Lisandro Mendez's "Coyote and Deer": On Reciprocity, Narrative Structures, and Interactions
Author(s): Anthony Webster
Published by: University of Nebraska Press
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1185923
Accessed: 30/04/2009 15:22

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=unp.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.
Lisandro Mendez’s “Coyote and Deer”:
On Reciprocity, Narrative Structures,
and Interactions

ANTHONY WEBSTER

When the question arises, for instance, of investigating the poetry of the Indians, no translation can possibly be considered as an adequate substitute for the original.
Franz Boas, Handbook of American Indian Languages

Some forms of verbal art – verse, song, or chant – depend crucially on morphological and phonological, even syntactic, properties of the language in which it is formed. In such cases the art could not exist without the language, quite literally.
Ken Hale, “Language Endangerment and the Human Value of Language Diversity”

1. INTRODUCTION

The people who are now referred to as the Lipan Apache once hunted and gathered in Texas and Northern Mexico. However, by the beginning of the twentieth century their numbers had been largely reduced by the extermination policies of the governments of Texas, Mexico, and the United States. Today the Lipan Apaches’ language is one of many indigenous languages that are on the brink of, if not already beyond, extinction. Knowledge of the language and past practices of this group of Southern Athapaskan–speaking people is primarily found through the linguistic work of Harry Hoijer and from the ethnographic work of Morris Opler.1 While Opler contributed an important collection of English-only Lipan Apache myths and legends, only Hoijer has published a Lipan Apache text in the Lipan Apache language.2 The purpose
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here is to analyze a previously unpublished Coyote narrative from Hoijer's Lipan Apache notebook and, in doing so, to rectify the apparent bias of past research toward English-only translations.

First I will give some background on the narrative event between Lisandro Mendez and Harry Hoijer (section 2). I will then present Mendez's brief narrative, "Coyote and Deer," in Lipan first and then in English (section 3). In section 4 I will discuss the rhetorical and poetic devices employed by Mendez to create meaningful units within this narrative (i.e., the line, the verse, the stanza, and the part). In section 5 I will suggest that this narrative be understood as a narrative about reciprocity. In section 6 I discuss in a preliminary and general way the relationship between this narrative and some Lipan Coyote narratives told by an unnamed narrator or narrators as taken from the unpublished works of Pliny Earle Goddard, John Rush Buffalo's Tonkawa Coyote story, two Mescalero Apache Coyote tales, and the Coyote narratives told in Chiricahua Apache by Sam Kenoi and Lawrence Mithlo. In section 7 I will discuss the implications of the various themes developed in the prior sections.

2. MENDEZ AND HOIJER

Lisandro Mendez told the story of "Coyote and Deer" to Harry Hoijer in 1938 while residing on the Mescalero Reservation. Hoijer was interested in this narrative from Mendez for his, Hoijer's work on understanding the complex Southern Athapaskan verb. For Hoijer the narrative was linguistic data. He was not greatly concerned with the narrative as Lipan Apache culture, as Lipan Apache verbal art. Hoijer wrote little about Mendez. What we do know is that Hoijer found him to be of the utmost help in translating and understanding the narrative of another Lipan Apache storyteller, Augustina Zuazua. We also know that Mendez attended boarding school in California and Arizona. Of the four Lipan Apache texts recorded in Hoijer's notebook, three were told by Lisandro Mendez and the other by Augustina Zuazua. "Coyote and Deer" is the only Coyote narrative found in the notebook. It also is the first Lipan Apache narrative told to Hoijer. Mendez's other two narratives concern his experiences at school in California and Arizona.

Hoijer wrote down the narrative but did not record it on a phonograph or any other sound recording device. Therefore, one is left with the visual representation of the spoken utterance only. Information concerning paralinguistic devices is nonexistent. I cannot make statements concerning intonation contours, pauses, or shifts in voice quality. However, by following Hymes's ethnopoetic methodology I believe that something of the narrative structure can be seen. Something of the patterning within Mendez's narrative may be recovered. This recovery of part of the narrative structure of a Lipan Apache
Coyote narrative adds to the work of Morris Opler who was, unfortunately, content to present English-only translations of Coyote narratives without giving attention to the structures found within Lipan versions. I do not claim that a single story from a single narrator can be held up as the archetype of Lipan Apache narrative tradition. Instead, I am concerned with how one Lipan Apache, Lisandro Mendez, told this one Coyote story to Harry Hoijer in the real time circumstances of the linguistic interview on the Mescalero Reservation in the late 1930s.

Ideally Coyote stories were, according to Opler’s Lipan Apache consultant, told “in either the winter or the summer.” Furthermore, one of Opler’s consultants said that “the Coyote story is a night story.” However, at least according to one of Opler’s Lipan consultants, this ideal could be set aside: “It must be told only at night. But you are a white man, and so I’ll tell it to you in the daytime.” Additionally, Lipan narrators, and Apache narrators more generally, often used Coyote stories as subtle and not-so-subtle critiques about participants presiding at the narration. For example, Opler offers this discussion by an Apache consultant of the use among the Chiricahua Apache of a particular Coyote narration to provide commentary on a participant at the narration:

> Once the old man was telling the whole bunch of us Coyote stories. It was just the time E. was having some troubles with his wife and mother-in-law. The old man thought he would have some fun with E. He made believe he wasn’t looking at E., but he was watching him out of the corner of his eye. When he came to a part where Coyote has some trouble with his wife or mother-in-law, if E. wasn’t looking he’d motion toward him and say, “I guess it’s this fellow.” Everyone would laugh, and E. would look up. By this time the old man would be looking the other way and going on with his story as though nothing had happened.

