the process.

Dr. Kari has done extensive linguistic work in several Athabascan languages, making him an interesting interviewee, especially since he also had the chance to work with many different storytellers firsthand. Unfortunately, working with storytellers is getting rare these days, a point Dr. Kari emphasizes. He mentioned that eliciting a story from just any speaker of a language might not get a researcher the results they want. According to Kari (personal communication, November 2014) it is important to work with “real storytellers” when attempting to do comparative work12. Picking the right informants might affect the results a researcher can receive. Dr. Kari had the chance to work with some very knowledgeable people like Mary Tyone and Shem Pete, two excellent storytellers in his opinion. Not only was Dr. Kari able to record several versions of the same story by either the same storyteller at different points in time, but also by different storytellers. Each version is as unique as the storyteller who narrates it. However, finding the same motifs or themes is relatively easy when working with real storytellers, a prerequisite, according to Kari. As examples he lists Spider Woman or The Butterfly Story, mentioning that while the motifs are the same, the details may be different, resulting in longer and shorter versions depending on the amount of detail. However, the fact that meetings are usually planned ahead of time also gives the informant, or narrator in case of stories, the advantage of reflecting what and how they want to discuss/narrate a story, event, etc. beforehand.

---

12 Linguist Jim Kari used the designation “real storyteller.” The only times I am using this designation is when referring to this interview. I am not attempting to explain or define who is or is not a real storyteller.
An interesting detail that emerged when discussing variations of the same story concerned the audience on a performance. As an example, Kari tells about working with Shem Pete and receiving the same story twice, once when it was just the two of them, a requirement for a good recording, and another time with several other Dena’ina (formerly Tanaina) speakers in the room. The version narrated in front of the Dena’ina audience was about 50 percent longer because Shem was so energized due to his indigenous audience. Audience responses led him to perform the same story including much more detail that emerged in the version performed when the audience consisted only of James Kari. However, the story was still the same as the one Dr. Kari recorded when it was just the two of them in the room.

Another topic arising in the same context was the influence of non-native listeners on the ways a story is told. According to Kari, stories might be slightly altered depending on the audience. Performing in front of a native audience, a storyteller can be relatively certain that their audience will understand any non-obvious meanings, whereas in front of a non-native audience, any heavily embedded meanings would have to be mentioned and explained. However, whether explanations are given or if a story is narrated without any accompanying explanations also depends on a narrator. As a linguist who has worked with many different storytellers over the years, it is possible that Dr. Kari either already knows certain stories so well that no explanations are given, or that they are expressly given because he pursues a specific objective by recording a specific story.

The influence of gender on how a story is narrated is another interesting topic. Kari had the chance to record spider woman by both Martha Jackson and Fred John, two people with very distinct personalities. He notes that their versions of the story are “pretty strongly similar,” indicating that gender may not play such an important role in how a story is told, but maybe more so in what story a person would tell (J. Kari, personal communication, November 2014). It is very likely that the content of a story is the same, even if different narrators tell the story; however, the amount of detail or specific detail such as materials might differ slightly depending on where a narrator is from.

Regarding the topic of an incorrectly narrated story, the emerging answer showed that even an excellent storyteller is always willing to learn more and accept different versions and unique styles of other people, especially since people mostly do not work off
strict memorization, leaving room for distinct interpretations and different detail. Kari discussed the example of Shem Pete, whom he calls an excellent storyteller and one of the greatest narrators he ever worked with. He mentioned that sometimes Shem Pete and Anton Evan would stay at the same place and exchange stories, usually stories they both did not know in full. By the end of their meeting, both narrators had a new story in their collection, each having taken bits and pieces from each other’s versions and assembling a mutual version. This topic also led to a brief detour about recordings done in group settings, which Kari mentions may be inhibiting to some people, and also resulting in rather poor recording quality. The presence of people who are familiar with the story or native speakers of the language can result in ‘corrections’ and also more disciplined awareness of how the story is being told—especially to an outsider. Kari, however, mentioned only instances in which variations of the same story were accepted by either native speakers or other storytellers.

The final topic addressed was translation. Kari explains his approach, which includes accounting for every spoken line and using alternating lines. As an example, we briefly looked at *Ttheekädn Ut’iin Yaaniidq’ Oonign’ – Old-time Stories of the Scottie Creek People* (1996). The book includes stories told by Mary Tyone in Upper Tanana Athabascan, which were transcribed and edited by Dr. Kari. Except for the foreword by James Kari, an appreciation of Mary Tyone by James Ruppert and some information on the Upper Tanana dialects and writing system, the book follows the same structure throughout: titles in Upper Tanana and English are given, reference to recording date and tape are made, which is followed by a short introduction if necessary, and then follows the first sentence in Upper Tanana and English.
Table 1: Dr. Kari’s Approach to Translating Upper Tanana Stories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doodagndįį</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How I Learned The Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded November 8 and December 5, 1994. Tape 4B.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**T’ay t’oot’eey neenaattheh xa ch’ah naxognign.**
I am telling the really old-time stories from before our times.

**Ay neenaattheh sts’ikeey iin itadulsi’ ts’a’ hixha huushya’ xy sts’ikeey iin xa neenaattheh xa naxognign.**
I tell these so that my children will read of the old times and so that my children can then gain the wisdom of the old times. ¹³ ¹⁴

Except for the table format, the reader of Dr. Kari’s publications encounters the same format in the aforementioned book. At times, there is an additional line, showing some additional information given by Mary Tyone, prefaced by the initials of the speaker.

Dr. Kari states that some people may prefer a different style, but he has had good experiences with his approach, which includes accounting for each spoken line and using alternating lines to display the Upper Tanana and English text, respectively.

He further emphasizes the importance of repetition and false starts when creating a translation for a story. If a translator decides to omit repetition and false starts, in its own way a form of cultural redaction, for the sake of the storyteller, he may be doing more harm than good by saving the face of a narrator. He may indeed neglect to cover a narrator’s intent of repetition. Similarly, deciding that a succession of several syllables may be a mistake on the part of the storyteller and not reflecting it in the final version in the same way may obscure the narrator’s change of thought.

Having had the chance to interview someone who was able to work with storytellers firsthand and discuss the abovementioned topics was a great help in consolidating my understanding of not only storytelling, but also what it means to record stories and work with the material gathered in an interview. Dr. Kari was further very helpful in outlining his own techniques and enriching them with examples from his own fieldwork, deepening my own understanding of all the processes involved.

¹³ For a more detailed impression of Dr. Kari’s approach refer to *Theek’ādn Ut’iin Yaaniiq’ Oonign’ – Old-time Stories of the Scottie Creek People* (1996).
¹⁴ *Theek’ādn Ut’iin Yaaniiq’ Oonign’ – Old-time Stories of the Scottie Creek People* (Tyone 1996:1).
4.1.1. Man in the Moon

*Man in the Moon* is a story about a boy who has the ability to foresee the future, aids his people in times of need by telling them that they would soon catch some caribou, and as a price wants a caribou of his choice. However, that caribou is already claimed, so that the boy’s wish is not granted. This leads to tears on the boy’s side. At some point the boy announces that he will leave his people and live on the moon, which is naturally met with incomprehension from his parents. Although the boy is watched carefully from that point onwards, he is still able to set off in the middle of the night. He returns to his parents a few more times to tell them how to survive in times of starvation, to inform them on the peculiarities of the shape of the moon, and to console them.

4.1.2. The Old Woman and the Brushman

*The Brushman* is a tale about an old woman who lives along a river, sustaining herself off the land by snaring, singeing and eating ground squirrels. Her routine is abruptly interrupted when a brushman appears and starts to annoy her. The old woman reciprocates his annoyance by throwing heated intestines at him, effectively killing him in the process.

4.1.2.1. Story Characters

The two stories discussed in this research, *Man in the Moon* and *The Brushman*, revolve around several characters, all of whom I will introduce here very briefly. *Man in the Moon* revolves around a young boy with the ability to see into the future. The story further includes the boy’s parents and another man, possibly the boy’s uncle. *The Brushman* revolves around an old woman who has a camp along a river. In her attempt to live a peaceful and quiet life, the old woman is interrupted by a brushman, a feral individual who is widely known among Athabascan groups.
4.1.2.1.1. Brushmen

The brushman, sometimes also called bushman, and among the Gwich’in known as na‘in, is a being often held in fear, but also greatly respected. Some non-academic authors (Bourne 2003; Wallis 1998; Kaye 1992a, Kaye 1992b) as well as McGary (1984) writing about the brushman all agree that brushmen were ostracized from their groups for disobeying rules. The brushman is a widely known figure among northern Athabascan groups. Whether brushmen are real human beings who have been outcast by their groups for acts of cannibalism or by committing murder, or if they are personified supernatural beings, or humans who have acquired supernatural qualities, that is the question. A question that may receive varying explanations, sometimes even within the same culture and community. McGary describes na‘in as “semi-human creatures [that] are generally supposed to have originated from ordinary humans who committed some awful crime, usually cannibalism, and became savage, cave-dwelling hermits” (1984:37). Velma Wallis recounts that Jeffrey John, her former husband, encountered a na‘in when he was hunting above the Chandalar country (1998:24). A similar account is related by John Bernard Bourne of a road trip taken on the ice road near Rae Lakes in the Canadian Northwest Territories. He explains that the sighting occurred during a blizzard when they were stuck in the middle of nowhere on Faber Lake, somewhere between Gameti and Rae-Edzo. The bushman was nothing more than a quick glimpse of something tall and hairy (Bourne 2003:33). Bella Francis tells of Vi‘it gwaat’ral, “the solitary brushman whose avoidance of human contact became a folk legend” (Kaye 1992b). Bella Francis relates that growing up she and her siblings were warned of different forms of the brushman. Vi‘it gwaat’ral, supposedly a real na‘in, was a man whose wife left him for another man. Hurt, he left his group to live in solitary existence; only returning to his people toward the end of his life (Kaye 1992b:H6). While a brushman may just be a lonely man seeking a solitary life in the wilderness, not trying to bother anyone, brushmen are often described as malicious, staying close to camps, and occasionally stealing from the people, kidnapping women and children, and even killing those who venture into the wilderness (Kaye 1992a; Kaye 1992b;

15 Spelling of the Gwich’in term for brushman vary: na’in, naa‘in, na’en. In this thesis I am spelling the Gwich’in term as follows: na‘in.
McGary 1984). Furthermore, no agreement could be reached, as Wallis so aptly describes, whether the brushman is “a myth, a monster or a lonely man” (1998:24). Existing in many northern Athabascan cultures, *na’ín*, sasquatch, bogeyman, etc., have been an integral part of many myths and legends.

4.2. Transcribing

Transcribing the recorded versions of *Man in the Moon and The Brushman* enabled me to analyze the data in ways an analysis of a written account would not have permitted. For example, using recordings of the stories instead of a simple written account enables a scholar to analyze the data for the actual spoken text, any paraverbal features of the storyteller’s voice reflecting what they are doing with their voice, such as tone, pitch or pacing, as well as any additional noise that could have affected the narration of the story by, for instance, requiring repetition. Linguist Ladefoged describes tone as “pitch variations that affect the word,” and pitch as an “auditory property that enables a listener to place it on a scale going from low to high” (Ladefoged 2011). In a language such as Gwich’in, two distinct words may be written the same, but their pronunciation may differ. Speakers of such a language know which word is meant by listening for tone.

Furthermore, when using a recording of a spoken text, a researcher can annotate anything they consider important, whereas a written account will most likely only display the actual, possibly adjusted, text. Each transcriber has the choice to transcribe the features they consider important and leave out what they deem of little importance. Undeniably, decisions about the extent of a transcription are subject to a multitude of factors involved. Among those factors are, for instance, whether a transcript is further used, what purpose a transcript serves after its creation and who the anticipated addressee of a transcript is. Naturally, those factors change with each transcription and may not only be subject to the transcriber’s own opinion, but may depend on the opinion of others as well. It is important to be aware that what appears in a transcript does affect further procedure and establishes the character of a transcript. For instance, representing repetition and false starts may actually show a speaker’s intent to repeat certain segments or it could be a sign that the speaker changed their thought right there (J. Kari, personal
communication, November 2014). Yet, repetitions and false starts are often deleted from a final transcript because they may put the speaker in a bad light, and may be erroneously interpreted as speech impediments, while in fact the speaker may have intended to use those devices.

The processes of transcribing the two stories chosen for this research, *Man in the Moon* and *The Brushman*, did not only require general decisions such as determining what to transcribe, for instance whether or not to annotate inhaling and exhaling or background noise, but it also required decisions about the manner of transcribing. Transcribing in intonation units may be the most appropriate approach because it reflects spoken language; yet, for the understanding of the story as a whole it may be more useful to annotate in whole sentences, or at least annotate not only intonation units, but also provide a literary version that may be closer to or further away from the actual spoken text. Linguist Chafe describes an intonation unit as containing an “initial pause,” which is then followed by a period of vocalization (1987:24). In any case, transcribing a spoken text requires certain decisions from the transcriber that will affect a potential subsequent analysis. Thus, I decided to transcribe both stories and all four versions myself, even though both of Sarah Frank’s versions of *The Brushman* were already transcribed and existed in written form.

4.2.1. The Old Woman and the Brushman

The process of transcribing *The Brushman* involved the peruse of the text in Craig Mishler’s book *Neerihiinjik* (1995). The written Gwich’in version in the book was first and foremost used as a guideline for myself, and secondarily to identify whether the printed text and the actual spoken text were correlates. Moreover, the adjusted transcript in *Neerihiinjik* (1995) was used to complete the transcript so that the version used to work with is a complete transcript reflecting every spoken word insofar as words could be recognized as such.

While I used the Gwich’in text in *Neerihiinjik* (1995) as a basis to create my own transcript, in which more of the spoken text is reflected than what appears in the book, the English version in the book was almost fully accepted in its published form. The reason behind this decision was that it might not be possible to create a comprehensible
translation. Yet, an attempt was made to create a translation of almost every intonation unit in the ELAN file to see whether the English version roughly reflects the Gwich’in version. To do this, I used both the *Gwich’in to English Dictionary* (Alexander 2008) and the *Gwich’in Junior Dictionary* (Peter 1979). Although dictionaries were used, it was still not possible to create complete and comprehensible translations of intonation units since those two dictionaries have a naturally limited scope and do not include every word a language learner could possibly need. The result is, therefore, a word-for-word translation where possible, and for those instances in which not every Gwich’in word could be accounted for, I provided as many English equivalents as could be found with the help of the two aforementioned dictionaries. Those ‘transcriptions’ of intonation units in English were then used to examine the version available in *Neerihiinjik* (1995). Subsequently, some of the English sentences in the book were slightly altered to reflect the written Gwich’in more closely. Those changes include, but are not limited to, word omissions or the exchange of one word for another one. In addition to the already mentioned (1) Gwich’in intonation units, (2) the English translation of intonation units, I also annotated (3) whole Gwich’in sentences, reflecting the version in the book, (4) a literary version in English, containing mostly whole sentences, (5) paraverbal features such as pauses, which may be used to create suspense, (6) background information pertaining mostly to noise coming from the recorder, tape or microphone, (7) additional information such as communication directed towards another person in the room and finally (8) themes emerging in the story.

4.2.2. Man in the Moon

I decided to work only with the English performances of David Salmon and Moses Peters, fully aware that the English performances of the two storytellers were most likely not equivalent to their Gwich’in performances. Therefore, there were almost no language related problems during the creation of the transcripts for *Man in the Moon*; nevertheless, the process came with its own share of problems. Transcribing the English spoken texts of the two storytellers was for the most part an uncomplicated process. Both narrators were able to narrate the story in English. There was one instance in Moses Peters’s version of the story where it seems likely that he substituted a Gwich’in word for an English one, which is, as Hymes calls it, code-switching and might be an indicator for a ‘‘breakthrough’
into full performance” (2004:90). However, right after the occurrence of this word Moses switched back to English and narrated the rest of the story in English.

Since Man in the Moon was only transcribed in English, there was no need to create translations. Therefore, I annotated the following criteria: (1) Bridjette March’s spoken text in intonation units, (2) David Salmon’s and Moses Peters’s spoken text in intonation units, (3) a literary version for each speaker, the majority of which are represented in whole sentences if possible, (4) background information comprising elements such as the noise coming either from recorder, tape or microphone, or animal related disturbances, (5) additional information such as the speaker mentioning something that was not part of the story, (6) paraverbal features and (7) occurring themes of the story.

4.3. Translating

The translation of Sarah Frank’s two versions of The Brushman was already provided in Neerithiinjik (1995); nonetheless, even translating a few intonation units was a challenge. Not only had decisions needed to be made pertaining to the choice of a word in case more than one equivalent existed in Alexander’s (2008) or Peter’s (1979) dictionaries, but also is translation only rarely a simple and straightforward process. Translation has been a debated topic for centuries. Among the scholars working on the discipline of translation are Jakobson (1959), Catford (1965), Toury (1995), Nida (2003) and Pym (2014). While in the past, translation was a prescriptive discipline, more recent approaches are of a descriptive nature. Even the introduction of translation as academic discipline could not end the debate between prescriptivism and descriptivism in the field. More recently even, cultural translation emerged, which emphasizes the importance of adapting culturally important concepts from the originating language and culture into the language and culture of the target language.

Even if the performer of the original performance provides a translation, the translation process will still not be a simple undertaking. Were another person to provide a translation, as in the case of The Brushman, there is a whole new set of ideas and in a sense ideologies entering the process. In this specific case this means the reader is not only presented with Sarah Frank’s choice of Gwich’in words and meanings, but also Lillian
Garnett’s. Furthermore, Sarah Frank provided a spoken text that was transcribed and appears in an almost identical form in *Neerihiinjik* (1995), with a few modifications and omissions. However, the translation was created as a written medium and was revised and edited before it appeared in a form that is easily intelligible for the English-speaking readership. At times, as my attempted translation of single intonation units has shown, the Gwich’in text and the English version in the book do not appear to be very similar. However, I am in no position, nor do I want to criticize the end product or what may have been changed between the audio-recorded version and the version that was published. I simply want to draw my readers’ attention to the fact that more than one person was involved in the creation of the written Gwich’in text and the published English translation. Furthermore, I am pointing out that there is a small discrepancy between the version heard on the audio-recording and the published Gwich’in text in *Neerihiinjik* (1995).

4.4. Interpreting

Working with a version that is not of the same medium, for example an oral vs. written account, involves a whole new level of interpretation and “is not a simple mechanical reproduction of what can be heard on the tapes, but an expressive and critical interpretation” (Frank 1995:xxiii). Involving another person in the process of interpreting the original text and creating a new text only adds to the complication. Sarah Frank narrated the story *The Brushman*, a story about a woman who courageously defended herself against a stalking brushman, in Gwich’in. Both versions were fortunately transcribed and translated by the same person, Lillian Garnett. Otherwise I would have been not only working with oral and written texts, but also facing the challenge of working with versions that might not be comparable on stylistic grounds because transcribers and translators, just like storytellers, each have a distinct style. However, Lillian Garnett was the only transcriber and translator involved in the creation of all four versions of *The Brushman*. In the process of translating Sarah’s words, Lillian Garnett interpreted the Gwich’in oral versions and provided an equivalent in English. According to Mishler, Lillian Garnett’s transcriptions are “literary, preserving only the essential words, eliminating false starts and many quotative redundancies,” allowing for certain discrepancies between the
recorded version and the one that appears in print (Frank 1995:xxiii). Mishler discusses the process of transcription and translation in the introduction to *Neerihiinjik* (1995) and explains how the transcribers marked the minutes and seconds of the texts at frequent intervals and that the person providing the translation used identical time marks, which led to a relatively close correspondence between the original Gwich’in texts and the English versions (Frank 1995:xxiii).

