

WRITING THE LIFE OF THE SELF:
CONSTRUCTIONS OF IDENTITY IN AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL DISCOURSE BY SIX
EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY AMERICAN INDIANS

A Dissertation

by

DAVID PRUETT

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

May 2004

Major Subject: English

WRITING THE LIFE OF THE SELF:
CONSTRUCTIONS OF IDENTITY IN AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL DISCOURSE BY SIX
EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY AMERICAN INDIANS

A Dissertation

by

DAVID PRUETT

Submitted to Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved as to style and content by:

M. Jimmie Killingsworth
(Chair of Committee)

C. Jan Swearingen
(Member)

Lawrence J. Oliver
(Member)

James Arnt Aune
(Member)

J. Lawrence Mitchell
(Head of Department)

May 2004

Major Subject: English

ABSTRACT

Writing the Life of the Self: Constructions of Identity in Autobiographical Discourse by Six
Eighteenth-Century American Indians. (May 2004)

David Pruett, B.A., University of Kansas; M.A., Texas A&M University

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. M. Jimmie Killingsworth

The invasion of the Western Hemisphere by empire-building Europeans brought European forms of rhetoric to the Americas. American Indians who were exposed to European-style education gradually adopted some of the cultural ways of the invaders, including rhetorical forms and operations that led, via literacy in European languages, to autobiographical writing, historical consciousness, and literary self-representation. This dissertation uses rhetorical criticism to analyze autobiographical discourse of six eighteenth-century American Indian writers: Samuel Ashpo, Hezekiah Calvin, David Fowler, Joseph Johnson, Samson Occom, and Tobias Shattock. Their texts are rhetorically interrelated through several circumstances: all of these men were educated in a missionary school; most of them probably learned to read and write in English at the school; they left the school and worked as teachers and Christian missionaries to Indians, sharing similar obstacles and successes in their work; and they are Others on whom their teacher, Eleazar Wheelock, inscribed European culture. The six Indian writers appropriate language and tropes of the encroaching Euro-American culture in order to define themselves in relation to that culture *and* make their voices heard. They participated in European colonial culture by responding

to, *and co-creating* rhetorical situations. While the Indians' written discourse and the situations that called forth their writing have been examined and discussed through a historical lens, critiques of early American Indian autobiography that make extensive use of rhetorical analysis are rare. Thus this dissertation offers a long-overdue treatment of rhetoric in early American Indian autobiography and opens the way to rhetorical readings of autobiography by considering the early formation of the genre in a cross-cultural context.

To my family

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am forever grateful to Kay, Michelle, and Rebekah for inspiring me and encouraging me to write this study of American Indian writing. Your questions, your suggestions, and your listening have been invaluable. My work is richer because of you.

Many thanks go to my committee. Jimmie Killingsworth encouraged and advised me, Jan Swearingen handed me countless references and suggestions, Larry Oliver gave my writing rigorous editorial scrutiny, and Jim Aune reminded me that we're agents. The weaknesses in this dissertation are solely my responsibility.

Thanks also to Barbara Johnstone, formerly of Texas A&M and currently at Carnegie-Mellon, who first encouraged my work on the discourse of American Indians and repeatedly read early drafts of papers as I explored the topic.

And thanks to Sue Geller who helped me establish a professional relationship with my work.

The dissertation support group at Texas A&M endured several versions of some of these chapters and responded with good advice and patience. Thanks Julie, Molly, Amy, Michelle, Huihui, and James.

I have received support, encouragement, and help from many who remain unnamed here not because they don't deserve recognition but because the list of people who've helped would be longer than the dissertation. Thanks to all of you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
DEDICATION.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
II AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL RESPONSES TO RHETORICAL SITUATIONS	20
III HOW THE WRITERS IDENTIFY AS AND WITH INDIANS.....	76
IV HOW THE WRITERS DISTANCE THEMSELVES FROM AN INDIAN IDENTITY	107
V CONCLUSION.....	149
WORKS CITED.....	164
VITA	172

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

With great Pleasure and satisfaction I take my Pen in Hand to try to
write You a letter [. . .].

Hezekiah Calvin to Eleazar Wheelock

11 August 1766

The invasion of the Western hemisphere by empire-building Europeans brought European forms of rhetoric to the Americas. European explorers, traders, colonists, and administrators brought poetry, religious texts, government documents, and other written artifacts with them when they crossed the Atlantic. Along with such items of literary culture, they brought their understanding of how those texts were made and their assumptions about what new examples of those genres should look like. After European forces overpowered aboriginal tribes, the defeated American Indians who were exposed to European-style education gradually adopted some of the cultural ways of the victors, including rhetorical forms and operations that led, via literacy, to autobiographical writing, historical consciousness, and literary self-representation.

This dissertation uses the documentation style of the *MLA Handbook*.

This dissertation uses methods of rhetorical criticism to analyze written autobiographical narratives produced by American Indians. In Chapter II, I use a discussion of genre to critique selected texts in terms of their autobiographicality; in Chapters III and IV, I use stylistic analysis, focusing on word choices and metaphors, to inform my discussion of six American Indian writers' identification with or distancing from Indianness.

I also use the concept of "the rhetorical situation," as laid out by Lloyd Bitzer, to critique the autobiographical narratives and the contexts in which they were written. Bitzer's theory of rhetorical situations is a useful lens through which to view autobiographical texts. According to Georges Gusdorf's autobiographical theory, writing an autobiography is typically a way for an individual to explain or justify one's life. This means that the production of an autobiography is often inherently motivated by situations that invite an individual to write a self-justifying life narrative. This theory of autobiography's motivation dovetails easily with Bitzer's theory of rhetorical situations. As Bitzer describes it, in a rhetorical situation, there are exigences that invite rhetoric, an audience to be addressed, and constraints on one's narrative. Applying Bitzer's rhetorical situation to autobiography, the exigence inviting one's life story is one's actions that need justifying; the audience is those people who require the justification; and the constraints are such things as the need to tell the truth, the need to make one's story

acceptable to the audience, and the need to fit one's story into the structure of one's chosen genre.

In applying the concept of the rhetorical situation, this dissertation offers a long-overdue treatment of rhetoric in early American Indian autobiography. Telling one's life history is always an act of rhetorical agency that responds to the demands and constraints of historical conditions that the rhetor shares with the ideal audience. Autobiography is thus recognized as a genre that makes special use of ethos, relying heavily on the author's character to appeal to an audience. The author's ethos, or character, expressed in a text, is one means of proving to readers the truth of a text by reinforcing the story's events with an authoritative and reliable narrative voice. There may be times when the narrative voice tries to persuade readers that the author has a bad character, as happens in Hezekiah Calvin's autobiography, but the writer's ethos still works to prove the text trustworthy. In the texts examined here—early autobiographical narratives of six American Indian writers—the exigences, chosen audiences, and constraints stand out in bold relief, thus offering a straightforward site for the initial exploration of the rhetorical elements of American Indian autobiography, as well as an interesting case in the genesis of what has become a favorite American genre.

Two bibliographies by H. David Brumble III cite six eighteenth-century American Indian writers who both produced autobiographical discourse and were students of Rev. Eleazar Wheelock. (A seventh writer, Hendrick Aupaumut, in 1792

wrote a text cited by Brumble, but Aupaumut had not been a student at Wheelock's school, and so is not included in this study.) The six writers cited by Brumble are Samuel Ashpo, Hezekiah Calvin, David Fowler, Joseph Johnson, Samson Occom, and Tobias Shattock. Occom was the first Indian student of Wheelock and lived in Wheelock's home. The other five attended More's Indian Charity School, headed by Wheelock. This dissertation analyzes texts written by these six writers from 1762 to 1775, a chaotic period in North American history. I focus on this group of writers because their texts are rhetorically interrelated through several circumstances: they produce texts that are related to each other in that they are all to some extent products of a missionary school context; most of the writers probably learned to read and write in English at the school; the writers left the school and worked as Christian missionaries to the Indians, sharing similar obstacles and successes in their work; the six writers come from four different tribes, and so represent different situations of aboriginal history vis-à-vis Euro-American contact; at the same time, all six are alike in being Others on whom Wheelock's school inscribed European culture.

The six writers discussed here appropriate language and tropes of the encroaching Euro-American culture in order to define themselves in relation to that culture *and* make their voices heard, allowing them to participate in the culture. Their written discourse presents a picture of a group of writers who are switching from traditional American Indian oral discursive practices to a communication

practice based on literacy and writing. Thus their texts stand as rhetorical products of traditionally educated speakers of one language communicating in a foreign language.

The texts that I have selected for study were produced by people who had been unequivocally conquered. For example, Metacom, called King Philip by the colonists, not many years earlier had rebelled against the forces of the empire and his Wampanoag tribe had been crushed. Other tribes in the southern New England region, such as Mohawks and Mohegans, actively participated with the colonial militias in hemming in Metacom, or, as did the Niantic and Narragansett, sought neutrality in Rhode Island, but in the years following the “war of extermination” (Leach 250) against the Wampanoags, all of these tribes suffered military defeat and loss of territory. The six writers are thus grasping onto the education, jobs, language, and cultural worldviews of the empire that overpowered their culture, imitating the English ways of expression. In these texts, American Indian ways of expression are almost nonexistent; the writers worked hard to adopt the colonists’ rhetorical conventions, and as a result they appear to have conquered any impulses to use traditional modes of discourse in their writing.

Several provocative questions arise as I critique a select set of writings of some eighteenth-century American Indians: What rhetorical features are common to autobiographical discourse produced by American Indians before 1800? What features are unique to particular autobiographies? How do we explain the common

and unique features? What non-Indian cultural sources influenced the writing produced by these Indians? What cultural context(s) (e.g., political, economic, military, legal, community health, and natural resources) helped to determine what they wrote, how they wrote it, and why they wrote in the forms they did? As I have pursued answers to these questions, I have come to believe that my study explains that the six American Indian writers were responding to, *and co-creating* rhetorical situations.

In this study, using methods of rhetorical criticism to interpret texts and their contexts, I rely on a set of rhetorical theories, including Kenneth Burke's neo-Aristotelian revision of classical rhetoric, and Lloyd Bitzer's invaluable essay on rhetorical situations. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson's *Metaphors We Live By* is useful in analyzing the texts' use of categories. In seeking direct and indirect causes for the Indians' texts, I base much of my interpretation on Louis Althusser's critique of the reproduction of the means of production and Burke's theory of identification. In my discussion of autobiography theory and practices, I refer to H. David Brumble III, Arnold Krupat, Georges Gusdorf, Philippe Lejeune, James Olney, Brian Swann, Karl Weintraub, and Hertha Dawn Wong. My knowledge of the historical context comes from James Axtell, Robert Berkhofer, Francis Jennings, Margaret Szasz, and other historians.

My method relies on a close reading of the texts, an explication of their contexts, biographical information about the writers, and documented effects of the

texts. This rhetorical approach to criticism has allowed me to discover how American Indian autobiographers use metaphors of the self—who am I?—and how they attempt to achieve identification between themselves and their audience—how are you and I alike? I augment my close reading of the texts with references to relevant contextual information, including, as needed, historical accounts and interpretations of the authors’ tribal life, with a focus on interaction between tribes and Euro-Americans. Drawing upon these resources, I am able to discover and point out sections of text in which an individual writer has conformed to or deviated from Euro-American rhetorical styles that were available to him. Thus the individual’s rhetoric, constructed from the catalog of possible feints and thrusts open to him, can be appreciated for its unique power.

The rhetorical analysis that I have undertaken in this dissertation is the first on this set of autobiographical texts as a group. Previous studies have approached various American Indian autobiographical texts from a number of critical points of view. For example, Brumble’s work focuses on defining the genre of “American Indian autobiography”; Krupat uses New Historicist and postmodern theories as part of a cultural critique of American Indian autobiography; and Wong relies on feminist theory in her explication of writing and graphic arts in Indian autobiography. (I discuss Brumble, Krupat, and Wong more extensively in Chapter II.) Other critics have written about American Indian autobiography, and there have

been applied linguistics treatments of text production, but no extended rhetorical analysis of this set of texts has yet appeared.

My dissertation contributes to the study of American Indian rhetoric by treating new topics or by having a new point of view. Some other noteworthy critical studies have treated the intersection of European rhetoric and American Indian writing, but those studies do not focus on autobiography. George Kennedy's *Comparative Rhetoric* includes a chapter on "North American Indian Rhetoric" (83-111), but here he focuses on Indian oratory, speeches made in the orators' native language and translated into English by interpreters of varying capabilities; my dissertation, on the other hand, analyzes written English discourse composed by the Indians themselves. Another work, Don Paul Abbott's *Rhetoric in the New World*, is an excellent recounting of European Renaissance rhetorical theory's importation to colonial Spanish America; however, Abbott's book traces New World *rhetorica docens*, classical European rhetorical theories and later Peruvian and Mexican revisions, where my dissertation explicates *rhetorica utens*, the rhetorical practices of six American Indians. Finally, Stephen Greenblatt's *Learning to Curse* uses New Historicist theory to discuss aspects of linguistic colonialism in the sixteenth century (16-39); however, Greenblatt romanticizes the Indians somewhat, arguing that, unless Indians use their native languages, most of them "will never speak to us. That communication, with all that we might have learned, is lost to us forever" (32). This insistence on linguistic purity contradicts at least two generally-accepted linguistic

theories: no language is superior to another; and all languages in contact borrow from one another.

My dissertation is a rhetorical analysis of early American Indian autobiographical discourse. The chapters present my analysis organized in the following manner:

- Chapter I introduces the texts, their cultural milieu, and the interpretive apparatus with which they are analyzed and interpreted.
- Chapter II presents my evaluation of the autobiographicality of the texts. I find that of the six writers, Samson Occom alone wrote a text that most closely resembles autobiography. Joseph Johnson's voluminous writings fulfill a genre requirement that a text be a lengthy recounting of one's life, but not all of his text is autobiographical material. The other writers, to varying degrees, produce texts that approach autobiography, but for different reasons do not conform fully to the typical expectations of theorists of that genre. I discuss autobiographical theory at length in Chapter II and demonstrate that the six writers, while not producing traditional autobiography, are writing texts which evidence an autobiographical intent.
- Chapter III focuses on evidence from the texts that shows the writers identifying with Indians. As students of a white Christian missionary,

their identifications with “pagan” Indians reveals the writers’ ambivalence about rejecting traditional culture and adopting a white one. When the Indian writers identified with Indian culture, they endangered themselves, because their jobs, their status in white culture, their very identification with a colonial way of life depended on their identification with the colonial culture. That the Indian writers identified with Indians, then, is a significant gap in their (white) cultural façade.

- Chapter IV focuses on evidence from the texts that shows the six Indian writers distancing from an identification with Indians. However, distancing from Indians did not equate identifying with white culture. The six writers used their autobiographical discourse, first, to create a new identity space between Indian and white, and then to create for themselves identities to occupy that space.
- Chapter V presents my concluding discussion of the texts from a more general point of view, and contains my proposals for further study of these texts. I also offer my apologia for doing this study.

In terms of a rhetorical analysis of autobiographical discourse, my study will move from a discussion of form and genre issues in Chapter II to discussions of textual identification in Chapter III and textual dis-identification in Chapter IV. The analyses in Chapters III and IV, while related to autobiography form issues, expand

the analysis of the texts into closer readings of selected samples from the texts for the purpose of connecting the signifiers of autobiographicality to the signifiers of Indianness.

■ ■ ■

Why autobiographies? One valuable rhetorical study could focus on *all* writing by American Indians from a specific period, for example the eighteenth century. That study would probably have to be limited by the number of authors considered because it would be examining texts from all genres, not just nonfiction prose. That type of study would be valuable for comparing and contrasting how, for example, one writer appropriates styles, lexicons, forms of discourse, etc. in order to produce texts. But I am limiting my study to autobiographical texts for these reasons: by its nature, autobiography is an act of rhetorical agency, a textual representation of one's self, yet several scholars claim that individuals in tribal cultures do not think of their relationship to the group in terms of self-to-Other, but in terms of part-to-whole, thus making the production of an autobiography by Indians problematic; autobiography is not an American Indian discourse form, so its use by non-Europeans may be linguistically and rhetorically different from the model insofar as Indians are different from Europeans; and, finally, the word "autobiography" first appears in print in 1797, after individual American Indian writers have begun to write their own stories and produce texts that help define this new literary category that is otherwise called *Confessions* (Augustine and Rousseau),

Essais (Montaigne), letters (Plato's seventh epistle), *Pensées* (Pascal), memoir, life, and so on (Winslow 3; Olney 5-6, 9). The American Indian writers were contributing texts to the genre *autobiography* even as it was being invented.

Further complicating this study is the situation that these texts are not autobiographies in the usual sense. Brumble admits that he has stretched the definition of "autobiography" to include these letters, so I have used this opportunity to question the very definition of the autobiographical form, i.e., what is an autobiography? how can Brumble justify calling these texts autobiographies? how are the texts like and not like autobiographies? how *are* the texts autobiographical or not autobiographical? Part of my study does then become a question of genre analysis, i.e., what are the elements of autobiography and how many of those elements do these texts have? But I hope I have gone further than merely making tables comparing the texts to a checklist of genre attributes.

Related to the question of the autobiographicality of the texts is a question of the self-representation of the writers. At various places in their text, the six Indian writers use language that works to persuade readers that the writers are identifying themselves as Native Americans, while in other places in their texts, the opposite is the case. So sometimes the texts claim an Indian identity and at other times deny or distance themselves from an Indian identity. While autobiographies are always *texts*, we usually assume they point to existing beings in the world. (There are, however, autobiographies that lie.) But, the writers being dead, we cannot compare their texts

to them. We are left, instead, with texts that are like mirrors holding frozen reflections, images of human beings who are no longer present. We are readers questioning visions that cannot speak. The texts mediate between two beings (writer and reader) spatially *and* temporally (then and now). We see the texts' signifiers and produce signifieds in our mind, hoping, or assuming, that we've hit on the right, or a close, interpretation. The six Indian writers, conquered by empire-building Europeans, learned and used European literary forms for their own—non-European—purposes. But because autobiography, by its nature, is a textual stand-in for one's self, I treat the texts as signifying artifacts that try to achieve identification and consubstantiality between writer and reader. The mediating textual signs stand in place of the self who writes.

Briefly here I shall introduce the writers and their teacher. (The information on the Indian writers is from Brumble and McCallum, and on Wheelock from McCallum.)

Eleazar Wheelock (1711-1779) was descended from English colonists. He graduated from Yale and was pastor at a church in Lebanon, Connecticut for 34 years. He founded More's (or Moor's) Charity School for Indians, in Lebanon. In 1769 he was granted a royal charter to establish Dartmouth College, and in 1770 he moved the Charity School to Hanover, New Hampshire and started Dartmouth.

Samuel Ashpo (1718-1795) was a Mohegan. His text dates from 1763-66. He was a schoolmaster before he entered More's. He taught and pastored thereafter.

Hezekiah Calvin (c. 1749-?) was a Delaware. His text dates from 1766-68. He entered More's in 1757 and was approved to be a schoolmaster in 1765, at 16. Two years later his health began to fail. The last known information on him is that he was in jail "for forging a pass for a Negro" (Wheelock; qtd. in McCallum 47).

David Fowler (1735-1807) was a Montauk. His text dates from 1764-68. He was a teacher most of his life. "He was an industrious farmer, and a recognized man of worth among the New England Indians, although much inferior mentally to [Occom]" (McCallum 85). He was one of the leaders of the Brothertown settlement.

