

COYOTE'S ANTHRO

An Intercultural Narrative Analysis

Richard Harris

Key word : Narrative; Cultural Difference

Anthropological representations are, after all, no less cultural (in the sense of socially constructing a worldview) than any other mode of thinking . . . whether they are more right or more wrong, mostly true or mostly false, science or obscurantism, or somewhere in between these extremes, they are socially constructed, socially transmitted, and socially enforced templates for interpretation and practice.

(Biolsi and Zimmerman 1997: 10)

In his anthology *The Telling of the World: Native American Stories and Art*, W.S. Penn places (perhaps questionably) Peter Blue Cloud's story "Coyote's Anthro" in the section entitled "Family." In his short introduction to the section, Penn briefly categorises this tale as "a funny story about contact with the outside world, in the form of an anthropologist who has come to study the "mythology" of Indians." (Penn n.d.: 75) While the story is certainly funny, it is a great deal more than merely amusing, and in the course of this present analysis I hope to show that it makes some profound comments about the relationship between two cultures with very different ways of making sense of the world — and thus, two contrasting narrative styles.

Although narrative has been defined in a bewildering multiplicity of ways, from Toolan's minimalist suggestion of "a perceived sequence of non-randomly connected

events" (Toolan 1988: 7) to the sophisticated formulations of Barthes and his notion of a "proaeretic code" (see Martin 1986: 163-4), all writers on the topic have agreed on the power of narrative as a form of "meaning making." (Polkinghorne 1988: 36) Many have also argued that it is a fundamental human instinct. Fisher, for instance, following MacIntyre's characterisation of humans as storytelling animals, has proposed that *Homo narrans* be added to the list of defining metaphors for human beings, arguing that narration can be used "as a paradigm for general study of human communication." (Fisher 1987: 59)

Narratives, according to Foss, "help us impose order on the flow of experience so that we can make sense of events and actions in our lives." (Foss 1996: 399) The wide variation in narrative styles and techniques, however, makes possible an equally wide diversity in the ways in which experience can be organised and represented. Analysis of the way a narrative is put together, therefore, can yield valuable clues as to the principles and orientations by which the narrator organises his or her material in order to "make sense" of the experience it embodies. As Foss goes on to add:

A narrative, as a frame upon experience, functions as an argument to view and understand the world in a particular way, and by analyzing that narrative, the critic can understand the argument being made and the likelihood that it will be successful in gaining adherence for the perspective it represents. (Foss 1996: 400)

As a rhetorician, Foss perhaps has more of an evaluative focus (as shown by the last clause in the citation) than a strict narrative analysis might require, and I shall be concentrating more on the "how" than on the "how well" aspects of the artifact selected for study here. (This narrative is anyway probably best read as an illustrative story rather than a persuasive one.)

Bruner (1990:77) cites four crucial grammatical constituents for effective narrative: agentivity, sequence, sensitivity to canonicity and narrative presence. While I shall be discussing all of these in my analysis of the artifact, the most interesting aspect of this particular story seems to me to be the last of these. Accordingly, my research questions are as follows:

- 1) What are the features of narrative structure that the author has chosen in order to tell his story?
- 2) What narrative and stylistic devices has the author used to characterise the protagonists and show the differences between their world views?
- 3) What and by what means does the narrative as a whole tell the reader about different ways of interpreting experience?

As my first two questions emphasise the rôle and decisions of the narrator in the construction of the story, I needed an analytic instrument that would allow me to focus on this aspect. Both the formalist approach of Propp (Propp 1968) and the structuralist analysis exemplified by Barthes (Martin 1986) and Chatman (Chatman 1969) tend to be more useful for analysis of the text itself, rather than for an investigation of the narrative voice, and so I chose to adopt as a starting point the examination of narrative features suggested by Foss (Foss 1996). In this scheme the artifact is analysed in terms of setting, characters, narrator, events, temporal relations, causal relations, audience and theme. At the same time, I made use of Rimmon-Kenan's model for the analysis of narratorial presence. In this scheme, narratorial knowledge and involvement are established by considering, in order of narratorial intrusiveness, description of settings, identification of characters, temporal summaries, definition of characters, reports of what was not thought or said and, finally, commentary in terms of evaluation, judgment and generalisation. (Rimmon-Kenan 1983) It is probably as well to emphasise here that my analytic method is somewhat eclectic, and that while this is not a structuralist analysis I have nevertheless found it convenient to make use of certain terms and concepts associated with the structuralist approach.