4.5. Recording Performance

“When stories are written down, they lose a kind of fluidity. Words and phrases become fixed, more like objects. They also become the subjects of more interpretation, acquiring definite meanings through analysis” (Mather 1995:15). This quote reflects that there is a difference between a written account and an oral version of a story. However, the above quote also nicely summarizes exactly what I am attempting to do in this thesis. I am taking an oral account, a story performed by different storytellers or at different points in time, and I am analyzing them, or more precisely their themes, for similarities and differences to find out whether the same stories are ‘identical’.

When people tell each other stories, they seldom do so in a monotone voice. We often use different voices to impersonate other speakers or we use phrases such as ‘he said’, ‘she said’ to convey that we are talking for someone else. In doing so, we do not just ‘tell’ a story, we actually perform it. For instance, Bauman discusses the use of the term ‘performance’ in conjunction with folklore “because it conveyed a dual sense of artistic action—the doing of folklore—and an artistic event—the performance situation, involving performer, art form, audience, and setting” (1975:290). Some of the scholars working on performance are Hymes (2004; 1996; 1977), Tedlock (1999; 1983; 1972) and Bauman (1975).

Probably all of the recordings that were used for this thesis were accomplished by creating an artificial situation. We know from Mishler’s introduction in *Neerihiinjik* (1995) that the storytelling events were set up with a specific goal: to collect as many stories as possible from people who have grown up with a specific storytelling tradition and were some of the last to live and know that tradition. By setting up such events, a researcher will
necessarily create an artificial situation and a performance may differ from a performance under normal circumstances.

This is probably one of the bigger problems encountered during fieldwork because the presence of the researcher will almost always create an artificial situation, even when the researcher is part of the community under observation or has known the people they work with for a long time. However, in documenting stories, this might just be the price we pay—a contrived event, sometimes even including an interview before the actual story is narrated, probably further adding to the contrived situation.

It seems conceivable that each storyteller discussed in this thesis has most likely different ways of narrating the stories examined here. Telling the stories solely to a researcher who is recording the event may differ from when the same story is performed in front of several people. Stories may also vary when told to a native audience as compared to a non-native audience. When dealing with a native audience, a storyteller can assume that many listeners understand any subtle or even non-obvious meanings of a story. However, if the story performed in front of a non-native audience, messages may have to be communicated openly because non-obvious meanings may otherwise be lost on the listeners. A non-native audience may not be used to understanding non-obvious meanings or moral lessons of a story, whereas native audiences are more likely to pick up those meanings because they may have grown up hearing the same stories over and over again, or they are already aware of the concept of non-obvious meanings embedded in stories.
Chapter 5: Analysis

In this chapter, the analysis of David Salmon’s and Moses Peters’s versions’ of *Man in the Moon* and Sarah Frank’s two versions of *The Brushman* are presented. Following this chapter is a discussion on my findings and the implications of what I have learned through this research.

5.1. Man in the Moon

*Man in the Moon* is a story about a boy who is able to foresee the future and help his people in the search for food\(^\text{16}\).

5.1.1. David Salmon

The first narrative that I will present was told by David Salmon, a retired Episcopalian priest, former Chief of Chalkyitsik and the First Traditional Chief of the Interior, on September 26, 1972, in Chalkyitsik\(^\text{17}\). He told the story to Bridjette March in an interview that lasted approximately 26:30min; the first part is an interview in which the interviewer asks him questions (1) about himself such as where he is from and where he grew up, (2) further questions are regarding his function as Episcopalian priest and finally (3) questions concerning the story such as where he learned it and what the function of the story is. David Salmon then narrates the story first in Gwich’in, which lasts approximately 12 minutes, and then gives an English performance of *Man in the Moon*, which is slightly longer than the Gwich’in version.

The quality of the recording is good, although throughout the story, different noises can be overheard. However, they do not reduce the quality of the overall recording or the audibility of David Salmon’s voice. If anything, they make the recording more authentic, since most of the noise can be attributed to animal sounds such as the chattering of birds or human noises originating from people speaking in the background. By far the most

\(^{16}\) For a more detailed description of the story refer to page 49.

\(^{17}\) https://www.tananachiefs.org/about/our-leadership/traditional-chiefs/chief-david-salmon/ [retrieved February 2, 2015].
interruptions can be accredited to the tape recorder and concern either the microphone or tape itself, which might suggest that the microphone was worn on a piece of clothing.

After listening to the story several times, I transcribed the story with the help of ELAN. To simplify the analysis, the following data was transcribed on different levels (tiers) within one and the same file: (1) intonation units Bridjette March, (2) intonation units David Salmon, (3) a literary version, (4) paraverbal features, (5) background sounds, (6) additional information and (7) story elements. The reasons why I chose to annotate the aforementioned information are diverse. The speakers’ utterances were transcribed in intonation units to guarantee that no information was missing. A literary version was created to simplify the analysis because working with a version that consists of whole sentences simplifies the analysis incredibly. Paraverbal features were transcribed because they may provide additional information about a speaker’s attitude in ways a simple annotation of the spoken words may not. For instance, slower and quicker spoken segments as well as pauses may reflect a speaker’s dramatization, while a simple annotation of the spoken words may not communicate this information. Background sounds were annotated in case they would affect the recording, which they did not. However, in all the recordings used for this analysis, background sounds were almost always present. Additional information was annotated in the transcript but is not discussed here. The information contained in those tiers concerns, for instance, change in language or the beginning and ending of a version. Finally, story elements and themes were annotated because they build the skeleton of the story.

A clear advantage of working with ELAN is that the transcription is displayed in an ongoing window within which the transcriber has the option of scrolling back and forth and has so the opportunity to move around the document with relative ease. The display is very user-friendly so that it is easy to see what is occurring at the same time. The transcriber can not only choose what to transcribe, but also in which order to display the information. The utterances of David Salmon and Bridjette March are both displayed in intonation units, since an intonation unit most closely represents the way a person speaks. Additionally, a line was created to display a literary version, in which the data is shown in whole sentences to improve legibility.
The little boy is a kid with special abilities, for example, he can foresee the future.

5.1.1.1. Intonation Units of Bridjette March

The only time the interviewer can be heard is during the first two minutes of the recording. Bridjette March prompts the interviewee with nine questions.

5.1.1.2. Intonation Units of David Salmon

Following the transcription of the interviewer’s questions is the transcription of David Salmon’s version of *Man in the Moon*. David Salmon narrated the story, which was transcribed in intonation units, which were then examined for emerging themes and story elements.
5.1.1.3. Literary Version

The main purpose of creating a literary version of both narrators’ utterances was to enable a smoother reading and handling of the transcript. The actual recording was almost solely used in the beginning until a transcript was created. During the analysis, the audio recording was only used to verify that the transcript reflected the audio recording. The literary version given in examples 1-9 is my own gloss.

5.1.1.4. Paraverbal Features

Paraverbal features enable a speaker to underline, modify or even negate their message (Linke, Nussbaumer, and Portmann 1991:309). On the level of paraverbal features, David Salmon uses pauses to create suspense, while a more slowly spoken segment may be an indicator for the end of a theme. Listening to his recording shows that David is not just telling Man in the Moon, he is actually performing the story. For instance, he uses direct speech when he is talking as the boy (i.e. line 173, 185, 238). The example on line 173 can be seen here:

(2)
well he told his: ... parents that tomorrow they gonna kill bunch caribou .. bi::g herds of caribou
‘he told his parents that tomorrow they were going to catch some caribou.’

He signals that he is talking as someone else by using ‘he said’ or, in this case, ‘his uncle said’, on line 243:

(3)
An his uncle said .. no this is mine.
‘his uncle said no because this was his.’

18 References made to line numbers in this section correspond to the line numbers in appendix A.
19 Examples are presented in two-line format, showing the transcription of the text as it was narrated in the first line and a gloss. A # sign symbols uncertainty as to whether the word presented is the one used by the storyteller, while a period indicates a pause in speech and a colon a slowly spoken segment.
But not only does David use direct speech in his narration, he also adjusts his voice whenever he uses direct speech. While there is no monotone part anywhere in David’s narration, the parts in which he speaks as the boy or someone else stand out more because he adjusts his voice to sound more like, what I imagine, the characters he impersonates.

By far the most noticeable paraverbal device in David Salmon’s version of the story is pausing. David uses pauses to create suspense throughout the story and make his listeners anticipate his next words. There are several instances throughout the story in which he keeps the listeners anxiously waiting for his next words. For instance, on line 213, David makes a dramatic pause after he says:

(4)  
he look around #eh for the caribou you know because  
‘he looks around for the caribou because’

He makes a pause before he tells us that the boy is looking around because he realizes that all the caribou are already divided at that point. Shortly after, he does the same on line 221 when he says:

(5)  
and when he got to the place you know . he look at the caribou an: .. here and there and he walk around and finally  
‘when he got to the place he walked around and looked at all the caribou and finally’

What follows is the part in which he tells us that the boy approaches his uncle and realizes that he has claimed the caribou the boy wanted. In both cases the listeners are kept waiting for what is to follow. David creates two of the most dramatic pauses towards the end of the story. One, when he narrates the part of the story when the boy returns to his parents in the bottom of the sled. Starting on line 478, David says:

(6)  
his mother was pulling ... sled you know with dogs .. one dog and finally the sled is caught has caught something you know an ... just can’t pull it  
‘his mother was pulling the sled with the help of a dog, but the sled gets caught on something and she can’t move it anymore.’
Salmon makes a dramatic pause before he tells us that the boy is the reason why the sled can no longer be moved. The other very dramatic pause occurs when David is about to fill his listeners in on the implications of a forward and backward bent moon. Starting on line 594 he says:

(7)
I gonna leave right now but .. every day you gonna see me in the moon for a:ll the generation for ever but one thing I gonna tell you is #the
‘I’m going to leave right now, but you will always be able to see me in the moon, and there’s one thing I’m going to tell you right now’

This is followed by lengthy pause before he informs us on the meaning of the moon eclipse and on the implication of a forward and backward bent moon.

While David uses a more quiet voice (e.g., line 252, 270, 299, 331, 366) or slower pace (e.g., line 144, 175, 184, 331, 366, 380, 437, 638) throughout his narration, quietness and slowness are used less in comparison to how he uses pauses to dramatize his narration and create suspense. For instance, when the boy arrives at the scene of the kill and realizes that his uncle claimed the caribou he wanted and informs the uncle that this is his caribou. The uncle responds by telling him that he will not give up that specific caribou, and the boy replies softly on line 252:

(8)
that’s mine since yesterday
‘that has been mine since yesterday.’

In this example it is possible that Salmon speaks more quietly because he wants to show that the boy shows deference to an older person by using a more quiet voice, while still stating his wish. An example of Salmon speaking more slowly than usually emerges on line 175 when he explains that the boy has a vision and foresees how his people would catch some caribou in the near future and says:
tomorrow they gonna kill bunch caribou. big herds of caribou will be enough for all the ... #kch-peoples
‘tomorrow they were going to catch some caribou, enough for everyone.’

Especially the segment ‘big herds of caribou’ is spoken more slowly than the rest, and might be used to underline the size of the caribou herd they were going to catch.

While a slower pace or a more quiet voice may be indicators for the end of a theme, this is not true for all transitions from one theme to the next one. A reason behind this might be that the transitions between themes are not very clear-cut. Sometimes, the transitional period between themes is occurring over several lines and may even include additional information that is not part of the story, such as Salmon explaining that he personally saw the fireplace (l. 390) or repetition of information, such as the boy returning to his parents several times (l. 578). For instance, in the transition from the first theme (the boy has a special ability) to the second theme (the boy has a vision), Salmon guesses the boy’s age and states that people did not know about the boy’s special ability. Between the second and the third theme (one of the caribou is meant for the boy), he mentions that the next day the people are going to hunt, but they would not catch anything. However, the day after, the people were going to catch some caribou. Between the third and fourth theme (by the time the boy arrives, the caribou are already divided), David gives some additional information about what would happen the next morning, and between the sixth (boy cries because the uncle won’t give up the caribou) and seventh theme (caribou are covered by snow), Salmon mentions briefly that they packed some of the meat. In the transition from theme eight (one caribou comes back to life) to theme nine (boy cries over the lost caribou), the listeners find out that the escaped caribou did not leave any meat behind, the only proof that there was a caribou buried in snow are the tracks leading away from the burial site. In the transition between theme fourteen (parents can see the boy in the moon, with his dog and a caribou front quarter) and theme fifteen (parents’ sled is stuck; boy is in the bottom of the sled), Salmon explains that the people kept getting weaker with each passing day even though they went hunting every day but did not catch anything, before he mentions that the parents find the boy in their sled. In the next
transition, Salmon explains that this was just the beginning of a long famine before the people would catch caribou again, while between theme 21 (forwards bent moon is a sign of starvation) and theme 22 (song), Salmon explains that his mother used to tell him this story when he was a child and that was also when he learned about the song.

To summarize, David uses his voice to dramatize his narration by pausing, slowing down or speaking more quietly throughout his narration of Man in the Moon. By adjusting his voice whenever he uses direct speech he makes the characters in his story become alive. He successfully uses his voice so that he is able to keep his listeners’ attention.

5.1.1.5. Background

The section background encompasses sounds that may be attributed to (1) tape, recorder, or microphone, (2) animals, (3) other people, (4) household and (5) movement. The reason for annotating those sounds was in case any of them would have affected the narration of the story. However, the noise did not seem to affect the process of recording the story, nor did it disturb the storyteller. Listening to the whole recording has shown that noise seems to be omnipresent, whether it is an animal squeaking, people talking or moving.

5.1.1.6. Story Elements

During the course of this research essential elements building the skeleton of the stories emerged. Those elements either belong to or represent themes themselves presented later in this thesis.

Emerging elements in David Salmon’s version of Man in the Moon are (1) the boy’s special ability, (2) crying, (3) the parents, (4) leaving for the moon, (5) living quarters, (6) caribou, (7) food, (8) moon eclipse, (9) clothing and (10) a song.

Considering only Salmon’s version of the story enabled me to find half of the story elements because they recur many times throughout the story. Those story elements are: (2) crying, (3) the parents, (4) leaving for the moon, (6) caribou and (7) food. Those elements emerged because they were mentioned very often, giving the impression that they are important for the plot of the story. The remaining elements, (1) the boy’s special
ability, (5) living quarters, (8) moon eclipse, (9) clothing and (10) the song only emerged after analyzing both versions independently and then comparing them. The boy’s special ability, the living quarters, the moon eclipse and the song only stand out because they occur in both versions. Considering only one version may not have brought these elements out, but because they exist in both versions, they seem to be important for the story as a whole. Only one element, clothing, emerges because the narrators describe it differently. While in one version the boy is wearing clothes made from caribou hide, the other version depicts him as wearing marten fur clothing, or probably a combination of both caribou and marten skin. However, this is not stated explicitly.

Element 1, for instance, contains information about the boy’s ability to foresee the future, which is directly linked to the boy telling his parents that the people will kill a bunch of caribou or moose, and the boy announcing that among those killed animals there is one specific caribou for himself. Listening to Salmon’s Gwich’in performance of this story has revealed that he did not explicitly discuss this special ability or give it a Gwich’in name such as the Gwich’in term for medicine or magic (nagwahtsi’). According to Hishinlai’ Peter20 (personal communication, May 2015) he explained special ability as ‘seeing things that are not real’ in Gwich’in, while in English he describes the boy as special and always predicting things ahead of time. I imagine that the reason why Salmon did not discuss the boy’s special ability any further in his English performance may be linked to a possible taboo regarding the discussion of certain topics such as magic or medicine with non-native people, while I think that his Gwich’in performance did not include any more detail because it may be assumed that any native audience would know what he was referring to without explicitly stating it (M. Koskey, personal communication, February 2015).

Element 2, crying, emerges whenever the boy is deprived of something he wants. For instance, he starts to cry after the uncle denies him the caribou of his choice, even though the boy had stated initially that he wants one specific caribou for telling his people about the herd of caribou.

Element 3, the parents, is a central element of the story. The parents play such an important role because they know that the boy is able to foresee the future, they more

---

20 The only time I’m referring to Hishinlai’ Peter by her old name, Kathy Sikorski, is when I make a reference to her M.A. thesis in chapter 3.
importantly also believe him when he tells them that the people will kill some caribou soon, and they also know that he is telling the truth when he announces that he will be leaving them soon. The parents keep an eye on the boy after he announces that he is going to live on the moon, although they are aware that they cannot stop him from leaving. Further, the parents wake up in the middle of the night and realize the boy is gone. Additionally, the parents are able to see the boy up on the moon along with his dog and a caribou front quarter. Furthermore, the parents find the boy in the bottom of the sled when the sled stops moving during a journey; and finally, the parents’ only food is a caribou front quarter when the people are slowly affected by starvation.

Element 4, leaving for the moon, emerges when the boy announces that he will be leaving for the moon, and the parents start to watch out for him. As a consequence of the boy’s announcement, the parents make him sleep between them; and finally, the boy makes his promise come true by leaving for good.

The living quarters of the family, element 5, are only mentioned once. Nevertheless, it deserves a brief mention in this section because it will later be used for the comparison between the two versions. The only time the living quarters of the family are mentioned is when the parents realize that the boy is gone and they are able to see him through the smoke hole in the skin house.

The caribou emerges throughout the story. For instance, the caribou occurs when the boy foresees that his people would catch some caribou or moose. The next encounter with caribou is when the boy tells his parents that among those caribou is a specific one for himself. The third time caribou emerge is when some caribou are killed and divided among the people, resulting in the next occurrence, when the boy’s caribou is already claimed. Further, the people have to leave behind caribou because it is too late and too dark to haul all of them back to camp. The next day, when the people arrive at the burial site, one of the caribou comes back to life and runs away, which leads to the final occurrence of the caribou in the story: the boy is crying over the lost caribou.

Element 7, food, is another important part of the story. Food is discussed when the boy tells his parents to store meat in a finely tanned caribou skin bag, underlining the importance of the caribou in the story. Also, the boy tells his parents that of the meat in the caribou skin bag, approximately half can be cooked and eaten, while the rest has to be
stored in the caribou skin bag, which will then replenish itself by the next day. Finally, food manifests itself as an important element because starvation and famine are both mentioned several times.

Element 8, the moon, is a central element of this story. Not only does the moon appear as the prime focus of the story through its title, but also because the significance of the moon is explained when the listeners learn that a forward and backward bent moon is linked to the availability of food. The boy cautions his parents that a forward bent moon in a moon eclipse is a sign for food scarcity. On the other hand, a backward bent moon in a moon eclipse is a sign for food abundance.

The boy’s clothing is mentioned here for the same reason the living quarters were briefly discussed. In David Salmon’s version of the story the material of the boy’s clothing is caribou skin. Caribou, along with moose and beaver are important materials for the manufacture of proper clothing in the subarctic and arctic.

