6-2020

From the Unspoken to the Verbalized: Different Ways of Communication and their Relationship to Culture in a Traditional Lakota Narrative "Ikto na wičhá ha kiŋ", or "Ikto and the Racoon Skin"

Liliana R. Boladz-Nekipelov
The Graduate Center, City University of New York

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_etds/3824

Discover additional works at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).
Contact: AcademicWorks@cuny.edu

FROM THE UNSPOKEN TO THE VERBALIZED: DIFFERENT WAYS OF

COMMUNICATION AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO CULTURE IN A TRADITIONAL

LAKOTA NARRATIVE "IKTO NA WIČHÁ HA KIŊ", OR "IKTO AND THE RACOON

SKIN"

By

LILIANA BOLADZ-NEKIPELOV

A master's thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Linguistics in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, The City University of New York, 2020.

©2020

LILIANA BOLADZ-NEKIPELOV

FROM THE UNSPOKEN TO THE VERBALIZED: DIFFERENT WAYS OF

COMMUNICATION AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO CULTURE IN A TRADITIONAL

LAKOTA NARRATIVE "IKTO NA WIČHÁ HA KIŊ", OR "IKTO AND THE RACOON

SKIN"

By

LILIANA BOLADZ-NEKIPELOV

This manuscript has been read and accepted by the Graduate Faculty in Linguistics in

satisfaction of the thesis requirement for the degree of Master of Arts.

Date: _____

Daniel A. Kaufman

Thesis Advisor

Date: _____

Gita Martohardjono

Executive Officer

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

ABSTRACT

FROM THE UNSPOKEN TO THE VERBALIZED: DIFFERENT WAYS OF

COMMUNICATION AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO CULTURE IN A TRADITIONAL

LAKOTA NARRATIVE "IKTO NA WIČHÁ HA KIŊ", OR "IKTO AND THE RACOON

SKIN."

By

LILIANA BOLADZ-NEKIPELOV

Advisor: Prof. Daniel A. Kaufman

This master's thesis is a discourse analysis of a traditional Lakota story, " Iktó na wičhá ha kiŋ", or "Ikto and the Racoon Skin", one of the 64 stories included in the "Dakota Texts", which were collected by Ella Deloria at three Lakota reservations in 1930s as a part of Franz Boas' language documentation project. The thesis is also an attempt to examine different communicative strategies employed within the narrative and their relationship to culture, as well as the relationship between form and the transfer of meaning and culture and meaning. The analysis is conducted using Dell Hymes' ethnographic approach to discourse analysis, based on which many different fields of research, such as anthropology, linguistics, psychology, semiotics and poetics, among others, work together for the purpose of the analysis, since communication is viewed as dependent on many factors being a part of community life. The methods employed by ethnopoetics were also used during my analysis and the translation of the story.

I re-transcibed the story for it to comply with the new spelling standards of the *New Lakota Dictionary*, and edited the gloss. Afterward, I re-translated the story to make it more current for the purpose of my analysis, and also to be able to experiment with its rhetorical structure as a part of the research on the form. I also translated the title of the story into Lakota, since Ella Deloria provided it in English only. Subsequently, I conducted a discourse analysis of the story.

The structure of the narrative appears to be inseparable from the meaning it conveys, through its esthetic effects on the audience. The structure employs specific elements which create those effects, and make the story a unique artistic form, crossing the genre constraints between prose, drama and poetry. The reported speech device *škhé* "so they say", as well as two conjunctions, *čhaŋké* "and so" and *yuŋkȟáŋ* "and then" play the most important role in creating the structure, and so does the final single line which ends the piece. Those elements of parallelism create a distinct rhythm of the story, which I tried to preserve in my translation.

I compared my findings against those of other scholars who have worked with discourse analysis, and Native American narratives: Dell Hymes, Dennis Tedlock, Anthony Woodbury and James Loriot, among them, and most of my findings were consistent with theirs.

The analysis itself (Chapter 5) is preceded by three introductory chapters, an Introduction (Chapter 1), Methods (Chapter 2) and Background (Chapter 3), in which the purpose of the thesis is described, the main characteristics of the language, its typology and a brief description of the Nations speaking Siouan languages are presented, as well as the method used --DA. The introductory chapters are followed by Source Materials (Chapter 4), where the story is presented in its re-transcribed form, together with the gloss, and a new literary translation. That is follow

by the Discourse Analysis itself (Chapter 5), followed by Conclusions, (Chapter 6), and Bibliography.

The analysis has proven differences in language usage depending on motivation, power play, roles assumed by the speakers, who use different genres for communication within one narrative, and the expectations of the audience. All of those elements contribute to the transfer of meaning since meaning is created also by the audience, and all are characteristic of the oral tradition, deeply rooted within the culture through the unique narrative form and symbolism. A close bond between the language used as discourse, its distinct form, cultural norms, in terms of ethics, behavior, and psychological conditioning of the modes of behavior as well as communal have been discovered and described. Based on my findings, discourse is strongly affected by culture, yet culture alone is built upon universals; archetypes common to most cultures, merely expressed in a culture-specific manner.

Dedicated to Prof. William Pitt Root who introduced me to the Lakota Language, and to the entire Lakota Community.

Table of Contents

"Grammar without philosophy is teaching a dead language"

(Albert White Hat 1999:9)

"Discourse is shaped by the world, and discourse shapes the world"

(Barbara Johnstone 2008:10)

"[…]structure is the matrix of the meaning of the poem and its effects"

(Dell Hymes 1981:42)

Chapter l. Introduction.

This master's thesis is a discourse analysis of a traditional Lakota story, collected by Ella Deloria at the Standing Rock Reservation during her work on the Lakota language documentation between 1927 and 1931, as a part of Franz Boas language documentation project at Columbia University, and an attempt to find out in what ways discourse reflects culture, if it does, and how form is related to discourse and the transfer of meaning. For the purpose of this analysis, I re-transcribed the story so it would reflect the *New Lakota Dictionary* standards; I edited the gloss, and re-translated the story, creating a new free literary translation, exclusively for the purpose of this analysis-- to make it more contemporary, and to be able to experiment with its structure, for it to either reflect the Lakota rhetorical structure, or that of the target language, English, in this case. I also translated the title into Lakota, since there was just an English version provided by Ella Deloria. I consulted a community member, and a fluent speaker of the language, with regard to some transcription and editing issues, as well as the *New Lakota Dictionary*. I would like to express special thanks to Ms. Caroline Humbert for the advice. My findings from the discourse analysis are compared against the claims of other linguists and

scholars who were interested in the relationship between language and culture, including Dell Hymes. Edward Sapir, Benjamin Lee Whorf, Ludwig Wittgenstein and Umberto Eco, and research by scholars who worked on Native American narratives and poetics, such as Dennis Tedlock, Anthony Woodbury, James Laurieault (aka Loriot) and others. Through the analysis, I have been trying to establish some culture specific features of this narrative in terms of form, icons, language used, norms of behavior reflected in discourse, paralanguage related to cultural standards or their violation, as well as certain universals, which are common to most cultures and communication in general.

I have provided the reader with a broader introduction, where I discuss the aims of the thesis, as well as the method itself, including exhaustive information about the language, the people speaking it, as well as revitalization efforts. I found the cultural background information important in the sense of inciting interest in an endangered language and familiarizing the reader with this unique culture and a beautiful language holding on to its life by a thread, and also crucial to the understanding of the main problems discussed in the thesis.

Ella Deloria was a linguistic anthropologist, one of the first people who worked with Franz Boas on preserving the Lakota language. The research was a part of the Columbia University project initiated by Franz Boas, a Professor of Anthropology at Columbia, and the founder of their Anthropology Department. Ella Deloria studied at the Teacher's College, when she was invited to conduct some of the research as a natural speaker of the language. She was also one of the fist Native American students to receive a Bachelor's Degree, which she received from Teacher's College at Columbia University (DeMallie 2006:VIII). Being of Siouan descent, she was a natural speaker of a variety of the language: the Yankton dialect. Both of her parents were of Yankton descent and spoke that variety of Dakota (earlier miscategorized as Nakota).

However, having grown up on the Standing Rock reservation, where her father was a minister, she had been exposed to the Teton dialect--the local variety in which the story was narrated, and became fluent in it (DeMallie 2006:VIII).

The research on the language was conducted from late 1920s through 1940s. It resulted in several books, only one published during Deloria's life, the *Dakota Texts*, a collection of traditional Lakota Stories in Lakota, and a grammar book written together with Franz Boas, and published in 1942 (DeMallie 2006: XII).

Ella Deloria collected stories by speaking to the authentic speakers of the language-- community members on the reservations, and either typed the stories as they were being told, or remembered them, and then wrote them down from memory since audio equipment was not available to her (DeMallieu 2006:VI). Some stories were related by more than one speaker; all men, and the community elders according to Deloria's notes. We have no indication, however, that this story was told by more than one person since the former happened at other reservations, not at Standing Rock (DeMallie 2006: XII). Franz Boas wanted her to trace the stories written down earlier by James Walker, as told by community members, and see whether she could find new versions of the stories, but she really could not find any new versions, or verify the authenticity of some of them, especially the creation story in which Walker used personified elements (DeMallie 2006: XIII, Walker DeMallie Jahner 1991:44). There were either new stories told by individual authors, or the same old stories. Some sounded new, like the creation of just one author, others, like "Iktó na wičhá ha kiŋ", were traditional stories, told the way they have been told for generations. "These are not tales retold for western audiences; they follow the structures and devices of Lakota storytelling conventions." Many similes are also drawn from them, that most adult member of the culture would understand right away (DeMallie 2006: XIII).

Those stories had a very important role in the Lakota society: "Sioux narratives functioned to relate individuals to their social and physical environment" (DeMallie 2006: XV, Jahner 1975:10). Most of the stories were collected at the Standing Rock reservation. Some of the material disappeared due to financial problems Deloria had been experiencing most of her life, and the inability to pay for the storage of the work she collected (DeMallie 2006:VI).

The type of stories as the one analyzed were told only after sundown, for entertainment, and bonding purposes. There are several types of such stories. This one, Story Number Seven, belongs to the so called *ohuŋkakaŋ* genre, hang-over from the old time, (Deloria 2006: XVI), or traditional old stories, based on beliefs. They are stories of longing after the past, when the real and unreal, or visional and natural, were one; after some times long gone, or outside of the historical reality, and non-referential, as most legends and beliefs are. Vision is a very important part of the Lakota culture, the Sundance being an example of that. The function of such narratives was very important within the community. These were stories rooted in culture and imagination, which, helped individuals to find their place in life (Jahner 1975, DeMillie 2006:XVI). The stories told the community how to live, how not to behave; they taught the norms, as well, as our story does, through various devices, the employment of an anti-hero in this case. Stories about Ikto showed children how not to behave.

The story which is the subject of this analysis is a part of the *Dakota Texts* published by the American Ethnographic Society in 1932, and then published as a book the University of Nebraska Press in 2006. Both editions are bilingual, English and Lakota, with the Lakota text first translated word-for-word into English of some stories, and then a general translation provided by Ella Deloria. There was also a monolingual, English version, published by the Society in 1978. Limiting the number of stories with a word-for-word translation, or gloss, was

done to reduce publishing costs. The original story was transcribed in an older orthographic system used from 1930s to 1940s. That system was used by Boas, Deloria and Swanton (Ullrich 2018:42, DeMallie 2006:XI), and since it might have been harder to analyze the story in that form, I have transformed it into the modern writing system; that used by the *New Lakota Dictionary* published by the Lakota Language Consortium. I also re-translated it, to make it more contemporary and to be able to experiment with the rhetorical structure.

Chapter 2. Discourse Analysis as a Method.

The method used to analyze the narrative is discourse analysis, or DA, a method which was devised by James Loirot (aka Lauriault) as a response to problems he encountered during Bible translation into a Native American language, Quechua, and later Shipibo, a language of Peru, in the 1950s, and a translation of a Shipibo narrative into English. He was a Bible translator and someone who translated Native American narratives, a son of missionaries who grew up in Peru. Since he initially had some problems publishing his materials, a similar method had been described a little earlier than his first paper appeared by Zellig Harris, in 1952, where he used some of his research on generative grammar from 1930s. Loriot originally wrote his paper about paragraph structure in Shipibo in 1958, and only published it together with Barbara Hollenbach in 1970, after he took studies at the University of Pennsylvania. In the paper, he proposed that larger units of text should be taken into account as the basis for analysis and translation, and that a paragraph was a more valid unit of analysis than a sentence. Zellig Harris proposed the sentence as the basis for meaningful analysis, where relevant sentences were matched, and compared after first being brought into the canonical form. His student, Noam Chomsky built on this research conducted by Harris when developing generative grammar (Johnstone 2008,

Tedlock 1983)**.** Even earlier than the article on the paragraph structure of a traditional Shipibo narrative, Loriot wrote an article in 1951 *Translating Mark into Shipibo*, where he discussed the problem with word-for-word translations and taking words out of cultural context when translating, which was a groundbreaking discovery in translation theory and contributed to the development of discourse analysis as well. In that paper, he was concerned that translating word-for-word and sticking to sentence boundaries when translating the Bible into Shipibo might have led to mistranslations. He proposed that larger meaningful discourse units should have been taken as the basis for language analysis and translation, which unfortunately some translators ignored in the past, trying to translate text word-for-word. He pointed out that there was no word-for-word equivalency between any two languages, and that translations should be done taking into consideration indexical meaning, as well as the close relationship between language, culture, meaning and context. "One of the most important lessons gained from translating of Mark was that no two words in two languages exactly coincide in meaning" (Loriot 1951:56). "The same so called 'word' in different environments (i.e., used in different places under different circumstances) will have different translations" (Loriot 1951:56). The dependence of meaning on context and situation is also stressed by sociolinguists (Fishman 1972, Lieberson 1978, Hymes 1974/1989). Loriot emphasized the importance of context in his findings, seeing language, and discourse, as dependent on context. Similarly, Ella Deloria when conducting her free translation of the story, went for larger units of equivalency to convey meaning rather than trying to find any word-for-word or even phrase-for-phrase equivalency, as the latter approach would prove insufficient to transfer meaning into another language (Deloria 1944:VI). Loriot also made some discoveries with regard to the relationship between meaning and culture, as stated in his 1951 article: "Another lesson was not to translate words blindly but to check the

meaning of the resultant translation with the cultural background of the people" (Loriot 1951:57). Using larger units for text and discourse analysis was also proposed by the Prague Circle, Zellig Harris, Denis Tedlock, Anthony Woodbury and Dell Hymes. Hymes was a proponent of preserving original poetics when translating Native American narratives into another language (Tedlock 1983:32, Hymes 1981:45). When translating some Chinookan narratives, Hymes noticed that the narratives had a three or five line meaningful unit which constituted a whole (Johnstone 2008:83). He followed the concept of ethnopetics as a method of translation of that kind of verbal art, according to which narratives were treated as poems since they exhibited a specific form, consisting of lines, stanzas, and verse (Hymes 1981: 40-46). The narratives also had other distinct features, phonological, intonational, morphological, and repetitive lexical and syntactic features, which contributed to the creation of the form. Ethnopoetics was a concept introduced by Jerome Rothenberg in 1968 and practiced by Dennis Tedlock. It is an approach to the oral art of indigenous narratives, either prose, chants or oral narratives, where each narrative is treated as poem, and has a specific poetic form. Narratives, conventionally considered prose, were now treated as poetic forms and their structure compared to the structure of a poem, which was to be retained in translation and transcription as they were being related orally, since "structure is the matrix of the meaning of the poem and its effects" according to Hymes (1981:42). Hymes referred to oral art as verbal art, or verbal narratives, since even if the narratives were transferred orally from generation to generation, they could also become written literature, if written down, thus verbal rather than oral (Hymes 1974:14). He made the boundary between oral literature and written disappear.

Anthony Woodbury analyzed the specific rhetorical structure used in orally transmitted Central Alaskan Yupik narratives. He recorded several narratives in 1970s in Chuvak, Alaska as

told by the elders and discovered some salient features of those narratives. They played an important part of Yupik community life at the time he conducted his research and the elders were trying to ensure that the performance of those stories continued, since it was the only way according to them to preserve those stories for the future generation and thus preserve culture (Woodbury 1984:15). According to Woodbury (1984:15), "One of the most important contributions of storytelling is ordering, organizing, and transferring cultural knowledge and experience". The performance of the narratives was also a source of pleasure, in which the audience participated, listening with half closed eyes, and making approving sounds from time to time. They were a part of the performance. Going back to the structure, Woodbury discovered certain salient features of a traditional narrative in terms of the rhetorical structure, which should not be ignored when translating the narratives. I made similar observations when working on the story analyzed here.

Woodbury, in a similar way to Tedlock, sees the importance of dividing the narration into lines and stanzas, or sections, in his case. Lines are marked by pauses the storyteller makes; sections are meaningful parts, which indicate some change in time, place, focus on characters or any other significant change (Woodbury 1984:17). I refer to the parts of the current story sections, too, rather than stanzas, since what I am dealing with is more of a poetic prose form, and I found the sections representing short paragraphs more relevant in this case, and helpful in preserving the rhythm well.

