Ullrich, J. with Black Bear, B. Jr. *Lakota Grammar Handbook : a pedagogically orientated self- study reference and practice book for beginner to upper-intermediate students*. Bloomington 47404: Lakota Language Consortium. x+624pp.ill., maps 30cm. ISBN-13:978-1-941461-11-2, Paperback.

Reviewed by Bruce Ingham, *SOAS University of London*

This grammar comes as part of an integrated series of books designed to assist the learner or teacher of Lakota. It follows the New Lakota Dictionary (2008; 2011), compiled, edited and authored by Jan Ullrich and the *Lakóthiya Wóglaka Po!- Speak Lakota!* textbook series. The orthography used is the same as in the earlier books, namely that of the Lakota Language Consortium, a system developed by the Lakota people in cooperation with non-Lakota linguists. The book is divided into the following sections: Introduction, Units, Appendices, Answer Key, Index, and finally Bibliography. There are in fact 230 units, each consisting of two pages, the first containing new material and the second containing the relevant exercises.

The introduction contains acknowledgements, a wide range of notes on how the Grammar can be used, notes on its compilation and rationale, and notes on related Siouan languages and the sister dialects, Dakota and Nakota. The appendices contain additional information and discussion and often point to areas where the writing of earlier scholars differs from that of the author.

The table of contents lists the sections in the Introduction by page number only, then the Units are listed by Unit number, page number, and in many cases also by an associated Appendix page number. Thus under the Introduction section, the first component, Acknowledgements I. – Native speakers, is listed only under the page column with the number 1, then under Introductory Units, the first unit is listed as 1 Alphabet and pronunciation (Introduction to Lakota Phonology) and shown as 24 under the page column and 486 under the Appendix page column. This is quite difficult to get used to at first, but definitely yields benefits as one progresses.

This is a very attractively presented book, using colors to pick out headings and to differentiate sections of the book. Accordingly the first major section, Introductory Units, has a pink page edge and section number at the top left of the page, while the second, Conjugation (Subject Affixes), has a light blue page edge and section number. This scheme continues through the book in the order pink, blue, brown, and mauve. Although this cannot be used to actually locate sections, it definitely helps in marking the beginning and end of sections in such a large book.

The book presents the material in two-page sections. Color is used here also to make the material clearer. The left hand page with a navy blue title background presents new material, while the right hand page with a grey title background presents the exercises for that material. The exercise page has lines picked out by alternately highlighting the lines in grey. This is very restful on the eye. Within the material

presentation, bold is used usefully to highlight particular words in the examples, which form the kernel part of the presentation. In later sections, where sentences are contrasted, red background is used effectively, i.e., the subject pronoun column in a conjugation table is shown with a red background (p.364), while the same color background is used to mark the head of a relative clause on p.121.

Another attractive part of the presentation is the use of illustrations of people with word balloons to elucidate the interaction involved in conversations (p.104) or the use of pronoun prefixes occurring in verbs (p.84). These make an effort to combine a view of old and new ways of life. They are done by Hervé Dupuy and in one case by František Valer and show traditional Lakota people from pre-contact days, modern reservation Lakotas, and also Lakotas illustrated in the traditional pictorial style of buffalo hide or ledger book paintings (p.84). Similarly, illustrations of horses alternate with cars (p.154) and thipis with mobile phones (p.155).

Previous grammars of Lakota and the related Dakota and Nakota (Assiniboine) varieties have in the most part been aimed at scholars and researchers. These include in chronological order Riggs (1893), Beuchel (1939), Boas & Deloria (1941;1979), Levin (1964), and Ingham (2003). There have also been teaching manuals which give a basic grounding of the grammar, including Hairy Shirt et al. (1973), Rood & Taylor (1976), and White Hat Sr. (1999).

This grammar is not arranged as a descriptive linguistic grammar so much as a teaching or learning tool, as described in its title "self study reference and practice book." However, as the author states (p.17), "theory based terminology is employed consistently where it was felt as helpful for the learner's understanding of the grammar construction descriptions." In fact, it adds enormously to the available descriptions of Lakota, in that it goes into a lot more detail in the description and is able to refine our knowledge of the usage of structures which were already familiar. It therefore combines the aims of both the above types, but goes much further than either of them.