Joseph Johnson (1751-1776) was a Mohegan. His text dates from 1767-74. He entered More's when he was 7 and was sent to Oneida as a schoolmaster when he was 15. He "turned pagan," kept school in Rhode Island, then went to sea. At 21 he was converted and again took up teaching and preaching. He married Occom's daughter Tabitha in 1773 and was a leader in organizing and securing land for the Brothertown settlement. "During the Revolution he was highly praised for his mollifying influence on the Oneidas and his aid was solicited by the Provincial Congress (New York), by the House of Representatives of New Hampshire, and by George Washington" (McCallum 121). He disappeared in 1776.

Samson Occom (1723-1792) was a Mohegan. His text is dated 17 Sept. 1768. He grew up among his tribe and converted to Christianity at about 16. Wanting to read the Bible, he asked Wheelock to teach him to read, intending to spend no more than a month at Wheelock's home. He spent four years there before

striking out to become a teacher and preacher. (Occom was Wheelock's first Indian pupil, and based on this success Wheelock began More's Indian Charity School.) Occom and a white minister toured England in 1765-67 to raise money for the Charity School. Occom was widely known for *A Sermon at the Execution of Moses Paul* which went through nineteen editions; he also published hymns, and wrote a brief history of the Montauk.

Tobias Shattock (1742-1768) was a Narraganset. His text dates from 1765-67. Shattock entered More's 16 Dec. 1766—his wife and child entering two weeks later—and stayed for about a year before being recalled by the Narraganset Council to help the tribe's fight to keep its territory intact. Shattock and his brother John sailed to Britain in 1768 to seek royal intervention for the tribe's aid; Shattock contracted smallpox and died in Edinburgh, Scotland.

All six of the Indians studied with Wheelock at one time or another; all six used English as a non-native spoken, and probably a first written, language; and all six overtly claimed to follow Christianity, a distinctly non-Native American religious system. The story of their situation is not a cluster of discrete narratives intersecting momentarily, but rather one history of the events of contact and relations between tribes and colonists as groups and between individual Indians and whites as more-or-less representative of those groups.

■ ■ ■

One element of the rhetorical situation that profoundly influenced the six Indians' writing was the racism inherent in most of their dealings with whites. Whites' attitudes about Indians was a force present in the exigence, audience, and constraints that invited American Indians to write, and it appears as a factor in the ethos of the texts. Examining the racial climate that existed when these six Indians wrote, it is important to note that the Europeans and Euro-Americans were not a cohesive group when it came to opinions about the Indians. From Columbus's contact on, white colonists, missionaries, politicians, et al. proposed competing interpretations of the meaning of Indians and debated where Indians came from and what should be done about them. One interpretation of the value of Indians comes from early seventeenth-century drama: Trinculo in Shakespeare's *The Tempest* wishes he could exhibit Caliban in England, since "not a holiday-fool there but would give a piece of silver" to view him (2.2.27). Trinculo feels certain of making his fortune off Caliban: "When they will not give a doit to relieve a lame beggar, they will lay out ten to see a dead Indian" (2.2.29-30). The Indians were popular visitors to England: "35 or more American natives [. . .] arrived in Shakespeare's lifetime" (Vaughan 59) and were the object of curious gazes by all classes of people, from the King to onlookers in the streets (Vaughan 57-58). As commodities in England's popular culture, they were money-making exotics.

Early interpretations of the origins of American Indians reflected other kinds of value that Indians held for Europeans (besides English fair-goers). “The seventeenth-century missionaries saw the Indians as embodiments of the spirit of nature in America, the type of fallen natural man,” having degenerated greatly since Adam’s Fall (Slotkin 195). And as late as 1775, James Adair’s *The History of the American Indians* argues that “the Indians are the ten lost tribes of Israel and systematically justifies it by comparative philology and anthropology” (Slotkin 255). These explanations of the presence and status of Indians in the New World follow from the logic of the religious thinking of the day. Whether the Indians were simply another race of humans on Earth fallen from grace or were in fact descendants of the Chosen People, they were, for Christian, missionary-minded colonizers, in dire need of conversion. The Indians—or their souls, anyway—were valuable.

Less-charitable Christian colonists held rather low opinions of the Indians. I discuss in Chapters III and IV some of the specific terms colonists used for the Indians, such as “savage,” “beast,” and so on, but two other examples here serve to introduce Wheelock, Ocom, and the racist environment in which they lived. When Wheelock was trying to raise money in New England for his Indian Charity School, he found little support because of the recent French and Indian War. “A collection plate passed in Windsor, Connecticut, in 1763 returned empty save for ‘a Bullet & Flynt’” (Axtell, *European* 102), the donor’s gift representing the hostility church-going whites harbored toward the Indians. And four years later, the conversation of

“several gentlemen” was reported to Wheelock, who wrote that they “spoke frankly of the hopelessness of converting Indians by anything but ‘Powder & Ball’” and that one gentleman rejected Wheelock’s plan to educate and convert Indians as “absurd & fruitlis” because of “the ireconsilable aversion, that white people must ever have to black. . . . So long as the Indians are dispised by the English we may never expect success in Christianizing of them” (Axtell, *European* 103). Finally, these gentlemen cease their generalities and turn their racist remarks toward a specific target, saying that “they could never respect an Indian, Christian or no Christian, so as to put him on a level with white people on any account, especially to eat at the same Table, no—not with Mr Ocham [Occom] himself, be he ever so much a Christian or ever so Learned” (Axtell, *European* 103).

The owners of the discourse of civilization may deny that an Indian is an Indian, may call the colonized population “beasts” or “silly children,” may claim authorship of the identity of the colonized, may privilege their own definitions of the Other, but theirs is a tenuously held position, ultimately indefensible. Over and over, Indians manage to slip into Burke’s parlor and join the conversation; they adapt the invaders’ discourse to their own ends, redefine themselves and their rhetorical situation, and author new identities for themselves and, sometimes, their white listeners. This is a recurring theme in my study and will likely remain a recurring theme in the cultural history of American Indians.

It was in this turbulent climate that the Indian writers produced their discourse. While some colonists sought the Indians' well being, others urged the Indians' annihilation. As the Indians learned to understand and speak English, they learned that one rhetorical function of the whites' language was denigration of darker-skinned races. As I show in my discussion of identification and distancing, the Indian writers, in a complicated rhetorical move, are able to re-produce discourse that devalues non-white people. I say it is a complicated move because, conversely, they are also able to produce discourse that represents Indians as a worthy people. One strength of language is its malleability, its ability to conform to the shape its users want to give it. Language is more than a tool; it is a living entity that transcends slavish usage.

CHAPTER II

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL RESPONSES TO RHETORICAL SITUATIONS

You should realize that focusing so intently on oneself like that and blithering on about your own life and thoughts is very bad form for Indians. I have heard Indian critics say, referring to poetry, that it is best if there are no “I’s” in it. I grew up and continue to live among people who penalize you for talking about yourself and going on endlessly about your struggles.

An unidentified American Indian poet
commenting on her autobiographical essay
(Swann and Krupat xii)

In this chapter, two textual issues are being dealt with at the same time. The first is whether or not these texts—especially the letters—can be counted as autobiographies. The second textual issue is an analysis of the texts as autobiographical responses to particular rhetorical situations. Both issues are part of the larger issue, writing the life of the self. My claim in this chapter is that not all of these texts are full-fledged autobiographies, but all constitute autobiographical responses to their respective rhetorical situations.

I selected these six sets of texts in response to critic H. David Brumble III's work in identifying them as some of the earliest (written between 1763 and 1776) autobiographical texts by American Indian writers. Because five of the sets of texts are primarily letters, at issue for some critics is whether they can legitimately be labeled autobiographies. However, while not all of the texts exhibit all elements of the autobiography genre, significant parts of the texts function autobiographically. These autobiographical acts do not arise in a vacuum, but are discursive responses to rhetorical situations. When these American Indians undertake writing the life of the self, they address rhetorical needs present before them. Further, in responding textually to particular situations, they then co-create new rhetorical situations. Therefore, in discussing the autobiographicality of the texts, we can do what other critics have not done by interpreting the texts as artifacts of autobiographical rhetoric.

Brumble's *Annotated Bibliography of American Indian and Eskimo Autobiographies* identifies letters written by Samuel Ashpo, David Fowler, Tobias Shattock, Hezekiah Calvin, and Joseph Johnson as autobiographies. Contesting Brumble's claim, the critic Arnold Krupat argues that these letters cannot be autobiographies because they lack too many elements of that genre. In my analysis of the texts, I find that the letters cited by Brumble are not fully autobiographies in that they do not satisfy all the criteria for being included in that genre, but they do function as foreshadowings of a fuller autobiographical discourse that appears in the text written by the sixth

writer treated in this dissertation, Samson Occom. In form and content, Occom's essay does successfully satisfy many of the criteria we may use in labeling texts autobiography.

Brumble admits that he is stretching the definition of autobiography in including the letters in his *Bibliography*. "To include these letters in this [bibliographic] listing is to strain the boundaries of autobiography [. . .]. Here are letters written by Indians snatched out of a nearly stone-age existence to learn Greek, Latin, English, hygiene, and Calvinism at Wheelock's knee" (Brumble, *Bibliography* 16). But Brumble decides to include the letters in his bibliography because, he claims, "there are autobiographical elements in many of the letters" (Brumble, *Bibliography* 16).

What then are the limits of a genre? How many elements of "autobiography" must be present for a text to be an autobiography? Need we merely compare a text to a checklist of generic elements in order to determine what category we can or must put the text in? In my critique of these six autobiographies, I approach the texts as rhetoric produced in response to situations, but I am also evaluating the rhetoric produced in terms of its autobiographicality.

In looking at the texts of these six writers, we can see autobiographical acts being undertaken in an epistolary context. The letters, perhaps coincidentally, exhibit more autobiographical functions with each passing writer. Ashpo, who first wrote in 1763, produces texts that are farther outside the boundaries of what

conservative critics would call “true” autobiography than the texts of Johnson, whose last text was written in 1776. As each writer came along, the texts become more expansive in their discourses about the individual’s life.

The next developmental leap, in terms of the production of autobiographical texts that look like autobiographies, is observable in the significant formal difference between the letters of the five writers and the narrative essay of Occom. The letters-as-autobiographies are life narratives composed on the spot, like autobiographies-in-the-moment. In contrast, Occom’s narrative is composed after the facts, in some cases many years after the facts, of the events. The letters, often written as the “postman” stood at the door to go, are unedited descriptions of events and people, unedited both on paper—that is, the letters are the first and last draft—and in time—that is, the letter writers had little or no time to mull over events experienced or people encountered and mentally edit memories of those events or people, to remember, to misremember, to question their own memories, and so on. Occom’s essay is a chronological treatment of events, beginning with the writer’s childhood and youth and continuing to his then-current situation. The structure of Occom’s autobiographical text, written in 1768, formally imitates longer personal memoirs produced by mature men and women who look back on their lives. In Occom’s case, his retrospective seems to combine an Augustinian motivation of confession with a rhetorical desire to justify his belief that his work has been undervalued by the white community that pays for his labor.

One problem I have with Brumble's labeling the five sets of letters as autobiographies is that the authors did not identify their own texts as autobiographies, they did not select the letters to be included, and they did not select the accompanying documents—letters from others, lists of debts, licenses to preach, and so on—that serve to contextualize their letters. On the other hand, Occom's essay, "A Short Narrative of My Life," stands alone as a self-constructed personal narrative that counts as autobiographical.

But I will not cast the sets of letters out of the category of autobiography completely, because they more aptly fit in a category, perhaps quasi-autobiography, that lies between not-autobiography and autobiography. The letters do tell events of the authors' lives, they do often occupy a point of view that looks back on and evaluates the past, and they do give us their story in the authors' voices.

Brumble has produced a theory of American Indian autobiography that posits what he calls pre-literate autobiography, which are oral forms of personal narrative used in particular situations in tribal discourse. While I will argue that Brumble's labeling the letters autobiographies stretches the genre's boundary almost out of shape, I will use Brumble's description of pre-literate autobiography to argue that the six American Indian writers that I am discussing use written forms to satisfy exigences that they would have responded to with oral forms before they began participating in a document-based culture.

In addition to Brumble's theory, Lloyd F. Bitzer's article "The Rhetorical Situation" gives me useful terminology and perspective to aid in analyzing the forces that called forth these autobiographical writings. Bitzer writes, "We need to understand that a particular discourse comes into existence because of some specific condition or situation which invites utterance" (302). For Bitzer, the "specific" rhetorical situations inviting utterance are made up of at least three elements: *exigence*, a situation that requires modification (304); *audience*, "those persons who are capable of being influenced by discourse and of being mediators of change" (305); and *constraints*, the "persons, events, objects, and relations which are parts of the situation because they have the power to constrain decision and action needed to modify the exigence" (305). The rhetorical situation is not the same as "context"; not every context that writers find themselves in have all the elements required to invite discourse.

A rhetorical approach to American Indian autobiography is rare among critics, but one theorist, Leigh Gilmore, uses rhetorical methods in proposing her definition of autobiography: "As a genre, autobiography is characterized less by a set of formal elements than by a rhetorical setting in which a person places herself or himself within testimonial contexts as seemingly diverse as the Christian confession, the scandalous memoirs of the rogue, and the coming-out story in order to achieve as proximate a relation as possible to what constitutes truth in that discourse" (3). Gilmore's definition focuses our attention on the text produced in a particular

“rhetorical setting” as well as, implicitly, an audience’s reception of that text, evaluating it as true, less-true, or not-true. Later in this chapter I will contrast Gilmore’s theory to more traditional ones of autobiography that evaluate texts more strictly on their elements.

Bitzer and Gilmore lead us to useful vantage points from which to interpret texts. Bitzer’s theory fairly directly relates to the texts of all six autobiographers considered here because in most of the letters and in Occom’s essay, a rhetorical situation of one kind or another is engendering the production of text. Gilmore’s theory also is important for a critique of these texts in its reminder to us that the truth of a text—whether or not it tells what really happened—is one way its genre classification may be evaluated.

Another hallmark of autobiography, noted by theorist Georges Gusdorf, is the presence of a major motive for producing an autobiography, self-justification: “No one can better do justice to himself than the interested party, and it is precisely in order to do away with misunderstandings, to restore an incomplete or deformed truth, that the autobiographer himself takes up the telling of his story” (36). This is what we can see, repeatedly, in many of the letters, as the writers report their own actions, explain circumstances, and argue for different interpretations of events, as they seek to present a true account, as far as they can tell it. And we see this self-justification definitely in Occom’s essay.

In the end, I do not reject Brumble's evaluation that the letters are autobiographies, but I would qualify his category by placing them in a subcategory that highlights their innovative move toward autobiographicality while admitting that they are still operating in the realm of not-yet-autobiography. In having such a category of quasi-autobiography, critical evaluations of these works could be benefited by not having to debate the texts' autobiographicality, but would be able to discuss the elements of such autobiographicality in the letters.

In the remainder of this chapter, I will focus on presenting portions of the American Indians' texts and interpreting them as autobiographical rhetoric. The six writers are treated in chronological order of production of the texts, regardless of whether the texts are letters or the lone essay.

My rationale for grouping these particular six writers is based on similarities of time, geography, education, profession, and textual production. One strength of this grouping is to allow similarities and differences to appear more clearly. Using Brumble's *Bibliography*, I selected six of the earliest texts he had found. The six writers were from Massachusetts and Connecticut, and all, at one time or another, attended Eleazar Wheelock's school for American Indians in Lebanon, Connecticut. They all wrote during the eighteenth century, before the word "autobiography" had been coined at the beginning of the nineteenth century, so their self-life-writings are produced during the decades preceding the codification of that genre. Five of the

writers' autobiographical texts are in the form of correspondence, and the sixth writer's text is in the form of an autobiographical essay. All wrote in English.

My analysis of the six autobiographical texts is complicated by a critical debate that has centered on these texts. Part of my effort, therefore, has been to evaluate the autobiographicality of the texts, to answer the question, "Are these texts autobiographies?" While Brumble identified the texts as autobiographies, Krupat argues that these short texts cannot count as autobiographies. My discussion of the texts necessarily includes reference to theories of autobiography as presented by Brumble, Krupat, Misch, Gusdorf, Lejeune, Olney, Gilmore, Roy Pascal, Starobinski, Weintraub, and Wong. Some of these theorists treat autobiography in general, while others apply autobiography theory specifically to American Indian texts.

I also use rhetorical theory in my critique of these texts as a way to analyze the writings as products of particular situations. Rhetorical analysis allows me to interpret texts without limiting myself to the restrictions of a genre. So, whether these texts "count" as autobiographies need not be the only point of reference for my critique. A rhetorical analysis allows me to view the texts from an additional point of reference that complements the autobiographical one.

To begin to see some of the complications of the situation, we have only to look at the text that Brumble called the earliest American Indian autobiography. The autobiography of Samuel Ashpo (Mohegan) consists of two personal letters written by him, five letters written about him, and three documents related to his official

position as a preacher. The texts date from 1763-1766. For illustrative purposes, I offer Ashpo's two letters.

Jarevary [Cherry Valley?] August 15th 1763

Rev.^d Eleazer Wheelock

Sir

Ageable to your Desire I attempt to Write you a few Lines as will as I can according to the Short time allowed me. when I came to Albany I Saw not Rev.^d Mar^t. and I know not what to write: from thence I wente to Sir William Johnson and I Saw not Him (but His Son) Aug 13th I sead unto Him what is become Rev.^d Smitch. for He was Sent to Preach to Mohoaks, and He Sead Smitch was hear two or three Days: and He is gone home about three weeks a goe because we hear enemies is coming: but their was nothing in it. for all our Mohoaks are Pice with us yet: and hear I meet mr Gunn He come from Onohoguagee: He sead their is nodenger a mong the Indians at Onohoguagee or Janingo Indians, for they are all good friends, and He and I believe the Providence of God will open the Door. that I my Preach the Gospel to these Indians: but I have Short time to write: but I am well through the Blessing of God: and I hope you are the Same

I am your

Humble Servant

Sam^l Ashpo

(McCallum 43)

Janingo Agust 22 AD 1766

Rev.^d Eleazar Wheelock.

j will inform you that j got well in to Janingo and j have Speak with the King, Concerning a bout the Minister and scool master. but He Seays. j Con not answer you now j am like a tenant unto unedogke King. (but j will trye to get Leberty the next Council they have hear) and then j will Give you answer. This is all He said. . and j Preached a bout 11 fournoon to small Number of Ind.^s j begun as it were with Fear and Trembling, feeling but little Power, but God greatly assisted me, few dry eyes seemed to be in the Assembly for a Considerable Time. j had an affecting Prosput of the glories of the upper World. and Was enable to speak of them feelingly to others. j believe many were filled as with new wine, it seemed as if time of

Refreshing was Come from the Presenc of the Lord even Come

Lord Jesus Come quickly Amen and Amen

j am your Humble

Servant

Sam^{ll} Ashpo

(McCallum 45)

In these two letters, Ashpo reports to Wheelock on the success of his missionary work. Ashpo's letters cover a brief span of his life, although they suggest a broader span of life because they allude to a broader context than merely the immediate events of Ashpo's travels. The two letters were written three years apart, yet they could have been written on two days of the same week.

