Title

Sam Kenoi's Coyote Stories: Poetics and Rhetoric in Some Chiricahua Apache Narratives

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3pz7x9x7

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 23(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Webster, Anthony K.

Publication Date

1999

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

Peer reviewed

Sam Kenoi's Coyote Stories: Poetics and Rhetoric in Some Chiricahua Apache Narratives

ANTHONY K. WEBSTER

INTRODUCTION

My goal in this paper is to present some of the rhetorical-poetic devices employed by Samuel E. Kenoi, a Chiricahua Apache, who told eight Coyote narratives in his Native language to Harry Hoijer in the early 1930s.[1] This paper adds to the growing body of literature analyzing Native American discourse as highly structured.[2] Such structures include shared, culturally constituted, rhetorical-poetic devices, individual strategies, and the emergent nature of real-time narration.[3]

    In Section 1, I present a brief biographical sketch of Sam Kenoi and describe his contact with Harry Hoijer. In 2, I discuss Kenoi's use of a Chiricahua Apache narrative enclitic, -ná'a 'so they say,' as a line signaling device. In 3, I present examples of Kenoi's use of an initial particle, nágo 'then,' as an ethnopoetic device that signals changes in actors, actions, time, and locations—thereby marking stanzas. In Section 4, I present information on various additional rhetorical-poetic devices, paying attention to quoted speech, numerical patterns centered on twos and fours, and formulaic devices that anchor these narratives to other Coyote narratives. In Section 5, I identify features of Kenoi's narratives that have wider application to Chiricahua verbal art and I make some comparative statements regarding other Southern Athapaskan languages. In 6, I provide a set of concluding remarks where I take up the implications of this narrative as a dialogic interaction between social actors (Kenoi and Hoijer) and as a part of a larger discursive tradition in an anterior here and now (the Mescalero Reservation circa 1930).

Anthony K. Webster received a master's degree in anthropology from New Mexico State University. He is currently a Ph.D. student in linguistic anthropology at the University of Texas at Austin.

CONTEXTUALIZATION

Kenoi, according to his own recollections, was born in 1875.[4] He was a member of the Southern band of the Chiricahua, who lived in Sonora, Chihuahua, southeast Arizona, and southwest New Mexico. In 1886, after the surrender of Geronimo, the Chiricahuas, including those who had helped the United States government, were forcibly relocated to Fort Marion, Florida. The government treated the Chiricahuas, including the eleven-year-old Kenoi, as prisoners of war for the next twenty-seven years. Kenoi attended the Carlisle Indian School in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, where it was school policy to "kill the Indian to save the man." In 1893 the Chiricahuas were relocated to Fort Sill, Oklahoma. In 1913, when Kenoi was thirty-eight years old, the United States government offered to resettle the Chiricahuas at the Mescalero Apache Reservation in New Mexico; otherwise, they would receive allotments of land and stay in Oklahoma. Two-thirds of the Chiricahuas, including Kenoi, chose to settle on the Mescalero Reservation. There, in the early 1930s, Kenoi and Hoijer met. Kenoi told Hoijer most of the narratives under consideration here between June 17, 1930 and June 26, 1930. Kenoi also told Hoijer *tsiłkizhéne ndé* 'Foolish People' stories, tales about the Comanches, and other historical narratives.[5] Hoijer did not record Kenoi's narratives with sound recording devices; therefore, we are left with only a visual representation of the audible event. However, by following the ethnopoetic methodological approach first articulated by Hymes and usefully applied by several other linguists and anthropologists, important aspects, albeit partial, of Kenoi's narrative organization can be recovered.[6]

    This methodology does not deny the reality that certain audible features of the narrative are irretrievable. Thus I cannot make claims about pause, intonation contours, and other paralinguistic features that highlight the orality of these narratives. Note that precisely those features that most readily index the oral quality of these narratives are absent and this, in turn, can lead to the illusion that these narratives were static artifices lacking an emergent and oral quality. This is, however, an illusion created by Hoijer's text artifacting process, or, as Greg Sarris suggests in discussing the oral literature of Mabel McKay, "writing recreates oral experience in given ways."[7] The artifacting of an oral phenomenon is selective and can obscure the very orality of the phenomenon.

    When Hoijer, looking for linguistic data on the complex Athapaskan verb structure, asked Kenoi to tell him some narratives in Chiricahua Apache, Kenoi told these stories using linguistic resources available to Chiricahua narrators, resources that make these stories poetic.[8] The very use of the following poetic devices suggests that while the narrative was told in the artificial setting of the linguistic elicitation session, Kenoi engaged in "performances" of these Coyote stories.[9] Kenoi, potentially, could have told truncated narratives that lacked quoted speech, the narrative enclitic, and the use of twos and fours. Instead, Kenoi used these rhetorical-poetic devices to create coherent texts, to create and sustain narrative force and organization. Hoijer, however, was not aware of the organizing principles that Kenoi employed in his narration. Hoijer was interested in presenting Chiricahua texts as objects *about* "culture," as windows into "culture." He did not take the narratives as enactments *of* culture; he did not take discourse in and of itself as a cultural phenomenon.[10]

   Nevertheless, Kenoi's texts are not just *about* Chiricahua culture, they *are* Chiricahua culture in that they are constructed and circulated according to narrative aesthetics. To tell a Coyote narrative in Chiricahua is to enter into a narrative tradition, a tradition that can validate or invalidate a person's specific narration by placing it within the context of received standards for a Coyote narrative. Narration is both creative (individual) and fixed (collective). All narration emerges in real time and a narrator can highlight or exclude specific aspects of a story. Nonetheless, the narrator also is constrained by prior discourse, and it is here that we have entered the realm of rhetorical-poetic structuring. These are the narrative devices that anchor a given telling in prior discourse and thereby create frames by which narratives can be recognized as a given type, that is, genre.[11]

   A brief comment on the source of these narratives seems warranted here. First, all the narratives to be analyzed in this paper are from Hoijer's published work.[12] I have also checked some of the information against Hoijer's unpublished notebooks housed at the American Philosophical Society. I would like to thank the American Philosophical Society for making available those notebooks.

NARRATIVE ENCLITIC

Hoijer presented these narratives as block prose, giving little or no attention to rhetorical and poetic devices. For example, because Hoijer believed the sentence and clause-final narrative enclitic *-ná'a* 'so they say,' was redundant, he chose consistently not to translate it.[13] I will argue, however, that Kenoi's narratives are poetically structured and that the narrative enclitic is vital to understanding this structure in that it serves three important functions. First, due to its superabundance within these narratives, it operates as the basic organizing principle of Kenoi's narratives, creating lines. Second, the enclitic indexes or indicates that Kenoi's stories belong to a particular type of speaking event. Third, it acts as an epistemic distancing device indicating from the narrator's perspective that these stories are not of his/her personal knowledge. Each of these points merits discussion.

Narrative Enclitic as Line Marker

In Kenoi's Coyote stories the narrative enclitic appears regularly and seems to act as a central organizing device. Kenoi uses the narrative enclitic *-ná'a* consistently at the end of sentences and some clauses outside quoted speech. The enclitic is affixed to the end of the verb in Chiricahua, which is a predominately verb final language.[14] The repeated and regular use of this enclitic at the end of sentences and clauses creates lines; in essence the narrative enclitic creates boundaries and units. By lines I mean a visual or textual representation of an oral phenomenon. Thus, Kenoi's repetition of this device separates sentences and clauses, and creates a poetic structure based on his patterned and regular use of the narrative enclitic. Here is an example of Kenoi's use of the narrative enclitic to separate clauses (*-go* is the subordinating enclitic):

(1) yiyeeshxahee holgholná'ago
         'ándiná'a:
                 "gah tséí xáń dailá?"ndiná'a.

   As he was going quite close to it, so they say,
         He spoke thus, so they say,
                 "Who would mess with a rock rabbit?" he said, so they say.[15]

   In examples 2a, 2b, 3a, and 3b, I give two extended examples of the regu-
larity of the narrative enclitic from two of Kenoi's stories, "Coyote and the White
Men" and "Coyote Marries His Daughter."[16] The notations that accompany the
narratives in the following examples can be explained as follows: lines are
marked every fifth line with numbers flush right. Stanzas, to be discussed below,
are indicated by the use of an uppercase letter flush right. Verses, or segmenta-
tion within stanzas, are marked with a lowercase letter flush right. Let me add
that any and all transcription policies are theoretical in that they assume a nar-
rative organization.[17] The retranscription policy that I use attempts to highlight
Kenoi's use of the narrative enclitic and an initial particle as well as certain the-
matic considerations. There are, of course, other ways to represent these narra-
tives and in doing so highlight other aspects of these narratives.
   I should add that inside quoted speech Kenoi does not normally use the
narrative enclitic. Thus, it is difficult to segment lines within quoted speech,
and so I do not.[18] Because of the lack of a narrative enclitic within quoted
speech the speaking event is understood as within the narrative frame but the
words within the quote are intended to be understood as representations of
precisely what was said. However, I will turn to the issue of the narrative
enclitic occurring within quoted speech later in this paper.