There are two types of stories in Yupik; the *quanemcit* and *qulirat*. *Qulirat* are traditional tales, handed down from generation to generation, which have been created by some remote anonymous ancestors, which makes them community property, just like our story, which belongs to a similar category of tales in the Lakota oral tradition called *ohuŋkakaŋ*, visional stories from

the past. The other category in Yupik are stories which are a product of an individual author be it present or past (Woodbury 1984:13).

The stories, which are divided into lines and sections also use other devices as a part of their rhetorical structure. Downdrift, which is falling pitch, is characteristic of single lines. Group lines are marked with rising pitch; a group of lines starts this way. Also, the pauses between groups of lines, and a single line are longer. These breaks represent pauses in the storyteller's narration (Woodbury 1984:19). I could not really analyze that aspect of the story, since I had only a written record of it. In the Yupik narrative, group sections begin with certain connective words: *tawa—taw* well, then, *waton-lli*, it was like this, *cuna-gguq*, and then, likewise. Larger sections may start with the use of enclitics, in front of the line: *un* and, *agug*, it is said, *am*, again, indeed and *ga* (or *g* a shorter form) it seems. The connective words, their usage, would correspond to the function of *yuŋkȟáŋ* "and then" and *čhaŋke* "so", "and so" in my narrative, the function of which is described in the chapters to follow. The enclitics would roughly correspond to the use of *škhé*, also classified as an enclitic by some, and *ké*, the shorter version of it. The difference is that the Yupik enclitics are on the left-hand side, at the beginning of some lines, since Yupik is a language with free word order. My findings have been similar to those of Anthony Woodbury's, in many respects, which is described within this thesis.

Discourse analysis is a method used to analyze language in use, rather than as an abstract system, and it is employed by people from various scholarly fields, ranging from psychologists, anthropologists, through linguists, political science scholars, communications people, as well as potentially many other researchers, where that method in one of its many forms may be beneficial (Johnstone 2008:1-2). It may deal with conversations as well as written down discourse, including narratives. It is always descriptive, describing the language in use, as

opposed to being prescriptive, and analyzing language as an abstract system only, outside of its context. Often those fields are working separately; each conducts its own analysis, yet all are engaged in discourse analysis. What Hymes wanted to add to discourse analysis was an ethnographic approach, where such fields as anthropology, psychology, linguistics, semiotics, poetics, and other fields would work in unison, and be a part of the analysis since communication is a part of complex community functioning (Hymes 1974/89:3-27).

For the purpose of further describing the method, we would have to define discourse. Discourse can be defined as any actual act of communication using the media of language. (Johnstone 2008:9). Hymes speaks of communicative events, and communicative acts, earlier called speech acts, which consist of utterances or sets of utterances which convey a certain meaning used in social situations, whereas Eco uses the term semiotic events (Hymes 1974/1989: 16, Eco 1976:69). In our case, the written down oral performance is a communicative event, and the story itself is composed of communicative acts in the form of utterances, and semiotic events in the form of perilingual communication. A performance of a narrative could be described as a communicative event.

Communication is not limited to language in the sense of verbal communication. It may encompass different media, such as sign language, gestures, movements, music, chant, even silence, which would qualify as communicative acts (Hymes 1974/1989:52) or semiotic events since any significant semiotic sign may be analyzed as discourse, or paralanguage (Eco 1976:60-72). Some of those other media will also be analyzed as they are used within the story. Even though the material I am analyzing is available just in its written form, I can conduct the analysis of the paralanguage on the micro level, within the narrative, as it is used by all the speakers within the story.

Based on modern views, discourse is a convention based on certain universals, common to all languages, while exhibiting many culture specific features. When conducting discourse analysis, we also have to take into consideration language change and adoption of cultural patterns from one language to another due to contact since forms move from one culture to another through diffusion. The importance of language contact is stressed by such scholars as Tedlock, Blommaert, Rickford and Rampton among others (Tedlock 1983, Blommaert, Rampton 2012, Blommaert 2014, Rickford 2004, 2014). Discourse is both Universal Grammar and its realizations conditioned by a multitude of other factors, such as culture, convention, psychology, stratification, identity, poetic use, and others. Treating language as an abstract system only would not be accurate since it is a system in action, encompassing both the abstract and the conventions. Analyzing an abstract language would be close to analyzing a dead language, since as Albert White Hat said: 'Grammar without philosophy is teaching a dead language' (White Hat 1999:9).

The story is for the most part non-referential, or it exhibits a different sort of culture bound referentiality, as stories based on beliefs do. Meaning is seen only in terms of reference by earlier 20th century scholars. A statement is true if it accurately describes the referent (Wittgenstein 1921/2013). The reader will only understand whatever he can find in the outside world or imagine as a referent. The imaginative referent is the condition for understanding, according to Wittgenstein's (1921/2013) *Tractatus*. Culture may impact our imagination in terms of obtaining a referent. If stones are inanimate in some cultures, the reader will be less likely to understand statements whose grammar treat them as human. In a similar way, statements referring to them may be harder to translate into languages which treat animals as people in terms of discourse. This is a different kind of culture bound referentiality, which can only be

checked against the culture it belongs to and, in this sense, all culture may be self-referential (Eco 1976:69)**.** According to this view, things outside of the recipient's own culture could only be understood within the code system of the other culture, and in order to understand them, one would have to get familiarized with that culture, and get the referents through the culture. This should be taken into consideration during the analysis. Yet, though contact, concepts not initially understood get assimilated, and they become a part of language, after having acquired their meaning within the new code (Eco 1976:81).

Apart from cultural relations, discourse employs a lot of universal tools, features universally valid across languages and cultures, the understanding of which does not require complex cultural references. Such sections show similarities across cultures. This should support the archetypal character of culture reflected in language. Just a simple description of women picking up wood and taking down the tree are examples of universal acts, understood by most observers, the motif of a journey, seduction, among others. That there is much of the universal in the Lakota oral tradition is the view of Zitkala Ša (1901/2017:89), "The study [of Indian folklore] strongly suggests our near kinship with all the humanity, and points a steady finger toward the great brotherhood of mankind". Dennis Tedlock, who worked with Zuni narratives, talks about the universal behind all narratives, and universality in the storytelling practices: all storytellers create a frame and a rhythm for their story, using symbolism and methods of storytelling common to most languages. Each storyteller needs to pause, uses intonation, receptions; that is what links them all (Tedlock 1983:286-301).

Native American languages share an oral tradition. Many also have a written tradition, mostly related to Bible translations in the beginning. The verbal record we are discussing is of a different kind; it is an oral record written down rather than composed as written literature. Lakota

has a longer tradition since it was written first by the missionaries as early as 1830s (White Hat 1999:3). The Dakota dialect was the earliest to be transcribed. In 1834 some Episcopal missionaries, including Samuel W. Pond, Gideon H. Pond, Stephen R. Riggs and Dr. Thomas Williamson created the Dakota alphabet. That alphabet was adjusted to the Lakota alphabet by Rev. Eugene Buechel, and further developed by Franz Boas and Ella Deloria (White Hat 1999: 3). The meaning of many words was changed by the missionaries to suit the purpose of translating Biblical language. The translators were looking at Lakota from the Western point of view; ascribing Lakota words Western meanings, which deprived the language of the traditional meaning of the words and cultural references (White Hat 1999:8). The meaning of such words as *wakaŋ*, "power over life and death" was changed to "sacred", or "holy" by the missionaries and "mystical" by the anthropologists, so the translation depended on who translated the word. What was translated as a prayer by the missionaries, *wačhékiye*, was a word denoting the connection between all relatives, or all creation in the traditional sense (White Hat 1999:47). This is an example of language contact and diffusion of lexical items, and language change due to contact. The Bible translations into such languages as Lakota may serve as an example of a change of the traditional meaning to the target culture related meaning. Loriot talks about some problems with translating the word "spirit' into Shipibo since it had either bad connotations, or was related to psychological traits (Loriot 1951: 56). Those new meanings due to language contact were adopted later by the late 19th and 20th century Lakota community, educated mostly in boarding schools, not the traditional cultural environment, which resulted in the young generation not being able to understand the elders (Walker, Jahner 1989:35, White Hat 1999:47). According to Albert White Hat, language is closely bound with philosophy; with the worldview of the people. As a result of those translations, the meaning of the Lakota spiritual teachings was also lost, and

so were social hierarchy references and the code of behavior taught to children. The contribution of those missionaries who wrote down the language, and worked on its grammar, and the first orthographies should not be neglected either, though. The impact of English on Lakota resulted in some people "speaking English in Lakota. That is what happened, when they followed just the English referenced meaning attached to the Lakota words, and the English sentence structure" (White Hat 1999:9). Language is closely connected to worldview, and otherwise philosophy or culture. This is reflected within the narrative discussed.

The story is examined with regard to how it reflects communication forms used in the Lakota language based on social roles and tradition as the language is believed to be closely bound with the philosophy of the Nation, and many elements of discourse, such as kinship terms, customs, daily activities, communicative strategies and word choice reflect the beliefs and social structure of the community and so does the traditional narrative form. The psychology of the speaker also reflects the cultural and social norms of the community to a large extent in addition to universal and individual features, even if someone violates most of the norms, like Ikto does.

Chapter 3. Background.

3.1   The Lakota Language.

Lakota, also spelled as Lakhota, or Lakȟótiyapi in Lakota, and also referred to as Teton, Teton Sioux, is a Western Siouan Language, and one of the most studied and widely spoken Native American Languages. It is spoken by a group of people on the reservations in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota as well as in a few urban communities in Colorado and Rapid City, South Dakota, as well as Montana, Wyoming, Nebraska, and Canada (White Hat 1999:2). It is thought to be spoken by approximately 2,000 people, some sources mentioning

close to 6,000, which may include some active learners, and children who are taught the language as a part of revitalization efforts (Ullrich 2018: 33). According to the community's beliefs, the language originated at the beginning of time when the Nation was created from the eternal storm, or Cosmic Egg (Walker, Jahner 1989, Walker, DeMallie, Jahner 1991).

The few related nations were referred to as the Sioux by then French missionaries and trappers in the 17c. It is basically a word coined based on some misunderstanding of the last syllable of the Ojibwe word *nadowessioux*, an Ojibwe term by which they characterized their enemies, the Iroquois, whom they called *nadowewok*, a snake, or *nadowessioux*, a lesser snake, and the suffix *sioux* just meant lesser or minor in Ojibwe (Desmore 1972:1 White Hat 199:10). According to another version, it was just the word's plural ending, or the French suffix, *oux* which marked plurality, *nadowessioux* snakes, a word with an Ojibwe stem and a French ending. The word came from a word misheard, or misinterpreted. It was then adopted by the whole group of people to refer to the Lakota and related nations. Lakota, on the other hand, means "neighbors", or 'acknowledge the relative or a family member' to be more precise (White Hat 1999:2). Lakota is closely related to the Dakota language, and earlier categorization pointed out to a close relationship between Lakota, Dakota, and Nakota, the last one wrongly categorized. Dakota and Nakota represent different pronunciation of the initial plosive, produced as /d/ by some and /n/ by others. Nakota, or otherwise Yankton and Yanktonai languages are also dialects of Dakota, and Nakota or Nakoda, are language not understandable to the speakers of the former two groups (Ullrich 2018:36-39). Lakota people are those of the seven tribes, "Seven Councils Fire" (fire as a circle, around the fire, a circle of relatives) Dakota, Nakota and Lakota. Four tribes speak the Dakota Language: Mdewakaŋ tun, Wahpetun, Wahpekute, Sisitun; two speak

Nakota: Ihanktunwan, Ihanktunwani, and one tribe the Titunwan, people of the Parries, speak Lakota (White Hat 1999:2, Riggs 1973:1). Nakota is now considered Dakota, though.

The Lakota people can be divided into seven subtribes. All of the tribes have been placed on reservations in South Dakota: Oglála (Pine Ridge Reservation), Sičháŋǧu (Rosebud and Lower Brule Reservation), Mnikȟówožu (Cheyenne River Reservation), Húŋkpapȟa (Standing Rock Reservaktion), Sihásapa (Cheyenne River Reservation), Itázipčho (Cheyenne River Reservation), Oóhenuŋpa (Cheyenne River Reservation) (White Hat 1999: 2, Buechel 1939: 49).

Since 1970s, there have been revitalization efforts, with schools established on two reservations, Pine Ridge and Standing Rock, and the Lakota Language and Cultural Department established at the Sinte Gleska University. The University itself was established in 1971 on the Rose Bud Reservation, initially headed by Ben Black Bear Jr, and then Albert White Hat in 1979. In 2006, the Lakota Summer Institute was established as well as some immersion schools on some of the reservations. Ben Black Bear Jr. contributed a lot to the development of the teaching methods. He headed the Lakota Summer Institute since 2009. The Lakota Consortium was established, which contributed tremendously to the documentation and revitalization of the language (Powers 2009). As part of the Consortium Projects, 20 episodes of the Bernstein Bears were translated into Lakota. A teaching program at the South Dakota University was also established where BA degrees studies are offered in Lakota.

The Lakota language is a left branching, SOV language. It is highly polysynthetic, with the verb being the only essential element, a syntactic category conventionally described as a verb, although in polysynthetic languages the categories may not be as clear-cut, or exactly correspond to the categories in English. According to A.W. Tuting, there is no distinction between verbs, nouns and adjectives in Lakota as they all possess a certain intrinsic, non-overt

verbal qualities of static verbs. Also, Jan Ullrich mentions some grammatical categories not corresponding to Western categories exactly: "Many words traditionally classified as adverbs do not work as adverbs with static verbs since they modify the object, not the verb phrase, and thus work as adjectives or "derived modifiers". An example is the word *héčhel* (Ullrich 2018:20, 176). Derived modifiers are words morphologically derived mostly form static verbs, but also other categories at times such as active verbs, numerals, simple nouns and others, which are treated as adverbs, yet syntactically they function as adverbials (Ullrich 2018:20). The first clause of the sentence of the story illustrates the SOV order, although that order may be changed for emphatic purposes, or others. "Iktó kákhena íčhimani yá-haŋ', SAOV /Ikto/there/journey/making/. "Iktó kákhena íčhimani yá-haŋ yuŋkȟáŋ léčhel hakítȟuŋ škhé"/Ikto/there/journey/making/and/this is how/he was dressed/they say/reads the whole compound sentence, including the reported speech phrase. "Ikto was setting off on a journey, and this is how he was dressed; they say."

With regard to phonology, there are five oral vowels in Lakota; a, e, o, u, denoted in writing as *a, e, i, o, u;* and three nasal vowels: a, i, u, *aŋ, iŋ, uŋ* in writing, according to the *New Lakota Dictionary*, herewith referred to as *NLD*. The pitch accent ' is represented by an acute accent diacritic: *á, é, í, ó, ú, áŋ, íŋ, úŋ*, and it falls on stressed vowels. Those have a higher tone than other vowels in the word. Pitch in monosyllabic words falls on the stressed vowel. It is usually the second vowel in the word, but it may also be another vowel, such as first, and then that vowel gets a higher tone than other vowels in the word (Ullrich 2018:41). There are thirty three consonants in the language. The glottal stop is not counted as a consonant. They vary based on the place of articulation, and can be classified as bilabial, dental, alveolar, postalveolar and glottal. They also vary based on the mode of articulation such as nasal, plosive, fricatives or

affricates, (Ullrich 2018:42) Nasals [m] and [n] differ just with regard to the place of articulation: bilabial and alveolar respectively. Plosives p, b, d, t, g, k vary with regard to voicing aspiration and ejection. The aspiration may be either glottal or uvular so we have p [p], t [t], b [b] , which may also be described as aspiration and velarization, resulting in ph [pʰ], pȟ [pˣ], th [tʰ], tȟ [dˣ] [dʰ] [tȟ] [tˣ], čh [tʃʰ] and kh [kʰ], kȟ [kˣ] (Ullrich 2018:42). Even though those two types of aspiration are in complementary distribution, they are marked by the NLD to make it easier for the speaker to pronounce the words. Fricatives in Lakota have only voiced, voiceless and ejective contrast z [z], ž [ʒ], ǧ [ʁ], s' [s'], š' [ʃ'], ȟ' [χ']. There are four approximants bilabial w [w], alveolar l [l], postalveolar y [j] and glottal h [h].

Table 1. Lakota Consonants, based on (Ullrich 2018:44)

Bilabial			Dental	Alveolar	Post alveolar	Velar	Uvular	Glottal
Nasal		**m** [m]		**n** [n]				
Plosives and Affricates	Voiceless	**p** [p]	**t** [t]		**č** [tʃ]	**k** [k]		**'** [ʔ].
	Voiced	**b** [b]				**g** [g]		
	Aspirated	**ph** [pʰ] and **pȟ** [pˣ]	**th** [tʰ] and **tȟ** [tˣ]		**čh** [tʃʰ]	**kh** [kʰ] / **kȟ** [kˣ]		
	Ejectives	**p'** [p']	**t'** [t']		**č'** [tʃ']	**k'** [k']		
	Voiceless			**s** [s]	**š** [ʃ]		**ȟ** [χ]	

Frica tives	Voiced			z [z]	ž [ʒ]		ǧ [ʁ]	
	Ejectives			s' [s']	š' [ʃ']		ȟ' [χ']	
Approximants		w [w]		l [l]	y [j]			h [h]

There are three types of ablaut: a/an ablaut, e ablaut and in ablaut in Lakota.