Ashpo did not make his own autobiography. We know that autobiographies may include documents not written by the author. For example, photographs, official documents, letters from others, and so on are included in autobiographies by writers who use them to help compose a picture of the person. But it is notable that in Ashpo's so-called autobiography, the letters and documents written by others were not selected by Ashpo as accompaniments to his own letters.

Ashpo's autobiography is an assemblage produced by a twentieth-century perspective. Ashpo's two letters were published in 1932 in *The Letters of Eleazar Wheelock's Indians*, edited by James Dow McCallum. The book is an anthology of

correspondence and documents relating to American Indians who were students of Eleazar Wheelock, founder of a school for American Indians and, later, Dartmouth College. With each writer's own text, McCallum includes letters or documents written by others that pertain to that writer's life. In this case, McCallum frames Ashpo's two letters with the following texts: McCallum's short biographic introduction; a letter of recommendation from Wheelock that briefly outlines Ashpo's former religious heresy and past history of drinking problems and his current desire to be ordained to preach to Indians in New York; a letter from a preacher to Wheelock, reporting that Ashpo had joined his church and would "Desist Preaching" until he could be examined and ordained; a document signed by Wheelock and three other pastors giving Ashpo provisional permission to preach to "the Indians at Geningo" [near current Binghamton, New York]; a letter from a schoolmaster reporting on the drinking of the Indians at Geningo and offering to host Ashpo's ordination examination; Ashpo's license to preach to Indians at "janningo"; a letter from the schoolmaster (dated two months after the license to preach) detailing Ashpo's debts; the first of Ashpo's letters (see above); a letter from a Boston merchant to Wheelock, reporting "with pleasure" the "promising prospects" of the Indians at "Jeningo," where Ashpo had been working; Ashpo's second letter (above); and, finally, a document recording Ashpo's suspension from preaching and missionary work until he can explain accounts of his "Drinking Strong

Drink to Excess, & of Quarrells, Indecent, unChristian behaviour” (McCallum 35-46).

Brumble labels this set of letters and documents Ashpo’s autobiography, but McCallum, the editor of the collection, does not claim to be publishing Ashpo’s autobiography, nor does Ashpo himself label his two short letters autobiography. So the labeling is Brumble’s, an interpretive act that merits further debate.

In his description of Ashpo’s autobiography, Brumble acknowledges his controversial claim: “To include these letters in this listing is to strain the boundaries of autobiography; however, there are autobiographical elements in many of the letters in this book, the letters in the rich context McCallum supplies are fascinating, and all of this is so early—certainly these are some of the earliest writings by Indians ever published—that I finally decided to include them” (Brumble, *Bibliography* 16). Unfortunately, Brumble leaves it to the reader to infer which autobiographical elements are present.

The effect of Brumble’s pushing the limits of the genre’s definition is to get us to read the autobiographies as products of particular rhetorical situations. In a later book, *American Indian Autobiography*, Brumble remarks that “narrow definitions [of autobiography] are more crippling in the consideration of Indian autobiography, I think, than they are in considerations of autobiography in general” (*Autobiography* 182). By including such marginal texts, Brumble in effect asks readers to approach the texts rhetorically, instead of sizing them up against a prescribed set of genre

criteria. Brumble's approach is in response to genre definitions of theorists Philippe Lejeune and Roy Pascal. Brumble acknowledges that Lejeune "has provided one of the best known definitions of autobiography: it is a 'retrospective account that an actual person makes in prose of his own existence, stressing his individual life and particularly the history of his personality'" (Brumble, *Autobiography* 182). And Brumble notes Roy Pascal's insistence "that in 'true' autobiography we must find some 'coherent shaping of the past'" (Brumble, *Autobiography* 182). Brumble reacts against these definitions throughout his work on American Indian autobiography by citing autobiographical texts that lack an overt history of the writer's personality, and that use an achronological and episodic structure to recount major events in an individual's life.

When Brumble defines the term "autobiography," he tries to focus our attention on similarities he finds between "published autobiographies and oral autobiographical traditions" (Brumble, *American Indian Autobiography* 17). Thus he defines "autobiography" broadly, as "first-person narrative that seriously purports to describe the narrator's life or episodes in that life" (Brumble, *American Indian Autobiography* 17).

Brumble proposes a definition of autobiography that is more open than narrowly defining. His reaction against "Western" definitions of autobiography is based on this methodological reasoning: the "Western" definitions of autobiography, by Lejeune, Pascal, and others, see Augustine's *Confessions*, Rousseau's *Confessions*, and

Benjamin Franklin's *Autobiography* as seminal texts that initiate kinds of autobiography, but a categorical definition based on these kinds would, on formal grounds, omit many American Indian autobiographies. So, for Brumble, the "Western" definitions of autobiography inevitably refer directly back to the seminal European-influenced texts.

Brumble's definition of American Indian autobiography is based on a claim that

long before they knew anything of the written word, the Indians were delivering themselves of a wide variety of oral, autobiographical narratives. They told stories about their personal experiences quite without the aid and encouragement of Anglo amanuenses. These early Indians did not, of course, compose such autobiographies as Rousseau, Franklin, Henry Adams, Gertrude Stein, and other moderns have taught us to expect. For the most part the oral autobiographical narratives were brief and episodic. And none tells the story of a whole life, really. But if we look closely at all that has been published, we can still discern certain preliterate autobiographical traditions at work. (Brumble, *American Indian Autobiography* 22)

Brumble claims that there are “six fairly distinct kinds of preliterate autobiographical narratives”: coup tales, warfare and hunting tales, self-examinations, self-vindications, educational narratives, and tales of the acquisition of powers (Brumble, *Autobiography* 22-23). I will briefly describe each kind so the reader may grasp the main implication of each.

Coup Tales. These short tales were a résumé of a warrior’s accomplishments. “In a wide range of tribes, an Indian could best win honor by striking an enemy. [. . .] Among such tribes as the Cheyenne and the Pawnee, warriors would sometimes try to rush up and strike the enemy before even attempting to kill him, so highly was the coup prized” (Brumble, *American Indian Autobiography* 23). There were other, less valued, ways to count coup—stealing enemies’ horses, capturing weapons, scalping, being first to strike a dead enemy. Warriors then told their coup tales, acted them out, or recorded them in pictographs. The tales are short; when written, they take a few lines or a paragraph. Brumble explains their brevity this way: “They were spare because they functioned, as it were, as the warrior’s *curriculum vitae*”; warriors told these tales, and were “graded” by means of them, so that they would earn glory. Thus each tribe’s category of coup differed (for example, Ponca differentiated between counting coup on an unwounded enemy and a wounded one). “The coup tales, then, were the means by which a warrior established his place in his society. [. . .] And warriors rose [in

rank] not only by doing deeds of bravery; it was necessary that these deeds be known” (Brumble, *American Indian Autobiography* 27).

Warfare and Hunting Tales. These tales are told on less formal occasions. Warriors might use their coup tales as the kernel, then expand on them by including more details, more information about the context of the events, and other circumstantial details. These stories are not used by the tribe to evaluate a warrior’s standing in the tribe. They are used as “entertainment,” and they become part of a tribe’s “detailed oral historical record” (Brumble, *American Indian Autobiography* 30). Often, one warrior would tell a tale, then another would follow with one of his own, and so on, in informal story sessions (Brumble, *American Indian Autobiography* 31). Brumble gives the opening of this story by Standing Bear, about the events leading up to Custer’s Last Stand, as an example of the informal expansiveness allowed in these tales:

That morning when we got up, most of the women went out to dig turnips and my uncles were out hunting. My grandmother who was very old and feeble, my uncle and I all stayed in the tipi. . . . My grandmother began frying some meat on the ashes of the fire. Then she fed us all. (Brumble, *Autobiography* 30)

And after describing the battle with Custer’s troops, Standing Bear tells what the battlefield looked like after the fight:

When we killed the last man, we could hear the women coming over and it was just a sight with [dead] men and horses mixed up together—horses on top of men and men on top of horses.

(Brumble, *Autobiography* 31)

Brumble notes, “Virtually none of this detail would have appeared in Standing Bear’s coup-tale version of the Custer fight” (*American Indian Autobiography* 31). Because this level of detail about eating breakfast and his grandmother’s physical condition was irrelevant to the needs of a warrior to establish his prowess, these anecdotal details would never appear in a typical coup narrative. When Standing Bear came to tell his coup story about the Custer fight, the narrative would be focused more narrowly on the coup acts.

Self-Examinations. According to Brumble, these discourses function as “a way of accounting for diseases, misfortunes, failures of ceremonies. [. . .] When the dance for rain, or for success in war, has been danced, if the rains do not fall, if the enemy is not defeated, an explanation must be found. The explanation that a dance can have no effect on clouds or enemies is culturally unacceptable. And so the fault must be found in the performers” (Brumble, *American Indian Autobiography* 34). The self-examination discourse is so similar to the Roman Catholic practice of confession and so widespread among “primitive” peoples around the world that early Christian missionaries believed the missionary work of the Apostle Thomas was responsible for producing this discourse. “Yet these ‘confessions’ were hardly

touched by moral ideas,” writes Georg Misch. “In them the religious exercise was based rather upon judicial procedure or medical practice” (Misch 29). The self-examinations were the record of an individual’s focus on his or her actions for the purpose of determining causes of “diseases, misfortunes,” and “failures of ceremonies” (Brumble, *American Indian Autobiography* 34). In this process, one could be led through the ritual of self-examination; a shaman, healer, or medicine man could ask questions trying to elicit an individual’s “confession.”

Self-Vindications. These discourses arose from the same motivations as self-examinations: failed ceremonies, defeat in battle, personal tragedies, lack of food and water for the tribe, and other bad occurrences. But an individual may be accused of causing the problem, so one would vindicate oneself by reviewing one’s innocent or pious actions. One could in turn accuse one’s accusers. The pattern thus produced is accusation, self-vindication, counter accusation. Brumble claims that such exchanges are common oral discourses, but an innovative turn occurs when the people practicing preliterate traditions begin to write these stories. Brumble cites this type in half a dozen major American Indian autobiographical texts.

Educational Narratives. Autobiographical narratives in this category function exclusively to teach, using the narrator’s personal experiences or personal observations as the source of information to be passed on. The instructive narratives Brumble cites range from agriculture to hunting to lovemaking. The five other kinds

of preliterate autobiography (coup tales, warfare and hunting, etc.) could also be said to function as educational discourse for children and youth, teaching what deeds are counted as honorable, how to hunt and wage war, what consequences are entailed when one fails to correctly perform ceremonial ritual, and so on, but for those kinds of stories the educational function is a secondary one. The boundary between education stories and others is not exact; as Hugh Blair, in *Rhetoric*, reminds us, “literary species ‘shade into one another like the colors of nature’” (qtd. in Whitcomb 279).

Tales of the Acquisition of Powers. In these stories, the teller recounted events, dangers, deprivations, visions and dreams, and so on that led to his or her acquiring power, by intent or not. “The most elaborate stories of the acquisition of power were told by the shamans” (Brumble, *American Indian Autobiography* 41). The motivation for telling these tales is similar to the motivation for telling coup tales: a shaman’s story advertised “the extent of the powers claimed” (Brumble, *American Indian Autobiography* 43). If one wanted a powerful shaman to heal one’s sick child, one would know which shaman commanded the most powerful medicine because one had heard the shamans tell their stories. Within a tribe, certain signs in the stories would indicate which shaman had most power. Therefore, in these tales, details can be crucial. Furthermore, because a shaman’s acquisition of powers typically took place over some time, events throughout one’s life may have had to be described, in the necessary detail, and relations between those events made and

foregrounded. For example, these events could be quite distant (temporally) from each other, such as a “miraculous” birth, a significant supernatural event in childhood, the onset of visions and dreams in young adulthood—such events would be described in detail and related to each other. Detail was also important if icons, personal names or signs, or identity of one’s helping spirit were to be determined (Brumble, *American Indian Autobiography* 42-43). In Brumble’s view, because the tales of acquisition of powers are so detailed and narrate more than merely one episode in a life, they are more like modern autobiography than the other types. And these tales make connections between events in an individual’s life that may be separated by many years. Such a narrative structure is more similar to the extended autobiographical texts of Euro-American traditions than are the shorter American Indian types, such as the coup tales, self-examinations, and self-vindications (Brumble, *American Indian Autobiography* 45).

Using Brumble’s six kinds, we can argue for the presence of autobiographical elements in Ashpo’s two letters. In the first letter, Ashpo reports on his travels and tells who he met and did not meet. This is suggestive of self-examination and self-vindication stories, as he explains that he could not meet with people who were not available. He tells his story, motivated to do so, as Gusdorf would suggest, “in order to do away with misunderstandings, to restore an incomplete or deformed truth” (36).

However, it is difficult to concur with Brumble's calling this set of texts Ashpo's autobiography when it seems that Brumble has stretched the definition of autobiography beyond what seems reasonable. Ashpo does not call his letters autobiographical; McCallum, in publishing the letters and their accompanying documents, does not label them autobiographies; and Ashpo and the other letter writers did not select the documents that accompany their letters. At best, McCallum is Ashpo's biographer, in selecting the set of texts that trace major events in Ashpo's life.

Brumble's justification for labeling Ashpo's documents autobiography comes partly from his use of Karl Weintraub's theory. Weintraub's *The Value of the Individual* takes Augustine's *Confessions* as autobiography's starting point, *not* to say that that was the first autobiographic writing, but because Weintraub is more interested in "that proper form of autobiography wherein a self-reflective person asks 'who am I?' and 'how did I become what I am?'" (1). While Ashpo's letters suggest that such questions may arise, still they do not reveal self inquiry consistent with Weintraub's notion of an autobiography.

However, Weintraub does introduce a potentially useful category of autobiography: the "additive autobiography." In examining European autobiographical writing from the Middle Ages, Weintraub notes that very few works were "'self-contained' autobiographies [. . .] that attempted to give a coherent view of a life in one single writing. During the period from 500 to 1400, not more than eight

to ten such works were produced [. . .]. But a number of medieval authors wove segments of autobiographic content into writings devoted to wider objectives. And several of them did this in more than one work, thus producing a characteristic cumulative genre that can be called ‘additive autobiography’” (49). In additive autobiography, “the author does not write one self-contained life of himself but reveals himself in various writings” (54-55). Weintraub says the “modern” reaction to this medieval writing is to “peel out the precious autobiographic matter, shucking the other contextual matters in which the writer embedded them, and then stringing up, like pearls, the author’s personal revelations for the reader,” all of this to compose the writer’s scattered fragments of self-revelation “into a picture of a coherently presented personality” (55). Against the “modern” reading that decontextualizes the autobiographic parts of larger texts, Weintraub claims that we are better able to see a *coherent* medieval personality when we keep autobiographic writings in their context. His claim is strengthened when he notes that in a 900-year period, fewer than a dozen “coherent” autobiographies were produced. “[F]or the medieval writer, there was something right and fitting in placing his self-presentation *in* the contextual matter in which he perceives it to have significance. If, in other words, it was ‘natural’ and proper for a medieval writer to view his self in relation to its context, to view the self as a prolongation of itself within its surroundings, as an integral part of its enveloping world, then the phenomenon of additive

autobiography may indeed say something of importance about that specific form of self-conception” (55; italics added).

The short autobiographical narratives that Weintraub saw in other texts and counted as autobiographies can be seen to parallel the short oral narratives of the American Indian that Brumble wants to count as autobiographical. Brumble’s six kinds of oral autobiography, brief and episodic narratives, remind us of Weintraub’s additive autobiography, which are smaller parts of a larger whole.

Weintraub discusses several examples of additive autobiography. In one case, Bishop Raterius of Verona (c. 890-974), “became bishop of Verona, lost his see, regained it, and lost it again” (55). Afterward, being made bishop of Liège, he lost this see also. “The struggles he undertook to recover his bishoprics, extending over decades, turned him into a writer. In four different kinds of writings he spoke of himself and his troubles” (55). The earliest was a satire against immoral clergy who had pushed him out of his bishopric at Verona; in this text, Raterius calls himself “a certain bishop” and contrasts his reform ideas to the immoral practices of his antagonists. After being removed from the bishopric at Liège, Raterius sent “explanatory and fighting epistles in all directions. These he subsequently pulled together and furnished with a self-revealing preface” (Weintraub 56). He wrote of himself in the third person. Another writing was a confession, written as a dialogue between himself and a priest, confessing sins that “he and such as he” are guilty of, thus putting himself again in the third person and satirizing immoral clergy. Finally,

later in life, he wrote a literary self-portrait, “On the Character of a Certain Someone,” in which he undertook a self-critique by giving voice to criticisms of himself that others might have made or did make (Weintraub 56).

Weintraub cites additional examples of medieval additive autobiography, but the pattern is similar in the works of the several writers: the individual’s story is told obliquely, by telling “other” stories. Weintraub sees in this rhetorical technique a claim about the medieval worldview, one which saw more value in stories about the workings of the cultural machinery than stories of individual experience. The technique involved is to present oneself obliquely:

[Ratherius] fights for himself by setting his case in the wider framework of a satire on the prevailing immorality. He makes his legal case by satirizing the legality of others. He hides the personal confession in a tract on the need of Christian confession in general. He indirectly tries to defend his reputation with a catalogue of what others say about him. (Weintraub 56)

In addition to Ratherius, Weintraub notes the rhetoric of several other additive autobiographers: Othloh of Emmeram, Jean de Fécamp, Petrus Diaconus, Pietro of Murrone (Pope Coelestinus V), Ailred of Rievaulx, Guigo of Chastel, John of Salisbury, Hermann of Scheda, and the abbot Suger of St. Denis (57-70). Their writings, in which they embedded self-revelatory passages, included devotional literature, historical archives of religious orders or monasteries, conversion accounts,

epigrammatic meditations, written confessions, songs and poems, and biography into which the author, though well in the background, presents his own actions, experiences, and ideas.

What Weintraub calls “additive autobiography” is a class of material that, as he noted, would not be labelled autobiography by itself. Instead, the self-assessment, the self-examination, the self-referential narratives, occur as smaller parts of a larger whole. However, whether the autobiographical parts are discrete segments of a bigger text or threads woven throughout a pattern, the individual writers are telling their stories.

Why do we need Weintraub’s category, “additive autobiography”? One seeming weakness of having such a category is that in appealing to it there appears to be a clutching at straws, a claiming that a text is “autobiography” when it is overtly labeled something else: e.g., a history of a monastery or a collection of Christian allegory poems. Or, to call a text “autobiography” *and* devotional literature may seem to dilute the validity of the claim of the identity for that category. That is, to call a work *both-and* may make that work seem *neither-nor*. And once-coherent categories—autobiography, Christian allegorical poetry, etc.—lose that coherence as the category is fragmented into genre-straddling categories.

Yet there *is* an answer why Weintraub’s “additive autobiography” is a useful critical classification. The existence of that category is a way to recognize that descriptions of genres are *post hoc* orderings of information. And, while there are

well-thought-out generic orderings, it is possible and illuminating to re-think generic paradigms, to reclassify, to make new groupings of data and thereby discover new relations within and between texts. Weintraub's category "additive autobiography" encourages a way of reading autobiographical material *without* excising context-revealing material. The value of this: an autobiography tells an individual's story, not only in telling but in omitting; or an autobiography assumes readers know a context; or an individual in a hostile context necessarily writes obliquely, obscuringly, hoping or trusting that readers who know the context can read between the lines.