A final element emerging from the story is a song, which is mentioned towards the very end of the story. However, David Salmon either does not sing it for this occasion, or the song is not recorded at this time. Nevertheless, David mentions not only that growing up they learned about a song that was sung when the moon was bent backward, implying there would be plenty of food, but also that the children would carry certain things from house to house because they knew that the next year would be a good one.

5.1.2. Moses Peters

The second narrative that I will present is Moses Peters’s version of *Man in the Moon*. He told his version to Bridjette March in Chalkyitsik on September 25, 1972. The interview is approximately 24:13 minutes long; in the first 1:21 minutes the interviewer asks him questions about himself such as where he is from and when he came to Chalkyitsik, before asking him to tell the listeners something about the story he will be narrating. The recording continues with the Gwich’in performance of the story of about 11:50 minutes, which is followed by the English performance, lasting about 11 minutes.

The quality of the recording is good and Moses Peters’s voice is mostly clear. Whenever I was not completely certain what was said, I marked it in the transcript with a # sign. Most of the noise pertains to the recorder, tape or microphone. It is possible that the
microphone was worn on a piece of clothing, accounting for many instances of rustling or moving throughout the recording. Likewise, there seems to be an almost constant background noise pertaining to animals in the vicinity.

A transcript was created using ELAN, annotating the same criteria as in David Salmon’s version.

5.1.2.1. Intonation Units of Bridjette March

Bridjette March only said a few words at the beginning of the recording. Her role in the interaction was to ask the storyteller for information about his person and some details about the story.

5.1.2.2. Intonation Units of Moses Peters

The transcription of Moses Peters’s utterances followed the transcription of the interviewer’s utterances. This transcript contains many # signs due to either intelligibility of a word or a whole intonation unit.

5.1.2.3. Literary Version

A literary version was created serving as basis for the following analysis. The literary version given in examples 10-20 is my own gloss.

5.1.2.4. Paraverbal Features21 22

Listening to Moses Peters’s narration of *Man in the Moon* reveals that he too, just like David Salmon, did not simply tell the story, he performed it. During his performance of *Man in the Moon*, Moses uses not only strategically placed pauses to his advantage, he also speaks more loudly and more quietly in places to gain his listeners’ attention, while at other times he speaks more slowly or more quickly. Further, he also uses direct speech (e.g., line 145, 187, 195, 240, 277, 442) when he is talking as the boy or someone else and

---

21 References made to line numbers in this section correspond to the line numbers in appendix B.
22 Examples are presented in two-line format. The first line shows a transcription of the text as it was narrated, the second line a word gloss. A # sign symbols uncertainty as to whether the word presented is the one used by the storyteller, while a period indicates a pause in speech and a colon signals a slower spoken segment.
his voice quality changes ever so slightly from the rest of his narration. One of those examples emerges on line 187 when he says:

(10)
I'll do it may I do it
‘I will do it, may I?’

However, there are some instances in which Moses really plays the part of the boy and fully uses his voice to convey the meaning (e.g., line 449, 452, 510). One of those examples can be found on line 449, when David says:

(11)
n-no: you can't you #would is in .. how could you .. move when missing you
‘No you can't, we would be missing you.’

Not only do the words spoken by the boy’s parents communicate their despair, Peters’s voice conveys the same exasperation the words carry. All those instances in which Moses uses direct speech are also marked with ‘he says’.

Throughout the recording, Moses uses pauses to create suspense. For instance on line 135, when he says:

(12)
so this little boy said
‘So the little boy said’

This is followed by a pause during which the audience is kept waiting for what the boy may have said. A bit later we find out that the boy had to convince his father to take him onto the hunt, even though he was not as fast as the rest of the group and had to be carried. One of the most dramatic pauses in Moses’s narration occurs when he performs the part of the story in which he mentions that the boy is waiting for a sign. The exclamation on line 474 is not only followed by a pause, the listeners never actually find out what kind of sign Moses is referring to:
Another noticeable moment is when Moses narrates the part about the implications of the moon on line 547 and says:

(14)
I #uh I had lots of #sufficient of
‘I had sufficient’

This is followed by a dramatic pause, keeping the listeners waiting for the moment when Moses tells us that he had enough food.

As previously mentioned, Moses not only uses pauses to keep his listeners’ attention, he also speaks more quietly in some places (e.g., line 157, 250, 257, 391, 484, 540). One of those examples can be found on line 157, when Moses talks about how the boy wants to go after the caribou with the adults but keeps talking, so the boy’s father tells him to be quiet:

(15)
talk and talk and then the father quiet him down
‘he talked until the father quieted him down.’

As Moses says ‘and quiet him down’, he also speaks more softly. At other times he speaks a bit more loudly (e.g., line 165, 359, 452). One of those examples occurs when Peters narrates that part of the story when the people return home after having tried, to no avail, hauling back all the caribou from the scene of the kill, and the boy cries because he did not get the caribou he wanted. Possibly showing the boy’s despair, on line 359, Peters says loudly:

(16)
#wouldn’t #take #nobody #word
‘He wouldn’t believe anyone.’
I think this shows the boy’s exasperation over the loss of his caribou. Twice during his narration, Moses speeds up dramatically, while the listeners are trying to hold on to every word he is saying. Once, when he talks about hauling caribou back on line 216 and 217:

(17)
and that little boy he started to #walk and he just . going down street down the snow he got to #haul something an he ‘the little boy just started to walk down the street.’

Here I imagined the boy increasing his pace just as Moses increases the speed of his narration. The other time he increases the speed of his narration is when Moses tells us on line 402-407 that a caribou came back to life:

(18)
the uncle threw a good and gi- and came back and little child #mattack all the caribou away kill we pack some of em in but is still getting well and get back to life and all run away ‘we were able to pack some of the caribou, but one of them came back to life and just ran away.’

In this example it seems as if Moses’s increased speed culminates as the storyline culminates with the caribou running away. Both times, the increased pace underlines the dramatization of the part he is narrating.

Beginnings and endings of themes may at times coincide with the use of the word ‘so;” however, this is not true for all themes. At times, ‘so’ may signal the start of a new theme (e.g., line 103, 250, 457, 498, 567), for instance on line 103-108, when Moses says:

(19)
so one winter .. people had li::tle hard time ‘one winter, people had a bit of a hard time.’

At other times ‘so’ occurs in the middle of a theme (e.g., line 149, 181, 193, 301, 351), for instance on line 192, when Moses says:
alright .. #te 'what you gonna do' so he said
‘what are you going to do?’

This is followed by instructions to catch and bury the caribou.

To conclude, Moses not only uses pauses to dramatize his narration, he also speaks more quietly and more slowly to gain his listeners’ attention, and twice he increases the speed of his narration dramatically. He further uses direct speech and adjusts his voice accordingly whenever he speaks as the boy. As a result, he can keep his audience attentive.

5.1.2.5. Background

Under the denominator ‘background’, noises attributable to recorder, tape and microphone, along with movement, and noise possibly originating from a generator are contained. As in David Salmon’s recording, some form of noise is almost always audible.

5.1.2.6. Story Elements

Emerging elements in Moses Peters’s version of Man in the Moon are (1) past times, (2) caribou, (3) moon, (4) magic craft, (5) food, (6) the boy’s clothing, (7) crying, (8) the boy, (9) the parents and (10) a song.

As in David Salmon’s narration of Man in the Moon, there were certain story elements in Moses Peters’s version of the story that seemed to be important parts of the story itself, without which the story would not function properly. Those elements are (2) caribou, (5) food, (7) crying, (8) the boy and (9) the parents. These story elements emerged because they occurred so frequently and are intricately linked with the story itself. Man in the Moon would not be the same story if any of the aforementioned elements were missing. The boy and his parents are important elements because they are the main actors within the story. Caribou occur throughout the story as a main source of food; food seems to be the main ‘driver’ of the story – the people are trying to survive in the harsh climate of the arctic and subarctic and can only do so if they find a source of food. Finally, crying is a recurring element whenever the boy is deprived of something he wants.
However, as in the discussion of Salmon's story elements, Peters also included story elements that only emerged when the versions were compared. The first element, the old times, is the element that led into the story and informed the listeners' of how things were in the past. The moon, an unquestionably important element, is not mentioned very often, but it plays an important role in the food security of the people, and when compared to Salmon's version reveals that the same position of the moon has the same meaning. The magic craft emerges primarily because it occurs in both versions; however, considering each version independently, the ability of the boy does not stand out. And finally, the song also emerges as an important element because it is mentioned in both versions, but neither of the storytellers sings it during their English narration.

The first element emerging from this version of *Man in the Moon* is the past. Moses Peters mentions it when telling us that whenever animals were killed in the past, it was done as a group activity, referring to the whole band, and the obtained meat was then shared among the whole group. The past times are also mentioned in conjunction with hard times, meaning that in the past, people oftentimes had to endure times when they did not know whether and when there would be a next meal.

Caribou, the second element, is a very important element, emerging many times. For instance, caribou are sighted in the mountains and the boy announces that he would like to go hunting with the adults. The second time caribou occur is when the people bury a caribou in a pile of snow because they cannot haul all of them back to their campsite. The caribou is also the center of attention when a presumed dead animal turns out to be alive. Finally, the caribou is mentioned when the boy tells his father that for informing the people about the herd in the mountains he wants a fat caribou as reward.

The moon, an unquestionably important element of the story, arises only a few times. The moon emerges at the end of the story when the boy informs his parents that he would be leaving them to go to the moon; and the moon is discussed in combination with the meaning of a forward and backward bent moon during an eclipse.

The boy's special ability is called magical craft; however, Moses never explains what exactly this magical craft is. In the Gwich'in performance of this same story, I found that magical craft was referred to as *dinji dazhan*, which translates into magic/medicine or
medicine man. This term was used a few times in the beginning of the story, one of those examples can be seen here:

(21)²³

dinjii dazhàn aįį veenjit khehlan neeroiizhik ts’ā’ dinjii dazhàn aįį veenjit
tr’oondak aįį tthak “crazy” yaghā’ khaaghaa kwaaw gwiizhik gliiya gliyaghan
“They went over to him and we get things for him and all that was just crazy. That one medicine man, he doesn’t get scared while they kill.’

In this example we can see how Moses talks about the magic craft, without ever explaining what it really is. He only says that the dinjii dazhan always received something from the people for predicting the future.

Food, the fifth element, is mentioned when the boy tells his parents to fill blood into the stomach of a caribou to preserve the only food they had to survive. The boy further states that the caribou stomach should be placed under a blanket, and that the blood would replenish itself by the next day, supplying his parents with food for another day.

The boy’s type of clothing is only briefly mentioned here, but it will be discussed later when comparing the two versions. In Moses Peters’s version of the story, the boy wears a pair of marten pants along with a marten coat, or probably clothes made of both caribou and marten.

Crying, the seventh element, emerges the first time when someone else wants to take the boy’s caribou; later the boy also cries over the loss of that caribou. The boy seems to cry whenever he is deprived of something he wants.

The boy, also a central element of the story, is mentioned when he goes missing one morning and when he is waiting for a sign. And finally, the parents make him sleep between them when he announces that he wants to live on the moon.

The parents, another important element of the story, tell the boy that they would miss him if he actually left. After his announcement, the parents keep an eye on the boy.

²³ This example is displayed in a two-line format: the first line showing the text narrated by Moses Peters, the second line showing a gloss provided by Hishinlai’ Peter (personal communication, May 2015).
because they do not want him to leave, and finally, the boy tells his parents that although they may not be together after he goes to the moon, they could be together in their dreams.

The final element, a song, is mentioned, but not sung in the English version. The discussion about the song emerges in the form of a detour in which Moses discusses the song’s existence and that he sang it as a child. However, in the Gwich’in version of the story, Moses sings the song, which tells, according to Hishinalai’ Peter (personal communication, May 2015), about having a bad dream and seeing things that are not real. I imagine that the reason why Moses sings the song in his Gwich’in performance but not in English might be the taboo to discuss topics such as medicine men and magic with non-natives. When narrating the story in Gwich’in, Peters could be relatively certain that most of his audience would understand a possible non-obvious meaning behind the song, while an English performance may invite questions and a discussion of a possibly taboo topic. On lines 576 and 577, he even says:

(22)

well it is kind of a foolish business but anyway I used to do when #I’m a kid

‘It’s kind of a foolish business, but I used to sing it when I was a kid.’

I think this may be an indicator that the song does no longer hold the same importance it held when he was younger, at a time when the Gwich’in were less assimilated into mainstream US American culture and believing into magic and medicine men may have been more acceptable than in the 1970s, when Moses narrated this story.

5.2. The Old Woman and the Brushman

The second story set that I will present is called The Brushman, which was narrated by Sarah Frank. The Brushman is a short narrative about a woman who bravely defends herself against a brushman, a feral individual and a widely known figure among many Athabascan peoples.24

Sarah and her husband Johnny Frank were both tradition bearers and learned an ancient system of storytelling from their elders (Frank 1995:1). Sarah told the story to

24 For a more detailed description of the story refer to page 49.
Craig Mishler in an interview in Venetie, May 14, 1979. She told the *The Brushman* a second time to Lillian Garnett in Arctic Village, in June 1984. Lillian Garnett transcribed and translated both versions, and they both became parts of *Neerihiinjik* (1995). Both versions are very short, the first version lasting about 3:25 minutes, the second version is approximately 2:30 minutes long. The first 18 seconds of the first version contain a brief introduction by Craig Mishler referring the listeners to the book and where the story can be found. After this brief introduction the story begins immediately and ends about 3 minutes later as suddenly as it began. After Sarah says the last sentence of the story, she laughs briefly and the tape fades out. The second recording is similar; however, there are no introductions, the story begins immediately and ends with Sarah laughing after the last sentence and then the tape fades out.

5.2.1. Sarah Frank 1979

The quality of the first version of *The Brushman* is good. Sarah Frank’s voice has a bit of an echoing quality, but her voice is mostly clear except for a few instances in which her voice is indistinct, probably due to the recording quality. After Craig Mishler introduces the recording, his voice can be heard a few more times, giving Sarah feedback in the form of back-channel behavior, such as “mhm” (Linke, Nussbaumer, and Portmann 1991). The voice of at least one other female can be overheard in the background, along with a child that is talking and singing at different points throughout the recording. Further, there is some noise attributable to movement and the opening and closing of a door, but nothing that would have interrupted the session.

A transcription of the Gwich’in audio recording was created using ELAN; and an already existing written text from *Neerihiinjik* (1995) was used to annotate the data into the following tiers: (1) Craig Mishler’s intonation units, (2) Sarah Frank’s intonation units, (3) translation intonation units, (4) Gwich’in sentence, (5) literary version, (6) paraverbal features, (7) background sounds and (8) story elements.
5.2.1.1. Intonation Units of Craig Mishler

Mishler introduced the story giving both Gwich’in and English titles and informing
the listeners about the whereabouts of the texts in the book. After the introduction, he can
only be heard twice more, both times using back-channel behavior in the form of [mhm].

5.2.1.2. Intonation Units of Sarah Frank

I transcribed Sarah Frank’s text using the adjusted story in the book. By far the most
difficulties arose whenever the audio version and the version in the book did not reflect
each other exactly.

5.2.1.3. Translation Intonation Units

After creating a transcript that reflected Sarah’s text as much as possible, a very
simple translation was attempted using the Alexander (2008) and Peter (1979)
dictionaries. However, due to the many words that could not be translated because they
did not exist in either of the two dictionaries, or because there were several equivalents –
almost forcing a decision from me, being fully aware that an equivalent is highly dependent
on the circumstances of use – I decided to translate only as much as possible when
perusing the two aforementioned dictionaries. Since I was unsuccessful at translating
whole intonation units, the information contained on this tier is not relevant for my thesis.

5.2.1.4. Gwich’in Sentence

Gwich’in sentences resemble the adjusted text in the book. Nothing was changed or
added, this version simply exists to present the readers with a complete version.

5.2.1.5. Literary Version

The literary version is a slightly adjusted form of the English text in the book. After
attempting to translate individual intonation units and noticing certain inconsistencies, for
instance cases where the version in the book contained information that could not be
gained from translating the Gwich’in intonation units, a few minor changes were made to
the text appearing in this tier. The literary version given in examples 23 through 26 and 33 through 35 is my own gloss.

5.2.1.6. Paraverbal Features

Listening to Sarah Frank’s narration of The Brushman reveals that she also uses pauses to create suspense and dramatize her narration. Even though the story is short, Sarah uses paraverbal features to keep her listeners’ attention. Pauses may, but do not have to follow the utterance of one of the following words: aii t’ee, ts’a’ t’ee, aii ts’â’. Pauses can not only follow the aforementioned terms, they can also precede them. However, they are in general much shorter before one of the aforementioned words occurs. They all roughly have the same meaning, ‘and then’, and may, according to Hishinlai’ Peter (personal communication, May 2015), signal the beginning or end of a theme or intonation unit. It is also possible that they stand completely alone and occur between themes and intonation units. They occur throughout the story; for instance on line 40 and 130 they can be found at the end of an intonation unit. The example on line 130 can be seen here:

(23)

\[ \begin{array}{llll}
\text{ttha} & \text{vat} & \text{aïçi t’ee} \\
\text{ground.squirrel} & \text{stomach} & \text{and.then} \\
\text{‘and that ground squirrel stomach’} \\
\end{array} \]

Line 48, 77 and 119 are the only times one of those terms stands completely alone. The example on line 77 can be seen here:

(24)

\[ \begin{array}{lll}
\text{aii ts’â’} & \text{t’ee} \\
\text{and.then} & \text{now} \\
\text{‘and then’} \\
\end{array} \]

References made to line numbers in this section correspond to the line numbers in appendix C. Examples are presented in three-line format. The first line shows a transcription of the text as it was narrated in Gwich’in, the second line a word-for-word translation and the third line a word gloss.
On lines 61, 84, 97, 107, 111 and 173 they mark the beginning of a new intonation unit. The example on line 107 can be seen here:

(25)

qjj ḥt’e  naa’īn
and.then  brushman
‘that brushman’

Another term that stood out is vârâhnyâa, which means ‘we say of them’. Hishinlai’ Peter (personal communication, May 2015) told me that it is normal for traditional stories to be interspersed with this term, because it is a way of signaling that the story narrated has been passed down to the person narrating the story and acknowledges that the story does not belong to the storyteller, but that they heard it from others. Vârâhnyâa, or as it is used within The Brushman, vârâh, occurs a total of six times throughout the story and is always said at the end of an intonation unit. The pauses following ‘we say of them’ are of varying length. The example on line 222 can be seen here:

(26)

yichi’tsij  ch’ãhkhaa  vârâh
his.head  hit  we.say.of.them
‘they say she hit him.’

Looking at the English translations reveals that instead of words such as ‘and’, ‘and then’ and ‘and now’, pronouns like ‘she’ (the old woman) and ‘he’ (the brushman) were used to create parallelisms within the narration. The first sentence introduces the old woman with “this one old woman”:

(27)

This one old woman was in the same situation as the other one.

27 Examples 27 through 32 are presented in a one-line format. These examples reflect the English sentences in Neerihiinjik (1995).
After that, seven of the 24 sentences begin with the pronoun ‘she’. One of the examples can be seen here:

(28)
She was living alone and snaring ground squirrels.

