

THE HOPI COYOTE STORY AS NARRATIVE

The Problem of Evaluation

David Leedom SHAUL, Roy ALBERT, Christopher GOLSTON and
Rachel SATORY*

Study of a small corpus of Hopi coyote stories, a traditional fable genre common in much of native western North America, shows that this type of Hopi narrative, unlike European traditional narratives (both oral and written) lacks an *evaluative* section. Such a section is clearly bounded and vouches for the story's tellability. Although this Hopi genre has evaluative devices throughout the structure, it rarely has a discrete section with this function. Note that if a narrative is told on request (coyote story, fairy tale) that it will tend to lack an evaluation section. If it comes from personal experience, it will probably require such a section. Further, if stylistic variation in structure is valued, the use of evaluative devices will predominate.

1. Introduction

Pratt (1977) has proposed that narratives consist of a discrete structure, and that this structure is explained if narratives are considered as a certain kind of speech act, following Labov and Waletzky (1977). A critical part of the model Pratt proposes is the *evaluative section*. In this characteristic part of a narrative, the narrator validates the story's tellability.

The Hopi *coyote story*, a genre discussed and exemplified below, generally lacks anything that could be evinced as an evaluation section. Instead, evaluative

* This paper stems from an undergraduate seminar conducted in 1982 at the University of California, Berkeley. It was sponsored by a grant from the Graduate Assembly and a grant from the Council for Educational Development of that institution. The Department of Linguistics provided office space and clerical support for the project. We would like to thank and gratefully acknowledge all of the support that allowed us to come together and share. Albert selected and edited the stories, and gave technical advice. Golston wrote the section on the architecture of the Coyote story. Satory was responsible for the analysis of the problem of evaluative sections in this genre. Shaul supplied the other sections, edited and unified the paper. Albert and Shaul translated the Hopi texts into English.

Correspondence address: D.L. Shaul, Department of Anthropology, IPFW, 2101 Coliseum East, Fort Wayne, Indiana 46805, USA.

devices (also treated below) are inserted throughout the story. Why do Hopi coyote stories lack an evaluation section? Why should they have one in the first place?

A feature that separates Hopi coyote stories from personal narratives is whether or not they are drawn from personal experience. The coyote story is community property; it may be told by anyone. A personal narrative, however, strongly requires an evaluation section. Pratt was able to extend the model of narratives that includes an evaluation section from the work with personal narratives of Labov and Waletzky (1977) to the fiction of Western culture.

This extension explains why a Hopi coyote story usually lacks an evaluation section. Yet, is a detailed, universal model of narrative discourse possible? Clearly, stories have comparable jobs to do the world over, but is it possible to create a model that is rich enough in detail and the configuration of those details that can account for such interesting differences? One wants to ask if there are universal *sections*, and, further, if there is/are universal *sequence(s)* to how such sections cohere textually.

One difficulty in defining any genre cross-culturally is that culture-specific conventions may attend a genre in a given culture. For example, Senft (1985) has analyzed a narrative from the celebrated Trobriand culture as a 'dirty joke'. He notes that all of the criteria that distinguish jokes in Western culture are fulfilled by the story he collected, except that it lacks a punchline. Haberland (1985) protests that a *joke* is a category of speech act peculiar to Western European culture. It is an emic requirement that a joke has a punchline; note that such a requirement, if it were an etic one, would constitute a necessary condition for applying the category of joke to non-Western (e.g. Trobriand) cultures.

Must seemingly culture-specific structural sections be related to a universal theory of narrative discourse? Clearly, such a theory should be as detailed as possible in order to have explanatory power. It matters whether a convention can be *claimed* to have universal status. In the case of the evaluation section, it seems reasonable that such a signature-like section should potentially be the hallmark diagnostic of narrative genres. If a concept, derived from oral and personal accounts, can be applied to written fiction, which may or may not be drawn from individual experiences, it is reasonable to ask how widely this application can go, and then to determine what might limit the application for the model.

Cross-culturally, a narrative has to relate a real/imaginary/mythical sequence of events so as to elicit an emotive reaction from an audience. It may be specialized into a joke, fable, anecdote, thriller and the like. Such specialization in intent (and form) is partly dictated by contextual constraints of appropriateness. This paper examines this type of constraint on Hopi coyote stories, with reference to the Labov-Waletzky-Pratt model, with brief mention of European fairy tales.

It was pointed out above that personal narratives in Western culture need an evaluation section, since they are not part of conventional culture. They must of necessity be highly individualized in terms of style. The art of the Hopi coyote story (section 3, below) largely consists of the use of individualized expression to bring to life a part of a commonly held fund. The factor of whether or not a story is drawn from personal experience (table 1) accounts for why a genre will have an evaluation section or not (table 2).

To some extent, a lack of evaluative devices (see section 3) may be expected in contexts where individualized stylistic manipulation of text is not desired. In children's fairy tales, the story must be performed exactly the same way every time. Variations in vocal quality and other aspects of delivery are important, but manipulation of the text is excluded, and hence the need for a heightened amount of evaluative devices. There will be no functional need in fairy tale performances to have evaluative devices (as in personal narrative) or use them as part of deliberate text manipulation (as in the coyote story), although some evaluative devices undoubtedly pre-exist in many of the texts for fairy tales and other bed-time fare. See tables 1 and 2; a plus or minus indicates a strong tendency, a norm, rather than absolutes.

In order to treat the problem of evaluation in Hopi coyote stories in some depth (section 3.2), it is necessary first to consider the structure of the Hopi coyote story (section 2) and how it differs from the Labov-Waletzky-Pratt model (section 3.1). The rest of this introduction will be devoted to background information on the place of the coyote story in Hopi culture.

Table 1
Factors constraining evaluation.

	Stylistic variation	Personal experience	Told on request
Personal narrative	+	+	-
Coyote story	+	-	+
Fairy tale	-	-	+

Table 2
Evaluative devices.

	Evaluation devices	Evaluation section
Personal narrative	+	+
Coyote story	+	-
Fairy tale	-	-

Coyote stories are not unique to Hopi culture. Almost every culture has animal stories that teach a lesson (i.e. fables). And nearly almost every tribe in western North America makes use of Coyote as a protagonist in stories in which animals are the main characters, acting anthropomorphically so that they speak and engage in activities that are typical of humans. Sometimes Coyote is a trickster figure, sometimes the butt of a joke, and sometimes a figure who is satirized.

There is a wide range of roles which Coyote may take in Hopi coyote stories. Typically, he tries out a spur-of-the-moment idea that backfires. This may include imitation of behavior typical of another animal. Sometimes Coyote learns his lesson, and sometimes he dies. Although Coyote is subject to more or less satirization (this appears to be subject to the narrator's imagination), in Hopi tradition, Coyote never figures as a creator or Prometheus figure. In the sedentary Hopi culture, coyotes are seen as a competitor of man, within the human sphere of life, and without any economic value (Malotki (1985)), in contrast to the nearby nomadic, foraging Navajo, who do not compete for small game with coyotes in a small, circumscribed area (Luckert (1984)). Hence, the Hopi do not deify the coyote in any way, as the Navajo do (Malotki (1985: 7ff.)). For an introduction to the coyote story genre in western North America, see Barclay (1938), Ramsey (1977), Bright (1978) and Bright (1984).