But Ashpo's autobiography fails to satisfy one very important criterion for being defined as additive autobiography: Ashpo himself did not assemble the contextualizing pieces of his set of texts. Ashpo's two letters were published in a context invented by McCallum. Ashpo's autobiography, as it is labeled by Brumble, is more correctly McCallum's biography of Ashpo.

Another critic who would reject Ashpo's texts as autobiography is Roy Pascal, who argues that an autobiography is a looking backward from one particular point in time, something a series of documents such as Ashpo's does not provide. "The formal difference between diary and autobiography is obvious. The latter is a review of a life from a particular moment in time, while the diary, however reflective it may be, moves through a series of moments in time. The diarist notes down what, at that moment, seems of importance to him; its ultimate, long-range significance cannot be assessed" (Pascal 3). Pascal of course allows that writers may include

extracts from diaries or letters in their autobiographies, but these extracts must be interpreted in the autobiography; they cannot stand alone, unaccompanied by authorial comment (Pascal 4-5). In Ashpo's case, we have a series of documents, written over a six-year period, each of which stands alone, not embedded in any larger, contextualizing, narrative. It is this missing contextualizing narrative that Pascal would call autobiography. But without this narrative—without Ashpo's reflections on past events—there is no autobiography in Pascal's view.

Many of my comments about Ashpo may be applied to the other writers also. The autobiographies of Ashpo, David Fowler, Tobias Shattock, Hezekiah Calvin, and Joseph Johnson, all as published by McCallum, face similar critiques because they are also letters and are collections not edited by their authors.

Considering next the autobiographical text of David Fowler (Montauk), written 1764-69, we have the following set of documents: fourteen letters from Fowler to Wheelock; a confession of misbehaviour, in leaving Wheelock's school, without permission, to help his sick father (written in Wheelock's hand); a list of books Fowler took "into the Mohawk Count^y from the [school] Libery" for his students (93); two letters from Wheelock to Fowler; and a letter from Ralph Wheelock, son of Eleazar Wheelock, about Fowler's desire to leave Wheelock's service.

Fowler's letters vary in topic, from writing about his wish to marry a certain woman, to reporting his success, and failure, at keeping school among the Oneida

Indians. In the latter letters, he reports on the progress of his students in learning English and in learning to sing hymns in parts, for example. He also complains about his living conditions and the “dirty” lifestyle of the Oneidas, and asks for more financial support from Wheelock. Later, Fowler complains of his treatment by Wheelock and one of Wheelock’s missionaries, and he asks for payment for tools he left when he left Wheelock’s service.

Critic Arnold Krupat would not call Ashpo’s and Fowler’s texts autobiographies. One specific quality that he finds lacking in American Indian autobiographies is sufficient coverage of one’s life: “Like people the world over, the tribes recorded various kinds of personal experience, but the western notion of representing the whole of any one person’s life—from childhood through adolescence to adulthood and old age—was, in the most literal way, foreign to the cultures of the present-day United States” (Krupat, *Native American Autobiography* 3). Krupat does not spell out what criteria he uses for defining “autobiography”; however, his unspoken definition of autobiography is clearly based on “western,” i.e., European, texts. To decide whether Ashpo’s and Fowler’s texts are autobiographies, Krupat needs only to compare them to European autobiographies. Thus while he finds value in the American Indian texts, he cannot accord them autobiography status because of their lack of necessary elements of Western autobiography.

Nonetheless, in his anthology *Native American Autobiography*, Krupat includes some of the David Fowler-Eleazar Wheelock correspondence and says this of it: “In the case of Fowler, there exist a number of letters documenting an important stage of his life; while these do not amount to an autobiography as such, they do convey a strong sense of his experience” (Krupat, *Native* 93). What’s missing from Krupat’s evaluation of Fowler’s letters—whether or not they are autobiography—is any explanation of his underlying reasoning that supported his choice. What elements are present in texts that *do* amount to autobiographies, and *which* of those elements are missing from Fowler’s set of letters? When introducing Fowler’s letters (and Wheelock’s reply), Krupat writes, “Fowler’s letters to his teacher and benefactor Eleazar Wheelock are not in any sense what we usually think of as constituting an autobiography, but I have included them because I believe they do present a good sense of a life. [. . .] I have also included one of Wheelock’s letters to Fowler among our selections, to provide a reference point for the reader with regard to ‘proper’ eighteenth-century spelling, syntax, and diction” (Krupat, *Native* 95). Again, Krupat does not explicitly announce his defining criteria for “western autobiography”; one is left to infer his definition of autobiography from the cryptic introduction and from the texts he selects. For example, it is puzzling that Krupat says Fowler’s text is *not* an autobiography but includes it anyway in his anthology of Native American autobiography, claiming that Fowler’s letters “convey a strong sense of his experience” (Krupat, *Native* 93). Perhaps at some level Krupat

recognizes Fowler's text as quasi-autobiographical enough to be admitted. Still it seems that Krupat's personal evaluation, rather than objectively discernable criteria, determines what's an autobiography. And ultimately this is not good enough. For a thoughtful critique of practices, a critique informed by a clear statement of theory and a clear evaluation of a text in light of that theory, it seems better not to rely too heavily on Krupat's work.

In contrast to Krupat's narrow definition, critic Jean Starobinski offers a description of autobiography that emphasizes less the text's form than the conditions that help shape the text. He claims, for example, that the autobiographer's text may be a memoir, a journal, or even a diary (73). "Thus, the conditions of autobiography furnish only a large framework within which a great variety of particular styles may occur. So it is essential to avoid speaking of an autobiographical 'style' or even an autobiographical 'form,' because there is no such generic style or form. Here, even more than elsewhere, style is the act of an individual" (73).

Starobinski's "conditions of autobiography" complement Leigh Gilmore's "rhetorical setting" and Bitzer's "rhetorical situation." For all three, analysis of an autobiographer's situation is as important as an analysis of text, because the writer's situation motivates the writer's discourse.

Furthermore, all three acknowledge the writer's personality as part of the rhetorical situation. For Starobinski, autobiographical "style is the act of an individual" (73); for Gilmore, "autobiography is characterized [. . .] by a rhetorical

setting in which a person places herself or himself” (3); and for Bitzer, one’s own discourse, produced partly in response to a situation’s constraints, becomes a new constraint (305).

If we appeal to Starobinski, Gilmore, and Bitzer, we could allow Ashpo’s and Fowler’s letters to be called autobiography. They occupy situations in which they are called upon to write about themselves, their own actions, their own thoughts. The situation calls for personal letters, and the Indians respond aptly.

The aptness of their letters is suggested by Hertha Dawn Wong, who rejects the idea that autobiography is “a distinctive product of Western post-Roman civilization” (3). Wong isn’t exaggerating the point of view she argues against; Roy Pascal says this of autobiography: “It belongs to Europe, in its essentials to the post-classical world of Europe” (Pascal 2). Against this, Wong claims that “long before Anglo ethnographers arrived in North America, indigenous peoples were telling, creating, and enacting their personal narratives through stories, pictographs, and performances” (3). Once Europeans introduce writing, the next logical step is to tell one’s story in prose. Ashpo, Fowler, and the other writers do not yet produce complete autobiographical stories, but, as they are at the beginning stage of self-representation, they do write pieces of their narrative. I believe that if they had had more time, and the appropriate rhetorical situation, they would in the next stage assemble the individual pieces into what Western culture would call autobiography.

Wong writes, “The autobiographical expressions of pre-contact Native Americans tend to be event oriented. In the same way an occasional poem is recited for a particular event, these self-narrations arise at certain meaningful moments, recording an important happening—a marriage or a vision, for instance” (Wong 17). And so, “from a Western perspective they appear to be fragmented. Unlike Roy Pascal’s early insistence that the ‘proper theme’ of autobiography (‘the autobiography of the whole man’) requires that such a work be written by an older person, usually a man, who can review an entire life, pre-contact native people tended to narrate their lives as they were living them. Rather than shaping a past life in the present, they shaped a present (and sometimes a future) life in the present moment. Once again, this process is more like that of a diarist capturing the immediacy of the recent moment in a diary entry than that of a memoirist pondering and reformulating the long-ago past into a unified and chronological narrative” (Wong 17). Wong’s comparison of event-oriented and reflective autobiography gives us a nice description of one difference between the letters of five of the American Indians and the narrative by Samson Occom. The letters are autobiographical narratives composed on the spot, one fragment at a time. In contrast, Occom’s narrative, like Benjamin Franklin’s, is composed many years after the facts of the events. The letters, often written as the “postman” stood at the door to go, are unedited descriptions of events and people, unedited both on paper (the letters are the first and last draft) and in time (the writers had little or no time to mull over events

experienced or people encountered and mentally edit memories of those events or people, to remember, to misremember, to question their own memories, and so on).

In Fowler's case, we have a larger number of letters relative to other kinds of documents, so we have more of Fowler's life in his own words than we saw in Ashpo's set of texts. And Fowler's letters do occur at and describe significant events in his life. Yet, as Pascal would object, each letter is written from its own point in time; there is no contextualizing text accompanying the letters that allows Fowler to interpret and evaluate his own experiences, from a later point in time. We have more information about Fowler than about Ashpo, because we have more letters. But we don't have reflective interpretation, except in bits and pieces in later letters where Fowler is looking back on events, interpreting them, explaining them, and arguing for particular interpretations of past events. For example, in various letters Fowler reports on the progress of his school for the Indian children: he informs Wheelock how many students he has, what page they have got to in their textbooks, and how many hymns they are able to sing in parts. In such letters, Fowler is looking back over anywhere from a few days to three or four months. Finally, however, Fowler's last letter does appear motivated by a rhetorical situation that calls for him to review and reflect on events of over a year before; because he wants reimbursement from Wheelock for tools he bought with what he thought was his own money and left for another missionary, he must recollect events, create his story, and create his own interpretation of that story. So in this letter, Fowler

records not merely an edited personal history but also arguments justifying his past actions.

The autobiographical text of Tobias Shattock (Narraganset) was written 1765-67. In Shattock's case, we have the following letters: six letters from Shattock to Wheelock; one letter from Shattock's spiritual mentor to Wheelock; one letter from a teacher to Wheelock, commending Shattock's character; a letter of introduction from Wheelock to help Shattock's travel to Scotland and England; and a letter from a Scot merchant to Wheelock, reporting Shattock's death, by smallpox, in Edinburgh, Scotland.

Shattock's letters offer a different kind of discourse for our analysis. While some personal events are reported, Shattock's primary concern in his letters is for the benefit of his tribe. He writes to prevent the tribal leader from selling off tribal lands to pay personal debts. In much of his correspondence with Wheelock, Shattock reports the battles he and his allies have fought against the sachem's irresponsibility. He chronicles his contacts with agents of the Crown, his successes in getting Rhode Island's legislature to block further land sales, and his optimistic scheme to sail to Britain in order to appeal directly to the King. At the same time, Shattock gives Wheelock news about his family and tribe, mixing political and personal narratives in the same letter. Shattock's autobiographical narratives function like medieval additive autobiography.

The genre of Shattock's discourse, like Ashpo's and Fowler's, is arguable. While Brumble identifies these letters as Shattock's autobiography, we must again face the objections against such a claim: Shattock did not select the set of texts and compile them; the letters report, at best, only a limited set of significant highlights from Shattock's life; and the set of varied letters gives readers no post facto evaluation of the events. These objections are the same kind that we have seen raised against the epistolary "autobiographies" discussed above. So the replies to these objections are also similar to those given above.

But Shattock's discourse suggests that a different rhetorical situation motivated it. In labeling Shattock's texts autobiography, we may begin to see the relevance of Brumble's and Weintraub's claim that autobiography is called for more urgently in unsettled times. Brumble, who is very interested in making a point about parallels between the early forms of European autobiography and the early forms of American Indian autobiography, seizes on Weintraub's idea that "[t]rue autobiography is almost impossible to imagine as a product of a monolithic age [. . .]" (Brumble, *Annotated Bibliography*4). That is, when cultures are stable, with few crises arising among the general population, and when everyone's life is like everyone else's, there is little or no motivation for individuals to write autobiography explaining and justifying one's actions.

In attempting to explain qualitative differences between Augustine's *Confessions* and autobiographical texts from earlier eras, Weintraub asserts the

existence of particular exigences that worked on Augustine and others: “The historian of autobiography often finds a rich harvest in the great periods of crisis when the lives of Western men take decisive turns” (18). That is, people living in “classical” ages “have a less contested repertory of answers and techniques for the perplexing questions of life”; “individuals less urgently face the need to account for the meaning of their existence” until an age of crisis forces on one “the task of doubting and reinvestigating the very foundations on which his self-conception traditionally rested” (18). So when there are no problems, no dilemmas to be faced by a culture, no choices needing to be made by individuals, then there is less reflection on the choices open to one, there is less questioning about competing cultural values, there is less self-assessment by individuals in the culture, and there is less exigence for production of a story that narrates a decision-making process and explains the underlying moral causes for one’s decisions.

On the other hand, some events, though they could be classified as crises, could not be told in American Indian forms. For example, many nineteenth-century American Indian autobiographical narratives end as the narrator moves into a white-controlled life on the reservation, “even though the Indian may still have been a young man at that time. The sedentary, inglorious, and painful life of the reservation period had no predecessor in Indian experience. No traditional autobiographical form existed in which the new life could find expression. Native thoughts and

feelings during that period were too painful to express. For many Indians, what happened in the depressing early reservation years ‘was not a story’” (O’Brien 8).

The new situation, on reservations, could not even be storied, narrated, made part of the linguistic culture of the tribe, using the tribe’s storytelling forms. Because the Indian canon didn’t have rhetorical forms in which such events as reservation life could be told, those stories are not spoken. And the Euro-American autobiography canon doesn’t allow the Indians’ stories, dances, and pictographs to be called autobiography, so those Indian spoken stories get their deficiencies (vis-à-vis the canon) highlighted.

The cultural gears clash loudest here—“new” events don’t fit Indian story forms, and new (white) forms don’t admit Indian stories.

Autobiographies arise when cultural and individual choices increase. Thus, for Brumble, Augustine’s *Confessions*, a product of a culturally unstable age requiring people to face choices about how to live, can be compared to the American Indian autobiographies produced in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. And still more notable to Brumble is to “imagine what would have been the effect of the anthropologists’ questions upon pre-literate American Indians. Not only were these Indians being forced to consider the existence of a culture farther from their own than was Augustine’s paganism from his Christianity, they were also being asked to consider *as questions* matters which they had previously regarded as simple matters of fact. Simply to be asked about the nature of one’s god, one’s moral system, one’s

sexual customs, is to be made aware that the universe allows alternatives” (Brumble, *Annotated Bibliography* 4). The observer is not neutral, is not without effect on the phenomenon observed, and Euro-American observers usually carry with them an effect that radically changes the observed American Indians, in this case, says Brumble, by not only *recording editing* and *publishing* American Indian texts but also by providing the exigence that caused them.

The idea of crisis-caused discourse is clearly evident in Shattock’s writing. Shattock faces a political crisis, with the sachem intending to sell off all tribal land to pay his own personal debts. Without land, the Narraganset nation would disappear. The rhetorical situation, imminent dissolution of the Narragansets, invites discourse (as Bitzer might put it), and Shattock produces spoken and written responses to the invitation.

As I noted above, theorist Georges Gusdorf claims that one major motive for producing an autobiography is self-justification: “No one can better do justice to himself than the interested party, and it is precisely in order to do away with misunderstandings, to restore an incomplete or deformed truth, that the autobiographer himself takes up the telling of his story” (36). This is especially the case for political and military figures, claims Gusdorf, who in autobiography can win the battles they lost, or correct mistaken impressions, and so on (36). “The man who recounts himself is himself searching his self through his history; he is not engaged in an objective and disinterested pursuit but in a work of personal justification.

Autobiography appeases the more or less anguished uneasiness of an aging man who wonders if his life has not been lived in vain, frittered away haphazardly, ending now in simple failure” (Gusdorf 39). Not only “an aging man,” but anyone who is aware of a situation calling for justification may produce autobiographical rhetoric.

The same thing that motivates European autobiographers to justify themselves also motivates American Indians to tell coup, self-vindication, and shamanic power stories. Both cultures produce self-life-writing in the form of *motivated* storytelling. The exigences are similar. “The literary work in which he offers himself as example is the means of perfecting [his] destiny and of bringing it to a successful conclusion” (Gusdorf 39). In both cultures, the writers construct narratives in which they try to present the best interpretations of their deeds.

Roy Pascal’s discussion of autobiography uses the example of Augustine’s *Confessions* to make a similar argument: “What distinguishes the story of people with an established public achievement and personality is a consistent relationship, a sort of harmony, between outward experience and inward growth or unfolding, between incidents and the spiritual digesting of them, so that each circumstance, each incident, instead of being an anomalous fact, becomes a part of a process and a revelation of something within the personality” (10). Pascal focuses on how the *Confessions* reveal stages of Augustine’s inward growth: “[I]n the first great autobiography Augustine selected from the ‘large and boundless chamber’ of memory a handful of experiences that chart the graph of his progress through error

to truth. We know that they do not represent anything like all the intense experiences of his early life, and that some of them, like the boyish theft of pears, acquired significance only in retrospect. But they are illuminated and linked by the autobiographer, for whom, as Augustine says, recollection is ‘re-collection’” (11). The shaping of the past, by selecting what goes into the narrative and what can be (or is better left) omitted, invents a story about the past from the point of view of the present; and the events selected take on, or are given, “significance only in retrospect.”

However, Gusdorf pronounces a “moral” warning against a too-perfect arrangement of one’s story: “the original sin of autobiography is first one of logical coherence and rationalization” (41). The author reconstructs his or her past, making it, when in its textual form, appear ordered and inevitable. When Brumble calls the letters autobiographies, he is basing his judgment at least partly on Gusdorf’s disapproval of too-well-ordered narratives.

The next autobiographical text to be considered is that of Hezekiah Calvin (Delaware) written 1766-68. Calvin’s autobiography would not be accused of being too well-ordered. There are seventeen letters in Calvin’s “autobiography”: twelve are from Calvin to Wheelock; one letter, to Wheelock, is from the father of a young woman Calvin wanted to marry; one letter, from Wheelock to another minister, briefly mentions Calvin as a prospect for serving as a teacher to the Indians; two letters, from another schoolmaster, report on Calvin’s drinking and spreading bad

rumors about Wheelock's school; and a letter to Wheelock from the young woman Calvin wanted to marry, asking Wheelock's advice.

Many of the letters from Calvin are confessions of misdeeds related to drinking or speaking ill of Wheelock and his school. Only one of the letters is a report of the work Calvin and Wheelock's son did in contacting Indians and setting up a school for them. The rest of Calvin's letters deal with personal topics such as Calvin's drinking and misspeaking, his desire to marry, and his desire to leave Wheelock's school.

Despite the fact that Calvin's "autobiography" has so many letters, the set does not tell a story as Shattock's letters do. Shattock's "autobiography" has only six letters from him, yet they narrate a series of events—though somewhat elliptically—that adds up to a story about Shattock's life. I noted above that for Pascal autobiography is retrospective, diachronic, and interpretive. The set of texts comprising Shattock's autobiography would more closely approach Pascal's definition of autobiography, but Calvin's set of letters does not conform to Pascal's definition, because Calvin's autobiography does not convey a diachronic narrative as Shattock's does.

Starobinski points out that the "conditions of autobiographical writing [. . .] require that the work be a narrative and not merely a description. Biography is not a portrait; or if it is a kind of portrait, it adds time and movement. The narrative must cover a temporal sequence sufficiently extensive to allow the emergence of the

contour of life. Within these conditions, autobiography may be limited to a page or extended through many volumes. It is also free to ‘contaminate’ the record of the life with events that could only have been witnessed from a distance” (Starobinski 73).