Twice, the pronoun ‘she’ is prefaced by “meanwhile,” one of those examples can be seen here:

(29)
Meanwhile she was busy singeing the ground squirrel in the fire.

“The brushman” and “that brushman” occur sentence initial once each, those examples can be seen here:

(30)
The brushman was doing that.

(31)
That brushman.

Finally, “they say” is at the beginning of a sentence three times, one of those examples can be seen here:

(32)
They say he was moving very noisily.

While it seems that repetition and parallelism was created with the use of the (formulaic) terms *aii t’ee, ts’â’ t’ee, aii ts’â* in the Gwich’in version, in English the same phenomenon was created with the help of the pronouns ‘she’, ‘he’ and ‘they’. After the old woman is introduced, seven of the total 24 sentences start with ‘she’. ‘They say’, marks the beginning of three sentences, marking another set of parallelisms. Finally, ‘he’ is the first word of one sentence, as are ‘the brushman’ and ‘that brushman’. More than half of the sentences in the book start with *aii t’ee, ts’â’ t’ee, aii ts’â* (and then) showing not only parallel beginnings of sentences, but a formulaic use of certain terms within stories.
Hishinlai' Peter (personal communication, May 2015) mentioned that certain terms such as the aforementioned ones frequently occur within stories, but do not add to the meaning of the story itself.

5.2.1.7. Background

Background sounds in this version of Sarah Frank’s story can be classified as human, mechanical or part of the family life happening in the background. The human sounds mostly belong to a child speaking and singing in the background, and at one point an unidentified female person says a sentence. The mechanical sounds in this recording are few and far between, originating mostly from the tape recorder. At one point a door can be overheard closing, and there is some clattering originating possibly from the kitchen.

5.2.1.8. Story Elements

During the course of this research essential elements building the skeleton of the stories emerged. Those elements either belong to or represent themes themselves presented later in this thesis. Emerging story elements in Sarah’s 1979 narration of The Brushman are: (1) the old woman, (2) the brushman, (3) dried willow sticks, (4) ground squirrel guts and (5) time of the day. Those elements emerged because they recurred either so frequently that it became clear that the story would not function properly if even one of those elements were missing, or because they occurred in both versions.

The first element, the old woman, occurs throughout the story. For instance, the old woman lives alone, living off the land by snaring and singeing ground squirrels. Furthermore, according to the translated version in the book, the old woman’s camp is on a riverbank, close to a strong current. Also, the old woman uses willow sticks to fend off the intruding brushman and to make a fire to heat up the ground squirrel guts.

The second element, the brushman, first appears in the story when he starts annoying the old woman. He is the target of the contents of intestines thrown not just at him, but into his eyes. Further, the brushman is described to be kneeling down and wearing a fur coat after the old woman starts throwing intestines at him. Finally, he is hit with a stick and eventually killed.
Dried willow sticks, the third element, appear in the story in the form of a poking device, used to poke the brushman, and to light a fire. Consulting the Gwich’in text has shown that Sarah never actually speaks of willow sticks, she first refers to them on line 33 as follows:

(33)

k’il ninjyàa aii oondaa
dried.willows long (…)\(^{28}\) out.there.on.the.water
‘on the water were long dried willows.’

The next time she talks about the willows is on line 92, when she says:

(34)

ooch’iitthan k’il jëlinchy’aa daatin
down.toward.the.bank dried.willows that’s.how.it.is it’s.just.laying.there
‘dried willows are laying over there, that’s how it is’

Again, she does not actually talk about willow sticks, she simply talks about dried willows. She does, however, talk about a stick or a bat on line 215, when she says:

(35)

gwà’an gał òonjik
around.there bat got
‘She has a bat.’

Gał is the Gwich’in term for bat or stick; and this is the only time Sarah actually mentions the existence of a stick. It is possible that she does not have to mention the term for stick or bat, it may be understood from the context of the story.

Ground squirrel guts, the fourth element, are mentioned as being the chosen device to be heated up, and then the contents of the guts are thrown into the brushman’s eyes.

The last element of the story that stood out is the time of the day: according to the English translation in the book it is *getting dark*.

\(^{28}\) (...) means that there is no gloss for this specific word in this excerpt. The meaning only becomes clear when looking at the bigger context.
5.2.2. Sarah Frank 1984

The last narrative that I will present here is the second version of *The Brushman*. The quality of the second version of *The Brushman* is slightly less intelligible and less clear than the first version. The first version was available as a single recording only consisting the story discussed; the second version is part of a bigger compilation of stories. However, as far as I can tell, there is no official introduction to the session and except for a short intermission between stories, there is no indicator that a new story has begun. Tape and recorder related sounds can be heard throughout the recording. Also, another person can be overheard in the background, possibly Lillian Garnett. Further, sounds coming from the kitchen or living room can be heard throughout the recording; however, those noises are never intrusive nor do they disturb the recording.

Again, a transcript was created based on the version in the book, using ELAN to classify the data into the same categories as in the version presented above.

5.2.2.1. Intonation Units of Lillian Garnett

There is a single occurrence during the 2:23 minute-long recording in which Sarah narrated the second version of *The Brushman* where it is possible that Lillian Garnett was the person saying a word (*izhik*). However, this cannot be verified because this utterance did not appear in the adjusted text in the book. Other than that, Lillian is completely silent.

5.2.2.2. Intonation Units of Sarah Frank

This version of the story is even shorter than the other one, and most of the text appearing in the book was part of the original recording. However, there were a few instances in which there was additional audio text in the recording that was not published in the book. In those instances, I attempted to transcribe the recorded words.

5.2.2.3. Translation Intonation Units

As before, I attempted to create a translation of independent intonation units to compare them to the text that appeared in the book. Since no equivalent could be found for many of the words, a real comparison is not possible at this time.
5.2.2.4. Gwich’in Sentence

As in the first version of this story, Gwich’in sentences resemble the ones appearing in the book.

5.2.2.5. Literary Version

A literary version was created, mostly reflecting the version in the book; however, minor adjustments were made whenever the version in the book and the translation of the intonation units showed significant differences. For example, if a word did not appear in the Gwich’in version but then appeared in the English translation. The literary version given in examples 36 - 37 and 41 - 42 is my own gloss.

5.2.2.6. Paraverbal Features\textsuperscript{29} \textsuperscript{30}

As did the other two storytellers discussed in this thesis, Sarah uses paraverbal features to enhance her short narration of \textit{The Brushman} in 1984. Pauses are the most prominent feature Sarah uses throughout her telling. They may occur in concordance with ts’a’ it’ee, aii ts’a’ it’ee and qiit’ee it’ee, all of which mean something along the lines of ‘and then’. There are three instances in which one of those terms stands completely alone (line 19, 30 and 73) and occurs after and before pauses. The example on line 19 can be seen here:

(36)

\begin{verbatim}
  ts’a’   it’ee
  and   now

  ‘and then’
\end{verbatim}

As mentioned in the section discussing Sarah’s 1979 telling of the same story, all those terms can signal the beginning or end of a theme. They occur intonation unit initial

\textsuperscript{29} References made to line numbers in this section correspond to the line numbers in appendix D.
\textsuperscript{30} Examples are presented in three-line format. The first line shows a transcription of the text as it was narrated in Gwich’in, the second line a word-for-word transcription in English and the third line an English gloss.
in several cases (e.g., line 53, 80, 88, 117 and 146). The example on line 88 can be seen here:

(37)
\texttt{qjj ts'\'a\' \ t't\'ee \ aji}^{31}\ t\texttt{tha}\alpha\texttt{a} \ \\
\text{and.then \ now \ (...) \ ground.squirrel} \ \\
\text{‘and now that ground squirrel’}

While the Gwich'in version of the story reveals \texttt{ts'\'a\' \ t't\'ee, aii \ ts'\'a\' \ t't\'ee} and \texttt{qjit\'ee \ it\'ee} (and then) are prominent features before or after pauses, the English translation shows that again, pronouns are prominent features in this version as well. The first sentence introducing the old woman is as follows:

(38)\textsuperscript{32}
\texttt{This one old woman I heard about once killed a brushman.}

After the first sentence, five of the total 17 sentences begin with the pronoun “she.” One of those examples can be seen here:

(39)
\texttt{She had a campfire on the edge of a steep riverbank and was singeing ground squirrels.}

One sentence begins with the pronoun “he,” referring to the brushman. This example can be seen here:

(40)
\texttt{He was wearing a worn out fur coat and kneeling down rubbing his eyes.}

\begin{footnotesize}

\footnote{This term, for which there is no gloss, may be spelled both with and without nasals (aj)i, depending on the pronunciation of the speaker. Hishinla' Peter (personal communication, May 2015) told me that the meaning is the same, regardless of the spelling. She further told me that it is quite common for speakers to pronounce this word interchangeably, both nasalized and a non-nasalized.}

\footnote{Examples 38 through 40 and 43 are presented in one-line format. These examples reflect the English sentences in \textit{Neerihiinjik} (1995).}

\end{footnotesize}
While in 1979 Sarah interspersed her narration with *vărând*náa (we say of them), 5 years later she did the same with *giyàññáa* (they say of them). Both terms have the same function; they are supposed to show that the story does not belong to the storyteller who is narrating the story, but that they heard the story from someone else and that it has also been told across generations. *Giyàññáa* occurs a total of five times in Sarah’s 1984 narration, but unlike *vărând*náa in 1979, which is only pronounced as *văràh*, *giyàññáa* is always pronounced completely. Four out of five times, *giyàññáa* marks the end of an intonation unit. The example on line 3 can be seen here:

(41)
shyaaghan ch’ihłak chan naa’iin dílghwájí *giyàññáa*
old.woman one also brushman kill they.say.of.them
‘they say there was once an old woman who killed a brushman.’

The fifth *giyàññáa* is at the very end of the story and is followed by another word: *t’aihnáa*. The example from line 185 can be seen here:

(42)
chan yílghwájí *giyàññáa* *t’aihnáa*
also kill they.say.of.them that’s.what.I.heard
‘they say she killed him that way.’

The pauses following the word *giyàññáa* are of varying length, just as the pauses following *vărând*náa.

Sarah changed her use of *vărând*náa to *giyàññáa* (they say) between her 1979 and her 1984 narration, the English translation of *The Brushman* in 1984 reveals that only two of the 17 sentences are introduced by “they say” reflecting that the story was passed down. One of those examples can be seen here:

(43)
They say he was moving very noisily.

While *ts’á*’i’t’e, *aïi ts’á*’i’t’e and *qiji’t’e e’i’t’e* (and then) were used repetitively in Sarah’s Gwich’in narration, the same effect was created in the English translation with the
pronouns ‘she’, ‘he’ and ‘they’. The Gwich’in particles ts’a’ it’ee, aii ts’a’ it’ee and qiiit’ee it’ee (and then) might occur at the beginning or end of a theme, or between themes. The English pronouns ‘he’, ‘she’ and ‘they’ seem to be used in the English translations in Neeriihnjik (1995) to create parallelism within the story and start multiple sentences with the same word.

5.2.2.7. Background

There is barely any background noise in this version. The only constantly audible sound is the one originating from the tape recorder. Movement can be heard in a few cases as well as clattering, which might also originate from the tape recorder.

5.2.2.8. Story Elements

As in the two versions of Man in the Moon and Sarah’s 1979 version of The Brushman, important elements of the story emerged in this version, too. Those elements either belong to or represent themes themselves presented later in this thesis. Emerging story elements in Sarah’s 1984 narration of The Brushman are (1) the old woman, (2) the brushman, (3) dried willow sticks, (4) ground squirrel guts and (5) time of the day. Those elements emerged because they recurred so frequently that it became clear that the story would not function properly if even just one of those elements were missing, or, in the case of the fifth element, because it occurred in both versions.

The first and most important element of the story, the old woman, is first mentioned as having a fire next to a river where she is singeing ground squirrels. Also, the old woman uses long dried willow sticks to burn things and starts watching out for the brushman after first seeing him. As a consequence of the brushman’s arrival, the old woman starts heating up the ground squirrels’ intestines, so that she can use them later to throw in the direction of where the brushman pulls on the willow sticks. The old woman goes as far as throwing the heated intestines into the brushman’s eyes, which effectively kills him.

The second element, the brushman, first enters the story as the culprit pulling on dried willow sticks. As a result, the brushman is the target of intestines thrown into his eyes, and while trying to run away, he causes a commotion crashing through the bushes.
When the old woman finds him, he is kneeling down, wearing a worn out fur coat and rubbing his eyes before he is killed.

The dried willow sticks are first mentioned because the brushman is the one pulling on them, and in the process of doing so, he annoys the old woman because she is using the dried willow sticks to burn things. Interestingly, the willows are actually never called willow sticks in Gwich’in, even though that is what they are called in English. Listening to the Gwich’in recording reveals that Sarah is talking about long dried willows (k’il njyah) on line 44 and about burning dried willows on line 68 (qìî k’il daak’à’ qìî jỳàa da’ìn giiyàhnyàa). The example on line 68 can be seen here:

(44)

k’il daak’à’ qìî jỳàa da’ìn
giiyàhnyàa
dried.willows burn (...) she’s.doing.something.with.it that’s.what.it.was.doing
dey.say.of.them
‘they say she burned long dried willows.’

The word stick or bat (gàt) does not occur in this version of the story. The reason behind this might be that the context of the story might give a listener enough information that they know that Sarah is talking about a willow stick or bat, without her ever mentioning that specific word.

The fourth element, ground squirrel guts, are heated on a fire and are used as ammunition to throw in the general direction of where the old woman can feel the brushman pulling the willow sticks. In the end, the old woman throws the ground squirrel guts into the brushman’s eyes, effectively killing him.

The final element of the story, the time of the day, is described in the English translation in Neerihiinjik (1995) as getting dark.

In this chapter, I tried to show that each version of both stories is made up of several important elements, which are intricately linked to information contained in those stories. In the next chapter I will discuss how all these elements are part of themes, which form the basic structure of those stories discussed in this thesis.
Chapter 6: Discussion

Throughout my research and work with the two versions of *Man in the Moon* and *The Brushman* I have discovered recurring elements and themes in the different versions of the stories. I will present those here. I will also discuss whether the information contained in the emerging themes of a story told by different storytellers or told at different times by the same storyteller is identical. To reiterate, to find out how similar the stories analyzed in this thesis are, I am comparing the emerging themes of two versions of each story to one another. I use the term identical to refer to the emerging themes of the analyzed stories. In this context, this means those themes contain the same information. Identity does not refer to the specific words used in each story, but the overall content.

6.1. Story Elements and Themes

As I worked with the transcripts of *Man in the Moon* and *The Brushman*, I noticed that contrary to my initial belief, there are quite a few identical elements and themes emerging in both versions of each story. As elements I labeled those parts of the story that have an important place within the stories. They all belong to something bigger, the aforementioned themes. It is those themes, which I will present later in this chapter, which make up the body of a story. A theme is a progression of the storyline, broken down into topics occurring within the story. Those topics emerged when the information contained in several intonation units was put together. It is possible that the themes in different versions of a story emerge at different points within the story; however, they are identical even when two different storytellers narrate the same story. In order to get a better general idea, I created several tables to track the sequence of themes and compare them to each other.

6.1.1. Man in the Moon

As previously mentioned, each story consists of several elements, which in turn are part of the emerging themes. To reiterate, emerging elements of *Man in the Moon*, in David Salmon’s version of the story, are (1) special ability, (2) crying, (3) the parents, (4) leaving for the moon, (5) living quarters, (6) caribou, (7) food, (8) moon eclipse, (9) clothing and
(10) a song. On the other hand, elements emerging in Moses Peters’s version are (1) past times, (2) caribou, (3) the moon, (4) magic craft, (5) food, (6) clothing, (7) crying, (8) the boy, (9) the parents and (10) a song.

While food is an emerging element in both David Salmon’s and Moses Peters’s narration of *Man in the Moon*, the emerging themes in the two versions discussing the actual food show that the food is not the same. David Salmon mentions that the parents’ remaining food is a caribou front quarter, while Moses Peters’s mentions blood. As a consequence of the different foods described, the storytellers necessarily also mention different ways to store the remaining food. In Salmon’s version of the story, the food (caribou front quarter) is stored in a finely tanned caribou skin bag, while Peters describes it to be a caribou stomach. This difference is unsurprising, considering that blood is best stored either in a stomach or a bladder, while a skin bag might be the best storage space for a caribou front quarter.

The boy’s special ability or magic craft, respectively, are both not described in detail in the English versions, and a consultation with Hishinlai’ Peter revealed that David Salmon does not discuss the boy’s special ability in any more detail when he narrates the story in Gwich’in. Moses Peters, on the other hand, mentions *dinjii dazhan* in Gwich’in, which translates into magic/medicine or medicine man. However, other than this added detail, he too, does not add further information regarding the magic craft. It is possible that listeners would be assumed to possess knowledge about such a thing called magic craft or special ability in case the listeners are native, or taboo to discuss in front of a non-native audience.

The boy’s clothing is another interesting topic that deserves a brief mention here. David Salmon explains that the boy’s clothes are made of caribou skin, while Moses Peters mentions marten fur. While it is possible that the boy in Moses’s version of the story was wearing clothing partially made of marten, it is rather unlikely that all of it is made of marten, since marten is very expensive, a point he even makes during his narration. However, it is possible that Moses describes the boy’s clothes to be made of marten skin because wearing marten fur may also serve as a status symbol.

Crying is another element that emerged in both versions of the story. The boy seems to cry whenever he is deprived of something he wants. Since he tells his people of
the caribou herd in the mountains, he expects a gift in return. Similarly, the boy cries when the people lose a caribou that they thought to be dead.

Finally, the song also warrants to be mentioned here because both storytellers mention it, but only Moses sings it in his Gwich’in performance. According to Hishinlai’ Peter (personal communication, May 2015), Moses sings about seeing things that are not real and having bad dreams in the very short (20 seconds) sequence of him singing that song. After this short intermission he returns to his narration and finishes the story.

Table 2: Themes in *Man in the Moon* 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>David Salmon</strong></th>
<th><strong>Moses Peters</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Old times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Animals are killed as group activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Hard times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Caribou in the mountains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Boy has a special ability</td>
<td>e. Boy has a magic craft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Boy has a vision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. One of the caribou is meant for the boy</td>
<td>g. One of the caribou is alive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. By the time the boy arrives, the caribou are already divided</td>
<td>h. Boy wants one fat caribou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Uncle receives the caribou meant for the boy</td>
<td>i. Caribou are killed as a group activity and the meat is shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Boy cries because the uncle won’t give up the caribou</td>
<td>j. Boy cries because the man claims the caribou the boy wanted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Caribou are covered by snow</td>
<td>f. Burying caribou in snow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. One caribou comes back to life and escapes</td>
<td>k. Rope didn’t exist a long time ago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Boy cries over the lost caribou</td>
<td>l. Moving the caribou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Parents are watching over the boy; he sleeps between them</td>
<td>n. One caribou comes back to life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Parents wake up; the boy is gone</td>
<td>m. Boy cries over the lost caribou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Family lives in a house with smoke hole</td>
<td>s. Parents are watching over the boy; he even sleeps between them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p. Boy is missing one morning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>q. Boy is waiting for a sign</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers represent themes in David Salmon’s version of *Man in the Moon*; letters serve the same purpose in Moses Peters’s version. The following numbers and letters show corresponding themes in the two versions: 1e, 3h, 5j, 6j, 7f, 8n, 9m, 10s, 13r, 16o, 17o, 18o, 20t, 21t, 22u.
In this section I summarize and discuss the emerging themes in the two versions of *Man in the Moon* by David Salmon and Moses Peters. The two versions of *Man in the Moon* have only minor differences, which I find surprising, considering that two different storytellers narrated the stories. However, both narrators lived in Chalkyitsik at the time when the recordings were made and the interviews occurred within a day of each other. Moses Peters narrated the story on September 25, David Salmon’s version followed on September 26, 1972. No additional information could be obtained from the audio recording received from the oral history department in the Rasmuson Library, and any additional material such as already existing transcripts or manuscripts belonging to the recordings either never existed or were never given to the oral history department.