There have been several writing systems used to write down Lakota, the first ones devised by the missionaries who first wrote down the language. Beutchel, and then Franz Boas and Ella Deloria in 1920-1940s, had their own system, also used by Swanton. According to Jan Ullrich, language teachers commonly used simplified spelling based on early missionaries' orthographies or, more often, employed imprecise random spelling. "In its philosophy, the NLD orthography is very much in line with the spelling system established by Boas and Swanton (1911), and adopted by Deloria (1932), in that it consistently marks stress and aspiration, two major phonemic features commonly overlooked by early lexicographers and grammarians among the missionaries. The Boas-Swanton-Deloria orthography was modified in the 1970s by Rood and Taylor who replaced the subscript diacritic used for marking aspiration with the letter h and introduced the marking of intervocalic glottal stop." **(**Ullrich 2018:42**)**

There are differences between the *NDL* spelling system, and that devised by Rood and Taylor. The main difference is that nasal vowels are spelled differently: nasal vowels are spelled with an enigma, not with ogoneks in the New Lakota Dictionary spelling system, as *aŋ, iŋ* and *uŋ* while there were spelled *ą, į, ų* by Rood and Taylor. The intervocalic glottal stop is not marked

since it is not phonemic, and it is always predictable (Ullrich 2018:42). The last difference between the two is that the *NDL* distinguishes between stops with glottal aspiration (kh, ph, th) and those with velar aspiration (kȟ, pȟ, tȟ). These two groups are in complementary distribution so they are allophones. This is done for practical reasons, as it is easier for the learners (Ullrich 2018:42).

Verbs can be classified into active and static, and the former into transitive and intransitive, or taking and object or not. Tense is not marked within the main verb. It is marked by using an adverb, a point of reference (Ullrich 2018:20-37). Enclitics or otherwise particles mark different grammatical events. There are affixes, suffixes, and infixes. For first and second person singular and plural, a morpheme *pi* is used, a free morpheme to mark plural animate as opposed to dual. Pronouns are rarely used. If any plurality is marked, it would be with suffixes. Dual person *you and I* as opposed to *we* is also present. Inflection is marked by attaching morphemes marking various inflectional function. The third person singular is unmarked.

The language is highly polysynthetic, so words are created by stacking on morphemes, like *ksa.pala*, *ksa* and *pala*, wisdom and the diminutive suffix, little wisdom, *waste.sni*, waste good, and *sni*, without goodness not good, devoid of goodness. Polysynthetic languages are sometimes called incorporating but these terms are not synonymous since the word creating methods in incorporating languages involve stacking lexical items to create new meanings, whereas in simply polysynthetic languages, words are created through stacking on morphemes, not necessarily lexical, perhaps one lexical, and other grammatical as in Chukchi (Comrie 1989:26). Lakota is a polysynthetic, incorporating language since new meanings can be created thorough stacking on lexical morphemes as well as grammatical ones. Otherwise, it is an agglutinating language rather than a fusional one since it has a high morpheme per word ratio.

Gender is marked by particles like *yeló , kšto*, *yé* . It is also shown in forms of kinship and exclamations. Both the gender of the speaker and of the interlocutor is often seen, especially in forms of address. The usage in recent years has not been that strict due to changing roles; men learning the language from women, their mothers and sisters, as well as various social trends and preferences, and the language being preserved predominantly by women (White Hat 1999:20).

There are many enclitics in Lakota, which have different grammatical and lexical functions.

Table 2. Enclitics.

Enclitic	Function
HAŋ	Continuous
Pi	Plural
La	Diminutive
Ka	Attenuative
KtA	Future
Šni	Negation
S'a	Repetitive
Yeló	Assertive, feminine
Yé	Assertive, masculine
He	Interrogative
Huŋwó	Interrogative, feminine
Huŋwé	Interrogative, masculine
Waŋ	Dubitative, question

Kinship terms are very important in Lakota; they set the whole mode of communication between various community members. This is a list of the most common terms:

Used mostly by men:

Tȟaŋháŋši, my male cross-cousin

Haŋkáši, my female cross-cousin

Tȟaŋke, older sister

Tȟaŋkši, younger sister

Tȟaŋkšila, precious younger sister

Čiye, older brother

Kȟolá, friend used by man

Used mostly by women:

Čépȟaŋši, my female cross-cousin

Šič'éši, my male cross-cousin

Mišúŋ, my younger brother used by both men and women

Hakátaku, her brothers and male cross cousins, his sisters and female cross-cousins

Čhuwé, older sister

Mitȟáŋ younger sister

Mitȟáŋkhala precious younger sister

Thibló older brother

Mišúŋkhala precious younger brother

Maškhé female friend

Used by anyone:

Até, father, or father's brother

Iná, mother

Uŋčí, grandmother

Lekší uncle, mother's brother or cross-cousin

Atéla, father's brother

Tȟuŋwí, aunt, father's sister only

Inála, mothers' sister

Čhuŋkší, daughter

Čhiŋkší, son

Tȟakóža, grandchild

Wičahča, husband

Winuhča, wife

Mihíngna, my husband

Mitawiču, my wife

(White Hat 1999:102-126)

3.2. Cultural Icons: Iktome.

The Story Number Seven is one of the Iktome narratives, relating his adventures and mischiefs. Iktome is a very important character in the Lakota mythology. He appears in many Native American narratives, yet here we are more concerned with what the Lakota people believe and how they see him. In the Lakota culture, he is a spirit, a deity, which often manifests in a human form. He can be called Ikto, for short, Iktomi, Ictinike, Uktome and Unktomi, depending on the dialect (Zitkala Ša 1901:2017, Walker Jahner 1989). He is usually portrayed as a small being--not a spider, just with the posture of a spider according to James Walker. He often manifests as a human, though, wearing Lakota attire. At those times his face is painted in yellow, red and white, and he has dark circles around his eyes (Zitkala Ša 1901/2017:91). Iktome means a spider, which does not mean Iktome is a spider, as assumed by some scholars. He may also manifest as the Coyote, the most anecdotal trickster. Some stories refer to him as a spider, including some of the stories collected by James Walker, whereas Ella Deloria claimed that there was no indication that he was a spider or a spider spirit at all; only in one story, spiders came out of his body when he died (Deloria 1932/2006:5).

He is a trickster and a creator of language and games based on the beliefs, a free spirit, beyond standard morality, and thus a Faustian character in Western terms, a devil, perhaps, one who "travels light" (Von Goethe 1832/1998:10), and tricks people as the Faustian Devil tried to rob people of their souls through tricking them into signing a contract and charming them with a speech. Ikto also tries to rob people of their will. He is a fallen angel of sorts, a son of Inyan, the Rock, a male creator god who hatched from the Comic Egg or a storm. He is one of the oldest deities and represents corrupted wisdom, wisdom turned into folly by the acts of the beautiful demon Gnaski, a son of Uta, Ikto's mother and her son Iya; Gnaski is the fruit of their incestuous relationship. Iya despised his brother, Ikto, and decided to corrupt him (Walker DeMallie Jahner 1991). We can see some parallels to Cain and Abel here, and other siblings throughout mythology. He is an archetypal character.

Ikto was originally *Ksa*, wisdom; the creator of knowledge, stories and games, and only later he was corrupted and turned into folly in the form of Ikto, a symbol of immaturity. As a result of the corruption, Ikto was turned from *Ksa*, knowledge, into *Ksapala* little knowledge (from *ksa* wisdom, and the diminutive suffix, *pala*). Yet, people were unable to tell *Ksa* from *Ksapala*, since the latter was created though exactly mimicking the *Ksa*, wisdom (Walker Jaher 1989: 286-87). When Ikto was Wisdom both people and gods were laughing at him; after the change he just accompanies people, and plays tricks on them, but they stopped laughing (Walker Jahner 1989:286-87).

Figuratively, Ikto represents a good spirit misunderstood, or envied, and turned bad by the demons, or fake knowledge. His main deficiencies are immaturity, lack of integrity, lack of honesty, ingenuity, lack of feelings, compassion, a sense of guilt, respect and ethics in the sense of community values, which incorporate many universal human values. Since originally people

were not able to discern between *Ksa* and *Ksapla*, such stories were told to help them tell the two apart, and to show the children how not to behave. Immaturity like that exhibited by Ikto is seen as a major deficiency and the source of disharmony in the Lakota culture (Walker 1989, Jahner 1991, White Hat 1999). There are various stages of maturing and upbringing in the Lakota culture. When people are mature enough to start a family and have children, they are called *wičháša* "a mature man" and *winyan* "a mature woman". It is an honor to be considered mature enough to be able to start a family and have children. Also, the forms of address *uŋčí* and *tȟuŋkášila*, a grandmother and grandfather are honorific. When people get married, they are called *wičháȟča* and *winuȟča*, which is also a source of honor, the words meaning "leading the lives of a real man and a real woman," respectively. The terms indicate maturity and wisdom, rather than age. Only later due to the influence of the English language, terms related to maturity which came with age started acquiring pejorative meanings. The first stage of the upbringing of children was by the grandparents, and only after parents started taking care of them and teaching them cultural knowledge and norms handed down (White Hat 1999: 12, 89). Older people were not ashamed to be called elders; this was a source of pride since maturity is something valued and it is likened to knowledge in the Lakota culture.

Ikto is mischievous, capable not just of some nasty tricks, overall not that harmful as seen in this story, but also cruelty, such as killing of whoever he pleases, such as the buffalo girl who got on his nerves (Deloria 1932/2006:40). Ikto is not viewed as totally bad, however, but rather as an anti-hero, a villain or a renegade, who, regardless, remains a part of the community and culture (Deloria 1932/2006).

Iktome violates any social standards, which is reflected in his language and modes of behavior, be it gestures, movements or attitudes. He is an anti-model for children. To play

Iktome means to pretend to be a nice fellow but in fact just trying to obtain a favor (Deloria 1932:2006: 2). At the same time, he is able to communicate with humans, spirits, birds, animals, rocks and elements, showing the universality of the Lakota language, understood by the whole environment. He also changes proportions, or is seen in the right proportions by human, and animals. He talks to the women and he seems to be the size of a man, yet he rides a hawk so he must be smaller at times, or beyond dimensions.

He is an integral part of the Lakota culture, and so he appears in the story, with all his characteristics; easy to recognize on the spot, and perhaps even predict some of the modes of his behavior. The story just shows him in his acts, without any moralizing metalanguage.

Chapter 4. Source Materials

A. STORY NUMBER SEVEN

" Iktó na wičhá ha kiŋ "

Iktó kákhena íčhimani yá-haŋ yuŋkȟáŋ léčhel hakítȟuŋ škhé. Wizí waŋ kazázapi čha otȟúŋ na ptehíŋpaȟpa waŋ pȟégnakiŋ na wičhá há šhiŋté-aópȟeya íŋ škhé. Ťȟasíŋta míla waŋ yuhá na itázipa waŋ wáŋ núnp kȟóhéčhel yuhá škhé.

Wakpála číkʼala waŋ opȟáya yá-haŋ yuŋkȟaŋ uŋgna wakpa waŋ otȟáŋkaya na šma čhaél iyóȟloke čhaŋké óhuta kiŋ él inážiŋ. Tókȟa iyúweǧe šni čhaŋké éna íyotakiŋ na čhéya-he ȟčeháŋl pteǧópȟeča waŋ kiŋyáŋ hiyáya čhaŋké kipáŋ na:

"Hé, misúŋ, hú ye misúŋ", eyá yuŋkȟáŋ: "Tokȟa huwo?," eyá čhaŋké: "Misúŋ kȟowákataŋ éiȟpemayela ye!" eyá ké. Yuŋkȟáŋ íŋš'dluŋmakečiŋ "Ohán" eyíŋ na khiyéla

pahá waŋ tȟáŋka yaŋk čhaŋké héčhiya aí na "Hó akáŋl mayáŋka yo. Na sutáya yúza yo. Oínitomni kte séče eya yuŋkȟáŋ. Tókša hé taŋyáŋ makíŋ kte kiŋ; philámayaye, misúŋ," eyáya akhozal íyotake ké. "Héčhetu weló, misúŋ, hokšíčhaŋlkiyapi čha héčha éčhel waúŋšila yeló'"

Waŋná pteǧópȟeča kiŋ Iktó k'íŋ kiŋyáŋ iyáya yuŋkȟáŋ kȟoháŋ nažúte kiŋ apȟósiŋsiŋ na ačhéžiyaŋpyaŋp yaŋkíŋ na waŋná mní kiŋ ópta yé k'uŋ heháŋl ečháŋl pteǧó pȟesléte kiŋ okát'apt'ap yaŋká škhé. K'éyaš ziŋtkála kiŋ naǧíta waŋglág kiŋyáŋ čhaŋké "Waȟtéšni, waŋná akhé lé Iktó é yeló. Itȟó čhúŋȟloka waŋží ektá oblúšna, ke ečhíŋčhiŋ kiŋyáŋ yá yuŋkȟáŋ Iktó ogláȟniǧe s'e. Hó, héna kȟéš, misúŋ, héna kȟéš!" eyáya na kȟoháŋ akh okát'apt'ap yaŋká yunkȟáŋ akhé naǧíta waŋgláka ké.

Čhaŋké čhúŋȟloka waŋ waŋná kál háŋ čhaŋké isáŋp ékawiŋǧiŋ na héktakiya kú na iwáŋkab oȟ'áŋkȟoya iglúptaŋyaŋ iyáya čhaŋké Iktó ektá mahél okášičahowáya iȟpáya ké. Héčhiya mahél yaŋkíŋ na čhéya-haŋ yuŋkȟáŋ wagnúka pȟášá waŋ él híyotaka čhaŋké "Misúŋ, hél omíčaȟlokela ye!" eyá yuŋkȟáŋ kató-hiŋ na kíčaȟloka čhaŋké hetáŋhaŋ tȟaŋkátakiya étuŋwaŋ yaŋká-haŋ ké.

Ȟčeháŋl wíŋyaŋ núŋp čhaŋk'íŋ hiyáyapi čhaŋke "Tókheškhé kaná wičháwagnayiŋ kta huwó?" ečhiŋ na uŋgná olówaŋ waŋ yawáŋkal eyáya ké.

"Hí - hó! Hí - hó Hi! Wičhá čhépa lél maŋké ló!"

Heyá-haŋ yuŋkȟáŋ wíŋyaŋ k'uŋ uŋmá "Má, čépȟaŋši, wičhá waŋ hél yaŋká kéye!" eyá čhaŋké heháŋl iyótaŋ líla howáya ké.

Sáŋp hótȟaŋkakiya lowáŋ na leyá ké:

"Wičhá čhépa lél maŋké ló! "

"Wičhá čhépa lél maŋké lo!"

Yuŋkȟaŋ "Héčha kiŋ wahíŋyuŋ waštépi k'uŋ uŋkókhiŋ kte", eyápi yuŋkȟáŋ akhé. "Omákaȟloka pó, wahíŋyuŋ mawášte yeló," eyá ké. Čhaŋké waŋná nazúŋspe ikíkčupi na čháŋ k'uŋ kaúŋkapi so yuŋgkȟáŋ wičhá há šiná waŋ íŋ k'uŋ hé siŋté kiŋ oȟlóka waŋ kaȟwíčhaši k'uŋ heháŋtaŋ patȟáŋkal hiyúyiŋ na akhéšna yumáhel ičú-haŋ čhaŋké akhé wínyaŋ kiŋ uŋmá heyá ké.

"Čépȟaŋši, lénaȟčiŋ yaŋké, tókheškhe ečuŋk'uŋ kiŋháŋ waste kta huwé," eyá yuŋkȟáŋ Iktó "Pȟéta aúpi na oízilmayaŋ pó."

Héčhel ečéla waglínapȟiŋ kte" eyá čhaŋké héčhetulapi na waŋná uŋmá gníŋ na pȟéta aú na uŋmá íŋs éna awáŋyag náziŋ kta keyápi ké. "Hiyá, nuŋphíŋ yá pó. Owékiš uŋmá níčisnipi k'éyaš uŋmá éčuȟčiš taŋyáŋ pȟéta ayáglipi kte ló," eyá yuŋkȟáŋ akhe ȟéčhetulapi na nuŋphíŋ iyáyapi čhaŋké kákel aísiŋyaŋ iyáyapi tkȟáš Iktó glinápȟiŋna čhaŋanákitaŋ na héčhiyataŋhaŋ ahíyokas'iŋ yaŋkíŋ na iȟát'a-haŋ škhé.

Táku čhéwiŋš wíŋyaŋ núŋp witkópi ke, ognáye waštépina míš miyé kiŋ makhíli yeló," eyá ke. Waŋná wíŋyaŋ k'uŋ nuŋphíŋ pȟéta yuhápi na temnít'e kiníl kúpi čhaŋké iglúš'iŋš'iŋ na igluȟlaȟlata ke. Inážiŋ na tȟasíŋta míla k'uŋ hé úŋ ináȟni waŋság waksáksa hiyáyiŋ na kažípžip étkiya wičháya ké.