The book benefits enormously from the fact that the author has spent a considerable amount of time in the region, and has absorbed a very wide knowledge of everyday usage and been able to perceive where the language has changed since the time of earlier descriptions. He has also been able to check statements by previous authors against the reactions of present-day speakers. This is revealed particularly with regard to the passive voice (p.525) and dative verbal forms (p.523). His description is refreshingly honest in being able to state that certain differences seem at present to be free variants. A good example is that of the two dative forms of transportation verbs glossed in Boas & Deloria (1941) as (b) kíčahi 'to bring his without sanction,' showing the possessive prefix *kí-* marking the verb object as possessed by the indirect object, and (c) kíčičahi 'to bring his for him with sanction,' showing the benefactive prefix *kíči-* 'for' applying to the indirect object. Here he states (p.523): "However, many speakers suggest there is no difference between the (b) and (c) variants. Corpus data gives us many tokens of the (c) forms, but occurrences of the (b) forms of transportation verbs are less numerous, and the analysis of the limited data does not reveal any differences in the semantic coding."

This is an excellent and very comprehensive grammatical description covering a number of areas which have not been treated in the generally available literature. In fact, it can almost be read as two separate books: one can work through the exercises in the Units section, checking with the Answer Key, and one can read the Appendices as a separate entity.

As this is such a substantial book, covering so many topics in the form of 115 units, I will not attempt to give an overall description, but will highlight certain topics which I found particularly interesting and useful and where the author's long exposure to the language has allowed him to come up with new facts, particularly on the syntactic level. These often involve quite simple sentence types where, although they have been recorded as structures in previous works, the nature of the syntax has not previously been made clear.

Units 19 and 20 constitute a revealing case. Here on p.64, the author introduces the concept of the zero topic in sentences such as *thípi číkʼala* 'it is a small house,' where he takes *thípi číkʼala* 'small house' to be the comment and the topic to be Ø equating to 'it.' He also gives the examples *wičhíŋčala* 'it is a girl' and *hokšíla* 'it is a boy.' Here the nouns occur in predicative position without any stated topic. He states that *wičhíŋčala* 'girl' and *hokšíla* 'boy' do not need a verb 'to be,' because "Lakota nouns do not need a verb to form a sentence. In a way they are a kind of verb themselves. When nouns are used as verbs, we say they are in predicative position" (p.62). I would argue about whether these nouns are being used as verbs, but they are definitely in predicative position. Quite apart from how we define them however, I do not know of any other work on Lakota which has given these structures as sentences. So this is a valuable contribution.

I found the section on *ča* in cleft sentences (sections 117–125) particularly useful. The use of *ča* has been treated in earlier grammars, but the explanation here is, I think, more comprehensive. In "A) Introduction to cleft sentence with *ča*," he contrasts the simple with the cleft type. He gives the following pairs of simple and cleft sentences (p.258):

(1)  Simple (a) and cleft (b) sentences

   a.  *Hokšíla waŋ    ú*
       boy     INDEF  he.was.coming
       'A boy was coming'

   b.  *Hokšíla ča    ú*
       boy      who  he.was.coming
       'It was a boy who was coming'

(2)  Simple (a) and cleft[1] (b) sentences

   a.  *Psáloka     waŋ    hiŋgnáyiŋ    kte*
       Crow.man  INDEF  she.marries  FUT
       'She will marry a Crow man'

    b. *Psáloka    čha  hiŋgnáyiŋ  kte*
       Crow.man  who  she.marries  FUT
       'It is a Crow man who she will marry'

(3)    Simple (a) and cleft (b) sentences

    a. *Táku  a<yá>hi    he?*
       what  <you>bring  Q
       'What did you bring?'

    b. *Táku  čha    a-yá-hi    he?*
       what  which  <you>bring  Q
       'What is it that you brought?'

I have often seen examples of this 'cleft' type in the various text collections, but have never seen them so clearly explained. I am not quite sure why the author feels it necessary to state that "the noun before ha functions as a (stative) verb" (p.258), but this is in line with his procedure mentioned in the above paragraph, where he speaks of nouns being used as verbs, so it is consistent, but it would be useful to know what his theoretical basis for this is. Nevertheless, in neither case does this detract from the clarity of the description.