The number of themes emerging from the two versions of the story is almost identical\(^4\). I found 22 themes in David Salmon’s story and 21 in Moses Peters’s. I find it surprising, however, that Moses Peters’s version has fewer themes than David Salmon’s, considering that Moses Peters’s version of the story is richer in detail.

\(^4\) Working with the Gwich’in version may have resulted in a different number of themes or story elements; a future study could address this limitation of my thesis.
The development of the plot of the two versions is slightly different, possibly because Moses's version begins with a short overview of the past times. However, it seems also possible that this is simply the setting for the story. Since he never resolves this issue, we cannot be certain whether the setting for the story is in the old times or whether he actually gives some information about the past to better situate the story. However, shortly after he begins performing the story in English and talks about 'the old times' there is an instance when he mentions that there was one winter when people were having a hard time, possibly an indicator that the real story starts at this point.

Contrary to Moses Peters's version of the story, which begins under somehow uncertain terms, David Salmon's version starts with the introduction of the main character, the boy.

There are only three times within the two versions where the detail pertaining to specific themes is clearly different. The first difference emerges when the material of the boy's clothes is addressed. David Salmon describes the boy's clothes to be made of caribou skin, while Moses Peters explains the boy's clothes as consisting of, or at least partially containing, marten fur. Both caribou skin and marten fur clothing are important for the Gwich'in people and both materials are regarded highly. Marten fur is additionally regarded as a status symbol and might be an indicator for the boy's status within the group. The second difference between the versions can be noted when the remaining food of the boy's parents is discussed. In David Salmon's version, the parents are left with a caribou front quarter. In Moses Peters's narration, on the other hand, the only food the parents have left is blood. While Moses does not state openly that the blood is from the caribou, this is probably implied. The last difference emerges when the storage place of the remaining food is addressed. David Salmon mentions a finely tanned caribou skin bag, while Moses Peters states that the blood has to be stored in the stomach of a caribou. It seems possible that the finely tanned caribou skin bag in David Salmon's version is actually made from a caribou stomach. However, while we cannot verify this information, we know that the material is taken from the same animal, the caribou, an important element in both versions. Similarly, Moses Peter explains that the only food the parents have left is caribou blood, warranting the caribou stomach as storage space.
David Salmon mentions themes that are unique to his version. Those elements are the boy's vision, which emerges when the boy tells his parents that the next day they were going to kill some animals. Further, Salmon mentions that the parents see the boy in the moon with his dog and a caribou front quarter, and finally, he also mentions that the boy returns to his parents in the bottom of the sled. Similarly, Moses Peters's narration includes two themes that are unique to his narration. At one point, Moses mentions that the people did not have rope in the past, describing how they had to use animal hide instead, which could be an addition for non-local listeners. This topic arises in the story when the people are attempting to take all the killed caribou back to their camp and to do so, they tie the caribou up to pull them behind them. The second unique theme is a sign. This topic appears in Moses's version shortly before the boy leaves his people, possibly indicating that the boy is expecting a sign for the best time to leave.

The remainder of the story is identical, one version listing more detail where the other one is less specific. However, overall, the versions and their emerging themes are in Jim Kari's words “pretty strongly similar” (Kari, personal communication, November 2014). Both versions contain a main character able to see into the future. Whereas David simply calls this ability a *special ability*, Moses refers to it as *magic craft*. In both versions the boy tells his parents about the presence of a caribou herd in the mountains. As a result, the people travel there and kill some of the caribou, but end up being unable to take all the caribou back to their camp, forcing them to leave some caribou behind, which they bury under piles of snow. When the people return to the place where they killed the caribou, one of the animals comes back to life and escapes. In both versions the boy's family lives in a skin house with a smoke hole. As soon as the boy mentions his desire to leave his people and live on the moon, both storytellers mention that the parents start keeping an eye on the boy and make him sleep between them. As soon as the day arrives when the boy is gone, the parents are sad but carry on with their lives immediately. In both variations, the parents can see the boy on the moon through the smoke hole in their skin tent. According to both storytellers, the boy returns to his people a few more times, each time hidden in the bottom of the parents' sled. Before leaving for good, the boy informs his parents of the implications of a forward and backward bent moon at the annual moon eclipse, and how to handle hard times with shortfalls in food supply.
6.1.2. The Old Woman and the Brushman

As mentioned above, every story consists of certain elements, which have an important place in those stories. Those elements are in turn constituent parts making up the emerging themes of stories. To reiterate, the elements of both of Sarah's versions of *The Brushman* are (1) the old woman, (2) the brushman, (3) dried willow sticks, (4) ground squirrel guts and (5) time of the day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table 3: Themes in The Old Woman and the Brushman</strong>&lt;sup&gt;35&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sarah Frank, 1979</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. There was once an old woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The old woman lives alone and snares and singes ground squirrels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The old woman uses a willow stick as poking device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It's getting dark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The old woman lives on a river bank, below her runs a strong current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Back then, axes didn't exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The brushman starts to annoy the old woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. The old woman is watching out for the brushman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The old woman has a pile of dried willows she lights on fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The old woman heats up ground squirrel intestines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The brushman is crashing through the bushes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The old woman throws the insides of the intestines into the brushman's eyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The brushman is kneeling down, wearing a fur coat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>35</sup> Numbers represent themes in Sarah's 1979 version; letters serve the same purpose in her 1984 narration. The following numbers and letters show corresponding themes in the two versions: 1a, 2b, 3e, 4c, 5b, 6f, 8h, 9k, 10j, 11l, 13m.
In this section I summarize and discuss the emerging themes in the two versions of *The Brushman* by Sarah Frank narrated in 1979 and in 1984. As the two versions of *Man in the Moon*, Sarah’s two versions have only minor differences. The two recordings were made five years apart, allowing for certain inconsistencies in the stories, especially considering that Sarah was already about 86 years old when the first recording was made, which would make her 91 years old by the time she was recorded again in 1984.

Both versions of the story are relatively short, the first version lasting about 3.5 minutes, resulting in a total of 13 emerging themes; the second version is about 2.5 minutes long, resulting in 13 themes as well. Overall, both versions contain the same information. Neither version includes a significant amount of additional information that the other version does not include.

There are a few differences between the versions; however, I am referring to a very small number, which mostly pertains to the amount of detail. For instance, in the 1979 version, the old woman uses a willow stick as poking device. Such a device does not emerge from the second version. However, in the 1984 version, the old woman uses long dried willow sticks to burn things, which might be the equivalent to the poking device in Sarah’s 1979 version. In 1979, Sarah specifies that the old woman throws the *insides* (i.e., contents) of the intestines into the brushman’s eyes, while in 1984, the old woman throws simply the *intestines*. Further, in 1979, Sarah describes the brushman simply as wearing a *fur coat*, whereas in 1984 she is more specific and describes the brushman’s fur coat to be *worn out*. Also, in 1979, Sarah relates that ‘the brushman *starts to annoy* the old woman’, a theme that might be implicitly expressed in the sentence ‘the brushman *keeps pulling on the dried willow sticks*’ in her 1984 version.

There are only very few themes that are unique to one version. In 1979, Sarah explains that *the old woman lights a pile of dried willows on fire* and that *she hits the brushman with a stick*, both elements are unique to her 1979 version. Similarly, in 1984
Sarah explains that *axes did not exist* a long time ago. She further describes the old woman to be *throwing intestines in the direction of where she can feel the brushman pulling on the sticks* and finally, that *she is watching out* for the brushman. All of this information only emerges in her 1984 narration.

The development of the plot and the information contained in the two versions is, however, identical. Both versions begin with the introduction of the old woman and end with the brushman being killed at the old woman’s hands. Both versions describe where the old woman lives and explain what she does to survive. In 1979 and 1984, the plotline continues and the brushman is introduced shortly before he starts annoying the old woman. As a consequence of his annoying the old woman, she heats ground squirrel intestines up and throws them at the brushman to get rid of him. The story culminates in the death of the brushman at the old woman’s hands.

Finally, I would like to stress that when comparing the two versions of Sarah Frank’s story I am aware that I am working not only with Sarah’s spoken words, but possibly I am dealing with the end result of several people’s work. Nonetheless, I am impressed with the level of ‘identity’ of the two versions especially considering that most likely several people were involved in the process that led to the published version in *Neerihinjik* (1995).

A final topic that I would like to address is the function of the stories discussed in the previous pages. As stated earlier in this thesis, traditional stories (stories that have been told across generations) may have an additional function besides being told as a form of entertainment (e.g., McKennan 1965). While some of the stories may be told to communicate moral values, David Salmon explains that *Man in the Moon* is used to teach children “how to go out into the woods” along with other, unexplained, things (Salmon and March 1972). However, he does mention that the story is supposed to give wisdom about life in the wilderness and that the main purpose of telling the story is to teach children to survive in the woods, both during winter and summer (Salmon and March 1972).

While Moses Peters does not mention why the story was told in the past, he makes another very interesting statement. He remarks that he has to be correct when telling this story; however, in the next sentence he somehow negates this statement again when he asks the audience not to blame him in case he does make mistakes, since he only knows the version he has been hearing since he was a little kid himself (Peters and March 1972). It
would be interesting to know what exactly he meant when he said “I have to be correct when telling this story” (ibid 1972). It would be fascinating to find out whether his statement is simply meant to convey that the content and overall plotline is supposed to stay the same or whether he actually learned the story a certain way, for instance, word-for-word.

Considering that David Salmon mentions that *Man in the Moon* was used to teach children about going out into the wilderness, I imagine that the story may have been told in slightly different ways, highlighting and adapting parts of the story to the audience’s needs. Peters’s statement, on the other hand, leads me to think that he believes that the story has to be told in a specific way. The similarity in thematic structure in the two versions of *Man in the Moon* supports the idea that the versions represent the same story, but only, if a story has just those themes.

Since Sarah Frank’s two versions of *The Brushman* started without any introduction, the function of her versions of that specific story may forever stay undisclosed. However, Mishler writes in his introduction to *Neerihinjik* (Frank 1995:xix) that by the time Sarah narrated the first version for him, she was already a widow and may have intended to demonstrate that women can survive in such a hard climate without the help of men if they have to, or she may have simply wanted to tell a good story.

Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation and Shirleen Smith mention that heroic tales about women often highlight how “old women outwit danger and overcome great obstacles to protect and provide salvation for their people” (2009:41). They further emphasize that “old women, especially widows, were relatively powerless physically and vulnerable members of Gwich’in society. Long-ago stories highlight how they were able to overcome great difficulties in spite of their weakness and limited resources” (ibid 2009:41). While stories might be told differently in different villages even in Alaska, the function of these stories is most likely the same because the function is associated with the story, not with the different versions. The words used to convey a message may change not only between villages, but they may also adapt to individual storytellers. However, the message in itself stays the same.

To end this chapter, I am going to revisit my research questions regarding the two stories discussed in this thesis. To reiterate, my research questions are:
1. What are the emerging themes in the versions of a story narrated by two different storytellers?

2. What are the emerging themes in the versions of a story narrated by the same storyteller at different times?

3. How identical are the themes and the information contained in the emerging themes of the same story told by different storytellers or told at different times by the same storyteller?

Considering the findings presented in my analysis and discussion (the current chapter), I am concluding that the themes and content of the two versions of *Man in the Moon* and the themes and content of the two versions of *The Old Woman and the Brushman* is identical. To reiterate the themes of each story, refer to table 2 on page 93 of this thesis for the emerging themes in both versions of *Man in the Moon*. For the emerging themes of *The Old Woman and the Brushman*, refer to table 3 on page 97 of this thesis. As previously stated, the themes and content of both stories are identical. However, the amount of detail varies in each version. This means that a large number of themes appear in both versions of each story. While the two versions of a story are not the same word-for-word, they are identical on the level of emerging themes and information contained within those themes. Because they are identical on the level of emerging themes and the information contained within those themes, we can talk about identical versions of the same story.

Eliza Jones's statement, that stories can only be told a specific way, and no one can alter or revise them, should probably be taken with a grain of salt. Eliza Jones is Koyukon and not Gwich’in and it is possible that the storytelling traditions of the two Athabascan nations differ in that respect (DeMartino 1985:51). Additionally, we do not really know how far Eliza Jones's idea of telling a story in a certain way goes. For instance, telling a story a certain way may simply refer to the content or overall chronology of the story or the emerging themes, which may have to stay the same. If Eliza Jones’s statement refers to content and chronology, the two versions of *Man in the Moon* and *The Brushman* are identical. However, narrating a story a certain way may also refer to a word-for-word equivalent of the story, as it used to be told by the Elders (DeMartino 1985:51). If that is
the meaning of ‘a story can only be told a specific way’, then the different versions of the stories analyzed in this research are not identical.

Through my research I learned that the themes, or the occurring topics within multiple versions of a story, contain identical information, regardless of how much time passed between the storytelling events or whether the story is narrated by different storytellers. The most valuable lesson I learned was that different storytellers can perform the same story a little differently, for instance, one storyteller uses pauses, while another storyteller uses quickly spoken segments or a more quiet voice to express the same information. The result, the content and maybe less so the words, is overall the same. Even more importantly, I learned to be open to an idea in which identity between versions refers not to a word-for-word correlate between the versions, but to the transmitted content of the story. Since the emerging themes of both sets of stories and the information contained within those themes is the same, I conclude that the two versions of *Man in the Moon* and the two versions of *The Brushman* are identical.
Chapter 7: Conclusions

To conclude, this research project focuses on two Gwich’in stories. It sought to better understand how identical two stories are when they are narrated by two different storytellers or at different times. I found out that the themes and content of a story is identical, even when told by two or more different storytellers, or by the same storyteller, but at different points in time. It is possible that in the past stories were learned word-by-word and had to be told in a certain way, as Eliza Jones, a Koyukon elder, mentioned (DeMartino 1985:51). However, it is also possible that the storytelling traditions in Gwich’in and Koyukon are different and that while the aforementioned statement may apply to Koyukon storytelling, it may no longer hold, or never held true in Gwich’in. Yet, it is also possible that the content (i.e. the moral, ethical, and spiritual aspects of the story) is what has to be ‘retold exactly’. By that I mean the story may not be the element of concern, but the contents of the story are what is held essentially to be ‘sacred’, just as our physical, spoken voice is the element of concern, but what is said is what is really important/meaningful.

My research has demonstrated that with my method of analyzing two versions of a story by looking at the themes and the information contained within those themes, it is possible to find that several versions of a story have identical themes and contain the same information, only very few themes are unique to one version. A story may display identical themes whether the same storyteller narrates it or if two different storytellers tell a story. It is possible that one version includes some detail the other one does not contain and vice versa, but overall, the important parts of the story, the main themes, stay the same and the plot has only minor differences. The analyzed stories are not identical, however, when looking at a word-for-word comparison.

There is a gap in the literature pertaining to how people tell stories, which I acknowledge differs across cultures. I mentioned in the introduction of this thesis that I was able to locate literature concerning storytelling, as it seems prevalent in ‘western societies’, referring to storytelling enjoyed as a form of entertainment, which is also mostly addressed to children. However, storytelling as practiced in a former oral culture such as
Gwich’in has a different significance than in our traditions. While in the past stories such as the ones researched in this thesis oftentimes included moral or educational lessons, this aspect may have faded more into the background and may hold less importance currently than it used to in the past. For instance, David Salmon even mentions that *Man in the Moon* was supposed to teach children some wisdom about how to survive in the wilderness (Salmon and March 1972). Since the stories used in this research were recorded between 30 and 40 years ago, the functions of those specific stories may have changed and may no longer be equivalent to what they were said to be.

Nowadays, Gwich’in stories may also be told to entertain people. However, it is also important to remember that Gwich’in people may tell those stories to their descendants because they realize that this tradition is slowly dying. While many stories have been documented in one form or another, and sometimes it is even possible to find several versions of the same story, it is becoming increasingly rare and difficult to have a storyteller narrate such a tale. However, even if the tradition is practiced in the family and the narrator is not a storyteller, the tradition may remain intact until the voices of the last generation with that knowledge die and all that remains are the written and recorded stories. It is therefore important that stories are recorded, even if a version already exists.

In this MA thesis I have attempted to answer questions regarding the sameness of two versions of two specific Gwich’in stories. I learned that a story does not have to be significantly more identical just because it is narrated by the same storyteller, even versions of two or more different storytellers can indeed display an astounding identity when a story is parsed into its themes and those themes are compared to one another.

My comparison represents the beginning research that could be developed further, considering further versions of the story by different speakers and done at different times. Furthermore, working with English performances instead of written translations may have changed the outcome of this research. However, even if Sarah’s performance of the story in English were different from Lillian Garnett’s translations that were used as a basis for part of the data of this thesis, it is still likely that the results would be the same. Since, as Lévi-Strauss stated, “the mythical value of the myth is preserved even through the worst translation” (1963:210). Working with the original Gwich’in narrations may have painted a different picture regarding the emerging themes; for instance, the number of emerging
themes may be different had I worked not only with the English performance, but also with the Gwich’in version. However, I argue that my results are valid, but future research could enrich this research greatly.

7.1. Future Research

For future studies it would be important to examine more versions of a story such as the ones discussed in this research and compare them to each other to solidify the above discussion, that the emerging themes of a story narrated by the same storyteller at different times and the emerging themes of a story narrated by different storytellers are identical, and provide a deeper insight into Gwich’in stories.

Additionally, considering not only the English versions, but also the Gwich’in versions fully would benefit a further study greatly. While I attempted to create very simple translations, I ended up not using them due to their incompleteness. Working with Gwich’in speakers could enrich a further study significantly and could also attract the attention and interest of others in the field.

Furthermore, it would be interesting to talk to Gwich’in elders and find out more about Eliza Jones’s statement regarding storytelling in Koyukon and how supposedly children had to learn a story a certain way and they were not allowed to change anything about those stories (DeMartino 1985:51). This could lead to very interesting results considering that Moses Peters made a similar proclamation in the interview with Bridjette March (Peters and March 1972).