"Tȟaŋkší, táku lé tókȟanuŋpi huwo?" eyá yuŋkȟáŋ okíyakapi čhaŋké, "Očhíčhiyapi kte ló. Ečáš héčha kiŋ líla wígli ótapi čha etáŋhaŋ waŋság isláye mayák'upi kte," eyáya čhaŋpáhi škáŋ ké. Waŋná átaya oíleyapi na čháŋ k'uŋ kabléblečapi k'éyaš tákuni šni yuŋkȟáŋ Iktó heyá škhé : " Tȟaŋkší, wičhá kiŋ líla wičhášapišni k'uŋ, íŋše pȟéta hiyóilalapi k'uŋ slolyá héčiŋhan kákhel aísiŋyaŋ ilálapi k'uŋ héčhena tokhíyotȟaŋ iyáya načhéče ló," eyáya ȟeyáb khinážiŋ na

šiná óǧeya wičhákat'apt'ap nážiŋ kte "Itȟó ečhá akhé waŋság kaksá omáwani kte," eyíŋ nčháŋaglágla iȟát'at'a ya-háŋ ké.

"Wíŋyaŋ núŋp atáya čhaǧú iyúȟpa waníčape ló. Lená tuktél kiúŋuŋpilake ló. Wačhíŋka loyuŋkȟáŋš núŋpi tokȟášniya ínawičha waȟmiŋ kta tkȟá. Tkȟá akhéš witkópi k'éyaš nimáyaŋpi čha itȟó eyáš héčhena kte,"eyáya ya-háŋ škhé.

Heháŋyela owíhaŋke.

b. Gloss and a free translation of the sections.

1. Iktó/kákhena/íčhimani/yá-haŋ/yuŋkȟáŋ/léčhel/akítȟuŋ/škhé/

Ikto /somewhere /trip /was making /and so/this way/he was dressed/they say/

Ikto was setting off on a journey, and this is how he was dressed-- they say.

2.Wizí/waŋ/kazázapi/čha/otȟúŋ/na/ptehíŋpaȟpa/waŋ/pȟégnakiŋ/na/wičhá/há/šhiŋté-aópȟeya/íŋ/škhé/

Old tipi/a/slashed/which had been/he wore as pants/and/clump of buffalo hair/a//he had on his head/and/raccoon/skin/ tail - included /he had wrapped around his shoulders/they say/

He wore pants made of smoked tipi hide, with fringes at the sides, a clump of buffalo hair on his head and raccoon skin wrapped around his shoulders with a tail hanging down-- they say.

3. Tȟasíŋta/míla/waŋ/yuhá/na/itázipa/waŋ/wáŋ/núnp/kȟó/héčhel/yuhá/škhé/

Buffalo tail/knife/a/he had/and /bow/a/and/arrows/two/also/like that/he had/they say/

He had a buffalo tail knife, a bow, and also two arrows he had-- they say.

4.Wakpála/čík'ala/waŋ/opȟáya/yáhaŋ/yuŋkȟaŋ/uŋgná/wakpa/waŋ/otȟáŋkaya/na/sma/čhaél/iyóȟloke/čhaŋké/óhuta/kiŋ/él ínážiŋ/

Creek/small/a/along/he was going/when/unexpectedly/river/a/wide/and/deep/that was/in/emptied/and so//shore/the/on/he stopped/

The small creek alongside which he was going suddenly turned into a wide and deep river, and there he stopped.

5.Tókȟa/iyúweǧe/šni/čhaŋké/éna/íyotakiŋ/na/čhéyahe/ȟčeháŋl/pteǧópȟeča/waŋ/kiŋyáŋ/hiyáya/čhaŋké/kipáŋ/hé/misúŋ/hú/ye/misúŋ/eyá/yuŋkȟáŋ/tokȟa/čhaŋké/misúŋ/kȟowákataŋ/éiȟpemayelaye/eyá/kéhuwo/eyá//čhaŋ.ké/misúŋ/kȟowákataŋ/éiȟpemayelahuwo/eyá/

There/ was no way/to cross/so/right there/he sat down/and/he was /crying/when/hawk/a/a/flying /went by/so he called out/and/hey/little brother/come here/(command)/little brother/he said/and the/what's the matter/(question) he said/and so/little brother/across the river/take me and leave me/(command) /he said/

There was no way to cross, so he sat on the bank, and he was crying, when a hawk flew by, so he called out to him:"Hey, little brother, come here", he said. "What's the matter?" the bird then said. "Little brother, take me across the river, and leave me there," he said.

6.Yuŋkȟáŋ/íŋš'dluŋmakečiŋk/ohaŋ/eyíŋ/na//khiyéla/pahá/waŋ/tȟáŋka/yaŋk/čhaŋké/héčhiya/aí/na/ hó/akáŋl/mayáŋka/yo/na/sutáya//yúza/yo/oínitomni//kte/séče/yuŋkȟáŋ/ókša/hé taŋyáŋ/makíŋ/kte/kiŋ/philámayay ló/misúŋ/eyáya/íyotake/ké/

So/the other fool one/ Okay/he said/and/nearby/hill/a/big/sitting/and so/over there/he took him/and/ well/on top of//me sit/(command)/and/firmly/hold on/(command)/dizzy/you will be/perhaps/he said and then/ it will be/that/alright/I will sit/the (fact that); thanks/little brother/saying/he sat down/it is said/

So, the hawk, foolishly said: "Ok", and there was a big hill nearby where he would take him. "Well, sit on top of me, and hold on to tight. You may get dizzy," he said, and then the other one said, "it will be all right, I will do that. Thanks, my little brother," and while saying that he took the seat.

7. Héčhetu/weló/misúŋ/hokšíčhaŋlkiyapi/čha/héčha éčhel/waúŋšila/yeló/

That is right/(assert.)/little brother/beloved child/who/is of such kind/like this/shows compassion/

"That is good, my little brother, child beloved. It is customary of those to show compassion."

8.Waŋná/pteǧópȟeča/kiŋ/Iktó/k'íŋ/kiŋyáŋ/iyáya/yuŋkȟáŋ/kȟoháŋ/nažúte/kiŋ/apȟósiŋsiŋ/na/ačhéž iyaŋpyaŋp/yaŋkíŋ/na/waŋná/mníkiŋ/ópta/yé//k'uŋ/heháŋl/ečháŋl/pteǧó/na/waŋná/mníkiŋ/ópta/yé/ /k'uŋ/heháŋl/ečháŋl/pteǧó/pȟesléte/kiŋ/okát'apt'ap/yaŋká/škhé/

Now/hawk/the/Ikto/carried on his back/flying/he took off and then/meanwhile/back of the neck/the/he made faces at/and/sticking out his tongue/he sat/and/now/water/the/across/he went/(in the past)/at that inappropriate moment/hawk top of the head/the/snapping his fingers (in contempt)/he sat/it is said/

Now, the hawk carrying Ikto on his back, took off, while Ikto started making faces at the back of the bird's neck, sticking out his tongue, and as they were flying over the water, he snapped his fingers above the hawk's head.

9.K'éyaš/ziŋtkála/kiŋ/naǧíta/waŋglág/kiŋyáŋ/čhaŋké/waȟtéšni/waŋná/akhé/lé/Iktó/é/yeló/Itȟó/čh úŋȟloka/waŋží/ektá/oblúšna/ke"/ečhíŋčhiŋ/kiŋyáŋ/yá/yuŋkȟáŋ/Iktó/ogláȟniǧe s'e/

Hó/héna/kȟéš/misúŋ/héna/kȟéš!"/eyáya/na/kȟoháŋ/akhé/okát'apt'ap/yaŋká/yunkȟáŋ/akhé/naǧíta/ waŋgláka/ké/

But/bird/the/in the shadow/seeing it/he flew/and so/rascal/now/again/this one/Ikto/this is/(assert)/I think/hollow tree/a/in/I drop him/huh/he kept thinking /flying /he went /and/then/Ikto/understoodit/seemed/now/right/there/rather/little/brother/right/there/rather/he/repeated and/meanwhile/again/snapping his fingers/he sat/and then/again/in the shadow/he (the bird) saw it/it is said/

But the bird could see it in his shadow, as he was flying. I think I will drop him into the hollow tree,"and said: "You rascal, so again it is Ikto. I think I will drop him into the hollow tree." He kept thinking that, as he was flying, and then somehow Ikto understood that; it seemed so at least. "Now, right there, little brother, right there, to be more precise", he kept saying, at the same time snapping his fingers as he sat down, but the bird saw it again -they say.

10.Čhaŋké/čhúŋȟloka/waŋ/waŋná/kál/háŋ/čhaŋké/isáŋp/ékawiŋǧiŋ/na/héktakiya/kú/naiwáŋkab/oȟ'áŋkȟoya/iglúptaŋyaŋ/iyáya/čhaŋké/Iktó/ektá/mahél/okášičahowáya/iȟpáya/ké/

So/hollow tree/a/now/over there stood/and then/beyond it/he turned around/and/backward/came back/and/above it/quickly/turning over he went/and so/Ikto/into/inside/howling/he fell/it is said/

There was a hollow tree right there, he hovered over it, and then suddenly turned around and made a backward movement, and dropped Ikto into it, howling.

11.Héčhiya/mahél/yaŋkíŋ/na/čhéyahaŋ/yuŋkȟáŋ/wagnúka/pȟášá/waŋ/él/híyotaka/čhaŋké/"Misúŋ, /hél/omíčaȟlokela/ye!"/pȟášá/waŋ/él/híyotaka/čhaŋké/"Misúŋ,/hél/omíčaȟlokela/ye!"/eyá/yuŋkȟáŋ/katóhiŋ/na/kíčaȟloka/čhaŋké/hetáŋhaŋ/eyá/yuŋkȟáŋ/katóhiŋ/na/kíčaȟloka/čhaŋké/hetáŋhaŋ/tȟaŋkátakiya/étuŋwaŋ/yaŋká-haŋ/ké/

There/inside/he stood/and/he was crying/when/woodpecker/red headed/a/in/landed/so/little brother/there/make me a little hole/(command)he said/then/he kept pecking at it/and made him /an little hole/so/from there towards the outside/looking out/he was standing/it is said/towards the outside/looking out/he was standing/it is said/

There inside he sat, and was crying, when a red-headed woodpecker went by, so he said: "Little brother, make me a little hole right there." He said, and the bird started pecking at it, and made him a little hole, so he was standing there looking through the hole, they say.

12.Ȟčeháŋl/wíŋyaŋ/núŋp/čhaŋk'íŋ/hiyáyapi/čhaŋké/tókheškhé/kaná/wičháwagnayiŋ/kta/huwó/ečhiŋ/na/uŋgná olówaŋ/waŋ/yawáŋkal/eyáya/ké/

Just then/women/two/carrying wood/passed by/so/how/those/I will trick them/ (future) /(question)/he thought/and/suddenly/song/a/raising his voice for/he started/it is said/

Just then, two women carrying wood were passing by, so he thought "How should I trick them?" and suddenly he raised his voice, and started singing; this is what they say.

13.Hí/-/hó!/Hí/-/hó!/Wičhá/čhépa/lél/maŋké/ló!/

Hi – ho! Hi – ho!/Raccoon/fat/here/(where) I sit/(assert)/

Hi, ho, hi ho, a fat raccoon, here I am.

14.Heyáhaŋ/yuŋkȟáŋ/wíŋyaŋ/k'uŋ/uŋmá/má/čépȟaŋši/wičhá/waŋ/hél/yaŋká/kéye/eyá/čhaŋké/heh áŋl/iyótaŋ/líla/howáya/ké/

He kept saying that/and then/women/the (aforesaid)/one of them/Gee/cousin/

raccoon/a/there/he sits/saying that/she said/so/next/the most/intensely/he cried out/it is said/

He kept saying that, and then one of the women said: "Gee, my cousin, there is a raccoon there who is saying that." So, then he started calling with all might; they say.

15.Sáŋp/hótȟaŋkakiya/lowáŋ/na/leyá/ké/ Wičhá/čhépa/lél/maŋké/ló/wičhá/čhépa/lél/maŋké/ló/

Furthermore/making his voice louder/he sang/and/said this

Raccoon/fat/here/(where) I sit/(assert)/raccoon/fat/here/(where) I sit/(assert)

And also, he started singing louder: Fat raccoon, here I am! Fat raccoon, here I am.

16.Yuŋkȟaŋ/héčha/kiŋ/wahíŋyuŋ/waštépi/k'uŋ/uŋkókhiŋ/kte/eyápi/yuŋkȟáŋ/akhé/omákaȟloka/p ó/wahíŋyuŋ/

I'm good/(assert)/he said/it is said/ and then/that kind/the/to grease hides/they are good/as you know/let's dig it up (future)/they said/and then/again/make me a little hole/(command)/

 And then the woman added:" That kind is good for greasing hides, as you know, let's get it out."

17. Čhaŋké/waŋná/nazúŋspe/ikíkčupi/na/čháŋ/k'uŋ/kaúŋkapi so /yuŋgkȟá /wičhá /há /šiná /waŋ/íŋ/k'uŋ/hé/siŋté/kiŋ/oȟlóka/waŋ/kaȟwíčhaši/k'uŋheháŋtaŋ/patȟáŋkal/hiyúyiŋ/na//akhéšna/y umáhel/ičú-haŋ/čhaŋké/akhé/wínyaŋ kiŋ uŋmá heyá ké/

So/now/ax/they took out their own/and/tree/past tense/and/tree/they/knocked down/raccoon/skin/blanket/(as) a/he wore/the (aforesaid)/that/tail/outside/he pushed/and/again and again kept drawing it in/and so/again/women/he/one of them/said that/it is said/

So, then, they took their axes, and knocked down the tree, and Ikto would stick out the raccoon tail he wore, back and forth through the hole the woodpecker made for him; so they say.

18.Čépȟaŋši/léna/ȟčiŋ/yaŋké/tókheškhe/ečuŋk'uŋ/kiŋháŋ/waste/kta/huwé/eyá/yuŋkȟáŋ/Iktó/pȟét a/aúpi/na/oízilmayaŋ/pó/héčhel/ečéla/waglínapȟiŋ/kte/eyá/čhaŋké/héčhetulapi/na/waŋná/uŋmá/g níŋ/na/pȟéta/aú/na/uŋmá/íŋs/éna/awáŋyag/názikta/keyápi/ké/ahíyokas'iŋ/yaŋkíŋ/na/iȟát'a- haŋ/škhé/

Cousin/right here/in this very spot/he sits/how/we do/when/good/it will be/I wonder/she said/so/Ikto/Fire/bring/and/smoke me out/(command)/That way/only/I will come out/(future) he said/and so/they agreed/and/now/one of them/(will) go backfire/bring/and/one of them/as for her/right there/watching/(will) stand/(future)/they said that/it is said.

The woman said, "Cousin, right there, in the very place he is, what should we do to get him out?" Then Ikto said, "Smoke me out, bring fire and smoke me out. This is the only way I may

come out," he said and they both agreed, and then one of the women was to go back and bring fire. And one was supposed to stay to keep watch; so they say.

19.Hiyá/nuŋphíŋ/yá/pó/wékiš/uŋmá/níčisnipi/k'éyaš/uŋmá/éčuȟčiš/taŋyáŋ/pȟéta/ayáglipi/kte/ló/ eyá/yuŋkȟáŋ/akhé/kta/keyápi/ké/ȟéčhetulapi/na/nuŋphíŋ/iyáyapi/čhaŋké/kákel/aísiŋyaŋ/iyáyapi /tkȟáš/ Iktó/ glinápȟiŋna/ čhaŋanákitaŋ/ na/ héčhiyataŋhaŋ/ ahíyokas'iŋ/ yaŋkíŋ/ na/ iȟát'a-haŋ/ škhé/

Carefully/fire/you will bring back/future/(assert.)/he said/so then/again no/you both/go/(assert.)/might/on one of you/it (the fire) goes out/but/the other/at least they agreed/and/both/they went/So/the instant/out of sight/they went/actually/Ikto/he came back in sight/and/he woods/he rushed towards/and/from there/peeking out/he sat/and/was laughing/they say.

To what Ikto said:" No, you both go. Just in case one of your fire's goes out, the other one will keep burring. And they agreed, and both went. As soon as they went out of site, Ikto emerged, and ran right into the woods, and from there he was watching, laughing at the same time. Both can securely bring the fire back.

20.Táku/čhéwiŋš/wíŋyaŋ/núŋp/witkópi/ke/ognáye/waštépi/na /míš/miyé/kiŋ/

makhíli/yeló/eyá/ké/

What/how very/women/those two/crazy/huh/to fool/they are easy/myself/the/am so cool/(assert.)

What fools are those women, so easy to trick, and as for myself, I am such a fellow." He said.

21.Waŋná/wíŋyaŋ/k'uŋ/nuŋphíŋ/pȟéta/yuhápi/na/temnít'e/kiníl/kúpi/čhaŋké/iglúš'iŋš'iŋ/na/igluȟl aȟlata//ke/

Now/women/the (aforesaid)/both/fire/they carried/and/dying from sweat almost/came back/so/he tickled himself/and/scratched himself repeatedly/it is said/

"Now, the two women came having sweated almost to death, and brought the fire. He was just tickling and scratching himself.