Conspicuous in the Hopi genre is its setting around the familiar milieu of the village the narrator belongs to. While not absent from the fiction of European and American authors, this sense for the land on which one lives makes this genre a *literature of place*. Snyder (1977) points out that the trickster figure of Coyote is more appropriate to the American West than the Indo-European warrior transformed into the cowboy archetype. Indeed, the Coyote image appears in a significant body of contemporary poetry in English produced in the American West.

Having noted the importance of locale in this Hopi form, we will pass to a major difference that appears to distinguish it from Western fiction. Pratt (1977), in extending the notion of *speech act* to account for the affective properties of narratives in general, defined a narrative speech act as one where all persons in the speech context but one waive their rights to turn-taking while one person tells a story. The felicity condition for a narrative speech event is *tellability*: a story is appropriate only if it is tellable:

"In making an assertion whose relevance is tellability, a speaker is not only reporting but also verbally *displaying* a state of affairs, inviting his addressee(s) to join him in contemplating it, evaluating it, and responding to it." (1977:136)

Pratt then demonstrates that written narratives are essentially the same in Euro-American practice as the oral narratives (also from American culture) studied by Labov and Waletzky (1977).

In order to create tellability, writers as well as everyday raconteurs use certain *evaluative* grammatical devices: intensifiers such as ‘very’, expressive phonology (intonation, lengthening of a segment), repetition, interjections, and complex verb phrases (negatives, futures, modals, questions, comparatives, and imperatives). They also employ evaluative comments in order to create a story that is tellable.

Moreover, a narrative speech act will contain among its clearly identifiable sections an *evaluation* section which specifically points out why the story is tellable. Pratt (1977) and Labov and Waletzky (1977) distinguish the following basic structure for both oral and written narratives: abstract (title, introduction), orientation (setting), complicating action (plot), evaluation, result or resolution, and a coda which “returns the listener [= reader] to the present time” (Labov and Waletzky (1977: 369)).

It is the contention of this paper that Hopi coyote stories lack an evaluation section, having only evaluative grammatical devices and comments throughout the story. We first outline the typical structure of Hopi coyote stories and then discuss the problem of evaluation.

2. The architecture of the Hopi Coyote story

There are strong structural similarities among most Hopi coyote stories. An obvious one is that they are likely to begin with *Haliksa’i* ‘hark’ and end with *pay yuk pölö* ‘here it is humped’ or some equivalent ending formula. But there are other, less obvious structural similarities as well; in particular, Coyote stories have a similar plot structure. The six stories analyzed here exhibit a common archistructure that may be conveniently seen by the story of Coyote and the *Tsövöwhoya* (Little Antelope); the reader may want to consult the text in appendix B.

- | | |
|-----------------|--|
| (a) Setting | Yaw Orayve yesiwa...
‘They were living at Oraibi...’ |
| (b) Isaw’s want | Pas nu sonqa haqam tsötsöpt pangsoni...
‘Surely I can get some antelope...’ |
| (c) Plan | Pan pay nu sikwit sonqa wuuyavo...
‘That way, I can get a lot of meat...’ |
| (d) Journey | Qavongvaqw yaw pam nöst pu’ nakwsu.
‘The next day he set out after he had eaten.’ |
| (e) Realization | Pay pam hihin hoyoyota...
‘He was moving a little...’ |
| (f) Plan sours | Noq yaw Isaw tönmiq tso’omti...
‘So Coyote jumped at the throat...’ |

- (g) Resolution Pay yaw Tsövöwhoya... tuwat Isaw yama.
 'Well Little Antelope (got away)... and Coyote also came
 out (OK).'

The story texts given here are essentially folkloric abstracts done in Hopi, but which carry all the characteristics of the genre. The lines quoted above are the beginning of each respective section in the text.

Following this schemata, the structure of *Tsövöwhoya* may be contrasted with the other four stories given here; note that *Töötölö* (Grasshopper) has two plot sequences in it, as does *Tutsvo* (Wren). An X indicates absence of an element.

Tsövöwhoya	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
Lölöqangw	a	b	c	d	e	g	f
Povolhoya	a	b	d	c/a'	e	f	g
Töötölö	a	d	b	(c)	e	X	X
	a	b	(c)	d	e	f	g
Tutsvo	a	b	c	X	e	f	g
	a	b	c	X	e	f	g/f'

Tsövöwhoya and *Lölöqangw* are the same except that one ends in (fg) and the other in (gf). The chart clearly shows that (gf) is irregular since it does not occur in any other story; Coyote usually returns home after his plans fail. The effect of postponing (f) in *Lölöqangw* seems to add an element of suspense: Coyote carries out his plan (e) and goes home (g) and the story seems to be over; but we know that it can't be over because Coyote has not yet gotten hurt, and this is expected. The reader/hearer expects (f) and thinks it will happen before (g).

Povolhoya and *Tsövöwhoya* are identical in structure except that an element of (a), namely an (a'), is postponed and does not occur until (c), and also that (d) precedes (c). Both of these matters are minor variations. That (a') is merely the introduction of the *Povolhoya* (Little Butterfly) into the plot; before this, only Coyote and the animals he is hunting have been mentioned; these animals end up playing no part in the story. Placing (d) before (c) is of little consequence since, as is evident in other stories, (d) is a rather unstable element and one that is easily moved by its very nature.

There are really two (abc) sequences in *Töötölö* and they work off one another and add suspense in much the same way as postponing (f) in *Lölöqangw*. The first sequence begins as usual: (a) is given and the two characters are introduced. The sequence then goes on with (d), Coyote hunting; again the position of (d) is moved before (b) and (c). He works for Grasshopper and is rewarded with food and rest. There is no (f) or (g) and the sequence reaches a dead end.

A second and complete sequence then begins. The second sequence has an end: Coyote can't carry all the food Grasshopper has given him (and that he took in his greed), so he must cache some of it in order to return home. He then must make a second trip to recover the hidden food.

Tutsvo, like *Töötölö*, has two sequences of narration. The first sequence runs (abc) with the weak (d) not even present. There is a trace of an (f) in the first sequence: Coyote cannot get Wren to sing for her again and thus fails in her plan to learn to sing, but Coyote is not hurt (f). So the second sequence begins with Wren's counterplan to crush Coyote's teeth with a rock-filled dummy wren. Again a journey (d) is omitted, but (e) and (f) follow as they should, with Coyote cracking her teeth (f). She tries to return home but runs into a second predicament (f') on the way.

Please refer to appendix A for a sequential analysis of the other stories in the corpus; they are similar to the analysis of *Tsövöwhoya* given above. In appendix B, the reader will find all five story texts with English translations.

3. The problem of evaluation in Hopi Coyote stories

3.1. Narrative Structure in Hopi and European stories

Labov and Waletzky (1977) distinguish six distinct sections in oral narratives of speakers of American English.

