

The plot of the case history traces out connections that make human actions intelligible as the expression of individual character. But this connection is neither one of logical implication nor one of chronological sequence. It is important to not that, unlike a proposition or conclusion that can be detached from its argument, the meaning embodied in the narrative form of the story cannot be replaced by some other kind of account. Although a story may be said to have a point that can be stated independently of the narrative, we generally recognize that the point becomes platitudinous unless it returns us to the story for another reading.

-- Steven Goldberg, Two Patterns of Rationality in Freud's Writings

The quotation above comes from a narratological discussion of psychoanalytic case history, and it claims to identify a degree of interrelatedness between narrative form, characterization and meaning that is unique to the case history. The notion of story not as a vehicle of meaning but as constitutive of meaning is I think fundamental not only to case history but to Lushootseed oral tradition as well. I think we see it played out whenever the children rescued from the Basket Lady or the seal hunters brought home on the back of a whale then recount in some detail the story of what has happened to them, needlessly, modern audiences are tempted to think, repeating the story that the storyteller has just told. I think we see it played out also in the coexistence of incompatible versions of the "same" story and of the same "archetypal" characters.

From whatever quantity of Mink stories there were in ancestral days, possibly two dozen have come down to us today. As we go through them, seeing how they speak to each other, we are forced to recognize that it is not possible to draw a composite portrait of Mink by collecting all that is said about him and putting it together. All that is said of him does not go together. The Junior Mink of Hagan Sam's "Little Mink and His Little Younger Cousin Tetyika" as he displays himself in relation to the Whale does not have the spiritual gifts that enable him to be engaged as he is with *duk<sup>w</sup>ibəɬ* in

Martha Lamont's "Mink and Changer." The Mink who begins to cannibalize his half-Deer son by chewing away one ear and then continues by shoving a stick into him and roasting him alive (Lucy Williams' "Mink and Deer Woman") is not an older version of the boy about whom his grandmother disgustedly says (in the somewhat antique English of William Shelton's "Mink and his Brother" as rendered by Herman Haeblerin), "I should not be surprised if that foolish boy has killed his little brother Tetiska." Even though all of the stories concern Mink's ability to obtain food, what they say even about that single aspect of his character is not reducible to a single declaration. (This is why the notion of "archetype" fails to work when it is applied to characters in specific traditional tellings of stories.) Efforts to combine all versions of a story into a single master version fail to recognize that when you extract a plot incident from its setting as one of a mutually reflective pair or denude it of the circular structure by means of which it is delivered to the audience's consideration, then you have made it something about which the narrative tradition no longer has anything to say. In the same way, translations that proceed from sentence to sentence, considering each one as a separate problem, create documents from which the story has somehow vanished.

In this paper, we will look at Martha Lamont's "Mink and Changer" to see how Lushootseed tradition supplies the tools for crafting a narrative whose meaning is not detachable from its form. It needs to be said, however, "Mink and Changer" is only the first part of a longer narrative in which Martha tells about several other people's encounters with *duk<sup>w</sup>ibəɬ*; and so the aspect of meaning that "Mink and Changer" has as the initial move in a collection (its function in the story, as opposed to its utility to me in this essay about its narrative anatomy) is not represented in the following discussion.

Lushootseed oral tradition puts at the disposal of its practitioners rhetorical strategies by means of which they can organize and direct the reflective activities of the audience as it listens for meaning. The fact that it is looking back at the narrative that enables us to appreciate it in its unfolding is mirrored in the fact that the chief medium of traditional rhetorical strategies is repetition. By the storyteller's use of such artifices as hermeneutic dyads, pattern episodes, chiasmic structures and keywording, events are not merely told, but revealed in patterns that invite examination and remembering.

Of the 134 lines of Martha Lamont's "Mink and Changer" (as lineated by the editor of Lushootseed Texts, 1996) only a passage of six lines is not paralleled elsewhere in the story at the level of event, rhetorical structure or diction; but even this little passage itself forms part of the core of an inclusio. The density of the story's display of traditional narrative resources allows us not only to identify these resources, but also to see how they are used for performing such functions as evaluation

and characterization and for creating such textures as humor, irony, pathos and suspense.