22.Inážiŋ/na/tȟasíŋta/míla/k'uŋ/hé/úŋ/ináȟni/waŋság/waksáksa/hiyáyiŋ/na/kažípžipétkiya wičháya/ké/

He stood up/and/buffalo tail/knife/the (aforesaid) that/with/losing no time/and/sticks for arrows/he cut up/he did quickly/whistling them/towards/them he went/it is said.

Then, he stood up, and wasting no time, he went toward them still cutting sticks for arrows with his buffalo tail knife.

23.Tȟaŋkší/táku/lé/tókȟanuŋpi/huwo/eyá/yuŋkȟáŋ/okíyakapi/čhaŋke/očhíčhiyapi/kte/ló/ečháš/hé čha/kiŋ/líla/wígli/ótapi/čha/etáŋhaŋ/waŋság/isláye/mayák'upi/kte/»//eyáya/čhaŋpáhi/škáŋké.

Little sisters/what/this/you're doing/(question ?)/he said/then/they told and so/ I will help you/(future)/(assert./For sure/that kind/the/really/fat/there is plenty/and so/some of it/arrow/grease/you will give me/(future) /he said/picking wood/busy/It is said.

"Little sisters, what have you been doing?" He asked them, and they told him to what he said:" I can help you for sure, but that kind has plenty of grease, so I hope you will give me some to grease my arrows." He said, picking up wood.

24.Waŋná/átaya/oíleyapi/na/čháŋ/k'uŋ/kabléblečapi/k'éyaš/tákuni/šni/yuŋkȟáŋ/Iktó/heyá/škhé//Tȟaŋkší/wičhá/kiŋ/líla/wičhášapišni/k'uŋ//íŋše/pȟéta/hiyóilalapi/k'uŋ/slolyá/héčiŋhaŋ/kákhel/aíšiŋ yaŋ/ilálapi/k'uŋ/héčhena/tokhíyotȟaŋ/iyáya/načhéč/heló/eyáya/ȟeyáb/khinážiŋ/na/šiná/óǧeya/wičhákat'apt'ap/nážiŋ/ké/

 Now/the whole thing they set it afire/and/tree/the (aforesaid)/they chopped it to pieces/but/there was nothing (in it)/and so/Ikto/said that/it is said/"Little sisters,/raccoon/the/very/they are tricky/they are tricky/the (aforesaid)/just/fire/you went to bring back/the (fact)/he knew/when/the instant/out of sight/you left/the (aforesaid fact)/immediately/somewhere/he went/maybe/(assert.)/he said/aside/standing/and/blanket/through/he kept snapping his fingers at them/standing//it is said/

Now, they set the whole thing on fire, and cut the tree into pieces. But there was nothing there, so Ikto said, "Little sisters, that kind, raccoons, they are very tricky, and the minute you went out of sight, he must have come out and run somewhere." He said that, snapping his fingers under the blanket.

25. Itȟó/ečhá/akhé/waŋság/kaksá/omáwani/kt/eyíŋ/na/čháŋaglágla/iȟát'at'a//ya-háŋ/ké/

I guess/in that case/again sticks for arrows/I will walk about/(future)/he said/ and/the woods/along the edge/laughing/he was going/it is said.

*There are 2 typos in the original text where it says ečháš, whereas ečhá is the right word, and kaská should be kaksá.

I think in this case, I will keep walking around and cut sticks for arrows, he said.

26.Wíŋyaŋ/núŋp/atáya/čhaǧú/iyúȟpa/waníčape/ló/Lená/tuktél/kiúŋuŋpilake/ló íŋka/yuŋkȟáŋš/núŋpi/tokȟášniya/ínawičhawaȟmiŋ/kta/tkȟá/Tkȟá/akhéš/witkópi/k'éyaš/nimáyaŋpi/čha/itȟó/eyáš/héčhena/kte/eyáya/ya-háŋ škhé

Women/both/totally/lungs/all their/they don't have/(assert.)/These/are(ridiculously) foolish/(assert)/I was inclined to/if both/with no[trouble/seduce them/I would have/But/again/they are foolish/however/hey saved me/so/I think/enough/it will go on (like this)/(future)/assert. »/he said/as he was going/it is said.

"Those women have no lungs. If I wanted to seduce them and ran away with them, I easily could have. But again, they are foolish, yet they saved my life, so I guess let it be." He said, and kept going, they say.

27. Heháŋyela/owíhaŋke/

Only as much/it ends/

C. Literary translation

Ikto was setting off on a journey, and this is how he was dressed-- they say. He wore pants made of smoked tipi hide with fringes on each side, a clump of buffalo hair on his head, and a raccoon skin wrapped around his shoulders, with a tail hanging down—they say. He had a buffalo tail knife, a bow, and also two arrows he had-- they say.

The small creek alongside which he was going then suddenly turned into a wide and deep river, and so there he stopped. There was no way to cross, so he sat on the bank, and he was crying, when a hawk flew by, so he called out to him:"Hey, little brother, come here", he said. "What's the matter?" the bird then said. "Little brother, take me across the river, and leave me there," he said.

So, the hawk, foolishly said, "Ok,' and there was a big hill nearby where he would take him. "Well, sit on top of me, and hold on to tight. You may get dizzy," he said, and then the other one said: "It will be all right, I will do that. Thanks, my little brother," and while saying that he took the seat. "That is good, my little brother, child beloved. It is customary of those to show compassion."

Now, the hawk carrying Ikto on his back, took off, while Ikto started making faces at the back of the bird's neck, sticking out his tongue, and as they were flying over the water, he snapped his fingers above the hawk's head. But the bird could see it in his shadow as he was flying by, and said to himself: "You rascal, so again it is Ikto. I think I will drop him into the hollow tree." He kept thinking that, as he was flying, and then somehow Ikto understood that; it

seemed so at least. "Now, right there, little brother, right there, to be more precise," he kept saying that, at the same time snapping his fingers as he was sitting down, but the bird saw it again. There was a hollow tree right there; he hovered over it, and then suddenly turned around and made a backward movement, and dropped Ikto into it, howling.

So, there inside he sat, and he was crying, when a red-headed woodpecker went by, so he said: "Little brother, make me a little hole right there." He said that, and the bird started pecking at it, and made him a little hole. So now, he was standing there looking through the hole--so they say.

Just then, two women carrying wood were passing by, so he thought "How should I trick them?", and suddenly he raised his voice and started singing--so they say.

"Hi, ho, hi ho, a fat raccoon, here I am."

He kept saying that, and then one of the women said: "Gee, my cousin, there is a raccoon there who is saying that." So, then he started calling with all his might--so they say. And also, he started singing louder:

"A fat raccoon, here I am! "

"A fat raccoon here I am!"

And, then the woman added: "That kind is good for greasing hides, as you know, let's get hm out." So, then, they took their axes, and knocked down the tree, and Ikto would stick out the raccoon tail he wore, back and forth through the hole the woodpecker made for him. So they say.

One woman said:"Cousin, right there, in that very place he is. What should we do to get him out?" Then Ikto said: "Smoke me out, bring fire and smoke me out. This is the only way I may come out," he said, and they both agreed, and then one of the women was to go back 'and bring fire. And, one was supposed to stay to keep watch-- so they say.

To what Ikto said: "No, you both go. Just in case one of your fires goes out, the other one will keep burning." And, they agreed, and both went. Both can securely bring the fire back.

As soon as the women went out of sight, he came out, and ran right into the woods, and from there he was watching, laughing at the same time. What fools are those women, so easy to trick, and as for myself, I am such a fellow." He said.

Now, the two women came having sweated almost to death, and brought the fire

"Little sisters, what have you been doing?" He asked them, and they told him to what he said:" I can help you for sure, but that kind has plenty of grease, so I hope you will give me some of the grease for my arrows." He said that picking up wood.

Now, they set the whole thing on fire, and cut the tree into pieces. But there was nothing there, so Ikto said: "Little sisters, that kind, raccoons, are very tricky, and the minute you went out of sight, he must have come out and run somewhere," he said, snapping his fingers under the blanket. I think in this case, I will keep walking around and cut sticks for arrows," he said.

"Those women have even no lungs, not only no brains. If I wanted to seduce them, and run away with them, I easily could have. But then, they are fools, yet they saved my life, so I guess, let it be." He said, and kept going"- so they say.

That's all. Here it ends.

Chapter 5. Discourse Analysis of Story Number Seven.

"Iktó and the Raccoon Skin", or "Iktó na wičhá ha kiŋ", is a traditional Lakota story, which can be treated both as a linguistic record and a literary form since, it is an oral record handed down from generation to generation in almost the same form and an expressive piece of literature at the same time, created anew in each performance event. It has a specific storytelling form typical of the Lakota oral tradition, similar to the forms discussed by Woodbury, Hymes, Tedlock and Loriot, who did research on Native American and Inuit narratives (Woodbury 1984, 1985, Hymes 1981, Tedlock 1983, Loriot 1951, Hollenbach 1970). This narrative has a distinct structure, and it contains references to traditions, communal ethics in the form of norms of behavior or anti-norms, kinship terms, specific vocabulary liked to traditions, clothing, names of birds, activities typical of the Lakota community and locality specific vocabulary. The story is told in a spontaneous way rather than created in a premeditated manner by an individual author using artificially modified language for artistic purposes.

In the first part of this chapter, I will discuss the analysis of the form, all the salient features of the narrative discovered during my analysis and other phenomena observed which are related to discourse, such as the speakers' communicative strategies, modes of behavior, psychological conditioning of the discourse, and paralanguage, among others, and my approach to the re-translation of the narrative, and only later those observations will be supported by a further step-by-step illustrative analysis.

The story is told by a physical narrator, the one actually performing the act of storytelling. In this case, he tells the story to Ella Deloria. He is an unknown community elder speaking Teton from the Standing Rock reservation, as shown by some reservation specific words like *makéli*, 'such a fellow' (Deloria 1932/2006:40). We do not know the identity of the storyteller, their gender or exact age based on the written record of the story. It is mentioned in Deloria's notes that the stories were told by older men from the reservation but this is just some extratextual information (Deloria 1932/2006). It would have been different in oral transmission or an audio recording, but in the written form the identity of the storyteller is less visible. There are some suggestions that it could have been Standing Bear, but there is no confirmation of that in Deloria's notes (DeMallie 2006; V-VI). For this purpose, the storyteller is just an anonymous member of the community since we do not have the same information about the storyteller when exposed to the written records, even though in more general terms text is merely "written down discourse" (Johnstone 2008: 18). The function of the storyteller here is more that of a messenger, the conveyer of messages, rather than the author. Some individual characteristics of each storyteller are, however, still visible, in the written form through the choice of words and communicative strategies. The individual character of the story transfer and renditions has often been neglected when analyzing orally transferred stories according to Hymes (1981: 69). They ingenuity of the language, the tension building and humor may be something individual in this storytelling as well but it is very hard to prove it based on the written records alone. That would require some comparative studies of the same story written down when told by various storytellers, which is not the purpose of the thesis. With the use of the reported speech device of a withdrawn, remote, anonymous narrator *škhé*, "that is what they say" or 'they say [that]", or *ké*, a shorter form, the story is seen as a collective record, which belongs to the culture.

The narration employs descriptive passages, monologues, internal monologues, dialogues and verse within its discourse structure, and paralingual means of communication, including gestures, facial expressions, laughter, crying and silence. The motivations of the speakers are reflected though the choice of words and communicative strategies, which are linked to culture to a large extent. Power relations are created throughout the discourse, and they are either expressed verbally or through extratextual events, all using the traditional community norms as the basis, or violating them, the latter being more common in this discourse as the main speaker, Ikto, often violates the norms. He misuses kinship terms, using them for personal gain, and though his extraverbal communication violates most of the norms within the Lakota community code, as, for example, when riding the bird he makes faces, snaps fingers, or at other times, cries without a reason and impends on conversations (LB: 27-30). The communicative strategies are deeply rooted within the culture, yet they are based on some universals, common to all languages, and individual features as well.

The story exhibits many features of an oral tradition narrative. It has a specific rhetorical structure reflected in the form, and created though the use of specific sounds, and repeated words; mostly conjunctions, the reported speech device *škhé* or *ké* and the ending line; a single line, which functions as ending lines or codas in poems, a kind of closure linking it to other similar forms. The reported speech device, which is either overt or covert, creates text divisions separating the narrative into meaningful units. It is covert when the section ends in another real time reported speech phrase, that relating what the participants of the story say within the story, such as *eya*, "he said'. This is done to avoid two reported speech phrases next to each other. The use of the reported speech device also helps in tension building, the first three short one- line sections end in *škhé* to create the suspense, or tension. Then, when we have longer, descriptive

passages where *škhé* is either covert, or it is replaced with its shorter version ké (LB:33-36). All the structural elements reflect the manner in which the Lakota stories are told and what they say. The most important elements of the form besides the parallel structures of the reported speech device, are the repeated conjunctions *chanké*, and *yuŋkȟáŋ*,"and, and so", "and then". Those words are not just fillers, but conjunctions which create the rhythm of the story. Woodbury discovered something similar in Yupik narratives; many repeated conjunctions, which are discussed earlier in this thesis (Woodbury 1984). The clauses *škhé* or *ké*, "so they say", "so it is said", appear in the sentence final position since Lakota is a left branching language. In Yupik the tags start the longer passages. *Čhaŋké* is repeated 18 times within the story, and *yuŋkȟáŋ* 15 times. The reported speech clause in the form of *škhé* is repeated 6 times, and *ké* 13. *Ké* is a form of *keyA* say. Elaine Jahner, who did some work on Lakota narratives**,** thought that *škhé* and ké were just pause markers (Jahner, Walker 1989:35), but I think they have a more complex function in creating the rhythm of the story and removing the story from historical time. Most Lakota stories end in *Heháŋyela wíhaŋke* 'here it ends", and so does this one. This sentence is also a part of the rhetorical form. The structure makes the story a one piece, or one poetic form, which encompasses elements of all genres: prose, verse and drama. Here it is more grotesque or a Theatre of the Absurd due to the stances Ikto uses and his changes of footing. The analysis shows that the structure of the story is inseparably bound with the effect it creates: it binds the current audience with the future and past audiences who experienced the story through the use of the remote, indefinite narrator, and thus creates the effect of eternity, or lack of historical time. The rhythm of those stories, which is a part of the form, has an impact on memorizing language, language learning, and revitalization. The rhythm of such stories and songs, which involves repetition, was used by the revitalization efforts to restore Mazatec, as described by Paja Faudree

(2013). It is used in revitalization projects, where language is taught through songs, and repetitions; chants and poems.

The story is description of a trip, with the archetypal motif of a journey and with the motif of seduction and difficulties on the way-- typical of many narratives, like the *Odyssey* and *Kalevala* among others, and Viking sagas, which were also initially the art of oral tradition. Archetypes are universal, symbolic concepts existing within the collective consciousness of a culture, and common to all cultures. It is a concept first put forward by Carl Jung. There are archetypal characters appearing in many literary pieces of the world as well as types of stories common to most cultures. The character of a femme fatale, of the trickster, a dying god are some of those. There are also archetypal types of stories, a narrative describing a journey being one of them. Ikto's story is more of a parody as it happens on a local scale; it is a trip over the river on the hawk's back. The journey usually results in the protagonist being enriched through experience, or cleansed, acquiring some new consciousness, whereas Ikto remains the same. He does not change, mature or learn from experience since he is a symbol of immaturity; he is eternal. In eposes, the main protagonist does things himself: accepts challenges, challenges himself like Ulysses, the Kalevala hero, or Gilgamesh, whereas in this story Ikto tricks people into doing him favors, and doing everything for him. A journey has philosophical symbolism of enrichment, and acquiring consciousness. Life is often compared to a journey. Another motive is seduction. Ikto is also a seducer of women, like Don Juan or Sancho Panza. He is seducing them into doing him favors, and obeying him, not in a strictly sexual sense. He also uses a chant resembling a nursery rhyme to attract their attention. His is not the seductive singing of the sirens, or that of troubadours, but rather a kind of nursery rhyme: "Fat raccoon, here I am." (LB: 37 s. 13). This is where his immaturity also shows through, as well as through the intention to

trick women, and take advantage of them, in some way. In this story, he makes them work hard for nothing, and takes pleasure in being just able to control them, which is preceded by trying to establish seniority power relations based on the culture, where younger sisters are supposed to listen to older brothers. He is also not the one who bravely fights all the obstacles in front of him in a heroic manner as in the stories mentioned above but rather tries to trick others to remove the obstacles for him. That would be consistent with an anti-model. Even though the story exhibits many universal features, which appear in narratives of most cultures, I think their similarity is archetypal rather than a result of culture contact, since the community had no access to stories of Homer, or other narratives of that kind, and the stories are said to belong to a more remote past then the times of the first contact with the Europeans. There is also a universal, archetypal motif within the story of being trapped, and trying to get out, present in legends about trapped princesses, but first of all, the story of Jonah trapped in the whale's belly. It is usually interpreted as a symbol of rebirth, and change but Ikto remains the same after being freed from the tree. He still plays tricks, has no remorse, and thinks he is 'such a fellow" (LB:38). His character does not go through the process of development, or maturing. The story itself, however, is no less complex than the most sophisticated eposes of world literature.