- (1) Abstract
- (2) Orientation
- (3) Complicating action
- (4) Evaluation
- (5) Result or resolution
- (6) Coda

Pratt (1977) extends this analysis to written narratives of the English-speaking traditions, including the novel.

While this model may be applied to Hopi narrative structure, emphases in the Hopi coyote stories are different; indeed, some elements may only be implied. The abstract is a short summary of the story consisting of a couple of lines at the beginning of a narrative. Hopi coyote stories, however, begin with the formula *haliksa(y)* 'hark' which indicates a narrative is beginning. The Hopi story then moves directly to the orientation (setting).

The orientation in Hopi coyote stories may be quite elaborate. Typically, it introduces the characters and their activities and the explicit physical setting of the village and its environs. Hopi coyote stories contain very specific spatial references throughout; the language has available an elaborate system of locative particles (cf. Malotki (1983)). Use of these locatives and references to

actual local landmarks give the Hopi audience a sense of immediacy that intimately connects them with a sense of place. The orientation section is distinguished by the predominance of the habitual tense (-*ngwu* suffixed to the verb of a clause). Semantically, background information is part of the usual state of affairs.

The complicating action (plot) section, however, is introduced with a switch to future tense (-*ni* suffixed to a verb). It is not an actual future, but an expression of intent. The complicating action section forms the body of the coyote story and will be discussed below.

Hopi coyote stories lack an evaluation section (one that specifically demonstrates the story's bonafide status as a narrative); this is also discussed below. Grammatically, the resolution section switches to the present/past tense (no tense suffix on verb). The resolution is the affirmation of Coyote's anticipated failure in his scheme. This actualization ends the tension introduced through the complicating action section by the use of evaluative devices.

The coda simply keeps the story from ending suddenly by bringing the audience back to the present context. Hopi codas are usually short and consist of one of two formulas: (a) *pay uk pölö* 'here it is a clump', or (b) *pay yuk i' paasavo'o* 'it goes this far/it extends to here'.

3.2. *The problem of evaluation*

Labov and Waletzky (1977) consider the evaluation section to be possibly the most important structural element in a narrative, since it identifies/validates the discourse as a bonafide story. In European and American narration, the evaluation section is an explicit declaration of the narrative's tellability (for example, 'the strangest thing that ever happened to me'). Although evaluative devices are used throughout the narrative to strengthen and sustain this basic narrative property, the evaluation section grabs the hearer/reader's attention.

In Hopi coyote stories, evaluation is generally not explicit. There is usually no evaluation section. Instead, evaluative devices are used throughout the main narrative section (the complicating action). Grammatical devices such as lengthening a vowel, use of intonation, and modal adverbs, can be successfully rendered in English, having at least a partial impact in translation. One real source, however, of dramatic tension in the Hopi coyote story is the nature of Coyote himself.

Coyote is a trickster figure, "a figure who is symbolic of man's animal nature, personifying the libido. Coyote's lust, hunger and other urges are never satisfied. Both cunning and inept, he always gets into trouble resulting from her/his conniving" (Karenyi (1956:185)). People familiar with the Coyote image know and expect Coyote to have some scheme in mind that is sure to backfire. Thus, the ironic expectations of Coyote as a trickster automatically add tension to the story line, helping to obviate the need for a separate evaluation section.

Evaluative devices develop and sustain this built-in tellability. For example, Labov and Waletzky (1977) found in oral narratives of English speakers that shifts from simple narrative tense and usages such as modals which depart from the truth value of the clause's literal value (*comparators*) usually have an evaluative function.

It was noted above that the complicating action section begins by a clause in the future tense. This *comparator* induces the audience to look ahead at the story line suggested by the clause marked with *-ni* 'future tense' or *aw* (verb) *-ni* 'want to (verb)' which begins the complicating action section. The future/intent clause draws on a richer world of possible outcomes to create tension. The audience is invited to speculate on the details of Coyote's scheme and how it is likely to backfire. Use of future tense continues through the section. In quotes, however, future tense cannot be marked because the simple (no suffix) present/past tense must be used to give verisimilitude to the reported speech. However, in complimentary distribution with the use of future tense in the complicating action sections of Hopi coyote stories, the modal *kurs* 'possibly/if' takes the place of future tense in quotations. In *Lölöqangw*, for example, the complicating action section begins with Coyote's scheme outlined in two intent clauses and two clauses with future tense.

In the quotation attributed to *Lölöqangw* when he greets the arriving Coyote (*Ta'ay, pak'i, tsangaw pi um kurs angkw nuy pootay* 'thankfully you have come to see me'), *kurs* implies that Coyote has evidently come to pay a visit, while the audience already knows that he has come to get even with the Bullsnake whom he feels has infringed on his hospitality. *Kurs* then appears four more times in the following action. While *kurs* may appear in future clauses, its complimentary distribution with the future marker in *Lölöqangw* illuminates the role of both devices as evaluatives.

Labov and Waletzky (1977) also distinguish a second kind of sentence-internal evaluative device, the *intensifier*; such a device might be an intensifying particle ('very' and the like) or repetition of some linguistic material. It is not uncommon to find a single clause in a Hopi coyote story that is laden with intensifier particles: *NOQW PI nu' PAY so'on PIW uumi tawlawni* 'BUT TRULY I will not sing AGAIN to you JUST NOW' (from *Isaw niqw pu' Tutsvo*; intensifiers have been capitalized).

Repetition is used in Hopi coyote stories both at the word and phrase level. In *Isaw niqw pu' Töötölö*, for example, the impossibility of Coyote's journeying with his overlaid burden basket is emphasized effectively by repetition (with the addition of future tense to mark Coyote's directly stated intent).

Isaw ... tsöpaatani	'Coyote will pick up'
Nu' ... kyaatiniy	'I will be able to lift it'
Nu' ... tuwantaniy	'I will give it a try'

By repeating the idea of Coyote trying to succeed at the task of traveling with the basket that he has overstuffed in different words, the audience can anticipate some sort of consequence that Coyote will suffer.

Evaluative comments also play an important role in intensifying the plot of Hopi coyote stories. Labov and Waletzky's *external commentary* (the narrator's voice intruding into the story) occasionally occurs; i.e. the use of *is uti* 'oh dear' to describe Coyote's plight. *Internal commentary* (that offered by characters in the story) is concentrated in the coyote story in section (c) at the beginning: Coyote's soliloquy utilizing the verb *hin wuuwa* 'think thus'. Up to one fourth of the complicating action section – the core of the story – may consist of this internal commentary.

In *Isaw niqw pu' Tsöviwhoya*, for example, the following (c) section is found.

“Pas nu' sonqa haqam tsötsöpt yak pangsoni.

Nu sakine' suukw wuukoqw ngu'ani.

Pan pay nu sikwit sonqa wuuyavo pitsinani”, yaw Isaw yan wuwanta.

“Very much I surely will (find) antelopes along there.

If I am lucky, I will bag a large one.

That way I surely will have meat for a long time ahead”, Coyote thought.