> At first E. laughed too. He didn’t know it was for him. But after awhile he got suspicious. He kept his eyes on the old man. Then he’d get tired or look around, and just that quick the old man would do it again . . .

> Then they came to the story where Coyote tells his mother-in-law to put her arm in the log after the rabbit because her arm is longer. Right there E. caught him. He jumped up. He cursed and said, “You just talk about me all the time!”

> The old man laughed. “What’s the matter? Why do you get mad? Was it you? Are you that Coyote?”

> E. was so mad he walked out. The old man called after him, “You must have been that Coyote.”

Mendez’s Coyote story was also part of a larger tradition that was in circulation at the time. Thus an analogous Coyote narrative appears in Opler’s collec-
tion. In that narrative Antonio Apache, the narrator, builds the story on the interaction of Coyote and Buffalo, in place of contact between Coyote and Deer. A similar story, "Coyote and Buffalo," can also be found in the unpublished Lipan narratives collected by Goddard. The presence of Buffalo instead of Deer in two Lipan Apache versions may be an attempt by the particular narrators to reflect a Lipan Apache Plains orientation. The story of "Coyote and Deer" is also part of a wider tradition of "Bungling Host, Benevolent Host." Accordingly, Hymes has analyzed a Wishram Chinook version of "Coyote and Deer" and Opler recorded a Chiricahua Apache, English-only version of "Coyote and Deer" and an unpublished Mescalero Apache version as well.

3. THE NARRATIVE

Coyote and Deer, Lipan Apache Version

Part 1
A
Bij Mai'hi yaahaanishniya
   'Ako yilsikj
   Dàyilsikjó go dà'dziya ni'nií'ã

B
Nóo dáá bá’áyilá
   'Itsi'jí náhiisgahí yá'ik'i'itsíh
   Hoyóo báy ôqtsíh
   'Ániidah bíchóshni'á ná'ishísh chishíbíi'
   'Ániidah 'áshj xáhi diisnah
   'Ániidah yi'fiikanáníizii

C
Mai'hi yich'jnínikjá
   'Ániidah i'niíyá
   'Ashj iyá sidá
   'Ániidah dáá'ô'oyá

D
'Ákonóó shá'ô'ó'ã
   Nóo kich'á nádiisjá
   'Ákonóó hakiiłní
   "níigo shaadóó'nal"

Part 2
A
   'Ákonóó 'ô'ós'ahnoo Bijihígo kaaska'niyá
   'Ániidah (Mai'hi) bidii 'ágóląa. Chishj diisjáhí bitsii yił
   yi'llistl'ó
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Coyote and Deer, English Version

Part 1
A (Coyote visits Deer)
Coyote went to visit Deer.
   And he sat with him.
   As he was just sitting with him, they stopped eating.

B (Deer prepares food for Coyote)
Then he prepared food for him.
   He pounded dried meat for him.
    He had pounded it well for him.
   And now he poked a stick inside his nose.
    And now grease poured out of there.
    And now he mixed them together.

C (Deer gives food to Coyote and Coyote eats)
He put it down for Coyote.
   And now he began to eat.
    There he sat eating.
     And now he ate it.

D (Coyote leaves Deer)
And then the sun had set.
   Then he started to leave him.
    And then he spoke thus:
     “You, also, will come to me.”

Part 2
A (Deer visits Coyote)
And then later that same Deer also visited him.
   And now (Coyote) had made horns. Branchy sticks he had tied to his head.

B (Coyote prepares food for Deer)
Then he sat down toward him.
   Then he also had pounded meat for him.
    And now he also poked inside his nose.
     There only blood poured out.
4. DISCUSSION OF TEXT

I have broken the narrative into two main parts based on the internal organization of the narrative (marked part 1 and part 2). The first part is Coyote’s visit to Deer and the second part is Deer’s visit to Coyote. Part 1 opens with Coyote visiting Deer; both are named at the beginning of the narrative. Mendez opens part 2 with an explicit mention of Deer and Deer going to visit Coyote. In reading through this text it quickly becomes apparent that many sentences (17 of 23; 74 percent) begin with an initial particle: ‘áko ‘and’, n6o ‘then’, ‘ániidah ‘and now’, ‘áshí ‘there’, ‘ákonoo ‘and then’. I have taken Mendez’s repeated use of these initial particles to be one signal that a line has been created. I have also translated each particle, when it appears as an initial particle, consistently. It is obvious from the frequent presence of the initial particles that they are the primary way that Mendez organized his narrative. In two lines, including line 1, Mendez begins with an explicit mention of one of the two characters in this narrative. I treat these explicit mentions of a character as a line marker.

However, Mendez does not constrain himself to the use of initial particles and the explicit mention of characters by name as line markers. Mendez also uses parallelism within his narrative. In lines 5 and 6 Mendez uses a form of the verb -tsih ‘to pound’ in both lines. Thus we find that “He pounded dried meat for him / He had pounded it well for him.” Likewise in lines 11, 12, and 13 Mendez uses a form of the verb -yá ‘to eat’ in each line. In fact, this three-line sequence builds a nice “arc of expectation.” Coyote begins to eat, he eats, and he finishes eating.