The story concerns Mink, who steals food that is cooking on the campfire of an old man who is asleep.  $\text{duk}^w\text{ib}\text{e}\text{t}$ , the Changer, then steals food from Mink's fire while he is sleeping. To get even, Mink tricks  $\text{duk}^w\text{ib}\text{e}\text{t}$  twice into mistaking piss for water and drinking it. In response,  $\text{duk}^w\text{ib}\text{e}\text{t}$  changes Mink into an animal. Though this is a story about a pair of characters who do similar things -- stealing and getting even -- it is a more complicated structure than a story, such as Martha Lamont's "Pheasant and Raven," that shows characters who are the opposite of each other and who demonstrate their difference in parallel episodes that reverse one another. And though this is a  $\text{duk}^w\text{ib}\text{e}\text{t}$  story that ends as usual in somebody's being reduced from myth-age polymorph to modern day niche-occupant, it is not at all like the typical tale in which  $\text{duk}^w\text{ib}\text{e}\text{t}$  arrives, asks, "What are you doing?" and then condemns the person to the performance of an animal, vegetable or mineral version of that activity forever. In Martha Lamont's "Mink and Changer," the tale-type ( $\text{duk}^w\text{ib}\text{e}\text{t}$  story) and the structure-type (a pair of protagonists in parallel episodes) are combined, complicated, and extended to form a prismatic narrative of which it can be said that the more one pays attention to it, the more it seems to be about.

Schematically, the story can be described as having three parts: the two thefts of food, Mink's piss trick, and  $\text{duk}^w\text{ib}\text{e}\text{t}$ 's changing of Mink. These sections may be described in the light of differing evaluations, as in the following examples: 1)  $\text{duk}^w\text{ib}\text{e}\text{t}$  pays Mink back for stealing food from an old man; Mink takes revenge;  $\text{duk}^w\text{ib}\text{e}\text{t}$  punishes him; or 2)  $\text{duk}^w\text{ib}\text{e}\text{t}$  decides to engage this clever Mink, about whom he has already heard, in a game; Mink wins two rounds of the game; it is in the nature of his power that  $\text{duk}^w\text{ib}\text{e}\text{t}$  is too jealous of his own position in the world to let this go on, so he ends the game; or 3)  $\text{duk}^w\text{ib}\text{e}\text{t}$ , lonely in his assigned role of punisher, seeks the company of one who is enough of a supernatural being himself to be able to delay the inevitable; Mink does this not just once, but twice, letting into the world a new notion of agency;  $\text{duk}^w\text{ib}\text{e}\text{t}$ , his own activities already determined by the future that is coming, forecloses the novel possibility. Martha's storyteller's decisions can be read in all these ways and more: what she does is to set the pair up in a shifting field of relations -- now suggesting their equality, now their ranking in a hierarchy, now the possibility of changing the plot, now the impossibility: in exploring the dynamics between the two persons, she is asking questions about the nature of human existence in a spiritual world. By telling everything two times, so the listener cannot think about anything just once, she opens up the  $\text{duk}^w\text{ib}\text{e}\text{t}$  story to speculation, so that when she closes it up again with the traditional ending, we hear that ending as less final (or perhaps more

final) than ever before. We have said that meaning is inseparable from form, and yet we have just discussed ways in which form opens up the field of signification, rather than defining specific meaning. What is overdetermined in Lushootseed narrative is a range of possibilities, not a collection of specificities. It is to maintain the tensions set up by the story within this range that formal artifices are of service.

The events of the story -- the thefts, the drinkings of piss and the reduction of Mink to an animal -- are each presented as the cores of inclusii. Someone is traveling, then an event happens at the place where he has arrived, then he travels on. In the hands of a lesser storyteller, the passages telling how this person travelled can be mere boundary markers between scenes. In Martha Lamont's storytelling, and notably in "Mink and Changer," they perform the function that commentary by the omniscient author performs in a Victorian novel: they let you know more about the characters than they know about themselves, thus placing the story in the context of the world at large. Indeed, the final disposition of Mink is described by  $\text{duk}^w\text{ib}\text{e}\text{t}$  in terms of how Mink will be travelling from now on; and his speech makes use of wordplay to contrast that future way of travel with the way Mink has travelled throughout the story from episode to episode and the way he travelled into it in the beginning.