The employment of a specific narrative structure in creation of traditional Lakota narratives implies that when trying to translate them into another language, the structure should be taken into consideration, and retained to the highest degree possible . Each structural element plays an important role. The fallacy of many translations of indigenous texts into a Western language or vice versa before Loriot's was not taking into consideration the unique discourse structure of the Native language, translating text word-for-word, and imposing the target language's cultural referents on the source language (Hymes 1989, Loriot 1951, Loriot

Hollenbach 1970). Hymes believed that the poetics, or the rhetorical structure, of the source language should be retained in the translation when translating Native American narratives (Tedlock 1983, Hymes 1981). So did Tedlock, and they both treated oral narratives as narrative poems. There were some other schools and translators who did work on Native American narratives, who did not consider the form to be an important element, which should be retained in translation. Boas, for example, cared mostly about the accuracy of the transfer (Tedlock 1983:89), while Levi Strauss thought that regardless of form, whether it was retained or not in translation, myths did not lose anything because it was mainly the story told that mattered. (Tedlock 1983:98). Jacobson did not pay much attention to form either (Tedlock 1981: 92). In fact, after Deloria, 1930s, not much was done in terms of translating Native American narratives. Loriot did some translations in 1950s, and then many were re-translated in 1980s, by people who did not necessarily know the source languages well but rather worked from previous translations done by Native American translators who did not pay that much attention to the form in English. According to Hymes and Loriot, the bond between structure and meaning was often ignored by translators, as words were taken out of context, text artificially divided into words and phrases, and cultural references underestimated. According to Loriot, paragraphs should be taken as the basis for analysis or translation, which in our case may be the segments denoted by the verb *škhé* at the end of the sections, either overt or implied. Boas just wanted the translation to be accurate, and then it was adjusted as to the literary form in English (Tedlock 1983:89).

Ella Deloria concentrated on larger units with relevant meaning correspondence when translating, according to Vine Deloria, who talks about it in the Introduction to *Speaking of Indians* (Deloria 1944/2016:VI). I chose a similar approach when working on my free literary translation of the narrative. Her work is very detailed and outstanding as one of the first culture-

based translations into English. Franz Boas who supervised Deloria's research, however, did not pay as much attention to the artistic and esthetic effects of the translation, but rather its accuracy (Tedlock 1983:89), so the free translation does not retain the Lakota rhetorical structure in English. Boas edited Deloria's translations for style, so his impact is visible. All the reported speech phrases *škhé* are skipped in the English translation, and so are the equivalents of the recurring conjunctions *čhaŋke* and *yuŋkȟáŋ*. There is almost no parallelism because form was not something considered important at that stage of research into Native American poetics.

When translating the story, I first edited the gloss, familiarized myself with the lexical content, and grammatical structure, and then wrote the passages in English from memory; based on the meaning extracted from the original, with attention to form, still having in mind the original rhythm of the story, segment by segment. That was done to avoid word-for-word translation, and also take larger units of text as the basis for the extraction of meaning and transferring that meaning into English. The prior translation may also a part of the new one to some extent since each translation reuses prior texts as a part of the intertextuality of discourse. Afterward, I checked the translation again against the original, whether the whole meaning was retained, and the artistic effect. There is no sentence for sentence correspondence but rather that of meaningful segments of information. Often, the only equivalent of some Lakota words when translating them into English was a description of what the word referred to in Lakota, like *ptehíŋpaȟpa*, a "buffalo hair headdress", or replacing it with an equivalent where the etymology of the word, unfortunately, was lost, what it literally meant like *pteǧópȟeča,* which was replaced with 'a hawk' rather than "one going through the swamps". Ella Deloria obviously used the same word "hawk" since it is the equivalent of the very poetic, visually inspiring word *pteǧópȟeča*. The word could also be translated as a turkey vulture, but hawk might be better for the purpose

of the story, as a less taxonymic term. It is also better from the phonological point of view, in terms of the sound of the story. It is also a word from an everyday use, and so are the stories; they employ everyday discourse as opposed to sacral language used in chants and prayers. It is very important to stick to the same register as the original. Even though in English repetition of "so they say" may seem redundant, I decided to leave the reported speech phrases, *škhé* , or *ké* in translation, exactly the way they appear in the original to preserve the narrative form, and the rhythm of the storytelling, wherever possible. I tried to stick to the original poetic form, something also Hymes (1981) proposed, although I chose using short paragraphs instead of stanzas, the way the poetic prose often divides text. The form was formed by the repetitive elements, as well as certain structure in terms of onsets and suspension created by those repeated elements, mostly, and the phonological properties of the piece. When translating the story, translation of the reported speech device *škhé*, and putting it at the end of the sections in English, where they originally appeared applied only to the *škhé* constructions denoting removed reported speech. Those translated clauses could not be moved from their final position even in English, which is a right branching language. When putting the main reported speech clause at the beginning of the sentence, the whole rhythm of the storytelling was lost. This restriction does not apply, however, to regular reported speech, within the story:" he said "they said", reporting what some participants of the discourse say. Those reported speech clauses could be placed either prepositionally or post positionally when translated into English. "Ikto said:[….] or […], Ikto said.', which is the translation of *eya.* The difference in the rhythm was marginal, when the position of those phrases changed. This proves that the remote, unidentified narration reporting device pays a much broader role as far as the structure of the poem is concerned than regular reported speech clauses, reporting the discourse of participants within the story. I tried to

preserve the reported speech device, at the end of the sections "so they say' wherever possible. I used the same approach to the conjunctions; I repeated them in the same positions as they appeared in the original whenever possible using English words or phrases, the closest to the original form. This contributed to the overall effect of the translation Another step was to compare the meaning of words against Native sources, the work of Ella Deloria, the *New Lakota Dictionary* which is a product of the Lakota community themselves to a large extent, as well as consulting a community member.

Most of the messages conveyed throughout the narration are the result of an interaction between the speaker, the audience and the context. The participating audience which is capable of understanding the culture-bound, highly indexical signs, through participating in the interaction turns meaning into a mobile phenomenon rather than static, constantly created through the use of various media, including: dialogue, monologue, silence and gestures--any significant semiotic sign that can be interpreted is playing its role within the interaction, and so do their expectations. The main condition to understand the transfer is, however, being able to understand the Lakota language which employs all the cultural references as well. Those who don't understand the language, may experience the narratives on some other level; as pure sound, but they would not be able to understand the message, unless in translation. When translated, the narrative may become another story, if we assume that translations are new stories, at least on some levels. Even when trying to preserve the form and the rhetorical structure of the story, it will still be different since the referents of the highly indexical elements will differ, and so may the form, and individual rendition of the story.

The main problem with understanding traditional stories at the times when Walker recorded his stories, and later during Deloria's times at the beginning of the 20th century, was that the elders spoke the traditional language with culture specific-referents, often sacral language used for chants and rites, whereas the young generation spoke mostly the language affected by the Bible translations with European referents, and thus could not understand what the elders were saying (Jahner 1991:35). That is why Albert White Hat thought that it may be worthwhile to try giving the Lakota words their original meaning (White Hat 1999: 10-12), that which would refer to the culture, its traditions, and norms; to bring back the spirituality, and the Lakota ways of life for people of any creed or worldview to share, or learn about.

Besides the narrator and the live audience in the traditional story telling scenario, or Ella Deloria, in this case, there are other players or participants of the story, who become narrators and listeners on the micro level; within the story, all using speech and other means of communication. There are five characters in the story, or speakers, who either communicate with one another or speak to themselves either aloud or through internal monologues. Those are narrators on the intra level. They also become the audience for their microlevel, within the story, interlocutors, be it intended or unintended.

Ikto is the most present and engaging communicator within the story. He is an anti-hero, and this is what is seen through the language he uses; he uses both nonstandard forms of verbal expressions and nonstandard behavior. Ikto is, however, a mythical part of the community, and thus a cultural icon, not just an outcast. Ikto's nonstandard language and behavior are expressed through the goal-oriented uses of kinship terms to extort favors, which is the opposite use as the one forms of address were created for; he calls the male birds *misúŋ*, a younger brother, and the women *tȟaŋkši*, younger siters. The forms of address are used to show respect and support the

community structure, relations and seniority roles at different stages of life and those of the community. Ikto uses them for self gain only, and violates all the rules. He overhears, impedes on conversations, uses paralanguage against the cannons, expressed through snapping fingers, making faces, laughing behind the scenes, calling the women stupid, *witko* (the converted stem is Ikto with a metathesis of the consonants), and tickling himself. He also says quite rude things, such as that the women have "lungs missing". To have no heart means to have no brains, and when more organs are missing, indicates a higher degree of stupidity (Deloria 1932/2006:40). This is an example of gradation, a rhetorical device which is responsible for creating intensity of experience. To say that someone is more stupid, he turns the idiom around, and adds another organ missing, the lungs. The gradation of the colors from the yellow family is an example of gradation of the intensity of sound corresponding to the intensity of color *zi, ží, ǧi*, yellow, orange, brown (Deloria 1932/2006:42).

There are two women in the story, who refer to each other as cousins *Čépȟaŋši,* although they don't have to be blood cousins as such forms of address are used between all community members. They would not be first cousins, though, because first cousins refer to one another as sisters, *tȟaŋkši*. Many members of the community are addressed as cousins based on spiritual and social kinship as a part of the *oyáte* "nation" (Deloria 1932//2006). The women are occupied with their everyday chores, picking up wood, looking for grease for hinds, possibly. They use genuine, simple communication as opposed to fake, goal-oriented, conceited language as used by Ikto. Their understanding of discourse, and especially Ikto's tricks, show a certain naivete, based on trustfulness, and being used to genuine speech, practiced by the Lakota community as a part of the value system. They seem not to question Ikto's offer to get him for the grease, or smoke him out (LB:37).

Then, there are also two birds which participate in the discourse, the hawk, *pteǧópȟeča* who speaks Lakota. The word itself is interesting from the morphological point of view as it reflects the typical polysynthetic language structure, and the cultural and natural environment background of the Lakota people. It means "it goes through the swamps" if literally translated. The second one is a red-headed woodpecker, *wagnúka* (from *waǧo*, to make marks in the wood) who is silent but understands requests in Lakota and participates in communication.

Three are many extraverbal forms of communication in this narration as well, on the intra level: silence, laughter, crying, making fun of people. Employing many different semiotic signs, Ikto often communicates in a non-verbal way. Those communications happen on the microlevel; within the story, and we just get a record of them through the written down narration. He also senses things intuitively, as when the bird is about to drop him into a hollow tree, he asks to be dropped off earlier, but the bird does what he planned. His other paralingual communication strategies include laughing, scraping, making faces and other movements and gestures. At times, the non-verbal, which explains the preceding verbal serves as an intention marker within the narration (LB: 35-38).

Non-verbal communication plays an important role in Lakota. The customs inside the tipi and trying to preserve privacy may be responsible for the employment of extensive nonverbal communication. People tend not to look at one another inside the tipi to respect individual privacy, but rather look at things. Unnecessary talk has always been avoided (Deloria 1944:26-33). Certain people were excluded from the conversations almost completely as people were not supposed to talk to their in-laws at all. Neither were sisters and brothers supposed to talk to one another when they were at a young age before they became mature communicators. Avoidance of certain relatives is called *wakáǧipi* (Deloria 1944:26, White Hat

1999:90). Making faces, sticking out one's tongue, snapping figures are things completely forbidden by the Lakota code of acceptable behavior (Deloria 1932/2006:40).

Silence is an important part of discourse, and it is also present in this narrative. The only participant of the discourse who does not speak but rather responds by acting is *wagnúka,* the red headed woodpecker. He just makes the hole for Ikto when asked to do so. According to such scholars as Robin Lakoff silence in Native American cultures is mostly toward strangers (Lakoff, Johnstone, 2008:39). This might be just a generalizations and an overstatement. There is a certain sacredness of speech in many Native American cultures. Each stage of life has its own communicative rules in the traditional philosophy of the Nation (White Hat 1999:90). Speech is *wakaŋ*, sacred in the Lakota philosophy, and thus the scarcity of speech, and avoidance of unnecessary talking (White Hat 1999:12).

The story employs culture specific terms, as mentioned before. Those include elements of clothing, customs, greetings, kinship terms, ways of life, daily activities and other culture specific terms such as names of animals and places. Here is the description how Ikto was dressed in traditional Teton attire: *Wizí waŋ kazázapi čha otȟúŋ na ptehíŋpaȟpa waŋ pȟégnakiŋ na wičhá há šhiŋté-aópȟeya íŋ škhé. Tȟasíŋta míla waŋ yuhá naitázipa waŋ wáŋ núnp kȟóhéčhel yuhá škhé.* "[Ikto] wore smoked tipi hide as pants with fringes on either side, buffalo hair piece on his head, raccoon skin worn as a blanket, and he also has a buffalo tail knife, they say." There are also idioms, such as "to have no heart, or even no lungs"**,** terms like smoked tipi hide *wizi* as a used material, headdresses such as *ptehíŋpaȟpa,* which is an ornament made of buffalo hair, something worn as a blanket *in*, not just worn but worn as a blanket, and other terms, which are understood only within the cultural context. There are three kinship forms of address used. Ikto uses two *Misúŋ* 'my little brother' toward the birds; it is used several times,

in an excessive manner, and *tȟaŋkši* toward the women. *Čépȟaŋši*, is used between the women, as they address one another. Also, the use of verbs is very unique. We have verbs which mean to wear on someone's head *pȟégnakiŋ* rather than just wear, to wear as a blanket, among others. Culture specific activities, such as making arrows, how one does that, tanning hides for which grease is required. "I am good for greasing hides", how would one understand it without the context, and the knowledge about traditions handed down from generations. Tipi were made of buffalo hide which was smoked for waterproofing and when the hides were not used for tipis anymore they were used to make clothing and shoes. *Ptehíŋpaȟpa* was a hairdress made of chunks of buffalo hair (Deloria 1932:2006:40).

The sociolinguists also stressed the situational use of language, Joshua Fishman, Stanley Lieberson, among others, the dependence which is clearly seen within the narrative. Situations have to be analyzed within the cultural context as well, since they are composed of semiotic events. Each linguistic event is a collection of prior linguistic events, situated within culture to a large extent, and cultural knowledge is often needed to decode the message. Ikto's behavior and language depend on situations as well; whether he is alone or with the audience, whether he talks to women or to males. He seems to be equally charming, though, talking to both, yet it is not understood right away that his behavior is nothing but a play, to trick people, and obtain favors. Instead of standards, he uses anti-standards. He asks the male participants for favors by charming them through complementing them, whereas he tricks women using quite a rude kind of tricks, playing on their naivety, and submissiveness. Both stances are against the Lakota code of behavior. The birds are called *misúŋ* 'little brothers', child beloved *hokshichiliapi* (LB:28), whereas the women are simply tricked and asked to perform various chores, like taking down a tree and making a few to smoke Ikto out, which makes them almost 'sweat to death." His flirting

is an element of seduction; a play, stance by stance. He preys on their naiveté or trustfulness, although Ikto thinks those women were extremely naïve compared to traditional Lakota women.

Motivation is the denominator of communicative strategies. Ikto, is the one that mostly speaks in goal-oriented speech and engages in role playing which even crosses over his own integrity. His motivation is usually to trick somebody to obtain favors, using cultural references and norms for that purpose, and play on their culture based expectation, such as that relatives won't trick you.

Crossing over is another salient feature of Ikto's speech in the narrative. We see him speaking of himself as a raccoon from the point of view of someone interested in hunting him down and obtaining the grease for greasing hides, or arrows, even though the latter apparently did not require greasing according to Standing Bear (Deloria 1932/2006). His speech is an example of intentionally devised discourse versus spontaneous speech. "I am good for greasing hides, get me out" (LB:37 s.17). When Ikto speaks from the position of the raccoon, the footing changes. The anthropomorphized raccoon speaks from the point of view of a third party, not the agent, referring to himself. "Smoke me out. This is the only way I may come out" (LB;37 s.17). This kind of statement is usually never made by the agent referring to himself. He starts acting as a third person, an observer, referring to himself as an agent who thus becomes a patient, which creates a split, within the discourse and its participants. "Crossing over manifests in divided authorship or speech perspectives, from which one speaks, otherwise called footing" (Johnstone 2008:151). Statements like "I am good for greasing hides" is a grotesque stance, goal-oriented, characteristic of double play, where the agent and the patient become one: the advisor, the speaker and the thing to be used itself for a practical purpose such as greasing hides become one. This kind of stance entails the death of the agent, turning the agent into a patient, and then an

instrument, even, an inanimate thing. He plays on the naiveté and traditional trustiness of the Lakota women brought up in genuine speech environments and not alert to goal-oriented, fake speech, the aim of which is to trick. That serves as proof that the psychological characteristics shown through his behavior are bound with the cultural values and their violations.