Before examining the story in terms of Foss's scheme, however, a few initial observations might be made. First, the style of authorial attribution is interesting in that the title of the story on the page, "Coyote's Anthro" is followed on the next line by the word "Mohawk" and then, on the next line: "Told by Peter Blue Cloud." The deliberateness of this ordering and phrasing seems to present the story as part of a canon, as part of Mohawk

oral tradition, which is why the story is “told” and not “written.” This impression is partly reinforced by the title itself in that it mentions Coyote (not “a” or “the” coyote), a traditional character in Native American stories, yet the impression is undermined by the coupling with “Anthro” — not a traditional feature of folktale. An opposition, or tension, is therefore immediately created by the title lines, as it is apparent to the reader that, in spite of its traditional form, the story cannot be a canonical one and that the attribution “Mohawk” refers, in spite of its position, to the author, not the story. Also, a more traditional form of the title might be “Coyote and the Anthro,” the possessive form chosen in this case perhaps to suggest a dominance relationship the reverse of what might have been anticipated given the tendency in the past for anthropologists to be associated with their “subjects” in possessive terms: “Mead’s Samoans,” “Evans-Pritchard’s Nuer” and the like.

The setting for the story is not prominent in textual terms; details are vague, as in the reference to “a deep pool of water near some mountains” (78-9)*, and any sense of place has to be inferred by the reader. Mention of coyotes (8) implies the west, and sagebrush (6) implies the southwest, as do the understated references to sand (74) and the desert (78), but overall the location is unspecified. (Although a traditional Mohawk story would, paradoxically, indicate the northeast.) This lack of detail is again appropriate for a folkloric oral canon, where if a locution such as “in a place far away” were not used, listeners would probably assume that the events narrated took place in their own locality. A shack belonging to the anthropologist’s latest informant is mentioned (6), but not described, its narrative function (or rather index, in Barthesian terms) perhaps being to point up the economic disparity in the anthropological relationship, the anthropologist having received a generous grant (5). Indeed, the fact that the anthropologist is setting up camp at some remove from his informant’s home may be an index of the metaphoric distance between them. The setting does change in the course of the story, Coyote taking the anthropologist across the desert (78) on a trip of unspecified length or duration, although it is presumably the same night. Again, this spatial ellipsis is a common feature of folktale, an extreme example being the climactic scene (87) where Coyote leaps to hang on to the moon, yet can still talk to the anthropologist — a scene structurally balanced by the

* Numbers in parentheses refer to lines of the story. (See appendix.)

anthropologist's anticlimactic leap onto the reflected moon, after which he can only gasp and spit (93).

The characters in the story also fit the folktale paradigm, in that the human is unnamed (many stories begin: "There was once a man . . .") and the reader (or the listener) is required to accept the existence of Coyote Old Man, a "mythic" figure, by means of a Coleridgean "willing suspension of disbelief." (During the course of the story, the meaning of "mythic" is explored and questioned, as will be discussed later.) The anthropologist's informant is not identified, and the only other personage mentioned in the story is Fox Young Man (27), another Native American folklore figure. In stories, Fox is often seen in opposition to Coyote, variously as his rival, successor or resuscitator, but in this narrative he seems merely to function as a way for Coyote to answer his interlocutor's question with (as so often) another question of structural complementarity.