(2a) Coyote and the White Men, Chiricahua version[19]

mai 'íntin holgholná'a.	1 A
'íntinshí ditsí 'óó'áí bitáshí neesdáná'a. 'aashí sidágo 'a'áálná'a.	B
nágo ditsí 'óó'áí bééso yaadahyeesndilná'a.	C
nágo 'íntinshí 'indaa naaki xéél yil'inayolná'a.	5 D
'aashí, 'íntinshí ditsí'óó'áí bitláshí , sidáná'a.	E
xéél baabil'inéńyooná'a. 'indaań 'ábiilndiná'a: "'iyáabaáɔlá'kodeshí síndá?"biilndíná'a.	Fa Fb

"dooda,"ndiná'a.
     "'ádíí ditsi'óó'áí baasídá,"ndiná'a.
          "díí ditsií bééso baanánt'í.'áíbaáɔhilnzhóɔ'ndiná'a.
	10 G

'indaań 'ábiiɬndiná'a: H
    "naanaahiiɬndii,"biiɬndiná'a.

nágo 'ándiná'a: 15 I
    "dooda, dáɂayáɬáɟ'ílí, "yiiɬndiná'a.

(2b) Coyote and the White Men, English version

Coyote was going along a road, so they say.   1 A

He sat down under a tree that was standing by the road, so they say. B
    There he sat for some time, so they say.

Then he put several pieces of money upon the tree that was standing there,
so they say.   C

Then two white men came along the road driving a burden, so they say. 5 D

There, under the tree that was standing there, he sat, so they say.   E

They drove the burden to him, so they say.   Fa
    The white men spoke thus, so they say: Fb
        "Why are you sitting in this lonely place?" they said to him, so they say.

"No," he said, so they say.   10 G
    "I sit guarding this tree that stands here,"he said, so they say.
        "Money grows on this tree. For that reason, it is valuable to me," he
        said, so they say.

The white men spoke thus, so they say: H
    "We will buy it from you," they said to him, so they say.

Then he spoke thus, so they say: 15 I
    "No, it is worth a great deal," he said to them, so they say.

(3a) Coyote Marries His Own Daughter, Chiricahua version[20]

nágo ai jígo, bigha'isdsáńń bitláshí náánóoɬghoɬná'a.   A
    ch'osh 'isda'yeesndilí nii'yá yaaheesndilgo yiiɬtsáɑ́a'a.

t'áɣá biche'shkéneí yaaná ghoná'a.   B
    hichaná'a.
        "ch'osh naaneesda. xáh hooká. 'ch'osh naaniidágo,
        daahka,' naɬjindín"biche'shkéneí daayiiɬndiná'a.

joodaajibááyégo, jideeskaná'a.   C
    dásí haná'aɑ 'ijikáyá, 'áń bizáậɣéń, 'ikéyánaagháń,
    t'áɣá ditsi'óó'ání 'ákaa nádeesgalná'a.
        ditsi'óó'ání bikáshí bitaanń yaanáaɬghogo yiiɬtsáɑ́a'a.   25

nágo bimáń 'áyiiɫndiná'a: D
    "shimá, ditsi'óó'ání bikáshi shitaa yaanáaɫgho 'ííyéhe."gooɫndiná'a.

nágo bimáń 'ábiiɫndiná'a: E
    "doo'ájindida, shishke'é. 'iɫk'idáɈédii. doojózhída,"bimáń biiɫndiná'a.

dá'ághát'éndah, 'áń bizááyéń bimáń 'áyiiɫndiná'a: 30F
    "dooda, dishndi. dooda, dishndi. shitaa 'át'í. dábí 'át'í."ndiná'a.

dá'ághát'éndah bimáń bich'aaghagóchiná'a.   G
    ndáséyá jakaná'a.

(3b) Coyote Marries His Own Daughter, English version

Then, the next day, his wife was coming again to the place under him, so they
say.   A
    She saw the worms he had dropped lying scattered about on the ground,
    So they say.

She went back to her children, so they say.   20B
    She was weeping, so they say.
        "The worms have fallen. We shall go right away. 'When the worms
        fall, you will go,' he had said to us," she said to her children,
        so they say.

Sadly, they started off, so they say.   C
    When they were nearly out of sight, the small one, the youngest one,
    Glanced back to the tree that stood there, so they say.
        He saw his father jumping from the tree that stood there,
        so they say.   25

Then he spoke thus to his mother, so they say: D
    "My mother, [I'm] sure my father jumped from the tree that stands
    there!" he said to her, so they say.

Then his mother spoke thus to him, so they say: E
    "Do not say so, my child. He is gone long ago. Do not mention him,"
    his mother said to him, so they say.

In spite of that, the little one spoke thus to his mother, so they say: 30 F
    "No, I say! No, I say! It was my father! It was certainly him!" he said,
    so they say.

In spite of that his mother stopped him, so they say.   G
    They went on, so they say.

Narrative Enclitic as Framing Device

A second function that the narrative enclitic serves is that it identifies the nar-
rative as a particular type of speaking event. Let me begin this discussion by
noting that Kenoi did not invariably use the narrative enclitic. If Kenoi forgot

a word, needing to clarify a statement after the narrative enclitic, he did not hesitate to do so. Here are two examples from "Coyote Dances with Prairie Dogs."

(4) *ndiná'a ma'yeí.*
     3rd person say/so they say coyote
     He said, so they say—Coyote. [21]

(5) *łínádaagołchíná'a gishibe.*
     3rd person pretend to hit at them again and again/so they say with the club
     He pretended to hit them again and again, so they say—with the club.[22]

In both cases the word that follows the narrative enclitic seems to clarify or emphasize the previous point. Thus, in example 4, Kenoi adds an aside after the closing of the frame with -*ná'a,* clarifying who was speaking. In example 5, Kenoi explains what was used in the pretend hitting. Both examples represent breaks in the narrative frame when Kenoi clarified, for Hoijer perhaps, certain points in the narrative that may have been ambiguous. Indeed, it is at just these moments, these extra-narrative moments, when the narrative event comes to life and reminds us that these were oral products that have been "artifacted" as visible texts on printed pages.[23]

On other occasions when Kenoi drops the narrative enclitic, outside quoted speech, he appears to be signaling that his comments are outside the narrative frame. That is, for instance, Kenoi is attempting to clarify the subject of the line or stanza for Hoijer.[24] For example, from Kenoi's "Coyote and Beetle," Beetle tells Coyote that there are some people who are going to kill someone who has earlier defecated on a rock. In Kenoi's Coyote stories, Coyote defecating on rocks is a common event, a habitual action. Coyote responds to Beetle that he, Coyote, has left "something," using the indefinite classificatory stem -*'ii* , "over there." Kenoi goes on to explicitly clarify that Coyote has defecated on a rock, thus disambiguating the indefinite classificatory verb stem in Coyote's quote. Finally, Kenoi connects the quote and the prior action with the clarification, "that is what he was speaking about," and here he drops the narrative enclitic, thereby breaking the narrative frame to comment on the narrative.

(6) *nágo ma'yeí 'ábii łndiná'a:*
     "*háдзh 'ítsé. dá'iishí shiba'síndá. 'aghaee 'iyáa'ást'enní'ií baanánshdá.*"
     k'asaだshóó łgholdáдsé hik'eescháддaná'a.
     ná'aí 'áiłndi.

     Then Coyote spoke thus to him, so they say:
         "Well, wait. Wait right here for me. I'm going back over there for
         something that I left."
     Just as he had been coming there, he had defecated on a rock, so they say.
     That is what he was speaking about.[25]

There is, also, some evidence that Kenoi was aware of his use of the narrative enclitic. In "Coyote Marries His Daughter" Kenoi adds a line after the

narration while working through the narrative with Hoijer.[26] Thus, Kenoi, after the narrative event, makes an editorial addition to his narrative. Kenoi inserts this line:

(7) *bíńtlayá soos ntsaaí baadasi'áɨɬbeebégóziná'a.*

    They knew him by a large wart that was on the side of his head, so they say.[27]

Here Kenoi "corrects" his narrative by adding the above line, and in doing so he includes the narrative enclitic, thereby maintaining the narrative frame. This is a different phenomenon than the breaking of the frame in the real-time narrative event. Here, when Kenoi has time to think about the form of the editorial insertion, he maintains the narrative frame by including the narrative enclitic. Consequently, he maintains the narrative frame in the process of artifacting his text.