In lines 2 and 3 Mendez uses yiisiikj ‘he sat with him’ in both lines, adding a prefix and a subordinating enclitic in line 3. The two forms are as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{yiil}-\text{si-kj} & \quad \text{with him-he-an animate object sits} \\
\text{da-yiil}-\text{si-kj-go} & \quad \text{just-with him-he-animate object sits-subordinating enclitic (as)}
\end{align*}
\]

Elsewhere, in lines 12 and 20, Mendez uses the neuter perfective form of this verb sidá ‘he sat’. It should be noted that Mendez uses the -kj ‘animate object lies’ form for Coyote only at the beginning of Coyote’s visit to Deer. Mendez uses the neuter perfective form -dá when Coyote is eating and later when he is the host. Hoijer suggested for Navajo, a related Southern Athapaskan language, that the ‘animate object lies’ form is used to highlight the animacy and potential movement of the object that lies. The neuter perfective form is used for animate beings to indicate the “withdrawal of motion,” and thus a person is not indicated as performing an action “but as a person . . . associated with an action or position.” This form, then, highlights the “at rest” condition.
With the above distinction in mind, I would suggest that Coyote, who is often identified only by his habitual motion, comes to visit Deer and therefore begins as an animate being, whose habitual state is moving. Mendez uses the ‘animate object lies’ verb stem to highlight Coyote’s animacy and his potential for movement. Once he begins eating (and this is speculation), Coyote assumes a position that is normally understood as at rest. People eating are normally at rest. Likewise, Coyote’s placement at home is also suggestive of stillness, a “withdrawal of motion,” that is, being at rest. At home one is normally at rest and therefore the neuter perfective form is appropriate. Mendez, it seems, is alternating the use of the ‘animate object lies’ and the neuter perfective form to indicate activities in relation to movement, Coyote’s habitual motion, or a “withdrawal of motion”: Coyote eating and at home. Consequently, Coyote starts the narrative as a highlighted animate being, “the trotting Coyote,” but Mendez seems to “withdraw” Coyote’s motion as the narrative continues and as Coyote, in eating and preparing food, becomes more settled.

Mendez also parallels part 1 in part 2, when Coyote attempts to both reciprocate the kindness Deer has shown and reproduce Deer’s abilities. This is signaled by Mendez’s repeated use of the phrase bichishni’a nā’iishish ‘he poked it inside his nose’ in both lines 7 and 22. The connection also is signaled by Mendez’s repeated use of a verb form -tsih ‘to pound’ in both part 1 and part 2.

I have broken this narrative further into stanzas (marked by capital letters flush left and above) and verses (marked by lowercase letters flush right). Stanzas have been organized on thematic considerations. Thus stanza B of part 1 depicts Deer preparing food for Coyote. Stanza C of part 1 concerns Coyote eating that food. Stanza D of part 1 relates Coyote taking his leave of Deer and inviting Deer to visit him sometime. Stanza A of part 2 sets the stage for the action that follows in Stanza B. Stanza B of part 2 then describes Coyote’s attempt to replicate Deer’s magic and the consequence of that action. Due to the lack of explicit naming of characters in this narrative, I have included in italics a parenthetical summary of each stanza above the corresponding stanza. I hope this clarifies the actor in each stanza, that is, who is doing what for whom.

Verses are segmented according to both thematic considerations and Mendez’s use of parallelism. For instance, in part 1 stanza C verse b, Mendez uses three forms of ‘to eat’ in those three lines. In stanza B verse a of part 1 Mendez uses a form of yá’ ‘for’ in each line. Likewise, in stanza B verse b of part 1 Mendez begins each line with the identical particle, ‘áníidah ‘and now’. The use of ‘and now’ also seems to suggest an active-ness to Deer’s drawing forth grease from his nose. It should be added that this is the crucial action that Coyote will attempt to replicate later in the narrative. As I pointed out above, line 7 is paralleled in line 22 with bichishni’a nā’iishish ‘he poked it inside his nose’; it also is paralleled by the initial particle ‘and now’. Notice that it is the ‘stick’ that is
missing from Coyote’s attempt to draw grease from his nose. His attempt in line 22 nearly replicates line 7, but the absence of the ‘stick’ seems to undo his endeavor. Here are the two lines:

line 7: ‘Ániidah bíchishní’á ná’íishiish chishíbib.
and now inside his nose he poked it with a stick
And now he poked inside his nose with a stick.

line 22: ‘Ániidah bišó bíchishní’á ná’íishiish.
and now he also inside his nose he poked it
And now he also poked inside his nose.

5. RECIPROCITY AMONG THE LIPAN APACHE

In this section I explore the place of this narrative within a framework of Lipan Apache “beliefs, values and norms” that had as a precept the notions of “sharing and generosity.”²¹ Opler has pointed out, in rather functionalist terms, that the Lipan Apache, who had been primarily hunters and gatherers in prereservation days, used reciprocity and generosity – the sharing of food – to decrease the stress about the uncertainties of subsistence.²² That is, following Opler’s explanation, though a hunter may not be successful he can rely on the generosity of fellow band members to keep from starving. Likewise, when that hunter has been successful he will provide for those who have been less successful. Whether or not we accept Opler’s functionalist explanations, we can certainly infer that many Lipan Apaches valued the importance of reciprocity and generosity – in the form of food sharing.

Unlike the Chiricahua Coyote narratives told by Sam Kenoi (discussed in the next section), this narrative is about actions and not about speaking. Only one spoken line can be found in Mendez’s “Coyote and Deer,” line 17, Coyote’s invitation to Deer. Instead, this narrative is broken into two parts, two halves, both concerning actions. In part 1 Coyote visits Deer and Deer feeds Coyote. In part 2 Deer visits Coyote and Coyote intends to feed Deer. Hymes has pointed out that the focus on the “Bungling Host” has distracted us from the other aspect of this narrative: that of the “Benevolent Host.”²³ The implicit message of this narrative is that a good host shares food. Deer behaves in an appropriate manner and is invited by Coyote to visit him; that is, Coyote will attempt to reciprocate Deer’s hospitality. Coyote, however, in attempting to reciprocate Deer’s generosity also attempts to replicate Deer’s “power” to make grease pour from his nose. Coyote shows hubris here in trying to replicate Deer’s “power.” Instead of grease pouring from his nose, as Deer had done, only blood pours from Coyote’s nose. A second, implicit message might be that one should not try to use “power” that one does not have the ability to access.
Notice that the majority of this narrative is spent on Coyote’s visit to Deer and not on Deer’s visit to Coyote. By spending more “narrated time” on Coyote’s visit to Deer, Mendez brings to the fore Deer’s behavior, his generosity as a host. The “Bungling Host” section, or punch line, is secondary. The brevity of part 2 – it takes only three lines for Coyote to try to prepare the meat as compared to in part 1 where it takes six lines for Deer to prepare the meat – also suggests a hastiness and carelessness in the preparation of the food. This is reflected in the incompleteness of the parallel lines 7 and 22, where Coyote’s effort is performed without the stick. These sticks were, instead, used as artificial horns in Coyote’s dressing up as Deer.