In the relatively short compass of "Mink and Changer," word echo and wordplay of various kinds can have not only a local effect, but can serve to unify and contextualize the entire story. The echoes of near homophones like  $\text{qadadid}$  ("to steal," from the theft episodes) and  $\text{q}^w\text{u}^w\text{q}^w\text{adid}$  ("to drink," from the piss episodes) can bring into parallel two widely separated episodes. And, as in other stories (such as "Pheasant and Raven," which became a meditation on the levels of meaning encompassed by a word for "person in need of help"), Martha holds up for examination in "Mink and Changer" a key word whose exploration in the story starts at one end of the spectrum of its lexical field and has traveled to the other end by the time the story draws to a close. Since this word,  $\text{duk}^w$ , is also part of  $\text{duk}^w\text{ib}\text{e}\text{t}$ 's name, the changing ways it is invoked provide a series of evaluations of  $\text{duk}^w\text{ib}\text{e}\text{t}$  himself and thus open the path to metaphysical reflection, if you care to go there in the course of a slightly naughty story about a Mink long ago.

## II

Let us begin our investigation about the inseparability of form and meaning by looking at what the narrations of the ways Mink and  $\text{duk}^w\text{ib}\text{e}\text{t}$  enter the story have to tell us about each other.

(about Mink)

1.  $\text{?acac ti?it b}\text{e}\text{š}\text{c}\text{ab}$ .
2.  $\text{b}\text{e}\text{š}\text{c}\text{ab te ?ah}$ .

(about  $\text{duk}^w\text{ib}\text{e}\text{t}$ )

35.  $\text{g}^w\text{ehaw}\text{e? l}\text{e?ib}\text{e}\text{š}\text{ex}^w\text{ ti?e? duk}^w\text{ib}\text{e}\text{t}$ .
36.  $\text{l}\text{e}\text{dx}^w\text{d}^z\text{alg}^w\text{ep}\text{ex}^w\text{ ti?e? duk}^w\text{ib}\text{e}\text{t}$ ,

3. tulaʔibəš,  
 4. ʔi, tulaʔibəš tiʔit bəščəb,  
 5. ləʔibəš tiʔəʔ bəščəb.  
 At that place, there was Mink.  
 Mink was there.  
 He would travel long ago,  
 Yes, Mink would travel long ago,  
 This Mink was traveling.

- 339  
 37. ləʔibəšəxʷ ʔal tiʔacəc liʔiʔilgʷit.  
 38. ləʔəydxʷ tiʔit ʔacittalbixʷ.  
 39. ləwiliqʷid stab kʷi səshuɬ.  
 Right at that time, dukʷibət was traveling.  
 This dukʷibət was perambulating the water's edge.  
 He was traveling along that very shoreline.  
 As he went, he was finding people.  
 He was asking them what they were doing.

The story begins with the entrance of Mink: the passage above presents him as he is just before he comes upon the sleeping old man and his roasting salmon. We notice the chiasmus of the first two lines and, along with taking pleasure in the figure, may wonder what besides this tradition opening for a story is encoded there. I have taken the liberty of translating the tu- prefix, which indicates a time long ago, as "would," in order to mark the absence of it in the third repetition of ləʔibəš. It seems to me that in the first four lines Martha is situating Mink as he customarily was in the world before this story happened and in the fifth line is moving into the action of the story; for the next thing she says is "That's when he came upon him [the old man]". There is nothing remarkable about this passage telling how Mink inhabits the place when we consider it in isolation. But meanings accrue when we compare it with the narrative of dukʷibət's intrusion into the place and with the description at the end of the story of Mink's future way of being there.

dukʷibət enters the story just after Mink has gone to sleep while his salmon is roasting over the campfire. In contrast to Mink, dukʷibət has a mission in life. His way of walking along the shore is conveyed by a word, dxʷdʒalgʷəp, that, among numerous passages in the story telling how people walked along the shore, is used only here. By this time, Mink has also walked along the shore (thus I take tiʔ acəc liʔiʔilgʷit in line 37, "along the shore that was there," to refer to the place Mink walked), but the word used for his traveling is the same ʔibəš of the introduction. In comparison to ʔibəš (literally, "walk), dxʷdʒalgʷəp is a fancier, more specific word, as its presence as the core of a small circular figure with ʔibəš as its outer rim seems to testify. In addition, ləʔəydxʷ (going along finding) and ləwiliqʷid (going along asking people) amplify ləʔibəš (going along walking) as it is used of dukʷibət in a way that contrasts with its bare repetition of ləʔibəš in the passage about Mink. These

