

VOLUME 28 • NUMBER 3 • FALL 2016

Studies in American Indian Literatures

EDITOR

CHADWICK ALLEN, University of Washington

Published by the University of Nebraska Press

The editor thanks the Office of the Provost at the University of Washington for its financial support.

The book review editor thanks the Electa Quinney Institute for American Indian Education at the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, for its financial support.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

Studies in American Indian Literatures (SAIL ISSN 0730-3238) is the only scholarly journal in the United States that focuses exclusively on American Indian literatures. SAIL is published quarterly by the University of Nebraska Press for the Association for the Study of American Indian Literatures (ASAIL). For current subscription rates, please see our website: www.nebraskapress.unl.edu.

If ordering by mail, please make checks payable to the University of Nebraska Press and send to

The University of Nebraska Press
1111 Lincoln Mall
Lincoln, NE 68588-0630
Telephone: 402-472-8536

All inquiries on subscription, change of address, advertising, and other business communications should be sent to the University of Nebraska Press.

A subscription to SAIL is a benefit of membership in ASAIL. For membership information, please contact

Jeff Berglund
PO Box 6032
Department of English
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, AZ 86011-6032
Phone: 928-523-9237
E-mail: jeff.berglund@nau.edu

SUBMISSIONS

The editorial board of SAIL invites the submission of scholarly manuscripts focused on all aspects of American Indian literatures, as well as the submission of bibliographical essays, review essays, and interviews. We define "literatures" broadly to include all written, spoken, and visual texts created by Native peoples.

Manuscripts should be prepared in accordance with the most recent edition of the *MLA Style Manual*. SAIL only accepts electronic submissions. Please submit your manuscript by e-mail as an attachment (preferably as an MS Word document).

SAIL observes a “blind reading” policy, so please do not include an author name on the title page or first page or anywhere else in the article. With your submission do include your postal and e-mail addresses along with your phone number. All submissions are read by outside reviewers. Submissions should be sent directly to the new coeditors, Michelle Raheja and Siobhan Senier, at sail.editors@gmail.com.

For detailed information on *SAIL*'s editorial policy for special issues, please consult the title's submission guidelines on the Journals side of www.nebraskapress.unl.edu.

SAIL BOOK REVIEW POLICY

SAIL publishes reviews of a wide range of books and other publications related to Native American and Indigenous literary studies. The *SAIL* Book Review Editor solicits reviews by scholars, community members, and advanced graduate students in the field, but also welcomes queries from scholars, community members, and advanced graduate students interested in reviewing in a particular area or in reviewing a particular publication. Although *SAIL* typically publishes only a single review of a given work, the Book Review Editor will consider publishing additional reviews of the same work when multiple perspectives are available and will enhance the scholarly conversation. Reviews undergo copyediting to ensure they meet professional, style, and publishing standards for the journal and for University of Nebraska Press, but the accuracy of reviews and the evaluations and opinions expressed therein are the responsibility of the reviewer. The journal and its parent association, ASAIL, do not necessarily endorse the evaluations or opinions of reviewers.

Copyright © 2016 University of Nebraska Press

All rights reserved

Manufactured in the United States of America

If you would like to reprint material from *SAIL*, please query for permission using our online form, located under the Journals menu heading on www.nebraskapress.unl.edu.

SAIL is available online through Project Muse at <http://muse.jhu.edu> and through JSTOR at <http://www.jstor.org>.

Articles appearing in this journal are abstracted and indexed in *Anthropological Index*, *Arts & Humanities Citation Index*, *Bibliography of Native North Americans*, *Current Abstracts*, *Current Contents/Arts & Humanities*, *IBR: International Bibliography of Book Reviews*, *IBZ: International Bibliography of Periodical Literature*, *MLA International Bibliography*, and *TOC Premier*.

Cover photo courtesy of Bonita Bent-Nelson, copyright © 2003. Cover and interior design by Kimberly Hermesen.

GENERAL EDITOR

Chadwick Allen

BOOK REVIEW EDITOR

Margaret Noodin

EDITORIAL BOARD

Lisa Brooks, Jodi Byrd, Robin Riley Fast, Susan Gardner, Patrice Hollrah,
Molly McGlennen, Kenneth Roemer, Christopher Teuton, and Jace Weaver

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Lydia Heberling

BOOK REVIEW ASSISTANT

Bryce Stevenson

EDITORS EMERITUS

James H. Cox, Helen Jaskoski, Daniel Heath Justice, Karl Kroeber,
Robert M. Nelson, Malea Powell, John Purdy, and Rodney Simard

CONTENTS

vii From the Editor

ARTICLES

- 1 Old Song, Rough Music: The Shivoree Politics of
Lynn Riggs's *Green Grow the Lilacs*
JENNA HUNNEF
- 23 Discontinuous Narrative, Ojibwe Sovereignty, and the *Wiindigoo*
Logic of Settler Colonialism: Louise Erdrich's Marn Wolde
DEBORAH L. MADSEN
- 52 The Sartorial Indian: Zitkala-Ša, Clothing, and
Resistance to Colonization
C. DANIEL REDMOND
- 81 Apess's *Eulogy* on Tour: Kinship and the Transnational
History of Native New England
DANIEL RADUS

BOOK REVIEWS

- 111 Joy Harjo. *Conflict Resolution for Holy Beings: Poems*
FRANKLIN K. R. CLINE
- 113 Deborah L. Madsen, ed. *The Routledge Companion to
Native American Literature*
LYDIA R. COOPER
- 117 Sarah Deer. *The Beginning and End of Rape:
Confronting Sexual Violence in Native America*
MATTHEW L. M. FLETCHER

- 119 Richard Van Camp. *Night Moves*.
JOHN D. KALB
- 122 Kurt Schweigman and Lucille Lang Day, eds.
Red Indian Road West: Native American Poetry from California
PATRICIA KILLELEA
- 127 Daniel H. Wilson. *Quarantine Zone*
JACE WEAVER

FROM THE EDITOR

The Practice(s) of Rereading

The diverse essays brought together in *SAIL* 28.3 share common methodological practices of rereading by purposefully resituating Native authors and texts and by purposefully refocusing the lens of analysis. Jenna Hunnef begins the issue by rereading Lynn Riggs's largely ignored 1929 stage play *Green Grow the Lilacs*, source material for the better-known musical *Oklahoma!*, which debuted on Broadway in 1943, by resituating one of the play's key scenes within the European-derived custom of the shivoree, a mechanism for expressing communal disapproval of what the community determines is an incongruous marriage. This shift in critical lens enables Hunnef to investigate Riggs's subtle engagements with the turbulent politics at play in the Indian Territory prior to Oklahoma statehood, when relocated Indigenous peoples and recently arrived settlers were caught in the violence of a forced and "incongruous" union.

Deborah Madsen then examines the surprising complexity of the character Marn Wolde from Louise Erdrich's 2008 novel *The Plague of Doves* by rereading Wolde through a discontinuous and allusive practice rather than simply chronicling the character's linear progression across the story. Madsen's critical disruption of a linear understanding of Wolde's narrative resituates her character within multiple relevant Native and non-Native contexts and multiple Native and non-Native intertexts. The result is an expansive reading of Wolde outside the confines of her legibility as a victim of domestic violence and a better understanding of Erdrich as a writer who consistently challenges and consistently problematizes any easy understanding of settler-derived historical "truth."

Next, C. Daniel Redmond offers a rereading of Zitkala-Ša, her political activism on behalf of Indian citizenship, and her well-known 1921 collection *American Indian Stories* by refocusing the lens of analysis on

Zitkala-Ša's preoccupation with personal dress. Redmond asks us to consider how Zitkala-Ša's representations of both Native American and European American attire, as well as her rhetorical layering of multiple tropes of clothing in her published works and in her public performances, helped her to forward a particular activist agenda in the particular context of the 1920s.

Finally, the issue concludes with Daniel Radus's rereading of William Apess's 1836 *Eulogy on King Philip* and the largely unknown final years of Apess's public life by resituating Apess and refocusing the lens of analysis on live performance and travel rather than exclusively on textual production and reading. This attention to public performance, Apess's "touring" of his lecture, and all that such touring entailed—including engagements with local media technologies through the development of promotional publicity and engagements with local social and kinship networks through embodied practices of visiting—invite us to expand our understandings of the rhetorical and political projects of Apess as an early Native American "writer."

Chadwick Allen

Old Song, Rough Music

The Shivoree Politics of Lynn Riggs's *Green Grow the Lilacs*

JENNA HUNNEF

In a 1929 letter to his literary agent, Cherokee poet and playwright Rollie Lynn Riggs described his vision for a new play that would “concern itself with that night, that darkness . . . which has come to the Cherokees and their descendants” (qtd. in Braunlich 80). With seven achronological scenes spanning more than thirty-five years, a cast consisting of even more characters, and a demanding set design, the play Riggs was referring to, *The Cherokee Night*, certainly fulfills the terms of the “most curious, most novel long play” he described in his letter. In the decades since it was first produced, *The Cherokee Night* has received the lion’s share of critical attention and scholarly interpretation. Although many critics have productively mined *The Cherokee Night* for evidence of Riggs’s personal and political engagement with the contemporary issues confronting his fellow Cherokees, few have entertained the same hypothesis for his most successful and well known play, *Green Grow the Lilacs* (1929).

Riggs’s name and dramatic career have ebbed from popular memory over the last half-century, but *Green Grow the Lilacs* achieved lasting fame in 1943 when Richard Rodgers and Oscar Hammerstein revised it as the musical *Oklahoma!* Perhaps because of *Oklahoma!*’s overwhelming popularity and reputation as a lighthearted romantic comedy about “whether a cowboy would or would not take a farm girl to a country dance” (Zinnemann 136), *Green Grow the Lilacs* has often been overlooked as evidence of Riggs’s engagement with Indigenous concerns. Indeed, this play, like much of Riggs’s work, has often been criticized for a perceived absence of Indigenous characters or content. On the contrary, I suggest that, far beyond the play’s representation of a multiple-murdering villain, *Green Grow the Lilacs* dramatizes the confluence of lawlessness and racial violence in the decade before Oklahoma state-

hood—a confluence that resulted from a unique cocktail consisting of the racial, sexual, and economic concerns of white would-be settlers in the Indian Territory during that period. Riggs's play metaphorizes this confluence in its depiction of a shivoree, a centuries-old custom of European extraction in which a community expresses its disapproval of what it deems an incongruous or inappropriate marriage through a mock serenade of the offending couple using common household items or a satirical parade through the streets.¹ In scene 5 of *Green Grow the Lilacs*, the male and female leads are subjected to a raucous and menacing shivoree despite their best efforts to avoid the humiliating ritual by eloping. The shivoree scene's rapid devolution into violence and death, coupled with the play's troubling refusal to divulge the legal fate of its hero, represents Riggs's clandestine engagement with the political concerns of the Indian Territory's Indigenous inhabitants in the two decades preceding its forced integration into the Union as part of the new state of Oklahoma in 1907.

Set in 1900 near Riggs's hometown of Claremore in the Cherokee Nation, *Green Grow the Lilacs* dramatizes a frontier courtship besieged by the envious violence of a scorned rival and the sexual and racial surveillance of an increasingly hostile frontier community. The overwhelmingly white cast of Riggs's play reflects the dramatic increase in the Indian Territory's white population in the last decade of the nineteenth century. In 1890 white settlers outnumbered tribal citizens by a ratio of two to one; a mere ten years later, the gap had widened to a ratio of almost six white settlers to one tribal citizen (Maxwell 169). The rapid rise in the Indian Territory's white population was matched by those settlers' increasing clamor for representation in the U.S. Congress and the growing influence they wielded in the movement for single statehood with Oklahoma Territory. All of these changes and the effects they had on the territory's Indigenous citizens are, I suggest, the overriding concerns of *Green Grow the Lilacs*. Riggs orchestrated his shivoree's devolution into violence as a means of staging the various conflicts that arose from and were perpetuated by the territory's problematic transition into the state of Oklahoma in 1907.

In *That the People Might Live*, Jace Weaver (Cherokee) criticizes *Oklahoma!* for its representation of an ethnically cleansed Indian Territory. He notes that although Rodgers and Hammerstein borrowed liberally from Riggs's script, they nonetheless vacated their stage of the racially

diverse communities that populated the Indian Territory in the decades preceding statehood (98–99). He adds, “It is commonly assumed that *Green Grow the Lilacs* . . . also reflects an ethnically cleansed territory” (99). Challenging this assumption, Weaver suggests that *Green Grow the Lilacs* “is not devoid of Indian characters at all but is, in some sense, a play *about* them.” However, Weaver’s analysis of the play’s Indigenous content overlooks what is, perhaps, the strongest evidence in support of his claim: the shivoree scene, in which the shadowy outlines of the latent racial tensions undergirding the play’s action emerge in a kind of bas-relief.

The American shivoree has its roots in the French custom of charivari, “a practice of noisy festive abuse in which a community enacted its specific objection to inappropriate marriages and more generally exercised a widespread surveillance of sexuality” (Bristol 3).² In medieval and early modern Europe, the reasons why a newlywed couple might be subjected to the humiliating public spectacle varied; some included a marked difference in age between the newlyweds, the beating of a man by his wife, adultery on the part of a wife, or marriage with a foreigner (Alford 506). Anton Blok suggests that the more violent forms of charivari in eighteenth-century Holland and Germany “were intended to drive the residents out of the community as undesirable persons,” citing the German word *Wüstung* (destruction) to characterize this form of popular justice (103). In Blok’s construction, the charivari was part of the “collective violence” deployed by authorities in the Dutch borderlands “to repress banditry” (104). In the absence of a regular police force, these authorities were comprised of members of the ruling class who “restored their domination through the theater of law,” that is, through the performance of charivari and other methods of distributing rough justice (105).

Loretta T. Johnson notes that many American frontier shivorees “fit the pattern of the French ritual for *mésalliances*” (384), which means “a union between two people that is thought to be unsuitable or inappropriate; *esp.* marriage with a person of a lower social position” (“Mésalliance”). According to Johnson, moreover, the European charivari served two major functions in society: as both a rite of censure designed to reinforce custom and a rite of passage designed to facilitate “a change of social order” (379). Riggs’s shivoree fulfills both of these functions, bringing it into closer kinship with the European charivari *and* recalling an even more violent extrajudicial practice that was enacted in the United States throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries: lynching. Much

like lynching, shivoree in the American South was exercised as a kind of right by those seeking to establish the permanence of popular white rule in a region with an otherwise racially diverse population (Wyatt-Brown 436). Johnson adds, “[S]outhern shivarees were related to Ku-Klux-Klan activity in function and ritual and [were] only somewhat less menacing than lynching as a means of controlling social behavior” (385).

Riggs would almost certainly have been aware of the American shivoree’s European roots—he did, after all, write *Green Grow the Lilacs* during the year he spent in France on a grant from the Guggenheim Foundation. He could not have been ignorant of the custom’s origins, neither of the word’s French etymology nor of the malicious intentions that originally motivated its practice. According to George Seldes, one of Riggs’s acquaintances during his time in Paris, the play’s working title was not *Green Grow the Lilacs* but *Shivaree* (Braunlich 73). Riggs’s biographer, Phyllis Braunlich, interprets this working title as evidence of the penultimate scene’s central importance in the play. Indeed, the very fact that Riggs structures the play’s climax and denouement around the shivoree highlights its function as a rhetorical device replete with the kind of deep, or “coded,” statement that Craig Womack (Creek-Cherokee) has suggested characterizes many of Riggs’s most complex dramatic works (273).³

Eschewing his original design, the title Riggs finally gave to his production is also the name of one of the “old songs” that the hero, Curly McClain, sings in the play. In scene 1, Curly sings “Green Grow the Lilacs,” a song about unrequited love, after Laurey Williams announces her plans to go to Old Man Peck’s dance with her hired hand, Jeeter Fry, thwarting Curly’s attempt to court her (Riggs, *Cherokee* 20). In his preface to the script published by Samuel French in 1930, Riggs suggests that an appropriate subtitle for his play might have been *An Old Song* and declares that his intent was “solely to recapture in a kind of nostalgic glow . . . the great range of mood which characterized the old folk songs and ballads I used to hear in my Oklahoma childhood” (4). For these reasons, he includes musical asides that do not interrupt the dramatic action of the play so much as they lend to it “the substance of an ancient song” (4). Although the play was never formally known as *Shivaree*, its thematic evolution from “rough music” to “old song” nonetheless illustrates the layering of the nostalgia and romance implicit in the final title over the violence and discord implied by the proposed title.

Weaver’s interpretation of Riggs’s play as the dramatization of a racially

diverse Indian Territory facilitates the emergence of several malicious cultural attitudes from beneath the play's manifest benignity, "most notably," he says, "traditional fears in American theater concerning interracial marriage" (100). As evidence of the play's Indigenous content, Weaver suggests that Curly's racial background, like Riggs's, consists of both European and Cherokee ancestry. Curly's surname, nickname, and occupation as a cowboy, Weaver argues, are all indicative of such a lineage (99). "McClain (or McLain)," Weaver notes, "was a fairly prominent Native last name" (99). Curly's nickname "could have come about because he, as a mixed-blood, had curly hair, an uncommon trait among Indians" (99). According to Weaver, "It is at least marginally more likely that Indians would have been the cattlemen and the Amer-Europeans the farmers" during this period of Oklahoma's history (99).⁴ Furthermore, Curly's description of Jeeter Fry as "[t]hat bullet-colored growly man 'th the bushy eyebrows that's alwys orderin' the other hands how to work the mowin' machine" (Riggs, *Cherokee* 17) is, Weaver suggests, an Indian's observation of a white man's hirsute, grayish visage and assumed intellectual superiority (100). As further evidence, Weaver also argues that the play is, in fact, populated with *both* white settlers *and* Indigenous people, citing the reaction of the posse members to Aunt Eller's accusation in scene 6 that the men are "furriners" for having sided with the U.S. government against a member of their own community (Riggs, *Cherokee* 103). The men, Weaver asserts, defend themselves "in explicitly racial terms" (99). One exclaims from the darkness, "Now, Aunt Eller, we hain't furriners. My pappy and mammy was *both* borned in Indian Territory! Why, I'm jist plumb full of Indian blood myself," to which another adds, "Me, too! And I c'n prove it!" (Riggs, *Cherokee* 103). The humor of this exchange derives from the sheer credibility of the men's retorts.

In contrast to Curly's mixed racial background, Weaver reasonably suggests that the cowboy's love interest and the play's leading woman, Laurey Williams, "is clearly White," citing as evidence her desire to live in Virginia or California and the fact that she is from Missouri (100). An even more illuminating moment in the play, however, is Laurey's observation in scene 2 that if her parents had not immigrated to Indian Territory, then she would still be living in Missouri, and thus, she says, "I'd a-had education" (Riggs, *Cherokee* 25). Prior to the dismantling of the tribal governments in 1906, the children of noncitizens, who were mostly white settlers, had limited access to educational opportunities in

the territory except by voluntary subscription schools (Debo 18), and therefore Laurey's lament over her lack of education leads us to assume that she is, in fact, white and that her family probably immigrated to the territory during that massive wave in white settlement in the decade before 1900, which witnessed the threefold increase in the territory's population of noncitizens.

The participants in Riggs's shivoree conform to the older custom's traditional "community" of young, unmarried men, who, as Michael D. Bristol suggests, "represent a social principle of male solidarity that is in some respects deeply hostile to precisely that form of institutionally sanctioned sexuality whose standards they are empowered to oversee" (3). The hostility of the group in Riggs's play has its source in its reticence toward the interracial marriage of the young lovers, a hostility that was not unprecedented even at the time of the play's setting in 1900 and its composition in 1929.⁵ It is reasonable to conclude, then, that the violence and derision with which Laurey and Curly are confronted during the shivoree have their source in the participants' aversion to the couple's interracial union.

Interracial unions of this nature were not unprecedented at the time of the play's setting or in the decades that preceded it. Angie Debo has commented on how, prior to Removal, intermarriage with whites was fairly common amongst the members of the so-called Five Tribes in the Southeast. For a period of time after resettlement in Indian Territory, she notes, "white influence almost disappeared," that is, only until just after the Civil War (11). The construction of the railroads after the war witnessed the resurgence of white immigration to and intermarriage within the territory's Indigenous Nations. However, the frequency of interracial unions did not guarantee their universal acceptance by all of the territory's residents. In the early nineteenth century, monogamous marriage between white men and Indigenous women was, in fact, encouraged by influential secular and religious officers of the United States, including the federal Office of Indian Affairs and the Reverend Jedidiah Morse, who "assumed that native Americans' assimilation had to be founded on monogamous marriage, from which would follow the conventional division of labor, property, and inheritance" (Cott 26). By the end of the nineteenth century, however, "[o]fficial views on the desirability of Indian-white marriage gave way to greater racial differentiation and distaste" and reflected earlier biases of the nineteenth century (27).

Violet Alford identifies “rough music,” or charivari, as “the beginning of popular justice” (505). She envisions the European ritual as a carefully structured three-stage process, the third stage of which provides the means of resolving the charivari’s otherwise potentially damaging consequences. Although Alford’s study focuses solely on the shivoree’s European context, her three stages are nevertheless equally applicable to the escalation of violence in Riggs’s fifth scene.

The first stage that Alford identifies is that of the “rough music” itself, a discordant “overture” on common household items, such as pots and pans or whistles and bells, performed near the dwelling of “a culprit” on the night following the marriage ceremony or a few days after the ceremony took place (505). The diction of the stage directions that establish the tone and setting of Riggs’s fifth scene immediately denotes stealth, deception, and surreptitious behavior: “A soft summer wind, *creeping* about the meadow, lifts the spears of grass that have escaped the sickle. . . . After a moment, Curly and Laurey *steal* into sight, looking around *cautiously*. They stop, move forward a little, breathless, begin to speak in *hushed* voices” (*Cherokee* 75, emphasis added). Having eloped in order to escape the humiliation of the customary shivoree, Laurey and Curly must return to the former’s home under the cover of darkness like two criminals. Once the lovers disappear into the security of Laurey’s bedroom, the shivoree participants emerge from behind the haystacks, equipped with the “noise-making instruments—tin lids, pots, washboilers, cowbells, gourd rattles, tambourines, pans, iron triangles, whistles, [and] drums”—on which they will perform the ritual overture of rough music (77). The stage directions further describe the men’s mood as “*disturbed* and *hysterical* with conjecture on the marital scene they have come to despoil” (77, emphasis added). Moreover, the men have worked themselves up into an “excited frenzy”; they are “mocking” and “satirical” of the newlywed couple (79, 77). After a brief period of anticipation during which the men voice their lascivious speculations and minor jealousies, they unleash “[t]he sound of raucous noise and excitement” with their improvised musical instruments, signaling the beginning of the illicit ritual (80).

As the shivoree scene progresses, the mob increases its application of sexually and racially motivated violence against its victims in order to shame and humiliate them into a sense of their “place” in the established—or desired—order of the community. After leering for several

moments through the curtains of Laurey's bedroom, watching as the newlyweds undress for their first night together, the men disrupt that private ritual to commence the couple's public shaming. They "drag" Curly out of Laurey's bedroom; he is "struggling and angry," and his shirt is "ripped off in the struggle" (Riggs, *Cherokee* 80). This ritual performance is no joke: Curly threatens to murder anyone who lays a hand on Laurey, but notwithstanding his threat, the newlyweds find themselves surrounded by "a wide circle of men." The couple are forced to mount a haystack, and the revelers suggest the two "[m]ake out it's a bed" (81).

The second stage of the shivoree, Alford says, is the public display of the culprit(s) by means of a parade, whether on the back of a donkey or astride a ladder or pole (505). In northern England, the use of a pole on which to parade the ritual's victims through town is commonly referred to as "Riding the Stang" (508). In Riggs's play there is neither a donkey nor a pole; instead, there is the haystack, from the height of which the couple's ignominy is more plainly visible to those below. "Stack," in this context, is sufficiently homonymous with "Stang" to suggest its use for the same purpose of public shaming. Alford avers that this second stage of the ritual is often "more deadly" than the one that precedes it or the one that follows (505). Indeed, the threat of danger is explicit in this stage of the ritual in Riggs's play. The men are ominous and threatening in their demands: "Watch it!" snaps one man; "Don't want to fall and break yer neck," another warns Laurey (Riggs, *Cherokee* 81). The crowd of anonymous men becomes "more jubilant," expressing "crazier derision" as Curly mounts the stack. One man darkly admonishes, "Better be glad we didn't ride you on no fence rail!" (82). The stage directions further describe how the men "break out into derisive and lascivious guffaws, . . . circling the haystack, kicking up their heels, in an orgy of delight" as they encourage Curly to devour his new bride (82). One man suggests, "Bite them shoulders," and another, "Eat 'er alive!" (83).

The latent threat of violence undergirding this stage of the ritual becomes manifest when the party notices that one of the other haystacks is aflame, the source for which they soon realize is a torch brandished by Jeeter Fry, Curly's former rival for Laurey's affections (Riggs, *Cherokee* 83). Once Curly notices that the stack has caught fire, he begs someone to bring a ladder. At this moment Jeeter emerges from the shadows carrying his flaming brand, which he applies to the stack that bears the helpless couple. Curly jumps down from the stack not to save his bride

but to fight Jeeter, who draws a knife. During the ensuing struggle, Jeeter trips and appears to fall on the knife, killing him almost instantly. The stage directions describing the manner of Jeeter's death during the fight are uncharacteristically evasive, stating, "The men struggle over the knife, their arms gripping each other desperately. Suddenly, Jeeter trips and they go down on the stubble. Jeeter groans and whimpers and lies very still" (84). Horrified, Curly exclaims, "[L]ook at him! Fell on it—Stuck it though his ribs!" The stage directions notably omit any explicit instruction that Jeeter accidentally falls onto his own knife. Moreover, a slight, but crucial, alteration to this exclamation between its appearance in the 1929 typescript and what Riggs himself described as the "more complete" version of the play published in 1930 similarly obscures the nature of just what, exactly, happens during the men's scuffle (4). In Riggs's original typescript, Curly cries, "Look at him! Fell on it—*Stuck though* his ribs!" (*Green* 5.11, emphasis added). In the published play, Riggs adds a direct object in the form of the neuter pronoun "it" to Curly's exclamation. As a result of this emendation, the function of "stuck" changes from adjectival (describing Jeeter's condition) to verbal, indicating the presence of an agent. Whether Jeeter accidentally sticks the knife through his own ribs or Curly sticks Jeeter in the ribs with the knife in self-defense is not clear. Moreover, in scene 6, a brief exchange between Ado Annie and Aunt Eller heaps more doubt upon the circumstances of Jeeter's death. Ado Annie asks Aunt Eller, "Did—did Curly *kill* Jeeter—'th that old knife?" to which the latter replies, "Naw! 'Course not! Jeeter *fell* on his old knife—and died" (Riggs, *Cherokee* 89). Aunt Eller's denial is sufficiently vehement to blur the distinction between whether her response represents the truth or merely her desire to convince herself that it is the truth. These uncertainties, coupled with the rapidity with which Curly agrees to turn himself in at the end of scene 5, preclude his innocence beyond a reasonable doubt. This doubt is exacerbated by the play's open-ended conclusion: we never learn the outcome of Curly's trial.

The apparently accidental death of Jeeter during the ritual's "dangerous" second stage is what precipitates the ritual's third stage, the "public play" or "re-enactment of the censured conduct, with a mock judgement and sentence" (Alford 506). In traditional shivorees, this third stage achieves resolution when the couple agree to make "reparations" for their conduct, often in the form of a "treat" for the ritual's participants

variously consisting of money or refreshments (Greenhill 114). In Riggs's play, Jeeter's presumably accidental death forecloses on the possibility of such a tidy resolution; instead, the potential for resolution in this play is held out by Curly's consent to turn himself in. However, Riggs's play complicates not only its own dramatic resolution but also the prescribed resolution of the very folk tradition it uses to imbue its final two scenes with conflict and drama. The inability of Riggs's shivoree to resolve its own divisive consequences by purging the community of its resentments and aspersions gestures toward the limitations and failure of folk law, and it challenges the ability of institutionalized law and order to govern society in the first place. With one of the principal justifications for Indian Territory statehood being the curbing of lawlessness and crime, the lack of resolution in Riggs's play represents yet another of the playwright's coded indictments of U.S. politics at work in the Indigenous Nations: one form of crime is suffered to persist into the twentieth century (namely, an extralegal Eurowestern custom, the democratic motivation behind which was to maintain "reciprocity" between members of a community [Greenhill 19]) at the expense of justice.

Significantly, scene 5—the only outdoor scene in the play—transpires in "the hayfield" (Riggs, *Cherokee* 6). It is, therefore, the *farmer's* space; more specifically, it is the space of Jeeter, the Williamses' hired hand, and of most of the shivoree's participants, at least one of whom is explicitly identified as a "Young Farmer" (78). This is the space that will, more and more, change the landscape of the Indian Territory, forcing those like Curly to abandon the freedom of the cowboy's saddle for the drudgery of the plough.⁶ Scene 3 makes clear that Jeeter is a farmer and Curly is a cowboy. Curly admits that he could not distinguish a peach tree from a cornstalk, and Jeeter verbally self-identifies as a farmer (Riggs, *Cherokee* 41, 48). The farmer is a murderer; the cowboy is a hero. The farmer is the future of the state; the cowboy is "vanishing." Riggs establishes a dichotomy that does not bode well for the future of Indian Territory.

In the same way that the newlyweds must submit themselves to the torment of the shivoree, they must also accept the changes coming to that land. Curly only grasps this reality and submits himself to it *after* being subjected to the humiliation and violence of the shivoree, proclaiming to Laurey in scene 6: "I got to learn to be a farmer, I see that! . . . [T]hings is changin' right and left! Buy up mowin' machines, cut down the prairies! Shoe yer horses, drag them plows under the sod!

They gonna make a state outa this, they gonna put it in the Union! Country a-changin', got to change with it!" (Riggs, *Cherokee* 100). The fact that this avowal (or perhaps one might construe it as a coerced surrender) comes after the horrific events precipitated by the shivoree have unfolded suggests that the process of statehood was not one of progress and opportunity but rather one characterized by violence and achieved through extralegal means. Moreover, even though Riggs's play is set in the period before single statehood with Oklahoma became a foregone conclusion (and thus the possibility still existed for Indian Territory to become a separate Indigenous state), Riggs's characteristic pessimism and the benefit of hindsight imbue Curly's avowal and the play's conclusion with a pervasive sense of doom. The shivoree is effectively the means by which Riggs gestures toward the future damage that will be wreaked upon the Cherokee Nation by statehood.

Unlike some historians, Riggs does not subscribe to a belief in the shivoree's benevolently transformative role in North America. Johnson suggests that the tradition's translation from Europe to North America altered its teleological function from punitive to inclusive. Shivorees on the American frontier, Johnson claims, "were transformed into unifying rituals rather than punitive ones; their function was to integrate immigrants into a unified American culture rather than to protect communities from outside influences" (386–87). Pauline Greenhill has also remarked upon the tradition's apparent transformation from a ritual of exclusion to a ritual of inclusion. While recognizing the ritual's nefarious origins, both of these scholars nonetheless attempt to recuperate the transformed shivoree as an expression of North American democratic values. Riggs's shivoree "unifies" the residents of the Cherokee Nation, all right, but it does so under the terms and conditions of the "new" *American* (namely, white) order, whose gradual encroachment threatens to engulf Cherokee citizens entirely. Precisely because the shivoree "can act both to reinforce order and to suggest alternatives to the existing order" (Davis 123), the ritual to which Laurey and Curly are violently subjected suggests that the existing order prevalent in the Cherokee Nation is already in the process of changing into a "furrin" country: the United States of America.

More significantly, however, the hostility directed at the union between, presumably, a Cherokee citizen and a white woman by this group of anonymous men, most of whom, at least, are farmers, suggests

that there is also an economic motivation behind these men's assault of the newlywed couple.⁷ According to Daniel F. Littlefield, Jr. (Cherokee), "[T]he lure of economic gain to be extracted from 'undeveloped' Indian land and resources made the Indian Territory appealing to thousands of whites and blacks. By 1897, nearly 300,000 were there," a number that had tripled in the seven years since 1890, while the Indigenous population, far surpassed by the presence of white settlers, remained static (20). Littlefield adds,

To landless Americans, particularly poor whites and blacks from the South, so much open land was irresistible. Most of those who came rented land from the Indians or intermarried white or black citizens of the nations, but many of them were there illegally and were known as intruders. Whether renters or intruders, these people were mainly castoffs of American society, who lived off the Indian resources, let their children grow up in ignorance, and raised the loudest cry for the government to dismantle the Indian nations. (20)

Thus I arrive at yet another significant issue in this play: On what ground, literally, lies the Williamses' claim to their farm? Given that *Green Grow the Lilacs* is set in the Cherokee Nation in 1900, it stands to reason that the Williams farm is not the unproblematic sole possession of either Laurey Williams or her Aunt Eller. If the Williamses took up farming in the Cherokee Nation before the implementation of the Curtis Act in 1898, then there were only a few possible means of settling on Cherokee land available to them: intermarriage into the tribe, illegal squatting, the renting or sharecropping of land, or the free-hold purchase of structural "improvements" and the farming of the land on which they sat. Because Laurey was ineligible for schooling in Indian Territory, it is unlikely that either one of her parents was Cherokee, so the first possibility is moot. Moreover, because Laurey and Aunt Eller appear to be relatively financially secure, it is also unlikely that they are sharecroppers on someone else's land. Therefore, the most likely options are that the women are squatting on Cherokee land, or they are renting the land, or they have purchased someone else's improvements and consequently have some legal claim to their farm. A cynical reading of the play might suggest, then, that although Laurey has affection for Curly and might even love him, her marriage to him (if he is of Cherokee

descent) is as practical as it is romantic. Her marriage to Curly would not only help to prevent further unwanted advances from Jeeter Fry but also provide her with automatic citizenship in the Cherokee Nation, entitled to all of its rights and privileges, which at this time meant an allotment of over 160 acres.

Comments made by the shivoree participants in scene 5 obfuscate the nature of the Williams family's status in the territory. During the shivoree, one participant exclaims, "Wish't I uz in [Curly's] shoes." Another observes, "He shore got him sump'n there!" (Riggs, *Cherokee* 78). At first one might think these men are referring to Curly's luck in his marriage to Laurey, but the ensuing exclamations from the other men indicate otherwise: "Couple of sections!" "Grazin' and timber and plowed land!" "Money!" "Scads of it in the bank, and more comin'!" Finally, one of the men chimes in with "And God! She's a purty un, too!" Now, it's possible that the men's envy of Curly's acquisition of Laurey's farm through marriage is an error on Riggs's part (even if both newlyweds are white, the politics of ownership remain murky). However, if the men who participate in the shivoree are predominantly white farmers, as the name Young Farmer and the men's envy of the Williamses' wealth suggest, then the violence of the ensuing scene and its bloody climax are subtly indicative of the threat that the increase in white settlers in Indian Territory posed to the well-being and survival of tribal citizens, their intermarried partners, and their offspring.