Finally, it would also be interesting to talk to the people behind the translations to integrate that knowledge into any future studies if working with the original language is not an option.
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Appendix A: Man in the Moon, David Salmon

1 IUs Bridjette March And eh where are you from
2 Literary Version Where are you from?
3 Background micro micro

4 IUs David Salmon Chalkyitsik mostly from
5 Literary Version Mostly from Chalkyitsik
6 Background micro

7 IUs David Salmon black river
8 Literary Version From Black River
9 Background micro

10 Literary Version Have you lived here all of your life?
11 IUs Bridjette March have you lived here all of your life
12 IUs David Salmon yes::
13 Literary Version Yes
14 Background micro

15 Paraverbal Features slowly
16 Background micro

17 Literary Version And you're a referend in what particular church?
18 IUs Bridjette March ah.. you're you're a referend in what? particular church
19 IUs David Salmon episcopal church
20 Background micro

21 Literary Version I'm a referend in the Episcopal Church
22 Background bird chatter micro

23 IUs Bridjette March and how long have you done that?
24 Literary Version How long have you done that?
25 Background micro bird chatter

26 IUs David Salmon e::h .. I was ordained
27 Literary Version I was first ordained in 1958

28 IUs David Salmon I was first ordained in 1958
29 Background bird chatter unknown noise

30 IUs David Salmon #deacon
31 Literary Version As deacon
32 Background unknown noise
IUs David Salmon then the second I was ordained

Literary Version Then the second time I was ordained pre 1962, both times in Fort Yukon

IUs David Salmon pre .. s ... 1962 ... both in Fort Yukon

IUs Bridjette March is ah . Chalkyitsik your ah

Literary Version Is Chalkyitsik your group of people? Is this where you hold most of your services? Or have you traveled to other places too?

IUs Bridjette March your . group of people is this where .. mostly you hold your services or have you traveled other places too?

IUs David Salmon eeh I travel to other places

Background micro

Literary Version I travel to other places, like the southern United States and Canada

IUs David Salmon like United State and Canada:

Paraverbal Features slowly and high pitch

IUs David Salmon down southern .. United State and . all the way to New York.. this is mostly for . training

Literary Version I'll travel to the southern United States; all the way to New York. This is mostly for training

Background micro

IUs Bridjette March now . the story that you're going to tell us today . eh

Literary Version Now, the story that you're going to tell us today, which particular story will you start with? Can you give us the title?

IUs Bridjette March which . particular story will you start with.. can you give us the title?

IUs David Salmon well the.. the title of the story

Background micro

Literary Version Well, the title of the story is the Man in the Moon

IUs David Salmon is the .. man in the moon #the

Background recorder
It's an old Indian story. I learned it from my father and other old people many years ago when I was young. This story is from the early time before white people came into this country. The sum of the story is that they use it for young people; they teach their young children how to go into the woods and do a lot of things.
Both for summer and winter time, this story is teaching the children some wisdom. For example, this story is used when boys grow into men. But they also use this story for many other things, for example, where they're living. One kid you know was once a kid, a young man. He is a special kid in his group of people. The little boy is a kid with special abilities, for example, he can foresee the future. The group of peoples you know.
He always predicts things ahead of time. For example, he knows what's going to happen tomorrow and he knows what's going to happen next week.

And many people, even of his own group of people, don't know about him and his special abilities.

And many people, even of his own group of people, don't know about him and his special abilities. But his parents, of course, they know about him.

Naturally, his parents would listen to him. So when he tells his parents that the people would kill a moose or a bunch of caribou the next day, they believe him.

The boy has a vision and foresees that the people will kill a bunch of caribou or moose.
IUs David Salmon 
the people gonna kill moose

IUs David Salmon 
or a bunch caribou

Background 
unknown person talking 
clattering

IUs David Salmon 
and they were gonna have lot of food

Literary Version 
The boy says they're not just going to kill some animals, but they're going to catch a lot

IUs David Salmon 
so one time you know

Background 
micro and tape

Literary Version 
One time their group of people was going to kill a bunch of caribou

IUs David Salmon 
eh

IUs David Salmon 
their group of people ... well he told his: ... parents that

Background 
micro

IUs David Salmon 
"tomorrow they gonna kill bunch caribou .. bi::g

Literary Version 
He tells his parents that the people are going to kill a big caribou herd

IUs David Salmon 
herds of caribou"

IUs David Salmon 
will be enough for

Background 
micro

Literary Version 
He says that the herd will be big enough for all the people, but he also tells them that one of those caribou would be his

Themes 
One of those killed caribou is just for the boy

IUs David Salmon 
all the...#kch-peoples

IUs David Salmon 
"but: .. one of those caribou will be mine" .. he said

Background 
tape
IUs David Salmon and ... "it'll be fat one too .. that's a special caribou .. that's for me

IUs David Salmon they gonna kill that among the p-

IUs David Salmon bunch caribou a
IUs David Salmon # I gonna have it"

Background animal

IUs David Salmon well . his parents knew

IUs David Salmon so the next
IUs David Salmon the next morning
IUs David Salmon the people went out
IUs David Salmon an:
IUs David Salmon they got .. bunch caribou
IUs David Salmon and then he start behind

IUs David Salmon when he got to the place

Background animal

IUs David Salmon he look around #eh for the caribou you know
IUs David Salmon because
IUs David Salmon well

IUs David Salmon all the caribou is . already divided you know
IUs David Salmon maybe
IUs David Salmon There are two or three caribou per person

IUs David Salmon two three caribou to each person
IUs David Salmon and when he got to the place you know he look at the
caribou and: he here and there and he walk around and finally

Literary Version So when he gets to the place he looks at all the caribou
and walks around

IUs David Salmon he comes to his angle
Background animal

Literary Version When he comes to his uncle and looks at that caribou, he
decides that this is the caribou he wants

Themes The uncle's caribou was supposed to be the boy's

IUs David Salmon uncle you know
IUs David Salmon sister: brother
Background animal

IUs David Salmon and he look at that caribou
IUs David Salmon an that's
IUs David Salmon that's the caribou he's talking about
IUs David Salmon that's a his

Literary Version He tells his uncle that he'd known that this caribou
would be his since the day before

IUs David Salmon and he told his uncle you know this caribou is mine
since yesterday you know I know this

Background coughing

IUs David Salmon thus this caribou is mine
Background clattering and animal

IUs David Salmon an his uncle said no

But his uncle tells him that he can't have this caribou

IUs David Salmon this is
IUs David Salmon mine
Background movement

IUs David Salmon people give it to me

The uncle says that people gave him the caribou because
he divided them and it was his right to have it

IUs David Salmon #for I divided the caribou and I have right to have it"
The boy says that this caribou has been his since the day before yesterday. His uncle wants to skin the caribou, but the boy starts crying because the uncle doesn't want to give him that specific caribou. The boy just walks around and cries for that caribou and then they bring back some of the caribou meat. The boy is wondering how they're going to haul the meat the next day. The next morning the people go out to haul the caribou.
IUs David Salmon to see
Paraverbal Features incompleteness of pronunciation

IUs David Salmon to #hold
IUs David Salmon caribou anyway

and when they got to the place is all covered with a snow you know

Literary Version When they get to the place where they left the caribou,
they find it all covered with snow

IUs David Salmon whole #a
Themes There is a caribou covered in snow

IUs David Salmon caribou
Literary Version The whole caribou is covered in snow

came to life and just run away .. that's all they see the track

Literary Version And suddenly, the caribou comes back to life and runs away

Themes The caribou comes back to life, runs away, and leaves tracks

IUs David Salmon that's the only thing they saw

Literary Version All they can see are the tracks it left

IUs David Salmon not even one piece of #meat there

Literary Version There is not even a single piece of meat left

an: then
Background micro and tape

IUs David Salmon from that time . you know . every night . he cry for that caribou

Literary Version From that time on the boy would cry for that caribou
every night because it was supposed to be his

Themes The boy cries over the caribou

IUs David Salmon "that caribou is supposed to be mine"

Background movement

IUs David Salmon and for that reason you know

Literary Version That is the reason why there would be a famine
It's early in the winter, so the boy knows that all the people would starve to death. He knows that all the peoples will be starved to death in that winter. But every night he started cry for that caribou. From then on the boy would cry every night for that caribou. Finally, the boy starts talking about leaving. He says that he would be leaving the people because he is going to the moon. He tells his parents that someday he will go to the moon. "Some of these night I'll go up to the moon." And then
From that time on, the parents keep an eye on him. The parents keep an eye on the boy; at night he even sleeps between them.

Every night they keep him. They watch him. When they sleep at night, the boy even sleeps between them.

They cover the boy with a blanket at night. That night his parents keep him the same way they always do.

One day he said, "This night I'll leave your people." That night his parents keep him the same way they always do, but they went to sleep both of them they went to sleep quickly.
At some point both of his parents fall asleep and when they wake up, early in the morning around three o'clock, before broad daylight, the boy is gone.

The parents wake up in the middle of the night and the boy is gone.

IUs David Salmon and early

Background movement recorder

IUs David Salmon in the morning.. round three o'clock. maybe clattering

Background tapping on micro

IUs David Salmon before broad daylight tapping on micro

#while they. wake up .. the boy is gone taping on micro

IUs David Salmon well they remember what he said anyways so they just..

got up and

They remember what the boy told them the day before; so they just get up and go about their business.

IUs David Salmon got up an:

Paraverbal Features incompleteness of pronunciation

IUs David Salmon I saw the fireplace is still there

Background tapping

IUs David Salmon They got hole up there you know and

Paraverbal Features incompleteness of pronunciation

IUs David Salmon They have a smoke hole in the skin house

Themes They live in a skin house with a smoke hole

IUs David Salmon skin house an:

Paraverbal Features incompleteness of pronunciation

IUs David Salmon where does the smoke go through
Background movement and breathing

IUs David Salmon well they look at-t-t#

The parents look everywhere but they can't find the boy

all over but they can't find the dogs too tapping

the boy's little dog

Neither can they find the dog incompleteness of pronunciation

and then they look at the hole up there

So when the parents look up at the smoke hole they can see one side of the boy's caribou skin fur pants hanging up there

an: sure enough incompleteness of pronunciation

the one side of his skin pants caribou

The boy has caribou skin pants

fur pants is .. #hanging up there it's caught you know it's caught in the stick you know it's just

One part of the pants was caught on a stick and torn off

torn off ... it's just hanging clinking and movement

up there you know

So it is just hanging up there animal

in a hole

so that both animal

Both of his parents go out and look at the moon
IUs David Salmon they both went out and
they look at the moon as
he's already up there

the
They see that he is already up there
slowly

the picture is already up there his dog was there and
The picture is already up there, completely with dog and

The parents can see the boy with his dog up on the moon,
along with the caribou front quarter

#the caribou front quarter .. he hauled you know
The caribou front quarter he hauled was on the right side

on the right side
you hold it like this and #the
the bo@y's

The boy is up there with one side of his pants torn

up there with ... one side #pants
unidentified noise

#eh and so
well
they came back an
animal

incompleteness of pronunciation

When they come back they are really weak
they're really ... #weak you know
night after night you know
and then the people

The people go out hunting every day but they don't kill anything
yeey hunting everyday and they don't kill nothing
#nd star- starvation #appeared
it started you know

So finally people start to starve

it was cold weather too

quickly

On top of that it got cold too

and when they were traveling you know they ... these

When they were traveling his mother and father would

always stay behind

his mother and father #was come behind

Background recorder

#s fathers go ahead you know . behind the peoples

Background tapping

Usually fathers go ahead, in front of the rest of the people

his mother was pulling ... sled you know with dogs .. one dog

His mother was pulling the sled with the help of the dog

and finally

At some point the sled gets caught on something and is

completely stuck

Sled gets stuck and upon examination, the boy is found

the sled is caught

Background movement

has caught something you know an ... just can't pull it ahead

and then finally . he turned the sled over and

quickly

The boy's father turns the sled over so he can see the

bottom of the sled; that's when he discovers that the boy is in the bottom of the sled

he see the bottom the boy is in the bottom of the sled

all the sled

and he tried to grab him but he said .. "mother you can't touch me
The father tries to grab the boy but the boy says he wouldn't be able to touch him because he is not really there IUs David Salmon because I already left IUs David Salmon and you just can't touch me anyway just stand there I'll talk to you" IUs David Salmon well he told her Paraverbal Features quickly Background tapping

The boy tells them that this is just the beginning of the starvation period and that it would be a long winter before the spring would finally come IUs David Salmon "the starvation is just... now.. start Paraverbal Features slowly

and it'll be a long winter too #yet IUs David Salmon before the spring IUs David Salmon be here an Paraverbal Features incompleteness of pronunciation Background tapping

#I'll g- I'll give you what to do anyway IUs David Salmon I'll give you what to do IUs David Salmon I'm gonna tell you what to do IUs David Salmon right now you have . eh

He says that right now they have only a caribou front quarter Themes His parents have only a caribou front quarter left for food IUs David Salmon only . caribou front quarter IUs David Salmon part of #a caribou front qu-q q-quarter in your sled .. that's only food you got now ... #left

The only food they have left is that part of a caribou front quarter they have in their sled IUs David Salmon so I'll .. give you . the Paraverbal Features slowly
Background tapping

IUs David Salmon direction anyway

Literary Version So he tells them what to do

IUs David Salmon how you can take care of that meat

Background tapping

Literary Version He tells them how they can take care of that meat

IUs David Salmon be sure an

Paraverbal Features incompleteness of pronunciation

Literary Version He tells them to make sure to put the meat in the finely tanned caribou skin

Themes Meat is put into a finely tanned caribou skin bag

IUs David Salmon be sure and put it in the fine tanned caribou skin

IUs David Salmon and rub it

Background recorder

Literary Version And to rub the meat over and keep it that way every day and night

IUs David Salmon over and

IUs David Salmon keep it that way

IUs David Salmon every day

Background micro

IUs David Salmon and every night

IUs David Salmon if you cook you can cut some of it

Paraverbal Features loudly

Literary Version And if they cook, they may cut some of it

IUs David Salmon maybe half of it and you can eat all you want

Literary Version Maybe half of it, and then they can eat all they want

Themes 1/2 of the meat can be eaten, the rest is put into the skin bag

IUs David Salmon and then put it back in the recorder

Background recorder

Literary Version But then they have to put it back in the skin
Paraverbal Features

557 high pitch

558 IUs David Salmon skin
559 IUs David Salmon and then the
560 Background movement and micro micro

561 Literary Version The day after they can open the caribou skin bag and the
562 meat will be the same piece again

563 IUs David Salmon the day after you can ... open it and eh .. it will be
564 the same piece again

565 IUs David Salmon you can do that all winter

566 Literary Version They can do that all winter long; that way they will live

567 IUs David Salmon and then you can live
568 Background micro

569 IUs David Salmon but all these people will be just . died you know

570 Literary Version But all the other people will die, they will starve.
571 There won't be enough food

572 IUs David Salmon starvation will be no food"
573 IUs David Salmon so
574 Background tapping

575 IUs David Salmon he disappeared
576 IUs David Salmon again
577 Literary Version Then the boy disappears again

578 IUs David Salmon #or . probably maybe next week
579 Paraverbal Features low pitch

580 Literary Version Maybe a week later, the same thing happens

581 IUs David Salmon same thing happened
582 IUs David Salmon he come behind

583 Literary Version The boy would follow the people and when their sled was
584 caught that would be the father's cue to look for the boy under the sled

585 IUs David Salmon people you know
586 IUs David Salmon the sled is #caught .. he look for his boy
587 IUs David Salmon boy is under the sled
588 Background micro
589 IUs David Salmon and the boy say "this is the last time I'll visit you
590 Literary Version However, that time the boy says that this would be the
591 last time he is visiting them before the spring, maybe the last time ever
592 IUs David Salmon before the spring
593 IUs David Salmon forever
594 IUs David Salmon I gonna leave right now
595 Literary Version He tells them that he would leave right now, but that
596 they would see him in the moon every day
597 Themes Boy announces that he will be leaving for good
598 IUs David Salmon but .. every day you gonna see me in the moon
599 IUs David Salmon for all the generation for ever
600 Literary Version For always
601 Paraverbal Features slowly
602 IUs David Salmon but one thing I gonna tell you is #the
603 Background tapping
604 Literary Version However, one thing he tells them is that during the moon
605 eclipse each year they have to pay attention and watch
606 closely
607 Background tapping
608 IUs David Salmon when the moons eclip you know .. each year
609 IUs David Salmon you have to watch
610 IUs David Salmon this will be the sign
611 Literary Version Because he would make a sign to the people
612 IUs David Salmon for the people
613 IUs David Salmon that I gonna make
614 IUs David Salmon and every time the sun eclipped you know
615 Literary Version He tells them that every time a sun eclipse happens, when
616 the moon hides the sun, and the moon is fully backwards
617 this means there will be a lot of food
618 Themes A backwards moon means there will be plenty of food
619 IUs David Salmon when it's
Background micro

IUs David Salmon t-the moon you know is just full backward like this you know
like #mean there'll be lots of food
next winter you know

He tells them to watch next winter

next year
so you watch there will be plenty

There will be plenty of food for the people

food for the people

but when the

But when the moon is bent over like this, when it almost falls over, then that means there will be a starvation

A forward bent moon means there will be a starvation

moon #christened you know #it is just bent over like this you know fall over like this that mean will be starvation so be sure and watch that, each year"

He tells them to make sure to watch out for that each year

When I was a kid my mother used to tell this story every time the moon falls back like this

He’s giving extra info here, not actually telling the story

every time
every time eh
the moons fall back like this you know and eh ... eclipse eh .. they have a song for it .. and I

There is a song for it

Mentioning of a song that exists

I forgot the song

But I forgot the song

and they ... carry the pack you know
So they carry packs of something you know and they just visit around

They visit with each other and then they sing this song because they know there'll be plenty of food the next year

around town like this #then (H)

They sing and everything because there'll be a plenty you know .. there'll be plenty of food next year

and I used to sing that when I was kids you know I go around and visit the peoples you know because that's good sign for next year

I used to sing that song when I was a kid and I'd go around and visit the people because that's a good sign for next year

well alright

Another way that

Another way the moon may fall over means something else

the moons fall over like this you know (H)

then the people

Then the people look sad tapping

#or look sad you know I myself well I don't say nothing anyway I don't sing or jus:

In that case I don't say anything or sing, I'm just sad because next year will be tough

sad you know because .. next year will be tough

well this- that's the .. that's the whole story of the .. man in the moon

That is, that's the whole story of the man in the moon
Can you give me your name please?

Moses Peters

Can you give me your name please

Moses Peters

Were you born and raised in Chalkyitsik, or when did you come here?

and .. were you born and raised in Chalkyitsik or when did you come here

I was born way up in the wilderness at a time when there were not very many white people around

I was born way up in the wilderness and where's that time was not very much #of .. white people and so I guess now I leave I born as #childress

I was born in the year of 1895

the years an:::

When did you come to Chalkyitsik?

1895

and when did you come to Chalkyitsik

I was raised in Fort Yukon and came to Chalkyitsik in late 1919

I come to ## raised in Fort Yukon .. (H) and I come to Chalkyitsik in 1919 late

This means you've been here for a long time
Bridjette March IUs: So you've been here a long time huh.

Literary Version: I've been here during all this time. Even when they were trapping. Unfortunately, now I'm getting too helpless to stay home alone.

Moses Peters IUs: Now I've been here all the during the time trapping and everyone and ### time to raise. Now I'm getting too helpless while stay home.

Background micro micro micro

Literary Version: Can you tell me a little bit about the story that you'll tell us today?

Bridjette March IUs: Can you tell me a little bit about the story that you'll tell us today.

Literary Version: Yes. I'm going to tell you a story that I got from my children.