340  
 two passages, which only seem to be "filler" between episodes and to be accomplishing nothing much besides moving characters around, actually serve to distinguish the characters from one another and to set them in a certain tension with one another. Mink belongs here; at this point he is part of the background. dukʷibət has arrived, walking in Mink's tracks but with a different step and in a different frame of mind.

(about Mink)

6. gʷəl huy, tčisəxʷ.  
 7. bəqadidəxʷ ʔə tiʔəʔ səsqʷəlb ʔə tiʔəʔ luχ  
 ʔə tiʔəʔ sʔuladxʷ, tiʔit bəščəb.  
 8. qadadid ʔə tiʔəʔ səsqʷəlb ʔə tiʔit  
 sʔuladxʷ ʔal tiʔəʔ huds.  
 9. gʷəl tuʔitutəxʷ tiʔəʔ luχ.  
 10. gʷəl huy tčiləxʷ tiʔəʔ gət, tiʔəʔ cədit bəščəb.  
 11. huy ləkʷyidəxʷ ʔə tiʔəʔ cədit tə  
 səsqʷəlb ʔə tiʔit sʔuladxʷ.  
 12. gʷəl hay, huy tiʔəʔ sʔətəds.

(about dukoibe;)

- 40\41. gʷəl tčisəbəxʷ tiʔəʔ bəščəb ʔəsʔitut.  
 42. xʷuʔələ ʔəxʷcutəbitəb ʔə tiʔəʔ cədit dukʷibət,  
 43. "dayəxʷ haʔit tiʔəʔ səsqʷəlb ʔə tiʔəʔ acəc bəščəb."  
 44. ʔəshaydub bəščəb ʔə tiʔəʔ cədit dukʷibət.  
 45. huy dxʷcutəbəxʷ, " xʷuʔələʔ  
 46\47. χub čəd ʔu bəqadadid ʔə tiʔit səsqʷəlb  
 čəda gʷəʔətəd, huy ʔastagʷəxʷəxʷ."  
 48a. huy, ʔətədaxʷ ʔə tiʔəʔ.  
 48b. kʷədalikʷəxʷ ʔə tiʔəʔ səsqʷəlb ʔə tiʔəʔ bəščəb.  
 49. ʔətədaxʷ tiʔəʔ dukʷibət.  
 50. hay, kʷaʔdəxʷ tiʔit xʷuʔələʔ ʔəsəxid tə  
 səsqʷəfbs sʔuladxʷ.

And then he happened upon him.  
 As he had done to people before,  
 Mink now stole from the old man  
 what he had cooked, some salmon.  
 He stole from him what he had cooked,  
 salmon that was on his fire.  
 (For, long ago, this old man was asleep.)  
 And so he got there, this rascal Mink,  
 And he gobbled right out from under the  
 old man's nose the cooking he  
 was doing, the salmon.

And now Mink was come upon while he was sleeping.  
 Perhaps this one, dukʷibət, thought to himself,  
 "What Mink here has cooking looks really good."  
 (Mink already was known to this one, dukʷibət.)  
 So he said to himself, "Should  
 I maybe steal what he's cooking and eat it, since  
 I am hungry now?"

And afterward, his eating was done.

So he ate it now.

He picked and chose from what Mink was cooking.

ḡuk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ ate now.

But he left alone maybe for some reason some of  
what Mink had cooking, some salmon.

Mink's action is opportunistic, and it is not the first time he has seized such an opportunity (I translate the "bə-" prefix ["again"] on qadadid ("to steal") with a whole clause in order to bring out this point.) lək<sup>w</sup>yid is literally "to gobble away from someone." Mink, like an animal, does not steal the food with his hands, take it away and eat it later, but steals it with his mouth, devouring it on the spot. Martha speaks about Mink first as "stealing" and then, after the statement that the victim is not only old, but asleep, about Mink as "gobbling away." As far as he is concerned, the end of the food is the end of the incident, even though the old man will eventually awaken. The close of the episode, huy ti?ə? s?əʔəʔs (And then his eating was done) mimics one of the ways a story can close (huyəx<sup>w</sup> ti?ə? syəhub, this story is done now).