While there are obviously narratorial decisions made in the identification of the actors in the story, the presence of the narrator is more evident in what Rimmon-Kenan calls their definition: which character traits are emphasised. In this respect, it is significant that the term "anthropologist" is only used twice: once in the first line as narratorial description, and then again (41) when the narrator reports on the character's thoughts: "He was, after all, an anthropologist." Actually, as far as both the narrator and Coyote are concerned, he is not; he is an anthro, and has been described as one since the first arrival of Coyote (11). The use of this latter term by both Coyote and the narrator suggests a shared perception, and a somewhat derogatory, contemptuous one at that, as shown by Cecil King's essay, "Here Come the Anthros." (King 1997) Taken along with the title, it is a strong initial indication that Coyote, in this story, speaks for the narrator. This impression is strengthened by the privileged access that the reader, through the narrator, has to the anthropologist's interior thought processes: "He wondered . . ." (9); "The anthro knew . . ." (24); "he thought . . ." (25); "he felt . . ." (40). Coyote enjoys the same access; he can hear the anthropologist's thoughts, which to him sound like pebbles (23) — an image suggestive of hardness, separateness and fixity. By contrast, neither the anthropologist nor the reader is granted access to Coyote's inner thoughts, except as reported in his speech.

The anthropologist is also defined by his speech, which is the dry, linear, inflexible,

compartmented (pebble-like?) discourse of academia (50-3). He relies on his tape recorder to reassure his sense of identity (40), and is even crass enough to offer to pay Coyote for his time (42). Coyote, on the other hand, is a word magician, adroit at twisting words into unexpected meanings and relationships, making outrageous, yet philosophically suggestive plays on words that are strongly reminiscent of Lewis Carroll. (The “learning” and “leaning” contrast (61) and the “foot from the ground” episode (72) are particularly Carrollian.) Coyote’s gentle “leaning” metaphor is also qualitatively contrasted with the anthropologist’s intention of “cutting to the core” (58) of the Creation myth, his shaking his head “violently” (20), his being “so excited he couldn’t sit still” (36-7); all possibly helping to explain why Coyote is able to bounce on the reflection of the moon while the anthropologist shatters it (95).

The narrator of the story is, for the most part, omniscient but detached. The narration is in the third person, using a mixture of simple, non-evaluative description of events, direct discourse and what Martin, following Cohn, calls “psycho-narration” (Martin 1986: 140) by which the contents of the character’s mind can be described. (In fact, as discussed above, only the anthropologist’s thoughts are reported.) At one point, however, the narrator intrudes into the story in a very odd way. In the “foot from the ground” episode, Coyote accuses the anthropologist of not studying his notes “to this story” (70) and explains the magical phenomenon by referring to the “paragraph in front of this one” (71). The emphatic deixis produces a startling blurring of boundaries, in which the narrator suddenly assumes the trickster persona of Coyote, and the reader is identified with the character of the anthropologist. A similar disorientation is experienced by the reader a few lines later when the narrator reports that “because this story is getting too long, Coyote became somewhat impatient” (75-6), where the change of tense again blurs the separation of reader and participant, narrator and character, past and present. (This is a common feature of oral narrative, but unusual in a written text.) The narrative style then reverts to its previous detachment, but it is at this point that Coyote leads the anthropologist on a journey to do “some leaning” (77) and the latter does not speak again in the story.

The events of the story are related simply, without narratorial commentary, yet are increasingly magical in character. Coyote’s first utterance is a reply to the anthropologist’s unspoken thought, as are many of his subsequent remarks in the conversation at the

campfire. In Chatman's terms, the narrative kernels are the first appearance of Coyote, Coyote's balancing of his coffee cup on a hair, his bouncing on the moon's reflection and, finally, the failure of the anthropologist to emulate this feat. The sequence therefore rises to the magical climax of Coyote's swinging from the moon, before the bathetic resolution of the anticlimactic finale.