Finally, notice that Mendez uses a form of ya’ ‘for’ in a number of lines (4, 5, 6, and 21). Thus, Deer does not just pound meat. Instead, Mendez uses this form yá’ik’i’ntsíh ‘he pounded it for him’, suggesting that the action is for someone. Deer is preparing the meat for Coyote. Here Mendez is making it clear that Deer is doing this for someone, he is being generous. Likewise, Coyote is pounding the meat for Deer (line 21), but it is his rashness and incomplete reconstruction of Deer’s action that leads to a bloody nose. The correctness of generosity and reciprocity is thus implicit throughout this narrative. It is, indeed, what motivates the story.

6. COMPARATIVE NOTES ON LIPAN, MESCALERO, CHIRICAHUA, AND TONKAWA COYOTE NARRATIVES

In this section I will make some general and preliminary connections between Mendez’s story and a small corpus of Lipan Apache Coyote narratives collected by Pliny Earle Goddard.24 I will also compare Mendez’s narrative to a number of narratives collected by Hoijer in the 1920s and 1930s. These include a collection of Mescalero Apache Coyote narratives, some Chiricahua Apache Coyote narratives, and some Tonkawa Coyote stories.25 The discussion that follows is meant to be suggestive – to point toward future lines of research. A more complete study of Southwestern ethnopoetics is beyond the scope of this paper. I have chosen these narrative traditions because of there interconnectedness.

Before continuing I need to make one important point. In the discussion that follows I will be drawing conclusions based on the texts transcribed by Pliny Goddard and Harry Hoijer. Specifically I will be arguing that the absence or presence of certain narrative devices – be they particles or enclitics – is important. It can therefore be rightly asked, Is the absence of a narrative enclitic simply due to Hoijer or Goddard not transcribing it? Andrew Wiget points out that there were two general strategies with regard to “reportative features” such as a narrative enclitic.26 One strategy was to simply not transcribe narrative suffixes and the like because of their repetition. The second was to transcribe
them in the source-language text and not translate them or use an abbreviation (such as a capital S) in the English versions. Hymes has noted that the second way was the primary way Hoijer dealt with Tonkawa quotative suffixes. In his work on Chiricahua and Mescalero texts Hoijer transcribes the narrative enclitic but does not translate them. Likewise, Goddard transcribes narrative suffixes and enclitics but does not consistently translate them. I am operating under the assumption that Hoijer and Goddard did not transcribe a narrative enclitic minimally because they did not hear it and maximally because it was not uttered. I base this assumption on the fact that in their previous collections of texts Hoijer and Goddard consistently did transcribe narrative enclitics and suffixes.

Historically, the Tonkawa were the eastern neighbors of the Lipan Apache. As early as the 1780s the Tonkawa were reported to be trading with both the Lipan and Mescaleros. Throughout the 1800s the Tonkawa and Lipan Apaches were often reported to be trading, raiding, hunting, and, at times, residing together and intermarrying. All this interaction suggests, at the least, individual bilingualism among Tonkawa and Lipan peoples. Furthermore, one group of Lipan were relocated to Oklahoma with the remnants of the Tonkawa. A second group of Lipan, comprising nineteen individuals, were relocated from Mexico to the Mescalero Reservation between 1903 and 1905.

The Mescaleros were, historically, the western neighbors of the Lipan Apaches, and, as pointed out above, had occasional interaction with Tonkawas as well. Verne Ray, in his review of historical Apache documents, concludes that the Lipan and Mescaleros had often interacted on “friendly” terms. Opler, in his preface to his collection of Lipan narratives, points out that since the Lipan had arrived on the reservation many Lipans and Mescaleros had intermarried. Harry Basehart suggests that Lipans and Mescaleros had intermarried since the 1850s. He also points out the Mescalero Apaches would visit their “kinsmen” among the Lipan and the Lipan would visit the Mescaleros as well. Opler also adds that he had to exclude from his collection some “myths and legends” because he could not verify that they were of “pure” Lipan origin and not Mescalero in origin. To give some sense of the connections between Lipans, Tonkawas, and Mescaleros, I quote below a discussion by Antonio Apache, a Lipan, on the origins of the peyote ceremony.

The Mescalero already had the ceremony before I came here to the Mescalero Reservation. The Mescalero used to go down and meet the Lipan. That is how it started. They got it from the Lipan.

The Lipan learned it from the Carrizo before they had had any experience with white people or Mexicans. They were by themselves then. The Tonkawa got it from the Carrizo people too.

The eastern tribes hardly know how to use peyote. They got it recently. They use dancing songs in there now.
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The Tonkawa tell of a time some Indians from the north came with peyote. The Tonkawa already knew it, but they kept quiet. These Indians said, “Let’s put up a ceremony.” “What kind?” “Oh, a medicine ceremony.” “With what?” “Peyote.” Then they had a big meeting. The northern people said, “It’s this way, this way.” They started with their gourd and drum. But they could not do much. The songs were about half and half. It did not sound like much. Then it was the turn of a Tonkawa to sing. They did it right. They shook the rattle. They sang four songs in the right way. The others were ashamed. They stopped at midnight and went on their way.