One of the Lushootseed teachers at Tulalip says that since "Mink and Changer" only has two characters in it, the old man must be ḡuk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ. (To her, this means that ḡuk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ is either a very limber old man who could follow Mink over the bluffs along the shore, or else he is in disguise during the first scene.) In its interlaced binarism, the story suggests both of these possibilities, along with others. Even the one linguistic clue linking the old man with ḡuk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ can be interpreted several ways. When he is thinking about stealing Mink's salmon, ḡuk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ uses bəqadadid, "steal again" or perhaps "steal in turn," an echo of what Martha says about Mink's stealing. It fits Mink because he is a chronic thief, but how does it fit ḡuk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ? Is he going to turn the tables on Mink in carrying out a personal revenge? Is he a moral force whose mission is to let Mink know what it feels like to be treated as he treated an old man? What one makes of this "bə-" prefix echoed here from the earlier episode will color one's reception of the rest of the story. But, crucial as it is, the echo itself cannot be reproduced in the translation: in the first episode, I add a clause to capture its meaning; in the second, I underline two words to suggest an intonation pattern: the result is that the interrelatedness of the two passages is not represented fully and the rest of the story is diminished as well.

It is noteworthy that in this story ḡuk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ does not ask Mink stab k<sup>w</sup>(i) subuy ("What are you doing?"), as he traditionally does when he comes upon people. Instead, he does what Mink has done.

This departure from expectation is counterpointed by the very traditional diction in the first four lines of the passage, which I cannot find a way to bring over into acceptable English.

Whenever ḡuk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ appears in a story and begins to interact with people, all the transitive verbs appear in passive form. The stories never say, "ḡuk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ did this to X," but always instead, "This was done to X by ḡuk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ." In Lushootseed, if both ḡuk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ and X are named, the passive is obligatory. But when the actor is not named, both passive and active voices are acceptable. Nevertheless, the stories always choose "It was done to X" rather than "He did it to X." An attempt to preserve this powerful feature of Lushootseed storytelling is seen in my rather odd English, "And now, Mink was come upon" (ʔčisəb, the passive). In the theft passage in which Mink is the agent, we see the verb in the active form: ʔčis ("happened upon"). (ʔčis is hard to translate into English anyway, because it is the transitive form of a verb, to arrive, which does not have a transitive form in English.) I used "happen upon" for Mink, since the previous reiterations of ləʔibəʔ (walking, traveling) do not seem to express a destination or purpose; I use "come upon" for ḡuk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ because with him, you may not know for sure but always suspect predetermination.

Martha continues her narrative about ḡuk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ with another passive that I could not bring over into English: ʔəx<sup>w</sup>cutəbitəb ("It was thought about to himself"); evidently even when ḡuk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ is not acting on others, but only on his own thoughts, the one who tells about it feels pressure to express his actions in the passive. As ḡuk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ talks to himself, however, he names his own actions in the active voice. There follow in this passage several sentences with intransitive verbs ("eat" and "pick and choose" are intransitive in this passage), until, at the end, there is something rather unusual, a transitive verb in the active voice telling what ḡuk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ did. The verb, k<sup>w</sup>aʔəd (to leave alone, cease to occupy oneself with) is prominent acoustically by occurring as the first important word after a pause and rhetorically as the verb in the cap statement in a circular figure. It is also important for the plot.