In scenes 5 and 6, Riggs ventriloquizes his coded criticism of the American takeover of Indian Territory through his plausibly mixed-race cowboy. At the beginning of scene 5, before any of the shivoree participants reveal themselves, Curly and Laurey take a moment to envelop themselves in the secure knowledge that they are "Married—and purt' nigh home" (Riggs, *Cherokee* 76). Briefly, they can afford to wax romantic. Curly observes:

Look at the way the hay field lays out purty in the moonlight. Next it's the pasture, and over yander's the wheat and the corn, and the cane patch next, nen the truck garden and the timber. Everthing laid out fine and jim dandy! The country all around it—all Indian Territory—plumb to the Rio Grande, and north to Kansas, and 'way over east to Arkansaw, the same way, with the moon onto it. (76–77)

This passage incorporates some very tricky syntax, namely, in Curly's reference to "all Indian Territory" ensconced between two dashes. His meaning may be straightforward: he takes comfort in the democratic function of the moon, which spreads its light equally over all of Indian Territory the same as it does elsewhere. On the other hand, Curly may be suggesting that the country surrounding him and Laurey—inclusive of the land beyond the arbitrarily defined geographic borders of the Indian Territory—is, in fact, all *Indian land*. This claim is further borne out by Curly's evocation of the four journey directions in the references he makes to the Rio Grande (south and west), Kansas (north), and Arkansas (east). This subtle claim is compounded in the play's final scene after Curly absconds from the Claremore jail. When he tells Laurey and Aunt Eller about his experience in the jail, he observes, "Don't know whut's got into Indian Territory nohow! They puttin' everybody in jail—women and all!" (99). Following the abolishment of the tribal courts in 1898, the structure of crime and punishment has fundamentally changed—for the worse—in the Indian Territory of 1900, and Curly knows it.

Lynching and shivoree witnessed the release of social tension through spectacle; both of these practices are circumscribed by an understanding of how far their practitioners may go (Wyatt-Brown 437). However, the collective recognition of these limits only applies to a homogeneous culture, which is absent in Riggs's play and was—and continues to be—absent in Indian Territory / Oklahoma. Consequently, in *Green Grow the Lilacs* the shivoree spirals out of control, and the social tensions that the ritual was perhaps designed to alleviate remain not simply unresolved but exacerbated. In the final scene, which takes place three nights after the shivoree, Laurey expresses her fears and anxieties to Aunt Eller while they wait to learn Curly's fate (he has been in the jail at Claremore ever since their wedding night). If there are any lingering doubts about the intensity of the shivoree's violent malevolence, they are laid to rest by Laurey's obviously shaken reaction to the events, even three days after they transpired. She asks, "Why'd they have to thow Curly in jail? Anyone could see how it happened—" Aunt Eller interrupts her niece's complaint to explain, "Shore they could, honey. But you know the way everybody feels about shivoreein'. They got a right to it somehow. And a thing like this a-happenin' in the middle of a shivoree—why, it looks *bad*, that's all. . . . Why, it won't be no time now, till it's all over with—and forgot" (Riggs, *Cherokee* 91). Laurey's perplexing response to her aunt's reassur-

ances recalls “with horror” the events of her wedding night in a manner that, as Raymond Knapp points out, is suggestive of rape (81). “No,” Laurey vehemently protests, “*not* over with, *not* forgot. You didn’t see. Other things. Things you can’t git outa yer mind. . . . Over and over! The way them men done. The things they said” (Riggs, *Cherokee* 91). The “things” to which Laurey refers remain obscure, but a passage in the typescript that was omitted from the published version of the play sheds some light on Laurey’s vehement rejection of Aunt Eller’s reassurances, and it renders the future of her marriage to Curly even more uncertain. Old Man Peck delivers a sustained speech in scene 5 of the original typescript in which he criticizes the shivoree tradition for “[m]akin sump’n ugly and nasty outa bein alive” and for “makin [newlyweds] feel dirty” (Riggs, *Green* 5.4). In a kind of soliloquy before the shivoree gets under way, Peck recalls an earlier manifestation of the ritual in the territory:

Onct they uz a young feller, strappin and full of life. He married him a . . . frail-like girl, . . . good as a angel. On their weddin night, a shivoreein party come, a gang of hoodlums. They said sich things and done sich things ’fore this innocent girl, it made her sick in her mind. After that night, ’f her husband even ’s much ’s kissed her er teched her hand, she’d turn pale and trembly, and commence to cry, and run away from him, ashamed. Ashamed of herself, ashamed of the way God made her! Shore fine fer her! Fine fer her husband, too! Never did have her in his arms, even! She tuck sick, and died in six months. Mebbe that was a blessin, fer he married again—a heartier kind of woman this time. . . . But the first un was so damn sweet and purty, he never could seem to git her outen his mind. (5.5)

In the published play, Old Man Peck never appears in the fifth scene; instead, his speech is uttered by an anonymous “Old Man” who stumbles onto the scene only long enough to repeat a single line from the original speech before exiting the scene (Riggs, *Cherokee* 80).

Riggs begins the preface to his revised, published version of the play with a pensive disclaimer: “This reading version of *Green Grow the Lilacs* is a little fuller, a little more complete, especially in Scenes Five and Six, than the version so admirably produced by the Theatre Guild” (*Cherokee* 4). Excepting the excision of Old Man Peck’s soliloquy, some of these revisions are relatively minor, such as the chronological rear-

rangement of some events and the reduction of some characters' roles. Crucially, the most conscious revision Riggs made to his typescript is to the circumstances governing Curly's reappearance at the Williams farm in scene 6 after absconding from the Claremore jail. In the 1929 version of the play—the one that was produced on Broadway by the Theatre Guild—Curly does not break out of jail. In a move sanctioned by the legal authorities in Claremore, Old Man Peck amiably returns Curly to the farmhouse so that Curly might see his bride before his trial the next morning (Riggs, *Green* 6.12–13). The play concludes with a stable tetrad of heterosexuality as the newlyweds disappear into Laurey's bedroom and the two older folks banter flirtatiously with each other (6.21–22).

In contrast, the “reading” version of the play concludes neither with Curly's legally sanctioned absence from the local jail nor with his acquittal for the death of Jeeter Fry, as in Rodgers and Hammerstein's conclusion to *Oklahoma!* The published version of *Green Grow the Lilacs* concludes far less optimistically than either its earlier or its later incarnation with Curly's solitary escape from jail and his agreement to turn himself in to the authorities (again) when confronted by the posse of deputized men led by Old Man Peck that arrives at the house to take him back to jail. Whereas in the typescript Old Man Peck is deputized by the local sheriff to bring Curly to Laurey and back again, in the reading version of the play he is only deputized in order to *apprehend* him.

The posse agrees to allow Curly to spend the night with Laurey if he will allow himself to be returned to the jail the next morning, giving himself and Laurey a night's reprieve in which to consummate their recent nuptials. These alterations necessitate a conscious shift in tone between the typescript and the reading version of the play: from the playful tone of Aunt Eller's pleas for Curly to stay the night in the former, to her vocal criticism of the posse members for being “furriners” working on behalf of the U.S. government in the latter (Riggs, *Cherokee* 103). The members of the posse express their belief that Curly will “git off” from the charges against him, but ultimately the cowboy's fate remains hanging in the balance as the curtains close upon the final scene.

With the creation of Oklahoma Territory in 1890 and the passage of the Curtis Act in 1898, statehood for Indian Territory became inevitable; consequently, the question was no longer whether it would become a state but whether it would become a state separate unto itself or be combined with Oklahoma Territory to form a single new state with a cen-

tralized government. The single statehood movement received most of its support from white settlers, thoroughly Americanized mixed-blood tribal citizens, and eastern parties with financial interests in the outcome of the decision. Although many Indian Territory residents vehemently supported single statehood, there was also a strong contingent of believers in separate statehood for an Indigenous state. In opposition to the Curtis Act and the looming reality of statehood for Indian Territory, “[m]any Indian leaders believed the United States had promised the Indians a separate state and envisioned one whose political destiny would be controlled by Indians” (Littlefield in Posey 57).

At the end of 1902, Alexander Posey, a Creek poet, journalist, and politician, began to orient some of his *Fus Fixico* Letters around the topic of impending statehood.⁸ The possibility of an independent Indigenous state must have begun circulating shortly after—or even before—the passage of the Curtis Act, as it was sufficiently evident for Posey to take it up in his letters and for his audience to be able to recognize and understand his satirical purpose. In his critical remarks on the effacement of Indians from *Oklahoma!*, Weaver warns, “[I]t must be remembered that by 1900 some in Indian Territory were already lobbying for separate statehood as an Indian state, leading to the Sequoyah convention, of which Posey was secretary” (99). Therefore, it is reasonable that Riggs’s 1900 setting for *Green Grow the Lilacs* represents a space in which the possibility that the Indian Territory would become an independent Indigenous state was still very real indeed: this is a space *as yet undefined* as *either* Oklahoma *or* the proposed state of Sequoyah. As such, it is highly significant that he sets this play—his most enduring and beloved (and, possibly, his most optimistic)—during the lead-up to the Sequoyah Convention in 1905, whereas some of his most tragic and nihilistic plays (*Big Lake*, *The Cherokee Night*, and *The Cream in the Well*) are set entirely or partially in the immediate aftermath of the convention’s failure, and immediately after the Cherokee tribal government was dismantled in 1906. It is also significant, then, that *Oklahoma!* takes place not “in 1900,” as Riggs specifies, but “just after the turn of the century,” an alteration that, as Knapp notes, “places the action significantly closer to 1907, the year Oklahoma became a state” (79), and further befits the musical’s steamrolling of racial diversity into the homogeneous optimism of white settlement.

This apparently arbitrary alteration to Riggs’s original script is not so

innocuous as it may at first appear. Not only does Rodgers and Hammerstein's creative alteration increase the immediacy of Oklahoma statehood and its implications in their adaptation of Riggs's play, but it also contributes to Weaver's suggestion that the Broadway musical's evacuation of all things Indian from Indian Territory perpetuates the logic of Manifest Destiny and validates the rhetoric of *terra nullius* (99). Knapp notes that this particular alteration is a consequence of the "radically different public mood" of the World War Two era United States as compared to an America teetering on the brink of economic disaster when Riggs wrote the play in 1929 (79). Knapp suggests that the musical's "shamelessly patriotic" representation of life in the territory on the eve of Oklahoma statehood is one of the "fundamental changes" that "greatly alter[ed] the themes" of Riggs's script. Rodgers and Hammerstein moved the setting of their play to the summer of 1906 (Rodgers and Hammerstein iii), roughly six months after the constitution for the Indian state of Sequoyah failed to gain the necessary approval of the U.S. Congress, a period contemporaneous with President Theodore Roosevelt's signing on June 16, 1906, of the amended statehood bill H.R. 12707, which made Oklahoma and Indian Territories a single state, thus "end[ing] all hope for a separate state for Indian Territory" (Maxwell 330). The obliteration of the proposed Indian state of Sequoyah by a few strokes of the presidential pen sealed the fate of the Indian Territory's future as part of the domestic United States, subject to the laws, jurisdiction, and sovereignty of the federal government in Washington, D.C., and the new state government of Oklahoma.

Green Grow the Lilacs' cautious optimism stands in stark contrast to the tragic conclusions of *Big Lake*, *The Cherokee Night*, and *The Cream in the Well*, whose worlds are defined by the impending damage of statehood. The optimism of *Green Grow the Lilacs* is similarly marred by its inconclusive denouement, an uncomfortable premonition of the "Night" into which the Indian Territory and its tribal nations will be plunged just a few years later, because Riggs, writing the play with the advantage of hindsight and in tandem with *The Cherokee Night*, was not, of course, ignorant of what the next decade would hold for his protagonists' futures. The earlier setting of *Green Grow the Lilacs*, as compared to Riggs's Indian Territory tragedies, may be responsible for its more cautiously optimistic tone, but its removal in time from the moment of statehood is also strategic: it gives Riggs the necessary distance to chal-

lenge the perceived legitimacy of Oklahoma statehood. Notably, the shivoree is the vehicle of Riggs's critique. Riggs's shivoree draws a parallel between the ritual's historic connotations and the implications of statehood for the Indigenous nations of the Indian Territory. In the same way that the practice of shivoree was designed "to facilitate a change of social order" (Johnson 379) and repress undesirable persons through *Wüstung*, or "destruction" (Blok 103), the ritual in *Green Grow the Lilacs* metaphorizes the imposition of statehood on the Indian Territory as the result of an illegitimate, coercive, and "destructive" change of social order enforced by the homogenizing will of a dominant group.

JENNA HUNNEF is a non-Indigenous scholar of Indigenous literatures and nineteenth- and twentieth-century American literature. She recently received her doctorate in English literature from the University of Toronto, where she wrote her dissertation on outlaws and nation making in literature of the former Indian Territory.

NOTES

1. Notwithstanding the more commonplace American spelling of "shivaree," I maintain consistency throughout this discussion with Riggs's spelling of "shivoree."
2. "Charivari" is most commonly translated as "rough music."
3. Womack's theory of Riggs's "codetalking" refers more specifically to the idea that the latter's "Indian identity and gay identity are the two most relevant aspects of his life and work, but owing to the constraints of his time, he was forced to deal with these issues through coded statement" (273). The present discussion primarily invokes Riggs's coded engagement with the first of the two identities Womack identifies in order to elucidate my claim that *Green Grow the Lilacs* represents Riggs's clandestine engagement with the political concerns of the Indian Territory's Indigenous inhabitants in the two decades before Oklahoma statehood. Unfortunately, the limited scope of the present discussion does not also permit a queer critique of Riggs's shivoree politics. However, the play is certainly amenable to such a critique, and I do, in fact, develop a queer critique of these politics in a longer dissertation chapter in which I suggest that the targets of Riggs's satire in his depiction of the ritual are institutionalized heterosexual marriage and the inaccuracy of the marriage metaphor as an apt analogy for the relationship between government and governed. A more sustained application of Womack's "queer Oklahomo theory" of Riggs's work to *Green Grow the Lilacs* would enlarge the consequence of the play's shivoree politics as a similarly "coded" indictment of the social surveillance of sexuality and the violent enforcement of heterosexual norms.
4. Citing changes made in 1892 to the *Constitution and Laws of the Cherokee Nation*, Kirby Brown (Cherokee) has observed that the employment of noncitizens in the cattle industry was explicitly forbidden by the end of the nineteenth century (90).

Indeed, the Cooweescoowee District (now part of Rogers County), which included the town of Claremore, was primarily known for its large cattle ranches, which were mostly owned and operated by mixed-blood Cherokees. Janey B. Hendrix notes that the mixed-blood families of the Cooweescoowee District “were very nearly indistinguishable from any white frontier family, with the exception of their fiercely defended Cherokee nationalism. They were very much citizens of the Cherokee Nation and were as determined as any fullblood to protect the autonomy of their government” (44).

5. Margaret D. Jacobs has noted that even though laws against interracial marriage between Native Americans and Anglo-Americans were not as common as laws designed to prevent black-white marriage, nonetheless, “social taboos could be as powerful as legislative acts in shaping the lives of white women and their Indian husbands or lovers” (32). In 1891, for example, Dr. Charles Eastman, a member of the Wahpeton Dakota Nation, and Elaine Goodale, the daughter of a prominent white New England family, felt compelled to justify their marriage through their political and humanitarian work in response to the skepticism of “a hostile and intolerant public” (37). In the 1920s, when Riggs lived in the artists’ colony of Taos, New Mexico, he came under the patronage and tutelage of Mabel Dodge Luhan. In the early 1920s Mabel began an affair with Tony Lujan, a Taos Indian, even though both of them were married to other people at the time. According to Jacobs, white Americans viewed the relationship as scandalous not so much because of its interracial element but because of the couple’s “adultery and cohabitation without marriage” (43). In a manner that sheds light on how Indigenous populations may have viewed interracial liaisons—an area of study that Jacobs notes has often been overlooked in favor of privileging the white perspective—the tribal council of Tony Lujan’s Taos Pueblo “did take offense at Tony’s relationship with a white woman” and his abandonment of his first wife. The tribal council actively punished Lujan for his transgression by barring him from participation in kiva ceremonies for nearly twenty years (43).

6. By the time the cinematic adaptation of *Oklahoma!* was filmed in 1955, widespread agriculture had changed the Oklahoma landscape to such an extent that the movie had to be shot in Arizona. Oklahoma was already so heavily farmed and dotted with oil wells that it was well-nigh impossible to re-create the highly rural and “undeveloped” Indian Territory of just half a century earlier (Zinnemann 138).

7. Riggs’s 1929 typescript of *Green Grow the Lilacs* describes the mob’s composition as consisting of “a great many farm people, all men” (5.1); therefore, it stands to reason that the mob in the revised version of the play is similarly constituted. It’s possible that this mob is racially mixed and that hostility toward the union is expressed from both the white and Cherokee communities in the same way that the Taos Pueblo and white Americans were hostile toward the marriage of Tony Lujan and Mabel Dodge (see n. 5 above).

8. Between 1902 and 1908 Posey published seventy-three satirical letters in the *Indian Journal*, the weekly newspaper at Eufaula, Creek Nation, of which he was the editor. Written in the persona of Fus Fixico, a traditionalist Creek, these letters functioned as editorials, employing humor, dialect, malapropisms, and wordplay to comment on the dramatic changes that were taking place throughout the Indian

Territory in the years before Oklahoma statehood and the effects of those changes on the Creek Nation.

WORKS CITED

- Alford, Violet. "Rough Music or Charivari." *Folklore* 70.4 (1959): 505–18. Web. 30 Oct. 2012.
- Blok, Anton. "Bandits and Boundaries: Robber Bands and Secret Societies on the Dutch Frontier." *Challenging Authority: The Historical Study of Contentious Politics*. Ed. Michael P. Hanagan, Leslie Page Moch, and Wayne Te Brake. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1998. 91–106. Print.
- Braunlich, Phyllis Cole. *Haunted by Home: The Life and Letters of Lynn Riggs*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1988. Print.
- Bristol, Michael D. "Charivari and the Comedy of Abjection in *Othello*." *Renaissance Drama* 21 (1990): 3–21. Web. 30 Oct. 2012.
- Brown, Kirby. "Citizenship, Land, and Law: Constitutional Criticism and John Milton Oskison's *Black Jack Davy*." *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 23.4 (2011): 77–115. Web. 19 Dec. 2013.
- Cott, Nancy F. *Public Vows: A History of Marriage and the Nation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2000. Print.
- Davis, Natalie Zemon. *Society and Culture in Early Modern France*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1975. Print.
- Debo, Angie. *And Still the Waters Run: The Betrayal of the Five Civilized Tribes*. 1940. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1972. Print.
- Greenhill, Pauline. *Make the Night Hideous: Four English-Canadian Charivaris, 1881–1940*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2010. Print.
- Hendrix, Janey B. *Redbird Smith and the Nighthawk Keetoowahs*. Park Hill, OK: Cross-Cultural Education Center, 1983. Print.
- Jacobs, Margaret D. "The Eastmans and the Luhans: Interracial Marriage between White Women and Native American Men, 1875–1935." *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* 23.3 (2002): 29–54. Web. 30 May 2013.
- Johnson, Loretta T. "Charivari/Shivaree: A European Folk Ritual on the American Plains." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 20.3 (1990): 371–87. Web. 15 Aug. 2012.
- Knapp, Raymond. "Assassins, Oklahoma! and the 'Shifting Fringe of Dark around the Camp-Fire.'" *Cambridge Opera Journal* 16.1 (2004): 77–101. Web. 11 Mar. 2013.
- Littlefield, Daniel F. *Seminole Burning: A Story of Racial Vengeance*. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1996. Print.
- Maxwell, Amos. "The Sequoyah Convention." *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 28.2 (1950): 161–92; 28.3 (1950): 299–340. Web. 20 Mar. 2013.
- "Mésalliance." *OED Online*. March 2013. Oxford UP. Web. 3 June 2013.
- Oklahoma!* Dir. Fred Zinnemann. Perf. Gordon MacRae, Shirley Jones, Gloria Grahame, Gene Nelson. Magna Theatre Co., 1955. DVD.

- Posey, Alexander. *The Fus Fixico Letters*. Ed. Daniel F. Littlefield, Jr., and Carol A. Petty Hunter. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1993. Print.
- Riggs, Lynn. *The Cherokee Night and Other Plays*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 2003. Print.
- . *Green Grow the Lilacs*. 1929. Typescript. Riggs File, Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma Library, Norman. Print.
- Rodgers, Richard, and Oscar Hammerstein II. *Oklahoma!* New York: R & H Theatricals, 1943. Print.
- Weaver, Jace. *That the People Might Live: Native American Literatures and Native American Community*. New York: Oxford UP, 1997. Print.
- Womack, Craig S. *Red on Red: Native American Literary Separatism*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1999. Print.
- Wyatt-Brown, Bertram. *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South*. 1982. New York: Oxford UP, 2007. Print.
- Zinnemann, Fred. *Fred Zinnemann: An Autobiography*. London: Bloomsbury, 1992. Print.

Discontinuous Narrative, Ojibwe Sovereignty, and the *Wiindigoo* Logic of Settler Colonialism

Louise Erdrich's Marn Wolde

DEBORAH L. MADSEN

When we are young, the words are scattered around us. As they are assembled by experience, so also are we, sentence by sentence, until the story takes shape.

—Louise Erdrich, *The Plague of Doves*

The dominant consensus among interpretations of Louise Erdrich's novel *The Plague of Doves* (2008) represents Marn Wolde as a victim figure, abused by her husband, Billy Peace (Hudson 47–52; Strehle 119; Valentino 131–32; Roemer 122–23, 129). This characterization of Marn emerges coherently when the novel is read continuously and linearly and especially when Marn's story is interpreted independently of other narrations within the novel and in isolation from its earlier form as "Satan: Hijacker of a Planet," first published in the *Atlantic* (August 1997). A rather different profile of this narrator-character emerges when Marn is read discontinuously, across the narrations offered by five distinct narrators, across Erdrich's wider oeuvre, and across her extraordinarily wide range of intertextual allusions to Ojibwe stories, the Bible, the *midrashim*, the Kabbalah, and *Paradise Lost*.¹ The tension between covert symbolic convergence and overt narrative discontinuity, I argue, is key to the demand that her writing be interpreted in ever-widening contexts in order to reveal the possessive logic of settler sovereignty, on the one hand, and to constitute Ojibwe sovereignty, on the other. It is easy to forget that the narrative Marn tells, a narrative framed by her traumatic story of domestic, sexual, and spiritual abuse at the hands of her husband, is the story of how she came to murder her husband and walk away with sole possession of their money and land.² The fragmented and unreliable nature of

her narration reveals the ways in which she rationalizes her entitlement to kill in order to possess, that is, the ways in which her discourse exemplifies the possessive logic of settler sovereignty. At the same time, the very unreliability of her narration opens discursive opportunities that reveal the repressed meaning of her actions as a traumatic repetition of the historic lynching with which the novel begins. Settler land hunger, symbolized here and elsewhere in Erdrich's writing in Ojibwe terms as a *wiindigoo* psychosis, emerges in the interstices of Marn's narration to disrupt the logic of settler entitlement to indigenous land.

The Plague of Doves, like many of the novels that comprise Erdrich's North Dakota series, originated in a group of nine separately published short stories.³ Reworked into novel form, these stories generate a discontinuous style of narrative: the twenty-two chapters are recounted by five different narrators, starting with the prefatory section entitled "Solo" by an unnamed third-person omniscient narrator, focalized through an anonymous "he"; Evelina narrates the following six chapters; Judge Antone Bazil Coutts is the narrator of the next four chapters; and Marn Wolde's three chapters interrupt his telling of the story. A single chapter by Evelina follows Marn, providing commentary on Marn Wolde and the aftermath of her murder of Billy; the Judge completes Billy's story in the following chapter; and Evelina's narration concludes in the next three chapters. The novel ends with two chapters narrated by the Judge; and the narrator of the final chapter is the town doctor and president of the local history society, Cordelia Lochren. While some chapters are divided into named sections or vignettes, others are unnamed, both emphasizing the discontinuous nature of the novel and underlining the significance of those parts that are titled. What continuity would be created by the alternating narrations of Evelina and the Judge is disrupted by the interventions of Marn and Cordelia, which stand out in contrast to those of the two primary narrators in that Marn and Cordelia share an intimate relation to the primary problematic of the novel: Who murdered the Lochren family? And why? Cordelia is the only survivor of the massacre; Marn is the niece of the real murderer, her Uncle Warren, who sees that Marn has inherited his capacity for murderous violence. The answer to the question, Who did it? is gradually uncovered in the stories told by the anonymous narrator of "Solo," Marn, Evelina, and Cordelia, who provide the key contexts for interpreting the novel beyond the overt level of storytelling. The novel must assume a discontinuous form, because this covert

story—which contradicts the hegemonic narrative of the crime—is made available only in fragments and isolated allusions. But while the novel is discontinuous, it is far from lacking in coherence. As Evelina reflects in the words quoted in the epigraph to this essay, words must be “assembled by experience”—disconnections read connectively—and in the process characters like Judge Coutts and Evelina herself are reconnected with their Ojibwe histories, community, and selves.

Erdrich’s style of fiction writing encourages this form of discontinuous reading; from her earliest stories, gathered into the generically ambiguous book *Love Medicine* (which itself exists in three distinct editions), to the still-expanding North Dakota series of novels, Erdrich has demanded that her readers work to make connections among her communities of characters, the places and spaces they inhabit, and the histories in which they participate. The emphasis upon history, the occupation of land, and diverse but related communities is central to the questioning of received settler-colonial history characteristic of Erdrich’s writing. As David Stirrup observes, drawing on Catherine Rainwater’s work, the conclusion of *The Plague of Doves* focuses intensely on the problematic of determining historical truth (“My Body” 57–58). The narrator of the closing section, Cordelia Lochren, wonders about the legacy of her efforts to preserve the story of a town that she perceives as dying: “What shall I have said?” she asks herself. “How shall I have depicted the truth?” (Erdrich, *Plague* 308). The novel that Cordelia concludes requires that readers ask “what” has been said by determining “how” history has been “said.” That is, we are invited to read closely in the minutiae of narration to see the performative nature of discourse: the capacity of language and stories to give ontology to, and create, what is received as reality. This is the effect created by the possessive logic of settler sovereignty, described by Aileen Moreton-Robinson as an ideological effect that “operates at the level of beliefs and discursively at the level of epistemology . . . to circulate sets of meanings about white ownership of the nation as part of commonsense knowledge, decision making, and socially produced conventions” (81). In novels like *The Plague of Doves* Erdrich shows how the conventional narrative of U.S. formation has renarrated indigenous historical experience so that Native dispossession becomes “manifest destiny,” land thefts become “land claims,” and lynching murders become “rough justice” (297). Indigenous tellings of this history as attempted genocide are refract(ur)ed through

the possessive logic of settler discourse; in response, Erdrich's discontinuous narratives offer to suture these fragments into a sovereign Ojibwe history through narrators like Evelina and Judge Coutts, who enter the collective experience of loss by learning their erased family and community histories, and the ways in which the privilege acquired by settlers and their descendants continues to be played out across the generations. As I show in what follows, this discursive suturing of residual traces of disavowed Native history operates on the covert figurative level of reference through symbolic registers that converge within the novel, Erdrich's oeuvre, and her extensive network of intertextual allusions.

In the context of the novel, the revised short story exposes one of the most fundamental ideological strategies of settler colonialism: rhetorical displacement. Marn Wolde's narration achieves the displacement of the indigenous into the category of the monstrous and of the political into the sphere of the private by portraying herself as the spousal victim of Billy Peace's overwhelming appetite for power of all kinds. This is the overt significance of Marn's storytelling. However, the covert levels of intra- and intertextual reference, in both the story and the novel, together with the obvious unreliability of her narration, create a discontinuous structure of reference that exposes the settler-colonial biases of Marn's rhetoric. That is, in the very telling of her story Marn betrays the ways in which her first-person narration depoliticizes the primary problematic of *The Plague of Doves* (the identity and motive of the Lochren family's murderer) by obscuring Marn's own family history and their collective land hunger through displacement into the register of Billy's (deviant) appetites. The figure of the monstrous Ojibwe *wiindigoo* is assigned to Billy by his wife, who overtly characterizes this monstrous greed as a private psychosis rather than as a projection of her own inherited settler-colonial pathology. To unpack the ways in which Marn projects this mythical identity onto her indigenous husband is to uncover the discursive process of disavowal that works through the logic of settler sovereignty to replace Native histories with, alternatively, silence or triumphalist settler myths such as "manifest destiny." In Erdrich's recovery of these indigenous histories, form does not so much follow as it constitutes function; as Susan Strehle remarks in her account of Erdrich's engagement with the settler myth of American exceptionalism, "The separation of aesthetics and politics does not hold in Erdrich's fourteen novels, which enlist a postmodern aesthetics in the service of a

complex politics designed to resist and reverse the disavowal of Native culture" (109). A very specific instance of the "postmodern aesthetics" to which Strehle gestures is Erdrich's use of the discontinuous narrative form combined with a complex centrifugal network of symbolic reference. This allows the overt use of settler rhetoric by characters like Marn Wolde while, on a covert level of reference, counterdiscourses work subversively in the interests of Ojibwe sovereignty. Strehle describes the power of Erdrich's strategies of plural narrative points of view and dislocative chronology to "fracture the narrative surface while highlighting the political nature of the forgetting that is required by American exceptionalism" (124).⁴ To this insight must be added close attention to the covert level of storying to highlight, for example, Marn's role as a voice of disavowal structured by the logic of settler colonialism that is subverted by a repressed register of indigenous historical truth.

FROM STORY TO NOVEL: WHO IS
"SATAN: HIJACKER OF A PLANET"?

Both the original short story and the first chapter of Marn's narration in *The Plague of Doves* carry the same enigmatic title, which raises central questions like: Whose story is told? Who is "Satan" in the story? Is the "Satan" of the story also the "Satan" of the novel? Who "hijacks" or holds the "planet" to ransom? The way the story is told raises the question of possession: Who owns the story? Who is the central subject of the action—the narrator's younger self or the itinerant preacher (Stan/Billy) who seduces her—and how does the title relate to the narrative's subject? In both texts, responses to these questions are conditioned by the unreliability of the narrator, the narrative structure, and Erdrich's use of a highly evocative symbolic register of language. Ostensibly, the story is a *bildungsroman*, or narrative of formation, in which the unnamed first-person narrator recounts a specific event that was life-changing: the intrusion of a young traveling preacher into her dull rural life, her experience of his charismatic church, and her erotic awakening. The consistent use of anticipatory rhetoric within the retrospective narration underlines this story of beginnings by sustaining a temporal dichotomy. However, the location and situation from which the narrator is telling her past are never revealed. The narrator distances herself from her younger protagonist-self: in the opening of the story where she uses

the “little did I know . . .” topos; later when she prefigures her resistance to Stan’s control, “I was too young to stand against it”; and in the conclusion, which frames the story as the start of her uncontrollable desire for Stan that continued “always . . . from then on” (Erdrich, “Satan” n. pag.).

A perhaps more important rhetorical strategy, one that conveys meaning on multiple levels, is the narrator’s use of paralipsis, the practice of drawing attention to something by claiming to disregard it. At the end of the story, the narrator overtly claims that she avoids the details of Stan’s childhood abuse but immediately goes on to list “the burning welts, the scissors, the pinched nerves, the dead eye, the strap, the belt, the spike-heeled shoe, the razor” (Erdrich, “Satan” n. pag.). Implicitly, she suggests that she could but will not recount Stan’s sermon “word for word,” but that is precisely what follows. Paralipsis is a rhetorical technique also known as preterition. In theology, preterition describes the condition of being passed over or excluded from God’s elect; in Roman law, preterition is the omission of an heir from a will, which is then invalidated. These theological and legal subtexts establish, through the very form of Erdrich’s storytelling, covert levels of meaning that complicate Marn’s overt narration with themes of belonging and possession and set up her anxiety concerning ownership of land in the novel.

Possession as a narrative theme and as ownership of the story itself is further complicated by the sequence of action, the crisis of which should concern the primary eponymous subject: Satan. There are, however, not one but two major turning points in the story. Explicitly, the narrator announces, “This is when it happens” (Erdrich, “Satan” n. pag.), when in her vision or mental “picture” she guides Ed’s terminally ill mother toward death, suggesting that the narrator is the eponymous protagonist. Earlier, however, the centrality of Stan’s sermon, which is underlined formally by the shift from the narrator’s direct address to her use of free indirect discourse, suggests that in fact he is the main subject of the narrative. In each of these two moments, the narration shifts from past to present tense, and the intense focalization through the narrator becomes free indirect discourse, which reports what is in the narrator’s head or imagination or spirit. The words of the sermon do not belong to Stan (as they would if direct speech was used), nor does Ed’s mother’s vision; both are mediated through the narrator’s consciousness. Emphasizing this work of mediation, the prophetic structure of the sermon formally echoes the narrator’s prefigurative style of rhetoric. In this way,

she takes possession of his words and thoughts just as she takes possession of Ed's mother's spirit, effectively "hijacking" their autonomy as independent subjects.

Not only as a character in the action but also through her style of characterization the narrator instrumentalizes others, interpreting the world she narrates as a projection of her own feelings, values, and circumstances. For every characterizing observation that is offered of others, the narrator betrays something of how she evaluates that world. Almost exclusively she uses objects to describe others: Stan through his car, her mother through the objects she buys, her father through the land he unsuccessfully farms. She describes her father's love of "his" land in terms of possession and exploitation: "He loves his land, so he has to figure out how to cultivate it—what it needs in each season, how much abuse it will sustain, what in the end it will yield" (Erdrich, "Satan" n. pag.). Immediately she goes on to characterize herself through this image: "And I, too, in order to increase my yield and use myself right, was taking my lessons" (n. pag.). Her instrumentalization of the land is later represented formally when she uses it as the objective correlative of her own emotional landscape: "All my life my parents had been splitting up. I lived in a no-man's land between them, and the ground was pitted, scarred with ruts, useless" (n. pag.). This land is Creston, Montana, a town adjacent to the Mission Mountains, a landscape located on the Flathead Indian Reservation and sacred to the Salish-Kootenai peoples. This sacred land is further instrumentalized by the narrator as the place to which she takes Ed's mother in her vision or "picture." Even more than instrumentalization, this action is desecration: the narrator violates the sanctity of this indigenous place by guiding the spirit of the dying woman so she "gains peace from it, gains the rock strength, the power" (n. pag.). In a sense, she "hijacks" the sacred power of the land for her self-interest.