These thoughts of Coyote illustrate the essential irony of the Hopi coyote story. The word *sonqa* 'surely' (composed of the two negative particles *so'on* and *qa*), the conditional verb *sakine'* 'if lucky', the use of the future tense (*-ni*), and the dubitative modal *kurs* all underscore the irony of Coyote's hopelessly high expectations of success, expectations which are shared by the narrator and the audience. Both the Hopi audience and narrator are intimately familiar with Coyote's grandiose scheming, and can imagine the likely outcome of a given scheme.

Tension is perhaps most prolonged in *Tutsvo* by extending the coda to include a secondary plot before the ending formula *pay yuk pölö*. This lengthened coda, by the way, may be related to story cycles involving Coyote with other animals as fellow schemers (for example, a story where Coyote, Badger and Mole scheme to steal food, race for the leftovers and then go hunting). This second story line is given tellability by the use of repetition. A female Coyote wanders from spring to spring to get a drink, only to be frightened away by her own reflection.

Prior to this extended coda, the Coyote cracks her teeth on a bag of rocks that she mistakes for Wren. In relating the cracking incident, the narrator placed the verb before the subject (the neutral word order in Hopi is Subject-Object-Verb):

... pu' yaw put sumoytaqe put *ngaroroyku* Isaw.

Yan pay yaw pam tamay soosok kookonta.

'... and took it in her mouth and *began crushing* it, Coyote this way cracked all her own teeth.'

The focal fronting of the verb *ngaroroyku* 'begin crushing' (italicized in the citation and translation) is a highly marked word order and draws attention to Coyote's fate.

In *Povolhoya*, the same structural device (extended coda with repetition) is also employed. The plot consists of Coyote chasing after butterflies with a sundry of pitfalls and obstacles blocking his way to success. Repetition of certain ideas (*maktongwu* 'usually goes hunting', *haqami* 'towards somewhere', *yaavoq* 'far off') at the beginning of this story, phrasal repetition (for example, *soosoyhimu ang s'ivangwu* 'everything was coming into bloom along there'), and the drawn out coda help sustain interest in the simplex plot.

In summary, Hopi coyote stories employ the same sorts of evaluative devices used in European stories/fiction. The basic task of narratives is to relate a memorable (series of) event(s). Yet the Hopi coyote story lacks a clearly bounded evaluation section as a headlink to the plot, the hallmark of Western fiction. There is a moral in *Töötölö* (Coyote's self-admission of greed toward the end of the story) which perhaps brings this particular coyote story closer to the Old World fable, but the moral of Hopi coyote stories is usually unstated, shared by the narrator and audience in the same way as the genre's built-in irony.

Since our research was completed, a large collection of Hopi coyote stories has appeared (Malotki and Lomatuwa'yma (1984)). This collection holds the prospects for testing the model proposed here, especially with respect to the distribution of the evaluative function. A single reading of the Malotki and Lomatuwa'yma volume indeed tends to affirm our model, but, of course, a formal analysis is beyond the scope of the present study. Analysis of their data awaits a more extensive study.

Appendix A

Sequential analyses of five Hopi Coyote Stories

Following are sequential analyses of the Coyote story texts used in this study. The formulaic *Haliksay/Aliksa'i* and *pay yuk pölö* have been left out for convenience. *Tsövöwhoya's* sequence is given in the text in section 2. The actual texts with English translations follow in appendix B. Readers may locate the beginning of each section of a particular story (a, b, c, etc.) by finding the initial line in the sequential analysis and matching it with the same line in the text.

- Lölöqangw*
- (a) Yaw Oraive yeesiwa.
 - (b) Asakis yaw Lölöqangw Isawuy aw kiikinumte'...
 - (c) Noq paypi yaw Isaw okiw sutsep tsöngmokiwtangwu...
 - (d) Oovi yan pam iits qatuptut pu' kwiniwiq nakwsu.
 - (e) Pangqw a'ani hoqlö'yaqw...
 - (f) Hisatniqw yaw Isaw nawus nima.
 - (g) Naat yaw pam oovi kiy aqw qa pituqw...
- Povolhoya*
- (a) Yaw hisat haqam Orayve piw yeesiwa.
 - (b) [the verb *maktongwu* in (d), below]
 - (d) Noq yaw pam Isaw yaw talöngvaqw...
 - (c/a') Noq pas yaw pam wuuwaq yaw kya pu' kurs lomatalatini.
 - (e) Noq yaw Isaw amumi pangqw pu haypaq
 - (f) Antsa Isaw yaw tso'omtikyangw...
 - (g) Pu' yaw Isaw piw angqw yama.
- Töötölö*
- (a) Yaw hisat yep sinom yesngwu.
 - (d) Yaw hisat Isaw Mastupkyat haqami aqlami makto.
 - (b) [Coyote is hungry and tired from (d), above]
 - (c) [implied plan to get food]
 - (e) Ya sen hak yep paasa'ya...
 - (a) Noq yaw Isaw niq pu Töötölö puma a'ni tumalta.
 - (b) Yaw Isaw melonuyit aqw niique ho'apuy kurs hin tsöpaatani.
 - (c) [implied plan to get food home]
 - (d/e) Pay sen put nu kyaatiniy...
 - (f) Yaw Isaw kurs hin ho'apuy kyaatiniqe huruuti.
 - (g) Yaw pam peehut meloonit angqw nawus ipwa.
- Tutsvo*
- (a) Yaw Orayve yeesiwa.
 - (b) Yaw Isaw aw kwangwa'ituswa.
 - (c) Yaw taawi sootapnaqw ...
 - (e) Ta'a, pay pi uum'i so'on pi um taawi'vani...
 - (f) Noqw pi nu pay so'on piw uumi tawlawni...
 - (g) Yaw Isaw nawus aapiy pay nima.
 - (a) [same]
 - (b) Pay yaw pam nimakyangw, yaw taawit ang wuuwanma.
 - (c) Noq yawll pam Tutsvo tuwat piw wuuwanta...
 - (e) Pu yaw pam Tutsvo wuuwaqe...
 - (f) Pu' yaw aw yooto...
 - (g/f) ... pu' yaw Isaw nawus pay nima.

Appendix B

Hopi texts with English translations

ISAW NIQ PU' TSÖVÖWHOYA

Aliksa'i.

Yaw Orayve yeesiwa. Yaw tavangqöyve Ismo'walpe Isaw ki'ya. Yaw taala' nösiwqa a'ni sinom haalayyangwu.

Ismo'walpiy tavangqöyve yaw aqawqölö a'ani wungwa. Noq yaw pep piw tsötsöpt timu'iyungwa. Puma yaw pay ephaqam aqawqölöt ang wa'ökiwyungngwu. Pu' pay ephaqam yaw piw suup hinnumyangwu. Yaw tsötsöphoyam yumuyamuy amumi tayyungqw noonovangwu.

“Pas nu songqa haqam tsötsöpt yak pangsoni. Nu sakine' suukw wuukoqw ngu'ani. Pan pay nu sikwit sonqa wuuyavo pitsinani”, yaw Isaw yan wuwanta.