The narration of the thefts is full of repetition within episodes and echoes between them. In Mink's episode the repetition is not figured, or perhaps figured only latently. The most striking feature is that by the end of the passage qadadid (steal from someone) has changed to lək<sup>w</sup>yid (gobble away from someone) as the characterization of his action. ḡuk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ's passage, however, is realized in two circular figures:

- |    |    |  |
|----|----|--|
| I. | Aa | Maybe he thought                       |
|    | Ab | direct quotation of his words          |
|    |    | core Mink was known (ʔəshaydub) to him |

- Aa' He thought "Maybe"  
Ab' direct quotation of his words

- II. A He ate  
core he picked and chose  
A' He ate  
cap he left something alone (k<sup>w</sup>a?əd)

In his theft episode, Mink does not think, he acts. Everything we need to know about him we can learn from watching. The circular figuration shows duk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ, on the contrary, to be full of thought, even intent. He does not heedlessly devour but carefully chooses; the food is not finished, but some is left: the occasion for a reply has been put in place. In the notes to the text of "Mink and Changer" in the 1994 volume, it is suggested that duk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ leaves a little food on Mink's mouth, so he will think when he awakens that he has eaten the salmon himself (a traditional motif). If so, he has underestimated Mink; for when Mink wakes up,

Immediately he knew.  
"Oh, it was duk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ who came upon me.

It was that no-good duk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ who came upon me and gobbled away (lək<sup>w</sup>yic) my food from me."

Perhaps it is the very food left behind to dupe him that lets Mink know who the thief was. Perhaps Mink, identifying with this other thief as this thief has with him, even sees duk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ as stealing the food with his mouth, like an animal. At any rate, the appearance of k<sup>w</sup>a?əd (to leave alone) in the active voice at the end of duk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ's theft episode has already reduced him from supernatural cause of things that happen to people to mere actor in the transitive-active mode of daily life.

### III

In this discussion of the theft passages, it is clear that in translating, the task of representing the meaning that resides in the forms of the narration -- complementary morphological forms, rhetorical forms, structural forms -- often works against the task of representing meaning at the level of the individual word.

Even when the important individual word can be translated the same way in two importantly different settings, failure to incorporate the settings can reduce the translation to a shadow, as we shall see with

the example of a word we have already noticed, k<sup>w</sup>a?əd.

After the theft episodes, Mink and duk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ walk away toward the next scene in the story. Mink goes along in his typical fashion. What is utterly fascinating is that duk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ, having committed a transitive action in the active voice like anyone else, is described as "going along" in almost exactly the same way that is characteristic of Mink:

(about Mink)

13. huy g<sup>w</sup>əl bə ?ibəʔ ti?iʔ bəʔčəb.  
14. lə?ibəʔ.  
15. lə?ibəʔ bək<sup>w</sup> dx<sup>w</sup>čad.  
16. x<sup>w</sup>u?ələ? s?ibəʔ ?al ti?ə? liʔ?ilg<sup>w</sup>iʔ  
?ə tə x<sup>w</sup>əlč.  
17. ah k<sup>w</sup>i ʒubəs?iʔtəqts,  
liʔ?al ti?iʔ ?iʔtəqts.  
18. ?ah k<sup>w</sup>i s?iʔčə?k<sup>w</sup>s.

And then Mink walked on.  
He was walking along.  
He walked all over everywhere.  
He might walk along the shore of  
the salt water.  
Or again he might walk along the  
heights.  
Or he might go down along the water.

(about duk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ)

51. huy g<sup>w</sup>əl huy, bə?ibəʔəx<sup>w</sup> ti?ə?  
cədiʔ duk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ.  
52. bəhiwilex<sup>w</sup>.  
53. lə?ibəʔ liʔ?ilg<sup>w</sup>iʔ ?ə ti?ə? x<sup>w</sup>əlč.  
54. ?ah ʒubəsliʔtəqts.  
55. g<sup>w</sup>əl ʒubəliʔčə?k<sup>w</sup> k<sup>w</sup>i s?ibəʔs liʔ?ilg<sup>w</sup>iʔ.

And then he walked on now, this duk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ.  
He went on his way.  
He was walking along the shore of the  
salt water.  
He walked along the heights.  
And again down along the water he might  
walk, along the shore.