The capacity of the narrator to take possession of the words of others and to instrumentalize them through her characterizations is an effect of the intense focalization of the action through the first-person perspective. The story's obsessive interest in sight and pervasive imagery of eyes emphasize this effect: from the story's epigraph to the contrast between Stan's eyes, "the blue of winter ice," and her grandfather's eyes when he is planting trees (Erdrich, "Satan" n. pag.); the sermon incorporates the epigraph's image of the eyes of God and stresses the imperative

to *look* in “The Book”; later, Stan demands of his congregation a gesture of belief by closing their eyes and surrendering their credit cards; and when in her “picture” the narrator privileges sight over the senses of sound and smell. Sight then takes on multiple meanings: as an access to personal character or personality, spiritual knowledge, and faith. Faith or belief is elaborated by the double meanings of the word “credit” in Stan’s sermon, signifying not only salvation through belief in a future redemption but also financial security through the assurance of future payment. Stan identifies the Antichrist with “the plastic in our wallets” and damnation with reliance on the financial future. If we return to the narrator’s own desire, as she admits, to “increase my yield and use myself right,” then despite the words that Stan directly addresses to her—“You’re too young to have established a line of credit”—she has already taken Satan’s part by interpreting herself as the object of investment in her own future security.

The eponymous Satan of the story’s title (who hijacks a planet), on the overt level of the storytelling, is Stan, who has stolen the narrator’s agency by holding her captive to the sexual power he wields over her, directing her life toward charismatic religion. But on the covert level, it is the narrator who conforms to Stan’s description of the Antichrist, and it is she who appropriates the world for her own needs. She “hijacks” in the sense of seizing control of the consciousness of the other characters: Stan through her appropriative use of free indirect discourse, Ed’s mother through the vision in which her spirit is controlled and guided. The narrator assumes the communicative power of others’ minds and spirits (through her “pictures”) and so becomes an illicit source of power and influence. But in what sense does she hijack a “planet”? Certainly she appropriates landscapes for her own emotional and spiritual uses with no regard for the indigenous status of the land she and her family occupy. Thus the narration performs a complex exposure of the settler-colonial biases of the story by revealing covertly the indigenous status of the world in which it is set.

This work of exposure is taken further in *The Plague of Doves*. The novel shifts the setting of the story from Montana to Pluto, North Dakota, but the narrator’s (Marn Wolde’s) land is still located adjacent to indigenous land. As Billy tells her, the family farm was once reservation land, and, he threatens, it will be again. The conflict between Billy and Marn over land is one aspect of the novel’s transformation of the

relationship between Stan and the unnamed narrator of the short story, though all of the revisions contribute to a very different characterization of their relationship by placing it squarely in the context of settler colonialism. The classical temporal unity of the story that unfolds over the course of one day is extended to several years in the novel, though the exact time-span is indeterminate, so the moment when Marn decides to murder Billy is difficult to specify. Stan becomes Billy Peace, and his Ojibwe backstory is elaborated both through the guides Henri and Lafayette Peace, who helped to found the town of Pluto, and through Cuthbert Peace, one of the lynched men. Stan's itinerant preaching is expanded into Billy's cult-like congregation; and the narrator of this sequence is identified by name as Marn Wolde, who is now Billy's wife. Perhaps the most important addition in the novel is Marn's Uncle Warren, along with her two children. The story is located in the middle of the novel, and the original story is split into three sections: the events of the story leading to the encounter with Ed's dying mother comprise the first chapter, which retains the title of the short story; in Marn's third chapter, entitled "The Kindred," she gives her account of the Milwaukee "picture" (Erdrich, *Plague* 160–61); and the sexual encounter that concludes the short story is presented in the novel after her return from a fund-raising trip to Seattle, and it is represented in much more violent terms than in the story. The implicit struggle for dominance portrayed in the short story between the narrator and Stan becomes in the novel an explicit power struggle that characterizes the possessive logic of settler colonialism working through the relationship between Marn and Billy. This struggle is intimately connected to the change of setting, which is thematically incorporated into the action of the novel. After "wandering in the desert," where Marn has "trouble with the pictures" (Erdrich, *Plague* 147), she returns to her family farm in Pluto, and there her visions also return. The significance of the link between Marn's capacity for spiritual visions and the physical landscape she occupies is underlined by a seemingly minor change in the setting: the "lodgepole pines" described early in the short story become the "great oak," whose roots suck water "from the bottom of the world."⁵ This echoes the "hanging tree" from which the innocent Ojibwe men were lynched, which is also located "on the edge of Wolde's land" (77). The sole variety of oak indigenous to North Dakota is the bur oak (*Quercus macrocarpa*), which, with the long trailing limbs of its mature specimens, agrees with

the description of the “hanging tree.” The bur oak is described interestingly by USDA Forest Service scientist Paul S. Johnson as “a pioneer tree invading prairie grasslands” (USDA n. pag.). Johnson explains that, because of its flood resistance, the bur oak is the first variety of tree to become established on the edge of floodplains, such as those of the Missouri River in North Dakota. Thus, the bur oak is both a native plant and a “pioneer” because it begins the process of environmental transformation. In *The Plague of Doves*, the “pioneer” oak displaces an indigenous reference embedded in the name of the “lodgepole pines” and specifically functions as the residual physical trace of historic settler murder in a place where Marn regains her exceptional spiritual power. And she is not the only member of the Wolde family who has visions or “pictures” here. In a sentence added to the original introduction of her “pictures,” in the novel Marn remarks: “That’s what my uncle does when he’s just staring” (Erdrich, *Plague* 146). Her Uncle Warren is her grandfather’s brother, “whose dad originally bought the farm” (139). In the time-scale of the novel, this land would have been allotted Ojibwe land: “Indian land,” as Billy calls it.⁶ The figure of the grandfather is absent from the novel, but, like his brother Warren, he would have been of the generation of settlers who lynched Billy’s ancestor. Her Uncle Warren repeatedly confronts Marn, claiming insight into and affinity with her capacity to kill. Fixing her with his “frozen” eye, he predicts that she is going to hell: “Sometimes he would say that I was just like him, that I maybe was him, he could see it. He could see my whole structure. I couldn’t hide” (141). In the opening to the chapter “The Kindred,” in unmarked direct speech, Marn reports his assertions, “It’s on you, I can see it. . . . You’re gonna kill. . . . It’s on you. You’re gonna kill” (158). Later, as Marn watches her “picture” and listens while her snakes tell her how she will kill Billy, her exchange with Uncle Warren returns:

It’s on you, I can see it.

What’s on me? What?

It’s on you, I can see it, you’re gonna kill. (177)

This untagged indirect dialogue could be Marn’s memory; it could also be her internalization of her uncle’s words. The dialogue is set off from the surrounding sections of the text and stands dramatically isolated, emphatic, and chilling.

SATAN AND THE WIINDIGOO

Marn's character and her relation with her uncle, grounded in settler history, are covertly explained through the dense subtext formed by the novel's figurative language. There is the symbolic significance of names, for example: one variation of Marn is the shortened form of Maren, signifying the sea, and Wolde, as a German name, means "child of." The name Marn Wolde, a child of the sea, would underline her status as the child of immigrants, in contrast to Billy's indigenous ancestry.⁷ Marn identifies herself explicitly through her physical likeness with her daughter, Lilith. In *midrashim*, Lilith was the first wife of Adam. She refused to serve him and so was sent into exile (Neusner). Biblically, Lilith is associated with the screech owl, the harbinger of death (Isaiah 34; Ginzberg; Graves and Patai), while Marn and Lilith also share a symbolic link through the novel's extensive intertextual register of snake imagery. In *Gilgamesh*, Lilith is the spirit inhabiting a powerful tree, in the base of which lives a serpent; in the *Kabbalah*, she is the "Tortuous Serpent"; in Greco-Roman mythology, she is the daughter of Hecate, human but serpentine from the waist down, gifted with second sight but cursed never to close her eyes. In Marn's own narration, intratextual traces link her intimately to snakes. Her copperhead snake bears hourglass markings (Erdrich, *Plague* 160) that echo the "figure-eight sign of eternal life" that Billy engraves into Marn's thigh (173). Significantly, given Billy's desire to return the Wolde land to the reservation, this image is also evocative of the flag of the Métis Nation: "The horizontal figure or infinity symbol featured on the Métis flag . . . represents the immortality of the nation" (metisnation.org n. pag.; see also Roemer 129), though the two conjoined circles suggest the coexistence of Native and settler peoples. Marn reports Billy's action simply as an instance of his physical abuse, but the image further recalls the 888 acres of farmland that Marn wants to claim by returning to Pluto (Erdrich, *Plague* 149). The connection between snakes and the disputed Ojibwe origins of the name for their traditional enemy, the Sioux, adds an even more sinister dimension to this cluster of allusions: Douglas Parks and Raymond DeMallie reference both J. N. B. Hewitt's etymology of "Sioux" as derived from *nadoweisiw*-eg, "a diminutive of *nadowe*, 'an adder,' hence 'an enemy,'" and also Frances Densmore's "more accurate translation 'they are lesser enemies'; she noted that the word *nadowe* meant both 'an

adder' and 'an enemy'" (Parks and DeMallie 234). When to this allusive cluster of enemy, snakes, and land is added the allusion to the daughter of Hecate and the infinity symbol, evoking a capacity to see into time twinned with the inability to disavow this vision, the resulting symbolic complex is suggestive of Marn's continual silence about but inadvertent betrayal of her family's implication in the historic lynchings and the Lochren murders.

Marn's unwitting exposure of her family's historic involvement in settler violence is an effect of her unreliable narration. A perhaps innocent yet radical example of her unreliability is the inconsistency between Marn's description of the town café as "a spare room, big and functional" (Erdrich, *Plague* 165), in contrast to Evelina's perception of the same space as both "solid" and gracious, befitting its former role as the National Bank of Pluto (190), an account that is later validated by Cordelia Lochren's description of "[t]he granite façade, arched windows, and twenty-foot ceilings [that] make our café seem solid and even luxurious" (295). More subversive of her reliability is Marn's passing remark that she works as a waitress when necessary; otherwise, she "raised money for Billy by speaking at big tent meetings and writing pamphlets and handling my snakes in the spirit-trance" (164), which conflicts with her subsequent claim that when she returns to the farm she will be a prisoner, and it will be a long time before she sees the outside world again. The falsely sinister tone of Marn's description of the farm buildings casts significant doubt on the objectivity of her claim: "I couldn't stop my eyes from catching on certain things—the lock on the gate of the play area, the intercom in diapering, the way the windows shut and locked from the inside, the walls built heavy, reinforced, a bunker" (174). All windows lock from the inside; windows that lock only from outside certainly would be indicative of a prison, but Marn frames her account of the material fabric of her environment in such a way that normal features appear to be threatening. In such an environment, she frames herself as victim.

It is as a victim that Marn contextualizes her murder of Billy as the killing of a *wiindigoo*. And yet her actions, starting with Billy's assertion that their land should be returned to the reservation and leading to the murder, reveal a different set of motivations. Billy's words are mediated through Marn's voice as reported speech, rendering the whole exchange ambiguous: "The end of our land bumps smack up to the reservation

boundary. This was reservation, Billy says, and should be again. This was my family's land, Indian land. Will be again. He says it flat out with a lack of emotion that disturbs me. Something's there. Something's different underneath" (Erdrich, *Plague* 152). Billy's sentiments are presented in terms of the effect of his words on Marn so that what becomes "different underneath" is her attitude toward him now that he wants to return their land to tribal ownership. It is from this point in Marn's narrative that she begins to characterize Billy in very specific ways that evoke the Ojibwe figure of the *wiindigoo*, a cannibalistic monster with an insatiable appetite.

Basil Johnston's account of Ojibwe spiritual and cultural traditions includes the following description of the *wiindigoo*:

The pain of others meant nothing to the Weendigo; all that mattered was its survival.

The Weendigo gorged itself and glutted its belly as if it would never eat again. But a remarkable thing always occurred. As the Weendigo ate, it grew, and as it grew so did its hunger, so that no matter how much it ate, its hunger always remained in proportion to its size. The Weendigo could never requite either its unnatural lust for human flesh or its unnatural appetite. . . . [T]he more it ate, the bigger it grew; and the bigger it grew, the more it wanted and needed. (222)

Marn stresses Billy's appetite, his bodily expansion, and his limitless energy (Erdrich, *Plague* 152–55), describing "the bigger, uncontrollable force that Billy becomes" (154), and, after Billy is struck by lightning, she sees that he is left "bigger than before, swollen with unearthly power" (156). However, upon her return from Seattle, Billy seems to her "[n]ot vast as he'd been when he'd absorbed lightning, but big enough" (167). With the threat of losing her land less urgent because she has already decided to murder him, Billy also appears less threatening, less monstrous. Only Marn figures Billy as a *wiindigoo*, but covert elements of the novel that are independent of Marn's perspective characterize her in precisely this way. In the short story, the narrator remarks upon Stan's "icy blue eyes," which are evocative of the *wiindigoo*, but in the novel Evelina describes the "intense blue iris" (184) of Marn's eyes; unlike Billy, Marn has the capacity to run very fast, as when she runs her "rattlesnake route" (175–76); she enters the spirit of other people and possesses them through

her “pictures”; and the *wiindigoo*’s uncontrollable greed and desire to consume characterize Marn’s instrumentalization of the landscape, objects, and other people, as well as her appetite for food and land.

Working through the novel and into Erdrich’s earlier fiction, the cannibalistic *wiindigoo* figure is strongly associated with the insatiable land greed of settler colonialism. The term *wiindigoo* is explicitly used in *The Porcupine Year*, published in the same year as *The Plague of Doves*: “The dreadful cannibal spirit of the wiindigoo was on the land, the spirit that drove people mad with hunger as it hid the animals and put the fish to sleep. They could all feel its bitter breath” (114). In *The Birchbark House* (1999), the protagonist’s father tells a story about his near escape from such a monster and, in his commentary on that story, reflects with Omakayas’s uncle upon the pressure of white aggression, which is relentlessly pushing the family westward, and the growing knowledge that this process of dispossession through settler greed will never end: “‘Not until they have it all,’ said Fishtail. ‘All of our lands. Our wild-rice beds, hunting grounds, fishing streams, gardens. Not even when we are gone and they have the bones of our loved ones will they be pleased. I have thought about this. . . . Before they were born, before they came into this world, the chimookoman must have starved as ghosts. They are infinitely hungry’” (79–80).

Woven into the anticolonial subtext of *The Plague of Doves* is the only explicitly cannibalistic *wiindigoo* character, Liver-Eating Johnston, who appears in Mooshum’s various tall tales of their encounter.⁸ Folk “heroes” of the settler frontier, like Johnston, are sustained in stories that celebrate the hero as “the perfect representative of frontier virtue and independence” (McNeil n. pag.). Often called “pioneers,” “explorers,” “frontiersmen” (most famously, Davy Crockett), and hunters (like Buffalo Bill Cody), these figures were actively engaged in the process of colonial indigenous erasure. John “Liver-Eating” Johnston belongs to this group of Indian killers—he was, among other things, a scout, gold seeker, hunter, trapper, and whiskey peddler (Walker 92)—and he is most famous for stories in which he eats the livers of those he killed as a revenge-fueled insult against the Crow (who consider the liver necessary to entry into the afterlife) for killing his Native wife (92). This “hero” of settler-colonial folklore is introduced by Evelina, who overhears Mooshum recounting to the priest the story of how he lost part of his ear. In Mooshum’s terms, Liver-Eating Johnson [*sic*] becomes an

antiheroic Indian hater, an “evil trapper and coward” (Erdrich, *Plague* 37) characterized by features of the *wiindigoo*: his ability to run very fast over very great distances, his desperation, and his eating of human flesh. But Mooshum also places himself in the position of cannibal, biting off Liver-Eating’s fingers, toes, and nose, which he offers to show the priest. The priest’s objection to the idea of keeping a relic of the encounter and his outrage when Mooshum not only likens it to the Christian relics held in the local church but goes on to compare Liver-Eating’s cannibalism to the Eucharist creates the novel’s opportunity to suggest that cannibalism is an appropriate image of the workings of settler colonialism. Later, Judge Coutts makes this explicit by underlining the cannibalistic *wiindigoo* impulse among the founders of Pluto. Struggling to survive the brutal winter that interrupts the land-claim expedition, the Buckendorf brothers—whose “eyes glowed with hunger like mystic stones and their fangs had grown yellow” (111)—want to eat Reginald Bull and are prevented only by the Ojibwe guides, who bury the dead man before he can be consumed by his partners. The “blackened piece of leatherlike gunk” Mooshum produces ostensibly as Liver-Eating’s nose is identified by Evelina’s brother as “[a] bit of *Thamnophis radix*” (39), the common garter snake, which Evelina identifies by its scientific name shortly after (49), and one of the varieties of snake that Marn celebrates on her regular runs around the boundaries of her family farm (176). Mooshum connects Liver-Eating Johnson with the image of Marn’s snakes when he encounters her in the town café following Billy’s murder; Mooshum offers to tell the story of his escape to Marn but is interrupted, and when he addresses her again it is to ask her about the rumors he has heard concerning her plan to create a snake ranch on her newly claimed land. Their exchange brings together land, snakes, and cannibalism in the context of settler violence.

Greed for land and a willingness to murder in order to satisfy the hunger for land defines the *wiindigoo* logic of settler colonialism. And in *The Plague of Doves* it is Marn who wants the family’s land for herself. I am suggesting that caution should be exercised in relation to Marn’s account of her motives for murder, particularly in view of the clear parallel across Erdrich’s oeuvre between Marn’s murder of Billy and Pauline Puyat’s killing of Napoleon Morrissey in *Tracks* (1988). Believing that she is subduing Satan or Lucifer in the guise of the lake *manitou* Mishesheshu but in the midst of a vision that can otherwise appear to be

psychosis, Pauline strangles Napoleon with her rosary. Comparisons between Pauline and Marn are manifold, based on their figurative yet murderous possession by spirits of evil. In an incisive 1997 essay, Kate McCafferty maps the Ojibwe contexts in which Pauline is characterized as *wiindigoo* through affiliation with the Wa'bano witches society and its practices of ritual cannibalism, the use of the owl (or bear) as its tutelary spirit, and the capacity to travel at great speed (737).⁹ McCafferty traces the development of Pauline's *wiindigoo* character through her opposition to Fleur Pillager's growing spiritual power (743); similarly, as Marn sees Billy increasing in spiritual power (e.g., the power to heal), so she extends her own capacity (e.g., through the charismatic power of her snakes). Pauline, in her work with Bernadette Morrissey, "brings living souls into the waiting hands of death," including the schoolmate she "dreams to death" (744; Erdrich, *Tracks* 67), much as Marn guides Ed's dying mother through her "picture." McCafferty explains Pauline's turn, first to *wiindigoo* practices and subsequently to the Catholic Church, as a consequence initially of her marginal position as a clanless mixed-blood on the reservation and then as her response to the continuing influx of settlers into Ojibwe territory: "What makes Pauline's behavior Wa'bano is the fact that she twists this critical historical and personal moment toward competitive self-aggrandizement in opposition to her tribe" (McCafferty 746). While Marn is a member of the settler community and so cannot turn against the Ojibwe in the same way as Pauline, she acts to aggrandize herself by taking the children, the money, and the land—and rationalizes the killing of Billy that makes this possible by portraying him, in her narration of the murder, as being himself a *wiindigoo*. McCafferty offers a possible explanation for Marn's discursive maneuver as a self-interested psychological projection when she quotes Ruth Landes's paraphrase of her tribal informants: "The windigo disorder involved *projection of the sufferer's fears and vindictiveness* . . . from profound melancholy to violence [until] in the latter phase the sufferer yearned to kill and eat all human beings around" (qtd. 743, emphasis added). The self-interest that motivates Marn—obtaining land as her personal possession—serves her own settler-colonial interests and the historic "mission" of the town. As McCafferty suggests, through the character of Pauline Puyat and in Erdrich's work more generally, "the 'new' god of Western society may be the shape that a much older power has shifted into. . . . From a certain Chippewa angle, the church's evan-

gelical mission has veiled its own windigo desire to murder a culture in order to scavenge its heart" (746). The *wiindigoo* segues into the settler-colonial practice of murder and the Christian image of "Satan."

Marn's narration ends with her vision or "picture" of herself as she leaves the scene of the murder, taking with her the money, the children, and, as she says, "the land deed in my name" (Erdrich, *Plague* 179). In the next section, told from Evelina's first-person perspective, Marn sits with her children in the café, and there she tells Evelina that her purpose in coming to town is to see the judge and get her land back (187). But Marn's murder of Billy has an even greater significance than her appropriation of the land and her effort to ensure that it is not returned to the reservation. After she has killed Billy, Marn describes how her "picture" dictates that she must hang his dead body from the rafters (178), explicitly recalling the historic lynching of Billy's ancestor. This gesture brings together a number of covert elements of the novel, clustered around the image of the hanging tree. These symbolic traces are framed by the snakes that dictate to Marn in a vision the procedure by which she kills Billy. She only experiences these visions (the capacity for which she shares with her uncle) when she is on Wolde land. In combination, these details suggest that Marn inherits her Uncle Warren's psychosis and that the land itself is haunted by the terrible crimes it has witnessed.

SATAN, THE *WIINDIGOO*, AND THE POSSESSIVE LOGIC OF SETTLER SOVEREIGNTY

The settler pathology of land hunger haunts the reservation boundary, itself a remnant or trace of historical dispossession by the logic of possessive white sovereignty. The Wolde farm borders reservation land and the Lochren farm, locating both farms on what was once Ojibwe land. When Cordelia Lochren finally reveals the identity of her family's killer she does not disclose Warren Wolde's motive for murder; rather, she asks, "To what profit? For nothing was taken. Nothing gained. To what end the mysterious waste [of her family's lives]?" (Erdrich, *Plague* 308–9). The motive emerges from the covert intersection of fragmentary details, assembled discontinuously and synthesized into an indigenous counter-logic of possession. From the perspective of indigenous occupation of sovereign land, the settler disavowal and renarration of a genocidal history are reavowed. Cordelia Lochren, speaking in her role as town historian, remarks

that the lynching is never mentioned (297); that she was always led to believe that the lynched men were guilty until her fellow local historian, Neve, told her the truth (307). But even Neve does not want to ask the pressing historical questions forced upon her by Mooshum: How is it that Pluto lies within the reservation boundaries? “[H]ow was it stolen? How has this great thievery become acceptable?” (84).

The discursive reappropriation of indigenous history is played out through the symbolic value of the hanging tree both in *The Plague of Doves* and in the companion novel, *The Round House* (2012). Another narrative structured around violent anti-Native crime and narrated entirely by Joe—the son of Judge Coutts and Geraldine, Evelina’s aunt—*The Round House* explores the transmission of settler violence into the next generation of Pluto. Joe’s mother is savagely raped and nearly killed as she tries unsuccessfully to save a young Ojibwe woman and her baby from Linden Lark. The money that Lark tries to steal from Mayla, money she has been paid to keep quiet about the identity of the baby’s father, is found by Joe, who banks it and then buries the passbooks. He buries them near “the tree that the people call the hanging tree, a huge oak. . . . This was the tree where those ancestors were hanged. None of the killers ever went on trial. I could see the land of their descendants, already full of row crops” (Erdrich, *Round* 140). While the settlers’ claim to the land has not been displaced (indeed, their descendants prosper on stolen land), the tree itself has undergone a primal shift in symbolic significance: “There were prayer flags, strips of cloth. Red, blue, green, white, the old-time Anishinaabe colors of the directions. . . . Some cloths were faded, some new” (140). The tree, and the history it holds, has been and continues to be indigenized. The hanging tree is framed in the novel, early and late, by Joe’s memory of pulling tree shoots from the foundations of his home, a memory that he later marks as the last time he was happy, unaware, untouched by evil (294). The language of his recollection intimates that these trees, like the hanging tree, bear a considerable symbolic burden: “[H]ow funny, strange, that a thing can grow so powerful even when planted in the wrong place. Ideas too, I muttered. Ideas” (293). The idea that immediately comes to his mind is the Doctrine of Discovery, explained by his father as the foundation of possessive settler sovereignty: an idea that has been “planted in the wrong place” and yet continues powerfully to grow. However, the hanging tree, festooned with Ojibwe prayer flags, is an assertion of indigenous sover-

eignty that reavows the history of U.S. settlement as a murderous land grab enacted by the *wiindigoo*, which also comes to Joe's mind simultaneously with the remembrance of the unjust case law that is based on the fiction of "discovery."

Lark's sister Linda identifies something of his motive for theft and murder; she tells Joe: "[W]hy he did this to your mother had more to do with a man who set loose his monster. [A monster that is always] still hungry. Know why? Because no matter how much it ate, it couldn't get the right thing. There was always something it needed" (Erdrich, *Round* 300). But it is Joe who names this monstrosity *wiindigoo* as he recounts his fears: "Would I become a wiindigoo? Infected by Lark?" (294). Linda suggests that Lark inherited his "monster" from his mother; Judge Coutts offers a further line of descent when he reminds Joe that Lark's great-uncle was among the men who formed the lynching party (211). These men, continuing the legacy of their settler forebears, resemble the colonial Scots-Irish described by Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz as "the foot soldiers of British empire-building. . . . [T]hey and their descendants formed the shock troops of the 'westward movement' in North America, the expansion of the US continental empire and the colonization of its inhabitants" (52). Though these "foot soldiers" rarely benefited directly from their work of "clear[ing] areas for settlement" (53), they served the interests of U.S. settler colonialism and passed the material benefits to their descendants, just as it was the later families of the "discoverers" of the land that became Pluto who benefited after the railroad made the town viable.

The discontinuous, interconnected stories of Pluto's history explore settler sovereignty as the assumption of entitlement to take whatever is desired. In *The Plague of Doves*, when Maggie accuses her former lover John Wildstrand of being "just like your Indian-hating grandfather" (131), she speaks in the context of the instrumentalization of her brother Billy Peace, who is used by Wildstrand to kidnap his wife and, under the pretense of a ransom, to steal her retirement fund. Wildstrand acts from a sense of entitlement to the money, although it is not his, and a righteous desire to buy a house for Maggie in which she can raise the child of their adulterous affair. Judge Coutts tells Wildstrand's story immediately following his account of the land-claim expedition, which included Wildstrand's ancestor. What these two stories have in common is the dramatization of the fundamental settler-colonial attitude of entitle-

ment. In the Judge's telling, the historical Wildstrand and the other land speculators never paused to question their entitlement to claim indigenous land. This is precisely the attitude that informs John Wildstrand's exploitation of Billy in order to steal money and property from his wife, Neve, and it is the assumption that motivates Marn to kill Billy in order to acquire, again, money and land.

The land greed that brings dispossession and death to the Ojibwe creates the town that is significantly named Pluto, a name that evokes the ruler of the underworld (and, by implication, the Satan of Marn's opening chapter) and Plutus, the Greek god of wealth. Through the novel's emphasis on imagery of vision—sharing the stress on “eyes” in the short story—and of light, the mythical allusion to Plutus is linked to the biblical figure of Mammon: signifying greed, materialism, and gluttony, underlining the transhistorical force of settler land hunger. Mammon is opposed to the true God in Matthew 6:22–24 in the caution that no man can serve two masters. The opposition between God and Mammon is explained through the image of the eye, which allows the body to be filled with either light or darkness: “But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!” (Matthew 6:23, King James version, original emphasis). Marn describes herself as “dark inside,” while Billy is, to her, “too full of light” (Erdrich, *Plague* 173). In Marn's self-description and in the symbolic underworld of Pluto, darkness reigns and, with it, loyalty to Mammon. The narrative's indirect invocation of Mammon through the name assigned to the town of Pluto is supplemented by Marn's account of the intention of the congregation to mine the farmland for gold:

We were imaging gold. We were visualizing total and complete original support. We were seeing chunks, flakes, beads, veins, whole nuggets. We were seeing through the rock and gumbo, through igneous peat and shale, through the vestiges of lost black time, through the ivory teeth and petrified wood, through the bones and the tarry blood of dinosaurs. We were seeing gold, tasting it, biting gold coins, believing. We were going to start digging in the back field pretty soon. (172)

Marn introduces this description of the Kindred's faith in gold by telling of her “imaging”: “I closed my eyes and from inside my own dark

consciousness I stared down, far down, into the shaft of an empty mine” (172). The closing of her eyes, the entry into darkness and emptiness are details made significant by their biblical contextualization. Worshipping Mammon, she closes her eyes to the light and sees instead form after form of gold. Imagining through layers of earth and time, her account is evocative of the Black Hills gold rush in Dakota Territory that both violated the Treaty of Laramie (1868) and profoundly desecrated the sacred site; Marn’s description is also strongly reminiscent of Milton’s story of Mammon in the first book of *Paradise Lost* (lines 679–95). Even in Heaven, Mammon directs his eyes downward, preferring the “riches of Heav’n’s pavement, trod’n Gold” to

... aught divine or holy else enjoy’d
 In vision beatific: by him first
 Men also, and by his suggestion taught,
 Ransack’d the Center, and with impious hands
 Riff’d the bowels of thir mother Earth
 For Treasures better hid. Soon had his crew
 Op’nd into the Hill a spacious wound
 And dig’d out ribs of Gold. Let none admire
 That riches grow in Hell. (lines 683–91)

The congregation, which includes some descendants of the lynching party (Erdrich, *Plague* 243), is named the Kindred, and while the name simply refers to the alliance among group members, the symbolic significance attached to them via the name again connects their violent greed, and their allegiance to Mammon, to the figure of the tree. Billy’s congregation may be called the Kindred as a gesture toward the indigenous term “all my relations”; however, the narration exclusively through Marn’s first-person perspective blocks access to this kind of information. The *OED* lists among the obsolete meanings of the word “kindred” that of a genealogical tree, suggesting again that their appetite for wealth is an inherited settler drive for possession. Evelina brings the two into conjunction when she describes the location of the hanging tree: “The tree still grew on Marn’s land, where Billy Peace’s kindred used to stay” (253). Reinforcing this symbolic evocation of inherited settler greed are the multiple meanings of the term “kindred.” Figuratively, the application of kindred to a community of vampires suggests bloodsuckers in the sense of those who ruthlessly prey on others.¹⁰ The practice of drink-

ing their own human blood is set out in John Borrows's account of the *wiindigoo* in *Drawing Out Law* (223), to which he adds "other harmful forms of cannibalistic consumption that destroy lands and people" (224).¹¹ The figurative link to U.S. settler colonialism is supplemented by an older significance of the word "kindred": the *Middle English Dictionary* lists a variant meaning as "nation, tribe, people," including the twelve tribes of Israel.¹²

This cluster of discontinuous intertextual references casts particular light on the title of the novel. As Margaret Noori observes, "A biblical dove can be a sign of peace or of the Holy Ghost, and a flock is a message from God. Yet all that whiteness descending on Chippewa reservation farmland, hungry and destructive, is also a metaphor for the myth of manifest destiny" (12). The doves that plague Pluto with their voracious, insatiable appetite do indeed evoke the myth of Manifest Destiny when read in the context of the novel's exposure of the workings of settler colonialism.¹³ In Genesis 8:11, doves are sent by Noah after the flood to discover land where the Ark could disembark; the significance of the dove as a symbol of the people of Israel is made explicit in the Rabbinic *midrashim* on "Song of Songs" 2:14 (Neusner 106), an association that evokes the Puritan settlers' myth of themselves as divinely guided "Israelites" and their colonies in Native America as the "New Canaan." The connection between doves and settlers accounts for the ominous tone of Mooshum's words to Evelina as they return Holy Track's boots to the now flag-festooned hanging tree, "Awee, my girl. The doves are still up there" (Erdrich, *Plague* 254); earlier, Evelina reports overhearing Mooshum tell his brother, "*I saw the same thing as Holy Track, the doves are still up there*" (33, original emphasis). This image is repeated later by Marn to characterize the moment when she becomes possessed of a power that she suspects has been transmitted to her by her uncle: "I feel the stark bird that nests in the tree of the Holy Ghost descend and hover" (151). Marn's experience coincides with Billy's plans to take over her family farm, the land that she later kills to obtain for herself rather than allow him to return it to the reservation.

The evocation of the settler myth of Manifest Destiny operates in the context of the "kindred" as followers of Mammon, inheritors of the *wiindigoo* settler hunger for wealth, and Marn herself as "the great deceiver," or the Satan figure named in the title of her first chapter and the original short story. The symbolic subtext or covert level of the novel's meaning

works together with a network of allusions to Erdrich's other writing and a constellation of intertextual allusions to reavow the disavowed history of settler invasion and occupation of sovereign indigenous land by identifying the pathological (and potentially psychotic) nature of settler-colonial greed. Asiginak, shortly before he is lynched, confirms that the settlers are just not like the Ojibwe men: "You are a madness on this earth," he tells them in *Ojibwemowin* (Erdrich, *Plague* 75). And much later, the Judge thinks about this land greed, recalling his "grandfather's phrase for the land disease, town fever, and how he nearly died of greed, its main symptom" (115). The possessive logic of settler sovereignty, exposed through Marn's unreliable narration, is subverted by Erdrich's pervasive Native reappropriation and indigenizing of this history.

CONCLUSION: DISCONTINUOUS NARRATIVE,
"ASSEMBLED BY EXPERIENCE"

When it was published, *The Plague of Doves* joined several earlier Erdrich novels criticized by Native and non-Native readers alike for their discontinuous form. Typical of the view that Erdrich's use of narrative discontinuity is symbolic of indigenous alienation is Louis Owens's description of *Love Medicine*: "Formally, the novel's fragmented narrative underscores the fragmentation of the Indian community and of the identity that begins with community and place" (64). Owens echoes the earlier, and better-known, criticisms made by Leslie Marmon Silko, who, in her 1986 review of *The Beet Queen*, approached the novel as a "postmodern" exercise in linguistic self-referentiality divorced from the actual experience of indigeneity: "In Erdrich's hands, the rural North Dakota of Indian-hating, queer-baiting white farmers, of the Depression, becomes magically transformed . . . is an oddly rarified place in which the individual's own psyche, not racism or poverty, accounts for all conflict and tension" (180). These framings of Erdrich's narrative style appear to be indebted to understandings of discontinuity as a postmodern legacy of "high" modernist fiction, such as John G. Parks's remarks in his 1984 essay, "Human Destiny and Contemporary Narrative Form":

The loss of boundaries, experimentation and exploration, and Protean identities characterize much of the serious fiction since the Second World War. Not only has the thematic content of fiction

reflected cultural breakdowns—in its treatment of madness, disintegration, alienation, loneliness, absurdity—but also the *way* fictions are told. The abandonment of plot and character in favor of episode and voice, and an often fragmented and discontinuous narrative, reflect a radical questioning of, if not outright disbelief in, a notion of human destiny and a sense of relatedness to an overarching theological and cultural narrative paradigm. In short, for many writers, there is no longer available a central story which explains and gives human value to experience. (99, original emphasis)

These references to “alienation,” “cultural breakdowns,” and disbelief in the relatedness of humanity and grand cultural paradigms—like Parks’s claim that narrative must be discontinuous in the absence of “a central story which explains and gives human value to experience”—do not adequately describe Louise Erdrich’s literary achievement. Indeed, if the most fundamental principle of postmodernism is, as Jean-François Lyotard claims, the rejection of master discourses, or “metanarratives,” then a novel like *The Plague of Doves* is emphatically not “postmodernist.”¹⁴ The narrative is structured around the very real historical “metanarrative” of settler-colonial possession and indigenous genocide. More relevant to Erdrich’s work, then, are the terms used by Brian Kiernan to account for the discontinuous style of Australian writer Frank Moorhouse: “What happens does not ‘develop’ as in a continuous narrative, yet there is the sense that all is not random, disconnected, arbitrary. . . . [D]iscontinuity would seem to presuppose some continuity to depart from” (75, 94). In a comparable way, Erdrich creates a sense of indirectly communicated continuity through an elusive, covert pattern of reference that defies direct description yet articulates the violent dispossession and murder underpinning U.S. national formation. This history is disavowed by the white inhabitants of Erdrich’s fictional Pluto, but it constitutes the primary challenge confronted by indigenous American writers who seek to recover their sovereign histories under the regime of remembrance imposed by U.S. nation-state hegemony. John Freeman reports that in his interview with Erdrich shortly after the publication of *The Plague of Doves* she observed, “In the beginning, the whites had all the power . . . but . . . [t]he Indians have the history” (n. pag.).