Finally, the Chiricahuas were the western neighbors of the Mescaleros, and like the Lipans and Mescaleros they spoke a Southern Athapaskan language. Historically, the Chiricahuas occasionally intermarried with Mescalero Apaches. Chiricahuas also visited the Mescaleros and the Mescaleros “reciprocated.” In 1913 the Chiricahua Apaches, after being released from their twenty-seven-year status as prisoners of war, were given the option of relocating from Fort Sill, Oklahoma, to the Mescalero Reservation. Roughly two-thirds chose to relocate to the Mescalero Reservation. It should also be added that on an individual level Chiricahuas and Tonkawas also interacted. For example, Sam Kenoi—a Chiricahua Apache whose narratives will be analyzed below—attended boarding school with Tonkawa children and in 1902 participated in a Tonkawa peyote ceremony in Oklahoma.

During Opler’s fieldwork in the 1930s, he reported that many Mescaleros, Lipans, and Chiricahuas still differentiated themselves, that is, they identified themselves as Lipan, Mescalero, or Chiricahua. For example, Opler recorded this account from a Lipan consultant:

At J.’s mother’s [a Lipan woman, M.O.] camp a little while ago J. M. [also a Lipan woman, M.O.] and a Mescalero Apache woman were visiting. The three women heard a roaring outside. They rushed out to see what it was. They thought it was something down the road. They waited for an automobile to come by. The sound went by but no car. The two Lipan women said to each other, “It must be ghosts.” The Mescalero woman didn’t understand, for they used the word bak’oš for ghost. “What does bak’oš mean?” she asked. “Oh, we mean the same as ch’i’dn [the Mescalero word for ghost, M.O.] by that,” they told her.
comparative notes present something of the “ethnohistory of communication” concerning the circulation and structuring of Coyote narratives. That is, I take Lipan, Mescalero, Chiricahua, and Tonkawa to be “language communities” that interact within a “speech community,” all primarily focused on the Mescalero Reservation but not exclusively so – taking into account the complex relations Chiricahuas, Mescaleros, and Lipans had with Tonkawa speakers – especially given the intertwined histories of Tonkawas and Lipans. However, it should be clear that Mendez’s narrative stands on its own as a highly structured poetic narrative. What follows attempts to find connections and disjunctions with other narrators and narratives.

First, I have examined a number of unpublished Lipan Apache Coyote narratives collected by Goddard in the early 1900s. Among the stories collected is a story that concerns the “Benevolent Host” section of “Coyote and Buffalo,” a narrative that parallels the first half of Mendez’s “Coyote and Deer.” However, the narrative ends with the invitation by Coyote for Buffalo Bull to visit him. From a preliminary analysis, the narrator(s) of these Coyote stories also used the repetition of initial particles. Thus one finds the particles akoa, aaka, and aci repeated in the various narratives with some regularity. For example, initial particles occur six times in the brief narrative “Coyote and Buffalo.” These narratives also lack the repeated use of the narrative enclitic. Below I present “Coyote and Buffalo” from Goddard’s notes. I have not attempted to update Goddard’s orthography or clarify his translations. What should be noted is the repeated use of initial particles. Also note that Coyote begins on the move.

(i) aci a ca e tsi ko lun di bi ga ya ne cai e
he went again buffalo bull his house he came to

a ka a i ka doc to je ma tso tsi lic ma a dj e la
after that bark of tree pound it up meat he made it for him

a ko a tci se gis nez jis
after that stick he break off

a ko a kit tce xai na hai kit tso e des n da
after that his nose grease yellow ran out

mol ka na djonl tca
he mix up with for him

a ko a o ya
after that eat it
a ko a kiti dja
after that he went home

na de tsic ca ya xa
you must come to see me

han bil djin
yes he said

Coyote and Buffalo Bull, unnamed narrator

I have also examined a number of Coyote narratives told by Horace Torres and Charles Smith, two Mescalero men, to Harry Hoijer in the early years of the 1930s. They both used a narrative enclitic -n’a ‘they say’ regularly. Below, in examples (2) and (3), I present portions of Coyote narratives from Charles Smith and Horace Torres highlighting their use of the narrative enclitic.

(2) ‘ákoo shoödé goch’ánádeesdzáná’a
‘ákoo nádiidzágo ‘ilzénách’ísndiná’a
‘ákoo ‘inöödzáná’a
‘ákoo, dij’ hiishkánágo, bikooghayá baach’ ‘ikáná’áî

And then Coyote started to leave him, they say.
And then he arose and they embraced each other, they say.
And then he went away, they say.
And then, exactly four days had passed, they came to his home, they say.

Coyote and Blue Bunting, Charles Smith

(3) ma’yei ‘i’ntínnya holghoshgo dáldánéí bizhááí yi-ch’azhoshgo yíc
ītsáná’a
‘ákoo nahtlooshéí ‘ágoollindíná’a
“xa’yágoxeex nizháás’negó-zhónégo ‘ilkéé’t’igo nikiéé’ naanách’azhoshgo
‘á’sj?”
naahtklooshéí goollindíná’a

Coyote, trotting along a road saw Quail and her children walking along the road, they say.
Then Coyote spoke thus to her, they say:
"How do you keep your children going along after you in such a straight line?"
Coyote said to her, they say.