Qavongvaqw yam pam nöst pu' nakwsu. Pay pam hihin hoyoyota. Yaw pam ovi su'aw Owa'walpiy aqw pituq yaw taawa yama. Pay yaw pam pangqw taavangqöyumiq haawi. Pangqw yaw aqawqölo”, a'ani si'ya.

Antsa yaw haqam yaap tsovawta. Yaw pam hootayamuy and qöötsat tuwa.

Noq yaw Isaw amumiq henanaykuqw pay yuutu. Yaw qö'angpoknaya yuutuqe.

Yaw kwiniwiqwat yuutuq pangsoq qö'at wunu.

Pay yaw son Isaw pumuy wikiniqe pay qa amungkniiqey tuwanta.

Nawis'ewtiq yaw Isaw ahoy haqe' aqawqölöt aw pangso pitu.

“Pay sonqa naat yep haqam tsövöwhoya”, yaw pam yan wuuwa.

Yaw Isaw aqawqölöt ang hepnumkyang su'aw pitu. Yaw tsövöwhoya kwangwawuwi. Yaw qötö'at kokyayat ang pakiwta. Yaw nungwu Isaw aw pitutoqw yaw piw qa hoyo.

Noq yaw Isaw aw nungwu pitutokyang wuwanma, “Sen nu haqam ngu'ani? Sen nu hin ngu'ani?”

Naat yaw pam qa ang wuuwaqw pay yaw Tsövöwhoya sungwnuptut waaya.

Noq yaw Isaw as angk tso'omtiyang piw yaw qa ngu'a. Noq yaw Tsövöwhoya hongvitiqe a'ani wari.

Yaw Isaw ngöyva. Tsövöwhoya yaw Owa'walpiy pangqw atkyamiqwat piw wari. Isaw yaw as Tsövöwhoyat aw yootokngwu niq pay yaw piw waayangwu.

Yaw puma haqami pöövät aqw pituqe atkyamiq warit pu' pay ahoy ayoqwat piw wuuvi.

Pantsamakyang yaw Isaw piw angk pitu.

“Nu paapu tönmiq tso'omtini”, yaw Isaw yan wuuwa. Yaw okiw Tsövöwhoya pakkyang waytiwnuma.

Noq yaw Isaw tönmiq tso'omti. Su'aw yaw piw tso'omti. Noq yaw kurs hak pep tumqöppöt aqw samit tuupeqw put yaw Isaw qa tuwa.

Yaw Tsövöwhoya su'aw tumqöppöt atsvaqe tso'omtiq, Isaw yaw angk piw yootokyang tumqöppöt yaw su'aqw poosi.

Noq yaw Isaw qöppöt aqw posq pu' Tsövöwhoya huruuti. Yaw pam as Isawuy nuutaytaq pay yaw qa angqw yama. Yaw pam haalayti put Isaw qa niinaqö.

Pay yaw Tsövöwhoya kurs aapiyniq pu' yaw hisat niq kurs tuwat Isaw yama. Pay yuk i' paasavo'o.

COYOTE AND LITTLE ANTELOPE

Hark.

They were living at Oraibi. On the south side at Coyote Gap, Coyote was living. It was summer and food was plentiful and people were happy.

At Coyote Gap on the south side there were many patches of sunflowers. And there also were many antelopes with young. They would sometimes lie down in the sunflower patches. Then some of the time they would move along in a bunch. The fawns would look at their mothers as they were eating.

"I sure would like to get ahold of some antelope. If I am lucky, I'll be able to grab one. That way I can surely have a lot of meat", Coyote thought.

The next day he set out after he had eaten. He moved along gradually, a bit at a time. So he was just at Rock Gap when the sun came out. He descended the south side. Along there there were many sunflowers.

Indeed it spread out far. Along the many backs he saw white (from the antelopes' color).

And so as Coyote trotted after them they ran. They kicked up dust because of their running. As they ran toward the north, dust stood.

Coyote couldn't catch up with them but tried to follow them.

After a while, Coyote went back to the sunflower patches.

Coyote hunted among the sunflowers until he came to just the right spot. There was an antelope fawn napping pleasantly. Its legs were folded into its head. Coyote gradually approached and when he reached the spot he stopped.

As he approached, he was going along thinking, "Where will I grab it? How will I grab it?"

As he was still thinking the Little Antelope suddenly bolted and ran.

So Coyote lurched after it but missed it. Little Antelope got a burst of energy and really ran.

Coyote chased it. Little Antelope ran below towards Rock Gap. Coyote would try to pounce on Little Antelope and Little Antelope would run away.

So-doing Coyote would reach where he had been.

"I really ought to try for the gullet", Coyote thought. Poor Little Antelope was crying as he ran along.

So Coyote went for the throat. He lept right at it. However he didn't see the pit oven that someone had set up to roast sweet corn ears, and he fell right in.

After Coyote had dropped off into the oven, Little Antelope came to a halt. He waited for Coyote to come out (and continue the play). He was glad Coyote had not killed him.

Little Antelope went and Coyote in turn came out of it. Here the story ends.

ISAW NIQ PU' LÖLÖQANGW

Aliksa'i.

Yaw Orayve yeesiwa. Noq Orayve taavangqöyve. Ismo'walpe Isaw ki'yta. Pu yaw aqwningqöyve Mumursvat ep Lölöqangw ki'yta. Noq yaw puma pas naakwatsimu.

Asakis yaw Lölöqangw Isawuy aw kiikinumte' kivayat aqw oopokngwu. Noq yaw nawus Isaw kiy iipa qatukyng kwatsiy aw yu'a'atangwu.

Noq yaw tuwat Isaw o'o'kiw niique kurs hiita pas hakiy aw tuunösvongya-tangwu pu' yaw piw Lölöqangw pas kurs hunukya.

Noq paypi yaw Isaw okiw tuwat sutsep tsöngmokiwtangwu niique hisat tuwat kwatsiy aw kiikinumtoniiqey wuuwa. Niikyang yaw pam wuwanta hin yaw sen tuwat kwatsiy awnen hiita wuupat suru'uykyangni. Nen pu' yaw tuwat pas kivayat epaq na'opoknani pu' yaw Lölöqangw nawus tuwat iipoq yamakni.

Oovi yaw pam iits qatuptut pu' kwiniwiq nakwsu. Oovi pay yaw naat pu' tawa yamaqw pay yaw Huk'oviy aqw wuuvi. Pangqe a'ani höqlö'ytaqw pam laapuyat siingi. Pu' yaw put laaput naanami somta. Pu' yaw put antsa suruy aw soma. Is yaw antsa suru'at yaap angqw wiisilti.

Su'aw yaw ovi taawa nasaptiqw pam pangkw haawit kwatsiyat kiihut aw nakwsu. Pam pituqw kwatsi'at haalayti.

"Ta'ay, paki'i, tsangaw pi um kurs angqw nuy pootay", yaw Lölöqangw aw kita.

Pu' yaw pam aqw papki. Is uti! Naat yaw suru'at angqw qa sulawti. Nuwu yaw paapu qa haqam qeni akwsingwa. Pu' yaw nawus Lölöqangw iipomi haqam yayma. Hisatniqw pu' yaw kurs Isaw soosoy paki pu' tuwat Lölöqangw kurs soosoy yama!