What I hope to have shown is that when Erdrich’s 1997 short story is integrated into the longer narrative of the 2008 novel, two important

shifts occur. First, the story becomes radicalized. Marn Wolde, as a contemporary inheritor of *wiindigoo* psychosis, becomes the focal point of a settler-colonial history of violent land theft: she, through all that she represents, is “Satan, Hijacker of a Planet,” as the short story suggests. Second, the story is “indigenized” by the novel’s mobilization of the interlaced settler and Ojibwe histories of the town of Pluto in order to “imply an elusive pattern of interaction” (Kiernan 75), which is an indigenously remembering of original and enduring tribal sovereignty beyond the disavowal of that sovereignty by the possessive logic of settler colonialism. Using a metaphor that is particularly appropriate to discussion of *The Plague of Doves*, in *Love’s Knowledge* (1990) Martha Nussbaum describes “the terms of the novelist’s art [as] alert winged creatures, perceiving where the blunt terms of ordinary speech or of abstract theoretical discourse are blind, acute where they are obtuse, winged where they are dull and heavy” (5). In the context of indigenous dispossession and the disavowal of settler-colonial genocide, the “blunt terms of ordinary speech” are always already obtuse and blind to indigenous sovereignty, conforming instead to the “common sense knowledge and socially produced conventions” that Moreton-Robinson describes as the discursive vectors of possessive settler sovereignty. In a slightly different context, the protagonist of Erdrich’s novel *Shadow Tag* (2010) writes in her private journal:

How many times have I told you how difficult it is to resist the lure of the historical moment? The one action, the instantaneous truth that changes everything? How many times have I described my own struggles in telling stories, relating historical occurrences, searching for the sequence of events that results in a pattern we can recognize as history? There are always many moments, there is never just one. There are many points of clarity and many causes to one effect. However, after many, many, of these points, these moments, have occurred, there is, I should tell you, a final moment. A final scene. (48)

A “final moment” of this kind is described by Evelina in *The Plague of Doves*. Her narration concludes: “When we are young, the words are scattered around us. As they are assembled by experience, so also are we, sentence by sentence, until the story takes shape” (268). The possessive logic of settler sovereignty structures the disavowal of histories of

U.S. national formation. Thus, the construction of an Ojibwe counter-narrative of settler land theft and the *wiindigoo* pathology of insatiable land hunger requires that words be reassembled “sentence by sentence” across a widely dispersed discursive field: across the novel itself, across Erdrich’s oeuvre, and across the canon of literature. And as the words come together, performatively they re-create Ojibwe history: “the story” that displaces the settler fiction called the “Doctrine of Discovery.”

DEBORAH MADSEN is a professor of American studies at the University of Geneva, Switzerland. Most recently, she is the editor of the *Routledge Companion to Native American Literature* (2015).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply grateful to the anonymous reviewers, whose comments enriched and extended my thinking in this essay.

NOTES

1. Throughout, I follow Erdrich’s habit of referring to the Anishinaabe as Ojibwe.
2. Though beyond the scope of this essay, the figure of Fleur Pillager in *Four Souls* poses a significant comparison with Marn as another woman who destroys her husband to retake control of her land.
3. The following short stories became *The Plague of Doves*: “The Plague of Doves,” *New Yorker* (2006); “Sister Gozilla,” *Atlantic Monthly*, Feb. 2001, 96–99; “Shamengwa,” *New Yorker*, 2 Dec. 2002, 94–101; “The Plague of Doves,” *New Yorker*, 28 June 2004, 90–97; “Town Fever,” *North Dakota Quarterly* 73.4 (Fall 2006): 5–18; “Come In” (“Gleason”), *New Yorker*, 20 Mar. 2006, 118–23; “Satan: Hijacker of a Planet,” *Atlantic Monthly*, Aug. 1998, 64–68; “The Reptile Garden,” *New Yorker*, 28 Jan. 2008, 68ff.; “Demolition,” *New Yorker*, 18 Dec. 2006, 70–71; “Disaster Stamps of Pluto,” *New Yorker*, 13 Dec. 2004, 84–91.
4. On the discontinuous temporal structure of the novel, see Strehle 123–24.
5. On the symbolic significance of trees in Erdrich’s work, see Stripes.
6. The opening of *Tracks* is set in 1912, during the devastation caused by allotment and the subsequent loss of indigenous land and the stripping of forest from what was once reservation land. For a succinct account of the Ojibwe experience of dispossession as the result of allotment in the context of Erdrich’s writing, see Stirrup, “To Become”; Stirrup, *Louise Erdrich* 5–10.
7. On the significance of naming in the novel, see Roemer.
8. Erdrich changes the spelling of Johnston’s name to Johnson.
9. McCafferty’s sources are Sister M. Inez Hilger, “Some Early Customs of the Menomini Indians,” *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* 49 (1960): 45–68; Felix

M. Keesing, *The Menominee Indians of Wisconsin*, vol. 10 of *Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1939); Ruth Landes, *Ojibway Religion* (Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1968); Patricia K. Ourada, *The Menominee Indians, a History* (Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1979); Alanson Skinner, *Material Culture of the Menominee* (New York: Museum of the American Indian Heye Foundation, 1921); Louise Spindler, "Menominee," *Handbook of North American Indians*, vol. 15, ed. William C. Sturtevant and Bruce G. Trigger (Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1978).

10. The OED entry reads: "1741 C. Forman *Some Queries & Observ. Revol. in 1688*
11 These are the vampires of the publick, and riflers of the kingdom."

11. In Borrow's account of dealing with the *wiindigoo*, which Erdrich acknowledges in *The Round House*, what is stressed is compassion for a possessed community member rather than a brutal killing. So even if Billy were a *wiindigoo*, Marn's actions are in stark contrast to traditional Ojibwe practices.

12. The entry reads: "a1225(?OE) *Lamb.Hom.(Lamb 487)* 141: Sunnedei siriāt [read: smāt] Moyses þene stan . . . for þa twelf kunreden sculden þer mīde heore þurst kelen."

13. Gamber comments on "an excessively large, migrating, white mass of life clamping down on the American landscape, overusing the land and starving out the indigenous population" (144).

14. Quennet sets out the case for reading Erdrich's early North Dakota novels as postmodernist.

WORKS CITED

- Borrow, John. *Drawing Out Law: A Spirit's Guide*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2010. Print.
- Dunbar-Ortiz, Roxanne. *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States*. Boston: Beacon P, 2014. Print.
- Erdrich, Louise. *The Birchbark House*. New York: Hyperion, 1999. Print.
- . *The Plague of Doves*. New York: Harper, 2008. Print.
- . *The Porcupine Year*. New York: Harper, 2008. Print.
- . *The Round House*. New York: Harper, 2012. Print.
- . *Tracks*. New York: Harper, 1988. Print.
- . "Satan: Hijacker of a Planet." *Atlantic Online*. August 1997. n. pag. Web. 25 Nov. 2014.
- . *Shadow Tag*. New York: Harper, 2010. Print.
- Freeman, John. Interview. "Louise Erdrich: Secrets in the Indian File." *Independent*. 6 June 2008. Web. 9 Aug. 2015.
- Gamber, John. "So, a Priest Walks into a Reservation Tragicomedy: Humor in *The Plague of Doves*." *Louise Erdrich: Tracks, The Last Report on the Miracles at Little No Horse, The Plague of Doves*. Ed. Deborah L. Madsen. London: Continuum, 2011. 136–51. Print.
- Ginzberg, Louis. *Legends of the Bible*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1992. Print.

- Graves, Robert, and Raphael Patai. *The Hebrew Myths*. New York: Doubleday, 1964. Print.
- Hudson, Brian J. "Family Narratives and Self-Creation in Louise Erdrich's *The Plague of Doves and Shadow Tag*." MA thesis. Texas State University–San Marcos. 2013. PDF. 5 Aug. 2015.
- Johnson, Paul S. "Bur Oak." U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. https://www.na.fs.fed.us/pubs/silvics_manual/volume_2/quercus/macropcarpa.htm. n.d. Web. 30 Apr. 2016.
- Johnston, Basil. *The Manitous: The Spiritual World of the Ojibway*. Minneapolis: Minnesota Historical Society P, 1995. Print.
- Kiernan, Brian. "Frank Moorhouse: A Retrospective." *Modern Fiction Studies* 27.1 (Spring 1981): 73–94. Print.
- Lyotard, Jean-François. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1984. Print.
- McCafferty, Kate. "Generative Adversity: Shapeshifting Pauline/Leopolda in *Tracks and Love Medicine*." *American Indian Quarterly* 21.4 (Autumn 1997): 729–51. Print.
- McNeil, W. K. "Frontier and Folk Heroes." *Encyclopedia of American Studies*. Ed. Simon J. Bronner. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2015. Web. 14 Aug. 2015.
- Métis Nation of Ontario. "Symbols and Traditions." <http://www.metisnation.org/culture-heritage/symbols-and-traditions/>. n. pag. Web. 30 Apr. 2016.
- Middle English Dictionary*. University of Michigan. 2013. Web. 9 Aug. 2015.
- Milton, John. *Paradise Lost. Complete Poetry of John Milton*. Ed. John T. Shawcross. New York: Doubleday, 1971. Print.
- Moreton-Robinson, Aileen. *The White Possessive: Property, Power, and Indigenous Sovereignty*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2015. Print.
- Neusner, Jacob. *A Theological Commentary to the Midrash*. Vol. 3. *Song of Songs Rabbah*. Lanham, MD: UP of America, 2001. Print.
- Noori, Margaret. "The Shiver of Possibility." *Women's Review of Books* (Sept.–Oct. 2008): 12+. Web. 5 Aug. 2015.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. *Love's Knowledge: Essays on Philosophy and Literature*. New York: Oxford UP, 1990. Print.
- Owens, Louis. "Erdrich and Dorris' Mixed Bloods and Multiple Narratives." *Louise Erdrich's Love Medicine: A Casebook*. Ed. Hertha D. Sweet Wong. New York: Oxford UP, 2000. 53–66. Print.
- Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford UP. Web. 9 Aug. 2015.
- Parks, Douglas R., and Raymond J. DeMallie. "Sioux, Assiniboine, and Stoney Dialects: A Classification." *Anthropological Linguistics* 34.1/4 (Spring/Winter 1992): 233–55. Print.
- Parks, John G. "Human Destiny and Contemporary Narrative Form." *Western Humanities Review* 38.2 (Summer 1984): 99–107. Print.
- Quennet, Fabienne C. *Where "Indians" Fear to Tread? A Postmodern Reading of Louise Erdrich's North Dakota Quartet*. Hamburg: LIT Verlag, 2000. Print.

- Roemer, Kenneth M. "Naming Native (Living) Histories: Erdrich's Plague of Names." *Studies in American Fiction* 43.1 (Spring 2016): 115–35. Print.
- Silko, Leslie Marmon. "Here's an Odd Artifact for the Fairy Tale Shelf." 1986. Rpt. *Studies in American Indian Literatures*, n.s., 10.4 (Fall 1986): 177–84. Print.
- Stirrup, David. *Louise Erdrich*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2010. Print.
- . "My Body Is My Voice / Listen': Past, Presence, and the Poetic Voice." *A Usable Past: Tradition in Native American Arts and Literature*. Ed. Simone Pellerin. Bordeaux: Presse Universitaire de Bordeaux, 2010. 57–71. Print.
- . "To Become a Bureaucrat Myself': History and Law in *Tracks*." *Louise Erdrich: Tracks, The Last Report on the Miracles at Little No Horse, The Plague of Doves*. Ed. Deborah L. Madsen. London: Continuum, 2011. 48–62. Print.
- Strehle, Susan. "Prey to Unknown Dreams': Louise Erdrich, *The Plague of Doves*, and the Exceptionalist Disavowal of History." *LIT: Literature Interpretation Theory* 25.2 (2014): 108–27. Print.
- Stripes, James D. "The Problem(s) of (Anishinaabe) History in the Fiction of Louise Erdrich: Voices and Contexts." *Wicazo Sa Review* 7.2 (1991): 26–33. Print.
- Valentino, Gina. "It All Does Come to Nothing in the End': Nationalism and Gender in Louise Erdrich's *The Plague of Doves*." *Louise Erdrich: Tracks, The Last Report on the Miracles at Little No Horse, The Plague of Doves*. Ed. Deborah L. Madsen. London: Continuum, 2011. 121–35. Print.
- Walker, J. P. "Liver-Eating Johnston." *The Legendary Mountain Men of North America*. lulu.com, 2015. 91–92. Web.

The Sartorial Indian

Zitkala-Ša, Clothing, and Resistance to Colonization

C. DANIEL REDMOND

In 1919 Zitkala-Ša ended her five-year association with the Society of American Indians (SAI). Two years later, *American Indian Stories* was published. These writings, most of which originally appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly* and *Harper's Monthly* between 1900 and 1902, included three new additions: two short stories, "A Dream of Her Grandfather" and "The Widespread Enigma Concerning Blue-Star Woman," and a closing commentary about the impact of U.S. Indian reform policy on Native Americans, "America's Indian Problem." This essay begins its analysis of this collection by suggesting that Zitkala-Ša's departure from the SAI and the 1921 publication of *American Indian Stories* is no coincidence. As Lucy Maddox observes, the decision to republish older material "alongside [newer] reform stories suggests" that Zitkala-Ša viewed the earlier pieces "as relevant to the efforts of organizations like the SAI and the Women's Clubs to secure rights for American Indians, especially the rights of citizenship." Consequently, Maddox recommends that *American Indian Stories* be read "as a 1921 publication intended to address a particular set of issues . . . crucial to Indian intellectuals and reformers of the post-World War I period" (142). Building on Maddox's observation, I interrogate how *American Indian Stories* advances the reformist agenda that Zitkala-Ša developed and refined during her work with the SAI from 1914 to 1919, in particular through her use of clothing.

Recent scholarship has done much to enlighten us as to the motives behind the SAI's push for citizenship for all Native Americans. K. Tsianina Lomawaima, in "The Mutuality of *Citizenship* and *Sovereignty*: The Society of American Indians and the Battle to Inherit America," sees this effort as a struggle against a nation that legitimated its existence on American soil by "[m]aintaining American Indians as wards, in circum-

stances that denied or destroyed economic development.” This “Indian-ness,” as she calls it, which was “marked by selectively maintained cultural differences, economic incapacity, and communal property” (335), was made possible by the U.S. construction of “a distinctive *citizen-but-ward* status for American Indians” along with the parallel policy of treating tribal governments as little more than “*sovereign-but-domestic dependent*” nations subject to federal control.¹ In essence, the “ambiguous status of Native individuals and nations” (343) under the law was intentional, despite the stated assimilationist goals of U.S. Indian policy, and it was this cultivated difference that members of the SAI targeted in their reform efforts calling for full citizenship for all indigenous peoples. But, as Lomawaima makes clear, while the members of this organization may have shared the same goal, their individual efforts to articulate “the possibilities of coexistence of indigeneity and modernity, of life as a tribal member and an American individual varied dramatically,” revealing a “powerful legacy of *layers*” through which each tried to imagine what “an equitable, respected place in modern American society that descended from and remained connected to their indigeneity” would look like in practice (335, emphasis in original).²

Situating Zitkala-Ša’s reform work and *American Indian Stories* within these layers involves considering how she differed from her contemporaries in the SAI. While she too targeted the Indian Bureau as an ineffective bureaucracy, her approach to Indian reform sets her apart from thinkers like Carlos Montezuma: “Unlike many of her SAI colleagues—certainly including Montezuma—Bonnin continued to put the reservations and a traditional Sioux ethos at the center of her philosophy as a reformer and a thinker” (Maddox 150). Similarly, P. Jane Hafen adds that whereas SAI founder Arthur C. Parker and others like him preferred “to foreground progressive and educated Indians” in their reform efforts on behalf of all Native Americans, “Bonnin remained immersed in tribal work” (201). As Hafen notes, “Bonnin’s rhetorical themes reveal a consistency of resistance, tribal nationalism, and call for civil rights” that display an awareness “of her audience,” allowing her to “presen[t] her ideas in a pattern that affirmed tribalism while *paradoxically* utilizing ideologies of the colonizer” (199, emphasis added).

Yet, as I will show, this paradox unravels if one reads *American Indian Stories* as addressing the same issues Zitkala-Ša was concerned with in her activist writings published as a member of the SAI and even-

tual editor of the organization's *American Indian Magazine*. In particular, *American Indian Stories* shares with her reform work a preoccupation with dress, both indigenous and European American, as she spells out her grievances with U.S. Indian reform policy and the endemic mismanagement of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Much like Charles Eastman and Sarah Winnemucca before her, Zitkala-Ša in *American Indian Stories* gives European American audiences what they expected from a Native American author—a portrait of a “veritable little savage” dressed in moccasins “running wild over the prairie” (“Zitkala-Ša” 330).³ White readers relished this imagery because it confirmed what they presumed to know about Native Americans: they were a race doomed to extinction clinging to outmoded customs, dress, and behaviors fundamentally incompatible with white civilization. Gerald Vizenor has defined this presumed indigenous decline in the face of white cultural supremacy as another example of “manifest manners,” those “simulations of dominance; the notions and misnomers that are read as the authentic and sustained as representations of Native American Indians” in white minds (5–6). Operating under the assumption of cultural and moral superiority, U.S. Indian policy created the boarding schools to save indigenous children by exterminating their Indianness and passed the Dawes Allotment Act of 1887 to parcel out land to individuals to turn Native Americans into an agrarian labor force that would benefit the U.S. economy. But, as Lomawaima has shown, both acts failed to acclimate indigenous peoples to white standards of civilization primarily because they were intended to keep them in a perpetual state of alterity. Significantly absent in the discussions behind these policy decisions were the desires of the very people who were the objects, not subjects, of these reform efforts.

Following Malea Powell, I see Zitkala-Ša's prose as an act of “survivance (survival + resistance),” where she uses her writing to “reimagine and, literally, refigure, ‘the Indian’ and change the ‘object-status’ of indigenous peoples in white-led Indian reform efforts into ‘a subject-status, a presence instead of an absence.’” Paraphrasing Vizenor, Powell explains: “Vizenor’s postindian—‘the absence of the [occidental] invention’—‘renounces the inventions and final vocabularies of manifest manners,’ and is a trickster *par excellence*” (400, emphasis in original).⁴ Specifically, Zitkala-Ša capitalizes on the dominant-cultural fixation with Native dress to draw in readers seeking a first-hand account of

indigenous life from a real, live Indian. I argue that a productive reading of Zitkala-Ša's *American Indian Stories* considers how she deploys a rhetorical layering of clothing tropes, both indigenous and nonindigenous, to illustrate to a 1920s audience the tenuous state of Native Americans in the early twentieth-century United States who were the objects of a reform project premeditated to deny them the rights and economic privileges of full citizenship. I show that Zitkala-Ša crafts rich rhetorical garments with her pen, focusing on both Native American and European American dress to provide for her readers an indigenous viewpoint on the consequences of a reform project invested in sustaining difference over and above its purportedly benign purpose to elevate an entire race. She uses clothing to make visible rhetorically the double bind educated Indians faced as they were forced to choose between their tribal and U.S. identities, as well as to attack the presumption of white supremacy in the white reformers responsible for designing and implementing U.S. Indian policy.

"SAVAGE" MAKEOVERS

The U.S. government's boarding school project, as is well documented, intentionally denigrated Native customs and beliefs, indoctrinating Indian children to perceive their origins as backward.⁵ White colonizers in the form of Christian missionaries consistently and intentionally defined indigenous practices as uncivilized: "'Indian' boarding schools provided a basic category for indigenous identification, working through a curriculum based on a fundamental binary of 'savagery versus civilization.' 'Savagery' here designated tribal lifeways" (Madsen 35), which included traditional Native clothing.⁶ Yet, even before the advent of the federal, off-reservation boarding schools, Native attire was subject to scrutiny and prohibition. Linda Clemmons, in "'We Find It a Difficult Work': Educating Dakota Children in Missionary Homes, 1835–1862," draws attention to early white missionary efforts "to educate Indian children in their homes" (571). Naturally, "the first step in their cultural and religious transformation" involved white caregivers stripping Native children of their clothing (575). But, unlike the boarding school students, who were forced to attend these schools and therefore resisted the assimilationist goals of the boarding school covertly by speaking their Native languages and performing spiritual rites after the lights went out and

white supervision ceased, “parents chose to send their children to live with the missionaries,” and as a result, both “Dakota parents and the students” wielded greater agency in educational decisions, even refusing to participate if dissatisfied with the results (578).⁷ Clemmons offers a telling anecdote that stresses how altering the children’s dress did little to change their tribal identity. She cites a letter from Mary Riggs, a missionary involved in this effort, that details how the Dakota father, Wamdiokiye, while agreeing to allow his daughter to live with and be educated by the Riggs family, also stipulated that “my daughter says she wishes to wear Dakota clothes” and that this request was to be honored (qtd. in Clemmons 578).⁸ Although the Riggs family agreed to this condition, they proved unwilling to “honor her wishes” once the young girl was in their custody. Denied her wish to retain her Dakota identity by wearing her customary clothing, Wamdiokiyē’s daughter expressed her dissatisfaction by running away from her adoptive family after only one month (581).

This determination on the part of white missionaries to rid indigenous children of their habiliments continued unabated at the boarding schools. For example, at the Carlisle Indian Industrial School in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, Miss Marianna Burgess, responsible for all the school’s publications, created the Man-on-the-band-stand, a “constructed persona” that critiqued Native ways and cajoled Carlisle students to adhere to white standards, in one of the school’s many publications chronicling student life on campus, the *Indian Helper*.⁹ As its name suggests, this newspaper was designed to aid Native American children in their efforts to adapt to a white standard of civilization, with Burgess using the power of the Man-on-the-band-stand “to control, intimidate, and manipulate the children” at the school (Fear-Segal 210). This disembodied voice provided constant surveillance: “His attention focused always on the children. Few things about their dress, deportment, manners, physical appearance, or behavior escaped his comment” (208–9). The Man-on-the-band-stand was quick to praise evidence of assimilation—“The girls are buying rugs for their rooms when they have a little spare cash and the Man-on-the-band-stand is pleased to see the bright, cheery and home like effect it has upon their rooms”—and to condemn noncompliance—“The Man-on-the-band-stand would like to see all our workers present at morning services.” Through this crafted editorial presence, Burgess also solicited students to spy on their peers when they returned home to their reservations: “Let the boys and girls who

go home, write to the Man-on-the-band-stand something about what our other pupils are doing who returned before” (qtd. in Fear-Segal 220), and this desire to extend white control beyond the school campus prompted Burgess to write a faux Native American autobiography, *Stiya: A Carlisle Indian Girl at Home*.

Burgess’s fake Indian autobiography includes important sartorial and grooming details. Published in 1891 and originally serialized in the *Indian Helper* from September to December 1889, *Stiya*, purportedly written by a Pueblo girl, documents its heroine’s efforts to resist returning to her parents’ Native way of life. Tellingly, the first chapter contains a damning indictment of indigenous dress and appearance. *Stiya* returns home to the reservation only to recoil in horror at her mother’s appearance: “I had forgotten that home Indians had such grimy faces. I had forgotten that my mother’s hair always looked as though it had never seen a comb. I had forgotten that she wore such a short, queer-looking black bag for a dress, fastened over one shoulder only, and such buckskin wrappings for shoes and leggings” (Burgess 3). Dirty faces, disheveled hair, and ugly, non-Western clothing repel the fully assimilated *Stiya*. She begs to remain with her “school-mother,” but this request, indicating how alienated *Stiya* feels from her biological family, is denied, with the added admonition for her to “[m]ake the best of these people” (3–4, emphasis in original), which serves as a stern reminder that current and former boarding school students should retain the lessons of European American civilization and impart them to their parents. *Stiya* laments, “Somehow, I had my mind made up that my parents would be different, and it was hard for me to realize that they had been going backward while I had been going forward for five years” (4–5). Burgess’s contempt for parents on the reservation resonates throughout her brief fictional sketch, which does not hesitate “to denigrate the homes, dress, and all aspects of Pueblo life” (Fear-Segal 226). Furthermore, her “deliberate attempt to manage and direct” the lives of the boarding school students from afar brazenly “claimed the opportunity to speak as an Indian” and precluded the possibility of Native dissent (227). *Stiya*’s narrative—young Pueblo girl returns home, resists the efforts on the part of her parents and tribe to force her to resume Native dress and lifeways, and eventually wins her parents over to “the white Man’s god” (Burgess 89) and, most importantly, “the white man’s way” of life (89–90)—represents the ultimate white fantasy of not

just the boarding schools but also U.S. Indian reform policy. After five short years away from home, Stiya assimilates completely to the dominant white culture with no psychological side effects, and, together with her family, she thrives on the reservation, ending the story by successfully hosting two of her former Carlisle teachers in a “house” modeled on European American standards replete with “an ash wood double-bed . . . made up with as clean white sheets as they had at Carlisle” (114).

While Zitkala-Ša joined the staff of Carlisle in 1897, a full six years after the publication of *Stiya*, she most likely was intimately familiar with this blatant propaganda piece, especially considering the fact that all Carlisle students were given copies of this text upon their departure from the school (Gould 12). Indeed, I will suggest that *American Indian Stories* purposefully reverses Burgess’s narrative, providing readers with a decidedly different portrait of what life is like for Native Americans subject to white-led Indian reform efforts. In this retelling, clothing is essential.

BEFORE AND AFTER THE BOARDING SCHOOL MAKEOVER

Zitkala-Ša opens *American Indian Stories* with “Impressions of an Indian Childhood.”¹⁰ As Ron Carpenter cogently argues in “Zitkala-Ša and Bicultural Subjectivity,” Zitkala-Ša’s narrator exposes her white audience to this truth: indigenous people on the reservation “are not disappearing due to the encroachment of Anglos: they are adapting” (6). She displays her “bicultural subjectivity,” according to Carpenter, by incorporating elements of the European American “Indian stereotype” only to disprove the mistaken notion that Native Americans were forever “trapped in a state of timelessness” and destined for cultural extinction (5, 6). She accomplishes this feat by demonstrating to her white audiences that her life prior to enrolling at White’s Manual Labor Institute in Wabash, Indiana, already contained elements of European American culture (6). The first page of “Impressions,” included in *American Indian Stories*, features a “wigwam of weather stained canvas” (68), not of buffalo skin, showing that white practices had already impacted Native lifeways (Carpenter 4). Similarly, although Penelope Myrtle Kelsey observes that Zitkala-Ša employs Yankton “tribal gender role[s]” in “The Coffee-Making” when the young narrator attempts to serve a visiting elder according to the tribe’s rules of hospitality she learned from her mother (72), this bever-

age, coffee, is itself a “Euroamerica[n] . . . economic” product (Carpenter 4). Such details rebut Burgess’s portrait of life on the reservation as backward and in need of civilization. Zitkala-Ša establishes that prior to the boarding school she already was part of a civilization that was not dying out; instead, it was surviving and learning to cope with the encroachments of European American expansion.

At the same time, even as Zitkala-Ša chronicles Yankton adaptation to white lifeways, she stresses traditional continuity. She writes of elders with markings on their faces (72–73); children “exchang[ing] . . . necklaces, beaded belts, and . . . moccasins” in imitation of their mothers (75); and a celebration commemorating a “strong young brave[s]” ascendancy into Yankton manhood, with the participants wearing “painted faces,” “eagle plumes,” and “loose robes . . . drawn over their eyes” (79). Each of these descriptions featuring Yankton dress and practices also serves to demonstrate that, contrary to what white individuals believed, “Native societies” did not “lac[k] educational systems” (Lomawaima and McCarty 16). For example, when the young Zitkala-Ša asks for the meaning behind the mysterious marks on an elder’s face, she is offered a legend “of a woman whose magic power lay hidden behind the marks upon her face,” which leaves behind an “impression . . . so acute that the picture still remains vividly clear and pronounced” to the narrator (73). Likewise, by recounting the hours playing with her peers imitating their respective mothers’ speech patterns and gift exchanges, Zitkala-Ša points to how she and her friends “learned by watching” and emulating “[their] elders” (Lomawaima and McCarty 37). The Yanktons’ coming-of-age ceremony and the descriptions of the indigenous clothing worn by all in attendance serve to spotlight two important indigenous pedagogical lessons. The adolescent Zitkala-Ša is told to “learn to wait” by her mother (80), and, most importantly, she is instructed in the importance of “honoring the elders” (Hafen 200), since the reason for their late departure for the festivities is that her mother is preparing food for a sick elderly tribeswoman. Additionally, Zitkala-Ša learns the importance of respecting the dead when her mother forbids her from enjoying the “purple plums” from a bush whose “roots are wrapped around an Indian’s skeleton” (80). She reinforces the efficacy of this lesson by telling her readers that the “lasting impression of that day . . . is what my mother told me about the dead man’s plum bush” (81).

In “The Beadwork,” Zitkala-Ša continues to privilege the indige-

nous education she received from her mother, and, once more, clothing serves as a means to draw attention to these lessons. Our first exposure to her autobiographical persona features the young Yankton girl “clad in a slip of brown buckskin” and “a pair of soft moccasins” (Zitkala-Ša 68). These moccasins are the first of many that appear in the text, and as a motif, they represent Zitkala-Ša’s Native identity. In “The Beadwork,” the very title of which emphasizes traditional attire, we learn how these moccasins were crafted by her mother, showcasing her role as a productive and fit member of Yankton society, a portrait that runs counter to white beliefs that Native women lacked domesticity. Footwear is crucial to this anticolonial representation: “Often she worked upon small moccasins for her small daughter. Then I became intensely interested in her designing. With a proud, beaming face, I watched her work. In imagination, I saw myself walking in a new pair of snugly fitting moccasins. I felt the envious eyes of my playmates upon the pretty red beads decorating my feet” (73). We see the younger Zitkala-Ša observing her mother work, internalizing how to manufacture moccasins in addition to learning how to craft with beads. Tāte I Yóhin Win, her mother, is an exacting instructor, “requir[ing]” of her daughter “original designs” and adamant that no matter how “complex” the “pattern,” Zitkala-Ša must “finish whatever” she “began.” The narrator describes this latter lesson as a “self-inflicted punishment,” suggesting that the mother’s pedagogical goal here is not to punish but to instill in her young daughter the lesson to not undertake something she has no intention of finishing. Importantly, the mother’s “oversight” is not intrusive; instead, Tāte I Yóhin Win quietly observes her daughter with the goal of instilling in the child a sense of responsibility and faith in her “own judgment.” Zitkala-Ša adds, “She treated me as a dignified little individual as long as I was on my good behavior; and how humiliated I was when some boldness of mine drew forth a rebuke from her!” (74). The lessons here in Yankton womanhood are quiet and unobtrusive and reject the use of corporal punishment as a means to securing compliance. As Susan Bernardin observes, this portrait of her mother focuses attention on “the respect accorded” to Zitkala-Ša “as a young child,” preparing the stage for her criticisms of white-authored boarding school pedagogy in “The School Days of an Indian Girl,” the second autobiographical piece in *American Indian Stories* (221).¹¹

In addition to affirming indigenous pedagogical practices, rhetori-

cally these tropes of traditional Indian arts serve to engage Zitkala-Ša's white readers and thereby create an opportunity to critique the supposed supremacy of European American civilization. Her first observation on European American dress occurs late in "Impressions," with her commenting on the garb of the Quaker missionaries who come to take her to the East: "They were from that class of white men who wore big hats and carried large hearts" (Zitkala-Ša 83). For Quakers, the wide-brimmed hats worn by men, as well as other aspects of plain dress, served as visible testimony that Quakerism was a more refined, and purer, version of Christianity set apart from a fallen natural world; moreover, "plain dress was a kind of outward armor against [the] temptation[s]" of the allegedly degraded, sinful world (Hamm 102). However, Zitkala-Ša's allusion here to Quaker plain dress opens up a space from which to interrogate the wearers' supposedly benevolent intentions. As *American Indian Stories* transitions from "Impressions" to "School Days," Zitkala-Ša emphasizes the moccasins and blankets she wore upon her arrival to White's Manual Labor Institute to establish her bona fides as a real Indian girl. But these vestments also foreground the debilitating impact of her forced adoption of European American dress. Cacophonous "hard shoes" create a "noisy hurrying" (88) and an "annoying clatter" that reverberates against the walls of the enclosed spaces where she will be forced to internalize a new way of life (89). Zitkala-Ša's narrative persona complains of the "whirring in [her] ears" (88) caused by these shoes and proclaims that there is "no peace" at her new home (89). The din and racket caused by this foreign footwear symbolize the trauma experienced by the Native children when stripped of their familiar clothing and separated from their homes. Bewildered and dismayed by the noise Western footwear creates on hardwood floors, in addition to being "insulted" by a white woman treating her as a mere "plaything" in a way her Yankton mother never would, the young girl "cri[es] aloud" in shock at her first encounter with the European American customs associated with the "education = schooling paradigm" (Lomawaima and McCarty 20).¹² Further exacerbating her discomfort is the white staff at White's Manual Labor Institute who "misunderstood the cause of [her] tears" (Zitkala-Ša 88), leaving her grief unrecognized. Her "tears were left to dry themselves . . . because neither [her] aunt nor [her] mother was near to wipe them away" (89). Supremely confident about the superiority of white culture, the school officials have no comprehension of

how their hard-soled institutionalized learning environment literally causes Zitkala-Ša pain. Unlike the peaceful setting of her early education in Yankton lifeways from her mother, the sights and sounds of the boarding school emotionally overwhelm the young Zitkala-Ša, causing her extreme distress. Elizabeth Wilkinson concedes that the narrator's inability to express her pain to the staff of White's Manual Labor Institute might, at first glance, be blamed on the difference between English and Dakota, but she then notes that Zitkala-Ša "writes in such a way as to lay blame on the 'palefaces' inability to hear" (49). Clearly this particular deafness also raises significant doubts about the missionaries' claim to possess open and kind hearts. Zitkala-Ša's writing strongly suggests that the deaf ears of the employees at White's Manual Labor Institute, with their loud, hard-so(u)led shoes, signify that the hearts of these supposed caregivers are effectively closed to their Native American charges.