    A very enlightening section comes in various Units between 110 and 127. These involve the conjunction *héči*. This has no one equivalent in English, but occurs in various environments where an element of uncertainty is involved. These include relative clauses, indirect questions, open questions, expressions of surprise or wonder, and conditional clauses. A selection of examples occurs below, in which I gloss *héči* as 'if' in all cases, purely for the sake of simplicity, although it really has no direct equivalent in English:

(4)    Relative clause
    *Tóna    wičá<ya>la-pi    héči  hená  i<l>a<l>a-pi-kte*
    so.many  <you>accept-PL  if    those  <you>go-PL-FUT
    'Whoever of you accepts it, will go' [my translation] (p.262).

(5)    Indirect question
    *Táku  héči  waŋ<bl>áke  šni*
    what  if    <I>see    NEG
    'I didn't see what it was' (p.276).

---

[1]Note that in all these examples 3rd person singular subject or object has zero marking.

(6)    Open question

     *Otȟúŋwahe-ta  uŋ-yáŋ-pi  héči*
     town-LOC    we-go-PL  if
     'Maybe we should go to town. / Shall we go to town?' (p.246).


(7)    Expression of surprise or wonder

     *Táku  kȟe-ka        héči*
     what  he.means-EMPH  if
     'I wonder what he means' (p.246).


(8)    Conditional clause
     *Le   wašté<ya>laka héči ičú   we*
     this  <you>like      if    take IMP
     'If you like this, take it!' (p.248).

Examples of this particle do occur in earlier works, but they are nowhere expounded in such detail or classified as to translational equivalent and function so well. The specific semantic feature of this conjunction can be made plain by contrasting it with the more factual conjunction *kiŋ*, often translatable as 'the,' as in the following examples (p.276):

(9)    *táku  kiŋ waŋ<l>áka he?*
     what  the <you>saw Q
     'Did you see the thing?'


(10)   *táku  héči waŋ<l>áka he?*
     what  if   <you>saw Q
     'Did you see what it was?'


    There is also a very thorough examination of usages which would parallel English sentences where a preposition would have a 1st or 2nd pronoun object. The relevance of these is that Lakota postpositions do not frequently take object suffixes and also that the 3rd person singular is not overtly marked as the object of verbs or postpositions and the 3rd person plural is not marked when the postposition *ob* 'with' is involved, as shown in the following examples:

(11)   *Waŋ<bl>áke*
     <I>saw
     'I saw it' (p. 42)

(12)  *el   étuŋwe*
      at  he.looked
      'He looked at her' (Ullrich 2008:119)


(13)  *kičhí*                  *wa-škáte*
      with(for.singular.object)  I-play
      'I played with him' (p.378)


(14)  *ob*                  *wa-škáte*
      with(for.plural.object)  I-play
      'I played with them' (p.378)


Where the 1st and 2nd person objects are associated with certain postpositions, he notes (p.378) that structures occur where the object pronoun is attached to the verb, not to the postposition, as illustrated below:

(15)  *kičhí*                  *wó<ma>glake*
      with(for.singular.object)  <me>speak
      'He spoke with me'


(16)  *kičhí*                  *wa<ní>čhi   kte*
      with(for.singular.object)  <you>dance  FUT
      'She will dance with you'


However, he adds the qualification that these are not used by all and that some regard them as ungrammatical. He notes that "It is difficult to ascertain whether the lack of this construction in old texts is due to its overall low frequency or whether it is a new development in the language" (p.524). Because of the spread-out nature of the exposition, it is difficult to discover how one would more usually express these concepts. Ullrich implies (p.500) that it would be more normal for the 1st and 2nd persons to be cast as actors. Thus, rather than saying \**tuwá niyé kičhí wačhí he?* 'who danced with you?' one would say *tuwá kičhí wayáčhi he?* 'who did you dance with?', thus avoiding the need for an object pronoun.

Also, in many cases, the use of the 1st person dual fulfils that function, as on p. 48 *uŋškátiŋ kta wačhíŋ* 'I want to play with you' lit. 'I want that we two should play' and *uŋškátiŋ kta yačhíŋ he?* 'do you want to play with me?' lit. 'do you want that we two should play?' He also points out (p.493) that the forms *míčhi* 'with me' and *níčhi* 'with you', which occur in Bible translations, are felt ungrammatical by most, if not all, contemporary speakers.