Puma yaw nöst pu naami teevep yu'a'alawu. Hisatniqw yaw Isaw nawus nima. Pu' yaw pam piw pangqw yayma. Noq yaw kurs lapusuruy kohiit atsva lölökinta, niikyang pam put qa tuwa. Yaw pam yamakt pu kiy aqw nakwsu.

Naat yaw pam ovi kiy aqw qa pituqw pay himu hovaktuy pu' yaw pam ahoy yoriqw yaw himu u'uwuqa angqw ngöyta. Kurs yaw pam hintiqe pu' pay yaw pam a'ni wari. Pay yaw pam pangso manguyqw u'uwuqa pay pituqe pay put okiw tuupe.

Pay yuk pölö.

COYOTE AND THE BULLSNAKE

Hark.

They were living at Oraibi. On the south side of Oraibi. At Coyote Gap Coyote was living. And away from there at Marshy Spring Bullsnake was living. And they were good friends.

Each time that Bullsnake came to visit Coyote he filled up his kivan. And so Coyote had to sit outside (the kiva) in order to talk to his friend.

And Coyote was poor and so didn't lay out much for his guest to eat, but Bullsnake was a glutton.

And so poor Coyote was always hungry and sometimes thought of going to visit his friend. But he thought of going to visit his friend wearing a long tail. So he would fill himself into his (the Bullsnake's) kiva and Bullsnake would have to go outside (to sit) in turn.

He got up early and went to the north. So when the sun had still not come out, he climbed up Windy Place. Along there were many juniper trees (from which) he stripped bark. He then tied the bark together. He then tied this to his tail. Thus his tail trailed far (behind him).

So right at noon he descended and set out for his friend's house. As soon as he arrived, his friend was glad.

"O.K., come in! Thanks for coming to see me", Bullsnake said to him.

And then he was entering. Oh dear! There was no end to his tail. Gradually there was no room left. And so Bullsnake had to be exiting outside. After a while, Coyote was completely inside and Bullsnake was completely out!

After they ate they talked to each other all day long. After some time, Coyote had to go home. Then he again exited from there. All the while his tail of bark ignited (passing) over the fire, but he didn't notice it. After he emerged, he set out for his own house.

He was not yet to his own house when he smelled something and looked back and saw something burning chasing him. Because he didn't know what it was, he really ran hard. As he tired, the burning thing arrived there (= caught up with him) and the poor thing roasted.

Here the story ends.

ISAW NIQ PU' POVOLHOYA

Aliksa'i.

Yaw hisat haqam Orayve piw yeesiwa. Pu' yaw Isaw yaw Ismo'walpe piw ki'yta. Noq yaw pam Isaw yaw talöngvaqw pam yaw maktongwu haqami yaavoq haqami. Pu' yaw pay qa pas yaavoq piw'u. Pay yaw imuy hiituy tsatsakhoymuy pay taataptuy, qalqaltuy pumuy hiihituy yaw pam maktongwu. Pay yaw Isaw ep haqam qa hiita antsa tuwangwu.

Noq yaw yan taalangvaqw pu' Isaw piw antsa hisat maktongwu pangso paavasmi haqami. Yaw pam aw pituqw pas hapi a'ani yaw himu si'iyungwa. Pas yaw soosoy himu ang si'iyungwa.

Noq pas yaw pam wuuwaq yaw kya pu' kurs lomatalatini. Pas yaw soosoy himu ang, paavasat ang, lomsii'iyungwa. Pu' yaw Isaw antsa paasat aw pituqw hapi yaw povolhoyam piw angyay.

Noq pas antsa yaw ima povolhoyam ang aqlaq puuyawnumya. Hiitawat siihut awyat ep ang puuyawnumyat pu' piw yaw sutsvowatyangwu.

Noq yaw Isaw amumi pangqw pay haypaq qatukyung amumi tunatyawta.

Pantsatskya puvulyaltinumya. Noq pu' yaw ima povolhoyam yaw angqw nungwu yaw yaapi'iwwisa.

Noq hapi yaw puma yaw yap'iwwisa pu' Isaw yaw amungkw wayma. Noq pu' yaw Isaw antsa yaw tuwat amumi nen pu' yaw as hiitawat ngu'aniqey antingwu. Noq pam yaw pantsaki pu yaw Isaw piw as okiw pan tuwanlawkyangw qa hiitawat yaw ngu'aqw pay yaw soosoyam aapiyya. Pu yaw antsa pam as pumuy pep ngu'alawu. Nungwu yaw pam mangu'iy, pas yaw pam as sikwit pas pay ngu'aniqe. Yaw pam kurs pövamiq pitu. Angqey atsvaqeqey yaw puuyawnumya. Noq pu' yaw Isaw hapi as tsöngmokiwyangw mangu'iwkyango.

"Qa hiitawat ngu'at", pu yaw pangqawu, "pas hapi nu so'onqa suukw ngu'ani", yaw kita. "Nen nu' put nösni".

Antsa Isaw yaw tso'omtikyungw yaw pangsoq pövamiq muunat aw yaw aqw poosi.

Noq pam hapi a'ani muuna hongviniiqe pay put so'on pi qa wiiki.

Noq yaw pam put wiiki, Isaw yaw qa hiitawat povolhoyat ngu'aq.

Pu' yaw pangqw pam pay nawus yama.

Noq sen yaw oovi ima povolho'yam so'on naato qa puuyawnumya.

Pu' yaw Isaw piw angqw yama. Pam pangqw pay muunat angqw yamakqey naat kya yaw hahaqe' piw waynumay.

Noq sen yaw naato'o. Pam piw Isaw sen haaqe' sen yaw naato piw maknuma. Pu' noq yuk paasavo i' Isaw imuy povolhoymuy amumum tuuwut-siwta. Pay yuk i' paasavo'o.

COYOTE AND THE LITTLE BUTTERFLY

Hark.

Sometime at Oraibi they were living. And Coyote was also living at Coyote Gap. And so this Coyote day after day would go hunting somewhere far off. And sometimes not so far. Well, these little things, like cottontail rabbits and pack rats –things like that– is what he would hunt. Sometimes Coyote wouldn't see anything.

So one summer's day, Coyote was hunting along yonder fields. He got there and something was blooming. Everything along there was in bloom.

So he thought it was a nice day. Everywhere along there were flowers. And then, Coyote having arrived at the field, there were butterflies going along there.

So those butterflies were floating along nearby. At one flower, then another. And so Coyote sat near them, watching them.

Thus doing, doing like this, they were flying about. And then these little butterflies gradually drifted farther along.

As they drifted farther away, Coyote walked after them. So then Coyote really would look at them and try to catch one. So doing Coyote then was practicing poorly and didn't catch a single one and then they all would dart away. He just wanted to catch them there. Gradually he got tired, and he thought of meat as he tried to grab. He came to a ditch. It was flowing along there. So Coyote just was getting hungry as he was also getting tired.

"Didn't catch a single one", he said, "surely I will get one", he said, "and then I'll eat it".