Far from her family and her community, Zitkala-Ša learns quickly that she will be forced to give up more than her cherished, silent moccasins. Life in the boarding school amidst Christian missionaries required a complete sartorial makeover, which horrifies her:

These were Indian girls, in *stiff* shoes, and closely *clinging* dresses. The small girls wore sleeved aprons and shingled hair. As I walked noiselessly in my soft moccasins, I felt like sinking to the floor, for my blanket had been stripped from my shoulders. I looked hard at the Indian girls, who seemed not to care that they were even more *immodestly* dressed than I, in their *tightly fitting* clothes. (Zitkala-Ša 90, emphasis added)

Deprived of her Native attire, Zitkala-Ša accentuates the gentleness of her non-European American clothing—soft, quiet footwear and a loose, flowing blanket that moves with the human body—in contrast to the indecent attire of the Quaker boarding school students: the rigid shoes and straining dresses that both confine and display the human body, as if it is at one and the same time to be conquered and flaunted. The description stresses the schizophrenia at the core of Western notions of dress, the loathing of the human body—fear of its power and sensuality—yet the enormous vanity. Unfortunately for Zitkala-Ša, her dismay over the boarding school uniform does not protect her from the transformation and makeover intended to eradicate her Native heritage. Facing the prospect of having her long tresses shingled and mindful of

her mother's lesson that "only unskilled warriors . . . captured . . . by the enemy" (90) suffered this fate, Zitkala-Ša attempts to escape, but her "squeaking shoes," which the Quakers forced her to "exchang[e]" for her moccasins, give her away.¹³ Then the last component of her Western transformation, a haircut, robs the young Zitkala-Ša of her "spirit"; she laments that "now [she] was only one of many little animals driven by a herder" (91). Playing on the Christian rhetoric of Christ as benevolent, flowing-robed shepherd (an ironic contrast to the angularly attired Quakers), this metaphor highlights Christianity's failure to recognize the inherent humanity of the Native American children forced to attend boarding schools such as White's Manual Labor Institute. The herding of her peers and the shearing of her hair confirm the young girl's suspicion that the enemy—a severely garbed white supremacist majority intent on committing widespread cultural genocide by stripping Native American children of their dress and religion—has indeed captured her and her compatriots.

At the same time, even though she and her peers are held captive by the staff at White's Manual Labor Institute, Zitkala-Ša uses sartorial signifiers to prove that she and her peers resisted the rules and regulations of the boarding school, despite the consequences. "The Snow Episode" shows Zitkala-Ša and her two friends Judéwin and Thowin getting in trouble for falling "lengthwise in the snow" after being ordered not to by an unnamed "paleface" woman at the school. Since they were all "still deaf to the English language," the three children disobey the order, and in a scene that would be comical if it were not so unjust, Judéwin tells her two friends to say "no" to whatever the white woman asks of them when the correct response would indeed be "yes" (Zitkala-Ša 92). Thowin receives a severe beating, with the white woman using a "half-worn slipper" to administer this punishment. The slipper's tattered quality suggests that it gets more use as a disciplinary tool than as footwear, indicating that the students at White's Manual Labor Institute habitually broke the rules. Granted, Zitkala-Ša and her friends were still learning English at this time, but, even when she begins to comprehend this language, she uses it to her own advantage. Punished for violating "a rule which seemed" to her, in terms evocative of the Western clothing she is required to wear, "very needlessly binding," Zitkala-Ša is told to "[m]ash these turnips" (93), and she "literalizes the command" by "obeying the word to the letter, finding an outlet for her hostility in a deliberate lin-

guistic misinterpretation” that results in her breaking the bottom of the container used to hold them (Cutter 39). No turnips were served at that evening’s meal, a fact that causes the adolescent Zitkala-Ša’s body and soul to swell and strain against her tight-fitting boarding school clothing with pride “for having once asserted the rebellion within” (94).

Continuing this theme of resistance, Zitkala-Ša chronicles the trauma Native American children experienced from their exposure to and indoctrination into Christianity by focusing in particular on white representations of the devil, whose appearance she visually codes as hirsute and Caucasian. White Americans insisted that people either were saved by coming to accept Christ as their personal savior or were damned to Hell, a one-sided approach to spirituality that runs counter to most tribal customs. As Vine Deloria, Jr., points out: “Unlike Jews and Christians, who have interpreted their religious mission in terms of absolute divine commissions to oppose other religious traditions, regardless of value or content, the tribal-specific revelations did not spawn religious intolerance” (“Vision” 111). Zitkala-Ša’s first impressions of learning about Satan hint at this cultural difference:

Among the legends the old warriors used to tell me were many stories of evil spirits. But I was taught to fear them no more than those who stalked about *in material guise*. I never knew there was an insolent chieftain among the bad spirits, who dared to array his forces against the Great Spirit, until I heard the white man’s legend from a paleface woman. (94, emphasis added)

Here, Zitkala-Ša teases her white, reformist audience, as Bernardin argues, with a supposedly “authentic glimpse into an alien, exotic culture” as she alludes to the indigenous spiritual traditions of the Yankton people (218). But this peek into Native religious beliefs is used by Zitkala-Ša not only to question Christianity’s need for an evil, opposing counterforce to God’s greatness but also to criticize the white belief that the material world, in all its many manifestations, is the realm of Satan. In a not-so-subtle attack on white sartorial choices, she likens the devil’s appearance to that of her oppressors when she observes that “[h]is face . . . had bearded cheeks, like some I had seen palefaces wear” (Zitkala-Ša 94). The link is quite clear: those promising salvation from a cruel devil are actually in league with him.

Later in *American Indian Stories*, Zitkala-Ša uses clothing to describe

the complete transformation of the Native American children who survived the boarding schools and voices her own resistance:

They were no more young braves in blankets and eagle plumes, nor Indian maids with prettily painted cheeks. They had gone three years to school in the East, and had become civilized. The young men wore the white man's coat and trousers, with bright neckties. The girls wore tight muslin dresses, with ribbons at neck and waist. At these gatherings they talked English. I could speak English almost as well as my brother, but I *was not properly dressed* to be taken along. *I had no hat, no ribbons, and no close fitting gown.* Since my return from school I had thrown away my shoes, and wore again the soft moccasins. (99, emphasis added)

Her tone mocks the white assumption that a simple change of clothing will somehow magically alter indigenous peoples. The “braves in blankets and eagle plumes” and the “maids with prettily painted cheeks”—all representative examples of white, Western expectations of Indianness—have disappeared, as evidenced by their wearing white clothing and fluently speaking English. While the “jolly” young people may seem blissfully unaware of what they have lost, Zitkala-Ša, careful to remind readers that she did learn and can speak the white man's language, is torn, describing herself as “neither a wild Indian nor a tame one” (97). This internal conflict manifests itself upon the occasion of this party. She possesses the ability to speak English, yes, but she also lacks appropriate Western attire to attend, implying strongly that she could not afford the muslin and necessary materials to make these clothes at home.¹⁴ She does, however, retain the knowledge and materials to produce a form-fitting pair of moccasins, which she returns to only after disposing of her uncomfortable, Western-style shoes. Her inability to purchase and manufacture white clothing combined with her return to her moccasins testifies to the failure of the Christian boarding schools to, in the words of Col. Richard Henry Pratt, “kill the Indian . . . and save the [wo]man” (46). In this case, her return “back to the blanket,” a colloquial aspersion applied to “students who rejected their boarding school education” (Davidson and Norris xxvii), is brought about due to her family's extreme poverty in addition to the discomfort she feels in trying to resolve the conflict between her Yankton and Anglo identities.

In capturing the psychological anguish produced by her exposure

and forced indoctrination into European American lifeways, Zitkala-Ša again employs sartorial metaphors to expose that life for Native American children back home on the reservation is not at all like Burgess's *Stiya* would have white audiences believe. In a poignant scene of familial unrest, Zitkala-Ša's now teenaged narrator silently sheds angry "hot tears," and her mother, the very person she longed to dry her tears during her first night at the boarding school, no longer possesses the ability to "console" her aggrieved daughter because education has intervened (99). Zitkala-Ša and her mother are now at a distinct bicultural disadvantage: "Táte I Yóhin Win is unable to decipher the meaning of her daughter's silence (resistance to Anglo epistemology), because she has not experienced an Anglo education" (Carpenter 23). And with a metaphor that blends both textile and manufacturing imagery, Zitkala-Ša hints that the task of assimilation is a hopeless endeavor: "By daylight and lamplight, I spun with reeds and thistles, until my hands were tired from their weaving, the magic design which promised me the white man's respect" (101). No matter how intricate the pattern or how meticulous the execution thereof, white reformers blinded by racial prejudice will never be satisfied with her educational achievements. She likens the elements of her white education to the most difficult materials to work with: thin, slender reeds and thick, barbed thistles that bruise fingers and fatigue the weaver. She exhausts herself plotting and scheming new arrangements of these meager items, hoping to secure white approval, but, eventually, she realizes the futility of this desire. Like her younger self, who "ensnared many" an afternoon "into working a long design" learning to do beadwork with her mother, this older, bicultural Zitkala-Ša perceives that her quest for whites' approval on their terms is her second "self-inflicted punishment" (74). With her mother, Zitkala-Ša may have been forced to spend long hours indoors finishing an elaborate design of her own creation, but the time spent doing so did have a definitive pedagogical goal: she learned hard work and the intricacies of beadwork. In addition, she was also guaranteed praise and approval from her mother after completing this arduous task. Her white educators, on the other hand, who were part of a "cold race whose hearts were frozen hard with prejudice" (101), offered no encouragement, and the hours, days, weeks, and even years that the older Zitkala-Ša wastes seeking their acceptance as an equal belie their pledge to educate Native Americans and give them social and political equality.

Inevitably, Zitkala-Ša recognizes what she has lost pursuing a European American education, and that cost is an almost complete loss of her faith in Yankton spiritual practices: “For the white man’s papers I had given up my faith in the Great Spirit. For these same papers I had forgotten the healing in trees and brooks” (112). The white man’s knowledge, with its Christian belief in the “complete alienation of nature and the world from human beings,” derived from the Edenic myth of a fall from grace (Deloria, *God* 89), precludes the unity of the material and spiritual worlds. Zitkala-Ša acutely perceives how the knowledge she gained attending white educational institutions has systematically robbed her of her connection to her mother and her tribe, and with this realization, she abandons her job teaching at Carlisle Indian Industrial School to focus on restoring this link and working toward improving the lives of all Native Americans subject to white-led reformist efforts.

In a Native American formulation that parallels W. E. B. Du Bois’s famous double-consciousness, Zitkala-Ša acknowledges that her task now includes “solving the problem of [her] inner self” (112), and she presents her solution in imagery redolent of Native dress in the chapter “The Great Spirit,” originally titled “Why I Am a Pagan” in the December 1902 issue of the *Atlantic Monthly*. In it, she forcefully repudiates the Christian separation of the spiritual from the material world, using dress to reject this logic with descriptions of the natural world that are evocative of white expectations of Native attire. The narrator of “The Great Spirit” “plod[s] with moccasined feet” through a living, breathing landscape that pleases her senses and brings her closer to the divine, since the natural world is living testimony of this force’s greatness (115). By returning to the footwear of her youth, Zitkala-Ša signifies her return to the indigenous spirituality that her white education tried to eradicate. She confesses to this spiritual rebirth but adds that this internal change pales in comparison with the “clearly manifest” growth of the “green grass fringing the edge of the high bluff” behind her. The very cliffs, bordered by the unseen hand of the Great Spirit with fringes of verdant grass, exude its life-giving force. The flowers’ “quaint round faces of varied hue” resemble a multicolored patchwork quilt, with the many visages functioning as “living symbols of omnipotent thought” that permeates all of existence. Additionally, these vibrant blooms, like the ornate beadwork on her childhood moccasins, appear as if they were “wrought in luxuriant color upon the green,” and their beauty lies in

the “spiritual essence they embody” (114). She likens the Great Spirit to a master tailor, using words and phrases suggestive of Yankton dress, and demonstrates that the natural world and its many elements are the very vestments in which the Creator makes its presence known to her immortal soul.

In renouncing the Christian doctrine of a fallen, alienated world devoid of spiritual significance, Zitkala-Ša uses a series of textile metaphors. She celebrates a Native knowledge “[i]nterwoven with the thread of this Indian legend of the rock” her people call “Inyan” that “enable[s] them to recognize a kinship to any and all parts of this vast universe” (Zitkala-Ša 115). Again, she distances herself from Christian dogma, which denies the “unity of nature” (Deloria, *God* 87), arguing quite persuasively that only by living in the world and acknowledging its beauty can one recognize the uniformity of the Great Spirit and all of creation. The spiritual and the natural form an intricate tapestry here in which everything is “enfolded” into an indivisible cosmology (Zitkala-Ša 115). “[R]acial lines,” forces of disunity imprinted on her mind by her white education, are eradicated, “marking out a living mosaic of human beings” that is itself part of the Great Spirit (116). Casting aside the racism of Christian missionaries, Zitkala-Ša asserts that all races, regardless of color, are unified: “The pale-faced missionary and the hoodooed aborigine are both God’s creatures,” and she “prefer[s] to [the former’s] dogma” her own “excursions into the natural gardens where the voice of the Great Spirit is heard in the twittering of birds, the rippling of mighty waters, and the sweet breathing of flowers.” In gorgeous sartorial imagery, Zitkala-Ša claims that the physical world itself is but the “fluttering robe” of the Great Spirit, while the “phenomenal universe is a royal mantle” that reverberates with “His divine breath.” The “flowing fringes” of this incredible garment “are the spangles and oscillating brilliants of sun, moon, and stars” (117). With its free-floating fringes and ornate bead-like patterns of celestial objects, the Great Spirit’s regal cloak echoes the Native clothing that European Americans of the time expected indigenes to wear, but Zitkala-Ša uses this imagery instead to criticize the Christian belief that forever separates humanity from the natural order.

To be sure, Zitkala-Ša was willing to ally with Christians when necessary, and she did, in fact, convert to Catholicism with her husband, Raymond Bonnin (Hafen 200), signaling that she may very well have

had issues with Protestant Christianity. Her admission that both white missionaries and Native peoples are God's creatures subtly critiques the inherent white supremacy of would-be Christian Indian reformers, particularly their popular late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century conviction that the civilizing—that is, the complete Christianization—of the nonwhite world is the white man's burden. The original text of "Why I Am a Pagan" ends with this enigmatic line: "If this is Paganism, then at present, at least, I am a Pagan" (Zitkala-Ša 265–66n7). With this statement, Zitkala-Ša acknowledges that her Christian audience might find her merging of the natural world with the divine blasphemous; however, much as she affirms Native dress in so much of her writing, she defiantly forges ahead with her celebration of an indigenous spirituality that discerns a truth about creation that Christian theology cannot and will not appreciate. In her activist career, Zitkala-Ša did work with Christians of all sects in her efforts to promote the rights of indigenous peoples, but that fact does not contradict her critique of white Christianity's inherent racial prejudice. As Cathy Davidson and Ada Norris contend, in engaging in political activism on behalf of Native peoples of all tribes, Zitkala-Ša sometimes had to cooperate with individuals "whose other ideas she found repugnant" (xxiv). She might have affiliated with Christian activists and religious beliefs as she worked toward her goals, but her bicultural status disproved the boarding schools' claim that they completely eradicated indigenous spirituality. She operated within a European American context but never repudiated her Native identity.

MAKEOVERS THAT DIVIDE, ROB, AND KILL

In addition to offering her own semiautobiographical account of life before and after her boarding school experience, Zitkala-Ša published two stories detailing how the school negatively impacted life on the reservation, "The Soft-Hearted Sioux" and "The Widespread Enigma Concerning Blue-Star Woman," both of which depend heavily on European American clothing to illustrate the disastrous results of white-led Indian reform. The first, which originally appeared in the March 1902 issue of *Harper's Monthly* and was placed immediately after "The Great Spirit" in *American Indian Stories*, overtly stresses the negative impact of the boarding school's Christian education on the narrator.¹⁵ The European American clothes the Christian missionaries forced on this young man

testify to his bitter estrangement: "Wearing a foreigner's dress, I walked, a stranger, into my father's village." Dressed in Western male attire, most likely form-fitting trousers and a button-up shirt, the young Dakota man knows immediately that he stands out, and he frames this discomfort in terms of difference. A stranger among his own people, he now can only clutch "the white man's Bible" for comfort. This remedy proves deficient, however, particularly when he catches sight of the medicine man, "closely covered" in a "loose robe" that "draped his entire figure." Here Zitkala-Ša demonstrates the young convert's spiritual separation from his community while also foreshadowing how he would regret his adoption of Christianity. He says of the medicine man: "He was tall and large. His long strides I have never forgot. They seemed to me *then* the uncanny gait of eternal death" (Zitkala-Ša 120, emphasis added). Zitkala-Ša's protagonist recoils in horror at the medicine man's garb, revealing that his mind—filled with Christian dogma—quickly associates any sign of indigenous spirituality with eternal damnation and, quite possibly, witchcraft, another mortal sin in white Christian eyes. But within the syntax of the sentence, "then" indicates that he narrates his story from a changed viewpoint, one in which he acknowledges that his faith in Christianity was mistaken.

Before this painful lesson is learned, the Dakota youth persists in his plan to convert his community to Christianity, eagerly imagining he can persuade "the warriors soon to wash off their war paints" to accept Christ (Zitkala-Ša 121). Zitkala-Ša's narrator parrots white expectations that conversion to Christianity would naturally compel Native Americans to abandon their customs and rituals in favor of white standards of behavior and dress. Inevitably, he earns the enmity of the medicine man, and in a tense stand-off, the latter contemptuously calls the former a "foreigner" twice, ultimately labeling him a "traitor to his people" (122). Scorned by his people and possessed of a "soft-heart" that has "unfitted [him] for everything" (123), the young man is driven to kill white-owned cattle when faced with the sight of his starving father "clutch[ing] the buffalo-robe, and with his teeth . . . gnawing off the edges" (124). This Dakota blanket serves as a poor substitute for food, of course, but in Zitkala-Ša's world it means more than that. As Bernardin points out, "the absence of buffalo, the encroachment of white settlers, tribal dissension" are used by Zitkala-Ša to "contradict the narrator's repeated faith in the 'white man's tender heart'" (217). Driven mad by this image

of his father's desperation, the Dakota man, in a doomed attempt to save his father, rejects the ideology of Christianity and slaughters not only a cow but also a white man. The story ends with the young man in a white prison, destined for "the gallows" (Zitkala-Ša 126).

One of Zitkala-Ša's most critically acclaimed stories, "The Soft-Hearted Sioux" uses clothing to document the literally lethal trauma caused by white-led reform efforts. Dressed as a European American and implanted with a dogma that proclaimed the practice of indigenous religions savage, Zitkala-Ša's protagonist ends his life unsure if the "loving Jesus" will "grant [him] pardon" or whether his "warrior father" will "greet [him] and receive [him] as his son" (125). The tragic figure accepts his fate because without his people, he has no life left to live.

The second, equally revered story in this collection, "The Widespread Enigma Concerning Blue-Star Woman," directly targets the devastation to Native communities caused by the Dawes Allotment Act of 1887, and, once more, dress serves to make this tragedy readily apparent. This story features two white-educated Native American youths so indoctrinated in white ways that they gleefully conspire with a corrupt U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) to "exploit their people for personal gain" (Smith 53). Zitkala-Ša highlights their assimilation into white culture by focusing on their European American dress:

[S]he had not heard the footfall of two Indian men who now stood before her. Their short-cropped hair looked blue-black in contrast to the faded civilian clothes they wore. Their white-man's shoes were rusty and unpolished. To the unconventional eyes of the old Indian woman, their celluloid collars appeared like shining marks of civilization. Blue-Star Woman looked up from the lap of mother earth without rising. "Hinnu, hinnu!" she ejaculated in undisguised surprise. "Pray, who are these would-be white men?" she inquired. (146)

Blue-Star Woman cannot help but marvel at the two young men wearing white clothes and sporting shingled hair. Zitkala-Ša, on the other hand, barely masks her contempt for these would-be white men, describing their clothing in derogatory terms and their efforts at assimilation with disdain: "Did she guess the truth, she would have known they were simply deluded mortals, deceiving others and themselves most of all" (146). While they may wear white clothing, the two young Dakota men's

efforts fall short, and it is significant that their apparel is old, dirty, and unkempt. The filth and shabbiness of their clothing make visible the consequences of the limited economic opportunities available to both former students of the boarding schools and their unschooled parents at home on the reservations.

The others they deceive include not only their own people but also the white reformers who naively believe in the civilizing effect of white clothing. The two men may “speak [Blue-Star Woman’s] native tongue and shake hands according to [her people’s] custom” (Zitkala-Ša 146), but they violate indigenous rules of hospitality by eating “like ravenous wolves” all of Blue-Star Woman’s food. Zitkala-Ša zeroes in on their ill-kept clothing and violation of Native customs to show that these men have been robbed of their cultural heritage. Neither fully white nor Native American, these products of the reformers’ boarding schools have only one aim: “They thrived in their grafting business. They and their occupation were the by-product of an unwieldy bureaucracy over the nation’s wards” (147). Zitkala-Ša makes it clear that their adaptation to white culture, especially their love of graft and profit, has come at a terrible cost to their own people and that the mismanagement of the BIA is to blame. Dressed in dirty white-culture clothing following their education in white civilization—a clear symbol of the colonizers’ ethics—and facing a dearth of employment prospects, the young men tragically prey on their elders as a means of making a living. Because of them, Blue-Star Woman ends up on the tribal roll, but only after having lost “half of [her] land and money” (148).

This fact dismays Chief High Flyer and prompts his own encounter with assimilated ambassadors of white civilization wearing the regalia of the colonizer: “In a short time the riders surrounded him. On their coats shone brass buttons, and on their hats were gold cords and tassels. They were Indian police.” These customary European American tokens of power, epaulets and polished metal buttons, represent the authority and might of the BIA. By wearing these items, the Native American police pledge their allegiance to the U.S. government and promise to enforce white-authored laws—many of which directly targeted and outlawed Native American cultural and spiritual practices—on the reservation. Chief High Flyer, discovering that he is “the object of their chase,” regards his white-attired brethren with sadness: “It was their foolish ilk

who had murdered the great leader, Sitting Bull” (Zitkala-Ša 152). The chief’s internal aside implies that these men possess the same potential to behave as foolishly as those Native BIA officers who, blinded by the power bestowed upon them by their shining brass buttons and golden tassels, assassinated Sitting Bull, one of their own people’s greatest leaders. Subsequently jailed on trumped-up charges, presumably made by the two would-be white men from the story’s beginning, the chief is freed, but at the cost of his own land allotment: “‘It is our agreement,’ [Chief High Flyer’s son] explained to his father, ‘I pledged to pay them half of your land if they got you out of jail’” (154).

Both Blue-Star Woman and Chief High Flyer fall victim to the unscrupulous practices of their tribe’s white-educated children working in tandem with the U.S. government, and clothing again and again signals the tragedy. Unlike Marianna Burgess’s fictional *Stiya*, Zitkala-Ša presents to her white readers the real consequences of white-led Indian reform. Dressed like a foreigner, a young man psychologically traumatized by a regime intent on eradicating his heritage ends up executed for wanting to save his father from starvation. Decked out in shabby white men’s outfits, two English-speaking young people skilled in cunning and subterfuge take advantage of their elders for financial gain. In Zitkala-Ša’s world, parents and grandparents do not willingly conform to the white man’s ways; they continue to wear with pride their Native clothes. Tragically, their brainwashed children in strange garments forced upon them by white imperialism struggle to survive after the boarding school experience. Some literally perish, while others find economic success through the exploitation of their elders. In both instances, tribal life on the reservation faces an uncertain future.

ZITKALA-ŠA’S OWN PRACTICE OF SARTORIAL ACTIVISM

To be certain, Zitkala-Ša herself did not reject the fashions of the Anglo world. She dressed in European American clothing in her everyday life as she worked diligently on behalf of Native Americans in Utah, Washington, DC, Oklahoma, and California. Also, she did, on occasion, dress as an Indian when speaking in public. A cunning example of a Vizenorian trickster par excellence, she exploited European Americans’ desire to see a real, wild Indian in the flesh by donning this garb. In a letter

dated March 2, 1917, written to Arthur C. Parker, then president of the SAI, Zitkala-Ša concedes as much:

I have agreed [to perform in Indian dress], for in this case the use of Indian dress for a *drawing card* is for a good cause. No doubt, there may be some, who may not wholly approve of the Indian dress. I hope it does not displease you. Even a clown has to dress differently from his usual citizen's suit. In News papers, italics are resorted to, with good effect. (qtd. in Davidson and Norris xxiii, emphasis added)

Like many other Native activists, Zitkala-Ša used her body and physical appearance as a lure.¹⁶ For example, Laura Wexler, commenting on the willingness of Iron Tail to dress in the “costume” of a “Sioux” Indian to have his picture taken by famed photographer Gertrude Käseiber, astutely observes that his welcome in Käseiber’s studio was contingent on his wearing what this white woman photographer expected him to wear. But his willingness to wear this clothing, Wexler insists, was in itself a power move: “Iron Tail, apparently, insisted on his costume at least partly in order to invoke the familiar in a strange setting—the familiar which was the customary perversion in the colonizing eye” (204). Iron Tail came dressed in feathered headdress and buckskin clothing *not* because it defined his essence. Rather, his choice of dress signified awareness on his part that these particular items were the only signifiers that Käseiber, and other white people like her, could and would recognize as distinctively Indian (202).

For Zitkala-Ša, to appear before white audiences in indigenous dress was her own strategic choice. Dressing in tribal clothing was her way to draw in white spectators, and these audiences flocked to see her perform the role of the Westernized savage. Imagine their eye-opening surprise when they were greeted instead with a classically trained violinist and bicultural indigenous woman whose very existence stripped away their expectations. By disabusing her Anglo audiences of their stereotypical and limited conceptions of indigenous life, Zitkala-Ša exposed their preconceptions of Native life to be nothing more than the misprisions of manifest manners. In fact, she posed for Käseiber twice in 1898, appearing in Western clothing in one photo and in Native American dress in another. Wexler argues that Zitkala-Ša appears “uncomfortable” in the former and “more comfortable” in the latter (122). If so, her unease in

Anglo dress may very well have stemmed from her awareness that in subjecting herself to the camera's colonizing gaze, she once more was reduced to a "doll-baby" being thrown callously in the air by that white woman on her first night at White's Manual Labor Institute (Zitkala-Ša 120). However we interpret her appearance, Zitkala-Ša chose to pose for Käseiber, and regardless of her political ends, her decision to change in and out of white and Native dress opened her up to substantial criticism during her time, most notably during her crusade to eradicate the Native American Church's ritual use of peyote. Her stance on peyote led the "politically liberal ethnologist" James Mooney to label Zitkala-Ša a "fraud" who merely "claim[ed] to be a Sioux woman," as he pointed out that her Native costume in a photograph in the February 17, 1918, issue of the *Washington Times* included a peyote fan (Davidson and Norris xxii, xxiii). As this incident makes plain, Zitkala-Ša's multicultural fluidity of dress reflected the tenuous position she occupied as she navigated the fine line between her Anglo and Yankton selves.

While she viewed peyote religious practices "as nothing more than 'debilitating and degenerating' drug use" (Davidson and Norris xxii), Zitkala-Ša did champion and celebrate the indigenous practice of the Sun Dance, and she did so by openly criticizing European American dress. In her political essay "A Protest against the Abolition of the Indian Dance," originally titled "A Plea for the Indian Dance" and appearing in the *Word-Carrier of the Santee Normal Training School* in 1901, Zitkala-Ša reflects the white colonizing gaze back upon those Christian reformers who would like to see the Sun Dance and other religious ceremonies eradicated (267n2). She first ventriloquizes white criticisms of the dance and then segues into her own Native assessment of white, non-Native dances. Unsurprisingly, her attention focuses on elements of Anglo dress:

Again a voice speaks, "This dance of the Indian is a relic of barbarism. It must be stopped!" . . . Before me hangs a mist-tapestry. Woven in wonderful living threads is a picture of a brilliantly lighted hall with mirrored walls. Over its polished floor glide whirling couples in pretty rhythm to orchestral music. The daintiness and exquisite web-cloth of the *low-necked, sleeveless evening gowns* must be so from the imperative need to distract the mind from the *steel frames* in which the *fair bodies* are *painfully corseted*. It may be gauze-covered barbarism, for history does tell of the bar-

baric Teutons and Anglo-Saxons. It may be martyrdom to some ancient superstition which centuries of civilization and Christianization have not wholly eradicated from the yellow-haired and blue-eyed races. (Zitkala-Ša 236–37, emphasis added)

With scathing irony, Zitkala-Ša makes clear that the Sun Dance and other indigenous religious customs were perceived as savagery, while the low-cut necklines and sleeveless arms of white women's dresses covering painful rib-crushing corsets were not. She marvels at how fancy clothes distract the white male's gaze from the rigidity and nearly asphyxiating properties of that high-fashioned corsetry. And she casually reminds her white readers that their so-called civilized dances contain vestigial elements of a "barbarism" that no amount of Christianization can eradicate or whitewash away.

Zitkala-Ša was well aware of the white obsession that held fashion as a signpost of civilization. She says so herself in her remarks on her work helping the Ute people learn to sew "[p]lain, warm garments cut in the loose style they are accustomed to wear." Discussing the urgency of her task, she sarcastically states that "[t]here was no time to consult the fashion books" ("A Year's Experience in the Community Service Work among the Ute Tribe of Indians," Zitkala-Ša 168). Her knowledge of white dress provided her with ample opportunities to make pointed criticisms of non-Native sartorial practices. In addition to this piece from her time with the SAI, Zitkala-Ša used clothing in her writing for the organization's *American Indian Magazine* to demonstrate Native American fitness for American citizenship. She writes of "Indian soldiers" fighting alongside their "white brothers in khaki" in World War I ("Indian Gifts to Civilized Man," Zitkala-Ša 185); and she crafts images of "little French orphans" wearing "soft buckskin moccasins on their tiny feet" made by the "Indian women of America" ("America, Home of the Red Man," Zitkala-Ša 194). She also uses the sartorial to show her white readers and would-be reformers that a simple change of clothing does little to "elevate" an entire race: "I snatch at my eagle plumes and long hair. / A Hand cut my hair; my robes did deplete. / Left heart all unchanged; the work incomplete" ("The Indian's Awakening," Zitkala-Ša 164). White reformers may succeed in altering her appearance, but as Zitkala-Ša's poem reveals, without a true education in how to compete successfully in a white-dominated world, the white-led Indian reform

efforts will always be both insufficient and incomplete. Their efforts leave behind individuals who may resemble white people in appearance but who will never be accepted as equals, much less as full citizens.

Ultimately, Zitkala-Ša had a keen sense of how to use clothing in her writing and in her public life. Unlike Ruth Spack, I do not see her autobiographical fiction as an exoticization of the dress and customs of her people (156). Instead, moccasins, clothing, and other elements of attire were a means to an end for Zitkala-Ša. She sought to prove to her white audience that forced assimilation, such as the regimes at the boarding schools, caused profoundly harmful psychological damage to Native people. Similarly, Zitkala-Ša adorned herself in Native garments in her public appearances and photographs because she knew that was the only way she could gain the attention of white audiences raised on the patently false image of the savage Vanishing Indian. By representing traditional Native clothing positively throughout her career and criticizing the misguided goals of white-led Indian reform efforts, Zitkala-Ša refused to allow her white audiences the satisfaction of relegating her and other indigenous peoples to the history books as a race doomed to extinction. She capitalized on white people's fatalistic fantasies, stoking their desire for contact with the Vanishing Savage, only to lay bare before them the adaptability and perseverance of a bicultural Native woman quite capable of offering her own assessment of white Christian American society and the reform effort it forced upon an entire group of people.

C. DANIEL REDMOND is a PhD candidate in English at Tufts University. Currently writing his dissertation, "Those without Sin: Voices of Color on White Protestant Christianity in Nineteenth-Century American Literature," under the supervision of Elizabeth Ammons, he plans to graduate in May 2017.

NOTES

1. See Lomawaima, "Mutuality" 336–39 for a complete analysis of how these two concepts were used to perpetuate Indianness.
2. See Allen, Johnson and Wilson, Maroukis, and Warrior for different perspectives on the SAJ and Gertrude Bonnin's role in the organization.
3. For a discussion of Eastman and Winnemucca, see Powell.
4. Powell quotes Vizenor 11, 167, respectively.
5. See Adams, Churchill, Coleman, Ellis, Hoxie, and Reyhner and Eder.
6. For two classic texts about the "savage/civilized" binary, see Berkhofer and Pearce.

7. Madsen supports this claim in an endnote, pointing readers to Adams 233–35; Coleman 152; Ellis 106; and Lomawaima, *They Called It* 130–45.
8. Clemmons cites Mary Riggs to Mr. and Mrs. Longley, February 9, 1839, Riggs Papers, Minnesota Historical Society (597n40).
9. This publication was eventually folded into the *Red Man*, becoming the *Red Man and Helper*.
10. This story originally was published as a stand-alone piece in the *Atlantic Monthly* 85 (1900): 37–47.
11. This story was also first published in the *Atlantic Monthly* 85 (1900): 185–94.
12. See Lomawaima and McCarty 16–42 for more information on this paradigm and how it differs from indigenous pedagogical practices.
13. For a discussion of Western shoes and how they victimized Zitkala-Ša, see Wilkinson 49.
14. See Lomawaima, *They Called It* 90 for information on how students at Chillico Indian Agricultural School in north-central Oklahoma were required to supply their own sewing materials in their home economics courses, even being pressured to write home to ask for money to purchase these items from parents who could little afford to provide it.
15. As Susan Bernardin says, the story gives Zitkala-Ša's white audience an "account of the cultural and familial disintegration [caused] off-reservation" and indicts "Christianity as an imposed ideology that fractured both the narrator's family and tribe" (216, 217).
16. See Maddox 128 for a similar observation about Native American intellectual reformers like Zitkala-Ša.

WORKS CITED

- Adams, David Wallace. *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875–1928*. Lawrence: UP of Kansas, 1995. Print.
- Allen, Chadwick. "Introduction: Locating the Society of American Indians." *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 25.2 (2013): 3–22. Web. 9 Sept. 2015.
- Berkhofer, Robert F., Jr. *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present*. New York: Knopf, 1978. Print.
- Bernardin, Susan. "The Lessons of a Sentimental Education: Zitkala-Ša's Autobiographical Narratives." *Western American Literature* 32.2 (1997): 212–38. Print.
- Burgess, Marianna. *Stiya: A Carlisle Indian Girl at Home*. Cambridge, MA: Riverside Press, 1891. Google Books. Web.
- Carpenter, Ron. "Zitkala-Ša and Bicultural Subjectivity." *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 16.3 (2004): 1–28. Web. 19 Aug. 2014.
- Churchill, Ward. *Kill the Indian, Save the Man: The Genocidal Impact of American Indian Residential Schools*. San Francisco: City Lights Books, 2004. Print.
- Clemmons, Linda. "'We Find It a Difficult Work': Educating Dakota Children in Missionary Homes, 1835–1862." *American Indian Quarterly* 24.4 (2000): 570–600. Web. 16 Oct. 2013.