We can apply Starobinski’s theory to these letters and, in comparing Shattock’s and Calvin’s particularly, see that one major difference between the two sets of texts is that Shattock’s carries a narrative through several letters. In Shattock’s autobiography, the narrative is focused on events related to Shattock’s attempt to save his tribal lands. Calvin’s autobiography, in contrast, is more static in its focus on Calvin’s repeated confessions of excessive drinking and misspeaking and his wishes to marry a certain young woman; in Calvin’s case, there is no motion toward a resolution of the issues, where in Shattock’s case, there is movement on dealing with the issues.

The autobiographical text of Joseph Johnson (Mohegan), written 1767-74, offers several contrasts to the texts I have discussed so far. James Dow McCallum, the twentieth-century scholar who published Johnson’s letters, calls Johnson “one of the most intense (and verbose) Indians recorded in this volume” (121). McCallum describes Johnson’s letters as “interesting examples of the heart-searching and religious enthusiasm of the time, although their wordiness is at times tiring” (121). Indeed, Johnson’s autobiography occupies a significantly greater number of pages than any of the others discussed in this dissertation, as the following table illustrates.

Table 1

Length of Printed Text for Each Autobiographer

Ashpo	13 printed pages		
Fowler	28	”	”
Shattock	17	”	”
Calvin	20	”	”
Johnson	59	”	”
Occom	6	”	”

Sufficient length is only part of the definition of so-called “true” autobiography. Johnson’s autobiography is twice as long as Fowler’s and over eight times as long as Occom’s; yet Occom’s (which I discuss after Johnson’s) is closer to being a full autobiography, when held up to even the most conservative critic’s standards, because his has several elements of autobiography that are missing in the epistolary autobiographies. Johnson’s autobiography is still a borderline case, while Occom’s, as I show further on, is more solidly within the realm of true autobiography.

Johnson’s autobiography, like those I have already discussed, is identified as an autobiography by Brumble. Johnson’s text is a series of letters and relevant

documents written by, to, or about Johnson. Johnson's autobiography contains the following texts: fourteen letters from Johnson to Wheelock; one letter from another Indian missionary to Wheelock, reporting on Johnson's "diabolical Conduct" when Johnson turned away from Christianity (141); "An Account of Certain Exhortations" that seem to have turned Johnson back to Christian beliefs (McCallum notes that this text is not in Johnson's handwriting); a text, "To all Enquiring friends," in which Johnson recounts in a couple of pages his religious biography; a short account of Johnson's travels as a sailor along the eastern American seaboard and to the West Indies, during the several months when he was in rejection of Christianity; one letter to Andrew Oliver, secretary of the General Assembly of Massachusetts Bay and member of one of the governing boards of religious missionaries, asking for back pay for Johnson's work teaching school; Johnson's license to preach, signed by eight pastors and Wheelock; a letter from Johnson to a pastor he met in New York thanking him for hospitality and asking for money and Bibles for the Indians; a "passport" issued by the New York colonial provincial congress for safe passage for Johnson and three other Indians to Connecticut, addressed "To all officers in the service of the colonies, members of committees, and others the friends of American liberty"; a letter from an Indian pastor to Wheelock, reporting on Johnson's visit and satisfactory preaching; a document written by Wheelock identifying Johnson as a former student, a candidate for the ministry, and a person of good character; a letter from New Hampshire colony's House of Representatives assigning Johnson to help

maintain good relations between Indians and colonists during the Revolutionary struggles; a letter of recommendation and introduction, for Johnson, from New Hampshire colony's House of Representatives; a document by Johnson listing Bible verses and his vow of sobriety; a letter from George Washington to Johnson, asking Johnson to explain the Revolution to the Indians and asking Johnson to encourage the Indians to at least remain neutral and at best to voluntarily "take up the hatchett" in support of the colonists; and, finally, a letter from Christopher Leffingwell to Jonathan Trumbull, Governor of Connecticut, recommending Johnson and requesting reimbursement of money given to Johnson.

This collection of texts, adding up to a rough story of Johnson's life, still lacks some of the elements of autobiography that readers would expect to see. First, as is the case in the other letters I have discussed above, Johnson did not select or organize these documents. If he had done so, this set of texts would more closely fit into Weintraub's classification, additive autobiography. Second, the texts are out of context. Each letter and document presents itself as a unique point of view; this is not like an additive autobiography, which uses different kinds of writings, but all from the same temporal point of view.

It is fair to say, however, that the set of letters does add up to an autobiography. As readers draw inferences and make interpretations, the broadly-sketched narrative that Johnson gives becomes a filled-in narrative. Readers can draw reasonable inferences when texts offer enough data. Despite Roy Pascal's

claim that “We need to see the sources of a life from childhood; only in this way do we grasp it” (12), readers always do (and must) draw inferred conclusions, since no autobiographer can tell everything. Adhering too rigidly to Pascal’s argument that the narrative should show the whole of a life from childhood really would eliminate Ashpo’s, Fowler’s, Shattock’s, and Calvin’s texts from being accounted autobiography.

Partly because he is writing at length in response to urgent rhetorical situations, Johnson’s set of letters and documents does begin to approach a fuller explanation of Johnson’s actions in life. As I discussed earlier in this chapter, the theorist Gusdorf presents the idea that one motivation for writing one’s own life is to justify one’s actions: “No one can better do justice to himself than the interested party, and it is precisely in order to do away with misunderstandings, to restore an incomplete or deformed truth, that the autobiographer himself takes up the telling of his story” (Gusdorf 36). But, for Gusdorf, it isn’t only that the interested party undertakes clearing up specific misunderstandings; there is also a looking back on situations from the point of view of a broader context. “Autobiography appeases the more or less anguished uneasiness of an aging man who wonders if his life has not been lived in vain, frittered away haphazardly, ending now in simple failure” (Gusdorf 39). What Johnson is doing then in many of his letters and “confessions” is this exploration of the meaning of his actions in the wider context of the Christian values that he has adopted. He confesses his sins, he justifies his work as a teacher

and preacher by requesting payment for his work's value, and he notes that his work is part of a larger plan conceived by a deity. In his confessing, he humbles himself before those in authority in the religious system that he has adopted. At one point in his life, he had rejected a Christian lifestyle and "gone native," so his confession of sin is a choice he makes in affirming his return to and acceptance of that Christian lifestyle. In asking for payment for his teaching and preaching, he engages those in authority in an effort to gain fair payment for his efforts, and in doing so he must justify his actions as teacher and preacher within the system that values, and pays for, such efforts. And, finally, in claiming that his religious work is part of God's larger plan, Johnson justifies his actions as being part of a plan that is answerable to an even higher authority than the white males to whom he confesses. He justifies his actions by basing their cause in an authority greater than the authority of those for whom he works, thus he seems to go around their authority in an appeal to a higher authority.

This move by Johnson, presenting his arguments for justification of his actions, allows the reader to see in his set of texts a more autobiographical approach to his discourse than in, for example, David Fowler's and Hezekiah Calvin's texts. Recall that Fowler wrote a good number of letters, but without having in them an expansive point of view—each letter speaks from a narrow experience, not from a broader frame of reference—and that Calvin's letters rehearsed the same issues over and over without moving toward any resolution of those issues. Johnson's letters,

on the other hand, have a broader point of view, as Johnson is able to situate his actions in a larger context. Johnson's letters typically are longer than those of the other epistolary autobiographers, so in his case he is able to refer to a broader context, and to arrange his texts so that some contextual information can accompany his writing.

It is noteworthy that the length of an autobiography (or any text) can make a difference in how much readers must fill in gaps with their own contextual knowledge. That is, most of the American Indian autobiographical texts that I discuss here are brief and therefore rely more on readers' inferences than do longer autobiographies that can provide contextual material. In the case of Euro-American autobiographies, the writer, in expansive narratives, produces the signs that tell events, *and* the writer produces the concomitant meaning signs to interpret the story. That is, as the writers tell their stories, they can also include lengthy contextual information, because the Euro-American writer has a discursive space that allows for, or even encourages, such interpretation. An extended printed text can carry its suggested interpretation with it. On the other hand, a brief written narrative does not carry with it a complete cargo of interpretations. The early American Indian autobiographer does not have a materially large discursive space in which to send autobiographical (primary) information *and* accompany it with interpretive (secondary) information.

Of the texts considered in this dissertation, the autobiography of Samson Occom (Mohegan), written in 1768, comes closest to satisfying the criteria for a “traditional” autobiography. His short text has most of the formal and content elements that readers expect in autobiographical discourse. He presents events from his life from childhood up to the time of his writing, he presents formative, important periods of his life, and he writes his text from one particular point of view, from one point in time rather than from a series of points as the epistolary autobiographers do.

In his introduction to Samson Occom’s “A Short Narrative of My Life,” Krupat writes, “Occom, surely the best-known Indian preacher of the eighteenth century, wrote his own life, explaining, justifying, and representing himself” (*Native* 93). “Occom’s first ‘autobiography,’ actually a letter he wrote in Boston on November 28, 1765, before he set off for England, detailed his education in a single page. He then composed an autobiographical text of ten pages, dated September 17, 1768, that remained unpublished in the Dartmouth archives until 1982. The document is, in David Brumble’s sense, one of self-vindication, and so, for all of Occom’s Christian acculturation, it perhaps also exhibits elements of traditional Mohegan narrative modes. This is, in any case, an area for further study” (Krupat, *Native* 105).

Occom’s text, “A Short Narrative of My Life,” relates events from his life from his childhood up to his time of writing, at age 45. His narrative fills six printed

pages, and relates significant periods of his life chronologically. He uses headings to separate the chapters of his life. The first section, headed “From my Birth till I received the Christian Religion,” begins with his birth and childhood, offering some details about the life of his tribe. He tells about occasional contact with “the English” for trading (12), and one man who “went about among the Indian Wigwams, and wherever he Could find the Indian Children, would make them read” (12-13). In this way, at about 10 years of age, Occom was introduced to literacy in English.

The second section, headed “From the Time of our Reformation till I left Mr. Wheelocks,” is roughly the same length as the first section, and focuses on Occom’s conversion to Christianity and his desire to learn to read so that he might convert others of his tribe. At about 16, Occom begins to be influenced by preachers who visit the Indians. Occom, “awakened & converted,” got a primer to teach himself English, and began reading the New Testament, with an idea in mind to “Instruct the poor [Indian] Children in Reading” (13). Desiring more instruction, Occom goes to Wheelock to learn to read better, intending to stay two or three weeks, but ending up staying four years.

In the third section, headed “From the Time I left Mr. Wheelock till I went to Europe,” Occom describes about twenty years of his life. After leaving Wheelock’s school, Occom searched for a place to teach, finally landing at Montauk, on Long Island, New York. The Indians there provided his food in return for his

teaching and, later, religious duties. Occom married and was able, with Wheelock's help, to persuade white missionary organizations to grant him £15 per year. Occom also describes the farming, hunting, and occasional jobs he must do to support his family.

Occom describes his pedagogical methods in teaching the Indian children. He spends almost a full printed page—about one-sixth of his entire narrative—explaining how he taught English and “Religious matters.”

The last page of this third section is an argument about his current situation. He compares his years of work, his successes and setbacks, and his remuneration to that of a white missionary who was paid more for less work. Occom asks “what can be the Reason that they used me after this manner?” and he concludes, “I believe it is because I am a poor Indian” (18).

In these six pages written on September 17, 1768, Occom chronologically reports significant events from his life. At relevant points, he breaks in to the chronological flow with descriptions of ways of life and teaching methods. And, finally, he interprets the events in light of larger political, racial, and economic contexts.

It is notable that Occom, writing in 1768, does not refer to his trip to England and Scotland in 1764-65, “where he delivered some three hundred sermons in an effort to obtain funds for Wheelock's Indian Charity School” (Peyer 12). This fundraising tour was a success, with Occom and Reverend Nathaniel Whitaker

“collecting some twelve thousand pounds” (Krupat, *Native American Autobiography* 105). Amazingly, Occom mentions his trip to Europe in the section title, but his narrative doesn’t mention it or its success. This is a puzzling omission for a writer who is trying to show that he has been underpaid for his teaching and pastoral work.

Critical responses to Occom are interesting. Brumble (forgetting Ashpo, Fowler, Shattock, Calvin, and Johnson?) calls Occom’s text “the oldest Indian autobiographical narrative I know of” (*American Indian Autobiography* 244). Krupat includes Occom’s text in an anthology, *Native American Autobiography*, but doesn’t offer analysis of it; however, splitting critical hairs, he would probably label Occom’s autobiography a bicultural text, one example of the “autobiographies by ‘civilized’ or christianized Indians whose texts [. . .] contain, inevitably, a bicultural element,” making it as much a product of Euro-American culture as Indian (*After* 31). If Weintraub had had an opportunity to read it, he probably would have noted the “crisis” exigence motivating the text; and Pascal would have applauded the text’s chronological approach, beginning with Occom’s birth. Bitzer and Gilmore would focus on the rhetorical situation inviting or urging Occom to write.

Another critical perspective, from Lynne Woods O’Brien, reminds us of the power of the rhetorical situation in shaping a text. The Christian Occom, writing in English, produces a discourse that is radically different from a pre-contact one. O’Brien writes, “Plains Indians traditionally did not tell their entire life stories because the lives of tribal members did not vary enough from one another to

warrant a complete recital. Tribes were homogeneous cultural units in which the basic patterns of daily life were the same for all” (O’Brien 5). O’Brien’s point dovetails with Weintraub’s concept of “crisis” as a motivating force in the production of autobiography.

In Occom’s essay, we have a text that treats the author’s life from childhood up to his forty-fifth year. Occom’s autobiography thus differs formally from the other five writers in that his text is more like what we would think of as a traditional autobiography in its focus on events of a longer period of time. Earlier in this chapter we noted in Roy Pascal’s theory that a text written from one point of view by an older person looking back over his or her life is more truly autobiographical. Pascal’s example in Augustine’s *Confessions* shows Augustine “re-collecting” memories, ordering them, and adding interpretive evaluations of them. Autobiographers can only do this, says Pascal, when they have a full range of memories from which to choose: “We need to see the sources of a life from childhood; only in this way do we grasp it” (12). And in Occom’s essay, we are fortunate to be able to see many of the childhood sources of Occom’s later life.

And yet the autobiographicality of the many letters by the other writers cannot be entirely dismissed. They are telling stories about the authors’ lives, in bits and pieces sometimes, but they are thus doing autobiography.

For Gusdorf, an awareness of history is a prerequisite to autobiography: “The man who takes the trouble to tell of himself knows that the present differs

from the past and that it will not be repeated in the future; he has become more aware of differences than of similarities [. . .]” (Gusdorf 30). So to do autobiography, we must see a difference between now, then, and the future.

Occom’s essay shows a Gusdorfian sense of history. Some of the other writers’ letters in places do too. For example, in Shattock’s and Johnson’s letters we see the writer focusing on events or series of events that cover a more extended period of time. In Shattock’s letters, the history of his tribe’s financial and political troubles is compressed into brief letters, and in Johnson’s longer epistles, great religious and political movements are similarly condensed in description. In Fowler’s letters, there is a sense of the passing of time in that he is reporting on his progress as a teacher to the Indian tribes he works for. Finally, in the case of Ashpo and Calvin, the letters focus more narrowly on recent personal incidents in the writers’ lives; their attention is limited to a smaller circle of events.

I believe that all of the texts function as autobiographical responses to rhetorical situations. While not all of the letter writers produced full autobiographies, all of the writers undertook writing the life of the self. Wherever we may stand on inflexible genre definitions, there is no denying the autobiographicality of these texts.

CHAPTER III

HOW THE WRITERS IDENTIFY AS AND WITH INDIANS

Thesis: I have never met a Native American. Thesis reiterated: I have met thousands of Indians.

PEN American panel in Manhattan, November 1994, on Indian Literature. N. Scott Momaday, James Welch, Gloria Miguel, Joy Harjo, and myself. Two or three hundred people in the audience. Mostly non-Indians; an Indian or three. Questions and answers.

“Why do you insist on calling yourselves Indian?” asked a white woman in a nice hat. “It’s so demeaning.”

“Listen,” I said. “The word belongs to us now. We are Indians. That has nothing to do with Indians from India. We are not American Indians. We are Indians, pronounced In-din. It belongs to us. We own it and we’re not going to give it back.”

So much has been taken from us that we hold on to the smallest things with all the strength we have left.

Sherman Alexie

“The Unauthorized Autobiography of Me”

One's identity is no small thing to hold on to. Knowing oneself, and knowing apt words to call oneself, are vital. Treading in a foreign language, Indians negotiated narrow trails through the English lexicon, seeking apt words to help them hold on to their identities. When Indians asked, "Who am I?", what words did they deem fitting for their answers? Writing a life of the self involves identifying oneself: "an Indian" or "a perishing soul" or "a heathen savage." More likely it is not "or." As contact between Indians and Europeans in New England continued over the years, and as some Indians accommodated themselves to European culture, their self-identification was likely a passage through a series of states: "Now I am an Indian"; and later, "Now I am a heathen"; and later again, "Now I am a Christian like the white men." The self identifies itself by describing itself.

But not everyone in the New World accommodated themselves to the colonial culture. Because identifying oneself means identifying with another, many times Indians resisted European ways and identified themselves with other Indians or with aspects of Indianness in order to be seen by others—and by themselves—as Indian. And when they found themselves in situations that asked them to identify themselves, they often chose to produce rhetorical responses that announced their Indian identity.

They voice an Indian identity because whatever else they're doing (and they are doing some impressive writing, imitating the rhetorical moves of an alien language and culture), the Indians are telling themselves and others who they are. In

many cases, the six Indian writers address their rhetoric of identification to themselves as much as to other readers. A central function of autobiography, identification helps writers tell themselves and others who they are, and this helps readers identify the “I” who is writing a life. Despite being pulled away from Indianness by a Euro-American culture, the Indians identify with at least some of their traditional culture. In the autobiographical texts by Ashpo, Calvin, Fowler, Shattock, Johnson, and Occom, even as they use English to write a life of the self, their language reveals their desire to be seen as Indians. In a careful reading of their texts, we can see that the need to identify with Indians is often stronger than the need to identify with their primary addressee, their teacher and religious mentor Eleazar Wheelock. And this need comes from within. When the Indian writers identify with Indians, they describe themselves to themselves.

Another way these writers describe themselves is through the language they use to describe those with whom they identify. Whether writing about other Indians or themselves, they use similar metaphors. When Joseph Johnson, a Mohegan, pityingly calls the Oneida “these poor Ignorant heathen” (125), the meaning in his choice of words is not far from when he calls himself “an Indian and a good for nothing one” (123). Or when Hezekiah Calvin writes of his Indian hosts that “Indians will be Indians they will still follow their evil Practices” (51), his categorical description of them parallels his specific self-description: “the Devil is always

tempting me to some mischeif, & It seems to me that I am as ready to comply as he is to tempt” (66).