This is a narrative, however, in which the satellites (Barthesian catalysers) and indices do much to give the story coherence and force. The anthropologist, for instance, is introduced as having just received his doctorate (2) for a paper on Coyote as "Trickster, Thief, Fool and World-Maker's Helper" (3). Coyote also claims to be a doctor, here to help the anthropologist (47), perhaps in the sense of treating him, but ironically fulfilling his categorisation as "World-Maker's Helper," since the anthropologist wishes "to create a whole fabric of thought, a completed tapestry" (52); to construct, in effect, a world. The narrative also clearly shows Coyote to be a trickster and (in the Shakespearean sense) a fool, and his robbing the anthropologist of both academic certainty and dignity demonstrates his credentials as a thief. In this ironic sense, then, Coyote confirms the anthropologist's designation of him by exposing the limitations and arrogance of any such categorisation. There may even be a sly dig at academia and the anthropologist's recent doctorate when, in the final episode, the anthropologist is described as "creating a great splash as he sank from view." (92-3)

Temporal relations are generally straightforward, and can be discussed in terms of the three major temporal manipulations described by Genette: order, duration and frequency. (Discussed in Toolan 1988: 49) Order refers to the relation between the assumed sequence of story events and their narrative presentation, and the story seems to move forwards in time with only one simple analepsis used to introduce the anthropologist (1-2). Duration, the relation between the time taken by story events and the amount of text devoted to them, is also fairly unproblematic, especially since so much of the narrative is directly quoted dialogue. There is clearly a temporal ellipsis when Coyote takes the anthropologist across the desert (78), but the events of the story all seem to take place in the course of the same night. Frequency, the number of times an event occurs relative to its narrative repetitions, is not an important factor as the story is told sequentially.

Time as a concept, however, is a central concern in the story, as shown by Coyote's question, "What time are you?" (28) and his reply to the anthropologist's offer to pay him for his time (44-5). Coyote has obviously read Edward T. Hall's book defining nine categories of time (Hall 1983), and can both recognise them and operate appropriately, as shown by his dancing lightly from one class of time to another (45). The anthropologist, on the other hand, is restricted to "tick-tock time" (32) and is consequently unable to answer Coyote's question as to what time he is. The anthropologist's sense of time as an exact, quantifiable measure is, like his thought and language, part of his rigid identity as a social scientist.

Similarly, causality in this narrative is not susceptible to the rational world paradigm of Western science. Events are not so much the effects of observable causes, the results of certain actions, as they are incidents for which explanations (not necessarily rational) need to be inferred. The anthropologist is wondering what the coyote he hears would think of "the myths about him" (9) and Coyote appears; is this cause and effect? (There is a pleasing ambiguity lent to this exchange by the imprecision as to what the myths in question are: those of the traditional Coyote folklore canon, or those written about that canon by the anthropologist?) "The anthro knew he must be hallucinating" (24); is this the real cause? Nothing else in the story supports this hypothesis except that the events cannot be explained in scientific terms. Coyote's explanation of why the hair remains in the air (72) has a persuasive Carrollian logic to it, but it is not a scientific reason; rather, the explanation itself demonstrates the futility of trying to tie down the world and its phenomena in rational language. Answers are found not through learning, but by leaning, slowly, "so that you don't bend the solution too badly out of shape" (63). Coyote implies that there are outcomes about which he is not sure (88, 96), but both his actions (81) and his words (97) suggest that singing is an important causal agent. Earlier, Coyote's first question about the anthropologist's identity-confirming tape recorder had been "Do you pet it or sing to it?" (39)

As far as the audience for "Coyote's Anthro" is concerned, the narrative text itself gives few indications. Although it shares many structural features with traditional folktales, it is more sophisticated than many in content and technique, enabling it to work on a variety of different levels. It is, at the most accessible level, the "funny story" mentioned by Penn,

short and written in simple language; and can thus be appreciated by children. At another level, however, it is a witty and subtle study of the incompatibility of two world views, specifically (though not exclusively) those of anthropologists and their Native American "subjects," and the story perhaps has special significance for those two groups.

Foss's final analytic feature, theme, is inextricably connected with audience, since (unless the author's intention is assumed) the perceived theme will depend on the reader, as noted above. Clearly though, the story achieves its effects by presenting an interaction between two representatives of not only different cultures, but different ontological states; Coyote, after all, is "a myth" (18). This status, however, legitimises the presentation of narrative events not found in "naturalistic" stories and serves to dramatise the contrast between the two protagonists. Rather than the events of the story, however, it is the characters of Coyote and the anthropologist that carry the theme. "Today," says Dell Hymes, "Coyote has become a favorite symbol, even a patron saint, for a good many writers and artists, admired as a mocking, resourceful outsider, often down but never out." (Hymes 1996: 108) In this case, however, Coyote's outsider status is de-emphasised and instead he serves as a symbol of integration and wisdom; in this story, it is the anthropologist who is the outsider, attempting to apply his academic templates to a world of mystery beyond his comprehension.