- Coleman, Michael C. *American Indian Children at School, 1850–1930*. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1993. Print.
- Cutter, Martha J. “Zitkala-Ša’s Autobiographical Writings: The Problems of a Canonical Search for Language and Identity.” *MELUS* 19.1 (1994): 31–44. Web. 6 June 2013.
- Davidson, Cathy N., and Ada Norris. Introduction to *American Indian Stories* by Zitkala-Ša. New York: Penguin, 2003. xi–xxxv. Print.
- Deloria, Vine, Jr. *God Is Red: A Native View of Religion*. 30th anniversary ed. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing, 2003. Print.
- . “Vision and Community: A Native American Voice.” *Native and Christian: Indigenous Voices on Religious Identity in the United States and Canada*. Ed. James Treat. New York: Routledge, 1996. 105–14. Print.
- Ellis, Clyde. *To Change Them Forever: Indian Education at the Rainy Mountain Boarding School, 1893–1920*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1996. Print.
- Fear-Segal, Jacqueline. *White Man’s Club: Schools, Race, and the Struggle of Indian Acculturation*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2007. Print.
- Gould, Janice. “Telling Stories to the Seventh Generation: Resisting the Assimilationist Narrative of *Stiya*.” *Reading Native American Women: Critical/Creative Representations*. Ed. Inés Hernández-Avila. Lanham, MD: Altamira, 2005. 9–20. Print.
- Hafen, P. Jane. “‘Help Indians Help Themselves’: Gertrude Bonnin, the SAI, and the NCAI.” *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 25.2 (2013): 199–218. Web. 9 Sept. 2015.
- Hamm, Thomas D. *The Quakers in America*. New York: Columbia UP, 2003. Print.
- Hoxie, Frederick E. *A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880–1920*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1984. Print.
- Johnson, David L., and Raymond Wilson. “Gertrude Simmons Bonnin, 1876–1938: ‘Americanize the First American.’” *American Indian Quarterly* 12.1 (1988): 27–40. Web. 6 Mar. 2014.
- Kelsey, Penelope Myrtle. *Tribal Theory in Native American Literature: Dakota and Haudenosaunee Writing and Indigenous Worldviews*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2008. Print.
- Lomawaima, K. Tsianina. “The Mutuality of Citizenship and Sovereignty: The Society of American Indians and the Battle to Inherit America.” *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 25.2 (2013): 333–51. Web. 9 Sept. 2015.
- . *They Called It Prairie Light: The Story of Chilocco Indian School*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1994. Print.
- Lomawaima, K. Tsianina, and Teresa L. McCarty. *“To Remain an Indian”: Lessons in Democracy from a Century of Native American Education*. New York: Teachers College P, 2006. Print.
- Maddox, Lucy. *Citizen Indians: Native American Intellectuals, Race, and Reform*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2005. Print.
- Madsen, Deborah L. “The Making of (Native) Americans: Suturing and Citizenship in the Scene of Education.” *Parallax* 17.3 (2011): 32–45. Web. 23 July 2012.

- Maroukis, Thomas C. "The Peyote Controversy and the Demise of the Society of American Indians." *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 25.2 (2013): 161–80. Web. 9 Sept. 2015.
- Pearce, Roy Harvey. *Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and the American Mind*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1967. Print.
- Powell, Malea. "Rhetorics of Survivance: How American Indians Use Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 53.3 (2002): 396–434. Web. 4 Aug. 2014.
- Pratt, Richard Henry. "The Advantages of Mingling Indians with Whites." *National Conference on Social Welfare Proceedings*. Official Proceedings of the Annual Meeting, 1892. U of Michigan Digital Library, 2005. Web. 4 Nov. 2015.
- Reyhner, Jon Allen, and Jeanne Eder. *American Indian Education: A History*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 2004. Print.
- Smith, Jeanne. "A Second Tongue': The Trickster's Voice in the Works of Zitkala-Ša." *Tricksterism in Turn-of-the-Century American Literature: A Multicultural Perspective*. Ed. Elizabeth Ammons and Annette White-Parks. Hanover, NH: UP of New England, 1994. 46–59. Print.
- Spack, Ruth. *America's Second Tongue: American Indian Education and the Ownership of English*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2002. Print.
- Vizenor, Gerald. *Manifest Manners: Narratives on Postindian Survivance*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1995. Print.
- Warrior, Robert. "The SAI and the End(s) of Intellectual History." *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 25.2 (2013): 221–35. Web. 9 Sept. 2015.
- Wexler, Laura. *Tender Violence: Domestic Visions in an Age of U.S. Imperialism*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2000. Print.
- Wilkinson, Elizabeth. "Gertrude Bonnin's Rhetorical Strategies of Silence." *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 25.3 (2013): 33–56. Web. 17 June 2014.
- Zitkala-Ša. *American Indian Stories, Legends, and Other Writings*. Ed. Cathy N. Davidson and Ada Norris. New York: Penguin, 2003. Print.
- "Zitkala-Ša." *Harper's Bazaar* 33.15 (1900): 330. Web. 8 Sept. 2014.

Apess's *Eulogy* on Tour

Kinship and the Transnational History of Native New England

DANIEL RADUS

Though scholars have learned much about William Apess in the past two decades, the last three years of the Pequot intellectual's life—from 1836 to 1839—have remained, according to Robert Warrior, nonetheless “shrouded in mystery” (*The People* 4). In his collection of Apess's writings, first published in 1992, Barry O'Connell noted that two performances of the *Eulogy on King Philip* in Boston were Apess's “last in the public eye” (276). That Apess disappeared from public life after January 1836 has become the conventional analysis, persisting nearly to the present day.¹ Our adherence to this standard account is hardly censurable, of course. Insofar as we are interested in Apess for his remarkable writing, the first appearance of the *Eulogy* marks a watershed moment: the text is his last and, as many critics have claimed, his most realized articulation of the plight of Native peoples in nineteenth-century New England.² But the appeal to the *Eulogy* as Apess's last textual incarnation perhaps has diverted our attention unduly from the nature of its performance, from how this address—the only writing by Apess we know to have lived beyond the letter—in fact represented not a conclusion to Apess's intellectual life but rather a new beginning, one that has remained shrouded only by the difficulties of tracking the author from the page to the stage.

The *Eulogy* in Boston was neither Apess's last moment in the public eye nor the apex of his intellectual development. Instead, that lecture inaugurated a series of performances that took Apess across New England, to the nation's capital, and perhaps to New York City. In the months after his lectures in Boston, Apess delivered the *Eulogy* in Salem and Worcester and near Hartford. One year later, he likely lectured in New York. He then went south, visiting Washington in late 1837 to speak about and decry the treatment of several tribal delegations visiting the

city—likely those that had met weeks earlier to broker a peace among the Sauk, Meskwaki, and Sioux.³ Thus, while evidence of Apess's final years has led many to conclude that they were marred by dissipation—economic, familial, and physical—these revelations lend credence to Warrior's speculation that this period may have been marked also by a widening and an intensification of Apess's intellectual pursuits (*The People* 38–43).⁴ Indeed, as Warrior suspected, the geographical reach and the intellectual breadth of Apess's career expanded significantly in the three years prior to his death.

Though I attend in some detail to Apess's lectures outside New England, here I focus on how the *Eulogy*'s presence across that region signals a new stage in the development of Apess's public persona and political project. Advertisements for the *Eulogy* reveal that in his last years Apess augmented the practices that had structured his earlier public appearances. Since at least 1830, Apess had supplemented his itinerant preaching with lectures at larger and often secular venues where he would speak on social issues and sell books.⁵ In touring the *Eulogy*, Apess expanded his relationship with those venues by using the infrastructure of the region's burgeoning lyceum circuit. In all four of its locations, the *Eulogy* occurred in a venue that hosted speakers sanctioned by city lyceums.⁶ Concurrent with this new access to the lecture circuit was Apess's increasingly strategic use of print publicity to fashion himself and his works. The volume of promotions sold to publicize the *Eulogy* dwarfs that of earlier lectures by Apess, suggesting a concerted and well-funded effort to market the talk to auditors. Likewise, changes to those promotions as the *Eulogy* traveled in New England reflect Apess's keen sense not only of the region's media infrastructure but also of how the vagaries of local audiences and histories could impact the presentation and reception of his lecture. More than an addition to the historical record, then, this account of the *Eulogy* allows for considerations of Apess as a figure whose politics evolved in tandem with his manipulation of the practices that made those politics visible to a public inclined to dismiss them.

In this article I appeal to this revised performance history to claim that Apess's effort to publicize and tour the *Eulogy* aligned his text with traditions of historical expression practiced by indigenous peoples in early nineteenth-century New England.⁷ When Apess traveled the lyceum circuit he traveled also in a network of regional kinship that

"connected Indian people across the landscape" (O'Brien 146). This "network of relations" was sustained by the movements that informed Native existence and by the renewal of histories shared among the region's indigenous communities (Brooks 3).⁸ As these communal histories circulated, their recitation reaffirmed the presence of indigenous peoples in nineteenth-century New England and thus supported claims to their enduring political autonomy. History, then, was performative—"kinship [is] . . . something we *do*," in Daniel Heath Justice's formulation ("Go Away Water!" 150)—and communal, uniting groups in a ritual that affirmed "shared principles of alliance and association" (Rifkin, "Remapping" 12). In touring the *Eulogy*, Apess implicated his lecture in these traditions of historical expression. The past and the political, he argued, inhere not only in discrete groups but in the movements and relations that bridge their interstices. Apess thus intervened in debates about the political status of the region's indigenous groups. Narratives of tribal extinction in New England had severe legal ramifications for groups like the Pequot, whose inability to treat with federal officials compromised their status as a nation (Rifkin, "Shadows" 692–93; Huhndorf 11). The *Eulogy's* tour countered these narratives by invoking a transnational foundation for Native nationhood. These nations persist, Apess showed, because of the persistence of histories shared within networks of regional kinship. As the *Eulogy* traveled the region, so too did a transnational history of indigeneity that affirmed the social, political, and physical presence of indigenous nations in early nineteenth-century New England.

LECTURE CIRCUITS AND KINSHIP NETWORKS

Recent work in early Native literature has documented how the adoption of alphabetic literacy by indigenous communities was mediated by their extant expressive practices. For instance, as Lisa Brooks contends, even while pictographic "birchbark messages became letters and petitions," the latter forms were incorporated in established systems for the distribution of recorded knowledge (13). In this way, for indigenous peoples the written word was a new means of instrumentalizing an old practice; rather than revolutionize Native expression, writing supplemented earlier forms of graphic discourse, many of which had functioned similarly to the written word for centuries.

I want to suggest that, just as the written word was integrated into earlier communicative systems, so too was the lecture circuit incorporated into existing networks of indigenous kinship. In the early nineteenth century, indigenous peoples traveled New England for religious meetings and economic opportunities (Mandell 40–42). These travels followed established routes between the region's indigenous groups, preserving and strengthening a complex system of social relation that connected these distinct peoples “through stories told, customs practiced, and commitments fulfilled” (Bauerkemper and Stark 9). According to Jean O'Brien, this system of shared relations and histories “remained at the core of Indian identity in New England,” sustaining the autonomy of indigenous communities despite the diminution of their territories (117). Networks of regional kinship, then, served a political purpose—what Mark Rifkin calls the “geopolitics of kinship”—whereby relations between groups fostered the maintenance of each as a “distinct, differentiated entity” (“Remapping,” 10–11). As they moved within these networks, indigenous peoples performed and reinforced the communal histories that gave identity to individual nations; “community,” Justice explains, was “the constitutive measurement of selfhood” (“Go Away Water!” 151). Thus kin relations shared by otherwise distinct Native groups were essential to the maintenance of indigenous nationhood in early nineteenth-century New England.

As with indigenous literacies and the written word, the practices and ideals that attended kinship relations often mirrored those of nineteenth-century “lecture culture” (Wright, introduction 3). Though the earliest lyceums featured public debates by the local elite, later iterations attracted a broader audience by sponsoring the performances of traveling lecturers. As with most travel during this period, these performances followed routes established by indigenous groups as they interacted with their environment and neighboring peoples.⁹ Networks of lecturing and kinship, then, often formed parallel and contiguous circuits across early nineteenth-century New England. More than this, lyceum activities assisted in the development of national identity. These events, Angela Ray observes, “created a body of shared ideas and shared experiences, shaping a sense of nationhood through communal participation” (*The Lyceum* 7). Studies of the lyceum movement have long ascribed this nationalist character to what Tom Wright describes as its “solipsistic” nature; lectures, these studies claim, emphasized themes

that forestalled consideration of issues beyond the nation (introduction 6). However, though invested in the formation of a national public, the lyceum movement was never as solipsistic as previously assumed. Lyceums, Wright argues, also offered a broader perspective by featuring speakers that transcended the narrow concerns of the developing nation. In this way, the nineteenth-century lyceum was premised on the interaction of nationalist and “cosmopolitan” sentiments (1–6). This interaction produced in lyceum participants a national identity created not by looking inward but instead by considering the place of the nation in relation to those beyond its borders. According to Ray, even as they “positioned themselves as national citizens, they still saw the nation as a constituent of the cosmos” (“How Cosmopolitan” 32). Like networks of indigenous kinship, the lecture circuit created and sustained national identity by performing a connection to broader publics across the globe. In this sense, kinship networks and lecture circuits functioned similarly as institutions that cultivated national sentiment through compelling their respective participants to consider the transnational bonds that delimited national identity.

Though a recent addition to our critical lexicon, transnationalism—interactions across the social, political, and geographical borders of individual nations—has been an integral component of indigenous politics for centuries (Bauerkemper and Stark 9). Indeed, as many studies contend, these transnational interactions often have served to strengthen and even produce the sovereignty of individual Native polities. Perhaps counterintuitively, then, indigenous nations derive at least part of their authority and legitimacy from practices that extend beyond their borders.¹⁰ Tribal nationhood thus differs significantly from settler-colonial ideals of national belonging. Whereas the latter relies for its force on a “static separatism from the world and its peoples,” in indigenous contexts nationhood stems from “peoplehood . . . a relational system” that, Justice notes, “keeps the people in balance with one another, with other peoples and realities, and with the world” (*Our Fire* 24). While not limited to indigenous contexts, this notion of the transnational has gained currency in Native literary studies, traditionally a field that has invested heavily in nationalist paradigms. As the means to reinforce—rather than displace—nationhood, transnational practices have been recuperated by scholars as an essential element of indigenous sovereignty. Instead of threatening the internal coherence of indigenous nations, for centuries these practices

have been constitutive of their development and persistence. Unlike pan-tribal practices—which threaten to elide national boundaries—kinship relations reinforce these affiliative categories by defining the nation not as a hermetic entity but instead as a community that accounts for and “incorporate[s] difference . . . to assert distinctiveness as a people” (Justice, “To Look” 170). As Rifkin notes, kinship provides indigenous groups a means to assert their distinct identities even as those identities find meaning in “an intertribal matrix” (“Remapping” 11). Rather than conflate these identities, transnational interactions in the networks of indigenous kinship operate as “sites of nation-building” wherein distinctions are augmented through the exchange of “intellectual, cultural, economic, social, and political traditions” (Bauerkemper and Stark 9, 5). Kin relations thus simultaneously affirm the nation as a privileged site of indigenous political affiliation and acknowledge that those politics derive force from their origins beyond the nation’s purview.

The political effects of this dynamic interplay were particularly relevant for indigenous peoples in early nineteenth-century New England. In this period, the region’s indigenous groups lacked the state-recognized attributes of nationhood, most notably a history of treaty negotiations with the nascent United States (Rifkin, “Shadows” 691). The absence of these attributes licensed in the region’s settler imaginary the belief that indigenous peoples “had either ceased to exist, or their prospects for the future had dimmed to the vanishing point” (O’Brien 139). This erasure allowed settlers to claim indigenous history as their own, appropriating that past to create an identity that was distinct from that of their European forebears. As James Fenimore Cooper observes in *The Wept of Wish-ton-Wish*, his romance of colonial era Connecticut, indigenous peoples became “heroes of song and legend, while the descendants of those who laid waste to their dominions, and destroyed their race” were “yielding a tardy tribute to the high daring and savage grandeur of their characters” (x). In their willingness to dismiss the presence and politics of indigenous peoples in nineteenth-century New England, these tributes in fact replaced the region’s violent history with a fraudulent narrative of “just relations and property transactions . . . that legitimated [settler] claims to the land” (O’Brien 55). Lacking what Rifkin calls a “state-recognized language” with which to refute these spurious histories, indigenous groups appealed to alternative means of asserting their national sovereignty (“Shadows” 693). Apart from the numerous peti-

tions sent to state governments, these groups resisted legal restrictions on their autonomy by reaffirming, through the maintenance of kin relations, the transnational foundations of indigenous nationhood. As Amy Den Ouden writes of the colonial period, "The ties to kin and locality that held reservation communities together and lent authority to their leaders . . . were a source of power, creating possibilities for resistance" (28). Networks of kinship, premised on the transnational exchange of communal histories and social obligations, thus gave force to calls for the continued presence and political legitimacy of indigenous nations.

Three years before the *Eulogy* debuted on the lyceum circuit, Apess's participation in the Mashpee revolt connected these parallel networks of kinship and lecturing. Perhaps the strongest attempt to further indigenous autonomy in early nineteenth-century New England, the Mashpee revolt concerned local Wampanoags' efforts to abolish state guardianship, prevent theft of their natural resources, and regain control of their meetinghouse.¹¹ While he came to Mashpee as an ordained Methodist minister, Apess also traveled there within an existing network of indigenous kinship.¹² As he observes in *Indian Nullification of the Unconstitutional Laws of Massachusetts Relative to the Mashpee Tribe; or, The Pretended Riot Explained*, a description of his contributions to the revolt, the tribe adopted Apess "as one of ours" through a performance of kin relations that installed him as a leader in the movement for Mashpee autonomy (176). There, in solidarity with growing calls for Mashpee sovereignty, Apess gave a history of the region's indigenous groups and reaffirmed his relationships with the tribe. According to Apess, he spoke to his "brethren" from a "pamphlet that contained a sketch of the history of the Indians of New England" (172). Brooks, drawn to the similarity of this account and the *Eulogy*'s content, concludes that the pamphlet was a "draft" of the later *Eulogy* (177). The *Eulogy* thus likely debuted not in a lecture hall but at the Mashpee meetinghouse. If so, prior to appearing on the lyceum circuit, the *Eulogy* functioned in this indigenous nation as an articulation of communal history and as an assertion of Mashpee autonomy—in other words, as a performance of kinship in a transnational network of relations. The performance, Apess notes, produced in his audience of "kindred people" a sense of national identity created not only by their position as citizens of Mashpee but also by the shared history of what Native groups had "suffered at the hands of the whites" (*Indian Nullification* 172). Thus the *Eulogy* at Mashpee argued for the

constitutive role of the transnational in the construction of indigenous nationhood, connecting Mashpee autonomy to the experience of a broader public to impart that the success of Mashpee political objectives required the maintenance of kin relations that extended beyond their borders. Before the *Eulogy* arrived in the region's lecture halls, then, its presence in the networks of kinship at Mashpee functioned similarly to a performance at a lyceum. Not unlike other speeches performed on the lecture circuit, Apess's speech articulated national belonging in transnational terms.

THE *EULOGY* ON TOUR

Perhaps capitalizing on the success of the Mashpee revolt and his attendant notoriety, three years later Apess broadened his audience for the *Eulogy* by touring the lecture on the lyceum circuit.¹³ While Apess had preached and lectured across New England for several years, only when giving the *Eulogy* did he perform regularly at locations connected to the lyceum movement. The Odeon, home to the Boston Lyceum, hosted the *Eulogy* on 8 January 1836.¹⁴ Three weeks later, Apess delivered the lecture at Salem's Lyceum Hall.¹⁵ On two consecutive nights in March, he then performed the *Eulogy* at the Union Hall in Farmington, where members of the nearby Hartford Lyceum held lectures.¹⁶ And though the *Eulogy's* venue in Worcester—for one performance there in late February—remains absent from the historical record, Apess likely spoke at the Town Hall, home to the Worcester Lyceum.¹⁷ Ira Moore Barton, the chairman of an investigation into the Mashpee revolt, interviewed Apess soon after his performance of the *Eulogy's* draft and later served on the lyceum's executive committee.¹⁸ Barton's experience with the Mashpees may have familiarized him with the *Eulogy*, or perhaps Apess's acquaintance with Barton licensed access to the hall. In either case, rather than recede from the public, Apess followed the *Eulogy* in Boston with at least four additional performances.¹⁹

Apess's presence on the lyceum circuit coincided with a marked transformation in his use of print to publicize his appearances. Advertisements for the *Eulogy* in Boston and its subsequent venues differ greatly from prior efforts to market his sermons and lectures to potential audiences. For one, though Apess had long used print to attract listeners, the volume of promotions for the *Eulogy* was unprecedented.²⁰ Prior

to his performance in Boston, Apess placed notices in at least thirteen of the city's newspapers. In Hartford, he advertised in at least five. No prior sermons or lectures by Apess approach these numbers; more often, as in a series of sermons promoted in the *Liberator* in the summer of 1832, notices were placed only infrequently in single newspapers. In contrast to these earlier events, expansive publicity for the *Eulogy* in Boston and Hartford would have required significant funds and a sophisticated sense of how print media operated across the region. Apess would have visited printers, selected the wording for his notices, and bought space and time in each paper.²¹ He would have organized ticket sales at bookstores and arranged for venues (Wolfe 1). He may have solicited patronage from antiquarians or abolitionists, given his sustained relations with these groups and the affinity shared by the *Eulogy* and their respective causes. Coupling the lyceum circuit with this unprecedented use of publicity, Apess broadened his professional pursuits—preaching, advocacy, authorship—to include lecturing to larger and often secular groups across the region.

Further, more than the volume of promotions, the content of the *Eulogy*'s advertisements reflects Apess's increasingly nuanced negotiation of the media infrastructure of early nineteenth-century New England. Notices for the *Eulogy* are distinctive in their combination of transactional details—time, date, place—with editorial comments that changed based on the city in which they were printed. These variations did not occur prior to the *Eulogy*'s tour.²² For example, notices for Apess's performance in Boston announce that an "Indian preacher"—Apess remains unnamed—will provide a "specimen of Philip's language" ("The Indian King Philip," *Boston Press and Semi-weekly Advocate*, 8 January 1836). In contrast, advertisements printed in Salem omit any reference to linguistic specimens. Readers are informed instead that the *Eulogy* "will be the only chance to hear the true character of the mighty Philip" ("The Indian King Philip," *Salem Gazette*, 26 January 1836). The advertised emphasis of the lecture thus turns from Philip's language to the truth of his estimable character. Promotions for the *Eulogy* in Hartford echo and intensify this turn, describing Apess not only as "an Indian preacher" but also as a man who "understands his history" ("The Indian King Philip," *Hartford Patriot and Democrat*, 5 March 1836). Moreover, the tempered praise that Philip garners in Salem becomes, in Hartford, an effusive tribute. There, Philip "shin[es] so conspicuously . . . as to

put to flight the more enlightened” (“The Indian King Philip,” *Hartford Patriot and Democrat*, 5 March 1836). Or, as in a similar notice from the same location, he becomes a “giant personage of the Woods” (“The Indian King Philip,” *Hartford Times*, 5 March 1836). The promise of truthfulness in the Salem advertisement likewise becomes an assurance to audiences near Hartford that “the history of Philip shall be fairly explained, and in a manner it has never been before” (“The Indian King Philip,” *Hartford Christian Secretary*, 5 March 1836). Editorial statements within the *Eulogy*’s advertisements thus differed significantly in their portrayals of Apess, his lecture, and its eponymous subject.

Neither random nor capricious, these revisions remained consistent in each location that Apess visited. The differences reveal Apess’s awareness of how audience expectations varied relative to local prejudices and predilections. Audiences for the *Eulogy* near Hartford, that is, may have needed different enticements than those from Massachusetts. The trials of itinerant preaching had taught Apess to recognize and manipulate these differences. As he observes in *A Son of the Forest*, the sight of an indigenous preacher could draw a crowd of curious onlookers, “some to hear the truth, and others to see the ‘Indian’” (51).²³ Beyond simply recognizing this dynamic, however, during the *Eulogy*’s tour Apess tailored his advertisements to the locales in which he performed. In Boston, Apess traded consciously in the exoticism that accompanied the existence of an Indian preacher, attaining what Warrior has called a “critical relationship with the fact of his own novelty” (*The People* 23). Aware of that city’s fascination with the seeming remnant of its indigenous peoples, Apess cast himself as a “sensationalized commodity” (Round 166; see also Konkle 134). His presence in Boston mirrored and even personified his pledge to provide readers there with an example of Philip’s language. Apess thus became one further enticement, a living correlative to the moribund language that might satiate his audiences’ desire for a spectacle. In notices for the *Eulogy* in Hartford, however, Apess altered his approach. Rather than engage with the spectacle of the vanishing Indian, Apess promoted his lecture’s historical rigor and the good character of its subject. No longer the bearer of an exoticized language, Philip becomes instead a “beloved and lamented countryman” whose “true history” Apess intends to provide (“The Indian King Philip,” *Connecticut Observer*, 5 March 1836). Apess’s turn from language to history repositions Philip from an object of cultural voyeurism to a subject of

historical events. And though he remains an "Indian preacher," in Hartford Apess insisted additionally that he was "well acquainted" with the colonial past and thus tempered the potential sensationalism of that moniker ("The Indian King Philip," *Hartford Times*, 5 March 1836). In making these changes, Apess provided audiences in Boston and Hartford with opposed senses of what they could expect from the *Eulogy*. Whereas notices in Boston described the lecture as a curiosity, those in Hartford described it as a truthful account of colonial history. This distinction—from sensation to scholarship—also influenced Apess's description of the *Eulogy*'s subject and its speaker. That is, in Hartford, Philip seemed less a cultural specimen than a historical actor. Absent the promise of his exotic language, Philip became notable not through his cultural difference but rather through his neglected status as a towering historical figure. Likewise, when Apess appealed not only to his religiosity but also to his knowledge of the past, he transformed himself in Hartford from a spectacle into a scholar.

These modifications reinforce our sense of Apess as attentive to his audiences' reactions and adaptive to their desires. As with the abridged second performance of the *Eulogy* in Boston, perhaps Apess altered his promotional strategy in Hartford to account for the reception his talk received in prior venues. More than this, however, the focus of each city's advertisements aligned with and supported local attitudes regarding the subject of the *Eulogy*. Philip and his eponymous war ravaged central and eastern Massachusetts while leaving Connecticut all but unscathed. In the nineteenth century, addresses given in Boston and its environs often referenced these earlier battles as they sought to justify Indian extinction and valorize colonial origins. Edward Everett's 1835 address at the site of the Battle of Bloody Brook, for instance, used this occasion at once to commemorate that colonial conflict and observe that "as the civilized race rapidly multiplies, the native tribes will recede, sink into the wilderness, and disappear" (6). Apess perhaps encountered speeches like Everett's, and certainly he knew of the contempt with which many Bostonians held Philip. In the *Standard* for 6 January 1836, appended to a notice for the *Eulogy* is a preemptive response that veils its malice in an air of indifference:

Here is something worth while. Be it known, that on the eighth of January, 1836, a native American Indian is to pronounce in the city

of Boston, an eulogy on this great sachem. . . . Well, strange things have happened. Our fathers stuck the warrior's head upon a pole, and his limbs adorned the spires of Boston by way of weather-cocks; now let us make amends by hearing from one of his fallen race his eulogy.

Though comments like these are an imperfect metric for broader attitudes, one notice in Hartford suggests that, for at least some in Connecticut, the lecture was received positively: "We wish the Indian success and a full house," wrote editors at the *Hartford Times* ("The Indian King Philip," 5 March 1836). Advertisements for the *Eulogy* thus appealed to local history to promote the talk in accord with audience expectation. That is, to emphasize the exoticism of Philip in Boston was to soften or withhold the fact that Apess intended to lionize a man many there scorned. Likewise, distanced from the war's legacy, to promote in Hartford a true history of Philip was to recognize the absence of a communal narrative that might sanction the cynical "amends" of the *Standard*. The ignored truth of Philip's life, Apess seems to have understood, remained more acceptable to residents of Hartford than to those of Boston, for whom the centuries-old war continued to function as a fraught site of remembrance and contestation.

In addition, when Apess described his lecture in Hartford as an unprecedented and "fairly explained" interpretation of colonial history, he attested to the ubiquity of a historical narrative that dismissed the political legitimacy of Native nationhood in nineteenth-century New England. This narrative licensed Americans to claim the *Eulogy*'s subject as their national past, concealing Philip's resistance under a veneer of sentimental nationalism that rationalized colonization and its attendant denial of Native autonomy. The *Eulogy*'s only extant review enacts this process of appropriation and erasure. Writing for the *Massachusetts Spy* on 24 February 1836, Calvin Crane describes Worcester on the anniversary of Washington's birthday. He notes of the holiday that "no American should ever witness its return, without marking it well. The day should be honored, as the birth day of a hero, such as the world never saw—a man such as any one might be proud to imitate. We are unwilling that the day should go by without a passing notice, and we therefore present a few facts which may not be unworthy of record." Crane's panegyric to the president saturates each element of his article,

recalling Apess's claim in the *Eulogy* that "the virtues" of Washington are "engraven on the hearts" of his listeners (277). Crane first lauds the unseasonable clemency of the weather, observing that it made men "so pleasant and social that . . . even Washington himself would have been proud." He then describes a party where attendees "not only danced intellectually but patriotically—for it was a patriotic day." His concluding review of the *Eulogy* similarly gestures to the enduring legacy of the first president: "The orator was a true descendant of the Red Men, and he feelingly told the story of the Red Man's wrongs. He was, in my opinion, too severe upon our fathers, but his situation and the situation of his people must furnish his excuse. The history was interesting, and the orator was, in some passages, really eloquent." Though he expresses sympathy for the plight of indigenous people, here Crane purges the *Eulogy* of its politics by ignoring the complicity of his "fathers" in producing this lamentable "situation." Crane absolves his national heroes by casting indigenous resistance as a sentimental narrative of a regrettable but nonetheless eclipsed past. His review thereby replaces the lecture's history with an account of national origin that erases Native peoples from the physical and political landscape of nineteenth-century New England. As the *Eulogy* illuminates a history "buried in the shades of night," Crane reinters that past, offering instead a history wherein the wrongs of his ancestors are assuaged by the inexorable extinction of Native peoples and their political institutions (277). Only after the publication of this review did Apess begin, near Hartford, to promote the *Eulogy* as a "true history" in contrast to those offered by Crane and other settler-colonial writers.

More than attend to the local predilections of Hartford residents, then, the advertisements in that city refuted a historical narrative that offered, as Apess notes in the *Eulogy*, sympathetic "words" to the region's indigenous peoples even as it justified the past "works" that had facilitated the disenfranchisement and disappearance of indigenous nations (287). Given his Pequot heritage, for Apess, Hartford—more than any other locale—may have symbolized the persistence of this insidious history. Indeed, for Apess's audience, the colonial history of that city provided a facile rationale for contemporary denials of Native nationhood. At the end of the Pequot War, a treaty signed in Hartford in 1638 stipulated that the Pequots would "no more be called Pequots but Narragansetts and Mohegans" (Treaty of Hartford). Though the Pequot

nation reconstituted after the conflict, nonetheless the treaty served “to justify encroachment on reservation lands and obfuscate Native histories” in the colonial period and beyond (Den Ouden 10). The treaty and its enduring legacy thus abetted the creation of the very histories that advertisements for the *Eulogy* in Hartford sought to discredit. Even a source for much of the *Eulogy*, Samuel Drake’s *The Book of the Indians of North America*, notes that a “remnant” of Pequots after their eponymous war “promised to appear no more as a nation” (2:106). As O’Brien observes, in settler-authored histories written during the early nineteenth century, the Pequot War and its aftermath were touchstones “for asserting the extinction of New England Indians” (41). Hartford, these histories suggest, situated spatially the dispossession not only of the Pequots’ territory but also of their historical claims to nationhood.

Even as Hartford continued to mark the site of Pequot erasure, however, the city also became home to a sizable population of indigenous peoples. As Ron Welburn notes, Hartford served as a vibrant hub of indigenous transnationalism, attracting groups from across what he has called Missinnuok, the cultural and geographical region encompassing southern New England and parts of eastern Long Island (45). Native peoples—Corchaugs, Montauketts, Narrangansetts, Pequots, Shinnecocks—traveled from their communities to Hartford as they sought “religious fellowship, work opportunities, and education” (8). Indeed, at the time of the *Eulogy*’s rehearsal in Hartford, at least four members of Apess’s family lived there.²⁴ According to Welburn, the “resettlement” of Hartford by this indigenous diaspora at once recalled and resulted from the location’s “history as a cultural space” for peoples throughout Missinnuok (48). Suckiaug, a village that stood on the site of present-day Hartford, was “a hub of activity” in the seventeenth century; the town acted as a crossroads that aided “diplomacy, trade, and probably the enactment of ceremonies” (50). Hartford, then, retained a centuries-long significance as a gathering place where indigenous nations met to affirm and renew their relations. In this sense, the city acted as a central node in a network of indigenous kinship, one that began prior to colonization and continued throughout the nineteenth century. In resettling Hartford, indigenous peoples appealed to that city’s past as a site of connection and continuance. They thus claimed the city anew as a “Native space,” countering settler-colonial narratives that defined it as the site of their extinction (48; see also Brooks).

The *Eulogy* in Hartford likewise enacts this process of reclamation. As Apess toured the lyceum circuit, his advertisements attested to the development of his public persona and political project. More than this, however, promotions for the *Eulogy* reflected the lecture's distinct role in each of its four locations. In Hartford, Apess's attention to historical reinterpretation reflected the presence in that city of a history that required reinterpretation. Uncovering the *Eulogy*'s tour thus allows for a reading of the text that satisfies Brooks's essential admonition that any analysis of "early Native texts simply cannot take place without widespread understanding of the place-worlds [that] they inhabit" (xxiv). Following Brooks, in the last section of this article I read the *Eulogy* for how that text affirms the vitality of Pequot nationhood at the site of its foreclosure.

APESS'S TRANSNATIONAL HISTORY OF NATIVE NATIONHOOD

Apess affirmed Pequot nationhood in Hartford by attesting to the transnational relations that had sustained its existence. In its content and structure, the *Eulogy* provides a history of Native New England that transcends the nation as a category of indigenous affiliation. Emphasizing instead the transnational networks that structured national belonging, the *Eulogy* echoes and affirms the kinship bonds that strengthened articulations of indigenous nationhood in the nineteenth century.

Though Apess writes often of the discrete nations that comprised colonial and early nineteenth-century New England, at moments in the *Eulogy* he qualifies the term to distinguish between indigenous and settler-colonial notions of nationhood. When he describes the region's Native groups as "nations of this soil," for instance, Apess separates settler-colonial nationhood from forms of national affiliation that gain meaning through—and are literally grounded in—the experiences of indigeneity (*Eulogy* 286). As Justice claims, "Indigenous nationhood should not . . . be conflated with the nationalism that has given birth to industrialized nation-states" ("Go Away Water!" 151). As noted earlier, though the latter is "often dependent upon the erasure of kinship bonds," the former in fact relies for its survival on their perpetuation (151). Rather than neglect the transnational relations that inform national belonging, indigenous nations use those relations as the pri-

mary means of asserting their sovereignty. This sense of nationhood structures Apess's account of colonial history.