    It should be pointed out that example 2a is a story believed to be borrowed from the Spanish-American tradition.[28] Yet Kenoi uses the narrative enclitic and other rhetorical-poetic devices, which appropriates this story into Chiricahua narrative tradition. The narrative enclitic serves to index reflexively that a specific speaking event, narration, is occurring. The narrative enclitic can be found in a number of other narratives, including "Foolish People" stories told by Sam Kenoi and Duncan Belacho and a Coyote story told by Lawrence Mithlo.[29] However, it is not found in the songs Hoijer published for the Girl's Puberty Ceremony.[30] Thus, another genre of verbal art, the Girl's Puberty songs, lacks the narrative enclitic. Nor is the narrative enclitic consistently used by Lawrence Mithlo in describing the "old customs" of Chiricahua Apaches—that is, customs outside of his direct knowledge.[31] Thus, not all narratives concerning events outside the narrators firsthand personal experience require the narrative enclitic.

Narrative Enclitic as Epistemic Distancing Device

The third identified function of *-ná'a* is that it acts as an epistemic distancing device. There is an interplay here between poetic function and semantic meaning. Kenoi's repetition of the narrative enclitic creates lines. However, Kenoi's use of the narrative enclitic also indicates that he was not a witness to these events, that he is merely reporting what he has been told. It is a way for Kenoi to distance himself from the veracity of the events described. Not to use the narrative enclitic could potentially index that Kenoi had firsthand knowledge of these events. Its repeated usage is also a constant reminder that this narrative derives from the words of others. The narrative enclitic is a way for Kenoi to link his narrative to the words of a non-present cultural authority— that is, he places his words within a narrative tradition. In this way the narrative enclitic seems to relinquish responsibility for the veracity of the story but places responsibility on the accurate reproduction of the words of another.

    Below is an example in which Kenoi uses the enclitic as an evidential, to suggest a lack of firsthand knowledge of the reported events. In the story, Coyote has

told the Prairie Dogs that he has killed all the Prairie Dogs' enemies in a fierce battle. The Prairie Dogs were not present at this battle. Here, the narrative enclitic is not used as a line marker or to create the narrative frame; rather, its sole purpose is to indicate that this is what the Prairie Dogs heard from Coyote:

(8) *nágo: "'ao! 'áxaȟ, koodasahkaa. dákogo gotál nt'aa. nahi'nda'ní*
díík'eh nahánaajiistseená'a, "dlooyeí daandiná'a.

Then: "Yes! Hurry, build your fires. There is to be a ceremony right now. He has killed for us all of those who were our enemies, so they say," the Prairie Dogs said, so they say. [32]

The Prairie Dogs do not have direct knowledge of Coyote killing their enemies; rather, it is what has been reported to them by Coyote, which they indicate by using *-ná'a*.

A second example concerns Coyote and his wife from "Coyote Marries His Own Daughter." In this example Coyote, after pretending to be deceased, encounters his wife, who does not recognize him, and inquires into what else Coyote's wife's husband might have said before he died. Here Coyote is pretending not to have been a witness to the events he is asking about. He signals that he does not have direct knowledge of these events by his use of the narrative enclitic. Notice also that Kenoi has Coyote use a circumlocution when discussing the supposedly deceased Coyote; that is, he uses *haastii* 'old man' instead of Coyote's name. Kenoi also has Coyote use the fourth-person pronominal *ji-* 'one' which is used for persons who occupy a socially distant position (most notably in-laws and the dead). Coyote's wife believes Coyote is not the same Coyote partly because Coyote speaks correctly; that is, he uses circumlocutions, the fourth-person pronominal, and the narrative enclitic.

(9) *nágo, dábí 'át'í ndah, 'ágoondiná'a:*
"haastíí gojíyáȟee. 'iyaadaȟjindiná'a, hálí?"gooȟndiná'a.

Then, though it was indeed him, he spoke thus to her, so they say:
"The old man was wise. That one said something else, so they say, no doubt?" he said to her, so they say. [33]

Initial Particles

A second rhetorical-poetic device employed by Kenoi is the initial particle *nágo* 'then,' which marks changes in actors, actions, time, or locations. In examples 10a and 10b, I present an extended example from "Coyote and Beetle." For other illustrations of this device see examples 2a and 3a.

(10a) Coyote and Beetle, Chiricahua version[34]

nágo ma'yeí 'ándiná'a:	B
"'ik'ah hishááȟágo naashá,"yiiȟndiná'a.	
"xaȟ nishghaȟ,"yiiȟndigo hich'iisiziná'a.	5

nágo gólizhnłchinéí 'ábiiłndiná'a: C
  "'íłtséda, haastii doodaańndida! koyá ndiiítláhyá
  'iyáaxee daajindií 'iyéshtsáJ'

nágo ma'yeí 'ábiiłndiná'a: D
  "xaū! iyáadaajindií shiłgółndi! 'ándeeda nishghał,"biiłndiná'a.

nágo gólizhnłchinéí 'ábii¬ndiná'a: 10 E
  "'aashíxáńé tsé hik'eeschaāūń dákogo hádaashdighaał.
  daajiiłxe daajindi hiłts'a'."

(10b) Coyote and Beetle, English version

Then Coyote spoke thus, so they say: B
  "I eat only fat in order to live," he said to him, so they say.
    "I'm going to eat you right now," he said to him
    as he stood next to him, so they say.   5

Then Beetle spoke thus to him, so they say: C
  "Wait, old man, don't say anything. I am listening to what some
  [people] are saying there underground."

Then Coyote spoke thus to him, so they say: D
  "Hurry, tell me what they are saying. When you have told me,
  then I will eat you," he said to him, so they say.

Then Beetle spoke thus to him, so they say: 10 E
  "Right now they are going to look for someone who has defecated on
  a rock over there. Sounds like they saying they are going to kill him."

In lines 3, 6, 8, and 10 of example 10, Kenoi signals a forthcoming switch in speaker by his use of the initial particle *nágo*. It is followed by an explicit subject change. Notice that Kenoi ends Beetle's quotes without a verb of speaking and a line final narrative enclitic. The initial particle and the end of the quote work together in segmenting the different lines. The end of a quote in conjunction with the initial particle creates a line at the end of the quote.

Kenoi does not always follow the initial particle with an explicit subject change. In this example from "Coyote and the Prairie Dogs," Kenoi simply uses the initial particle and then switches to a quote:

(11) *nágo: "'ao! 'áxaū, koodasahkaa. dákogo gotál nt'aa. nahi'nda'ní díík'eh*
      nahánaajiistseená'a,"dlóóyeí daandiná'a.

  Then: "Yes! Hurry, build your fires. There is to be a ceremony right now. He
  has killed for us all of those who were our enemies, so they say," the Prairie
  Dogs said, so they say.[35]

Two examples from "Coyote Marries His Daughter" will show that Kenoi also used the initial particle to help signal changes in time (12) and location (13).

(12)   *nágo łai jígo, bigha'isdsánń bitláshí náánóołgholná'a.*

Then the next day, his wife was coming again to the place under him, so
they say.[36]

(13)   *nágo, náánándáséee, 'áń má'yeń biche'shkéneni dábíní dlói díí' yajishgo
godáhiłghoná'a.*

Then, at a place still further on, that Coyote himself, carrying four prairie
dogs, met his children, so they say.[37]

Kenoi creates larger discourse units with his repeated use of *nágo* and its cor-
respondence with changes in action, actor, location, and time. Following
Hymes, I call these units stanzas. The number of lines within a stanza is vari-
able.[38] For example, many quotations are in the form of two line sequences
(see examples 2a, 3a, and 10a). However, Kenoi also used three- and four-line
stanzas as well. Three-line stanzas tend to appear at crucial moments in the
narrative and thus mark these moments as out of the ordinary.

     Kenoi also gives different rhetorical functions to the initial particles *'ákoo* and
nágo. Hoijer often translated the words identically. However, Kenoi seems to use
'ákoo 'and so' as a resultative particle, where *nágo* 'then' operates, as described
above, to signal shifts in actors, actions, locations, and time.[39] Below I present two
examples in which the use of *'ákoo* accompanies a previous statement. Notice that
what follows *'ákoo* is a result of the previous statement or action:

(14)   *nágo ma'yeí díík'eh kánáyóółndáaná'a.*
       'ákoo tséí si'ããyá nnáńmáázná'a.

Then Coyote licked it all off for him, so they say.
     And so the Rock rolled back to where it had been before, so they say.[40]

(15)   *nágo kaa'ígodeestíná'a.*
       bigha'isdzáń 'áiłndiná'a:
       " doonzhódago kaasití"yiiłndiná'a.
       "'aaí ditsi'óó'áí bikáyá téesk'eh shá'ágólá.
       'ákaadashisiłtee, "goołndiná'a.
       'ákoo bigha'isdzáńń'ákaa téesk'eh bá'ágólaaná'a.