_Coyote and Quail, Horace Torres_

The exact amount of frequency of the narrative enclitic in these narratives is unimportant to my point. My point is that this narrative enclitic occurs in these two men’s Mescalero Coyote narratives. The Lipan arrived on the Mescalero Reservation in 1903 and prior to that had been the eastern neighbors of the Mescalero. One can, therefore, imagine a fair degree of intermingling. For example, in his preface to his collection of Lipan Apache narratives, Opler notes that he had to exclude some narratives because he was unsure if their origin was Mescalero or Lipan.⁴⁹

However, the narrative enclitic is completely absent from Lisandro Mendez’s narrative. The lack of such a narrative enclitic in his narrative as well as in Goddard’s Lipan Coyote stories marks these narratives as different from the two Mescalero storytellers’ Coyote tales which have the narrative enclitic as a line organizing principle. Mendez organized his narrative by using initial particles and did not use the narrative enclitic. It appears that different linguistic devices have been given different weights in organizing these narratives.

Turning to the Coyote stories of Sam Kenoi given in Chiricahua Apache, one realizes that he organized his narratives into lines by his consistent use of the narrative enclitic -ná’a ‘so they say’.⁵⁰ In fact, in many of Kenoi’s Coyote narratives every sentence outside of quoted speech ends with a narrative enclitic.⁵¹ Below is an excerpt from one of Kenoi’s narratives.

(4) mai ‘i’íntin hotghothná’a
‘i’íntinshj ditśj’óó’áí bitáshj néesdáñá’a
‘aashí sidágó ‘a’áálhná’a
nágo ditśj’óó’áí béesó yaađahyeęsndílná’a
nágo ‘íntinshj ‘indaاك naakí xééét yii’į́na’ilhná’a

Coyote was going along a road, so they say.
He sat down under a tree that was standing by the road, so they say.
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.
Then two white men came along the road driving a burden, so they say.

_Coyote and the Money Tree, Sam Kenoi⁵²_
Notice the stark contrast, regarding the narrative enclitic, to the Coyote narrative told by Lisandro Mendez. Kenoi’s use of initial particles also differs from Mendez’s. Kenoi used the initial particle nágo ‘then’ to signal switches in actor, action, time, or location. Kenoi used this particle to create larger discourse units and his use of other initial particles was far more limited.53 Mendez uses five different initial particles and he uses them more frequently than did Kenoi. I have argued, in fact, that Mendez uses the initial particle to create lines not stanzas.

Lawrence Mithlo, another Chiricahua storyteller, also told a Coyote narrative using the narrative enclitic regularly. Below is a brief excerpt from the beginning of Mithlo’s “Coyote Obtains Fire.”54 Note the repeated use of the narrative enclitic as well as the repeated use of the initial particle ‘ákoo. Notice also that Mithlo uses a form of the verb -gho, here in the perfective form, ‘to move, to run’, in conjunction with Coyote. This is similar to the openings of both Kenoi’s and Torres’s Coyote narratives. It also is similar to both Lipan versions of “Coyote and Deer/Buffalo” where Coyote begins on the move.55

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(s) 'ákoo tl'izhei gotál yiis'áñá'a} \\
\text{ 'ákoo mai 'áee híghoná'a} \\
\text{ 'gotál jiis'áí 'áee, mai tsibqae naaná'azhishná'a} \\
\text{ 'ákoo bitseei tsínáligoná'a}
\end{align*}
\]

And so the Flies held a ceremony, so they say.
And so Coyote came there, so they say.
At that place where they held the ceremony, Coyote danced around and around the edge of the fire, so they say.
And so he continually poked his tail in the fire, so they say.

Coyote Obtains Fire, Lawrence Mithlo56

Let us now turn to a comparison of the Tonkawa narrative told by John Rush Buffalo to Harry Hoijer and analyzed by Hymes.57 According to Hymes, John Rush Buffalo uses an interplay between initial particles and the quotative suffix (narrative enclitic) throughout his narrative.58 Thus in John Rush Buffalo’s Tonkawa Coyote narrative can be found both the quotative suffix and initial particles as rhetorical devices that create a coherent poetic text.

The use of a quotative device (either a particle or suffix) as a line or narrative organizing device is comparable to many Native American literatures.59 The absence of it in Mendez’s Coyote narrative is therefore of increased interest. While its absence says nothing about an overall Lipan Apache narrative style, it
does suggest that Lisandro Mendez organized this narrative by initial particles and not by the use of narrative enclitics. This is in contrast to the use of the narrative enclitic or quotative suffix in Sam Kenoi’s Chiricahua narratives (and Lawrence Mithlo’s Chiricahua Coyote narrative as well), in the two Mescalero men’s Coyote narratives, and in John Rush Buffalo’s Coyote narrative. My point is that other narrators of the Southwest who came from three different narrative traditions are known to have used the narrative enclitic while Lisandro Mendez did not. Mendez relied on the initial particle and the use of parallelism within his narrative to create a coherent and poetic discourse. I have also indicated that other Lipan Apache narrators telling Coyote stories, in the limited corpus I have examined from Goddard, also did not use the narrative enclitic but did use, with some regularity, a number of initial particles.

7. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Ultimately and most important, this was Lisandro Mendez’s narration to Harry Hoijer of a narrative he, Mendez, had heard before and probably told before, that is, he placed his performance within a previous narrative tradition. His narrative was situated in the real time fleeting moment of narration. Yet Mendez knew that these narratives were being “artifacted,” were being written down (recall that Mendez had gone to boarding schools). It also was an interaction between two social individuals: Mendez and Hoijer. An interaction that had an asymmetrical dynamic, Hoijer had the power to come onto the Mescalero Reservation and collect stories outside of their normal settings. Mendez, the host, held an asymmetrical relationship vis-à-vis cultural authority: Mendez was “the Lipan Apache.” Hoijer had also collected “Coyote Stories” from Mescalero and Chiricahua narrators earlier in the 1930s. In this light Coyote narratives were commodities that were of value to Hoijer – they were worthy of collection. They also provided a traditional way for Lipan Apaches to offer exhortations and to poke fun at given participants. Thus, on one hand Coyote narratives were an expected type of linguistic data – probably for both Hoijer and Mendez. On the other hand the narratives were a traditional way to indirectly express didactic and humorous opinions about participants. It is interesting that the first narrative that Lisandro Mendez tells Harry Hoijer is a Coyote narrative concerning the notions of reciprocity and hubris. It also is the only Coyote story Mendez tells Hoijer. Narrators, as Hymes pointed out long ago, tell stories for intentional reasons. Here I am suggesting that Mendez may have been connecting Hoijer and Coyote and, in effect, offering a subtle admonition to Hoijer about hubris and reciprocity. Note that I am not saying that Hoijer showed hubris or lacked a reciprocal relationship with Mendez. Rather, Mendez was admonishing Hoijer to not show hubris and to act in a reciprocal manner.
Let me state my argument explicitly: One interpretation of the interaction between Mendez and Hoijer — the telling of this story — argues that, as instructed, Mendez simply provided straightforward linguistic data to Hoijer for Hoijer’s linguistic work. A second interpretation, the one I have developed, holds that while Mendez may have provided linguistic data (in the form of a Coyote story) it was not problem-free linguistic data. That is, Mendez, in providing linguistic data also tapped into a tradition of using Coyote stories as a way to comment on participants, to draw them into the narrative. What is needed, I believe, is to see this narrative event as an interaction, where meaning was dialogic and negotiated.

Additionally, Mendez’s omission of a narrative enclitic while narrators of two other groups of Apaches on the Mescalero Reservation — the Chiricahua and Mescalero — had used the narrative enclitic may be a way for him to index or indicate his status as a Lipan Apache as differentiated from a Mescalero or Chiricahua Apache. Certainly there is a relationship between Mendez’s narrative structure and the narratives of Sam Kenoi, Lawrence Mithlo, Horace Torres, and Charles Smith. However, the reasons behind Mendez’s narration of “Coyote and Deer” in a particular way will remain elusive, because Hoijer did not inquire into these issues.62

The relationship between Tonkawa, Lipan, Mescalero, and Chiricahua was and continues to be a complex one. It would be fallacious to speak of these groups as isolated from one another. This multidimensional communicative interaction requires a theoretical approach similar to Silverstein’s notion of an “ethnohistory of communication.”63 Such a perspective is particularly focused on how discourse communities were multilingual during times of contact — be they European and Native American or Native American and Native American.64 I have attempted to outline what might be involved in such an approach, especially as it concerns verbal art and in particular how the Lipan, Mescalero, Chiricahua, and Tonkawa Coyote narratives were ethnopoetically structured. Thus I have been concerned with how a specific Coyote narrative was told so that it potentially could index the cultural position of the narrator. What made a Lipan Apache Coyote narrative a Lipan Apache Coyote narrative in relation to other Coyote narratives on the Mescalero Reservation? A few ways have been suggested in this paper. Further research into the “ethnohistory of communication” of the Mescalero Reservation (circa 1930) is required to explore these kinds of questions.

Finally, while the content of Chiricahua and Lipan Apache stories, for example, may be similar — that is, a story involving Coyote and Deer can be found to be told by both Chiricahua narrators and by Lipan narrators (leaving aside the alternation between Deer and Buffalo) — the form, the rhetorical structure, differs. Historical reconstruction based solely on the content of narratives is
not sufficient because it neglects the rhetorical structure as well as the “situatedness” of the narrative events. Specifically, a content-centered perspective misses the emergent ways narrators create interpretable contexts – to “become Lipan” and to offer admonitions about reciprocity and hubris to the audience – including “text”-collecting anthropologists and linguists (who were part of the audience and cannot be excluded). Ethnographers, linguists and the like often record seemingly straightforward “data” without realizing that they are also glimpsing performances, active and emergent, of their consultants. An “ethnohistory of communication,” therefore, needs to take into account the ways that the acts of elicitation were a part of the dialogic co-construction of text artifacts, implicated and entangled within a sociohistorical interactional context.

TRANSCRIPTION AND EDITING

I have updated Hoijer’s orthography to more closely match the orthography being used on the Mescalero Reservation. Therefore, ch represents a voiceless aspirated palatal affricate and sh represents a voiceless alveopalatal fricative. I have changed [t] to [tʰ], and for a glottal stop I have changed Hoijer’s half question mark to '. My goal in doing so is to make the narrative more accessible to both linguists and Apache readers. (For instance, this orthography is similar to the orthography currently being used among the Fort Sill, Oklahoma, Chiricahua.) Let me add here that no transcription is value free or neutral. Transcriptions are based on assumptions about narrative organization. The transcription policy I use highlights Mendez’s use of initial particles and parallelism.

In retranscribing and retranslating this narrative from Hoijer’s handwritten notebook I have relied heavily on a typed version of the narrative that is contained within Hoijer’s notebook. I have also examined Hoijer’s other work on Lipan and Southern Athapaskan in general, and Wilson and Martine’s piece on the closely related Jicarilla Apache language. I have attempted to render a reasonably accurate orthographic transcription. For example, Hoijer has in line 7 the final word as chishivii ‘with a stick’. I have retranscribed it as chishibii for a number of reasons. First, Lipan Apache does not have a phonemic [v]. Second, in Chiricahua Apache ‘with a stick’ is gishibe, the -ibe meaning ‘with’. Thus, I immediately suspected that the [v] was a /b/. In Hoijer’s presentation of Augustina Zuazua’s narrative on Lipan Apache customs he gives this form: bitqabii ‘with its leaves.’ Here -ibii ‘with’ is clearly spelled with a /b/. However, in Hoijer’s notebook he has written in his own hand a [v]. It seems probable that Hoijer heard a /v/, but realized later that it was a phonemic /b/. I have, therefore, changed [v] to /b/. However, Opler reports the Lipan word for ‘ghost’
as vakoc. Elsewhere, Opler reports the word as bak'oc 'ghost'. Again we see an alternation between [v] and [b]. It is therefore possible that Lisandro Mendez pronounced a [v] for sociolinguistic factors, such as indexing status or membership in a particular group. This is an intriguing question that appears to be unanswerable.