A further relevant fact to the above discussion must be that many sentences which in English would involve a verb plus a preposition, do not, in Lakota, involve a postposition, but involve the 1st or 2nd dative verbal types mentioned above (p.195)

showing the prefixes *ki-* and *kíči-* or verbs showing the locative prefix *a-* 'on.' This is shown in the following examples:

(17)  *tuwá  čhéǧa  o<wá><ki>lotiŋ…*
      who   kettle   <I><DAT>borrow
      'Who shall I borrow a kettle from?' (p.501)

(18)  *šúŋkawakȟaŋ  kiŋ  i<má><ki>ču*
      horse             the   <me><DAT>take
      'He took the horse from me' (p.170)

(19)  *wičhóškate  kiŋ  uŋ-kíči-yušiča-pi*
      game             the  us-DAT-spoil-PL
      'They spoiled the game for us' (p.178)

(20)  *a-má-čhaŋze*
      on-me-be.angry
      'He was angry with me' (Ullrich 2008, 2011)

(21)  *a-ní-maǧažu  he?*
      on-you-rain   Q
      'Did you get rained upon?' (Ullrich 2008, 2011)

In fact, one could surmise that the fact that Lakota postpositions cannot be preceded by the independent pronouns, while English prepositions can be followed by them, may be a function of Lakota being a more morphologically complex language and one where the majority of grammatical (and some semantic) material clusters around the verb. Ullrich mentions this use of semantic material under the heading of noun incorporation and truncation, where a noun is abbreviated in form and then attached to a verb as in *čhaŋkábupi* 'they were drum-beating' derived from *čháŋčeǧa kabúpi* 'they were beating drums' (p.498).

   Another subject where there is extremely interesting discussion is that of the passive voice (Unit 182, p.388, and Appendix, p.525–527). Ullrich mentions that Lakota was for a long time considered to be a language without a passive voice, and that the first study to refer to a passive voice was Pustet & Rood (2008) where they give the example *wičháša kiŋ matȟó ktépi* 'the man was killed by bears/a bear,' stating that the suffix -*pi* in the verb is a passive voice marker, and not, as one would normally expect (as in many of the examples cited above), a plural marker agreeing with a plural animate agent, namely 'bears' and suggesting a translation 'bears killed the man.' The discussion is quite involved and recourse is had to the examples with passive translations shown below:

(22) *wakȟáŋyeža kiŋ até-tȟuŋ-pi    kte  kiŋ héčhetu*
     child        the father-bear-PL FUT the be.right
     'It is the right thing that a child should be born having a father.' (p.525)


(23) *ptehíŋčala kiŋ wétu-wičha-tȟuŋ-pi    k'uŋ héčha*
     calf        the spring-them-bear-PL the be.of.a.kind
     'It was the kind of calf that is born in the spring.' (p.525)

The alternative suggestion is also presented that, in both the above, the noun preceding the verb and separated by the hyphen does not constitute an agent, but rather an adjunct, the verb phrases *até - tȟuŋpi* and *wétu - wičhatȟuŋpi* being rather of the type 'father-born' and 'spring-born.' It is noted that Boas & Deloria (1941:155) refer to this as a "quasi-passive construction" perhaps on the grounds that it corresponds in meaning to an English passive, but does not show any specific morphology, distinguishing it from the active. The factor supporting the passive interpretation here is that the verb shows the 3rd plural animate suffix *-pi*, whereas it cannot be said to have an animate plural agent. Ullrich (p.526) quotes a number of examples of that type taken from older texts, which seem to point towards the existence of a passive, albeit of a rather restricted distribution, such as *Até wašíču ktépi* translated as 'my father was killed by white people.' An example from Buechel (1939:299) is also given, *iȟáȟapi kiŋ he waȟtélašni*, which Ullrich regards as "correctly" translated as 'he hates to be laughed at,' using the passive voice. But that sentence could also be taken to mean 'he hates the fact that they laugh at him' with *iȟáȟapi kiŋ* being analysed as a noun phrase equivalent to 'their laughing at him.'

  The occurrence of the usage *matȟúŋpi* 'I was born' parallels the English usage in a way, in that the active use of 'to bear' is being avoided. One could argue that, although the usage 'to be born' is fully productive, the verb 'to bear' in the active is not particularly common in usage and could be regarded as archaic. More idiomatically in English one would say 'give birth to' or even 'have.' One could therefore argue that 'be born' is not really a passive, because its active counterpart is not used. Therefore it could be termed a 'quasi-passive.' It could also be termed a type of intransitive like 'be ill,' or in a different way like 'be drowned,' which does have a corresponding active but does not always imply an actor, sometimes only a patient, as in 'he drowned in a river.' In Lakota too the verb *yuhá* 'to have' can be used, as shown in an interesting example in Buechel (1978:393) shown below, which shows both words being used:

(24) *Ináwaye čiŋ ikpí-ma-gnake, wi šakówiŋ kiŋ el ma-tú weló. Heháŋl mayúha kte*
     *šni iyéčheča škȟa héčhuŋ weló*
     'My mother became pregnant with me and gave birth to me after seven months. She should not have had me then, but she did.'