In a sense, the narrative is a dramatised, fictionalised version of the arguments of Vine Deloria, Jr. in his influential book *Custer Died for Your Sins*, a savage but witty indictment of the motives and behaviour of many Anglo anthropologists:

Reduction of people to ciphers for purposes of observation appears to be inconsequential to the anthropologist when compared with immediate benefits he can derive, the production of further prestige, and the chance to appear as the high priest of American society, orienting and manipulating to his heart's desire. (Deloria 1969: 99)

The anthropologist in the story fits this characterisation reasonably well; he is excited (1) not by the work, but by his just having received a doctorate and a generous grant. His "latest informant" (6) seems little more than a cipher and, as he openly admits to Coyote,

“it’s the stories I’m most concerned with” (49); not, that is, by implication, the people.

One of Coyote’s attributes, not mentioned in the title of the fictional anthropologist’s paper, is that of shape-shifter, and it is interesting that a recent writer, discussing Deloria’s influence, explicitly compares him to “that sort of shape-shifter.” (Wax 1997: 50) In the story, that is, Coyote may be said to function as a critic of anthropology in the Deloria mould, and it has already been noted above that Coyote is the narrator’s voice. Is it then possible to take one step further outside the story frame and argue that Peter Blue Cloud is using the story form to voice the same concerns as Deloria? Certainly the selective presentation of the characters of the protagonists emphasises their differences, and Coyote satirises the anthropologist’s pseudo-scientific jargon by telling him he sounds “just like my tapeworm” (56), an odd simile except that a tapeworm is a notorious parasite — precisely the relationship that exists, Deloria implies, between anglo anthropologists and their Native American “hosts.”

In conclusion, the above discussion of the story in terms of Foss’s eight narrative features allows, I believe, reasonably confident answers to be given to the research questions posed at the beginning of this analysis. In response to the first question as to which features of narrative were chosen by the author to tell the story, it has been shown how, in particular, the narrative voice is manipulated to give selective access to the thoughts of the protagonists. While Coyote’s thoughts are closed to the reader, those of the anthropologist are presented openly, supporting my thesis that Coyote can be identified with the narrator. In Fowler’s terminology (Fowler 1986), the narration shifts between an intrusive, unlimited, omniscient style and a detached, limited, impersonal one depending on the character being presented. The “postmodernist” switch to what Fowler calls an estranged style, in which the narrator self-referentially comments on the length of the story and has one of the protagonists react to the narratorial intrusion as a causal factor (75-6), further suggests, in my view, authorial identification with the narrator, and hence with Coyote. A secondary inference from this point is that the reader can be identified with the anthropologist in the story.

The second question concerned the narrative devices used by the author to characterise the protagonists and their world views, and this point has been fully covered in

the discussion above. The most important indication in this respect is the difference in speaking styles of Coyote and the anthropologist, the former using words playfully yet suggestively, avoiding rigid definition and implying the superiority of lived experience over academic learning. By contrast, the anthropologist needs everything pinned down in words that reflect "reality": Coyote is a myth, so cannot be present; the time is exact; singing cannot be an important causal factor. Discussing this phenomenon Cecil King has written: "The language used by anthropologists to explain us traps us in linguistic cages because we must explain our ways through alien hypothetical constructs and theoretical frameworks." (King 1997: 116) Coyote, however, is a myth, a shape-shifter, able to slip through the bars of such cages — to the consternation of the academic "expert."