I have also, in line 22, changed Hoijer's bóó 'he also' to bígo 'he also'. I have done this for two reasons. First, in the previous line Mendez uses the form bígo 'he also' and the repeated use of this form would create parallelism across lines. Second, Hoijer himself puts an asterisk next to the form and writes bígo. I believe Hoijer realized that he had misheard the word or it did not fit his linguistic analysis and later corrected it.

In line 19 I have put mai'hi 'Coyote' in parentheses because in the original notebook it is inserted at an angle into the text. Here we may suppose that when going over the narrative Mendez realized that the actor who had fashioned horns might have been ambiguous and therefore inserted Coyote's name.
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2. For Opler's work see Myths and Legends; for Hoijer see "History and Customs"
3. See Hoijer, “Apachean Verb I,” “Apachean Verb II,” and “Apachean Verb III.”
15. The presence of initial particles is an interesting phenomenon in the Apache language. My own work on Chiricahua Apache suggests that initial particles can have different rhetorical functions. See Anthony Webster, “Sam Kenoi’s Coyote Stories: An Ethnopoetic Analysis of some Chiricahua Narratives” (master’s thesis, New Mexico State University, 1997).
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24. I thank Marilyn Graf, archivist, at the Archives of Traditional Music at Indiana University for locating Goddard’s Lipan Apache Coyote texts.


38. Opler, *Myths and Legends*.
40. Basehart, “Resource Holding Corporation.”
44. Opler, “Lipan Apache Death Complex,” 134. I have updated Opler’s orthography to match the orthography used in this paper.
46. One might assume that Lipan Apache did not have a narrative enclitic. However, a close examination of Hoijer’s “History and Customs” reveals a narrative enclitic —ná ‘it is said’.
47. For the texts see Hoijer, Chiricahua, 157–58. The example from Smith comes from Hoijer, Chiricahua, 157–58. The example from Torres comes from Hoijer, Chiricahua, 182.
48. I have not analyzed these narratives completely. I do want to note that Charles Smith, in example (2), uses ‘ákoo ‘and then’ regularly. Likewise, the verb form -gho ‘to move’ employed by Horace Torres in the opening of example (3) is similar to Sam Kenoi’s use of this in his Chiricahua Apache Coyote narratives. Both examples are from the “Bungling Host, Benevolent Host” tradition. See also Scott Rushforth, “Uses of Bearlake and Mescalero (Athapaskan) Classificatory Verbs,” IJAL 57:2 (1991), 251–66, for a discussion of the poetic uses of handling verbs in Charles Smith’s “Coyote and Blue Bunting.”
49. Opler, Myths and Legends, 10.
50. Webster, “Sam Kenoi’s Coyote Stories.”
51. Sam Kenoi did not regularly use the narrative enclitic within quoted speech. When he did, he often used it to signal that the speaker did not have firsthand knowledge of the events they were reporting.
52. Hoijer, Chiricahua, 18.
53. See Webster, “Sam Kenoi’s Coyote Stories” for a discussion of Kenoi’s poetics and rhetoric.
55. On the “trotting” Coyote see Toelken and Scott, “Poetic Retranslation.”
56. Hoijer, Chiricahua, 17.
57. Hymes, “Tonkawa Poetics,” and Hymes, “Use All There Is.”


62. In discussing this point David Leedom Shaul noted that there are at least two other reasons why the narrative enclitic may be absent from Mendez’s narrative. Shaul suggests that, first, “the lack of the usual genre signature could be iconic of the artificial context, and index of the lack of a bona fide status of his telling with Hoijer (in the day, probably out of winter season, etc.).” This is certainly a possibility. In all probability Mendez told the narrative in the daytime, contra Lipan norms (Hoijer tended to spend the summer months doing fieldwork on the Mescalero Reservation). What is of interest, then, is that Kenoi, Mithlo, Smith, and Torres all use the enclitic in the summer months, contra Mescalero and Chiricahua norms. From the dates in Hoijer’s notebooks we know, for example, that Kenoi told his narratives in June. Again, we have a distinction between Lipan and the other Apache narrators. Shaul’s second possibility is that “Mendez did not want a perfect or actual example written down for esoteric/ceremonial reasons.” Again, I agree. As Shaul points out, both of these reasons also fit my analysis, because they point to the narration as a real-time interaction.

63. See Silverstein, “Encountering Languages.”

64. See Silverstein, “Encountering Languages.”
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68. Hoijer, "History and Customs."

69. Phonologically speaking /v/ and /b/ share the distinctive features of +consonantal, -sonorant, +labial, +voice. They differ only in regards to continuation, where /b/ is a stop and therefore -continuant and /v/ is a fricative and +continuant. It is possible, given their phonological proximity, that they were allophones.

70. Opler, Myths and Legends, 4.

71. Opler, "Lipan Apache Death Complex," 134. Note that the variation in the use of [v] and [b] to possibly index some positionality is precisely the kind of information lost in English-only translations. I thank Scott Rushforth for suggesting the sociolinguistic implications of this variation.