On some level, perhaps not always a conscious one, they select language that will manifest their identities. That is, they create texts that exist outside of themselves and tell themselves, and others, who they are. Because it is a presence that speaks for its absent author, a text, as an object, becomes a sign of an absent author’s existence and identity. Radically postmodern interpretations claim that texts in fact *replace* their authors. Foucault, for example, argues that the presence of a text allows us “not only to circumvent references to an author, but to situate his recent absence” (182), a particularly fitting observation here because most of the texts produced by these Indian writers were letters, discourse present in the hands of readers when the authors were miles away. In the writer’s absence, the text speaks instead. “For a text to convey its message, it does not matter whether the author is dead or alive” (Ong 102). The message carried, of course, is influenced by the context: if the writer is long dead, the reader’s interpretation will be different than if the writer is still alive, for example. However, in either case, the present text replaces the absent writer, and the text’s voice replaces the writer’s voice.

If it makes sense to say that the voices of the letters replace the voices of the authors, then I would also argue that the letters’ semiotic value (i.e., their value as signs) is augmented by a monetary value when the signs become handled as objects that are exchangeable commodities, “sold” for money. The Indians wrote letters to

Wheelock who re-defined this personal correspondence to him as public writing samples for donors. In this case, as used for Wheelock's purposes, the Indians' letters, detached from any troublesome human body, accrued a monetary value when he forwarded these samples of Indians' writings to potential financial contributors in Britain as evidence of his school's successes (Murray, "Pray Sir" 17). As one historian describes it, Wheelock "not only gained gratitude and information from students' letters but also used them to raise his status as well as money [. . .]" (Murray, "Pray Sir" 29). Monetary support is more likely to be given to a thriving enterprise than to a young, unproven one. The letters, instrumental in proving Wheelock's school to be a thriving enterprise, thus showed their own worth in the marketplace.

The six Indian autobiographers were conscious of the particular rhetorical situation that invited them to respond by writing their letters, their writing samples. Wheelock once wrote to Oocom, "Don't fail to write nicely . . . write with care and all the acuracy you [can], Suitable to be sent abroad, if you want to write yt which is not suitable to be sent abroad write it on a different paper" (27 June 1762; qtd. in Wyss 10). These writers knew that Wheelock wanted information, and that he would be forwarding their letters to readers overseas who also wanted information. However, it is interesting that the letters themselves allude to this situation, of letters being supplied for a European audience, only when the letters suffer from some supposed deficiency. The authors apologize for letters that have frequent

misspellings, misapplied punctuation, ungrammatical sentences, and so on. The writers are quite aware of the rhetorical situation in which they are producing their texts, but, to Wheelock, they only hint at their awareness when they know their work has fallen short of Wheelock's needs. For example, Calvin writes in one letter, "I hope you will [*sic*] overlook the many Blunders I have made in my haste" (51), and Fowler explains one of his letters' problems this way: "Sir, I hope you won't let this Letter be seen, I have no Table to write upon, besides I have not writ so long my Hand's out of order" (Fowler 91). In another letter, Fowler adds a postscript to explain, "I hope you will overlook all my imperfections in this Letter for I wrote the biggest Part of it in Darkness" (Fowler 100). And Johnson also pleads a late hour in defense of his haste: "P.S. I began this Letter I believe it was about ten o'clock this evening and I am in such a great hurry that I can't write over again" (Johnson 177). These apologies are not merely for hastily written letters. The Indian writers know that for Wheelock to be able to use their letters for his purposes, he must re-copy and correct their writing. For example, the manuscript of one of Fowler's letters to Wheelock (24 June 1765) has interlinear corrections and even one completely revised sentence written in Wheelock's hand, much the way an editor would begin to prepare a text for publication (Fowler 96). And this is what Wheelock does with their letters to him: he prepares them for "public"-ation.

Another deficiency in the letters that made them unsuitable for Wheelock's purposes was the topics of some letters. In one of his letters, David Fowler writes,

“I am very sorry I cain’t write you a Letter, which can be seen abroad. because M^r Kirtland is so much hurrid to get down: but he can give you a proper Idea of my School and my own Affairs.—I believe I may venter [venture] to write my secrets to you as I wont to do. since I have so often seen and felt your tender Cares and Affections” (Fowler 102). The “secrets” that he writes about concern his courting a certain woman and his request for good cloth to make his clothes. Such a letter would be of no interest “abroad,” in Great Britain, except as the target of a voyeuristic gaze from those curious about marriage customs among colonized natives. At the end of this letter full of personal news Fowler writes, “Sir. Dont be angry with me for write so bold and foolish. I hope you will not expose me” (Fowler 102). Fowler has reason to anticipate Wheelock’s anger at this kind of letter, which is useless for Wheelock’s purpose in sending texts to benefactors as it does not even once mention Fowler’s missionary work among the Oneida.

One of Joseph Johnson’s letters (2 May 1768) displays a different kind of alleged deficiency, one that is actually useful to Wheelock. Johnson asks in his postscript for confidentiality, not because of the clearly controversial topic, but because of his composition skills: “P.S. please sir to overlook my hast, and the many Blunders which I suppose are in this paper. I have no time to write it over or correct it. dont Expose it. so I remain your Humble Servant” (Johnson 133). However, his letter has information useful to Wheelock. In this letter, Johnson has harsh words for French Catholic missionaries who were wooing Indians to a more

sensuous form of Christianity (that even allowed drinking!) than the forms of religion offered by Puritan-influenced New England Protestants. What Johnson does not want exposed to benefactors' eyes are his spelling errors and hastily construed grammar, but such a letter, warning that Jesuits from Canada were travelling south to make new converts, would be exactly the kind of information Wheelock could use to rouse the anti-Catholic Protestants in Great Britain to send even more money.

Regardless of real or imagined deficiencies, evidence of the monetary value of these Indians' writings is reasonably clear. Samson Occom and Nathaniel Whitaker spent two years—February 1766 to March 1768—preaching in England, Scotland, and Ireland to raise money for Wheelock's Indian school. This fundraising journey netted £11,000, thanks in large part to Occom, who was “probably more effective than anyone else connected with the mission” (Richardson 13). He inspired good feeling wherever he went. “Occom seems to have been a likeable person, who aroused no antagonisms, and who was held in high esteem both by those who met him casually and by those who came to know him intimately” (Richardson 13). Occom's physical presence in Britain represented the Christianized Indians of America, much as the Indians' letters, forwarded to Britain, represented the Indians who wrote them. Occom's presence gave flesh to the letters; however, the voices of the many letters could tell more about Indian life than Occom could tell alone. And so, from London, Whitaker wrote to Wheelock, “I beg you would send me all the good Samples of the Indians writing you can by the first

opportunity” (Whitaker 123). Ocom and Whitaker used these samples to bolster their claims that Wheelock’s school was successful in educating and converting the Indians. Showing this kind of success meant that Ocom and Whitaker (and Wheelock) stood to raise more money than if they had no evidence of success to present.

How does all of this relate to Indians identifying with Indians? “Wheelock needed model students to people the narratives he sent overseas to solicit funding” (Murray, “Pray Sir” 29). Not only “model students,” but model *Indian* students. Because the letters stood in for the authors, those letters had to display authentic Indianness if they were to be of value to Wheelock. Model students would certainly be expected to write grammatical sentences and spell correctly, but model *Indian* students would also be expected to identify themselves with Indian culture, if only to repent from and repudiate that Indian culture’s heathen way of life. Somehow, then, because their writings replaced the authors, in their letters, the Indian writers had to give sufficient textual evidence of their Indianness. Identification is one means of establishing such evidence.

Kenneth Burke’s discussion of the rhetoric of identification helps illuminate how these texts function. Identification, as one operation of communication, is a use of language designed to cause belief that one and another share common ground. Burke explains, “A is not identical with his colleague, B. But insofar as their interests are joined, A is *identified* with B. Or he may *identify himself* with B even when

their interests are not joined, if he assumes that they are, or is persuaded to believe so” (20; Burke’s emphasis). Identification is achieved through one’s rhetorical choices. In discussing the use of language to persuade, Burke writes, “You persuade a man only insofar as you can talk his language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, *identifying* your ways with his” (55; emphasis in original). When writers try to talk the language of their readers, they make such word choices: calling oneself *a Christian* instead of *an Indian, a perishing soul, or a heathen savage* is to make word choices that may persuade readers to see common ground between themselves and the writer.

I find it interesting that one of the linguistic choices made by these eighteenth-century writers is to use few or no words from their native languages. In contrast, twentieth-century American Indian writers using an autobiographical form more often use words from Indian languages, with or without translating them. The situation of the eighteenth-century Indians may seem odd, at first, if we assume that they will identify with Indians by using Indian languages; however, recall that the primary audience for these texts under discussion was Eleazar Wheelock. Wheelock neither spoke nor wrote Indian languages, and he was in most cases the “employer” to whom the Indians reported when they wrote about their teaching and preaching, so it would have made little sense to use Indian words when writing to him, even if the writer is identifying with Indians. Moreover, the secondary audience for the letters, the British benefactors, also had no command of American Indian languages.

While the Indian writers could have used words from their native languages as evidence in their texts that they were Indians, such a rhetorical move could have been counterproductive by proving that the Indians had not been completely civilized by Wheelock's school.

Identifying with Indians in English may have been too difficult. If the Indians received an English lexicon in the eighteenth-century that didn't provide for ways to say positive things about Indians, then Hezekiah Calvin, Joseph Johnson, and the others may have had to express their identification with Indians in other ways. English might be used to express the inadequacy of English, or English may be abandoned completely. For example, Calvin expresses regret at the loss of his native language, writing to Wheelock, "I greatly have a fond for, that I might learn somewhat of my own Native Language, [. . .] that I might be able to carry on a free discourse with the Indians if no more, And not be as A dumb stump that has no tonnge to use, like as when I was among the Mohawk Indians how tiresome was my life; could'nt understand ym and no body to keep up a free discourse with" (58). For Calvin, the knowledge of an Indian language represents "free discourse," meaning on one level being able to converse easily and skillfully in a language, but on another level being able to converse in freedom "with the Indians if no more," i.e., with the Indians if no one else. Calvin sees knowing his Indian language as a way to speak freely, something not available to him when he speaks English.

Joseph Johnson identified with Indians, not by using English, but by turning apostate from what he learned via English. According to the missionary Samuel Kirkland, Johnson “turn’d pagan for about a week—painted, sung—danc’d—drank & whor’d it, w^h [with] some of y^e savage Indians he cou’d find” (McCallum 141). He then left his teaching post in New York and went to sea, working on ships that carried him along the North American Atlantic coast and to Antigua, Grenada, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands (Johnson 150). This period lasted about 3 years, before Johnson turned again to a Christian faith and began organizing the Brothertown settlement. During this time away, he identified with “pagan” or non-colonized Indians by living like and with them. He could not identify with non-colonized, free, Indians in the language of the colonizers; instead, he used a discourse of his body.

When they use English to identify, the Indian autobiographers don’t identify solely with Indians; they also identify with Wheelock, the tenets of Christianity, the British colonial administrators, the King of England, and others. Sometimes these different identifications overlap. When, for example, one of the writers identifies with Indians, he may distance himself from Wheelock or Christianity, or he may try to identify with Indians *and* Wheelock *and* Christianity simultaneously, and so on. It is important to keep in mind that the Indians’ identification with or distancing from Wheelock is not always in response to his Christianity. However, Wheelock’s own self-identity is inextricably intertwined with Christianity—to disrespect Wheelock is

to disrespect Jesus, and *vice versa*. In light of Wheelock's point of view, we can see, in a few places in the texts, the Indian writers responding with a complicated pattern of identification in which they identify with Indians, against Wheelock, and with Christianity. This formula presents a claim by the writer that he is a saved, i.e., Christianized, Indian, which makes him as good as Wheelock. This formula not only allows Indian writers to identify with Indians and with Christian beliefs, it also works as resistance against anti-Indian racism. Yet the letters are to Wheelock, so other Indians are not aware that these six writers are identifying with them. Thus, even though the six writers are aware that Wheelock is their audience, they still identify with Indians in resistance to a complete assimilation and homogenization into white culture. In many cases, I believe, the Indian writers are addressing their identifications to themselves more than to any possible Indian readers of their texts.

Samson Occom's autobiography provides an example of someone identifying with Christianity and using that identification to argue against unfair treatment because of racism. As I have discussed in Chapter II, Occom's text tells his story of conversion, education, teaching, and preaching. At the end of his story, he contrasts the amount of money he has received to the amount a white missionary received. Both men received £ 180, the white man for one year's work and Occom for twelve years' work. Occom argues that the disparity is only because he is an Indian, and he ends his complaint about unequal pay with these words: "I Can't help that God has made me So; I did not make my self so" (18). With this sentence,

Occom launches a direct attack against the anti-Indian racism that permeated the culture even—or especially—among Protestant New England religious leaders. Wheelock too was not free from racism, calling his Indian students his “black children,” Samson Occom his “black son,” and unconverted tribes the “Black Tribes” (Axtell 211). “As an owner of black slaves for much of his life, Wheelock was perfectly capable of distinguishing the two races” (Axtell 212). Occom’s words ignore arguments about the Great Chain of Being or whether Indians have souls, and so on. Instead, by claiming that he is as God made him, he puts himself on equal footing with the other creations that God has made, including white Euro-American preachers.

Joseph Johnson also identified with Christianity and with Indians against white racism. This is most clear in his speech on 20 January 1774 to the Oneidas at Kanoarohare, New York. Johnson, part of a group that worked to create the Brothertown Settlement, presented the idea to the Oneidas, from whom they sought to buy land. In his speech, Johnson found ways to identify not only with the Oneidas, but also with other Indian tribes. This was important because Brothertown was to be a settlement comprised of Christianized Indians from seven New England towns and tribes who sought to live together away from English towns, government, and influences. To help promote identification among all the tribes meeting, Johnson’s speech uses a kinship metaphor to structure relations between the Oneidas and the seven New England tribes, addressing the Oneidas as “elder Brethren” and

calling the New England Indians younger brothers (Johnson 160). Johnson also works to establish a common ground between the New England Indians he represents and the Oneidas by referring to an Other, in this case the wicked Englishman who “loves to take the advantage of poor, Ignorant, and blind Indians” (Johnson 161). When they have the Indians “drowned in Spirituous Liquors,” the English “as it were cut off their Right hands” by taking away their lands, livelihood, and tribal unity; “and thus our English Brethren leaves us and laugh” (Johnson 161). Unable to defeat English racism or successfully use whites’ Christianity to argue against it, the Brothertown group hoped to move west, away from the English. Johnson’s speech masterfully works to weave together the interests of several tribes, getting them to identify with one another against injustices perpetrated by whites.

George Lakoff and Mark Johnson’s theory of “categories” in language, which provides an effective way to focus on categorical terms in the Indian autobiographers’ writings, complements Burke’s ideas about identification. When writers select and use terms denoting categories, their choice of language can, on one hand, define or describe a set of like aspects, but, on the other hand, conceal or divert attention away from other sets of aspects that may be categorically named. When one communicates, making categories is inevitable, say Lakoff and Johnson: “In order to understand the world and function in it, we have to categorize, in ways that make sense to us, the things and experiences that we encounter” (162). We categorize by “identifying a *kind* of object or experience by highlighting certain

properties, downplaying others, and hiding still others” (163; emphasis in original). Categories are constituted in language by selecting one set of aspects to focus on. The act of identifying categories complements Burke’s ideas on identification quite nicely in that both theories are related by their focus on discourse that is produced as a result of intentional word choice. Categories can be discovered more easily when a term may be observed in contrast to another. For example, writers who use the category “Christian,” whether in the eighteenth century or the twenty-first, necessarily rely on the existence of a contrasting category, “non-Christian.” But differentiating and focusing on one set of aspects puts other aspects out of focus.

This idea of contradictory categories sheds light on the tension these Indian writers lived with, suggesting how divided the writers were within themselves about the issue of Indianness. David Fowler on one hand calls Oneidas “My Friends” (94), “poor Creatures” (99), and “my poor benighted Brethren” (106), but in the same letters—sometimes in the very next sentence—he calls Oneida cooks “nasty as Hogs” (94), and he calls Oneida men “the laziest Crew I ever Saw in all my Days” and “lazy and sordid Wretches” (96). Hezekiah Calvin repeatedly calls his Mohawk hosts “Indians,” referring to them over and over as “the Indians” or “these Indians.” This sounds like a neutral term until he writes, “how glad should I be if I could do but a Little good among these Savages, but yet I think Indians will be Indians they will still follow their evill Practices” (51). Joseph Johnson’s terms for the Indians are generally respectful; still he makes an interesting reference to Oneidas as his “Savage

Brethren” (148), a category that mixes the uncivil and familial, perhaps reflecting his own conflicted feelings. Samson Occom offers one word—“heathen”—to stand for two contrasting categories when he writes of his tribe that “they strictly maintained and followed their Heathenish Ways, customs and Religion” (12). If Occom is using “heathen” as an ironic synonym for Indian (as I think he is), then he is actually praising the Mohegans for conserving the traditions of the culture and rejecting the culture of the English interlopers, even though “heathen” to Wheelock will only mean non-Christian. And one critic notes,

In his description of the lifeways of his people before his conversion, for instance, his wording seems too careful to overlook: strategically complicating the derogatory “Heathenish” with the positive connotations of “Religion”—a religion “strictly maintained” at that. (Nelson 56)

It appears that Occom is using a categorical term that “should” mean one thing to mean something else. This usage is a comparatively sophisticated use of language, especially if he’s slipping this by Wheelock, his employer and religious mentor.

In Wheelock’s discourse, we see represented the white religious colonialist attitude about American Indians, an attitude that gets taught to the Indians in Wheelock’s schools. He calls them “miserable creatures” and “savage” (*Narrative* vi), “Heathen Natives” (*Narrative* 10), “a sore Scourge to our Land” (*Narrative* 11), “lawless Herds” (*Narrative* 24), and other like terms of endearment. Wheelock

evidenced “a racial attitude that placed Indians on a level with blacks—on the lowest shelf of humanity. Like many of his contemporaries, Wheelock frequently referred to his ‘black’ children, especially his ‘black son’ Samson Occom, and to the ‘Black Tribes’ on the frontiers who needed his help” (Axtell 211).

Seeing Wheelock’s texts compared to the Indians’, it is little wonder that we discern the contrasting categories of terms for Indians. As these Indian writers struggle to identify with Indians, they must also take note of a racism on the part of some whites, who will be satisfied with a colonization of America only when all natives have given up their Indian identity or are dead. The Indians’ use of categorical terms for themselves reflects the writers’ precarious situation. When Joseph Johnson refers to himself as an “Indian,” he must qualify this categorical term, calling himself a “good for nothing Black Indian” (131). To an Indian writer who seeks to align himself with Euro-American culture, it may seem prudent to call other Indians “lazy,” “nasty as hogs,” and “sordid wretches,” but in the eyes of white racist readers, this name-calling is merely the pot calling the kettle black. While the Indian writers may be attempting to use these derogatory categories to identify with the colonizers, their terms function as ways to focus on the attempt to hide their own Indianness, perhaps from themselves as well as from Wheelock, since, as Lakoff and Johnson note, bringing to the foreground one category hides others. For an Indian to call another Indian a wretch hides the speaker’s Indianness.

To augment critical approaches such as Burke's and Lakoff and Johnson's, Lloyd Bitzer's theory of rhetorical situations offers a point of view from which to propose motives that invite a writer—or speaker—to identify with another. For Bitzer, a rhetorical situation begins as a three-part situation that is composed of an exigence to be faced, an audience to be addressed, and constraints that channel one's actions and thoughts. The rhetorical situation does not compel or demand one's response; instead, it “strongly invites utterance” (Bitzer 303). And, when one responds to that invitation and produces utterance (spoken, written, or otherwise), the speaker and the utterance become two additional parts of the rhetorical situation. Finally, because it *invites* utterance, a rhetorical situation must be seen as allowing for *options* in one's utterance—there *isn't* an inevitability in one's response to an invitation to speak.