Then he pretended to be sick, so they say.
     He spoke thus to his wife, so they say:
          "I am badly sick," he said to her, so they say.
               "Make me a bed on that tree that stands there.
               Put me up there," he said to her, so they say.
     And so his wife made a bed for him there, so they say.[41]

     Kenoi appears to use *'ákoo* to connect narrative units as a result of a pre-
vious action. Thus when Coyote licks clean the rock keeping him trapped in
a hole, the rock rolls away. Likewise, when Kenoi has Coyote tell his wife to do
something Kenoi uses *'ákoo* to signal that her action is a response to Coyote's

statements. To summarize this section, Kenoi uses *nágo* to separate narrative units, to show disjunctions, and *'ákoo* to indicate that the following action, whether by the same actor or not, is a result of what comes before, to show conjunctions. For Kenoi, *'ákoo* and *nágo* serve different rhetorical functions.

Other Rhetorical-Poetic Devices

Kenoi uses other rhetorical-poetic devices within his Coyote narratives, although the narrative enclitic and the initial particle *nágo* are the most common. In this section I outline four other rhetorical and poetic devices: (a) the use of formulaic phrases and words to indicate a specific genre, Coyote narratives; (b) Kenoi's reliance on quoted speech; (c) Kenoi's perpetuation of specific beliefs about language usage; and (d) Kenoi's use of twos and fours within his narratives.

Genre Marking Devices

Kenoi begins seven of the eight Coyote narratives with a form of the verb of motion *-gho* , and five of the seven begin with the progressive stem *-ghał*. Below I present all seven introductory lines:

(16) *mai 'íntin holgholná'a.*

   Coyote road progressive/to move/so they say
   Coyote was going along the road, so they say.[42]

(17) *ma'yeí 'íntin holgholná'a.*

   Coyote/aforementioned one road progressive/to move/so they say
   Coyote was going along the road, so they say.[43]

(18) *'íntin holgholná'a.*

   road progressive/to move/so they say
   He was going along the road, so they say.[44]

(19) *'íntin náánóolgholná'a.*

   road semeliterative/to move/so they say
   Once more he was going along the road, so they say.[45]

(20) *'áshí ndásá ch'énáánáálghoná'a.*

   and later on/semeliterative/to move/so they say
   And he went on once more, so they say.[46]

(21) *'áshí dáná'ntiná ch'énáánálghoná'a.*

   and very same/road on/semeliterative/to move/so they say
   And he once more went on the very same road, so they say.[47]

(22) *ma'ye 'íñtin hołghołná'a.*

> Coyote road progressive/to move/so they say
> Coyote was going along a road, so they say.[48]

Kenoi begins the eighth narrative, "Coyote Marries His Daughter," with Coyote living with his family. Parenthetically, not only is it the only Coyote story Kenoi tells without the verb of motion, but also the only story Kenoi tells in which Coyote dies. Indeed, I argue elsewhere that Coyote's death is a way for Kenoi to indicate his opinion of Coyote's behavior to Hoijer.[49]

Kenoi's use of the verb of motion *-gho* in the opening line of seven Coyote stories is the only constant. Both Coyote and the road are absent from at least one introductory line. Coyote stories are recognizable by Coyote's characteristic motion. Interestingly, in "Coyote Marries His Daughter," where Kenoi does not use a verb of motion Kenoi does explicitly mention Coyote by name. The verb of motion frames these narratives as Coyote stories, because Coyote is recognizable by his habitual motion. It connects the various Coyote narratives as a series of movements.

Kenoi also begins a number of his Coyote narratives with the initial particle *'áshí* 'and' (20 and 21). In these circumstances this particle seems to be used to connect narratives—to create a unified narrative sequence.

Kenoi also uses formulaic phrases. Two of the most common are standard Coyote utterances. Below I present two examples:

(23) *"ik'ah hisháɖ̃ágo naashá,"yiiłndiná'a.*

> "I eat only fat in order to live," he said to him, so they say. [50]

(24) *"ik'ah hisháɖ̃ágo naashá,"yiiłndiná'a.*

> "I eat only fat in order to live," he said to him, so they say.[51]

(25) *"mai bishke'!"*

> "Child of Coyote!"[52]

(26) *"mai bishke'!"*

> "Child of Coyote!"[53]

These formulaic statements by Coyote create a recognizable character, recognizable both by his habitual motion as well as by the very words he utters.[54]

Quoted Speech

Sam Kenoi's Coyote narratives rely heavily on dialogue (see examples 2a, 3a, and 10a). Quoted speech is obviously central to Coyote narratives. Many of Kenoi's Coyote narratives concern either Coyote or another character attempting to "con" or deceive the other. In his narratives, quoted speech is

often where the action is happening. Kenoi can also vary his characterizations of a given character by his use of quoted speech.[55] In "Coyote and Rock Lizard," Kenoi presents Coyote as inarticulate; this is in stark contrast to the verbally adroit Rock Lizard. In examples 27a and 27b, I present an exchange between Coyote and Rock Lizard.

(27a) Coyote and Rock Lizard, Chiricahua version[56]

"shoh, haastii, dooṅndii'édida. díí yábéyan'áí hónshtáꝛ   C
díí bidóóchigo, yáí nahk'izhi naakaa. haastii , ṅnáhiiyá.
ndída, nłtsó. doobiṅchídá. bidónchigo, ditsiní nan'óókéézgo,
yáí nahk'izhi naakaa. gółdzilgo hóṅtáꝛ'biłjindiná'a.

nágo ditsiní yaadaheesghalná'a.   D

ma'ishóⱦdlich'izhṅ 'ábiiłndiná'a.   E
     "'iłtsé. 'aashi łi' naajiyeestáꝛgoch'agoshchí. łashé
         nahádaajiiłtsó,"goołndiná'a.

ma'yeṅ "'ao,"ndiná'a.   10 F

(27b) Coyote and Rock Lizard, English version

"Say, Old man, don't be foolish. I'm holding this which holds the   C
sky. If I let go of this, the sky will fall down on us. Old man, I am
very tired. You, you hold it. Don't let go of it. If you let go of it, if the
tree falls over, the sky will fall on us. Hold it with all your strength,"
he said to Coyote, so they say.

Then he threw himself on the tree, so they say.   D

Rock Lizard spoke thus to him, so they say: E
"Wait, I'll let those who are sitting about over there know.
They will hold it on one side for us," he said to him, so they say.

Coyote, "Okay," he said, so they say.   10 F

Rock Lizard speaks in long sentences, while Coyote either responds in action or replies with a single word. In addition, Coyote's utterance in line 10 is not constructed the way Sam Kenoi normally relates quoted speech (see examples 2a, 3a, and 10a). Kenoi's standard word order here would be: *"ao," ma'yeṅ ndiná'a.* '"Okay," Coyote said, so they say,' or *ma'yeṅ ndiná'a: "ao," ndiná'a.* 'Coyote spoke thus, so they say: "Okay,"he said, so they say.' The unusual word order seems to heighten the sense of Coyote as inarticulate in this narrative, in contrast to the articulate Rock Lizard. Thus, Kenoi seems able to shift characterizations not just by what is in the quoted speech, but also in the very way he reports the quoted speech.

On the other hand, quoted thought is extremely rare in Sam Kenoi's Coyote narratives. In fact, in the eight narratives, quoted thought occurs only

twice. Kenoi quotes the thoughts of Coyote in "Coyote Holds Up the Sky"[57] and Coyote's daughter in "Coyote Marries His Own Daughter."[58] In "Coyote Holds Up the Sky" the use of quoted thought over quoted speech seems to highlight the inarticulateness of Coyote. Coyote's quoted thought is the longest statement by Coyote in the narrative; otherwise, he has responded to Rock Lizard by either an oddly constructed utterance or merely by action (see above). Kenoi's use of quoted thought allows us to understand what Coyote is looking for. Kenoi's use of quoted thought in "Coyote Marries His Own Daughter" also allows us to understand the daughter's intentions in searching her husband's head for a wart. Kenoi forms the quoted thoughts in the same way that he forms quoted speech. Below I present the two examples:

(28) *"xa'shíshí 'áxáánéshi nahagóñ'áshí?" ñzigo naagóñ'áí*
      hádees'íná'a.

   "Where is the nearest arroyo?" he thought as he looked for an arroyo, so
   they say.[59]

(29) *nágo 'áñ jeeke'ñ 'áyinziná'a:*
         "haashaᴣíyáabaaᴣiishígo dooda'dindihát'ída?" jíñzigo,
         dá'iɫxoshgo 'áshígo k'éshdeesghalná'a.