There are some simple impressions within the story which would suggest the universal character of discourse as well. Among such images within the story, there are those of women picking up wood for fire, the woodpecker making a hole in the tree, women taking down the tree. If someone did not know fire and that wood were used for making fire, their understanding might be different, but the visual impression would remain. No preconception or cultural knowledge is necessary to describe those acts; they are just simple physical acts shown through discourse and understood as one as one knows the code (LB: 36-38).

The genuineness of Ikto's speech changes depending on circumstances. Even though shrewdness and conceit are salient features of his discourse, he is authentic only when he speaks to himself, thus the only genuine pieces of his speech are his monologues. The audience requires role playing, so he plays. His play is often childlike, including the semi-chant: "A fat raccoon, here I am.' which may be an indicator of the immaturity Ikto is often accused of. He also embodies vivid imagination and a certain kind of freedom expressed through his going beyond the norms, on the other hand, which become salient features which is expressed in this discourse. discourse. He pretends a cool guy, for most part, in this story at least, and thinks of himself as a macho, or a cool guy, *makéli*. "I could have seduced the women, but I let them go, because they save my life after all" (LB: 38 s. 26).

In this particular story, we do not encounter his whole anecdotal nastiness, or cruelty, which he exhibits in other stories, where he is capable of killing for fun, like the poor birds he

tricks, and later cooks, for example, in one of the stories from the same collection, or seducing his mother-in-law, which is totally against the moral code (Deloria, 1932/2006, 30-40).

Let's go through a step-by-step analysis proposed earlier to support my claims and observations stated in the first part of the chapter. It will illustrate the observations discussed. Here the sections will correspond to Ela Deloria's divisions, to avoid confusion, not necessarily segments ending in the reported speech device.

The whole narration is the camera eye narration, still further withdrawn through the reported speech narration marked by the use of *škhé*. This phrase ends the first three sections, building up tension. The first three sections serve as an introduction to the further adventures on Iktó's journey over the river. In section two, already indexified, culture marked elements appear in the form of terms related to clothing and items of everyday use: *Wizí waŋ kazázapi čha othúŋ na ptehíŋpaȟpa waŋ pȟégnakiŋ na wičhá há šhiŋté-aópȟeya íŋ škhé. Tȟasíŋta míla waŋ yuhá naitázipa waŋ wáŋ núnp kȟóhéčhel yuhá škhé*. "He wore pants made of smoked tipi hide with fringes on either side, a clump of buffalo hair on his head, and raccoon skin wrapped around his shoulders, with a tail hanging down. He also had a buffalo tail knife a bow, and two arrows; they say" (LB:35 s. 1-3).

In section 4, we see Ikto in his misfortune at the beginning of his journey, as he cannot cross the river, and in section five he starts crying out of despair or being upset, rather: *Tókȟa iyúweǧe šni čhaŋké éna íyotakiŋ na čhéya-he*. "There was no way to cross, so he sat on the bank, crying" (LB 36 s. 4). Crying is a mode of extraverbal communication, which expresses sorrow, despair, being upset, or other things, depending on the context, and cultural conditioning. Here, it is more of a tantrum based on Ikto's ways of behavior, and preferences, and an attempt to extort a favor by inciting pity. The psychological analysis of the speaker seen

the act of speech is an integral part of discourse analysis, and it is linked to cultural norms as well.

Dialogue is introduced in the fifth section. It starts with establishing the kinship relationship, and power balance, before asking for a favor. Ikto calls the bird-- a hawk passing by, or *pteǧópȟeča* in Lakota, a "little brother", *misúŋ*, and asks him for help. Here, for the first time, kinship terms are introduced. Kinship forms, reflecting kinship relationship, not necessarily blood relationship, are essential in the structural make up of the community and philosophical principles on which traditional Lakota values are based (White Hat 1999: 89). In section 5 nothing is known about Ikto's intentions or why the kinship terms are used. Ikto says: *"Hé, misúŋ, hú ye misúŋ", eyá yuŋkȟáŋ: "Tokȟa huwo,?' eyá čhaŋké: 'Misúŋ kȟowákataŋ éiȟpemayela ye!"* "Hey, little brother, here, he said. "What's the matter," the other said. 'little brother, take me across the river, and leave me there, he said" (LB:33 s. 5). The meaning of any statement in a discourse is delayed until other elements previously implicit have been revealed, and especially the intentions. In this case, the intentions are revealed later through extraverbal communication. Ikto uses a kinship term to obtain a favor, and mark power relationship. Using the kinship term makes the hawk a relative, and also shows seniority, according to which, based on conventional Lakota norms, the younger brother should listen to the elder one, and respect him as more mature thus wiser. The kinship term serves as a term of endearment here as well. Only after having established the power relationship, Ikto asks the hawk for a favor. He asks the bird to take him over the river. The bird says "What's the matter?", *Tokȟa huwo?* Here, the gender of the speaker is indicated as masculine; the hawk uses a male questioning particle "huwo", which identifies his gender. A woman would have said: *Tokȟa he?*, although there is more freedom as to male and female

forms used in the 21c society. (White Hat 1999:20). A bird uses the same language as a human. This is consistent with the Lakota worldview, not just mythological use. Animals are animate, and have a spirit (Walker 1989). This is reflected in the grammatical forms used, such as the use of the plural morpheme *pi*. Also, in nonfigurative discourse animals are viewed as animate or anthropomorphized, and the same grammatical forms are used in reference to them as to humans. Certain elements, and stones; things which are part of the natural world are treated as animate as well, based on the worldview (White Hat 1999, Jahner 1991).

After speech had been introduced, in section 5, the hawk, *pteǧópȟeča,* speaks again, from the position of power this time, saying in a patronizing way *'Oháŋ' eyíŋ na khiyéla pahá waŋ tȟáŋka yaŋk čhaŋké héčhiya aí na.* "So, the hawk, foolishly, said, 'Ok.' And there was a big hill where he would take him. 'Well, sit on top of me, and hold on tight. You may get dizzy.'" (LB:36) These type of warnings are treated as patronizing by Ikto, to which Ikto responds, by calling the hawk, *misúŋ,* "my little brother", to signal the power relationship again, and the bird's place, as the one who should listen. As a response, he also says: *Hó akáŋl mayáŋka yo. Na sutáya yúza yo. Oínitomni kte séče yuŋkȟáŋ. Tókša hé taŋyáŋ makíŋ kte kiŋ; philámayaye, misúŋ eyáya íyotaké ké.* (LB: 36 s.6). He thanks the hawk, while sitting down.

In section 7, Iktó goes even further in his flattery, and uses the phrase *misúŋ hokšíčhaŋlkiyapi* (calling the bird "child beloved"), and devises an even more intricate verbal bait to make the hawk do what he wants him to do by flattering him. Here, the communicative aim is flattery. Flattery is something looked down on in the Lakota culture as something artificial, however, Ikto is an anti-hero, so he does that as a way of obtaining the intended

favor. This type of usage violates the community norms. *Héčhetu weló, misúŋ, hokšíčhaŋlkiyapi čha héčha éčhel waúŋšila yeló.* "That is good, my little brother, child beloved. That is customary of those to show compassion," (LB:36 s. 7). He refers to tradition and to general expectations the culture may have of youngest children, otherwise beloved, and uses it for self-interest. His intentions only became clear, though, after he makes fun of the bird in the following passage. The expectations may, in fact, be his own projection; there is no indication anywhere that youngest children were expected to show compassion.

Section 8, is the very place where Ikto starts making faces, and uses nonverbal communication, and here for the first time we find out that his speech was not authentic but rather goal-oriented, conceited, and all the traditional ways of addressing people used for self-interest or gratification. We could have guessed that based on metalanguage, or outside of the story information about Ikto and his ways, but here it is expressed through the discourse itself, in the form of paralanguage. The nonverbal regressively explains the verbal in this section. Ikto starts making faces, sticking out his tongue, making signs of contempt at the bird's head, which is totally against the cultural norms of the community (Deloria,1932/2006:40). This is a sample of Ikto's genuine communication, since he does not realize yet that he is seen by some unintended audience, such as the hawk, through the reflection of his gestures in the shadow. Whenever he has no audience, he is genuine. *Waŋná pteǧópȟeča kiŋ Iktó k'íŋ kiŋyáŋ iyáya yuŋkȟáŋ kȟoháŋ nažúte kiŋ apȟósiŋsiŋ na ačhéžiyaŋpyaŋp yaŋkíŋ na waŋná mníkiŋ ópta yé k'uŋ heháŋl ečháŋl pteǧó pȟesléte kiŋ okát'apt'ap yaŋká škhé* (LB:36 s. 8). "Now, the hawk carrying Ikto on his back, took off, while Ikto started making faces at the back of the bird's neck, sticking out his tongue, and as they were flying over the water, he snapped his fingers above the hawk's head," (LB: 36 s. 8).

In section 9, we have a speech sample what the bird says to himself, or even thinks:

K'éyaš ziŋtkála kiŋ naǧíta waŋglág kiŋyáŋ čhaŋké 'Waȟtéšni, waŋná akhé lé Iktó é yeló. Itȟó čhúŋȟloka waŋží ektá oblúšna, ké' ečhíŋčhiŋ kiŋyáŋ yá yuŋkȟáŋ Iktó ogláȟniǧe s'e 'Hó, héna kȟéš, misúŋ, héna kȟéš!' eyáya na kȟoháŋ akh okát'apt'ap yaŋká yunkȟáŋ akhé naǧíta waŋgláka ké. "But the bird could see it in his shadow as he was flying by, and said: 'You rascal, so again it is Ikto. I think I will drop him into the hollow tree.' He kept thinking that, as he was flying, and then somehow Ikto understood that; it seemed so at least. 'Now, right there, little brother, right there, to be more precise', he kept saying, at the same time snapping his fingers as he sat down, but the bird saw it again," (LB:39 s.9). He calls Iktó a "wretch" according to the free translation by Deloria. It can also be a "rascal", or a "bad one". The bird's speech is not conceited or much different in tone than his former speech.

Section 10 is descriptive narration again, reporting what the bird did. The bird is dropping Ikto into the hollow tree, which is a descriptive passage, which also reports that Ikto is crying. *Čhaŋké čhúŋȟloka waŋ waŋná kál háŋ čhaŋké isáŋp ékawiŋǧiŋ na héktakiya kú naiwáŋkab oȟ'áŋkȟoya iglúptaŋyaŋ iyáya čhaŋké Iktó ektá mahél okášičahowáya iȟpáya ké.Héčhiya mahél yaŋkíŋ na čhéya-haŋ.* "There was a hollow tree right there, he hovered over it, and then suddenly turned around and made a backward movement, and dropped Ikto into it, howling Iktó fell inside, and started crying," (LB:37 s 10). Crying is another a way of communicating emotional states, such as despair, anger, pain, sorrow and feeling helpless, but also a way to vent. For Ikto it may also be a way to appear pathetic, which he loves.

In section 11, Ikto had already fallen into the hollow tree, as another speaker is introduced: *wagnúka*, the red-headed woodpecker. Ikto asks him for help. He calls him a "little brother", and asks him to make a hole for him as a favor, again. The bird does not respond

verbally, but rather does whatever he is asked for. He understands the requests in Lakota, though. *Héčhiya mahél yaŋkíŋ na čhéya-haŋ yuŋkȟáŋ wagnúka ṗȟášá waŋ él híyotaka čhaŋké 'Misúŋ, hél omíčaȟlokéla ye!' eyá yuŋkȟáŋ kató-hiŋ na kíčaȟloka čhaŋké hetáŋhaŋ tȟaŋkátakiya étuŋwaŋ yaŋká-haŋ ké. Ȟčeháŋl wíŋyaŋ núŋp čhaŋk'íŋ hiyáyapi čhaŋke 'Tókheškhé kaná wičháwagnayiŋ kta huwó?' ečhiŋ na uŋgnáolówaŋ waŋ yawáŋkal eyáya ké.*

"There inside he sat, and was crying, when a red-headed woodpecker went by, so he said:' Little brother, make me a little hole right there.' He said, and the bird started pecking at it, and made him a little hole, so he was standing there looking through the hole, they say'' (LB:37 s. 11).

In section 12, two new speakers appear; two women. Ikto tries to devise a plan how to trick them. The intention to trick the women, and make them get him out of the tree, tells us something about his personality. His trickiness reappears throughout the story, and appears to be a salient feature of his behavior. Here he openly speaks about the plans to trick the women since he is speaking to himself, and he is the only audience. These are the only times when he is frank. *Ȟčeháŋl wíŋyaŋ núŋp čhaŋk'íŋ hiyáyapi čhaŋke 'Tókheškhé kana wičháwagnayiŋ kta huwó?' ečhiŋ na uŋgná olówaŋ waŋ yawáŋkal eyáya ké.* "And suddenly he raised his voice, and started singing; this is what they say" (LB:37 s. 12).

Section 13, is a children's rhyme, or a chant, possibly a parody of a chant, Ikto starts singing. Its aim is to attract attention, or to lure the women. The verse in addition to all the other repeated elements like *škhé* , and the conjunctions, *čhaŋké* and *yuŋkȟáŋ*, is an example of a parallel structure that the traditional oral narratives are known for. *Hí - hó! Hí - hó Hi! Wičhá čhépa lél maŋké ló!* "A fat raccoon, here I am!" (LB:37:13).

He plays a raccoon; his playing goes on as he plays someone else, not just a nicer version of himself. The intention of the song is to attract attention, and to inform that a raccoon is there. Ikto uses cultural knowledge about everyday activities, such as food production, or article production, to lure the women and make them do him a favor, again. He uses the knowledge about fat being an attractive commodity to lure the women. Greasing hides or arrows may be something the community does, and thus grease may be of some value to the women picking up wood. There are even verbs which mean two specific words referring to using fat for certain everyday purposes, like greasing hides, or lubricating arrows *wa'hiya*, and *wan'hiyaa*.

In section 14, the women talk among themselves. A gender specific term, *Má* "gee", or "oh" is used; it is a term used by women, mostly. *Heyá-haŋ yuŋkȟáŋ wíŋyaŋ k'uŋ uŋmá Heyá-haŋ yuŋkȟáŋ wíŋyaŋ k'uŋ uŋmá "Má, čépȟaŋši, wičhá waŋ hél yaŋká kéye!" eyá čhaŋké heháŋl iyótaŋ líla howáya ké* (LB:33 s. 14). Here, Iktó interferes. The women hear him, and talk among themselves, the companion being the only intended audience; yet Ikto overhears their conversation, and reacts. He starts singing louder. The women's speech is simple, unpretentious, informative mostly, with no other aim than to communicate the message. They use forms of; address, kinship forms, as customary. Three is no indication, however, of any other goal in using them. Their speech shows ingenuity, but also a certain naivety. One of the woman exclaims, using a women exclamation form.

Section 15, is Ikto trying to trick the women. Ikto, upon hearing the women talk, starts to talk louder and sing. He repeats the line of the rhyme twice, for emphatic effects, and to attract the women's attention, and perhaps to make sure that he was heard. Repetition is used in rhetoric to attract attention and emphasize the importance of the message communicated. *Sáŋp*

hótȟaŋkakiya lowáŋ na leyá ké "Wičhá čhépa lél maŋké ló! Wičhá čhépa lél maŋké ló. "And also, he started singing louder: 'A fat raccoon, here I am! ', 'A fat raccoon, here I am!" (LB: 37 s. 15). The employment of the rhyme is an example of the forms crossing boundaries between genres and styles.

Then, starting with section 16, one of the women speaks. *Yuŋkȟáŋ Iktó 'Pȟéta aúpi na oízilmayaŋ pó. Héčhel ečéla waglínapȟiŋ kte' eyá čhaŋké héčhetulapi na waŋná uŋmá gníŋ na pȟéta aú na uŋmá íŋs éna awáŋyag náziŋ kta kéyápi ké.* "And then the woman added: That kind is good for greasing hides, as you know, let's get it out," (LB:33). Here communication about old customs takes place also on the extraverbal level: "grease is good for greasing hides", thus linking the story to other discourse from the past and the present through the communal use of terms which refer to everyday customs and chores. Those terms reflect the culture, the daily chores their members are busy with and the harsh reality of life of people are trying to survive and function in the natural world. Ikto talks to the women, imposing himself on their conversation.

In section seventeen, the women take down the tree. *Čhaŋké wana nazuŋšpe ikikčupi na čaŋ kuŋ kauŋkapi yuŋkaŋ kŋwiča hasina waŋ iŋ kuŋ he siŋte kiŋ ohloka waŋ kahwičasi kuŋ hetaŋhaŋ pataŋkal hiyuiŋ na akésna yumahel ičuhaŋ čhaŋké aké wiŋyaŋ kiŋ uŋma heya ké.* (LB:37) "So, then, they took their axes, and knocked down the tree, and Ikto would stick out the raccoon tail he wore, back and forth through the hole the woodpecker made for him. So it is said." It is descriptive type of narration again, describing what the women have been doing. He is inside the tree, all the time, and starts plying tricks using extraverbal communication, sticking out the raccoon tail attached to his coat, and thus communicating that he is a raccoon. This constitutes section 17. He does it a few times. This may be interpreted as a kind of seduction as

well, on a more metaphorical level, or child's play, "hide and seek." The story is devoid of explicit sexuality, though. Ikto often changes footing, by turning the dialogue grotesque or absurd. This is what we have seen in the last section discussed.