Verily Coyote jumped along the ditch where it was running and just fell down in.

Now the stream was strong as it carried him along.

As it carried him along, Coyote didn't catch a single butterfly.

And so finally he had to get out.

Maybe that's why there are still butterflies floating around.

Then Coyote got out again. And so because Coyote got out of the current he was wandering around somewhere.

So that finishes it up. Maybe Coyote is still out there hunting. That's about the end of "Coyote and the Little Butterflies". Here the story ends.

ISAW NIQ PU' TÖÖTÖLÖT QA'ÖT HÖÖQÖ

Aliksa'i.

Yaw hisat yep sinom yesngwu. Noq yaw Isaw Ismo'walpiy ep ki'yta.

Noq yaw piw Töötölöt pay aqlep haqam Mastupkyat ep yaw pam ki'yta.

Yaw hisat Isaw Mastupkyat haqami aqlami makto. Yaw pam nanmurut ang wawarstimakyang aqw haawi.

Isaw yaw paahut aqw pituuqe pangqawu, "Pay tsangaw pi sutsep yooyok pas lomatala'a", yaw yan wuuwa.

Yaw Isaw hiisavo nasungnat pu' piw maknuma.

Noq yaw pam haqami paasat aw pitu. "Ya sen hak ep paasa'yta", yaw pam yan wuuwa. Noq yaw pam Töötölöt tuwa paasay ep tumala'ytaq. "Yaw kurs Töötölöt. Pay nu' pu' u'naqw kurs antsa pam vul yep ki'yta", yaw Isaw yan wuuwa.

"Ya umi, ikwatsi", yaw Isaw kita.

“Owi”, yaw Töötölöt hu’wana.

“Kurs um tumala’yta”, yaw Isaw kita.

“Owi. Pay nu peep yuku. Pay tsangaw um pitu.

Um nuy pa’angwaqw itam inungem höqni. Niikyang itam ovi mooti nösni”, yaw Töötölö kita.

Noq yaw Isaw niq pu’ Töötölö puma a’ni tumalta. Yaw taawanasave puma nöösa. Yaw puma kawayvatngat nit pu’ piikit nöösa.

Yaw puma hiisavo naasungnat pu’ piw ahoy tumala’yta.

“Pas ikwatsi a’ni tumala’yta. Pay itam yukuqw nu sonqa meloonit nit pu’ sipalat angkw maqani”, yaw Töötölö yan wuuwa.

Yaw puma teevep tumala’ytaqe yaw puma mangu’i.

Yaw Isaw kurs pumuy novayamuy angkw akwsingput soosok sowa.

“Pay um tsangaw pitu. Yep paasat ayangwat melonuyi. Pay um hiitaniqey put kimani. Pay um a’nti tumalta”é yaw Töötölö kita.

Yaw Isaw melonuyit aqw niqe ho’apuy kurs hin tsöpaatani.

“Pay sen put nu kyaatiniy”, yaw Isaw kita.

Pu’ yaw Töötölö engem wikpangwayat aw soma.

Pu’ yaw Isaw Ismo’walpiy aqw nakwsu.

“Pay um naat son manguyt pay uukiy ep pituni”, yaw Töötölö kita.

“Pay nu tuwantaniy”, yaw Isaw kita.

Yaw Isaw kurs hin ho’apuy kyaatiniqe huruuti.

Yaw pam peehut meloonit angqw nawus ipwa.

Yaw pam haqam qölöt hangwaqe pangsoq yaw pam hiisa meloonit tangatat pu’ aama.

“Pay nu qaavo sonqa angkw it ahoy yukutoni”, yaw pam yan wuuwa.

COYOTE AND GRASSHOPPER HARVEST

Hark.

People were living. And Coyote was living at Coyote Gap.

And somewhere around Skeleton Canyon was where Grasshopper was living.

So one time Coyote went hunting over towards Skeleton Canyon. He descended as he went running along the ridgeways.

Coyote arrived at the water and said, “Thankfully it has rained so that it is such a good summer”, he thought this way.

And Coyote rested awhile and then again went hunting.

So he then arrived at some field. “Whoever has a field here”, he thought. And he saw Grasshopper working in his own field. “It’s got to be Grasshopper. I forgot that he lived here”, Coyote thought this way.

“It’s you, my friend”, Coyote said.

“Yes’, Grasshopper agreed.

“I see that you’re working”, Coyote said.

“Yes. I am almost done. Thank goodness you’ve arrived. You can help and we can harvest on my behalf. However we first will eat”, Grasshopper said.

And so Coyote and Grasshopper worked hard. At noon they ate. They ate watermelon and piki.

They rested a short while and then again went back to work.

“My friend sure is working. When we finish, I’ll give him melons and peaches”, Grasshopper thought this way.

They worked all day, so they were tired.

Coyote gobbled up what remained of their food.

“Thanks for coming. Along this side of the field there are melon plants. Please take what you like. You’ve worked very hard”, Grasshopper said.

Coyote went to the melon plants and filled his burden basket with melons.

“Maybe I’ll pick it up”, Coyote said.

Grasshopper helped him tie his head strap.

And he set out for Coyote Gap.

“You are not so tired that you will not get home”, Grasshopper said.

“I’ll give it a try”, Coyote said.

So Coyote finally was unable to lift his own burden basket and so had to stop.

He had to bury some of the melons.

He dug a hole somewhere along there he put in some melons and buried them.

“Well I’ll come back to fetch this tomorrow”, he thought this way.

ISAW NIQ PU’ TUTSVO

Haliksay!

Yaw Orayve yeesiwa.

Pu’ yaw kiihut taavangqöyve ep Ismowalpe yaw Isaw ki’yta.

Pu’ yaw pam sutsep haqami hoqlömi pay tuwat hohut leposit pep haqam sowat pu yaw piw nimangwu.

Pu’ yaw ephaqam pay pangso Orayve timuy wikkyangw, kwayngyaphaqe’ tototsskwi, ööqat hepqw put yaw puma soswangwu.

Noq yaw pepeq maatsiwqat epeq yaw i’ Tutsvo piw ki’yta. Yaw haqaqw owat angkw hötsiniqw pangqw ki’yta.

Pu’ pay pam tuwat timuy amungem yaw aatumuy maknumngwu. Pu’ yaw timuy nopnat pay ephaqam kiy angqw yamakt oomiq wuuve’ pu’ pepeq pam yaw tawlawngwu, amungem’a.

Noqw yaw hisat pam piw aqw wupqe taatawlawq yaw Isaw as kurs pitu. Yaw Isaw as kwangwa’ituswa. Hin as yaw pam put taawi’vani, nen yaw tuwat as timuy as tawlawni.

Yaw taawi sootapnaqw pu' yaw Isaw aw pangqawu, "Kurs haaki! Um inumi tawlawqw nu' taawi've' tuwat itimuy aw tawlawni", yaw Isaw kita.

"Ta'a, pay pi uum'i so'on pi um taawi'vani", yaw pam Isawuy aw kitat pu' yaw piw aw tawlawu.

"Um so'on piwni?" yaw Isaw kita.