Occom's autobiography, for example, responds to an exigence of unequal pay, addresses an audience unknown (probably Wheelock since the autobiography was discovered in Wheelock's papers), and operates within various constraints, such as cultural, religious, political, legal, racial, and so on. Once he produces his autobiography, it and Occom become two additional parts of the rhetorical situation. To see how Occom could have responded differently to the rhetorical situation—or even not at all—we need only introduce new variables. For example, Occom could have internalized a racist way of thinking that led him to passively accept his inequitable situation. After all, it was Wheelock's contention that the cost of

educating an American Indian “would be one half that of educating a white man” (McCallum 15), so why should Occom complain about being paid less than a white missionary? On the contrary, he might have boasted of his ability to get by on less than a white missionary; he might have mocked the white missionary’s inability to do without. Or, since there is nothing in a rhetorical situation that makes one’s response inevitable, Occom could have kept silent. But something else in the rhetorical situation prompted Occom to express his complaint in his autobiography. Perhaps Occom wrote to persuade Wheelock to give him more financial support, or perhaps he wrote this text to someone in Britain, trying to win direct financial support from there that would not have to be channeled through Wheelock or the Boston board of commissioners. At any rate, regardless of the cause (or my inability to pinpoint it), Occom did produce a text in response to a particular rhetorical situation.

In responding to a particular rhetorical situation, Joseph Johnson speaks for the Indians of seven town and tribes in New England who are pursuing the Brothertown plan, part of the success of which relies on convincing the Oneidas to sell one hundred square miles of land and allow New England Indians to settle among them. When he makes his speech, Johnson is not proposing the idea out of the blue. There had been contact with the Oneidas beforehand to arrange the meeting. But at this meeting, Johnson has an opportunity to speak to Oneida leaders who at least have some knowledge of what he will be talking about. But the

exigence isn't the meeting or the speech to the Oneida chiefs and tribe members. The exigence is the deteriorating situation in New England that has driven various tribes to consider a move, perhaps even as far away as Ohio: the Indians' land is being stolen or bought out from under them (sometimes it's hard to tell the difference), diseases from Europe have reduced the population of many tribes by ninety percent, and so on. The dream of setting up Brothertown in Oneida territory is also part of the exigence that invites Johnson to speak. The audience for Johnson's speech, in light of his repeated accusations against the English, is clearly not the mass of English-American whites across New England. The implied audience is Indians, most of whom have had at one time or another, some dealings with the English and so can identify with Johnson's rhetoric. An example of a constraint, though, in this speech situation, is that Johnson and the other Indians know that not all white people are bad (their experience with Sir William Johnson, the Crown's superintendent of relations with Indians of the northern colonies who helped the Oneida and New England Indians organize Brothertown, was good), so Johnson has to keep repeating this point too, along with his accusations against the whites. This knowledge, that not all whites are bad, acts as a constraint on Johnson's speech that bars him from making a blanket accusation. He has to temper his claims with concessions that some whites are the Indians' friends.

For both Occom and Johnson, the response to their respective rhetorical situations includes identification with Indians. This is significant when we recall that

a true rhetorical situation must allow for options in one's discourse, making it *not* inevitable that Occom and Johnson would identify with Indians. Identification is one of several textual options open to the Indian writers. (This point will become a bit clearer in Chapter IV as I discuss places in their texts when they choose not to identify with but to distance themselves from an Indian identity.)

Another rhetorical situation prompting the Indians' writing is seen in the texts' recurring functions. The letters written by Ashpo, Fowler, Shattock, Calvin, and Johnson often served as progress reports from these field workers to Wheelock. They reported arrangements for setting up and supporting schools, how many students they had, how many worshipers attended church, how many converts were made, what supplies were needed, events in the life of the Indians, and so on. They also reported on which of their students showed promise to become successful students at Wheelock's school. These letters, full of the professional news that Wheelock could forward to benefactors in Britain, were fitting responses for the Indians' rhetorical situation as well as Wheelock's.

One response to the rhetorical situation, not specifically requested by Wheelock, is a report on the political climate of the areas the Indian teachers and preachers were working in. Wheelock had to rely solely on the reports he received from his contacts on the frontier rather than on his own first-hand understanding of situations. "Oddly enough [. . .] there is no evidence that Wheelock ever visited the Indians in their remote settlements in the Province of New York or that he ever

visited any body of Indians in Connecticut” (McCallum 15). He was thus left to depend on whatever information he could piece together from letters and visitors carrying news, a necessary task since the situations on the frontier affected the work of the Indian teachers and preachers. For example, if there was conflict between tribes, between a tribe and colonists, or even between factions within one tribe, the resulting potential for violence created dangerous situations for the Indians who worked for Wheelock, requiring them to temporarily abandon their host villages. Consequently, almost half of Ashpo’s first letter addresses this topic, attempting to reassure Wheelock that peace reigned. Fowler, reporting on the religious political climate, sent Wheelock information on other Protestant preachers, and Johnson fretted that Roman Catholic missionaries from Quebec were converting and exerting an “evil” influence on the Oneidas. For Shattock, the political climate extended from his tribe’s shrinking land-holdings to the Rhode Island colonial government to the government of King George III and his Privy Council. And for Occom, the political climate apparently included intrigue on the part of religious leaders in Boston who had tried to sabotage Occom and Whitaker’s fund-raising trip to Great Britain. While Wheelock could often do little about the issues raised in these climate reports, he took from them a better understanding of situations that he never saw in person, and he could sometimes aid a little by writing letters to influential parties (e.g., he wrote letters to aid Shattock’s case against the Narraganset sachem, he wrote

letters of introduction for his students when they went on missionary trips, and he wrote to Sir William Johnson to encourage the Brothertown project).

It is important to recognize that writers become part of the audience for their texts. As they write, they read over what they have produced, becoming aware of the text from the point of view of a reader, as well as a writer. They may focus on problems, for example grammar, spelling, or even a topic that, on reflection, doesn't fit the rest of the text. Bitzer's and Burke's theories support the idea that writers become their own audiences. We recall that for Bitzer, rhetorical situations have an exigence, an audience, and a set of constraints, and when one responds to a situation, the respondent *and* his or her response become parts of the rhetorical situation (305-06). Bitzer does not say as much, but presumably one is then invited to respond to this reconfigured rhetorical situation. Kenneth Burke also claims that one becomes one's own audience. He argues that all discourse is "persuasive" in the sense that it tries to convince an audience of its truth, and he claims that "persuasion implies an audience," even if it is only oneself (38). So a producer of discourse becomes one's own audience in addition to address others.

Not only Wheelock and British patrons saw the Indian in the text; the Indians also saw (at least a version of) themselves in their own written discourse. This fits Foucault's *écriture* theory, which claims that writing replaces or stands in for its author. From the point of view of *écriture*, a text becomes an object available for observation by all, including the author who now stands outside of it. Walter Ong's

comments on literacy parallel Foucault's claim: "By separating the knower from the known, writing makes possible increasingly articulate introspectivity, opening the psyche as never before not only to the external objective world quite distinct from itself but also to the interior self against whom the objective world is set" (Ong 105). Once writers begin to set down their thoughts, ideas, emotions, etc. on paper, the inevitable linearity of literate discourse helps to determine the order such things are set down, as well as offering the possibility that paper records replace memory, so that new connections between far-separated discourse points may be made. Thus when David Fowler writes his "confession" of misbehavior (87) or Samson Occom writes a "Short Narrative" of his life, they are able to learn more about their own identity, as introspectivity externalized. Because of literacy, Indians could read their own texts as if the author were another—an Other—and so learn more about themselves.

One problem that I have not dealt with yet concerns the motivations causing the Indians to identify with Indians. Bitzer has provided the theory of the rhetorical situation, which treats discourse as an effect produced by a writer who is responding to an invitation issued within a situation. In this situation, however, the Indian writers are invited to identify as both-and: In their texts, they must present themselves as Indians so their writing samples have value, and they must present themselves as Europeanized so their writing samples have value. One of the duties of their "job" is to provide written documents to Wheelock. "It was Wheelock's

plan, not only to train these missionaries and schoolmasters in his Lebanon school, but to direct their activities and to be responsible for their support in the mission field itself' (Richardson 11). Just as Wheelock used the Indians' writings to raise money for his school, the Indian writers themselves provided the writings as part of the work for which they were paid.

Political philosopher Louis Althusser's essays on ideology offer a useful window into the workings of State power and its effect on the individual, which I find apt in describing the Indians' situation. Althusser posits the existence of repressive State apparatuses (RSAs) and ideological State apparatuses (ISAs). RSAs are the government, administrators, the army, the judiciary, and so on (16-17). ISAs are such entities as the Church, schools, media, and cultural (literary, artistic, sports, etc.) aspects (17). Where RSAs function primarily through violence, ISAs function primarily through ideology, hailing subjects. (Hailing is Althusser's term, referring to the police "hailing" or stopping someone on the street; he uses "hailing" metaphorically to represent the State apparatus's order to citizens to obey.) In North America, the colonial RSA had used violence to overcome Indian resistance to white colonization. The relatively few remaining Indians of eighteenth-century New England knew well the history of Indian-white relations and needed little reminding that Euro-American political and military power, combined with "germ warfare," was overwhelming. But reminding, or hailing, is precisely how ISAs operate, persuading individuals to become and remain obedient subjects of the State.

Althusser argues that “school (but also other State institutions like the Church, or other apparatuses like the Army) teaches ‘know-how’, but in forms which ensure *subjection to the ruling ideology* or the mastery of its ‘practice’” (7; emphasis in original). Everyone learns facts and processes in school, as well as learning obedience to the prevailing ideology. Everyone “must in one way or another be ‘steeped’ in this ideology in order to perform their tasks ‘conscientiously’” (7). The two State apparatuses, repressive and ideological, use violence and hailing to “recruit” subjects into obedience. Forms of these apparatuses and their violence and hailing are part of the rhetorical situation. And one response to such produces self-life-writing.

Present, then, in all six of the autobiographers, is evidence that repressive and ideological apparatuses are operating upon them. First, and perhaps least obvious, is the fact that they write in English. They use a communication medium and a language forced on them by the government. To do business with that government, they must learn its language, via Wheelock’s (and others’) schools. If we argue that the Indians chose freely to adopt the colonizers’ language, we need only compare the New England context with the Spanish colonies, the French colonies, and the Portuguese colonies in order to see readily that Indians who succumb to the colonizers’ power adopt the colonizers’ language. That is, New England Indians may have had, in theory, freedom to choose which European

language to learn, but few opted for Portuguese or Spanish. They learned English because that was the language of those who wielded power there.

A second observable sign that these six writers have been recruited by the State apparatus is visible in their devotion to the Europeans' God and their zeal for undertaking cross-tribal evangelism. Typically, American Indian tribes did not try to convert other tribes to their spiritual practices, because they believed that the Creator gave each tribe its own set of practices.

Indigenous religious traditions are not, like Christianity or Islam, proselytizing faiths. Rather, one tribe has its instructions from the Creator and respects that others have their own instructions as well. One group sees no need to convert another to its religious system. As long as both tribes fulfill their responsibilities, all will be well. It is not necessary for sparrows to want to be eagles. This religious pluralism is one factor in Natives' easy initial acceptance of European invaders. They were simply one more set of people with different gods and different ways of organizing themselves. (Weaver xi)

But in most of these autobiographical texts we see their devotion, so to speak, to the religion of the English, as they plan and undertake sowing the Gospel about the Lord Jesus Christ.

A third sign of Wheelock's Indians' obedience to the State's ideology is their participation in the white education system. They attended Wheelock's school for

years, then left to set up schools of their own, satellites of Wheelock's institution. These satellite schools were to prepare the Indian children to be sent away to Wheelock's school, so the frontier schoolmasters were to keep an eye out for likely prospects (e.g., see Fowler 90, Johnson 124, Shattock 206). The Indian writers thus not only submitted themselves to the ideological education system, but planned in turn to persuade others to submit also; however, "despite white protestations that assimilation was the end desired, white-imposed restrictions were the most powerful influence reinforcing Indian identity" (Nielsen 401). That is, the colonists' education apparatus offered benefits to the Indians, but only at the high price of cultural suicide. In attending white schools, the Indians came into contact with institutionalized attitudes about Indians. As Wheelock wrote in his description of his Charity-School's plan, "Christianizing the Natives of this Land is expressly mentioned in the Royal Charter granted to this Colony [. . .]" (Wheelock, *Narrative* 12). Religious conversion of the natives was not merely Wheelock's personal, individual undertaking; it was part of the British government's policy for the colonized people.

Such is the case for the Indians writing to Wheelock. They are being hailed, not fully but half-way, into Christianity and the white world. And the Christianity they were hailed into prescribed particular behaviors for the Indians to follow to keep Wheelock's personal and financial support. Instead of being called to full

assimilation into white culture, to become white, they are being called to serve white culture's mission to expand its empire.

In responding to their rhetorical situation, the writers address one exigence calling for action—their need to identify with other Indians. Wheelock, their primary audience, is a major part of the rhetorical situation; we have seen examples, from his writings, of his thoughts about Indians, and so we can hypothesize Indians' responses to his point of view. In a situation, “persons, events, objects, and relations [. . .] have the power to constrain decision and action” (Bitzer 305). The relation between Wheelock and the Indians who write to him is one of unequal power when it is Wheelock who decides how much money to give his missionaries, Wheelock who often served on the committees that decided who shall be licensed to preach, and Wheelock who must be appeased when one of his adult students leaves school to help an aged and indebted parent (Fowler 87).

Ultimately, what's true for the Indians is true for all of us. They are hailed into systems, taught to communicate in that system's way, “invited” to identify with elements of that new system and leave behind disapproved elements of their old system, and then to educate (to lead out) or hail others from the old system into the new. When the Indian autobiographers writing within this system identify with Indians, they are using their discourse to react against the system in several ways: they are valuing, affirming, and standing with Indian culture in general; they are standing with *individual* Indians, not necessarily all Indians or all tribes; they are

valuing Indians as humans with souls; or they are using identification as a means of resisting the culture of the white invaders.

In a typical identification, one finds common ground directly with another. But in the case of these Indian autobiographers, in their letters *to* Wheelock, the writers often seek common ground with Indians and *against* Wheelock. This is the rhetorical situation in which one writes a life of the self against forces that are not seeking the same common ground in return. That is, Wheelock writes to persuade the Indians to come to his point of view. He isn't interested in going half way to meet the Indians on a middle no-man's-land common ground; he wants the Indians to dis-arm themselves (i.e., drop their culture and ideology), cross the no-man's-land, and join forces with Wheelock, taking up the white European Christian culture and ideology. Wheelock often represented that white culture to them, so their resistance to it often takes aim directly at him. In the face of hostility, in writing the life of the self, these six writers identify as and with Indians. They use identification with each other as a way to resist, to stand up against the non-Indian.

CHAPTER IV
HOW THE WRITERS DISTANCE THEMSELVES
FROM AN INDIAN IDENTITY

Are you Indian, Grampa?

No.

Then why is your skin so dark?

Cause I'm French. Us French is always dark.

Joseph Bruchac

“Notes of a Translator’s Son”

When the six writers I am studying distanced themselves from Indianness and identified with the English, they created a new discursive space and new identities with which to occupy that space. Drawing upon their own traditional culture and the new culture imported by the colonists, their words built up a new area of common ground in between the cultures of the Old World and the New. Like explorers venturing into unmapped lands, they followed rivers, backtracked, stumbled through forests, and wrote their stories.

As they wrote, with merely a sentence or two they altered their identities. Renaming and redefining one’s identity offered life-changing, or even life-saving, new choices. But this act of self-redefinition often came at the cost of their native

language, culture, and tradition. In exchange for survival, they had to pay with pieces of their former way of life. Because this identity exchange took place in writing, the texts themselves remain as evidence of what's gained and what's given up. When these six Indians, in their writing, distanced from an Indian identity, they left behind a traceable record of their cultural purchases and payments.

The six New England Indian writers were subjugated by a colonizing culture and labeled "Indian." If they wanted to participate in the colonists' culture, the Indians were required—as white colonists were not—to choose what racialized role to play. Although they acquiesced in part to the Indian role devised for them by white invaders, the writers also distanced themselves from a full identification with Indianness. Identifying instead with roles in the colonists' culture, they took up the work of one or another Euro-American ideological apparatus—the schools or the churches, for example—to glean a livelihood for themselves and their families.

However, while taking up the Other's work dislodged these Indian writers from a strictly Indian identity, it did not make them into copies of the Other they imitated; that is, identifying with a white, colonizing culture did not turn them into culturally white colonists, but neither did it let them remain only Indian. With varying degrees of intensity, each Indian writer used consciously selected language to both distance himself from characteristics that represented Indianness and identify with those that represented whiteness. This simultaneous distancing from Indianness and identification with white culture drew the Indians away from their

tribal point of view. By this move, the writers, no longer firmly “Indian” and unable to be white, created a new cultural location for themselves. Rather than identifying with and occupying either a traditional Indian subject position or a white colonist one, they created a new cultural space between these dichotomies. Then, in order to play a role in this new space, they created hybrid identities for themselves, drawing upon Indian and white cultures to invent eclectic personae to occupy the new cultural borderland.

In a discussion of *distancing* and *identification*, it is important that we recognize the inevitable relation between these rhetorical acts. I think of these two words as a set of “grounding” terms, in the sense that *identification* refers to seeking common cultural ground and *distancing* to abandoning common ground. Writers often shift ground, identifying with a new point of view, person, or institution *and* distancing from an old one. Note that I must write “and” in the previous sentence because, as I understand them, identification and distancing are paired rhetorical functions. That is, using one of these functions entails using the other (regardless of “which came first”). We can see their mutual entailment in their results: distancing from one’s current identity never leaves one with a null identity; instead, one inevitably moves closer to another identity. And the converse is also true: moving closer to a new identity entails distancing from an old one.

Both distancing and identification are products of the authors’ rhetorical choices. Recall Burke’s discussion of the language of identification: “You persuade a

man only insofar as you can talk his language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, *identifying* your ways with his” (55; Burke’s emphasis). In a discussion of distancing, Burke’s theory might be seen this way, from an opposite point of view: *You [distance yourself from] a man only insofar as you can talk his language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, [distancing] your ways [from] his.* Each Indian writer, speaking in reply to his unique rhetorical situation, defines himself through his rhetoric. And whether he is seeking or abandoning common ground, he tries to talk the language of his readers, the colonists.

In Chapter II I discussed the emerging autobiographicality in their self-life-writing as the six Indian writers faced the new paradigm of writing, in English, about themselves. In Chapter III I discussed how they identified with Indians as a way to identify themselves. In this chapter I want to turn the identification issue around and discuss ways they autobiographically identify themselves with the dominant culture by distancing themselves farther from an Indian identity.