In section 18, the women are trying to devise a method to get Ikto/the raccoon out. The women's speech is marked by naiveté. They are seriously thinking of how to get a raccoon, talking to them, and giving them advice. *Čepȟasi lenaličŋ yaŋké tokéše ečuŋhuŋ kiŋhaŋ waštekta ȟwe' eya yuŋkaŋ Iktó.* 'The woman said: 'Cousin, right there, in the very place he is; what should we do to get him out?'" He gives them a ridiculous idea, ridiculous from the point of view of the one trapped; "Smoke me out, smoke me out. This is the only way I will come out." *Pȟéta aúpi na oízilmayaŋ pó. Héčhel ečéla waglínapȟiŋ kte' eyá'.* The women may not be used to being tricked, or taken advantage of, so they obey. They take words, or discourse at face value, as genuine.

In section 19, Ikto is an advisor again, a very authoritative one. The women have a plan that one would go and bring the fire to smoke him out, and the other one would stay. He tells them to go together, and they listen. He explains that it might be more beneficial since if one women's fire went out on the way, the other one would still be burning. This may not necessarily be true but they listen to him unquestioningly. They also treat him as two characters at the same time; the raccoon, a product basically for their grease, and an older advisor brother. His changing of footing and crossing over impacts the way they treat him and respond to him. He calls them younger sisters, to make them obey, and that is predominantly why they listen to him. They both go. *Hiyá, nuŋphíŋ yá pó. Owékiš uŋmá níčisnipi k'éyaš uŋmá éčuȟčiš taŋyáŋ pȟéta ayáglipi kte ó* (LB: 33). "No, you both go. Just in case one of your fires goes out, the

other one will keep burning." And, they agreed, and both went convinced that they could securely bring the fire back.

In section 20, the women are gone. The minute they leave, he comes out of the tree, and runs away. When alone, Ikto jumps around and talks to himself. He escapes to the woods, and is laughing, which is also a form of extraverbal communication, exalting over his victory in tricking the women. He calls the women 'fools', *witkópi. Táku čhéwiŋš wíŋyaŋ núŋp witkópi ké, ognáye waštépina míš miyé kiŋ makhíli yeló", eyá ké.* "What fools are those women, so easy to trick, and as for myself, I am such a fellow," (LBB :33 s. 20). Ikto is alone so he behaves as if he were in the dressing room after a play; he goes back to genuine speech, away from the scene to the safe environment of behind the curtains.

Sections 21, 22 and 23 are all related to the scene when the women return; all tired, but they bring some fire. Ikto plays again; he enters the scene as a man this time, cutting branches for arrows, and trying to help the poor women. Now, he pretends he did not know what the women were up to, and he plays yet another character again. When he finds out that they want to smoke out the raccoon, he offers them help in return for some grease for his arrows. When the women put the tree on fire, the raccoon is obviously not there. Ikto's feelings seem untouched by the discovery; he shows neither happiness nor regret, as he plays the role of the wise one. This happens in the following section. *Waŋná wíŋyaŋ k'uŋ nuŋphíŋ pȟéta yuhápi na temnít'e kiníl kúpi čhaŋké iglúš'iŋš'iŋ na igluȟlaȟlata ké.* (LB:33tr). *Inážiŋ na tasiŋtamila kuŋ he uŋ Inážiŋ na tȟasíŋta míla k'uŋ hé úŋ ináȟni waŋság waksáksa hiyáyiŋ na kažípžipétkiyawičháya ké. Tȟaŋkší, táku lé tókȟanuŋpi huwo? eyá yuŋkȟáŋ okíyakapi čhaŋké, "Očhíčhiyapi kte ló. Ečháš héčha kiŋ líla wígli ótapi čha etáŋhaŋ waŋság isláye mayák'upi kte", eyáya čhaŋpáhi škáŋ ké.* "What were you doing, I will help you but give me some grease

for my arrows. 'Little sisters, what have you been doing?' He asked them, and they told him to

what he said: I can help you for sure, but that kind has plenty of grease, so I hope you will give

me some of the grease for my arrows.'" He said that picking up wood. When it turns out there

is no raccoon there, he stays cool and pretends. "Yes, that kind is a tricky one, and most likely

the minute you left he ran away" (LB: 38 s. 24). *Waŋná átaya oíleyapi na čháŋ k'uŋ*

kabléblečapi k'éyaš tákuni šni yuŋkȟáŋ Iktó heyá škhé : Tȟaŋkší, wičhá kiŋ líla wičhášapišni

k'uŋ, íŋše pȟéta hiyóilalapi k'uŋ slolyá héčiŋhaŋ kákhel aíšiŋyaŋ ilálapi k'uŋ héčhena

tokhíyotȟaŋ iyáya načhéče ló," eyáya ȟeyáb khinážiŋ na šiná óǧeya wičhákat'apt'ap náž''iŋ kte

'Itȟó ečhá akhé waŋság kaksá omáwani kte,' eyíŋ nčháŋaglágla iȟát'at'a ya-háŋ ké. "Now,

they set the whole thing on fire, and cut the tree into pieces. But there was nothing there, so

Ikto said: 'Little sisters, that kind, raccoons, are very tricky, and the minute you went out of

sight, he must have come out and run somewhere,' snapping his fingers under the blanket. 'I

think in this case, I will keep walking around and cut sticks for arrows,' he said. Snapping

fingers is another means of extraverbal communication, even without any outside audience,

indicting pleasure (LB: 38 s. 24). The blanket plays the role of the curtain, so that the

communication take place behind the scenes.

    In Section 26, he describes the women as fools, using a local idiom, or a made

up version of them. Here we see the high indexicality of the discourse in this narration. He

says the women have no lungs, not only the heart but the lungs are missing. This is what he

says to himself. *Wíŋyaŋ núŋp atáya čhaǧú iyúȟpa waníčape ló. Lená tuktél kiúŋuŋpilaké ló.*

Wačhíŋka yuŋkȟáŋš núŋpi tokȟášniya ínawičhawaȟmiŋ kta tkȟá. Tkȟá akhéš witkópi k'éyaš

nimáyaŋpi čha itȟó eyáš héčhena kte ,"eyáya ya-háŋ škhé. "Those women have no lungs. If I

wanted to seduce them and ran away with them, I easily could have. But again, they are

foolish, yet they saved my life, so I guess let it be." He said, and kept going, they say. He

plays macho again, generous and good hearted. Let them go. The speech is authentic again

because he is convinced about the truth of those statements, and he talks only to himself. *Škhé*

is returning, in its full form, as if to wrap up the piece, and then the final line.

The story ends in a traditional way: *Heháŋyela owíhaŋké* "Only a far as that; here it

ends" (LB:36 s. 27). This ending is also a part of the form and the expressive effect of the story,

an element satisfying expectations on the part of the audience and linking the story to other

stories of that kind and thus to the tradition. Most stories ended this way.

Chapter 6. Conclusions.

The aim of this thesis was to conduct a thorough discourse analysis of a traditional

Lakota narrative, according to the standard approaches of the DA method, which analyzes

discourse within context, using tools described in Methods (Chapter 2), and the ethnographic

method proposed by Dell Hymes, where many different branches of humanities, arts and social

sciences work together during the analysis. The aim was also to examine the relationship

between the transfer of meaning and culture, and meaning and form. The story was analyzed

with the purpose of discovering all the salient features of a Lakota narrative, and examining the

impact of the form on the storytelling, audience and meaning. An illustrative step-by-step

analysis of each meaningful unit of the story was also provided for the reader to show how the

conclusions were reached.

The analysis has been preceded by a re-transcription of the story into a contemporary

Lakota writing system based on the *New Lakota Dictionary* standards, editing of the gloss, and a

new literary translation performed for the purpose of the thesis, and to be able to experiment with the rhetorical form.

The analysis has proven that there is a close relationship between meaning and culture since the understanding of cultural icons, as well the interaction between the speakers, the interlocutors and audiences plus earlier texts in the form of tradition, and other literary works whether written or oral, are essential for the full understanding of the transfer of meaning. Meaning has been seen as something created during the interplay of all of those elements. As to the form, we can clearly see that meaning is also conditioned by the general expressive effect of the text, and that it is tightly bound with the form, as shown here and discussed by previous scholars such as Dell Hymes, Dennis Tedlock, Anthony Woodbury and James Loriot.

It has been discovered that the story employs a traditional for Lakota narration form, with parallel structures, verse, distinct rhythm, as well as traditional for storytelling vocabulary, including terms to denote traditional clothing daily activities, names of birds, and local vocabulary. The forms has been created by parallelism of certain elements such as the quotative *škhé*, which indicates a remote, unidentified narrator, or the repeated conjunctions *yuŋkȟáŋ* and *čhaŋké*; repeated many times within the story to create a certain rhythm and a bonding experience in the story's reception. This utilization of a storytelling effect, which employs a distinct rhythm has previously been used in revitalization efforts, as described by Faudree (2013), among others. This is also what Anthony Woodbury (1984, 1985) referred to as a specific rhetorical structure present in many indigenous narratives. He described in detail something very similar with regard to the Central Alaskan Yupik narratives.

The story also crosses over different genres: prose, verse, chant, grotesque, or a play, and a soliloquy, which is typical of the Native American tradition, becoming a kind of poetic form

itself. It is a highly complex piece of oral tradition storytelling, exhibiting complexity with regard to form, the employment of genres, effect, rhythm, psychological complexity of the participants and well as symbolism; nothing short of the greatest literary works of European or other traditions.

Structural units larger that words, phrases or sentences have been proven essential in the transfer of meaning, and translation, as well as taking into consideration the indexicality of lexical items, and structures, and preserving them in translation.

Even though, certain things may only be understood within the cultural context, each discourse contains a lot of universals as well as the blueprint of communication is common to all, what makes communication possible. It is made of universal grammatical features, archetypes and basic human norms. The oral narrative discussed is a part of a Native American tradition, and more precisely the Lakota tradition, but it also reflects many universal features of human discourse. It embodies both the unique and the universal.

All of the above features have been taken into consideration when translating the story, and the necessity to retain the original rhetorical structure of the narrative to the extent possible has proven to be of utmost importance. This approach may also serve as a future method of translating narratives.

Preserving those narratives is essential to preserving the language and the culture (Woodbury 1984:15), and reconnecting people with their culture, which was also the dream of such people as Albert White Hat, who wanted to restore the traditional meaning of Lakota words as well as Lakota spirituality, ethics, and language, which would bring harmony to the communities, and a sense of tradition and belonging, regardless of creed (White Hat 1999:12).

Let those stories help to preserve this beautiful language, and their translations bring their experience to the world.

Bibliography

Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhaĭlovich. *The Bakhtin reader: selected writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, and Voloshinov.* 1994.

Blommaert, Jan, Rampton, Ben. Language and Superdiversity. *MMG Working Paper,* (12-09). 2012.

Blommaert, Jan. Ethnography, Superdiversity and Linguistic Landscapes: Chronicles of Complexity, Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 2014.

Boas, Franz, and Ella Cara Deloria. *Dakota grammar*. Vol. 23. Dakota Press, 1941.

Boladz-Nekipelov, Liliana." From the Unspoken to the Verbalized: Different Ways of Communication and their Relationship to Culture in a Traditional Lakota Narrative "Ikto na wičhá ha kiŋ", or "Ikto and the Raccoon Skin." New York: GC CUNY 2019.

Buachel, S.J, Eugene, A Grammar of the Teton Sioux Indians. Saint Francis Rosebud Educational Society, 1939.

Chafe, Wallace L., ed. *The Pear Stories: Cognitive, Cultural, and Linguistic Aspects of Narrative Production*. Advances in Discourse Processes, v. 3. Norwood, N.J: Ablex Pub. Corp, 1980

Comrie, Bernard. Language Universals and Linguistic Typology. Syntax and morphology. The University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Coulmas, Florian, ed. *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics. Oxford, UK ; Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell Publishers, 1998

Deloria, Ella Cara. *Dakota Texts*. Bison Books ed. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2006.

Deloria, Ella Cara. *Speaking Of Indians*. Pickle Partners Publishing, 2016.

Deloria, Vine, Introduction. In Deloria, Ella Cara. *Speaking Of Indians*. Pickle Partne Publishing, 2016.

DeMallie, Introduction. In Deloria, Ella Cara. *Dakota Texts*. Bison Books ed. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2006.

Desmore, Frances. Teton Sioux Music. New York: Da Capo, 1918.

Eco, Umberto. *A Theory of Semiotics*. London: Macmillan Education UK, 1976.

Faudree, Paja. *Singing for the dead: the politics of indigenous revival in Mexico*. Duke University Press, 2013.

Fishman, Joshua. Language in Sociocultural change. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1972

Harris, Zellig, Michael Gottfried, Thomas Ryckman, Anne Daladier, and Paul Mattick. *The form of information in science: analysis of an immunology sublanguage*. Vol. 104. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

Hymes, Dell. *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. 9. paperback pr. Conduct and Communication Series. Philadelphia, Pa: Univ. of Pennsylvania Pr, 1989.

Hymes, Dell H. *"In Vain I Tried to Tell You": Essays in Native American Ethnopoetics*. Studies in Native American Literature 1. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981

Jahner, Elaine. Spatial Categories in Sioux Falk Narratives. PhD dissertation. Indiana University: 1975.

Jahner, Elaine. Introduction. In Walker, J. R *Lakota Myth*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989

Johnstone, Barbara, Discourse Analysis (2nd Ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2008.

Jonah, *The Holy Bible, New International Version.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House,1984.

Lieberson, Stanley. Domains of Language Usage and Mother Tongue Shift in Nairobi, 1978. Language Diversity and Language Contact. Lieberson ed. Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, 1981, p. 249-262. 1978

Loriot, James, "Lexical Problems in Shipbo Mark," Bible Translator 2.2 (April 1951): 56-66.

Loriot, James, and Barbara Hollenbach. "Shipibo paragraph structure." *Foundations of Language* (1970): 43-66.

Meek, Barbra A. *We are our language: An ethnography of language revitalization in a Northern Athabaskan community*. University of Arizona Press, 2012.

Matthews, G. Hubert. *Language* 51, no. 4 (1975): 999-1002. doi:10.2307/412712.

PBS. In Search of Myths and Heros. Myths and Archetypes. https://www.pbs.org/mythsandheroes/myths_archetypes.html (accessed 11/12/2019)

Poetry Foundation. Ethopoetics. https://www.poetryfoundation.org/learn/glossary-terms/ethnopoetics, (accessed 11/12/2019)

Powers, William K. "Saving Lakota: Commentary on Language Revitalization". *American Indian Culture & Research Journal*. **33** (4): 139–49, 2009.

Riggs, Stephen, Dakota Grammar, Texts, and Ethnography. Minneapolis: Rose and Haines, 1973.

Sapir, Edward. *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir*. Univ of California Press, 1968.

Rood, David and Taylor Allen. Beginning Lakhota. University of Colorado, 1976.

Tedlock, Dennis. *The Spoken Word and the Work of Interpretation*. University of Pennsylvania Publications in Conduct and Communication. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983.

Tuting, Albert W. Some Reflections on Lakota Language Structures as looked at by a naive* non-Native http://www.fa-kuan.de/LAKSTRUCT.HTML, 2003. (accessed 11/12/2019)

Ullrich, Jan. *Lakota Grammar Handbook: A Pedagogical Grammar for Self-Study and Practice*. 1st edition. Bloomington, IN: Lakota Language Consortium, 2016.

Ullrich, Jan F, and Lakota Language Consortium. *New Lakota Dictionary: Lakȟótiyapi-English/English-Lakȟótiyapi & Incorporating the Dakota Dialects of Yankton-Yanktonai & Santee-Sisseton*, 2011.

Ullrich, Jan. "Modification, Secondary Predication and Multi-Verb Constructions in Lakota." PhD diss., Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf, 2018.

Von Goethe, Johann Wolfgang. *Faust*. Vol. 2. Oxford University Press, USA, 1998.

Walker, J. R., Raymond J. DeMallie, and Elaine Jahner. *Lakota Belief and Ritual*. Lincoln: [Denver, Colo.]: University of Nebraska Press ; Published in cooperation with the Colorado Historical Society, 1991.

Walker, J. R., and Elaine Jahner. *Lakota Myth*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989.

White Hat, Albert, Jael Kampfe, and Vine Deloria. *Reading and writing the Lakota language*. University of Utah Press, 1999.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Tractatus logico-philosophicus*. Routledge, 2013.

Woodbury, Anthony C.. Cev'armiut qanemciit qulirait=llu: Eskimo narratives and tales from Chevak, Alaska. Fairbanks: Alaska Native Language Center, University of Alaska, 1984.

Woodbury, Anthony C. "The functions of rhetorical structure: A study of Central Alaskan Yupik Eskimo discourse." *Language in Society* 14, no. 2 (1985): 153-190.

Zitkala-Ša, Cathy N. Davidson, and Ada Norris. *American Indian Stories, Legends, and Other Writings*. Penguin Classics. New York, N.Y: Penguin Books, 2017.