   Then that girl thought thus, so they say:
      "Let's see, why does he not allow me to put my hand on this side?" she
      thought glancing on that side as he slept, so they say.[60]

While quoted speech is quite common in Kenoi's narratives, Kenoi is less like-ly to quote what people are thinking.[61]

Ways of Speaking

A third rhetorical device is Kenoi's perpetuation or circulation of certain ideas about proper language usage. In examples 27a and 27b, Kenoi has Rock Lizard speak in an appropriate manner. Rock Lizard uses the nickname *haastii*, 'old man,' to refer to Coyote. This is a common nickname that was used to refer to Chiricahua Apache men and commonly for Coyote as well.[62] The use of this nickname, and nicknames in general in Chiricahua, reflects a general prefer-ence for not using a person's name in conversation.[63] One of Opler's consul-tants said: "'Old man' is not used like the English 'Mr.' We never would say 'old man' and then add a man's Chiricahua name. The word refers to age or is used so that the name of a person can be avoided."[64] This need to avoid using a per-son's name, considered impolite behavior among the Chiricahua, is thus coded by Kenoi in an ongoing narrative. It also is positively evaluated since Rock Lizard succeeds in his con. Likewise, Coyote's use of *haastii*, in (9), when attempting to deceive his wife also succeeds in part, it would seem, because Coyote speaks appropriately—that is, he uses 'old man,' the fourth-person pronominal, and the narrative enclitic as an epistemic distancing device. In this way, narratives become ways to circulate and reproduce beliefs about language.[65]

Likewise, in examples 3a and 3b Kenoi again perpetuates a specific linguistic ideology within an ongoing narrative. In Chiricahua the fourth-person pronoun is used when referring to individuals who are understood as "socially distant." This pronoun is most commonly used when referring to in-laws or to the deceased.[66] In stanzas D and E in Figure 2a, the mother uses the fourth-person subject pronoun *ji-* when referring to her husband, whom she believes to be dead. For example, line 21 *natjindin* (*nat-* 'to us' *ji-* 'one [fourth person]' *ndi-* 'to say' *n* 'past tense enclitic'). In contrast, the son, who believes his father to be alive, uses the third-person pronoun when referring to his father; *dábí* 'certainly him' (*dá-* 'certainly' *bí* 'him [third-person independent pronoun]'). Kenoi has both mother and son engaging in proper speech, given their beliefs about Coyote. Kenoi also signals the daughter's awareness that her husband is her father Coyote when she utters:

(30) *gomán 'áatjindiná'a:*
      "*shimá, 'ághán shitaann 'át'íi. bíntlashí soos ntsaaí baadasi'á. 'áibee dábí*
      'át'íi bégózi."gootndiná'a.

    She spoke thus to her mother, so they say:
      "My mother, that one is my father. A big wart lies on the side of his
      head. That shows that it is surely him," she said to her mother, so they
      say.[67]

The daughter's use of *dábí* 'surely him' is reminiscent of the son's use of the same form earlier in the narrative (see example 3a). Likewise, the daughter's use of *shitaa* 'my father' would be unacceptable if her father was, in fact, dead. Not only does she say that it is her father, but the pronominals she uses also indicate that she believes her father to be alive. They also connect her pronouncement back to her brother's assertion earlier in the narrative. We are reminded that if Coyote's wife would have listened to her son earlier in the narrative Coyote would not have been able to marry his own daughter. Thus, a culturally constituted way of speaking is reinforced within this narrative.

Numerical Constraints

A final rhetorical-poetic device Kenoi employed was his use of twos and fours. This is not surprising given the general Chiricahua belief that four is an important number symbolically.[68] Four has also been reported as an important symbolic number throughout the Southwest.[69] This usage also correlates with Hymes' statement that narratives tend to be numerically patterned along two general numerical patterns: twos and fours, and threes and fives.[70] For instance, in "Coyote and the White Men" Kenoi has two White Men protagonists, and in "Coyote Dances with the Prairie Dogs," the Mountain Lion puts back two prairie dogs. In "Coyote Marries His Daughter," Kenoi has Coyote tell his wife to give their daughter to the first man they meet carrying four prairie dogs.

    Events also tend to occur in twos and fours. In "Coyote Marries His Daughter," Kenoi has Coyote's son assert twice that he has seen his father. In

"Coyote and Rolling Rock," Coyote runs away from the Rolling Rock four times, and each time the Rolling Rock stays on his heels. Kenoi also has the prairie dogs, in "Coyote Dances with the Prairie Dogs," line up in two lines, using two narrative lines to do this. In "Coyote Dances with the Prairie Dogs," Coyote pretends to strike the dancing prairie dogs twice. However, the third swing is the real one. Coyote pretends to hit the prairie dogs twice, and then on the third swing he begins killing the prairie dogs. Thus, at a crucial moment in a narrative, Kenoi seems to focus on the event by marking it as the third time. Other times, Kenoi uses a three-line sequence to build to a final event. For example, in "Coyote Holds Up the Sky" Kenoi uses three verbs of seeing -*ga*ł 'to glance', -*'i* 'to look', -*tsa*ʃ'to see' in three consecutive lines. Coyote glances, looks, and finally sees an arroyo.

Rhetorical-Poetics in Chiricahua Apache Narratives

In the above sections I outlined a set of rhetorical-poetic features that Sam Kenoi used in narrating his Coyote stories to Harry Hoijer. In this section I will suggest which devices of Kenoi's narratives have a wider application to Chiricahua verbal art and specifically Coyote stories. This analysis is based on the narrative tradition at the time that Kenoi told these Coyote stories to Hoijer.[71] I also make a few comparative statements that connect Kenoi's narratives to other Southern Athapaskan Coyote narrative traditions.

I have suggested that Kenoi used the narrative enclitic -*ná'a* to segment lines due to the superabundance of its usage. The use of the narrative enclitic in Chiricahua as a line-marking device also correlates with Basso and Tessay's discussion of a Western Apache narrative told by Joseph Hoffman to Hoijer in the 1930s.[72] In Hoffman's narrative, a passage final-verb particle indicated the smallest textual units.[73] In Kenoi's Coyote stories, the narrative enclitic also indicated that the events in these narratives were not known firsthand by Kenoi. This is similar to the use of *jiní* 'they say' in Navajo, which also acts as a rhetorical way to express that the events being recounted are not from one's own primary knowledge.[74] Finally, the narrative enclitic, because it is common in other narratives told by other narrators, also indexed that a specific speech event was occurring,[75] in contrast to those genres, the songs of the Girl's Puberty ceremony for example, that do not use the narrative enclitic. Its relative frequency in other narratives by other narrators as well as the use of narrative particles by other Southern Athapaskan languages and narrators also suggests that the narrative enclitic was a part of a larger Chiricahua rhetorical-poetic structuring.

The distribution of the narrative enclitic versus a passage final verb of speaking, such as the Navajo *jiní*, in Southern Athapaskan languages is intriguing. I have examined a number of Coyote stories in their original languages—Navajo,[76] Mescalero,[77] San Carlos,[78] Jicarilla,[79] and White Mountain Apache[80]—and have found a narrative enclitic or verb of saying used in a similar fashion as that used in Chiricahua. In Jicarilla Apache Pliny Goddard never translates the narrative enclitic, -*na*. However, Sandoval reports the narrative enclitic as -*ná* and translates it as 'that's how it is told.'[81] In an oral his-

tory of the Lipan Apache, told to Hoijer by Augustina Zuazua in Lipan, Zuazua employs a narrative enclitic -ná 'they say' at various points in her narrative to highlight that some of what she is recounting is hearsay.[82] However, in the only Coyote story collected by Hoijer in Lipan from Lisandro Mendez, the narrative enclitic is conspicuously absent.[83] In Mescalero Apache the narrative enclitic -ná'a 'they say' appears consistently.[84]

However, in White Mountain Apache (Western Apache) the verb 'to say' tc'indidn' appears, which Goddard translates as 'they say.'[85] Among the San Carlos Apache (Western Apache) the verb 'to say' tc'inin' appears, which Goddard translates as 'they say.'[86] Among the Navajo one finds the verb 'to say' jiní 'they say' used.[87] According to Young and Morgan, there is no comparable narrative enclitic in Navajo.[88] It seems that one could group Jicarilla, Chiricahua, Mescalero, and perhaps Lipan together since they use a narrative enclitic: -ná and −ná'a. On a similar basis, one could group Navajo, White Mountain, and San Carlos together for their consistent use of a verba dicendi (verb of saying) that is analyzable as such—it has a recognizable morphology as a verb of speaking with an attendant fourth-person subject pronominal (ji- fourth person, -ní 'to say'). More research needs to be done to understand the distribution of the narrative enclitic versus the use of a verba dicendi.

Kenoi's use of nágo and his distinguishing it from 'ákoo is not as straightforward as the wider applicability of the narrative enclitic. For example, in Lawrence Mithlo's "Coyote Obtains Fire,"[89] Mithlo appears to use 'ákoo more frequently than Sam Kenoi does, and he seems to use it in a manner similar to Kenoi's use of nágo. Certainly Kenoi created larger meaningful discourse units by his use of nágo. However, this and his different rhetorical usages of 'ákoo may be part of Kenoi's unique verbal artistry. Kenoi also uses the initial particle 'áshí as a connective particle across narratives. However, again, other narrators may have marshaled these linguistic devices and poetic resources for other rhetorical purposes.