In the *Eulogy*, Apess writes that Philip had gathered "a train of warriors" from nations so numerous that "it would swell [his] address too full to mention [them] all" (296). This profusion of warriors, he suggests, precipitated King Philip's War by prompting a conflict between settler-colonial and indigenous conceptions of nationhood. Apess notes that a council convened in 1671 "courted war instead of peace" by levying five charges against Philip (*Eulogy* 292). "The third charge," he recounts, "was: harboring divers Indians, not his own men but the vagabond Indians" (292). In *The Book of the Indians* Drake explains that the "vagabond Indians," though unspecified in the *Eulogy*, had "left their own sachems"—their own nations—to join Philip (3:23). The council, in other words, opposed Philip's right to welcome non-Wampanoags onto his lands, fearing that these coalitions would curtail English hegemony. This fear, though not unfounded, nonetheless signaled that the Puritans had misconstrued the nature of Philip's actions. As historian James Drake documents, Philip understood his actions not as the illicit "harboring" of "vagabonds" but rather as the reaffirmation of regional kinship relations (101). When he allowed "divers Indians" onto his land, Philip enacted a conception of Wampanoag nationhood that understood difference as a means of strengthening sovereignty. The Puritans, unable to accommodate this definition of nationhood, maintained in their charge that these transnational bonds weakened the Wampanoag nation and subjected it to English dominion. The council thus criminalized kinship, imposing on Philip a form of national affiliation that mandated his estrangement from other Native peoples.

Though his sources read this episode as unexceptional, Apess inveighs against the Puritan effort to forbid Philip's actions. He criticizes not only the council's desire to abolish Wampanoag sovereignty but also its failure to recognize the nationhood that supports those sovereign claims. "What a charge this was to bring against a king, calling his company vagabonds," he says, asking incredulously, "What right had they to find fault with his company?" (Apess, *Eulogy* 293). The question, of course, is rhetorical: Apess knows that the Puritans had no legal right to protest Philip's actions. Apess suggests that, without the rights required to threaten Wampanoag sovereignty, the English resorted to interpreting kinship as a nefarious and conspiratorial practice that jeopardized their claims to

power. He exposes the irrationality of this interpretation by documenting Philip's effort to unite his neighbors through the performance of kinship. When Philip divides a wampum-clad coat among his followers, for instance, Apess observes that the act so "cheered their hearts" that they resolved to "maintain their rights and expel their enemies" (297). Here, the assembled men are buoyed by more than the transfer of wealth. Philip often maintained kinship bonds with the ritualized exchange of gifts; in 1675, for example, he sent wampum and clothing to the Mohegan leader Uncas to ask for his assistance in the conflict (Sanders). Philip's followers are heartened, then, by the reaffirmation of their ties to the Wampanoags. These ties not only rallied their spirits but also assisted in the defense of their own nations. Thus, rather than "harboring divers Indians," Philip enacted what Joseph Bauerkemper and Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark call "transnational kinship diplomacy" (11). In apportioning his wampum, he sought not to "collapse one nation into another but instead . . . to cultivate productive relationships that could transcend political and territorial lines" (11). Apess, in his critique of the Puritans' council, suggests that the disastrous history of colonial New England resulted from the refusal to accept these relationships as evidence of the enduring sovereignty of the region's Native nations.

When Apess writes that identifying Philip's relationships would "swell [his] address too full," then, his comment signals more than a concern for oratorical economy. In his reluctance to differentiate between nations, Apess compels engagement with a form of national affiliation that emphasizes shared histories. His comment thus enacts rhetorically Philip's "transnational kinship diplomacy," foregrounding transnational bonds to affirm their critical role in the preservation of indigenous politics. In this sense, the *Eulogy* counters what Rifkin has identified as a problematic critical tradition in studies of Apess. As Rifkin notes, the assumption that Apess "did not engage with other Pequots" during his childhood has led to a belief in "the impossibility of a specifically Pequot perspective in his work" ("Shadows" 701). That belief, he continues, has licensed a conviction in "the necessity of understanding [Apess] as speaking pantribally" (701). Rifkin counters this assertion, finding in *A Son of the Forest* "elliptical allusions" that reveal Apess's connection to the Pequots even as they signal the "relative invisibility" of the tribe in the nineteenth century (703). Another challenge to this tradition might confront its implicit belief in the inimical nature of national and trans-

national affiliation. In other words, instead of accepting that Apess's activities "weakened his self-identification as a Pequot," scholars might acknowledge that when he spoke about the diversity of tribal nationhood in New England, Apess engaged with a system of regional kinship that supported Pequot autonomy (Velikova 326). As Chadwick Allen notes, recognizing the "interactions of indigenous peoples, cultures, histories, and texts" complements, rather than discredits, assertions of tribal nationalism (xiv; see also Weaver 18). Using these interactions as evidence of indigenous nationhood, Apess encodes in the *Eulogy* a "Pequot perspective" that emphasizes the nation's shared history and its continued presence in New England.

In an anonymous review of *A Son of the Forest*, the author—likely Samuel Drake—writes that Apess had expressed to him a desire to compile "the real history and antiquities of the Pequots."²⁵ Drake admonishes Apess, noting that, "as our readers might be aware," the Pequot nation "was destroyed in 1637, when it ceased to exist as an independent community." Apess, Drake warns, "must . . . not allow himself to be carried away by every slight and imperfect tradition." Perhaps discouraged, Apess never wrote a history of the Pequots and thus never argued explicitly—as he would have—against Drake's own "imperfect tradition." Despite the apparent absence of Pequot nationalism in his writing, however, Apess appeals to that cause in both *Son* and the *Eulogy*. He does so by stressing—even fabricating—the shared history that bound the Pequots to the region's other indigenous nations. An often-read passage from *A Son of the Forest*, for example, describes Philip as a "king of the Pequot tribe" (3). Scholars have read the inaccuracy of this description as a challenge to the narrative of Pequot extinction. As Rifkin observes, the error "can be read as a way of endowing greater political status" to the Pequots through an "inheritance" of Wampanoag sovereignty ("Shadows" 695).²⁶ These readings locate the rhetorical force of this error in its conflation of distinct tribal histories. Apess yokes his extinct nation to the discernible sovereignty of Philip, producing a counterfactual that refutes the legacy of the Hartford treaty. Though instructive, this account deemphasizes the role of transnational kinship in Apess's defense of Pequot nationhood. The rhetorical force of Apess's error derives less from its elision of these two tribes than from its affirmation of their shared relations. As he preached and lectured in Wampanoag territory, Apess himself appealed to these relations and

their political effects. Indeed, his role in the Mashpee riot evinces his appreciation for how the bonds between these two nations supported the sovereignty of each. Thus Apess's error need not be read as the suppression of Pequot history nor as an effort to supplant its indistinctions with the transparencies of the Wampanoags' sovereign past. Instead, in identifying Philip as a Pequot, Apess argues that the historical imbrication of these two nations served as a principal means of creating and sustaining their political distinctiveness.

The same argument suffuses the *Eulogy*. Rather than limit himself to the Pequots and the Wampanoags, however, here Apess widens his shared history to include indigenous nations from across the region. This transnational history evokes Pequot nationhood even as the particularities of the nation's past remain all but unstated. Prior to his account of Philip, Apess presents "a mass of history and exposition" wherein he catalogs "the deeds and depredations committed by whites upon the Indians" during the first years of English colonialism (*Eulogy* 289, 279). These events, remarks Apess, explain why "all the Indians generally felt indignantly toward whites, whereby they were more easily allied together" (289). This "mass of history," then, works not to distinguish between nations but rather to describe the shared history that facilitated their mutual defense. The *Eulogy* emphasizes the communal nature of this history by forgoing details that would allow its readers to differentiate between individual nations. In this portion of his lecture, Apess does not refer to the names of tribes, nor does he provide locations for the events that he describes.²⁷ For example, Apess recounts that "whites robbed the Indian graves, and their corn, about the year 1632" (282). He follows this with an episode from "1619 [when] a number of Indians went on board of a ship . . . and the whites set upon them and murdered them without mercy" (282). In these cases—and throughout the *Eulogy*—Apess strips otherwise distinct historical events of their tribal and spatial specificity. He offers no sense of the victims' tribal affiliations, nor does he disclose the location in which these events occurred. Apess thus avoids any account of the identities, boundaries, and histories that served to distinguish between indigenous peoples, rendering them simply "Indians" and situating them in an indistinct landscape that lacks reference to the borders between them.

In his reluctance to provide tribal and spatial details, Apess advances a rhetorical strategy that recalls Philip's efforts to resist English domin-

ion through “transnational kinship diplomacy.” Like Philip’s interactions with the Puritan council, in the *Eulogy* Apess dissociates indigenous peoples from the categories that rendered them legible to—and therefore erasable within—settler-colonial history. In the early nineteenth century, settler-authored accounts of indigenous history often made sense of indigenous groups by appealing to the identities and boundaries of distinct tribes. Drake’s *Book of the Indians*, for instance, uses these categories to structure his history of indigenous New England. Each chapter considers one or more tribes, describes the bounds of their territories, and details their histories from encounter to the colonial period. In his account of the Narragansetts, Drake provides first a “general account” that includes its “bounds . . . as described in the times of the sachems” (2:48). He then locates the “zenith of its greatness” in 1642 before transitioning to the present day, when, citing a census from 1832, he notes that—of its meager “remnant”—only “seven . . . were unmixed” (2:48). The Pequots fare even worse: theirs is the shortest chapter in the book, focused almost exclusively on their eponymous war and punctuated by the refrain that they would “appear no more as a nation” (2:106). As these accounts suggest, a reliance on tribal and geographical designations in settler-authored histories could abet—or even compel—claims of tribal extinction. The facts of Narragansett obsolescence or Pequot extinction, that is, become tenable to Drake because he relies solely on these categories for his sense of indigenous politics. For Drake, the Pequot “promise to appear no more as a nation” because the Treaty of Hartford—in apportioning Pequot survivors to neighboring tribes and confiscating their territories—severed them from the categories that made their political persistence legible to settler-colonial history. He thus imposed on groups like the Pequots a conception of nationhood that, given its adherence to these categories, facilitated assertions of their disappearance in the early nineteenth century.

In the *Eulogy*, Apess counters this imposition. He affirms that, despite Drake’s assertions, indigenous nations endure because their existence relies not on distinct tribes or territories but on the transnational networks that connect them. He emphasizes these networks by rewriting scenes from *The Book of the Indians* so that they accommodate the principles of indigenous nationhood. As Maureen Konkle has noted, though Apess borrowed extensively from Drake as he wrote the *Eulogy*, he did so “with a great deal of rearrangement and reinterpretation.”

tion" (102). For example, while Apess gleaned his descriptions of grave robbery and shipboard murder from *The Book of the Indians*, he revised Drake's account of these events so that their tribal and geographical details were omitted. In Drake's history, these details are clear: the English robbed the grave of a Massachusett woman in Plymouth and murdered several Wampanoags on a boat moored in Massachusetts Bay (2:43, 18). The clarity of these details in *The Book of the Indians* suggests that, in the *Eulogy*, Apess withheld them willfully rather than due to ignorance or even, again, a fear that they might "swell our address too full." Indeed, these omissions recur throughout the *Eulogy*, and their consistency reveals the presence of a rhetorical strategy that stifles assertions of tribal extinction. By refusing to offer these details, Apess forwards a transnational history of Native New England. He appeals to a conception of nationhood based not on the distinctions between the region's Native peoples but rather on their shared relations. He thus compels readers to consider Native New England as a network of relations joined together by the assertion of a communal past and the affirmation of a political present. That political present, the *Eulogy* argues, includes nations like the Pequots, whose presence in nineteenth-century New England Apess invokes by disavowing the categories that structured settler-colonial historiography.

BEYOND NEW ENGLAND

Though scholars have described the published *Eulogy* as the apex of Apess's intellectual project, in this article I have argued that our sense of this project expands significantly when we account for the intricacies of its promotion and performance. Attending to the *Eulogy*'s advertisements, for example, reveals the extent to which Apess used the period's media infrastructure to advance his professional pursuits. Likewise, attending to the *Eulogy*'s presence in the networks of kinship and lecturing reveals the extent to which he connected those pursuits with his decolonial politics. In touring the *Eulogy*, Apess aligned the objective of his lecture with the means of its circulation. He affirmed the social, political, and physical presence of indigenous nations in early nineteenth-century New England by attesting—in print and performance—to the transnational relations that sustained their existence. I will conclude, then, by suggesting that our sense of this project might

expand even further when we consider neither the *Eulogy* nor its performances as the apotheosis of Apess's activism. Rather than the apex of his intellectual project, the *Eulogy* spurred Apess to expand his professional and political objectives beyond New England—to, that is, use his role as a lecturer to affirm his kinship with indigenous nations across the continent.

Almost one year after his final appearance in Hartford, Apess lectured in New York City. Over four nights at Clinton Hall—"one of the city's prime venues for lecturers" (Gura 130)—he discussed "Indian history, wars, manners, customs, [and] religion" ("Indian Lectures," *New York Commercial Advertiser*, 22 February 1837). Advertisements for these lectures, written by Apess, refer to the speaker as "an Indian, named Gos-kuk-wa-na-kou-ne-di-yu,—by some reported to be a Mohawk, and by others a Pequot" ("Indian Lectures," *New York Spectator*, 21 February 1837). Another notice, written by the editor of the *New York Herald*, identifies the speaker as "an Indian warrior, Metecomet" ("Rabbi Noah at a Discount," 8 March 1837). As Philip Gura has noted, the name Apess uses to describe himself appears in *The Book of the Indians*, where Drake uses it to identify Handsome Lake, the Seneca prophet (Gura 129). "Metecomet," as Apess knew and likely divulged to the *Herald's* editor, was an alias for Philip. As in *Son*, here Apess aligns himself with the Pequots and the Wampanoags. But he also expands on this identification, affiliating with two members of the Haudenosaunee, whom officials in this period called the "New York Indians."

By the end of that same year, Apess had traveled from New York to the nation's capital. Identifying himself as "of the Mohawk tribe," he spoke at least twice "on the subject of Christian missions" at meeting houses associated with the Baptists (*Washington Globe*, 2 December 1837). As a correspondent for the *Baltimore Sun* reports, Apess's appearance in Washington coincided with the rearrival there "of a delegation of Indians who have been on a visit or tour to the North" ("From Our Correspondent," 5 December 1837). In the months prior, the city hosted a council to settle a conflict between the Sioux and their rivals, the Sauk and Meskwaki. These tribes were joined by representatives from the Missouri, Omaha, Oto, Pawnee, and Winnebago tribes (Viola 34–36). Apess may have read about the council and timed his lectures to align with the groups' return to Washington.²⁸ Given his established interest in the plight of the Cherokees, he may also have visited the city to lend

his support to their final—and ultimately futile—attempt to negotiate an alternative to removal (Moulton 86). In either case, he spoke not only on “Christian missions” but also on, as the *Sun* reports, the impropriety of parading these diplomats “out on the commons for the gratification of the people” (“From Our Correspondent,” *Baltimore Sun*, 5 December 1837). Apress, the correspondent observes, “resented, in strong language, the treatment of the Indians” (“From Our Correspondent,” *Baltimore Sun*, 5 December 1837). Though Apress did not affiliate himself with these nations, nonetheless he advocated for their politics at the seat of settler-colonial governance. Washington, itself a transnational city replete—like Hartford—with people from countless indigenous nations, was an ideal location for the extension of Apress’s professional, political, and intellectual goals.

As he toured in New York and Washington, Apress widened the objectives of the *Eulogy*. He expanded the audience for his lectures and thus broadened a network of transnational kinship that, he hoped, would sustain the social, political, and physical presence of indigenous nations in New England and beyond. Following him from the page to the stage in these cities—and others yet to be recovered—expands further our knowledge of Apress, his final years, and his lasting contribution to the literary and political histories of the early nineteenth-century United States.

DANIEL RADUS is completing his PhD in English at Cornell University, where he studies nineteenth-century American and American Indian literatures. He has published previously in *American Literature*, and his research has been supported by the American Antiquarian Society and the Newberry Library.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Research for this article was supported by a Kate B. and Hall J. Peterson Fellowship from the American Antiquarian Society. I would like to thank Katy Chiles, Drew Lopenzina, and Kelly Wisecup for their generous thoughts on earlier versions of this article.

NOTES

1. Rochelle Rainieri Zuck, for example, noted in 2013 that the *Eulogy*'s performance in Boston “marks the end of what we know of Apress’s career as an orator” (1). Though the consistency of this analysis has made Apress’s public disappearance after

January 1836 all but immune to critique, recent work by Philip Gura and a forthcoming study by Drew Lopenzina expand our knowledge of Apess's public life in his final years. Here, I build from these expansive treatments by focusing narrowly on the performance history of the *Eulogy* as Apess toured that lecture beyond Boston.

2. For Lopenzina, the *Eulogy* is "arguably the most powerful critique of the colonial endeavor to emerge from the first half of the nineteenth century" (675). Lisa Brooks calls the text Apess's "most provocative" (198). Maureen Konkle argues that Apess's works reveal "a developing critique of racial difference," one that finds its apotheosis in the *Eulogy* (105), and Warrior notes similarly that "Apess's *Eulogy* brings him full circle" in terms of his intellectual development (*The People* 36).

3. Scholars have accounted for the extent of Apess's post-1835 lectures only recently. In his biography of Apess, Gura mentions the *Eulogy*'s first performance in Hartford, elaborates on his possible lectures in New York, and references his visit to Washington. Apess's performances of the *Eulogy* in Salem and Worcester have not been referenced in scholarship, nor have the responses to the lecture published in Boston and Worcester, both of which I discuss later in this article.

4. Scholars have pieced together aspects of these final years by attending to recorded debt actions, mortgage loans, and a coroner's inquest into Apess's death. Apess was named as a defendant in four debt actions lodged in the Barnstable County Court between 1835 and 1837 and mortgaged his home and property in September 1836 (Kongle 152–53). The interviews conducted as part of the coroner's inquest suggest that either he had left his first wife or that she had died. By 1839 Apess had moved to New York City, married a woman named Elizabeth, and was struggling with bouts of intemperance (Kongle 154–56; Warrior, *The People* 39–41).

5. In 1830 Apess lectured at the courthouse in Hartford; an advertisement for the speech notes that "his object is to expose for sale, the Memoir of his life . . . the profits of which is to aid in erecting a house of worship" ("Rev. Wm. Apes," *Connecticut Mirror*, 25 September 1830). He did the same at the Baptist Meeting House in New York City. A review of that lecture notes that Apess, "although not gifted with the eloquence of *Samson Occom*, succeeds very well in enlisting the sympathies of those who hear him" (*New York Evening Post*, 3 July 1830). As Kongle has detailed, in 1832 Apess spoke on abolition and Cherokee removal in Boston (97–100).

6. The exception is the *Eulogy*'s second performance in Boston, given at Boylston Hall "by the request of the good citizens of Boston . . . a dissatisfaction being had in regard to [Apess's view of] the Mission cause" ("The Indian King Philip," *Boston Trumpet and Universalist Magazine*, 23 January 1836). A similar advertisement ran in at least six other Boston newspapers. The second edition of the *Eulogy*, published one year after the first, transcribes this version of the lecture. A comparison of the two editions shows that in the second, Apess softened his invectives against missionaries by, for example, particularizing complaints to individuals rather than placing blame on all (17).

7. Recent analyses of the *Eulogy* have modeled an interpretive practice that moves past the work's revision of colonial history to engage what Lopenzina calls the indigenous "systems of knowledge and belief" that inform the text's content and structure

(688). Brooks's reading is exemplary of this interpretive practice (192–218). In claiming that the *Eulogy* “reclaimed New England as Native space,” Brooks appeals not only to Apress's revision of colonial history but also, for example, to the intricacies of Algonquian languages and the concept of Manitou (199). I want to suggest in this article that these “systems of knowledge and belief” likewise influenced the *Eulogy*'s performances.

8. Daniel Mandell's study of indigenous peoples in southern New England during this period reveals that the transient nature of these groups was at once a willful effort to support and strengthen ties among communities and a coerced result of the severe economic deprivation that attended their position as colonial subjects (xvii, 7–8, 34; see also Warrior, *The People* 11; O'Connell xxv).

9. As Howard Russell notes, “It was by use of these immemorial ways, not, as some historians have imagined, by trail blazing” that colonists and later Americans would travel throughout southern New England (201).

10. Warrior argues that “our nationalism is born out of native transnationalism” (“Native American” 125). Similarly, according to Justice, “Our nationhood and tribal specificity has . . . been built upon a transnational foundation” (“To Look” 170). Tol Foster contends that a transnational frame is “not necessarily ancillary to tribal specificity, but is actually at times the very center of a given tribal practice” (272).

11. Jack Campisi's *The Mashpee Indians: Tribe on Trial* (1993) provides an overview of Mashpee history (see also Clifford 277–346; Mandell 97–103). The revolt was successful; one year later, Mandell explains, “the state legislature abolished Mashpee's guardianship and made it a district with the power to elect selectmen and other town officials” (101).

12. These practices—itinerant preaching and performances of kinship—often were mutually constitutive. As Mandell notes, “Religious gatherings . . . facilitated kinship connections between groups” throughout the period (41).

13. A similar draft of the *Eulogy* may have been given by Apress in Newport, Rhode Island, in the months following the beginning of the revolt. There, an “Indian Preacher . . . [and] son of the forest told many historical truths which could not be very palatable to those who term themselves civilized. He spoke charitably, fearlessly, but unfavourably of the conduct of the white Missionaries among them” (*Rhode Island Republican*, 30 October 1833). This lecture's description aligns with the speech given by Apress in Mashpee and with the content of the *Eulogy*.

14. For example, a lecture series sponsored by the Boston Lyceum welcomed B. B. Thatcher to the Odeon on 21 January 1836 (“Boston Lyceum,” *Boston Courier*, 20 January 1836).

15. The *Salem Observer* for 30 January 1836 noted that “An *Eulogy* was pronounced last evening, at the Lyceum, upon the Indian King Philip, by the Rev Wm Apes, the Indian Preacher.” Advertisements for the *Eulogy* in Salem appeared in other local newspapers (“The Indian King Philip,” *Salem Gazette*, 26 and 29 January 1836).

16. A meeting of the Hartford Lyceum at Union Hall was advertised in the *Connecticut Courant* for 5 May 1834. Advertisements for the *Eulogy* near Hartford appeared in several local newspapers.

17. William Lincoln, a historian of Worcester, wrote of 1836 that lectures hosted by the Lyceum in the city's "Town House" were "thronged with a continually increasing crowd" (276; see also *Some Historic Houses* 23–24).

18. Barton was elected to the executive committee of the Worcester Lyceum in 1835 (Worcester Natural History Society Records, Manuscript Department, American Antiquarian Society).

19. These four cities are the only ones known to have hosted the *Eulogy*. Though a "Eulogy on King Philip" was given on 18 August 1836 as part of the commencement exercises for Norwich University in Vermont, a program for those exercises names its speaker as Charles Douglas Gray ("Norwich University"). Gray, who attended Norwich as a student in the late 1830s (*Catalogue of the Officers and Students* 6), may have purchased a copy of the *Eulogy* and performed it, though this seems unlikely given the tenor of the day's festivities. Prior to Gray's address, fellow student Thomas Whipple delivered a patriotic address entitled *Eulogy on James Madison*. More likely is that Gray delivered a eulogy for Philip of Macedon; the university's library contained a biography of this King Philip, written in 1775 by Thomas Leland (*Catalogue of Books* 15).

20. Apess's appeal to newspaper publicity aligned his efforts with those of his fellow Methodists in colonial and early America. In his account of the Great Awakening, Frank Lambert discusses "the key role of newspapers in publicizing the revivals throughout the colonies" and identifies George Whitfield as the founder of the "preach and print" approach to evangelism . . . a combination that attracted huge outdoor crowds" (15, 111).

21. Absent correspondence or contracts with these newspapers' editors, we cannot know definitively whether Apess wrote the advertisements in the *Eulogy*. All extant evidence, however, suggests that he did. In the nineteenth century, lecturers often wrote their own promotional material and enlisted newspaper editors to assist in its printing and distribution. William Wells Brown, for instance, asked William Lloyd Garrison to print handbills promoting his talk in the city of Lynn in 1858 (Greenspan 359). Apess, an acquaintance of Garrison's, advertised the *Eulogy* in his *Liberator* ("The Indian King Philip," 2 January 1836). Angela Ray reveals similarly that lyceum organizers would place advertisements in newspapers for their forthcoming lecturers (*The Lyceum* 93). The *Eulogy's* promotions themselves also provide evidence for Apess's authorship. Near-identical promotions for the *Eulogy* were printed in at least nine Boston newspapers. Likewise, promotions from Hartford—printed in at least four of that city's newspapers—are similar to one another in sentiment if not phrasing. Had Apess allowed his editors to write the *Eulogy's* promotions, the content and layout of these notices would have differed relative to the newspapers in which they were printed. Perhaps the best evidence for Apess's authorship is found in Boston's *Standard* for 6 January 1836. As I note later, that paper includes not only a conventional promotion for the *Eulogy* but also, in an adjacent column, its editor's preemptive critique of Apess's performance. Given the tenor of that review, presumably the editor of the *Standard* would not have labeled Philip, as does the author of the *Eulogy's* promotion, a "celebrated warrior" ("The Indian King Philip, at the Odeon").

22. Prior to the *Eulogy*, advertisements for Apess's speeches rarely included more than transactional details. When these notices did include more than transactional details, often they were written by editors from individual newspapers. In promotions for the same series of sermons publicized in the *Liberator* in 1832, for example, added to a conventional announcement is William Lloyd Garrison's claim that after "a short interview" with Apess, the editor held "a very favorable opinion of his talents and piety" (19 May 1832).

23. Secular audiences were likewise desirous of the presumed spectacle that attended Indian lecturers. In her diary for 29 April 1832, Louisa Park writes that her friends reacted with "astonishment and disappointment" when, at an antiremoval event in Boston, both Elias Boudinot and Apess were "drest like *other* [white] *people*" rather than like a "real wild Indian with his hair streaming down his back, a tomahawk in his hand, and a wampum belt" (Park Family Papers; see also Konkle 97–99).

24. Letters were left at the post office in Hartford for Gilbert, Lyman, and Sally Apes—as well as William himself—in 1836 (*Times*, 5 March 1836, 16 April 1836, 2 September 1836). The next year, a letter was left for Lois Apes (*Times*, 15 April 1837). Welburn provides further evidence of the Apes or Apess family in Hartford during the late 1830s and 1840s (90).

25. Konkle argues convincingly for this attribution (102).

26. Roumiana Velikova notes similarly that Apess's claim tries "to restore the faded glory of the Pequots and refashion their historical record" (314). For Arnold Krupat, Apess associates Philip with the Pequots to suggest that Philip's eponymous war ought to "be seen to descend in a direct line from earlier Puritan aggressions," namely, the Pequot War (92).

27. After his "mass of history and exposition," Apess names the Narragansetts and the Mohawks (*Eulogy* 298–99).

28. Herman Viola notes that this meeting—one of the largest of its time—was a popular spectacle, attracting scores of curious onlookers and incessant coverage in regional newspapers (36).

WORKS CITED

- Allen, Chadwick. *Trans-Indigenous: Methodologies for Global Native Literary Studies*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2012. Print.
- Bauerkemper, Joseph, and Heidi Kiiwetinepinesik Stark. "The Trans/National Terrain of Anishinaabe Law and Diplomacy." *Journal of Transnational American Studies* 4.1 (2012): 1–21. Print.
- Apess, William. *Eulogy on King Philip*. 2nd ed. Boston, 1837. Print.
- . *Eulogy on King Philip*. O'Connell 277–310. Print.
- . *Indian Nullification of the Unconstitutional Laws of Massachusetts Relative to the Mashpee Tribe; or, The Pretended Riot Explained*. O'Connell 165–274. Print.
- . *A Son of the Forest*. O'Connell 3–98. Print.
- Brooks, Lisa. *The Common Pot: The Recovery of Native Space in the Northeast*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2008. Print.

- Catalogue of Books in the Cadets' Library at the American Literary, Scientific, and Military Academy*. Middletown, 1827. Print.
- Catalogue of the Officers and Students, of Norwich University, for the Academic Year, 1836–7*. Montpelier, 1837. Print.
- Clifford, James. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1988. Print.
- Cooper, James Fenimore. *The Wept of Wish-ton-Wish*. Philadelphia: Carey, Lea & Carey, 1829. Print.
- Crane, Calvin. "February Twenty-Second." *Worcester Massachusetts Spy*, 24 Feb. 1836. Print.
- Den Ouden, Amy E. *Beyond Conquest: Native Peoples and the Struggle for History in New England*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2005. Print.
- Drake, James D. *King Philip's War: Civil War in New England, 1675–1676*. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 2000. Print.
- Drake, Samuel G. *The Book of the Indians of North America*. 4th ed. 5 vols. in 1. Boston: Antiquarian Institute, 1835. Print.
- Everett, Edward. *An Address Delivered at Bloody Brook, in South Deerfield*. Boston, 1835. Print.
- Foster, Tol. "Of One Blood: An Argument for Relations and Regionality in Native American Literary Studies." *Womack, Justice, and Teuton* 265–302. Print.
- Gura, Philip F. *The Life of William Apess, Pequot*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2015. Print.
- Greenspan, Ezra. *William Wells Brown: An African American Life*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2014. Print.
- Huhndorf, Shari. *Mapping the Americas: The Transnational Politics of Contemporary Native Culture*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 2009. Print.
- Justice, Daniel Heath. "'Go Away Water!': Kinship Criticism and the Decolonization Imperative." *Womack, Justice, and Teuton* 147–68. Print.
- . *Our Fire Survives the Storm: A Cherokee Literary History*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2006. Print.
- . "'To Look upon Thousands': Cherokee Transnationalism, at Home and Abroad." *New Centennial Review* 10.1 (2010): 169–78. Print.
- Konkle, Maureen. *Writing Indian Nations: Native Intellectuals and the Politics of Historiography, 1827–1863*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2004. Print.
- Krupat, Arnold. *All That Remains: Varieties of Indigenous Expression*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2009. Print.
- Lambert, Frank. *Inventing the "Great Awakening"*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2001. Print.
- Lincoln, William. *History of Worcester, Massachusetts, from Its Earliest Settlement to September, 1836*. Worcester: Charles Hersey, 1862. Print.
- Lopezina, Drew. "What to the American Indian Is the Fourth of July? Moving beyond Abolitionist Rhetoric in William Apess's *Eulogy on King Philip*." *American Literature* 82.4 (2010): 673–99. Print.

- Mandell, Daniel R. *Tribe, Race, History: Native Americans in Southern New England, 1780–1880*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins UP, 2010. Print.
- Moulton, Gary E. *John Ross: Cherokee Chief*. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1978. Print.
- “Norwich University. Commencement, Thursday August 18, 1836. Order of Exercises.” Broadside, 1836, Norwich University Archives and Special Collections.
- Park Family Papers. American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, MA.
- O'Brien, Jean. *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians out of Existence in New England*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2010. Print.
- O'Connell, Barry, ed. *On Our Own Ground: The Complete Writings of William Apešs, a Pequot*. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1992. Print.
- Ray, Angela G. “How Cosmopolitan Was the Lyceum, Anyway?” Wright 23–41. Print.
- . *The Lyceum and Public Culture in the Nineteenth-Century United States*. East Lansing: Michigan State UP, 2005. Print.
- Rifkin, Mark. “Remapping the Family of Nations: The Geopolitics of Kinship in Hendrick Aupaumut's ‘A Short Narration.’” *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 22.4 (2010): 1–31. Print.
- . “Shadows of Mashantucket: William Apešs and the Representation of Pequot Place.” *American Literature* 84.4 (2012): 691–714. Print.
- Review of *A Son of the Forest*. *American Monthly Review*, Aug. 1832. Print.
- Round, Phillip H. *Removable Type: Histories of the Book in Indian Country, 1663–1880*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2010. Print.
- Russell, Howard S. *Indian New England before the Mayflower*. Hanover: UP of New England, 1980. Print.
- Sanders, Tobias, to Fitz-John Winthrop. 3 July 1675. *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*. 5th ser. Vol. 2. Boston, 1871. Print.
- Some Historic Houses of Worcester*. Boston: Worcester Bank and Trust Company, 1919. Print.
- Treaty of Hartford (copy). 21 Sept. 1638. Paul Grant-Costa et al., eds., Yale Indian Papers Project, Yale University.
- Velikova, Rumiana. “Philip, King of the Pequots’: The History of an Error.” *Early American Literature* 37.2 (2002): 311–35. Print.
- Viola, Herman J. *Diplomats in Buckskins: A History of Indian Delegations in Washington City*. Bluffton: Rivolo Books, 1995. Print.
- Warrior, Robert. “Native American Scholarship and the Transnational Turn.” *Cultural Studies Review* 15.2 (2009): 119–30. Print.
- . *The People and the Word: Reading Native Nonfiction*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2005. Print.
- Weaver, Jace. *The Red Atlantic: American Indigenes and the Making of the Modern World, 1000–1927*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2014. Print.
- Welburn, Ron. *Hartford's Ann Plato and the Native Borders of Identity*. Albany: State U of New York P, 2015. Print.
- Wolfe, Eric. “Mourning, Melancholia, and Rhetorical Sovereignty in William

- Apess's *Eulogy on King Philip*." *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 20.4 (2008): 1–23. Print.
- Womack, Craig S., Daniel Heath Justice, and Christopher B. Teuton, eds. *Reasoning Together: The Native Critics Collective*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 2008. Print.
- Wright, Tom F., ed. *The Cosmopolitan Lyceum: Lecture Culture and the Globe in Nineteenth-Century America*. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 2013. Print.
- . Introduction. Wright 1–22. Print.
- Zuck, Rochelle Rainieri. "William Apess, the 'Lost Tribes,' and Indigenous Survivance." *Studies in American Indian Literature* 25.1 (2013): 1–26. Print.

BOOK REVIEWS

Joy Harjo. *Conflict Resolution for Holy Beings: Poems*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2015. ISBN: 978-0-3932-4850-0.

Franklin K. R. Cline

Joy Harjo's newest collection of poems, *Conflict Resolution for Holy Beings*, is divine, ecstatic, heartbreaking, heartfelt, dangerous, loving, musical, playful, serious. This book does so much to the heart and mind that it's exhausting—in a good way, like exercise. It's the kind of book that takes weeks to read because each poem stands so strongly—you have to put the book down and drink a cup of tea and stare out of the window and wonder how you have lived so long and still don't have a brain that works like Harjo's, but where you might feel jealousy there's instead just a weird, intense rhapsody.