The third research question dealt with the effect of the narrative as a whole on the reader and, while this response of course depends on the individual, in most cases the reader will identify at least to some extent with the anthropologist. "In America we have an entrenched state religion," writes Vine Deloria, "and it is called science." (Deloria 1997: 211) Most readers will "know" that Coyote is a myth, that "a foot from the ground" refers to a point in space, not to an actual limb, and that the reflection of the moon on the surface of a pool cannot support human weight. The story works by challenging these rationalist assumptions and showing that there are alternatives to the prevailing paradigm. While, therefore, it is, as the anthology editor suggests, a "funny story," it is at the same time a great deal more. "It's not the learning that's important, but the leaning." (61-2)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Biolsi, T. and L. J. Zimmerman (1997). Introduction: What's Changed, What Hasn't. *Indians and Anthropologists: Vine Deloria Jr. and the Critique of Anthropology*. T. Biolsi and L. J. Zimmerman. Tucson, University of Arizona Press.

Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of Meaning*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Chatman, S. (1969). "New Ways of Analysing Narrative Structures." *Language and Style* 2: 3-36.

Deloria, V., Jr. (1997). Anthros, Indians, and Planetary Reality. *Indians and Anthropologists: Vine Deloria Jr. and the Critique of Anthropology*. T. Biolsi and L. J. Zimmerman. Tucson, University of Arizona Press.

Deloria, V. J. (1969). *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*. New York, Macmillan.

Fisher, W. (1987). *Human Communication as Narration: Toward a Philosophy of Reason, Value, and Action*, University of South Carolina Press.

Foss, S. (1996). *Rhetorical Criticism*. Prospect Heights, Waveland Press.

Fowler, R. (1986). *Linguistic Criticism*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Hall, E. T. (1983). *The Dance of Life: The Other Dimension of Time*. New York, Anchor Books.

Hymes, D. H. (1996). Coyote, the Thinking (Wo)man's Trickster. *Monsters, Tricksters, and Sacred Cows: Animal Tales and American Identities*. A. J. Arnold. Charlottesville, University Press of Virginia.

King, C. (1997). Here Come the Anthros. *Indians and Anthropologists: Vine Deloria Jr. and the Critique of Anthropology*. T. Biolsi and L. J. Zimmerman. Tucson, University of Arizona Press.

Martin, W. (1986). *Recent Theories of Narrative*. Ithaca, Cornell University Press.

Penn, W. S., Ed. (n.d.). *The Telling of the World: Native American Stories and Art*. New York, Stewart, Tabori & Chang.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1988). *Narrative Knowing and the Human Sciences*. Albany, State University of New York Press.

Propp, V. (1968). *The Morphology of the Folktale*. Austin, University of Texas Press.

Rimmon-Kenan, S. (1983). *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*. London, Methuen.

Toolan, M. J. (1988). *Narrative: A Critical Linguistic Introduction*. London, Routledge.

Wax, M. L. (1997). Educating an Anthro: The Influence of Vine Deloria, Jr. *Indians and Anthropologists: Vine Deloria Jr. and the Critique of Anthropology*. T. Biolsi and L. J. Zimmerman. Tucson, University of Arizona Press.

APPENDIX:

COYOTE'S ANTHRO

* *MOHAWK* *

Told by PETER BLUE CLOUD

The anthropologist was very excited. He'd just received his
doctorate after having delivered his paper, entitled: The Mythology of
Coyote: Trickster, Thief, Fool and World-Maker's Helper. He was at
this very moment in the process of gathering further data, working on
5 a generous grant from a well-known Foundation. He'd just set up camp
in the sagebrush not far from his latest informant's shack.

Now he sat by his fire, looking at the stars and sipping coffee. He
chuckled to himself when he heard a coyote bark not far away. He
wondered what the coyote would think if the myths about him (or her)
10 were read aloud?

"Not much!" said a voice. The anthro was startled, he hadn't
heard anyone approach. "Not much, maybe just a cup of coffee and
some of that cake I see sitting there." Then into the campfire light
stepped an old man, but not a man. He had long, furry ears sticking
15 thru his felt hat, and he had a long, bushy tail hanging from beneath
his greatcoat. He leaned on his walking stick and grinned.

Good God! The anthro was stunned: it was Coyote Old Man
himself. But it couldn't be; he was a myth!

"Not always," Coyote said, as the anthro closed his eyes and
20 shook his head violently from side to side. When he opened his eyes,
Coyote was leaning toward him, his head cocked sideways, listening.