Kenoi's use of twos and fours probably fits into a larger Chiricahua rhetorical-poetic structure due to the general Chiricahua belief about the importance of such numbers. For example, many of the events at the Girl's Puberty Ceremony center on the number four; things tend to happen four times.[90] Whether or not other narrators relied as heavily on two over four, as did Kenoi, is a question open to empirical investigation. I also have suggested that Kenoi sometimes used a pattern of three at crucial moments in the narrative—striking prairie dogs. More work needs to be done to understand how and to what extent the use of numerical patterns interacted with other rhetorical-poetic features. It does seem suggestive that Kenoi used three as the marked form and therefore draws attention to those events. Two and four are expected, with three indicating a marked occurrence.

The use of quoted speech is a common narrative device in a number of North and South American oral traditions.[91] The extensive use of quoted speech is also an indicator of "performance."[92] Kenoi seems to have been able to adjust characterizations by his emphasis on quoted speech. Coyote can be verbally adroit in one narrative, "Coyote and the White Men," and verbally inept in another, "Coyote and Rock Lizard." It is not surprising that in the former Coyote succeeds in his con, while in the latter Coyote is portrayed as an easy dupe for

Rock Lizard. The creative deployment of quoted speech, along with Kenoi's use
of nicknames and the fourth-person pronominal, seems to correlate with a sen-
timent about the importance of proper language use that has been widely
remarked on for Navajo, a related Southern Athapaskan language, and, to some
extent, Chiricahua.[93] Or as Lawrence Mithlo told Harry Hoijer, "*doodá'ákoyáx-
aanbich'iyájiłtida*" 'one did not say just anything to someone.'[94]

Kenoi's use of the verb of motion *-gho* in the opening line of a number of
his narratives correlates with a pattern in Navajo that has been commented on
by Toelken and Scott and Midgette.[95] Midgette calls Coyote's habitual motion
a "recurring trope."[96] Toelken and Scott have suggested that in Navajo Coyote
stories Coyote be understood to have always been "trotting."[97] That Kenoi's
Chiricahua Apache Coyote narratives would also identify Coyote by his habit-
ual motion is, therefore, not surprising.

What is surprising, compared to Navajo Coyote narratives, is the relative
"placeless-ness" of these narratives. Within Kenoi's Coyote narratives no localized
topographical features are named. In this respect, Kenoi's narratives are remi-
niscent of Bakhtin's notion of "the chronotope of the road."[98] Coyote travels
along a road, but this road traverses an abstract world not grounded in localized
topographical features. This is in contrast to the Navajo Coyote stories told by
Yellowman[99] and Curly Tó Aheedlíínii[100] which, while using the motifs of move-
ment and the road, are often explicitly placed in localized topographical places
via descriptive place-names. In fact much recent work on Athapaskan place-
names and moral narratives has suggested how important place-names are and
how intimately they are related to creating a "moral relationship with the
land."[101] One possible explanation for the relative "placeless-ness" within Kenoi's
Coyote narratives would be to look at the history of Sam Kenoi and the
Chiricahua Apache diaspora. Between 1886 and 1913 the United States govern-
ment forcibly moved the Chiricahua Apache and Sam Kenoi from their tradi-
tional homeland in Arizona to St. Augustine, Florida, then to Fort Marion,
Alabama, then to Fort Sill, Oklahoma, and finally to the Mescalero Reservation,
New Mexico. Coyote's relative placeless-ness may reflect Kenoi's displacement.
However, while it is a placeless world disconnected, as it were, from a localized
geography, it is a familiar world in the sense that the beliefs, norms, and values
found in the narratives were familiar and interpretable as such to Chiricahuas.
In fact, I have suggested that Coyote stories were one way to circulate and rein-
force culturally constituted ways of speaking and behaving.

CONCLUSIONS

This research supports the idea that Native American oral traditions should
be regarded as literature. It seems untenable to argue that oral narratives
were simply ways to pass on knowledge. They did, but they also were creative
products of individuals in real-time interactions. Oral narratives are highly
structured and creative literary accomplishments. To dismiss this fact is to
ignore or deny entire literary traditions from the Ojibwa of the Eastern
Woodlands to the Tillamook of the North Pacific to the Koasati of the
Southeast to the Chiricahua of the Southwest. Different narrators tell differ-

ent stories using different rhetorical-poetic devices at their disposal. These devices are often language-specific and historically contingent. They are evaluated according to the narrative standards circulated among a group.[102] Different Native American literary traditions have different rhetorical-poetic devices at their disposal, and these narratives are judged by specific narrative standards, whether they are Ojibwa, Koasati, or Chiricahua. One should not make the mistake of treating all Native American oral literature together; Native American literary traditions are diverse and should be treated with respect. Each tradition should be analyzed individually and only then should comparative work be done. What plays in Ojibwa narratives may not play by Chiricahua aesthetic standards.

Let me add that I do not mean to privilege Western notions of literature and in so doing appropriate oral literature into written literature. Instead I wish to broaden our understanding of the notion of literature. To argue that literature must be written is to make an *a priori* assessment of what is literature. I see no need to do this. Rather, I would suggest that literature is an ideological position.[103] Although Western literary traditions are based on written texts, this is neither natural nor necessary.[104] The Chiricahua "literary tradition," a tradition worth perpetuating and displaying, is and has been based on oral performances—on practice as opposed to product.[105] What is needed, then, is to expand the notion of literature away from the fetish of the written text and to approach literature as an ideological privileging of given kinds of narrative traditions—be they written or oral. That is to assess "literary traditions" and "literature" as practices enmeshed in larger discursive traditions and social practices and not as objectified products.

This research also builds on the work of ethnopoetics by paying attention to the dialogic nature of the linguistic elicitation session between Hoijer and Kenoi.[106] I have been concerned with the real-time moment of narration that occurred between two social individuals. Hoijer was not simply a passive audience in these narrative events, but was part of the co-construction of these narratives. Kenoi told the stories to Hoijer, and between the two of them these narratives were fashioned and something of that dialogic moment can also be recovered from these "artifacted" texts, for example, the moments when Sam Kenoi breaks from the narrative frame and addresses Hoijer, providing clarification or emphasis to his audience. These texts are not solely monologues; there is also a dialogic component here as well. We need to discard the illusion of staticness and approach these narratives as interactions in a prior here and now.

In conclusion, this paper has been a first step in understanding the ethnohistory of Chiricahua ethnopoetics; more work needs to be done. During Hoijer's fieldwork on the Mescalero Apache Reservation in the 1930s, he collected Coyote stories from narrators of all three Apache dialects there (Chiricahua, Lipan, and Mescalero). Little has been done with the published texts and virtually nothing has been done with Hoijer's unpublished notebooks.[107] Work needs to be done to understand how people interwove the narrative traditions of these three groups, to understand the "ethnohistory of communication."[108] For instance, did all narrators on the Mescalero Apache

Reservation use the narrative enclitic as regularly as Sam Kenoi? Did different narrative styles index different tribal affiliations (e.g., Lipan versus Mescalero)? Here the limits of English-only translations become apparent. For many of these, rhetorical-poetic devices were not presented in Opler's collections of Lipan, Chiricahua, or Mescalero texts.[109] Historical reconstruction that has been based on the content of English-only texts needs to be rethought in light of an understanding of Apache rhetoric and poetics. The texts in their original languages must be analyzed and compared to understand how language structure interacted with narrative structure and sociolinguistic factors such as indexing of group affiliation. Finally, we need to understand that Chiricahua oral literature is a living tradition and that Kenoi's narrative voice is a part of the "genealogy" of that narrative tradition.[110] Future work needs to be done to understand how Chiricahua narrators use poetic resources and narrative traditions today. In effect, entire Apachean literary traditions await exploration.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

NOTES

1.   This paper owes a great debt to Harry Hoijer (1904–1976), for it is precisely Hoijer's thorough understanding of the Apache languages and his attention to transcription that allows later anthropologists like myself to return to these texts. The Chiricahua now reside around Fort Sill, Oklahoma and on the Mescalero Apache Reservation in New Mexico, and the language is dying. This paper is dedicated to reviving interest in the Chiricahua Apache people and language. Chiricahua Apache is a Southern Athapaskan language closely related to Mescalero and Western Apache and more distantly to Navajo, Jicarilla, Kiowa-Apache, and Lipan Apache. I follow the standard Athapaskan orthography with these distinctions: For vowels I use the following: a = oral; a꜔ nasal. á = high tone; a = low tone. Voiceless alveolar lateral = ł Voiceless velar fricative = x. ń is a syllabic nasal with high tone. ' is a glottal stop. j = [j]; gh = a voiced velar fricative; ch = a voiceless aspirated palatal affricate; and sh = a voiceless alveopalatal fricative. In updating Hoijer's orthography I have not attempted to represent the phonological changes that have occurred in Chiricahua Apache since Hoijer did his fieldwork in the 1930s. Much future work is required to understand the ways in which Chiricahua Apache has changed during the last sixty years. My primary goal in updating the orthography has been to make the Apache texts more accessible to Apache readers. The orthography I use is similar to the current orthography used by the Mescalero Apache Tribe.