Moses Peters IUs: Yes. I gonna tell you a little story and I got that story (H).

Background micro

Literary Version: They may use this story when I passed away.

Moses Peters IUs: #ki-k#$i from my children. They may use #it #after I'm pass away.

Literary Version: Whenever I have time I tell them a couple of sentences of the story.

Moses Peters IUs: So I just keep making the # in the sentence #wherever #to #tunes # stop this is some time if they had chance.

Background movement tapping micro

Literary Version: I got to be correct in this story. But if I'm wrong, don't blame me, I'm telling you the version I've been hearing since I was a little kid.

Paraverbal Features quickly

Moses Peters IUs: I got to be correct in this story. But if I'm wrong with this story well then I don't make that story well that's the #version I been hearing since (H) I was a little kid.

Background tape
I'll give you one story, and the title of that story is: the Man in the Moon

Additional Information the title is slightly different (the man in/on the moon)

#so I'll give you one story: the man on the moon

Background micro

Gwich'in version starts here

Gwich'in generator

Gwich'in version ends here

Moses talks about narrating the story in English

That's the end of this little story

Now we try ... ehm translate it into English

Maybe I'm wrong #but it's alright

Way way back in the old time the people are just get together and are close when they're

The old times

A long time ago the people stay close together, even when they are moving around and roaming the country

Moving #around roaming the country

When they kill a moose, they share it with each other

When an animal is killed, the group does it together and then they will share the meat

Gwich'in word

hatsaa there's so why
When they kill a caribou, they surround it first and then they kill it.

Moses Peters IUs and when they kill caribou .. when they surround and they kill it.

That's the only way to provide food.

Moses Peters IUs and that's the only way .. they don't kill no.

If they don't kill anything the children won't have any food the next morning.

they don't kill nothing .. no food next morning for the children.

One winter .. people had li:::ttle.

One winter, people had a bit of a hard time.

and the young .. pretty two pretty

And there's this young, married couple.

They have a little boy

married

got one little boy

and they liked that boy and l'I'll- m-

They are all really close

boy .. liked the mother
Moses Peters IUs that the news come back and somebody's here

Literary Version Somebody comes back with the news that a big caribou herd was sighted in the mountains

Themes Caribou are sighted in the mountains, the boy wants to go with the grown-ups

Moses Peters IUs big h - caribou (H) caribou in the mountain

Paraverbal Features loudly

Moses Peters IUs so this little boy said

Literary Version The little boy begs his father to bring him to the hunt since there were half a dozen caribou there

Background micro motor (generator)

Moses Peters IUs "my father packed me

Moses Peters IUs "#half #dozen

Moses Peters IUs (H) "there"

Literary Version The father tells the boy he can't bring him because he would have to run after caribou, but the boy says he would just have to find a way to do it

Moses Peters IUs "I'll have to run after caribou how could I go and pack you" ... I said "just have to do it" he said

Paraverbal Features loudly

Moses Peters IUs so , alright

Moses Peters IUs he #pack-ed

Background tape

Moses Peters IUs and he pack me behind and "don't make no noise" and kid would just #ask #small #little ##

Literary Version The father packs his son onto his back and tells him to be quiet and whenever the child talks too much, the father would quiet him down

Background micro clicking
When they see the caribou, the boy almost loses his magic craft. The boy's “magic craft” changes the animal's behavior, making it crazy. When they see the moose, they have to choose a magic craft, and the little boy says he would do it.
Moses Peters IUs that little boy said, "I'll do it, I may I do it."

Background tape micro

Moses Peters IUs well, this is alright

Literary Version So the father tells him what he has to do

Background micro

Moses Peters IUs alright, #te "#what you gonna do"

Moses Peters IUs so he said

Paraverbal Features slowly

Moses Peters IUs "gimme"

Literary Version The father tells him to give an arrow to each person

Moses Peters IUs "each one"

Moses Peters IUs "one arrow to each person"

Literary Version The boy would get his part later. He packs and ties it up

Moses Peters IUs "I'll give you a #part #after #a #while" ...(H) and I tied it and let me pack it

Background micro

Paraverbal Features quickly

Moses Peters IUs "and make a bi:::g"

Literary Version They make a big snow pile, using the crown, the ribs, and they leave everything on it

Themes Burying a caribou in a pile of snow

Background clicking

Moses Peters IUs "snow #pole is it"

Moses Peters IUs "one from the #crown"

Background clicking

Moses Peters IUs "his #crib an: #price and everything on it"

Background micro

Literary Version So the little boy starts to walk; he just keeps going, along the snow and while he is doing so, he is also hauling something

Moses Peters IUs (H) and that little boy he started to #walk and he just, going down street down the snow he got to #haul something an: he (H)
And all of a sudden he finds a big horn; but it turns out it’s not just a horn, he finds a living caribou!

Moses Peters IUs (H) put a little #back #press on he come up with a big horn with a caribou #caribou #eh (H) live caribou

One of the caribou is alive

Moses Peters IUs clicking clicking and micro micro and then

He just pushes until the caribou is dead

Moses Peters IUs he just pushed it down #or ## and #killed #it

"kill all that

He tells him that he has to kill that caribou and that he couldn’t tell anyone else about it

"and then don’t let don’t let not one go kill all that

"but I tell you

But he says that he wants one fat caribou

The boy wants one fat caribou in a month

"you are gonna give me one.. fat caribou"

That he should give him that caribou in a month

"in #a #month that caribou .. give it to me"

So he agrees

#hell what he agree
When they get the chance, they surround a whole herd of caribou and kill all of them, giving a caribou to each family. So when they get the chance, they surround a whole herd of caribou and kill all of them, giving a caribou to each family.

Moses Peters IUs so they kill us or they surrounding rounds and they killing the whole caribou (H) and they shared a caribou to each a family.

Themes Caribou are killed together and shared among the whole group.

Background movement

Moses Peters IUs and his father go around he say the child said "you wanna

Literary Version The father goes around and asks who wants a fat caribou

Background tape

Moses Peters IUs "fat caribou"

Background micro movement

Moses Peters IUs nobody #know

Background micro

Literary Version Nobody knows except the boy’s uncle

Background micro

Paraverbal Features indistinct

Moses Peters IUs #except his

Moses Peters IUs his uncle his uncle

Literary Version The boy’s uncle has one caribou and this man comes and wants one too but it's the little boy's

Background micro

Paraverbal Features indistinct

Moses Peters IUs got one

Moses Peters IUs and this man coming to pack little boy in his # it's caribou "#rest little child #one .. no no"

Literary Version The man says that this caribou is his

Background micro

Literary Version So the boy starts crying

Moses Peters IUs "that's mine" he said

Moses Peters IUs and the baby started crying

Themes The boy cries because the man wants to take his caribou
280  Background movement
281  Moses Peters IUs and everybody #leaving that's
282  Literary Version Everybody leaves that night before it gets dark
283  Background clicking micro
284  Moses Peters IUs that night .. before dark
285  Paraverbal Features indistinct
286  Moses Peters IUs so he-the little boy said #eh
287  Literary Version The little boy tells them to haul all the caribou they have
288  Background micro
289  Paraverbal Features loudly
290  Moses Peters IUs "you have to"
291  Moses Peters IUs "#hauling #it a:ll the caribou you got here"
292  Background tape
293  Literary Version But the uncle wonders how he is supposed to do that because it's a heavy caribou
294  Background tape
295  Moses Peters IUs how could I #haul him he's heavy"
296  Literary Version The boy says they could haul the caribou tomorrow
297  Moses Peters IUs "#can #we a #haul him tomorrow" .. I says right away
298  Background micro
299  Moses Peters IUs he say #at #it .. so
300  Literary Version The uncle agrees and they tie the skin together
301  Moses Peters IUs "alright you tie the skin together"
302  Background micro and movement
303  Literary Version These days they would cut some rope but back then there was no rope
304  Moses Peters IUs in those day they those cut some rope but #then#they had no rope
305  Background clicking
306  Themes Rope didn’t exist back in the day
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They just cut a little string from an animal hide. They would use moose or caribou hide to make rope. He gets some hide and they tie it all up. He starts to pull and walk but he doesn't feel like he is making any progress. So he walks and looks back and tells himself that it is time to go home now. They are going home.
The child is crying all night. Moses Peters IUs and the child was crying all night.

The little boy is crying over the caribou. So the man gets up and tries to quiet the little boy and tells him he doesn't want to hear him cry anymore.

Moses Peters IUs and this man got up I can quiet that little child. "I don't wanna hear you cry" he said.

He finally gets mad because he can't stop the boy's crying.

The boy just won't listen to anyone.

The father tells the boy to wait inside the house. The father tells the boy to wait inside the house.
boy starts crying because he thinks the father is not going to help him

Moses Peters IUs when he started cry "I not gonna help me use it"

Background loud micro

Literary Version Those people are all like a big group

Additional Information This information may not pertain to the story itself

Moses Peters IUs and this people they all like group .. the family is going out

Literary Version The family is hauling a caribou

Moses Peters IUs and this people they all like group .. the family is going out

Literary Version The family is hauling a caribou

With a sled... #hauling a caribou .. (H) #mid in

On their way they hear something

Paraverbal Features loudly

Moses Peters IUs #but #anyway

Paraverbal Features indistinct

Moses Peters IUs #when #they #gone they hear som-some . something we hear something long way

Background tape

The child comes home crying

Moses Peters IUs #well but the crying

Paraverbal Features incompleteness of pronunciation

Moses Peters IUs come home crying

Moses Peters IUs an:

Literary Version When they come home the little boy starts crying

because their sled is empty

Moses Peters IUs they come home cry there's nothing they .. empty sled

Paraverbal Features indistinct

Themes One of the caribou gets back to life

Literary Version The little boy said he wants a fat caribou

Moses Peters IUs what the little child said he wanted the #fat #caribou #for #this

Literary Version They catch caribou and pack some

Paraverbal Features indistinct and quickly
Moses Peters IU: the uncle threw a good and gi- and came back and little child #mattack all the caribou away kill we pack some of em in but is still getting well and get back to life and all

Literary Version: One of those caribou gets back to life and runs away

Background micro movement and micro Moses Peters IU: run away Moses Peters IU: #they #said

Moses Peters IU: so .. after he got through

Literary Version: After he is done taking the wood inside the skin shelter, he is sore but happy

Moses Peters IU: pulling the wood inside the house . not house but the skin shelter

Moses Peters IU: he was

Moses Peters IU: he was #sore he not .. he's not really so happy

Moses Peters IU: and he said

Literary Version: The boy tells them to fill some blood into the caribou stomach

Themes: Filling blood into the caribou stomach, cooking and eating it, and putting it under the blanket, the next morning it will be filled up again

Moses Peters IU: "#full the little blood with the caribou stomach"

Paraverbal Features incompleteness of pronunciation Moses Peters IU: an:: ... he..t

Moses Peters IU: he's . making

Literary Version: And then he cooks the blood and eats it

Moses Peters IU: he cook. cooked the blood and e:at it

Moses Peters IU: he had

Moses Peters IU: nothing it's nothing inside the stomach
Literary Version When the stomach is empty they should put it under the blanket and the next morning it will have replenished itself.

Moses Peters IUs "they put under your blanket next morning we wanna fill up again."

Background micro
Moses Peters IUs "but don't move".

Literary Version The boy also tells them not to go anywhere until all the snow is gone so nobody can see them traveling; only then could they go home.

Moses Peters IUs "don't move nowhere until all the snow go out nobody gonna see you were traveling and you could go home."

Background micro
Moses Peters IUs "don't move nowhere until all the snow go out nobody gonna see you were traveling and you could go home."

Background micro
Moses Peters IUs "n-no: you can't you #would is in .. how could you.. move when missing you."

Paraverbal Features indistinct quickly
Moses Peters IUs why - we- why

Literary Version The boy tells them that he is going to the moon.

Moses Peters IUs and "I'll go to moon" he said.

Literary Version But his parents tell him that he can't go because they would be missing him.

Moses Peters IUs "n-no: you can't you #would is in .. how could you.. move when missing you."

Paraverbal Features loudly
Moses Peters IUs so he says "alright"

Background movement
Moses Peters IUs they hauling

Literary Version And then, one morning, the little boy is missing.

Moses Peters IUs one morning little child was missing.

Background micro
One morning, the boy is missing. Some people are sent out, but they all starve to death while they go out for something they were sent and all that (H) .. well that party was starved to death and forcing to death.

And then he goes out loudly and then he goes out.

He is looking for a sign, but there is none. There is no sign of any kind; it's snowing.

not of .. an::y kind of a sign ... it's snowing.

first snow is over and no sign.

When the first snow is over and there is still no sign, they all start to cry.

and they cry and cry and.

The boy has a marten coat and marten pants.

he got marten coat and marten pants.

The boy wears a marten coat and marten pants.

### that's pretty expensive #for

That is expensive fur for clothes in those days.

This seems to be additional information, not part of the story.
One night, the boy is sleeping in between his mother and father and they are holding him. He tells them that he really has to go, "I'll got to go," he says. They wake up and the boy tells them not to hold him because he has to go back. He tells them that he really has to go, "I'll got to go," he says. They stay with him for a little while and he tells them that he really has to go, "I'll got to go," he says. They wake up and the boy tells them not to hold him because he has to go back.
525 Literary Version The boy says that they will see him in their dreams
526 Moses Peters IUs I #meant that "you'll see me #we you'll see me"
527 Literary Version He tells them that they would be all together in his dreams
528 Moses Peters IUs "#on my dream ... you will see me with me"
529 Moses Peters IUs so when my dream
530 Background loud micro
531 Moses Peters IUs "#when the moon eclip ... is"
532 Literary Version The boy tells them that when the moon eclipse is
533 forward, there is going to be a bad disaster; they are going to have a hard time
534 for quite a while
535 Themes A forward moon eclipse means a disaster, a backward
536 moon eclipse means there will be plenty of animals
537 Moses Peters IUs "forward ... is that mean"
538 Moses Peters IUs "gonna be ... bad disaster"
539 Background micro
540 Moses Peters IUs "hard time for a long time"
541 Moses Peters IUs "and . when it eclip"
542 Literary Version However, a backward moon eclipse means that there will
543 be a lot of animals
544 Paraverbal Features indistinct
545 Moses Peters IUs "eclip backward"
546 Moses Peters IUs "that mean"
547 Moses Peters IUs "I #uh I had lots of "
548 Moses Peters IUs "#sufficient of"
549 Background micro
550 Paraverbal Features incompleteness of pronunciation
551 Moses Peters IUs "animal an:"  
552 Background micro
553 Moses Peters IUs "nd I packed bag" #he #saying
554 Literary Version While he is packing his bag he tells them that they
555 would see him again
556 Moses Peters IUs "you see me I pack bag and so my #pack is all heavy"
Background micro
Moses Peters IUs so that the time

Additional Information This seems to be an additional comment regarding the
microphone and him wanting to sing
Moses Peters IUs you put little piece of crap and I can sing listening
in English and I guess so I guess they could hear that and:

Paraverbal Features indistinct
Themes Mentioning of a song that exists

Background movement
Paraverbal Features loudly
Moses Peters IUs #other .. so he said
Moses Peters IUs you make this song is it
Additional Information This also seems to be additional info regarding a song
that is not included in this recording
Moses Peters IUs he make this song that somebody #could translate it
Moses Peters IUs to sing .. the same voice .. I hope I do

Background clicking
Paraverbal Features indistinct
Moses Peters IUs and then I can try it in English
Moses Peters IUs well it is kind of a foolish business but
Moses Peters IUs anyway I used to do when #I'm a kid

Paraverbal Features loudly
Moses Peters IUs so .. #why I gonna #lift #up #that sing anyway

Paraverbal Features loudly
Moses Peters IUs so:

Additional Information This seems to be additional information, not part of the story
Paraverbal Features indistinct
Moses Peters IUs ## #United #State #government

Background movement
Literary Version Goes to the moon
Moses Peters IUs goes to the ... to the moon

Background micro
Moses Peters IUs I heard it. not very long ago ... first time
Additional Information  This information seems to be directed at the interviewer and the audience.
Appendix C: The Old Woman and the Brushman, Sarah Frank 1979

1 Craig Mishler IUs We will now listen to: Sarah Frank’s very short story. shyaaghan naa’iin haa

2 Craig Mishler IUs the old woman and the brush man. the first version

3 Craig Mishler IUs it begins on page 224 and ends on page 226:

4 Sarah Frank IUs eh shyaaghan ch’ihlak

5 Literary Version This one old woman was in the same situation as the other one.

6 Translation IUs one old woman

7 Gwich’in Sentence Chan shyaaghan ch’ihlak aii chan gwik’it t’inchy’aa.

8 Sarah Frank IUs #chan ts’à’ shyaaghan ch’ihlak #chan

9 Themes There was once an old woman

10 Background sound in the background

11 Sarah Frank IUs aii chan

12 Translation IUs also like the one old woman that one also

13 Sarah Frank IUs aii chan gwik’it t’inchy’aa #zhik

14 Translation IUs also like that one

15 Sarah Frank IUs ts’à’ # ttha oonilj’

16 Translation IUs and ground squirrel

17 Gwich’in Sentence Adqhzrhrjh gwich’ij’ ts’à’ ttha oonilj’.

18 Paraverbal Features slowly

19 Themes The old woman lives alone and snares ground squirrels

20 Literary Version She was living alone and snaring ground squirrels.

21 Sarah Frank IUs #izhik #dhidii

22 Sarah Frank IUs #gwich’ii #dazhrii

23 Translation IUs sitting right there

24 Sarah Frank IUs akhài’ chan

25 Translation IUs live but then also

26 Background recorder

27 Sarah Frank IUs oo’òk ttha oonilj’ aii oondaa ikhyàa gwiizhik it’ee
Translation IUs she was out there singeing a few ground squirrels

Gwich'in Sentence Oo’ök tthaa tsal teech'alaj' aii oondaa ikhyàq.

Literary Version The few ground squirrels she caught in snares, she was singeing.

Themes She would singe the ground squirrels she caught

Sarah Frank IUs k'il ninjyàa aii oondaa

Background door slamming

Translation IUs a little farther there were long dried willows

Gwich'in Sentence Gwiizhik it'ee k'il ninjyàa, aii oondaa yitsì̂j gwizhrì̂h jyàa diyah'in ts'à' yìil̂k'á'.

Literary Version She was using a long dry willow stick to poke the willows.

Themes She uses a willow stick as poking device

Sarah Frank IUs yitsì̂j gwizhrì̂h jyàa diyah'in ts'à' #t'ee

Sarah Frank IUs yìil̂k'á'

Sarah Frank IUs aìì gwiižhik

Translation IUs she's only doing that nevertheless

Gwich'in Sentence Aìì gwiižhik gwintsàl too gòóllì̂j ts'à' t'ee.

Literary Version It was beginning to get dark.

Themes It is getting dark

Sarah Frank IUs gwintsàl too gòóllì̂j

Sarah Frank IUs ts'à' t'ee

Translation IUs it's getting dark and

Background tape

Sarah Frank IUs Han gwinjik vàh . tàjì̂h

Translation IUs along the river there's a hill

Gwich'in Sentence Han gwinjik vàh tàjì̂h jèiinch'yàa, gweedi' nììnlàjì̂j.

Literary Version She was up on top of the river bank.