"Pay nu kya so'on piwni. Pay nu mangu'i", yuw Tutsvo kita.

"Ta'a. Um ngas'ew as suus piwni", Isaw yaw aw kita.

"Noqw pi nu pay so'on piw uumi tawlawni", kita yaw Tutsvo nit pu pay ahoy haawi.

Yaw Isaw nawus aapiy pay nima. Pu yaw pam nimakyangw, yaw taawit ang wuuwanma. Yaw pam Tutsvot aqw itsivuti.

Noqw Yaw pam Tutsvo tuwat piw wuuwanta: "So'on qa yaw piw Isaw pituni. Pu yaw pam taawit qa taawi've' so'onqa nuy sowani".

Pu yaw pam Tutsvo wuuwaqe yaw it tukput ang tsiwavit mokyaatini. Yaw put ang mokyaatat yaw kiy ooveq wunuptionsinaqw put pi yaw pay Isaw sowani. Antsa yaw pam oovi pantsaki.

Qavongvaqw iits talavay yaw Isaw piw pitu.

Pu' yaw put atsatutsvot aw yaw pangqawu, "Um kurs inungem piw tawlawni. Nu pu' pay so'onqa taawi'vani", yaw Isaw kita.

Pay yaw qa hingqawu atsatutsvo.

Pu' yaw piw aw oqalti Isawu.

Pay yaw piw qa hingqawu. Pay yaw kurs pam so'on nakwhani, pay pi tsiwavi niqe oovi'o.

Pu' yaw pay Isaw itsivuti.

"Ta'ay, pay pi turs nu ung sowani", yaw kita.

Pu' yaw aw yooto; pu yaw put sumuytaqe put ngaroroyku Isawu. Yan pay yaw pam tamay soosok kookonta.

"Ya um hintiqw okiw nuy yan yukuna?" yaw kitat, pu yaw Isaw nawus pay nima.

Pu' yaw pam paami pituuqe, yaw pam mo'ay angqw kuksiniqe aqw yookolti. Yaw angqw himu an nuutsel'eway ungmotsovu'ytaqa aw kuyva.

Pu' yaw pam pangqw yamakt pu pay yaw waaya.

Antsa yaw pam waynumkyangw pu yaw haqam paamiq pitu. Yaw hihin aw pitu, pay yaw mangu'i niqe oovi'o.

Yaw pam pi ep paahut aqw kuyvaqw piw pay yaw angqw aw pam himu nuutsel'eway kuyvangwu.

Pu yaw pam pangqawu, "Ya uma hiitu inunyangwam yang tangawtaqe oovi pam itamuy okiw tsatsawinaya?" yaw kita.

Pu' yaw pam pangqw aapiy'o.

Naat kya yaw ooviy pam Isaw paahut hepnuma.

Pay yuk pölö.

COYOTE AND THE WREN

Hark!

They were living at Oraibi.

To the southside of the houses at Coyote Gap, Coyote was living.

She was always looking in turn around the juniper clump somewhere for juniper berries to devour and then she would go home.

She would sometimes take her pups over to Oraibi's dump and thereabouts to scrounge for worn out shoes and bones.

Now over there at that mentioned place Wren also lived. Somewhere there in the rocks was an opening where she lived.

She would go to find grubs for her children. After she fed her offspring, she would sometimes come out of her house and go above it and there she would sing for them.

So one time she had climbed up above her house and was singing, when Coyote arrived on the spot. Coyote was very covetous of the singing. Somehow she had to learn how to sing so that she could sing to her youngsters too.

The song came to an end and Coyote said, "Wait! Sing for me so I can learn to sing for my own children", Coyote said.

"O.K., but you won't be able to learn it", she said to the Coyote and then she sang again.

"Wouldn't you do it one more time?" said Coyote.

"No I won't sing again. I'm tired out", Wren said.

"O.K. You can at least sing once more", Coyote said.

"I'm not going to sing for you again", said Wren and she went back down into her house.

So Coyote had to go on home. As she was going home, she thought about the song. She got angry at Wren.

And so Wren was thinking to herself: "Surely Coyote will come back. If she can't learn to sing, she'll eat me for sure".

Then Wren thought and filled a bag with sand. After she had filled it, she took it and stood it up over her house for Coyote to eat. Indeed, that's why she did it that way.

The next day early in the morning Coyote returned.

Then she said to the false Wren, "Please sing for me again. Surely I can learn to sing", Coyote said.

The false Wren said nothing.

Coyote got determined (and again spoke).

It said nothing. Of course, it couldn't answer for it was made of sand.

Coyote then got mad.

"O.K., now I'm going to have to eat you", she said.

She pounced on it; then she suddenly got it in her mouth and was crunching it, Coyote. This way she cracked all her own teeth.

“Why did you do this to poor little me?” she said, then Coyote had to go. She came to water, and she bent over in order to wash out her mouth. From (the water), she saw a frightening thing with a bloody mouth.

She came away from there and ran away.

So as she wandered around she came to water. She barely got there, that’s because she was tired.

When she would get up to the water, that frightening something would come up out from the water.

She says, “Are you things that look like me contained along here just to scare me?” she said.

Then she went on from there.

Still perhaps that’s why Coyote goes around looking for water. Here it is humped.

References

- Barclay, Lillian E., 1938. ‘The coyote: Animal and folk-character’. In: J.F. Dobie, M.C. Boatright and H.H. Ransom, eds., *Coyote Wisdom*. Austin: Folk-Lore Society. pp. 36–103.
- Bright, William, ed., 1978. *Coyote stories*. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, Native American Text Series, Monographs, 1.
- Bright, William, ed., 1984. *American Indian linguistics and literature*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Haberland, Hartmut, 1985. Kilivila *sopa* ‘joke’?: A reply to Senft. *Journal of Pragmatics* 9:835–843.
- Labov, William and Joshua Waletzky, 1977. ‘Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience’. In: J. Helm, ed., *Essays on the verbal and visual arts*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press. pp. 12–45.
- Luckert, Karl. W., 1984. *Coyote in Navajo and Hopi tales*. Introduction to: Bernard Haile, O.F.M., *Navajo Coyote Tales*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Malotki, Ekkehart, 1983. *Hopi time: A linguistic analysis of temporal concepts in the Hopi language*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Malotki, Ekkehart, 1985. *Gullibille Coyote: Una’ihu*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.
- Malotki, Ekkehart and Michael Lomatuwa’yima, 1984. *Hopi coyote stories: Istutuwtusi*. *American Tribal Religions*, Vol. 9. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Pratt, Mary Louise, 1977. *Toward a speech act theory of literary discourse*. Bloomington; IN: Indiana University Press.
- Ramsey, Jarold, ed., 1977. *Coyote was going there: Indian Literature from the Oregon Country*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
- Senft, Gunther, 1985. How to tell – and understand – a ‘dirty joke’ in Kilivila. *Journal of Pragmatics* 9:815–833.
- Snyder, Gary, 1977. *The incredible survival of Coyote*. In: *The old ways: Six essays*. San Francisco, CA: City Lights Books, pp. 67–93.