2.   See Dell Hymes, *In Vain I Tried to Tell You* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania

University Press, 1981); Dennis Tedlock, *The Spoken Word and the Work of Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press, 1983); William Bright, *American Indian Linguistics and Literature* (Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, 1984); Joel Sherzer and Anthony Woodbury, eds., *Native American Discourse: Poetics and Rhetoric* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); and Brian Swann, ed., *Coming To Light* (New York: Vintage Press, 1994).

3.   See Dell Hymes, "Language, Memory, and Selective Performance: Cultee's 'Salmon Myth' as Twice Told to Boas," *Journal of American Folklore* 98:390 (1985): 391–434; and Michael Silverstein, "The Secret Life of Texts," in *Natural Histories of Discourse*, eds. Michael Silverstein and Greg Urban (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996): 81–105.

4.   Morris Opler, "A Chiricahua Apache's Account of the Geronimo Campaign of 1886,"*New Mexico Historical Review* 13 (1938): 362; see also Gillet Griswold, *The Fort Sill Apaches: Their Vital Statistics, Tribal Origins, Antecedents* (Fort Sill, OK: U.S. Army Field Artillery and Fort Still Museum, 1958–1962) for a different date of birth.

5.   See Harry Hoijer, *Chiricahua and Mescalero Apache Texts* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938).

6.   For early clear statements of Hymes' approach, see Dell Hymes, "Particle, Pause, and Pattern in American Indian Verse," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 4:4 (1980): 7–51; and Hymes, *In Vain.* For work that builds on Hymes, see Geoffrey Kimball, "Koasati Narrator and Narrative," in *New Voices In Native American Literary Criticism*, ed. Arnold Krupat (Washington, DC: Smithsonian, 1993), 3–35; Ridie Ghezzi, "Ojibwe Storytelling," in Krupat, *New Voices*, 37–76; and Paul Kroeber, "Rhetorical Structure of a Kalispel Narrative," *Anthropological Linguistics* 37:2 (1995): 119–140.

7.   Greg Sarris, *Keeping Slug Woman Alive* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 38.

8.   Roman Jakobson, "Concluding Statement," in *Style in Language*, ed. Thomas Sebeok (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1960), 350–373.

9.   Hymes, *In Vain*; Tedlock, *The Spoken Word.*

10.   This discussion builds on Greg Urban, *A Discourse Centered Approach to Language and Culture* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1991), 17. Furthermore, I do not mean to imply that Hoijer was unconcerned with the relationship between language and culture; that was certainly not the case. See Harry Hoijer, "Cultural Implications of some Navaho Linguistic Categories," *Language* 27 (1951): 111–120; and Harry Hoijer, "The Relation of Language to Culture," in *Anthropology Today*, ed. A. L. Kroeber (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), 554–573.

11.   See Paul Kroskrity, "Growing with Stories: Line, Verse, and Genre in an Arizona Tewa Text," *Journal of Anthropological Research* 41 (1985): 183–199; Anthony Woodbury, "The Function of Rhetorical Structure: A Study of Central Alaskan Yupik Eskimo Discourse," *Language in Society* 14 (1985): 153–190.

12.   Hoijer, *Chiricahua*, 19–27.

13.   Ibid., 82.

14.   Ibid., 88

15.   Ibid., 19.

16.   The narrative lines are represented according to the sentence and clause final enclitic. Larger units are partitioned according to Kenoi's use of the initial particle *nágo* (to be discussed below) as well as other stylistic and thematic devices. I describe

this in Anthony Webster, "Sam Kenoi's Coyote Stories: An Ethnopoetic Analysis of Some Chiricahua Narratives," (M.A. thesis, New Mexico State University, 1997). Complete ethnopoetic versions with explanations about the various notations can be found in Webster, "Sam Kenoi's," 118–196.

17.   Joel Sherzer, "Modes of Representation and Translation of Native American Discourse: Examples from the San Blas Kuna," in *On the Translation of Native American Literatures,* ed. Brian Swann (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Press, 1992), 426–440; and Joel Sherzer, "Transcreating Culture and Poetics," in *The Life of Language,* eds. Jane Hill, P.J. Mistry, and Lyle Campbell (Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, 1997), 355–368.

18.   This practice is similar to Keith Basso and Nashley Tessay Sr., "Joseph Hoffman's 'The Birth of He Triumphs Over Evils': A Western Apache Origin Story," in *Coming To Light,* ed. Brian Swann (New York: Vintage Books, 1994), 638.

19.   Hoijer, *Chiricahua,* 18–19.

20.   Ibid., 25–27.

21.   Ibid., 23.

22.   Ibid., 23–24.

23.   I borrow the notion of "artifacted" from Silverstein, "The Secret Life," 82.

24.   Because Chiricahua Apache can have a pronominal subject prefix on the verb or the subject argument can be embedded within the verb structure, Kenoi does not have to include Coyote explicitly. See Hoijer, *Chiricahua.* These "headless" constructions are common within Kenoi's narratives. However, they can make the subject of a sentence or line ambiguous, especially to a non-Native speaker such as Hoijer. There are paralinguistic devices that would serve to clarify who was speaking. For instance, in a Mescalero Coyote narrative told by Charles Smith, he states, "When this text was told, the informant pronounced all the -a- vowels of this sentence with an -w- timbre to imitate the quality of Owl's voice (193)." Hoijer, *Chiricahua,* 193. Grenville Goodwin, *Myths and Tales of the White Mountain Apache,* Memoirs of American Folk-Lore Society, Vol. 33. (New York: J. J. Augustin, 1939), 190 n. 2, points out that among the White Mountain Apache, Coyote takes a highly *nasalized* voice that White Mountain Apaches associate with Chiricahua Apaches. That is, according to Goodwin's White Mountain consultants, *Coyote talks like a Chiricahua Apache.* See also Barre Toelken and Tacheeni Scott, "Poetic Retranslation and the 'Pretty Languages' of Yellowman," in *Traditional Literatures of the American Indians,* ed. Karl Kroeber (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1981), 83, for a discussion of Coyote's voice among the Navajo. See also William Bright, *A Coyote Reader* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993) on Coyote's voice. See Edward Sapir, "Abnormal Types of Speech in Nootka," in *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir,* ed. David Mandelbaum (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1949), 179–196; Dell Hymes, "How to Talk Like a Bear in Takelma," *International Journal of American Linguistics* 45 (1979): 101–106; and Anthony Woodbury, "Meaningful Phonological Processes: A Consideration of Central Alaskan Yupik Eskimo Prosody," *Language* 63:4 (1987): 685–740 on sound symbolism.

25.   Hoijer, *Chiricahua,* 21.

26.   Morris Opler, "Ethnological Notes," in Hoijer, *Chiricahua,* 143.

27.   Hoijer, *Chiricahua,* 25.

28.   David French, "Comparative Notes on Chiricahua Apache Mythology," in *Myths and Tales of the Chiricahua Apache Indians,* Memoirs of the American Folk-lore Society, vol. 37, ed. Morris Opler (Menasha, WI: George Banta, 1942), 107.

29.   Hoijer, *Chiricahua,* 17–18.

30. Ibid., 48–52.

31. Ibid., 45–47.

32. Ibid., 23.

33. Ibid., 26.

34. Ibid., 21.

35. Ibid., 23.

36. Ibid., 25.

37. Ibid., 26.

38. Hymes, *In Vain.*

39. For Navajo, Robert Young and William Morgan, *The Navajo Language* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1987), 23, translate *'ákoo* as 'so, so that, so then.' For Mescalero, Evelyn Breuninger, Elbys Hugar, Ellen Ann Lathan, and Scott Rushforth, *Mescalero Apache Dictionary* (Mescalero, NM: Mescalero Apache Tribe, 1982), 29, translate *'ákuu* as 'then, and then.' My translation is closer to Young and Morgan's, but Lawrence Mithlo, another Chiricahua, seems to use *'ákoo* in a manner that would be closer to Breuninger, et al. The distinction is essentially between a sequential particle (*nágo*) and a causal or what I have called a resultative particle (*'ákoo*). I would like to thank Andrew Wiget for suggesting this term.

40. Hoijer, *Chiricahua,* 20–21.

41. Ibid., 25.

42. Ibid., 18.

43. Ibid., 19.

44. Ibid., 19.

45. Ibid., 20.

46. Ibid., 21.

47. Ibid., 21.

48. Ibid., 22.

49. For a fuller discussion of this narrative, see Anthony Webster, "Sam Kenoi's 'Coyote Marries His Own Daughter': Harry Hoijer and the Interactional Text," Unpublished manuscript in author's possession. See also Webster, "Sam Kenoi's."