Themes She was on top of a river bank, below her a strong current was running

Sarah Frank IUs tàjì̂h jèiinchy'àa

Translation IUs that's how it is

Background clattering
Sarah Frank IUs
gweedi' ní #nlajj
Translation IUs
up the bank
Sarah Frank IUs
aii ts'á' jyàa díí'in ts'á' .. #nya
Translation IUs
she's doing that, they say
Gwich'in Sentence
Aii ts'á' jyàa díí'in ts'á' yeendàa gwìilik'q' ts'á' tthaa ikhyaàq.
Sarah Frank IUs
#anh
Literary Version
Below her the current was running strong.
Sarah Frank IUs
oo'án #neekhoo
Gwich'in Sentence
Gwiizhik it'ee ooch'iitthàn k'il jèiinch'yaa daatin aijj
noondàk, aijj jyàa dàh'in vârâhnyàa.
Literary Version
Meanwhile she was busy singeing the ground squirrel in the fire.
Sarah Frank IUs
#nitth
Themes
She is singeing ground squirrels
Background
child singing
Sarah Frank IUs
#nitsee #yaghahan #nagoo'naa
Paraverbal Features
indistinct echo
Background
movement and unidentified person speaking
Sarah Frank IUs
#mhm
aii ts'á' t'ee
Additional Info
unidentified person speaking
Translation IUs
that one and then
Gwich'in Sentence
Aijj t'ee naa'in t'ii'in.
Literary Version
The brushman was doing that.
Paraverbal Features
quickly
Themes
The brushman starts annoying her
Sarah Frank IUs
aii ts'á' jyàa #díí'in yeendàa gwìilik'q' .. tthaa ikhyaàq
Translation IUs
and then she's doing that; later she's singeing ground squirrel
Gwich'in Sentence
Aii gwiizhik tthaa ikhyaàq.
Literary Version
She kept singeing the ground squirrel.
Background
child speaking
Sarah Frank IUs  tthaa ikhyàq gwiiżhik it’ee
Translation IUs  now she’s singeing the ground squirrel
Paraverbal Features  indistinct

Sarah Frank IUs  #eii .. ooch’iitthan k’il jëiinchy’aa . daatin aìì
Translation IUs  over there dried willows are piled up, that’s how it is

Gwich’in Sentence  Jìi tthaa vât aìì t’ee oondaa kò’ kat gwintł’òo yàhkhyàa.
Literary Version  She put the ground squirrel’s guts on the fire to make them hot.
Themes  She has a pile of dried willows and lights them on fire
Sarah Frank IUs  aìì t’ee #oon noondàk jyàa dàh’in vàràh
Translation IUs  they say that’s how
Paraverbal Features  incompleteness of pronunciation

Gwich’in Sentence  Gwintl’òo nindhaa yîltsàìì t’ëeq t’ee zhik traa noondak
izhik ch’iitthan gwíky’ànaìì akhài’ chan yeechit gwà’àn chan
neetrèegwahaathàk vàrâhnàa.

Literary Version  They say she made them really hot and then she took a
long willow and threw them down below where the firewood was piled up, they say.
Themes  She makes the ground squirrel guts hot
Background  child speaking
Sarah Frank IUs  aìì t’ee naa’in
Translation IUs  that one brushman
Paraverbal Features  indistinct
Craig Mishler IUs  mhm
Sarah Frank IUs  aìì #ts’à’ #jyàa #t’ii’in
Translation IUs  that one, that’s how
Gwich’in Sentence  Aìì shyaaghan hàanigwii’aiì t’ii’in.
Literary Version  The brushman kept annoying the old woman.
Background  child speaking
Sarah Frank IUs  aìì shyaaghan hàanigwii’aiì
Translation IUs  that one is annoying the old woman
Background  child speaking
Sarah Frank IUs aii ts’â’ t’ee
Translation IUs and then
Background child speaking

Sarah Frank IUs gwiizhik tthaa ikhyàq #jèiinch’yaa tthaa
Translation IUs that’s how it is; in the meantime she’s singeing ground squirrels

Gwich’in Sentence Tthaa trik nindhaa dzat vindée hee naanajj t’ii’in lèe.

Literary Version The insides of the intestines she threw down got into his eyes.
Themes She throws the insides of the intestines into the brushman’s eyes

Sarah Frank IUs #tthaa jii tthaa vat
Translation IUs ground squirrel
Background child speaking

Sarah Frank IUs tthaa vat ajj t’ee
Translation IUs that one fat ground squirrel
Background child speaking

Sarah Frank IUs oondaa kò' kat gwintl’òo yàhkhyàa
Translation IUs make it very hot on the fire

Additional Info last word is either slurred or does not reflect the word in the book
Background child singing and speaking

Sarah Frank IUs gwintl’òo nindhaa yiłtsajj tl’ee t’ee zhik
Translation IUs make that really hot

Sarah Frank IUs zhik traa noondak #jyàa #t’ii’in ızhik ch’iðhàn
Translation IUs she picks up that wood right there, but then it fell down

Sarah Frank IUs akhài’ chan
Translation IUs also then
Paraverbal Features quickly

Sarah Frank IUs yeechit ### gwà’àn chan neetrèegwahaathàk vàràh
Translation IUs over there, crashing through the bushes they say
Paraverbal Features quickly, then gradually slower; incompleteness of pronunciation
Sarah Frank IUs akhàì’
Translation IUs but then but then
Background child speaking
Sarah Frank IUs aii naa’in #deetthan t’ii’in ìee varàh
Translation IUs that one brushman, down the slope they say
Sarah Frank IUs naa’in
Paraverbal Features incompleteness of pronunciation
Background child speaking
Craig Mishler IUs hm
Sarah Frank IUs #mhm
Translation IUs the brushman
Background recorder child speaking
Sarah Frank IUs naa’in #dee’in #ìee #dzat
Translation IUs the brushman is doing
Sarah Frank IUs tthaa trik
Translation IUs the ground squireel intestines
Paraverbal Features indistinct
Gwich’in Sentence Tthaa trik nindhaa dzat vindèe hee naanaqìì t’ii’in ììe.
Literary Version The insides of the intestines she threw down got into his eyes.
Sarah Frank IUs nindhaa
Translation IUs hot
Background child speaking and clattering
Sarah Frank IUs aii dzat vindèe naanaqìì ììe
Translation IUs that one fell into his eyes
Sarah Frank IUs aii ts’ã’ #jììa jèiinch’aa zhyàq
Translation IUs and then, that's how it is
Gwich’in Sentence Aii ts’ã’ jèiinch’yaa zhyàq yeechit khàìty’ah’ee ts’ã’ jèiinch’yaa vàràhnyàa.
Literary Version They say he was kneeling over there.
Themes The brushman is kneeling
Background child speaking
Sarah Frank IUs yeechit #ts’a’ khâtly’âh’ee ts’a’#gwa’an jêiinchy’aa vârâh

Translation IUs over there, that’s how it is, they say

Paraverbal Features incompleteness of pronunciation
Background child speaking

Sarah Frank IUs aii #gwi- jêiinchy’aa gwiizhik #hee
Translation IUs that’s what happened

Paraverbal Features indistinct

Gwich’in Sentence Jêiinch’yaa gwiizhik jidii t’ii’in yuunyâq eenjit yuukeehâh’ya’ akhâi’ naa’in.

Literary Version While he was over there she wanted to know what happened so she went to see.

Sarah Frank IUs jidii t’ii’in yuunyâq #eenjit yuukeehâh’ya’ akhâi’
Translation IUs but then he was thinking something
Paraverbal Features indistinct and quickly

Sarah Frank IUs naa’in
Translation IUs the brushman

Sarah Frank IUs dazhoo . ik naatsuu ts’a’ yeechit dee’ân
Translation IUs over there he was wearing a moose fur coat

Gwich’in Sentence Dazhoo ik naatsuu ts’a’ yeechit dee’ân khâtî’âh’ee vârâhnâa.

Literary Version They say he was wearing a fur coat and was kneeling over there.

Themes The brushman is wearing a fur coat
Background child speaking

Sarah Frank IUs khâtly’âh’ee vûrâh
Translation IUs they say

Sarah Frank IUs #jyâa #t’iin’jyaa
Paraverbal Features incompleteness of pronunciation

Sarah Frank IUs #ah gwiizhik t’ee
Translation IUs he’s doing that
Background child speaking

Translation IUs in the meantime
211 Gwich'in Sentence    Gwiizhik t'ee zhik gwà’än gał ḏonjik.
212 Literary Version    Then she went and grabbed a stick to hit the brushman.

213 Themes             She hits the brushman with a stick
214 Background         child speaking

215 Sarah Frank IUs     #yuu gwà’än gał ḏonjik
216 Translation IUs     got a bat
217 Background         child speaking

218 Sarah Frank IUs     aii #ah dzq̓a̓q hee
219 Translation IUs     that one here

220 Gwich’in Sentence   Aii dzq̓a̓q hee yichi’itsiq ch’aghkhaa vàrâhnyàa.
221 Literary Version    They say she hit him with that.

222 Sarah Frank IUs     yichi’tsíq ch’aghkhaa vàrâh
223 Translation IUs     they say she hit

224 Sarah Frank IUs     yíiłkhwají
225 Paraverbal Features incompleteness of pronunciation
226 Background         tape

227 Translation IUs     she killed him
228 Gwich’in Sentence   Yíiłkhwají
229 Literary Version    And she killed him.

230 Sarah Frank IUs     @@@@@
231 Paraverbal Features laughing
232 Themes             She kills the brushman
233 Background         child speaking
Appendix D: The Old Woman and the Brushman, Sarah Frank 1984

1 Translation IUs one again
2 Sarah Frank IUs # ch’ihlak chan

3 Gwich’in Sentence Shyaaghan ch’ihlak chan naa’in dîlghwajj gîiyâñnyàa.
4 Literary Version Once again there was this old woman who killed a brushman.

5 Translation IUs they say that one old woman killed a brushman
6 Background tape
7 Sarah Frank IUs Shyaaghan ch’ihlak chan naa’in dîlghwajj gîiyâñnyàa
8 Themes There was once and old woman who killed a brushman

9 Translation IUs that one also
10 Sarah Frank IUs ajj chan reh
11 Gwich’in Sentence Ajî chan reh tl’eedik gwïïlk’q’ ts’â’ it’ee izhik chat tthaa ikhyaq.
12 Literary Version She had a fire next to a river and was singeing ground squirrels.

13 Translation IUs bank of land
14 Paraverbal Features indistinct slowly
15 Sarah Frank IUs tl’eedik
16 Themes The old woman has a fire next to a river and is singeing ground squirrels

17 Translation IUs fire and now
18 Sarah Frank IUs gwïïlk’q’
19 Sarah Frank IUs ts’â’ it’ee
20 Translation IUs right there she was singeing ground squirrels

21 Translation IUs a little bit right there
22 Sarah Frank IUs izhik chat tthaa ikhyaq
23 Sarah Frank IUs izhik chat # it’ee gwïntsål
24 Gwich’in Sentence Izhik chat it’ee gwïntsål too neegwiilik gïnyàa.
25 Literary Version It was just getting dark.
26 Themes It is getting dark
27 Translation IUs they say it was getting dark at that time
28 Sarah Frank IUs too neegwiilik gïnyàa
31 Gwich’in Sentence  
Ajj ts’å’ it’ee oondaa ttha ikhyàq ajj shrillii.

32 Literary Version And she was singeing ground squirrels.

33 Translation IUs she was taking care of it, she was singeing the ground squirrels out there

35 Translation IUs in the meantime

36 Sarah Frank IUs oondaa ttha ikhyàq ajj shrillii ts’å’

37 Translation IUs at that time, axes didn’t exist

38 Sarah Frank IUs #gwizh’ik #dikhii

39 Gwich’in Sentence  
Izhik daji’ daa’a̱jj chan gòoljj kwaa, nàhqa₆.

40 Literary Version They had no axes at that time.

41 Sarah Frank IUs izhik dài’ daa’a̱̱jj chan goołjj kwaa nàhqa₆

42 Themes Axes didn’t exist back then

43 Translation IUs right around there long dried willow sticks

44 Sarah Frank IUs zhik gwà’àn k’il njyah aįį

45 Gwich’in Sentence  
Zhik gwà’àn k’il njyah aįį oondàa giitsįį ts’āi

46 chigiíiyítthak ts’ā’ nihts’ā’ ts’ā’ giíyeelée.

47 Literary Version They used long dry willow sticks to burn things.

48 Themes She uses long dried willow sticks to burn things

49 Translation IUs a little farther she put it into something, she’s moving it around

50 Sarah Frank IUs oondàa ... giitsįį ts’āi chigiíiyítthak ts’ā’ nihts’ā’ ts’ā’ giíyeelée

51 Translation IUs and now that one

52 Paraverbal Features quickly

53 Sarah Frank IUs aįį ts’ā’ it’ee vitl’eech’iik’ik

54 Gwich’in Sentence  
Ajj ts’ā’ it’ee vitl’eech’iik’ik aii gwik’it t’iinch’yaa

55 chiniilii aįį yakha’ vashraj’ t’eh gwats’an k’iizhàq aįį k’il daak’ā’ aįį jyàa da’in

56 giíyahñyàa, naa’in.

57 Literary Version The willow sticks were burning up so she wanted to put
more into the fire but the brushman kept pulling on them.

Themes The brushman keeps pulling on the willow sticks

Translation IUs according to that one, put it under water

Paraverbal Features indistinct
Sarah Frank IUs aii gwik’it t’iinch’yaa chiinlii ajj

Translation IUs over here, alongside under from there

Sarah Frank IUs yakha’ vashraj’ t’eh gwats’an k’iizhåq

Translation IUs they say that one burned a long dried willow

Paraverbal Features slowly

Translation IUs the brushman
Sarah Frank IUs ajjj k’il daak’â’ ajjj jyàa da’in giyàhnya’

Additional Info might be L.Garnett or other unidentified person
Sarah Frank IUs naa’in

Translation IUs and then
Lillian Garnett IUs #izhik
Sarah Frank IUs ajjj ts’â’

Gwich’in Sentence Åjj ts’â’ gwiintsal too gòolijj ts’â’ yidik tr’ahshii kwaa, nåhåq.

Literary Version It was getting dark so she didn’t look for him at that time.

Translation IUs a little dark; he didn’t come over the edge
Background tape

Sarah Frank IUs gwiintsal too gòolijj ts’â’ yidik tr’ahshii kwaa

Translation IUs and that one
Sarah Frank IUs ajjj ts’â’ zhyàq

Gwich’in Sentence Åjj ts’â’ zhyàq yeenjit gok’aantii.

Literary Version She was watching out for him though.

Translation IUs for
Themes The old woman is watching out for the brushman

Paraverbal Features quickly, then gradually slower
Sarah Frank IUs yeenjit gok’aantii
and then that one ground squirrel
Sarah Frank IUs  akka ts'â' it'ee akka ttha

Gwich'in Sentence  Akka ts'â' it'ee akka ttha ts'ik hallii giiyåhnåa akhåi'
vitriq akka kwat yeendaa kò' kat vee niinlii ts'â' reh datthak yah khyå.

Sarah Frank IUs  it'ee ts'ik hallii giiyåhnåa akhåi'

Themes She put the intestines of the ground squirrels on the fire to make them hot.

Translation IUs  they say she took the intestines out
Paraverbal Features  incompleteness of pronunciation
Sarah Frank IUs  ts'ik hallii giiyåhnåa

Translation IUs  and that one ground squirrel
Sarah Frank IUs  akka ttha

Paraverbal Features  incompleteness of pronunciation
Sarah Frank IUs  akka ts'â' it'ee akka ttha
Sarah Frank IUs  akka vitriq
Sarah Frank IUs  akka kwat yeendaa
Sarah Frank IUs  kò' kat vee

Additional Info  there might be a word before yeendaa

Translation IUs  on the fire place it there
Sarah Frank IUs  akka kwat yeendaa
Sarah Frank IUs  kò' kat vee

Paraverbal Features  indistinct
Sarah Frank IUs  niinlii ts'â'
Sarah Frank IUs  kò' kat giiyåh shah

Translation IUs  it became all hot
Gwich'in Sentence  Datthak nindhaa dhidlit.

Literary Version  She wanted to make them very hot.
Sarah Frank IUs  tthak nindhaa dhidlit

Translation IUs  and then
Paraverbal Features  quickly
Sarah Frank IUs  akka it'ee akka

Gwich'in Sentence  Akkita it'ee akka ttha trik t'åihñåa it'ee zhik
k'iizhak yinaahëtä dahlii k'iizhak hee jyåa diiyånhå.
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She then threw them into the direction of where he was pulling on the willow sticks.

She is throwing the intestines in the direction of where she feels the brushman pulling the sticks

The intestines, that's what I heard

deaf tape and clattering

right there, straight down

behind its back

straight down, that's how he did it

indistinct

k'iizhak hee jyàa diyiinlik

hot ground squirrel intestines

tthaa trik dhah

She threw the hot intestines into his eyes.

She throws the intestines into his eyes

his eyes, evidently

indistinct

vinee- vinee nandhitl’ik roh

and then, down towards the river from the land in that area

quickly

They say he was moving very noisily.
The brushman is making a lot of noise crashing through the bushes. Translation IUs they say someone was crashing through the bushes. Additional Info Sarah might be either laughing or coughing at the end of this IU. Paraverbal Features indistinct. Sarah Frank IUs neetreegwahaatak yàhnyàa giiyàhnyàa. Background clattering and breathing. Translation IUs someone was crashing through the bushes. Background tape. Second word incomprehensible. Sarah Frank IUs neetreegwahaatak #. Translation IUs there is little to see. Sarah Frank IUs gwiintsàl vahn gweech’in reh. Gwich’in Sentence Gwiintsàl vahn gweech’in reh ootthan t’ohjuh hee gwaa’in dohljí akhài’ reh yeekit zhik dee’àn reh nàa’ìn dazhoo ik k’uu tsal naatsùu ts’a’ dee’àn khátl’yah’ee ginyàa. Literary Version Since it was a little bit dark already, she went over to the river to look and saw the brushman. He was kneeling down rubbing his eyes, wearing a worn out fur coat. Themes The brushman is kneeling down rubbing his eyes, wearing a worn out fur coat. Translation IUs just a little while ago, looking down that way. Sarah Frank IUs ootthan t’ohjuh hee gwaa’in. Translation IUs but then down toward the river. Paraverbal Features indistinct. Translation IUs the brushman. Sarah Frank IUs akhài’ reh yeekit zhik dee’àn reh. Sarah Frank IUs nàa’ìn. Translation IUs they say he’s wearing a moose fur coat. Paraverbal Features indistinct. Sarah Frank IUs dazhoo ik - dazhoo ik k’uu tsal naatsùu ts’a’ dee’àn khátl’yah’ee ginyàa.
181 Paraverbal Features indistinct and incompleteness of pronunciation

182 Translation IUs They say she killed him. That's what I heard.

183 Gwich'in Sentence Chan yìihghwàjj giìyàhnyàa t’aihnyàa.

184 Literary Version They say she killed him that way.

185 Sarah Frank IUs chan yìïlhghwàjj giïyàhnyàa t'aihnyàa @@

186 Additional Info another person

187 Paraverbal Features laughing

188 Themes The old woman kills the brushman