This travel pattern is a major vehicle of evaluation in the story: how people go places is made to tell about them. Here, the travel pattern encodes a revision of duk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ's relation to Mink and, if duk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ, in being more like Mink, seems less powerful than he usually is, then Mink, too, is less victimlike than duk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ's interlocutors usually are. It is in travelling up along the bluffs and looking back at duk<sup>w</sup>ibəʔ

on the beach that Mink gets the idea for making the little waterfall -- which, of course, comes from the heights and pours toward the salt water, echoing the diction of the travel pattern. After duk<sup>w</sup>ibət has taken a drink and been told what it is he drank (the second time, in fact, in a passive verb of which he is the experiencer, a reversal of his usual grammatical role: bəcucucəb ʔə tiʔəʔ bəščəb, "He was told by Mink"), Martha tells us about his state of mind by changing the travel pattern at the end of the theft episode:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 103. bək <sup>w</sup> aʔtəb ʔə tiʔit cədit duk <sup>w</sup> ibət. | duk <sup>w</sup> ibət let the water alone. |
| 104. gwəl huy bəʔux <sup>w</sup> .                                | He set off again.                          |
| 105. bətuʔtuʔad.  | Again and again he spat it out.            |
| 106. g <sup>w</sup> əl ʔibəš.                                     | And he walked on.                          |

His, letting the water (piss) alone is expressed in the passive that is conventional for his actions (Martha says literally: "It was let alone by duk<sup>w</sup>ibət"), but though the verb is the way it should be, the actor is not. The reduction of the travel pattern from bluffs and beaches to simply "going along" mirrors duk<sup>w</sup>ibət's distress, while the interlaced "let it alone" and "spat it out" show him the opposite of inspired, as Mink has been, by the landscape he is traveling through. The striking setting of the ironic passive k<sup>w</sup>aʔəd in the reduced version of the travel pattern, along with its echo of the unexpected active form (k<sup>w</sup>aʔəd) as the cap of the circular figure at the end of the theft passage result in a palimpsest of significations so numerous that they could never be collected and stated -- not in an essay, which does not take upon itself the task of enchanting an audience, and certainly never in a story. In a translation, as this discussion of k<sup>w</sup>aʔəd set out to show, k<sup>w</sup>aʔəd as an individual word does not signify: unless the circular figure and the travel pattern in which it is set are also brought over into the new language with it, k<sup>w</sup>aʔəd is untranslatable.

## IV

The travel pattern puts in a final appearance as an ironic ehco at the very end of the story in duk<sup>w</sup>ibət's words when, resuming his role as spoiler, he puts Mink once and for all in his place:

- |   |                                |
|---|--------------------------------|
| 123. g <sup>w</sup> əl hay, hay g <sup>w</sup> əl cut(t)əbəx <sup>w</sup> | And then, and then he was told |
| ʔə tiʔəʔ duk <sup>w</sup> ibət,   | by duk <sup>w</sup> ibət,      |

The first time we hear the word in the story is just after Mink has awakened to find his salmon gone. After his accusation of duk<sup>w</sup>ibət there comes this capped circular figure:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| A ʔəshaydub ʔə tiʔəʔ cədit bəščəb.                                   | He was known to Mink  |
| B huy, xəʔ ti bədx <sup>w</sup> qahig <sup>w</sup> əd                | For there was kind of a lot                                     |
| tiʔit bəščəb.  | to Mink.  |
| B' xəʔ ti b(ə)asduk <sup>w</sup> il.                                 | He was kind of paranormal, himself.                             |
| A' ʔəshaydx <sup>w</sup> tiʔit χusʔibəš ʔə ti duk <sup>w</sup> ibət. | He knew that duk <sup>w</sup> ibət was traveling.               |
| CAP ʔəsludx <sup>w</sup> -- ləʔibəš ti duk <sup>w</sup> ibət.        | CAP He had heard about it: duk <sup>w</sup> ibət was traveling. |

The first line of the figure is a repetition of the core of the circular figure in duk<sup>w</sup>ibət's theft episode, which immediately precedes this scene: "Mink was already known to duk<sup>w</sup>ibət." This line and the ʔəsduk<sup>w</sup>il at the core of the figure here begin to suggest that Mink may be able to engage on non-victim terms with duk<sup>w</sup>ibət. But when at the end of the story we hear of Mink as ʔəsduk<sup>w</sup> and sduk<sup>w</sup>, the meanings come from the other end of duk<sup>w</sup>'s spectrum, the difference pointed up by the homophony. To preserve the homophony in English, the translator would have to resort to a generalizable word like "strange" or "different" and rely totally on the surrounding figures into which the word is set to convey what it really means.

The same needs to be reiterated about the story as a whole, for it has been considered in this paper apart from its setting as one of three episodes in a larger narrative, and so deprived its contextual richness.