The relevant words here are *ikpí<ma>gnake* [<me>conceive] 'she became pregnant with me,' *ma-tȟúŋ* [me-bear] 'she gave birth to me,' and *ma-yúha kte šni iyéčheča* [me-have FUT NEG OBLIGATIVE] 'she should have had me.'

Ullrich makes the reservation (p.526) that "[t]here are, indeed, contexts in which it is not possible to distinguish whether the -pi form represents an empty subject 'they' or passive voice. But there are instances in which the agent is indisputably singular, as in matȟúŋpi *I was born* rather than *they gave birth to* me)." In one example (also p.526), the verb has the animate plural agent suffix *-pi*, although the agent in the example is one man. The relevant part of this sentence is:

(25)  *wičháša waŋ čhapȟá-pi k'uŋ…*
         man     a    stab-PL    the
         'The man who had been stabbed…'

Here I think that, although a passive translation stands better in English, one can still argue that what we have is an impersonal 'they' construction, i.e., 'the man they had stabbed.' Other languages have constructions like this, without them being said to be passives. In Persian, for instance, the sentence *košt-and-eš* (killed-they-him) 'they killed him' can be used to mean 'he was killed,' whether there was only one agent or more. This alternates with the actual passive *košteh šod* 'he was killed,' where the past participle *košteh* is followed by an auxiliary verb form *šod*, from the verb *šodan* 'to become,' marking it exclusively as a passive.

This is an interesting subject thoroughly and logically discussed. However, I think the case for a passive in Lakota is still not totally proven. Personally I think I would prefer to regard it as an impersonal construction, which can involve a singular or plural agent and which translates better into English as a passive.

This book is relatively free of typos and errors. In fact, I only noticed two in my reading of it, which, for such a substantial book, is very good. These were on p.500 "Ingham…titles the iyé series as 'predicative adverb'". In fact I entitle it "predicative pronoun." Also on p.503 we see "Lakota grammar normally doesn't allow animate agents with transitive verbs," where I think he must intend "inanimate agents" since there are many examples with animate agents, such as *čháŋčeǧa kabúpi* 'they were beating drums' (p.498).

This is a really interesting and informative book and a substantial addition to the literature on Lakota. Ullrich, Black Bear, and all who contributed to it can be rightly proud of their work. Anyone interested in Lakota will want to own a copy.

Beuchel, Eugene. 1939. *A grammar of Lakota: The language of the Teton Sioux Indians.* Saint Francis P.O., South Dakota: Saint Francis Mission.

Beuchel, Eugene. 1978. *Lakota tales and texts.* Pine Ridge, South Dakota: Red Cloud Indian School.

Boas, Franz & Ella Carla Deloria. 1979. *Dakota grammar.* Washington, DC: Memoirs of the National Academy of Sciences. (Reprint of Boas & Deloria 1941.)

Hairy Shirt, Leroy. 1973. *Lakota Wounspe Wowapi.* Aberdeen, South Dakota: North Plains Press.

Ingham, Bruce. 2003. *Lakota: Languages of the world* (Materials 426).

Levin, Norman Balfour. 1964. *The Assiniboine language.* The Hague: Mouton & Co.

Pustet, Regina & David S. Rood. 2008. Argument dereferentialization in Lakota. In Donohue, Mark & Søren Wichmann (eds.), *The Typology of Semantic Alignment*, 334–356. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Riggs, Stephen R. 1893. *Dakota grammar texts, and ethnography.* Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Rood, David S. and Allan R. Taylor. 1976. *Beginning Lakhota, vols 1 & 2.* Boulder: University of Colorado Press.

Ullrich, Jan. 2011. *New Lakota Dictionary.* 2nd edn. Bloomington, Indiana: Lakota Language Consortium. (Reprint of Ullrich 2008.)

White Hat Sr., Albert. 1999. *Reading and Writing the Lakota Language.* Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

Bruce Ingham
shokoohbanou@yahoo.co.uk