I do not think I am given to hyperbole, and it feels strange to reread my own words. But it's true, *Conflict Resolutions for Holy Beings* is a damn good book, and an important one. A few lines from "Talking with the Sun" may elucidate my excitement: "After dancing all night in a circle we realize that we are/a part of a larger sense of stars and planets dancing with us overhead./When the sun rises at the apex of the ceremony, we are renewed." The poem continues, "There is no mistaking this connection,/though Walmart might be just down the road." And Harjo concludes the stanza with "Humans are vulnerable and rely on the kindnesses of the earth and the sun;/we exist together in a sacred field of meaning." These lines, which comprise the second stanza of the poem, do so much in such a small area.

Harjo balances anger and playfulness, reverence and disgust: tricky tightropes to walk. In this stanza, as with much of the book, humans

come together to realize that their connection is not just to one another but also to the earth, and even though we (the humans, especially those of us in overly consumptive countries) now tend to rely on gross and harmful methods of survival (that's the Walmart part), there is still time, we might hope, to break free of the ways in which we mistreat each other and the earth itself. Later in the poem, Harjo notes: "The quantum physicists have it right; they are beginning to think like Indians."

It's a testament to Harjo's poise and her belief in a bond across all earthly things that these poems do not become didactic, petulant, or indignant. Of course Harjo is worried about global warming, but she is not Al Gore. Her concern manifests itself in song, not lecture. One other thread this book follows is that of the American genres of jazz, the freewheeling form that prizes unpredictability and quick thinking, and blues, the tightly constructed form that prizes earnestness and from-the-gut emotion. Harjo may think of humans and their connection to this earth as a kind of jazz, an ever-shifting dialogue, or, as she puts it in "We Were There When Jazz Was Invented," a "holy mess," but many of these poems are touched through with the unmistakable pang and rhythm of the blues: "What shall I do with all this heartache?" she asks in "Speaking Tree." Music is holy and again is a bond across humans and nature; this book works in the vein of that holiness.

I see more blues than jazz (not to create a false dichotomy) in lines such as "I am singing a song that can only be born after losing a country," which occurs in one of the many interludes this book offers.

Conflict is oddly but engagingly structured, alternating between a poem and a short, italicized paragraph that reads similar to a journal entry (given its focus on the I). It takes a bit of getting used to, but the book does eventually create a rhythm—ah, more music—that begins to make itself clear on the second, third, fourth read. The alternations are steps, and this book marches toward its titular resolution. It ends not with the title poem (a heady mix of land contract language, shoutouts to fellow Native poets, broken narratives, and that unique Native feeling of home-not-home displacement and ghostliness) but instead with "Sunrise," of course, newness, beginnings where there should be endings: "We move with the lightness of being, and we will go / where there's a place for us." We haven't arrived, but we are moving, using music and our deep connection to each other and the earth to get there. And it is that very hope and harmony—yes, more music—that propels Har-

jo's book into a vital, beautiful collection that earns a place on every bookshelf.

FRANKLIN K. R. CLINE's poems have been featured in *Banango Street*, *Cleaver*, *Matter*, *Word Riot*, and elsewhere. He is an enrolled member of the Cherokee Nation, a PhD candidate in English and creative writing at the University of Milwaukee–Wisconsin, a member of Woodland Pattern's board of directors, and the nonfiction editor of *cream city review*. He lives in Milwaukee with three cats and his wife, Rachel Kincaid.

Deborah L. Madsen, ed. *The Routledge Companion to Native American Literature*. London: Routledge, 2016. ISBN: 978-1-1380-2060-3. 524 pp.

Lydia R. Cooper, *Creighton University*

Deborah Madsen's masterful introduction to *The Routledge Companion to Native American Literature* sets the tone for this volume, which is nothing short of a requirement for any bookshelf—undergraduate, graduate, or professional—demonstrating an interest in literatures by the first peoples of the Americas. In order to set up the volume, which seeks to provide historical, political, cultural, religious, anthropological, and ethnographic context for the study of Native American literature, Madsen teases out and troubles each of those three terms: "Native," "American," and "literature." After providing a complex tapestry of definitions for each term, Madsen concludes by drawing attention to the single continuity that can be asserted about "Native America"—that the various distinct nations express through their literatures "an assertion of sovereignty the performance of which takes a variety of expressive or literary forms" (9).

The rest of the volume is divided into five sections, "Identities," "Key Moments," "Sovereignities," "Traditions," and "Literary Forms." The first chapter in the first section, Earl E. Fitz's "Indigenous American Literature: The Inter-American Hemispheric Perspective," takes a historical approach to contextualizing the question of "Native," "American," "literature" raised by Madsen. Fitz's chapter, while not clearly fitting the generic heading of "Identities," instead offers one of the most concise yet illuminating histories of literatures, from the Mayan *Rabinal Achi* and *Popol Vuh* to Leslie Marmon Silko's *Ceremony*.

The rest of the first section comprises a series of chapters that focus on peripheral identities in the field of Native American studies—from Alaskan Native (Susan Kollin) to Pacific Islander (Brandi Nālani McDougall), from urban Native experience (Carol Miller) to Two-Spirit writers (Cox). Of these, Chris Lalonde’s chapter on “mixedblood identities” is a very fine piece in itself, but a piece whose brevity is regrettable, as Lalonde’s chapter is the only one in this hefty volume to directly address questions of mixed-race status and the turbulent history of “blood quantum” laws in Native communities. The rest of the chapters are quite strong, however, with Kollin’s and McDougall’s chapters both providing welcome detail in their identification of major, though critically understudied, contemporary Alaskan and Hawaiian and other “protectorate” Pacific Island writers. Cox’s analysis of the history of Two-Spirit identity and the expression of queerness and queer identities in Native literatures elucidates the wealth of study that has been done and the incredible range of study yet to be done on this topic. Her work provides a concise picture, appropriate to a companion volume, that is more amply fleshed out in Mark Rifkin’s *The Erotics of Sovereignty: Queer Native Writing in the Era of Self-Determination and When Did Indians Become Straight? Kinship, the History of Sexuality, and Native Sovereignty*. (It should be noted that Rifkin’s own chapter in this volume deals exclusively with constructions of legal sovereignty during the turbulent removal periods of the nineteenth century, the 1820s and 1830s and the 1880s through the 1930s.)

The primary strength of the second section is its wealth of offerings that provide historical and legal approaches to Native sovereignty claims and to the complex relationships with constructions of identity and community in Native literatures. Oliver Scheiding’s “Native Letters and North-American Indian Wars,” for instance, connects specific texts by Native American writers to different approaches to legal sovereignty and to the relationship of the individual to complex national structures and interrelationships. By contrast, Amelia V. Katanski’s “Embodied Jurisgenesis” takes the specific approach of focusing on NAGPRA and its rhetorical construction of a sometimes literally embodied discourse on sovereignty, human rights, and the role of repatriation in recognizing the fluid boundaries of individual and communal identities. Katanski’s chapter is particularly welcome, as it connects the significant and controversial act to the “reading” of Indigenous bodies as texts.

The third section picks up on Katanski's connection of NAGPRA and literary texts dealing with "artifact" repatriation with the nonimperial and non-Western definitions of sovereignty needed for Native American studies. In this section, authors cover specific issues such as environmental sovereignty (Lee Schweninger), nonhuman animal rights (Hudson), food sovereignty (Janet Fiskio), the Ghost Dance (Susannah Hopson), and health (Hsinya Huang). Readers are also offered historical context on literary sovereignty (Tammy Wahpeconiah), activism (Bruce E. Johansen), and a succinct overview of literary theory (Kirby Brown). In fact, Brown's chapter, which provides historical context and a meticulous literature review of major players in the field of American Indian literary nationalism (AILN), is likely to prove the most useful—or at least the most used—entry in the Native American literature classroom.

In "Traditions," the fourth section, the offerings deal with various approaches to different aspects of Native American traditions, from early English language writings by Native authors in the colonial era (Kathryn N. Gray) to the hermeneutics of ceremony (Diveena S. Marcus). An emerging theme in this section is the recovery of colonially denied intellectual, spiritual, and cultural complexities. Birgit Brander Rasmussen's short yet provocative chapter, "Indigenous Literacy and Language," offers a brief glimpse into the wealth of early literacy systems, arguing that "pictographic scripts fit multi-lingual environments like the Americans" better than syllabary or alphabetic systems (300) and that, read in the context of complex linguistic systems, we find evidence of "polysynthetic languages with a high degree of metaphoric speech" expressing itself in complex ways that describe perceptions and practices of the varied people groups coming into contact in the bioregions of the Americas (302). Similarly, Cari M. Carpenter, in her chapter on mound builders, connects the complex mound systems in current-day Ohio to the critically understudied intellectual traditions of Native peoples, specifically the works of William Apess and Sarah Winnemucca Hopkins. Carpenter's chapter, like Rasmussen's, is suggestive more than comprehensive, but the possibilities they raise are sure to incite further study.

The final section, "Literary Forms," contends with transnational narratives, assimilation and reverse assimilation, and the ways in which Native American texts are transforming present and future literature. The final section also includes chapters that look at texts in various media, such as film (Theodore Van Alst, Jr.) and graphic novels (Susan

Bernardin). Perhaps the best offering on transnational influences is Iping Liang's "Crossing the Bering Strait," in which Liang challenges the "cosmopolitanism" Elvira Pulitano pushes for in her comparison of Native American and European literary traditions; Liang suggests that in fact Native American literature has cross-pollinated before and continues to do so—although it has most notably traveled west and not east. Using such case studies as Gerald Vizenor (Ojibwe), whose army tour in Japan bore fruit in his adaptation of haiku poetry, and Walis Norgan, from the Atayal in Taiwan, who writes comparative meditations on Native American experiences of colonization and that of Taiwan, Liang offers a compelling argument that Native American and Indigenous Asian communities demonstrate a rich tradition of transnational influence.

While regrettably few of the younger generation of leading tribally enrolled scholars, such as Mishuana Goeman (who is cited in a few chapters), are represented in the author list for this volume, *The Routledge Companion* does draw from various well-established voices and new voices in the field. Overall, *The Routledge Companion to Native American Literature* offers precisely what it claims to offer—a rich compendium of contextual and theoretical approaches to Native American literature that will make the book as close to indispensable for scholars and teachers of Native American literature as anything short of the primary works can be.

LYDIA R. COOPER is associate professor of twentieth- and twenty-first-century American and Native American literature at Creighton University. Her most recent book is *Masculinities in Literature of the American West*, part of the Global Masculinities series by Palgrave Macmillan (2016). Her other work on contemporary American and Native American writers has appeared in journals such as *Studies in the Novel*, *Studies in American Indian Literatures*, *Western American Literature*, *Studies in American Fiction*, and *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and the Environment*.

Sarah Deer. *The Beginning and End of Rape: Confronting Sexual Violence in Native America*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2015. ISBN: 9780816696338. 232 pp.

Matthew L. M. Fletcher, *Michigan State University College of Law*

Sarah Deer's *The Beginning and End of Rape* is a once-in-a-generation opus of powerful advocacy and precise scholarship. It is Deer's work, much of it collected here, that formed the justification for the tribal jurisdictional provisions of the 2013 Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act and earned her a MacArthur Fellowship in 2014.

American Indian women (and their children) have been the target of historical American forces designed to wear down Indian resistance, break up Indian landholdings, and break down Indian cultures. Deer's chapter on an 1825 Mvskoke law that allowed women to set the penalty for an act of sexual violence (perhaps one of the finest pieces of scholarship on tribal law ever written) establishes that Indian women played a critical role in tribal societies. But Indian women and their children suffered the worst in the Indian wars, as Indian foes burned villages and crops and used Indian families as hostages. Indian women often managed the property and family obligations of Indian nations, and they lost far more influence than Indian men when Indian people lost much of their lands and Indian tribes began to emulate non-Indian governments. One Indian boarding school administrator stated the malevolent brilliance of the federal focus on Indian women when he stated, "If we get the girls, we get the race."

The modern legacy of that focus on Indian women is apparent in the terrible reality of sexual violence against Indian women, including domestic violence, rape, and human trafficking. Deer links this violence to massive failures on every level and jurisdiction in the Indian Country criminal justice system. Tribal governments have no meaningful capacity to prosecute sexual violence crimes. The federal and state governments' responses are similarly limited. The United States was never intended to be the first responder to local crimes like sexual abuse. Moreover, the often extremely complex Indian Country jurisdictional questions that must be answered before the federal government can indict a perpetrator may stall or even preclude an indictment or a conviction. States may only prosecute Indian Country crime with the authorization of the federal government, and even when authorized,

states are limited by resources and political constraints. In short, no level of government is effective at enforcing the law in Indian Country. Deer persuasively argues that this is all the fault of the United States, which through its stunted and vicious history of Indian law and policy created this situation.

Indian victims, like non-Indian women, are not supported by tribal, federal, or state criminal justice systems. They are subjected to shame. They are ostracized. They are disbelieved. Their perpetrators retain power over them in the American system.

In 2013 Congress reauthorized the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). One of the more controversial provisions was the recognition of tribal criminal jurisdiction authority over non-Indians who commit acts of domestic violence against Indian women in Indian Country. Conservative lawmakers assailed the statute and the tribal courts that might soon begin to prosecute non-Indians for the first time since 1978, when the Supreme Court held that Indian tribes did not have criminal jurisdiction over non-Indians absent congressional authorization. Deer's scholarly and advocacy work, much of it represented in *The Beginning and End of Rape*, significantly influenced the enactment of the statute.

However, as Deer laments, a federal solution to a tribal problem has too many weaknesses. The 2013 act placed significant limits on tribal authority to prosecute non-Indians and virtually eliminated a culturally appropriate tribal response to sexual violence. For example, the requirement that tribal courts guarantee procedural protections to criminal defendants at least as stringent as those required under federal law is laudable. But they are expensive and, ironically, are not required in criminal cases against Indian defendants. Those tribes that do not have the capacity to prosecute crime in a meaningful way on their reservations are not empowered by the federal law to do so now. In fact, only a small number of tribes have pursued criminal cases against non-Indians since 2013. In short, as Deer shows, the tribes with the most need—rural, poor, isolated communities—likely will benefit the least from VAWA.

Deer contributes a theory—the Indigenous jurisprudence of rape—that offers some hope. Traditional tribal criminal justice offers a respectful and meaningful path toward reconciliation and regeneration. *The Beginning and End of Rape* concludes with twelve important questions that Indian nations must ask and answer about sexual violence. These questions place the onus on Indian people and tribal govern-

ments rather than a reliance upon outside governments to solve tribal problems. The mere fact of these enumerated questions may be Deer's greatest contribution. Indian people must start talking now.

MATTHEW L. M. FLETCHER is a professor of law at Michigan State University College of Law and director of the Indigenous Law and Policy Center. He is a member of the Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians and an appellate judge for several tribes. He recently published *Federal Indian Law*, a hornbook, and is the primary editor and author of the leading law blog on American Indian law and policy, Turtle Talk, <http://turtletalk.wordpress.com/>. Professor Fletcher graduated from the University of Michigan Law School in 1997 and the University of Michigan in 1994.

Richard Van Camp. *Night Moves*. Winnipeg: Enfield & Wizenty, 2015. ISBN: 978-1-972855-23-2. 197 pp.

John D. Kalb, *Salisbury University*

Richard Van Camp, Dogrib (Tlicho) Dene author, writes in a variety of genres. His collaborative works (with a number of visual artists) include comic books, graphic novels, children's books, and baby books. His prior solo works, and what one might argue are his more adult enterprises, include his first novel, *The Lesser Blessed* (1996), for which he is probably most well known, as well as three short story collections. With *Night Moves*, Van Camp brings that number to four.

Ronny, the narrator of the opening short story, "bornagirl," remarks on the denizens of Fort Smith in the Northwest Territories, the "Métis capital of the north," "They say Fort Smith is home to the rough and ruthless and the tough and toothless" (11). Readers of Van Camp's previous works will likely recall the roughness and toughness of his usually teenage and young adult characters, depicted in the rather hard shell exteriors they put on to mask their insecurities, weaknesses, frailties, and even human decencies. To term it macho posturing would be inaccurate, as often female characters succumb to such poses. Perhaps it's merely adolescent angst, unmercifully turned up a few degrees (ironically) in the frigid Northwest. Of course, beyond the harsh, yet often beautiful, landscape are the harsh realities that filter into a number of Van Camp's adult works: violence, sexual abuse, and self-hatred.

In “bornagirl,” a tough opening to this collection, the narrating Ronny confesses his role in the physical abuse of a transgender Brian; in “Blood Rides the Wind,” Bear (another first-person narrator) returns to Fort Simmer a week early ostensibly for his final year of school, but he is actually seeking revenge for the sexual molestation of his cousin Wendy; and in “Because of What I Did,” Flinch (aka Radar) is the threatening bear of a man (sometimes called “The Finisher”) who is troubled by his own capacity for violence. Yet each of these stories holds some redemption for the narrating protagonist, as Ronny faces his own misunderstandings about his own sexual longings, Bear finds a way to avoid being the Dogrib “ninja” he reluctantly set out to be, and Flinch helps rescue a girl from Lester who used “black medicine” to bewitch her into replacing his deceased wife.

Most, but not all, of the eleven stories have first-person narrators, but not all of them exclusively feature teenage characters. One of the strangest, more mysterious stories, “Skull.Full.Of.Rust,” is the lone second-person narrative. It involves a young man who, due to his special talent or gift, becomes, unbeknownst to “you,” one of the “Sniffers” (120) for the CIA. Telling “you” this information after many years have passed and “you” have potentially traveled through uncouned loops within loops brings into question who the “you” really is or becomes, except an artist who once “asked” “you” “Why do you place such haunting red hand prints throughout all of your paintings?” (123). Mystery abounds in “I Double Dogrib Dare You,” in which Valentina is a “witch” (or is she a “Holy Woman”?) (44) who returns to Fort Simmer for her twentieth anniversary high school reunion but hasn’t aged a day since (or since a photo was taken of her in 1921). Despite the ambiguity of these two stories, they are unsettling, yet oddly satisfying.

As is the case with most short story collections, *Night Moves* is a somewhat mixed bag. Crow is a sort of medicine woman in the previously mentioned “Because of What I Did” who is tasked with, among other things, bringing the young woman Lester has abducted back into reality. But for some reason, Van Camp follows that with a “story” entitled “Crow” that offers one and a half pages of first-person Crow observations. It serves to a certain extent as a coda to the preceding story, but there is not really enough there to term it a separately titled story. “Crow” seems a tossed-off fragment. The story that follows is “If Only Tonight,” which the blurb on the back of the book suggests is “sensual,”

but it strikes this reader as cloyingly annoying. This isn't an objection to the sex talk and sexual innuendo and teasing with this threesome, a couple and a friend whose husband recently left her just as she is about to have a double mastectomy for breast cancer. Van Camp has over-written it. A reader should not be able to see the marionette strings on the fictional characters as they engage in their sport and play. Unfortunately, in this one story, Van Camp's puppeteering seems quite obvious.

For readers who are familiar with Van Camp's other adult fare, there are returning characters. Bear from "Because of What I Did" previously appeared in stories from *The Moon of Letting Go* and *Godless but Loyal to Heaven*. Grant, who narrates "I Double Dogrib Dare You," may be familiar as one of the streakers in *The Moon of Letting Go* (and his fellow streakers, Clarence and Brutus, are mentioned elsewhere in this collection). Sfen and Torchy, whom readers may recall from other Van Camp stories, play an important back-story role in "Blood Rides the Wind" and are featured prominently in "Because of What I Did," where we find out what has happened to the item Bear is told they stole in the previous story. Fans of *The Lesser Blessed* may take some pleasure in "Where are you tonight?," a story that brings together Juliet Hope, Junior, Kevin, Johnny, Darcy (and Jazz), and Larry Sole. Actually, it consists of a series of individual third-person limited omniscient narratives, providing an interesting look at each one's separate night longing, their night moods rather than moves. Only in a character's thinking of another character is there any real linkage among the characters. Van Camp dedicates "Where are you tonight?" as a thank you to "everyone who had anything to do with the making of *The Lesser Blessed*, the movie" (195).

The interlinking of texts within the collection is intriguing. Sfen and Torchy are mentioned in three of them, for instance. Yet since story lines and characters in *Night Moves* interlink with Van Camp's other books, which readers may or may not have read previously or which they may simply not fully remember, I wonder if these linkages put certain readers at a disadvantage. Perhaps these links are only there to satisfy those of us who are diehard Van Camp fans.

I fear I may have made these stories sound bleak and drab. Actually, they abound with a certain amount of hopefulness and forward thinking, even when the toughness and roughness are among the first things a reader encounters. On a few occasions, the issue of the community's restoration is mentioned. One example is when the narrator

of “The Strongest Blood” observes that “ever since Fort Simmer hosted a sun dance four years in a row, Dene culture had come back with a force: there were now tea dances, drum dances, Hand games, singing groups and storytelling nights at the museum that all packed in the people” (36). In *Night Moves*, Richard Van Camp continues to bring forth a number of brief meditations, many of them quite successful, on healing and recovery from all the scarring and damage already done.

JOHN D. KALB is an associate professor in the English Department at Salisbury University in Salisbury, Maryland, where he teaches Native American, ethnic American, and contemporary American literatures.

Kurt Schweigman and Lucille Lang Day, eds. *Red Indian Road West: Native American Poetry from California*. Oakland: Scarlet Tanager Books, 2016. ISBN: 978-0-9768676-5-4. 110 pp.

Patricia Killelea, *Northern Michigan University*

According to diverse oral histories, California has been home to indigenous peoples since time immemorial, and today there are 109 federally recognized tribes in the state alongside 78 tribes that have petitioned for federal recognition (Judicial Council of California). Because these lands are so rich in natural resources, the state has also been a space of material and cultural transnational exchange for just as long. It is in the spirit of such exchange that *Red Indian Road West: Native American Poetry from California*, a new anthology from Scarlet Tanager Books, enters the growing body of work dedicated to California Indian studies, which privileges Native peoples’ perspectives. Familiar names such as Wendy Rose, Deborah A. Miranda, and Natalie Diaz appear alongside writers deserving more attention, including an emerging generation of young California Native poets whose voices speak to the state’s rapidly changing climates, both environmental and political.

Expanding on the regional lens offered in previous anthologies, such as *The Dirt Is Red Here: Art and Poetry from Native California* (Heyday, 2002), the editors of *Red Indian Road West*, Kurt Schweigman (Lakota) and Lucille Lang Day, frame this collection by asking critical questions: “How do the cities, ecosystems, and people shape our lives? How do we in turn affect the physical and cultural landscapes of California?” (10),

and in this way these poems will be of interest not just to writers and scholars of poetry and Native American literature in general but also to readers invested in ongoing dialogues in cultural geography, land ethics, gender, and indigenous language studies, just to name a few. Beyond these questions, the thirty-three distinct poetic voices in conversation in the anthology are contextualized within the U.S. government's Termination and Relocation policies of the 1950s, which have resulted in California's "largest" and "most diverse" Native American population compared to any other U.S. state (9). The collection also speaks to the continued disruption of cultures, languages, laws, and bodies stemming from the genocidal Catholic mission system, the impacts of environmental injustices against the Salmon Nation and other animal peoples, as well as the effects of irresponsible science and dams, threats to sacred sites, and other crucial issues affecting Native California.

Despite these crucial issues facing Native American communities in the state, the editors are careful not to couch these poems in a discourse of tragedy, acknowledging how each writer "not only tells about the struggles but also celebrates humor, music, dance, art, family, life itself" (9). In his introduction to the book, artist James Luna (Payóm-kawichum) acknowledges the importance of acknowledging the complex circumstances informing these poets' perspectives. While Luna overtly politicizes the work in these pages by pointing to "dysfunction" and "trauma," as well as to lessons learned from the "shared experience of poverty" (12), he likewise emphasizes shared experiences of survival and growth, humor, and the teachings of the land itself. Luna names the collection "a songbook of sorts" (12), and as familiar and emerging voices from Native California interlace with those from many other tribal nations, the end result is akin to a tightly woven basket: aesthetically engaging, yes, but, more importantly, *useful*, a living dialogue between people and land that tells a story greater than the sum of its parts for those who come to the pages with a careful and respectful ear.

Red Indian Road West's first poem serves as a prelude. "Ishi's Hiding Place" opens the collection with the question of naming, as Schweigman refrains, "What was your name Ishi?" The rest of the anthology seems to look back at this concern with naming and also to the ways in which indigenous peoples have been dehumanized, objectified, and criminalized within settler colonialism. In the case of California, it's important (and painful) to remember that as bounties were placed on Native peo-

ples' heads in the mid-1800s by the government in a program of state-sanctioned genocide (Heizer), California Native peoples were further violated at the hands of many insensitive anthropologists, whose narratives continue to hold more sway in the California public school system instead of Native peoples' own voices. Ishi's experience frames others' hereafter in these lands, as the poet explains that "after your final breath / no Indian could ever go back" (14). This is just one reason why *Red Indian Road West* would be an ideal book to teach in California public schools by educators committed to teaching the honest and personal histories and experiences of Native peoples in this state. "Ishi's Hiding Place" is an even more fitting prelude to the collection, however, not just because of its acknowledgment of brutal truths but because of Schweigman's rehumanizing of Ishi's person through direct address and his understanding of Ishi's untold real name as an ultimate "hiding place" (14), something that remained his own even as his body was taken from him. Likewise, the other poets in this collection find solace in language and song, and it is through this path of truth speaking and naming that these writers carve paths to understanding and knowledge for themselves and their communities.

On the subject of paths and navigation, readers of *Red Indian Road West* will be reminded of the continued salience of Janice Gould's (Koyoon'auwi) theory of "poems as maps," as outlined in her essay "Poems as Maps in American Indian Women's Writing." Cartographic images thread the anthology, with nods to map-making poetics in pieces by Jennifer Elise Foerster (Muscogee), Deborah A. Miranda (Ohlone-Costanoan Esselen / Chumash), and Carolyn Dunn (Muscogee/Seminole), among others. The collection also introduces new, refreshing takes on poems as navigational tools through images of basket weaving, rivers, and freeways. While not all of the writers employing map-making and path-making imagery in the collection are California Indian or women, readers of *Red Indian Road West* can benefit by turning to the literary criticism produced by California Native literary theorists, including Gould.

Though the collection nods to righteous anger and the ways in which the wounds from colonial violence, relocation, and assimilation policies are still not totally healed—especially as the settler colonial state inflicts new wounds all the time—the poems overwhelmingly tend toward hope and continuance. References to the Alcatraz occupation in several of the poems remind readers that California was/is an important hub of Native

American activism whose ripples reach beyond the state, and as Linda Noel (Koyoonk'auwi) writes in "Winter Within," "No thousand winters of ice / Could extinguish the flaming / Heart of / My people" (70). At the core of this collection, then, is a fierce love. That love includes romantic and erotic love, and several of the poems will make some readers swoon; given the context of ongoing violence targeting Native peoples' bodies, these loving and pleasure-affirming pieces should not be overlooked: see especially John Hershman's (Diné) "Given a Choice" (56), Sharmagne Leland-St. John's (San Poil) "Long Dusty Memories" (53), and Sylvia Ross's (Chukchansi) "Haswana Wotiye" (84). Other "love poems" in *Red Indian Road West* importantly move beyond romantic relationships by celebrating the loving ties between family members, as well as between the People, the land, and networks of spirit. One poem in particular, "The Wildflower of Vunxarak" by Shaunna Oteka McCovey (Yurok/Karuk), speaks to this complex nexus of kinship and love as it relates specifically to California Native women. McCovey asks of a wildflower to "Sing a blessed flower dance song" for "the girl who is arriving," a reference to the Flower Dance, a coming-of-age ceremony for young women (28). In Cutcha Risling-Baldy's (Hupa/Yurok/Karuk) forthcoming book, *no:òlchwin-ding, no:òlchwin-te (To Grow Old in a Good Way): The Revitalization of Women's Coming of Age Ceremonies as Decolonizing Praxis*, the author demonstrates how genocide in California "included systematic attacks on Native women and their coming of age ceremonies" but that "the resurgence of the Flower Dance is a tangible, physical, spiritual and communal act of decolonization" (in advanced contract with the University of Washington Press, 2017). McCovey's poem in *Red Indian Road West*, then, speaks to that "resurgence," with its final lines emphasizing the ways in which the land "reminds us to live and love / always in balance" (28).

This collection takes its place alongside other recent anthologies of Native American poetry like *SING: Poetry from the Indigenous Americas* as it features contemporary works ranging from the narrative and lyrical to the experimental, but also because it includes new voices anthologized for the first time. One such voice is Sal Martinez (Pomo), who during a conversation on March 30, 2016, offered critical insight into the relevance and necessity of this collection:

So many times I see CA NDNS adopt history (i.e. Wounded Knee Massacre, Little Big Horn) and culture (headdresses, warriors)

“that we do not have basket designs for,” associating themselves with the generality of the Columbus term “Indian” and the white sociologist term “Native American” with the “pop cultures” that follow, not quite reflecting the way how Indians survived California colonialism . . . we need more books like *RIRW* so we can keep ourselves informed of what each of us go through or even what we have discovered about ourselves and want to preserve, in itself maintaining a context about Indians that has been there since the time Coyote made people out of willow sticks and feathers.

Martinez not only argues for the importance of regional lenses and acknowledging cultural specificity but also situates this gathering of words in *Red Indian Road West* within a long-standing tradition of California Native literatures that continues to the present day. His words point simultaneously to the past, present, and future of California Native literatures, which have always been in dialogue with ancestral and emerging indigenous voices both within and beyond the lands now called California.

PATRICIA KILLELEA is a mixed-heritage Xicana poet, musician, and scholar. She is the author of the poetry collection *Other Suns* (Swan Scythe Press, 2011), and her second poetry collection, entitled *Counter glow*, is forthcoming from MANGO Publications (February 2017). Patricia earned her Ph.D. in Native American studies at the University of California, Davis, and she holds a master's degree in creative writing and English, also from UC Davis. She is currently an assistant professor of English at Northern Michigan University.

WORKS CITED

- Dubin, Margaret D., ed. *The Dirt Is Red Here: Art and Poetry from Native California*. Berkeley: Heyday Books, 2002. Print.
- Judicial Council of California. “California Tribal Communities.” 2016. <http://www.courts.ca.gov/3066.htm>. Web.
- Gould, Janice. “Poems as Maps in American Indian Women’s Writing.” *Speak to Me Words: Essays on Contemporary Indian Poetry*. Ed. Dean Rader and Janice Gould. Tucson: U of Arizona P. 2003. Print.
- Hedge-Coke, Allison Adele, ed. *SING: Poetry from the Indigenous Americas*. Tucson: U of Arizona P. 2011. Print.
- Heizer, Robert F. “Indenture, Kidnapping, and Sale of Indians.” *The Destruction of California Indians*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1974. Print.

Daniel H. Wilson. *Quarantine Zone*. Burbank, CA: DC Comics, 2016.
ISBN: 978-1-4012-5227-4. 160 pp.

Jace Weaver, *University of Georgia*

Cherokee writer Daniel Wilson has written fiction set in the Osage Nation (*Robopocalypse* and its sequel, *Robogenesis*) and in the Cherokee Nation (*Amped*) and at sundry other points around the globe. In some, Native characters are central. In others, they are totally absent. His latest graphic novel, *Quarantine Zone*, falls into the last category. It has no identifiable Native American characters, and it is set far from Indian Country, in and around Washington, DC. Yet even in Wilson's work without identifiable Indian characters, Native issues and an indigenous sensibility are still very much in evidence.

All of Wilson's long fiction deals with profound ideas, drawing upon his study of robotics (He has a PhD from Carnegie Mellon). Among the issues with which he repeatedly grapples the most frequent revolve around the ethics and ethical implications of scientific technological advances and the fundamental question of what it means to be human.

In his best-selling novels *Robopocalypse* and its sequel, *Robogenesis*, Wilson envisions world-changing events. In the not-too-distant future, artificial intelligence has been perfected and the singularity achieved. Technology revolts against its human masters, controlled by a powerful, artificial-intelligence computer known as Archos and determined to exterminate human beings. Achieving rapid and early success, the machines almost succeed, but a tattered humanity (centered in Osage County) manages to rally and fight back. *Amped* is Wilson's anti-"Harrison Bergeron" (Vonnegut is a clear influence). About a decade from now, science has perfected technology that enables all disabilities to be corrected. This creates a protofascist backlash, which claims that the differently abled have been given unfair advantages over "normal" humans.

Quarantine Zone opens forty years after science has discovered the cause of evil is a virus known as Malnoro. Those who are uninfected are incapable of committing intentionally evil acts. In most people, the virus is easily cured. For a small percentage of the infected population, however, Malnoro is incurable. Those with the disease are still capable of choosing to do good, but there is no guarantee.

In what comes to be known as "the Purge," the incurable are rounded up and imprisoned behind a high wall in the zone of the title. Think

John Carpenter's *Escape from New York*, in which Manhattan Island is turned into a giant, lawless penal colony. But the trope also recalls the confinement of American Indians on reservations during the nineteenth century. Natives were assembled and confined to these areas to clear land for white settlement and to protect those settlers from Indian attack. Yet it was also seen paternalistically as a way to protect the indigenes from depredations by whites.

In the novel, following the Purge, the cured world (now devoid of Malnoro) continues on. It is crime-free, if somewhat banal and sterile. As in *Amped*, however, a kind of paranoid oppression rears its head, fearing another outbreak. As the promotional materials for the novel states, *Quarantine Zone* "raises hard questions about free will and the nature of good and evil. If we could 'cure' ourselves of the capability to do evil—should we? And could a person truly be good without the choice to do evil?"

Containment of the incurables is maintained by a force known as Quarantine Zone Enforcement, just as the U.S. Army prevented outbreaks of "Hostiles" from reservations (terminology echoed in the novel). Most of this is simple perimeter policing. Occasionally, however, a spy from the QZ escapes and attempts to mix with the general population. When detected, they flee back across the wall. When that happens, a QZE squad must be inserted inside the zone to capture or kill the runner. The leader of one such multiethnic unit is Captain Matthew Huxley. Unbeknownst to his fellow soldiers, Matt contracted Malnoro as a child, but, sheltered by his parents, he makes the choice to do good and hides his infection.

To say much more would be to spoil a pulse-pounding, nonstop actioner. Wilson's work always has a cinematic quality. (His e-novella *The Nostalgist* has been made into a short film, and *Robopocalypse* is in development by Stephen Spielberg.) The impression is reinforced in this instance by the excellent artwork of Fernando Pasarin, the artist behind *Batman Eternal*. In the sure hands of Wilson and Pasarin, *Quarantine Zone* looks and reads like the storyboard for a film.

Wilson's publishers prefer to call his works "techno-thrillers." What they really are is science fiction, but science fiction has, in some circles, taken on the pejorative air of pulp (hence the "techno-thriller" appellation). Daniel Wilson writes "hard" or "literary" science fiction. He is just

beginning to gain the critical attention he merits (his first novel, *Robopocalypse*, was published just in 2011). And he deserves to be read and better studied in the context of Native literature.

JACE WEAVER is director of the INAS, Franklin Professor of Native American Studies and Religion, and adjunct professor of law at the University of Georgia. As director, he serves as advisor for all students in the undergraduate and graduate Native American Studies Programs. He holds two doctorates, a J.D. from Columbia Law School of Columbia University and a Ph.D. from Union Theological Seminary in New York.