50. Hoijer, *Chiricahua,* 19.

51. Ibid., 21–22.

52. Ibid., 20.

53. Ibid., 19.

54. For a review of the characteristics that Coyote shares across various narrative traditions see Bright, *Coyote Reader.*

55. See Kroeber, "Rhetorical Structure," for an analogous Kalispel example.

56. Hoijer, *Chiricahua,* 21–22.

57. Ibid.

58. Ibid., 25–27.

59. Ibid., 22.

60. Ibid., 26.

61. For comparative purposes, see Gary Witherspoon, *Language and Art in the Navajo Universe* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1977), on the importance of speech and thought among some Navajo.

62. Morris Opler, *An Apache Life-way* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941), 429–432.

63. Opler, *An Apache Life-way*, 430–431.

64. Ibid., 432.

65. For the implications of this kind of discursive circulation, see Urban, *A Discourse.*

66. Morris Opler, "An Outline of Chiricahua Apache Social Organization," in *Social Anthropology of North American Indian Tribes*, ed. Fred Eggan (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937), 214–223. Hoijer, *Chiricahua*, 72.

67. Hoijer, *Chiricahua*, 26.

68. Opler, *An Apache Life-way*, 116, 262–263.

69. Witherspoon, *Language.*

70. Hymes, *In Vain.*

71. See Opler, *An Apache Life-way*, 35, 197,438–439; Opler, *Myths and Tales of the Chiricahua*; and Webster, "Sam Kenoi's," 85–98.

72. Basso and Tessay, "Joseph Hoffman's," 638.

73. Ibid.

74. On the use of *jiní*, see Toelken and Scott, "Poetic Retranslation," 92–93; and O.F.M. Berard Haile, *Navajo Coyote Tales* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984).

75. See Woodbury, "The Function"; and Anthony Woodbury, "Rhetorical Structure in a Central Alaskan Yupik Eskimo Traditional Narrative," in *Native American Discourse*, eds. Joel Sherzer and Anthony Woodbury (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

76. Edward Sapir and Harry Hoijer, *Navajo Texts* (Iowa City: Whitney Linguistic Series, 1942); Haile, *Navajo Coyote.*

77. Hoijer, *Chiricahua.*

78. Pliny Earle Goddard, *San Carlos Apache Texts*, Anthropological Papers, vol. 24 part 3 (New York: American Museum of Natural History, 1919).

79. Pliny Earle Goddard, *Jicarilla Apache Texts*, Anthropological Papers, vol. 8. (New York: American Museum of Natural History, 1911).

80. Pliny Earle Goddard, *White Mountain Apache Texts*, Anthropological Papers, vol. 24 part 4 (New York: American Museum of Natural History, 1920).

81. Merton Sandoval, "The Syntactic Function of the Yi-/Bi- Alternation in Jicarilla Apache," *Coyote Papers*, vol. 5, ed. Stuart Davis (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1984),163.

82. Harry Hoijer, "The History and Customs of the Lipan, as told by Augustina Zuazua," *Linguistics* 161 (1975): 5–38.

83. Harry Hoijer, *Lipan Apache Texts*, Unpublished notebook from 1938 housed at the American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, PA. I have analyzed this narrative in Anthony Webster, "Lisandro Mendez's 'Coyote and Deer': On Reciprocity, Interactions, and Narrative Structures," Unpublished manuscript in author's possession.

84. Hoijer, *Chiricahua.*

85. Goddard, *White Mountain.*

86. Goddard, *San Carlos.*

87. Sapir and Hoijer, *Navajo*; and Haile, *Navajo Coyote.*

88. Young and Morgan, *The Navajo Language*,17–23.

89. Hoijer, *Chiricahua*, 17–18.

90. Opler, *An Apache Life-way*, 116, 127, 130.

91.   For a sampling of the use of quoted speech, see Hymes, *In Vain*; Tedlock, *The Spoken Word*; William Bright, "Coyote's Journey," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 4:1-2 (1980): 21–48; Bright, *American Indian*; Sherzer and Woodbury, *Native American Discourse*, Joel Sherzer, *Verbal Art in San Blas* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); Kimball, "Koasati"; and Kroeber, "Rhetorical Structure."

92.   My thinking on performance has been stimulated by Hymes, *In Vain*; Richard Bauman, *Story, Performance, and Event* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986); and the earlier work of Melville Jacobs, *The Content and Style of an Oral Literature*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959).

93.   On Navajo, see Witherspoon, *Language and Art*; Barre Toelken, "Life and Death in the Navajo Coyote Tales," in *Recovering the Word*, ed. Brian Swann and Arnold Krupat (Berkelely: University of California Press, 1987); and Paul Zolbrod, "Navajo Poetry in Print and in the Field, in *On the Translation of Native American Literatures*, ed.," Brian Swann (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institute, 1992), 242–256. On Chiricahua Apache, see Hoijer, *Chiricahua*; and Opler, *An Apache Life-way*. Webster, "Sam Kenoi's," offers a summary of the Chiricahua literature.

94.   Hoijer, *Chiricahua*, 18.

95.   Toelken and Scott, "Poetic Retranslation"; and Sally Midgette, "The Navajo Progressive in Discourse Context: A Study in Temporal Semantics" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1988).

96.   Midgette, "The Navajo Progressive," 129.

97.   Toelken and Scott, "Poetic Retranslation," 105.

98.   M.M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. M. Holquist, trans. M. Holquist and C. Emerson (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), 98.

99.   Toelken and Scott, "Poetic Retranslation."

100.   Haile, *Navajo Coyote*.

101.   Keith Basso, *Wisdom Sits In Places* (Albuquerque, University of New Mexico Press, 1996), 67. Basso's work on Western Apache place-names has stimulated a variety of research on Athapaskan place-naming practices and their connections to narratives and notions of place. For other discussions of the importance of Athapaskan place-names ranging from Northern Athapaskan to Pacific Coast Athapaskan, see James Kari, "Some principles of Alaskan Athabaskan toponymic knowledge," in *General and Amerindian Ethnolinguistics*, eds. Mary Ritchie Key and Henry Hoenigswald (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1989), 129–149; Julie Cruikshank, "'Getting the Words Right': Perspectives on Naming and Places in Athapaskan Oral History," *Arctic Anthropology* 27:1 (1990): 52–65; and James Collins, *Understanding Tolowa History* (New York: Routledge, 1998), 133–162.

102.   See Kimball, "Koasati"; Kathleen Danker, "Because of this I am Called the Foolish One," in *New Voices in Native American Literary Criticism*, ed. Arnold Krupat (Washington, DC: Smithsonian, 1993), 505–523; and Sarris, *Keeping Slug Woman*, for "Native" Native American literary criticism. More generally, see also Arnold Krupat, *New Voices in Native American Literary Criticism*, which contains, among others, a number of thoughtful articles by Native American scholars.

103.   Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977).

104.   Nor have all "writers" seen writing as wholly divorced from speaking. Perhaps the classic example is from Laurence Sterne, *The Life & Opinions of Tristram Shandy*,

Gent. (1759–1767; New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1950), 93; "Writing, when properly managed (as you may be sure I think mine is), is but a different name for conversation."

105. For the importance of this distinction, see Raymond Williams, *Problems in materialism and culture* (London: Verso, 1980); and Steve Caton, *"Peaks of Yemen I Summon": Poetry as Cultural Practice in a Northern Yemeni Tribe* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990). On literature as "kept language," see Donald Bahr, Lloyd Paul, and Vincent Joseph, *Ants and Orioles: Showing the Art of Pima Poetry* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1997), 174.

106. On the importance of the dialogic, see, of course, Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination.*

107. See, however, Scott Rushforth, "Uses of Bearlake and Mescalero (Athapaskan) Classificatory Verbs," *International Journal of American Linguistics* 57:2 (1991): 251–266, for an insightful analysis of the creative and discursive uses of classificatory verb stems in Charles Smith's "Coyote and Blue Bunting" in Hoijer, *Chiricahua.*

108. Michael Silverstein, "Encountering Languages and Languages of Encounter," *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 6:2 (1996): 126–144.

109. For Lipan see Morris Opler, *Myths and Legends of the Lipan Apache Indians,* Memoirs of the American Folk-lore Society, vol. 36. (New York: J.J. Augustin, 1940). For Chiricahua, see Opler, *Myths and Tales of the Chiricahua.* On Mescalero, see Morris Opler, "The Slaying of the Monsters, a Mescalero Apache Myth," *El Palacio* 53 (1945): 215– 225, 242–258; and Morris Opler, "The Creative Role of Shamanism in Mescalero Apache Mythology," *Journal of American Folklore* 59:233 (1946): 268–281.

110. On the notion of a "genealogy" of a narrative tradition, see Hymes, *In Vain,* 131.