He nodded, "Yes, I heard them there in your head. Sounded like pebbles. Is that how you anthro's make music?"

25 The anthro knew he must be hallucinating. Better go along with it, he thought frantically, and maybe it'll go away. "Uh, are you Coyote Old Man?" he asked.

"Do I look like Fox Young Man? And do you really want me to go away?" Coyote studied the anthro, then asked, "What time are you?"

30 The anthro raised his arm to look at his watch, "Well, it's exactly ..."

Coyote interrupted, "Nothing's exactly. It's not tick-tock time I asked about. I just want to know what time you are." The anthro looked blank. "I thought so," said Coyote. "Well, let's have that coffee, then we can maybe figure things out."

35 So they sat drinking coffee, the anthro so excited he couldn't sit still. He reached for his tape recorder, then looked at Coyote, "Uh, do you mind if I turn this on?"

"Why not? Do you pet it or sing to it? Will it dance?"

40 Once he'd turned on his tape recorder, he felt more confident. He was, after all, an anthropologist. He picked up his notebook and pencil, and began, "I'll pay you for your time, of course," he said.

"It's not really mine I'm worried about, it's yours I'm here for. How can you pay me for my time when you don't know what your own is? How about this time? Yes, this time put a little more sugar in my coffee." Coyote laughed at himself, then looked seriously at the anthro; "I'm a doctor you know. I'm here to help you. Now then, how can I help you?"

50 "Well, actually, it's the stories I'm most concerned with. The reasons behind the reasons, if you follow me: interrelationships, the problem of spatial paradox, sexual taboos, those kind of things. I want to create a whole fabric of thought, a completed tapestry, no loose threads. Know what I mean?"

55 "Parrot Boxes, huh? Sex shell tables and follow-youse: what's all that? That how you talk about pussy in college? You know, you sound

just like my tapeworm, and he never did make any sense. How about just one question to begin with, huh?"

"Well, let's start with the Creation myth, cutting to the core! What's the meat of it really, the true meaning?"

60 "My friend," said Coyote, "if you think Creation's a myth, you just might be in serious trouble. It's not the learning that's important, but the leaning. You must lean toward your questions, your problems; lean slowly so that you don't bend the solution too badly out of shape."

65 Coyote plucked a long hair from his tail and held it horizontally a foot from the ground. He whispered something to the hair, then let it go, and it floated there where he'd held it. He took a sip of coffee, then placed his cup on the hair. The anthro was incredulous: the cup sat on the hair above the ground. He blurted out, "But how did you do that? What's holding the hair up?"

70 "You're not studying your notes to this story very well, are you? If you'll just relook at the paragraph in front of this one you'll find that a foot from the ground is holding things up. Of course, you can't see the foot 'cause I just made up its measured guess. Something invisible is sleeping under this sand and only its foot is sticking out."

75 And so, because this story is getting too long, Coyote became somewhat impatient, and quickly finished his coffee. He stood up and beckoned the anthro, "Come on then, we got some leaning to do." And Coyote led him across the desert to a deep pool of water near some mountains.

80 A full moon was reflected in the water, shining as brightly as the one in the sky. Coyote sat down and began singing. Then, still softly singing, he leaned out over the water and touched the reflected moon. The water bent to his touch like rubber. Still singing he stepped onto the water moon, bouncing slightly. He jumped a bit and bounced up and down. Then he began bouncing in earnest, bounding into the sky, 85 even doing a couple of back flips. He bounced as high as he could and grabbed the moon in the sky and hung there grinning at the anthro. "Hey look at me," he said, "and I wasn't even sure I could do it."

90 He let go of the moon, did a double flip, bounced once and
landed next to the anthro. "Okay," he said, "I got it all nice and
rubbery. Go ahead and bounce a little."

So the anthro jumped from the bank, creating a great splash as
he sank from view. He was gasping and spitting out water as he
climbed from the pool.

95 "Well, well, look how you shattered the moon . . . You know, I
thought only us coyotes were silly enough to try things we weren't sure
of. And you, my friend, forgot to sing."