As we examine ways the six Indian writers distance from an Indian identity, we can see that, unlike Joseph Bruchac’s grandfather quoted in this chapter’s epigraph, none of the writers claimed a European identity. None tried to pass for English, French, or Dutch. They continued to identify themselves as “Indians.” The label “Indian” and its contents were Euro-American interpretations. Historically, the colonists, following their own tradition, had generally called the native people of North and South America “Indians,” and this error persisted until

almost everyone, Europeans and “Indians” alike, came to use it without thinking about its meaning. Roger Williams, founder of Rhode Island, wrote, “They have often asked mee, why we call them *Indians*[,] *Natives*, &c. And understanding the reason, they will call themselves *Indians*, in opposition to *English*, &c.” (Berkhofer 15). The “reason,” based on error, was of course no reason at all, but merely an explanation of the Europeans’ mistake. That the Indians submitted to the term “Indian” may have been partly owing to their alleged agreeable nature, but perhaps they saw it as a joke on the white explorers who had made a blunder and, rather than correcting it, paraded it for all to see. The writers’ rhetoric of distancing highlights for Wheelock, their primary reader, actions of the Indians that could be denoted “Indian,” as that term was used in the colonies. “Early English adventurers into Virginia spoke of *Indians*, *savages*, and *infidels* in one breath [. . .]” (Berkhofer 23). Historian Robert Berkhofer, Jr. characterizes colonial rhetoric about the Indians as persisting in “the tendency to describe Indian life in terms of its lack of White ways [. . .]” (26) and focusing on a “general deficiency” (28). Lack of hygiene, lack of proper English diet, lack of a strong work ethic are ways the colonists characterized the people they called “Indian.” The six Indian writers, then, learned this rhetoric from Wheelock and repeated it back to him in order to identify with Wheelock, his religion, or the colonists’ culture generally.

To some colonists, “Indian” meant *lazy*, *dirty*, *animals*, and *wanderers*. As some Indians accommodated to the colonial culture, they learned how they were seen by

the colonists. Using the colonists' own language and terms, the six writers identify themselves, then, through the words they use to describe those Indians from whom they are distancing. That is, they distance from Indianness by contrasting their own actions to "typical" (as defined by the colonists) Indian attributes, or they may contrast things "Indian" and "English," using a strong negative tone with the former. For example, David Fowler complains that the Oneida Indians he lives with allow dogs to "eat & drink out of the same [dishes] as I do" (91) and that the cooks' "Hands are dirty as my Feet, but they cleanse them by kneading Bread" (94). In contrast, Fowler's preferences are more "English" in nature: "I am almost sick now for want of some Refreshment that is nourishing. I wish I had some of Mrs. Wheelock's Bread & Milk, little sweet Cake and good boild Meat" (94). Similarly, when Joseph Johnson was working to organize the move by some New England tribes west to the Brothertown village in New York, he had occasion to contrast those Indians who were dragging their feet to those who enthusiastically supported the project: "I am pleased to see the Indians in these parts so engaged. I believe that there will be upwards of Sixty young Indian men from the Seven Tribes that will Sit of [set off] from hence by the 13th of March next to be destinguished as noble Spirited Indians, who will do their uttermost to get goood, and do good,—who will distinguish themselves from the Lazy crew that refuses the good offers made to them in these Latter Days" (186). Johnson positions himself with the Brothertown Indians and distances from "lazy" Indians who did not support the relocation plan.

Johnson is able to play simultaneously on two themes that were important to colonists: the desire to convert Indians to Christianity and the frustration over Indians' "laziness."

The Indian writers' rejection of Indian ways and their esteem for European ones (distancing and identifying at the same time) is clear. The example from Fowler focuses on hygiene, and the example from Johnson focuses on a work ethic. In both cases, the uncivilized, unconverted Indians come off looking very bad to "civilized" and "converted" readers. Fowler's enthymemic claim compares his hosts to dogs, and his description of their cooking practices emphasizes their uncleanness. He contrasts the dirty Oneida to the Euro-American Mrs. Wheelock, which, if intentional, is an astute rhetorical maneuver in a letter to Mr. Wheelock. In the example from Johnson, the southern New England Indians, though they have been converted to Christianity, are still culturally not up to snuff because they are lazy. In a place where the colonial government imposed "small fines or whippings" on Indians for "idleness" (Axtell, *Invasion* 142), Johnson's complaint about lazy Indians is not merely a passing comment on the Indians' character but a more serious accusation of criminal behavior.

Fowler and Johnson (and the other Indian writers) may have heard colonists call Indians lazy and dirty, but they certainly learned this interpretation of Indian culture in school from their master, Wheelock. The following example from Wheelock's writing shows his attitude about Indians, which he most likely

transmitted to his students: “They would soon kill themselves with Eating and Sloth, if constant care were not exercised for them at least the first Year—they are used to set upon the Ground, and it is as Natural for them as a seat to our Children—they are not wont to have any Cloaths but what they wear, nor will without much Pains be brot to take Care of any.—They are used to a Sordid Manner of Dress, and love it as well as our Children to be clean” (McCallum 17). In other letters, Wheelock alternated between calling his Indian students prudent, judicious, and religious (McCallum 193) or unclean, savage, and brutish (McCallum 19). These same prejudices of Wheelock reappear in the writings of Wheelock’s Indian students. Whether they are writing about unconverted Indians, the ones not schooled in white ways, or Europeanized Indians who walk, talk, and dress like colonists, Wheelock’s Indians describe other Indians, and themselves, using Wheelock’s own language.

Wheelock’s prejudiced language wasn’t unique among the rhetoric of Euro-Americans. For example, when Indians’ services were needed by colonists, “official instructions of the Virginia Company were careful to refer to the Indians as ‘native people,’ ‘naturals,’ and ‘country people’”; but in a later document, “the natives are ‘Indians’ when mentioned in trading contexts, ‘savages’ when the necessity for defense is mentioned” (Jennings 77). That is, when colonists needed to buy tobacco, animal skins, and food from “native people,” colonists’ names for their trade partners took on a favorable tone. After colonists learned from the Indians how to trap animals and grow tobacco and food and no longer needed aid from them merely

to survive, colonists then described the Indians as “savage,” “inhumane,” and “cruel beasts” (Jennings 78). Other disparaging terms were also used by the English for Indians, among them “pagans,” “barbarians,” and “heathens” (Berkhofer 15).

When the Indian writers adopt the term “Indian” for the native people of the New World, their use of the word seems sometimes neutral, as merely a categorizing term used to denote a group of people. However, when the writers are distancing from Indianness and identifying with whiteness, “Indian” takes on additional connotations that are an inevitable result of the way categories work. Lakoff and Johnson’s discussion of categories reminds us that, because they omit or obscure some facts while drawing attention to others (163), categories are never neutral; categories are always subjective instruments produced from someone’s particular point of view. When he uses the word “Indian” in his autobiography, Occom, for example, tells us, “My Parents Livd a wandering life, for did all the Indians at Mohegan” (12). Johnson writes to Wheelock, “I shall go with the Indians next week to their hunt (as all My scholars will go)” (133). Calvin, working as a schoolmaster, reports to Wheelock that “the Indians [. . .] are going out to hunt & that they must needs take their Children with them” (51). Ashpo, Fowler, and Shattock use “Indian” similarly. The negative connotation present in these examples comes from the Indians’ resistance to abandoning their wandering lifestyle and settling in towns, as the English colonists did and wanted the Indians to do also. When the six writers refer to Indians “wandering” or “roving,” they are using a concept familiar to their

primary reader, Wheelock, as well as to other colonists and Europeans. Thus to say that “the Indians are going hunting” signals the level of their noncompliance with the English culture. By connecting “wandering,” “roving,” “unsettled,” and “Indian,” eighteenth-century writers pointed to Indians who were not yet fully converted either to Christianity or the colonists’ white culture.

The six writers also used other terms for Indians that, at a glance, may seem neutral, but, like “roving Indian,” carried strong negative connotations. Calvin, sent to keep school among the Mohawks, reports to Wheelock, “I went to the Indians day after Day to get some of their Children to School, but all this signified nothing, the Indians would make excuses that they had work for them to do, so that they could not send them yet, but they would send them Tomorrow, & so on [. . .]” (50). The Mohawks’ reluctance to send their children to school caused Calvin to call them “Stubburn People”; he writes to Wheelock that he would like to do “a Little good among these Savages, but yet I think Indians will be Indians they will still follow their evill Practices” (51). He repeats a similar thought in a later letter, telling Wheelock that, if he thought he could help the Indians, he is willing to go “among the very wildest of them” (58). Calvin’s word choices highlight so-called “Indian” characteristics such as procrastination, resistance to conversion, and resistance to civilization. Calling the Indians *wild*, *stubborn*, *savage*, and so on was Calvin’s way to try to distance himself from the unconverted Indians and identify with Wheelock.

Laziness, another so-called “Indian” characteristic, is also decried in the Indians’ letters. In one letter, Fowler gives Wheelock a vignette of Indian life, and writes, in describing the gendered division of labor, “These men are the laziest Crew I ever Saw in all my Days” (96). Johnson used similar wording when he compared the Indians who were working to establish Brothertown to Indians who did not support the plan, calling the latter group a “Lazy crew that refuses the good offers made to them in these Latter Days” (186). I find it significant that Fowler used “laziest Crew” in 1765 and Johnson used “Lazy crew” in 1775, ten years later. While I have not yet found this phrase in Wheelock’s writing, I don’t doubt it came from him and was passed on to his students in the schoolroom.

In another letter, Fowler calls his host tribe lazy, complaining to Wheelock that, although they say they want him to keep school for their children, they do little to help him. “They are lazy and inhuman pack of Creatures as I ever saw in the World; They have seen me working and tuing Day after Day and never offerd to help me in the least thing I had to do in my House only finish’d covering it and left me” (98-99). His complaint appears as much motivated by his need for help in building his dwelling as by his evaluation of their characters. And what he interpreted as laziness may have been the Indians’ desire to give him freedom to put finishing touches on his house as he thought best. Yet he couches his rhetoric in the demeaning language that he learned from the Euro-Americans, calling the Indians lazy animals.

Johnson uses other denigrating terms for Indians in general as well as for unconverted Indians. In his early letters, Johnson referred to himself in two characteristic “Indian” ways. He calls himself “an Indian and a good for nothing one” in one letter (123) and a “good for nothing not quite Old Indian” in another (129). To be an *Indian* and *good for nothing* is to double the opprobrium. He describes his host tribe at Oneida as “Ignorant” Indians, and later combines the two concepts of *ignorant* and *good for nothing* when he refers to himself as Wheelock’s “Ignorant Pupil, and good for nothing Black Indian” (131). Certainly these phrases reflect the colonists’ interpretation of the Indians. There is no record of pre-contact Indians referring to themselves this way.

While the six Indian writers may not have balked at calling themselves lazy or ignorant when they communicated with Wheelock, they were not likely to describe themselves with the same terms they used for non-Christianized Indians. Four of the writers routinely use “heathen” and “pagan” to describe those Indians who have not converted. Ashpo and Shattock do not use these kinds of terms. One reason for Shattock not to use such rhetoric may be that when he writes to Wheelock about Indians, it is about his own Narragansett tribe; the other Indians are writing about other tribes than their own when they use “heathen” and “pagan.”

Of the six writers, Johnson comes closest to this practice, suggesting, in one of his letters, that, although he is a Christian, he still retains “pagan” beliefs. He writes to Wheelock, “I want to hear from you My Kind Benefactor (I have been

much troubled in dreams concerning you of late. I fear you are not well. but this is too much of my Indian principles.)” (133). Johnson’s parenthetical remarks reveal that he ascribes to dreams the ability to convey information that could otherwise not be known, but at the same time, the remarks show that Johnson is also able to see his “Indian” worldview from the point of view of the nonbeliever who sees dreams as private mental images not connected to a force larger than individual humans. Johnson is holding two opposed worldviews in his mind at the same time. One is the belief in “Indian principles” that claims dreams convey information that one would otherwise not know; the other is the white belief that dreams do not carry messages. His rhetoric reveals his dual worldviews and his self-conscious awareness of them.

Occom’s use of “heathen” reflects an interesting situation in his autobiography. The first section of his text uses third person grammatical forms when Occom is referring to his tribe—e.g., “their Heathenish Ways”, “not that they regarded the Christian Religion”—and it is in this section that Occom uses “heathen” to describe non-Christians in his tribe. In subsequent sections of his autobiography, he uses first person forms when speaking of his tribe—e.g., “my Poor Brethren”, “our Indians”—and he does not use “heathen.” His switch from third to first person, and from using “heathen” to “my Poor Brethren” allows him to distance himself and his tribe from a formerly heathen life and to identify, as converts, with other Christians. Occom’s rhetoric does not follow the pattern of the

other writers noted in the previous two paragraphs because his rhetorical situation is different from the other writers'. Their texts do not rehearse the story of their own tribes' conversion, where Occom's text begins at that very place. Occom focuses on his own tribe's origins in "heathenism" as part of his personal story of salvation.

While Indians in contact with colonists frequently faced terms of derision and even learned to repeat those terms about themselves, they did manage to find other aspects of Euro-American culture with which to identify, not the least of which was Christianity. I have noted in Chapter III that tribes in general were reluctant to impose their own religious beliefs and practices on others; however, they did practice voluntary syncretism. "All over North America, in fact, individuals and whole societies readily took from others those deities, ceremonies, and sacred objects that seemed particularly efficacious in curing, bringing the rains, ensuring abundant game or harvests," and giving "good things" (Furst and Furst 18-19). If Indians truly saw whites as "simply one more set of people with different gods and different ways of organizing themselves" (Weaver xi), they would take up Christian practices if they perceived the colonists' god to be a good provider.

The Indian writers identified with the colonists' culture in obvious ways, such as converting to the colonists' religion, using the colonists' native language, and learning to write. It is important to acknowledge these identifications because they are huge leaps across a cultural canyon for the Indians, but it is also important to discuss the less obvious ways these writers identified with colonial culture, because

those leaps are just as big. Examples of these less-obvious identifications are found when the Indians write about food and finances. By examining them we begin to produce a fuller picture of the situation in the eighteenth century.

The Indian writers use a rhetoric of distancing in interesting ways when they discuss “Indian” food and eating. As colonized Indians entered further into the colonial economic system, their dietary practices changed. When they lived and worked among the tribes, the six writers were not completely part of their tribe’s system for getting and distributing food. The “Indian” way of getting food for the tribe was to “wander” or “rove” to hunt, fish, gather wild fruit and vegetables—to do minimal cultivation, no animal husbandry, and to travel lightly from one area to another to get food, generally keeping within geographic boundaries agreed on between tribes. Their travel for food was often circular, or back and forth between particular places within a larger area. The timing of their movements was based on the seasons. Historian Francis Jennings explains, “The Indian did not wander; he commuted” (71).

The tribes’ commuting lifestyle disrupted the work of the schoolmaster and the preacher. The commuting Indians might argue in turn that the “labour” of school, while important for the future, did not feed the tribe in the short term. The Indian students who were old enough to go on a hunt or to help harvest fruits and vegetables would leave the school as necessary. Their school attendance was determined by the hunting and harvesting seasons, not by an administrative calendar.

In one letter, Fowler reports that his students are making progress in their spelling books and would do better except “they are always going about to get their Provision” (96). The chaotic situation led Fowler to become discouraged; he wrote to Wheelock, “I cant see what I can do here as long as these Indians don’t labour for their continually going from Place to Place” (110). The travelling life of the Indians interfered with Johnson’s work among the Indians also. He reports to Wheelock that most of his students have been away hunting for over two months, although he keeps school for the five younger students remaining (124). In another letter he reports his discouragement about the Indians at “Onondage” to whom Wheelock’s son preached, with Johnson as interpreter. Johnson expectantly awaits word that those Indians will accept the Gospel, but learns from two Onondage women that “no mankind was at home, not So much as the great man [the chief]; but were all gone a hunting” (131). The urgency that Johnson feels for the Indians to accept Christianity is apparent in his letter, as is his frustration at the Indians’ decamping at the moment of their conversion. However, again the short-term food needs of the tribe relegate the colonists’ plans to secondary priority.

Johnson’s cultural position is in the middle, between the colonists’ world of regular schedules and timetables and the Indians’ world of adaptation to unpredictable weather and seasonal hunts. He distances from aspects of an Indian identity although he does not cut off relations with that identity entirely. Johnson’s work as a teacher of the children of the tribe is constantly interrupted by the seasonal

travels for food, and he complains about that and expresses his discouragement over the lack of progress of his students, yet he expresses his gratitude for the food that is available because of those seasonal travels. For example, while the Indians' wandering disrupted Johnson's teaching plans, he did benefit from their way of procuring food, eating what there was available for the tribe. He reports in a February 1768 letter to Wheelock that the Indians "now begin to cook some good dried guts of Dear and what is in it. (Dung if I may So call it.) to Season the corn; likewise some rotten fish which they have kept Since last fall to Season their Samp[s] [a corn porridge], rottener the better they Say as it will Season more broth" (128). Later, in a letter in May 1768, he writes, "I fare very well at present plenty of pigeons in our woods" (133). He does not voice objection to the "good dried guts of Dear" or the pigeons; instead, his biggest complaint is that the supply of food is unpredictable: "I have lived very well the fore part of the Winter, but the Latter begins to come on heard—Sometimes Gluttled to the full at other times half Stearved never Steady" (128).

In contrast to Johnson, who "Lived Intirely upon the affare of the Indians" (128), Fowler more closely identifies with the whites' way of getting food. As we saw in Johnson's situation, the writers who lived among the Indian tribes to keep school and/or preach were not completely part of the Indian economy in that they did no commuting for food. They were part of the white economic system that tended to replace harvesting and hunting with buying and selling. Fowler writes, "I

am oblig'd to eat whatsoever they give me for fear they will be displeas'd with me" (94), and what they gave him did not please him. He reports, "My Cooks are nasty as Hogs; [. . .] their Hands are dirty as my Feet, but they cleanse them by kneading Bread" (94). Later in that same letter, he writes, "I wish I had some of Mrs. Wheelock's Bread & Milk, little sweet Cake and good boild Meat" (94). After living at Wheelock's school for several years and becoming "used to have his Victuals drest clean," Fowler is identifying with the Euro-American way of preparing food. He reports later that he has taken to eating "Tea and dry Bread, which I bought[,] little Fish which I cetch out of a small River and their Pottage which is made of pounded Corn" (95).

Fowler's phrase "which I bought" is significant. He identifies with the colonial culture that treats food as an item for profit. In explaining why it is so expensive for him to live with the Indians, he reports that he is far from an English settlement (94) and that he must go forty miles to buy his provisions (95). He asks Wheelock for money to buy a cow and hogs (106). When Wheelock is unable to send more money for Fowler to live on, Fowler applies to Sir William Johnson, British Superintendent of Indian Affairs, Northern Department, who orders that Fowler receive provisions from the Royal Block House. Once he obtains access to this source of supply, Fowler's identification with English-American culture is even clearer: "Now I live like a Gentleman, I have a plenty of Corn, Flour, Meat and rotten Fish" (99).

It is in *buying* one's food that one becomes more like an Englishman. In the early days of the colonies, Indians had to teach the Europeans how to plant and grow American foods. "The European 'settlers,' who knew nothing of tillage methods in America and were often revolted at the labor of farming, depended on Indian gardens for subsistence between the deliveries of cargoes from overseas" (Jennings 33). The English colonists of the eighteenth century may have espoused hard work for the farmers because this labor was necessary to support the lifestyle of the English Gentleman with whom Fowler identifies.

Another less-obvious route by which Indians identified with Euro-American culture was via participation in the workings of the colonists' economy. At first trading, then buying and selling, incurring debt, and relying on salaries and wages, the Indians became enmeshed in the foreign culture that dominated their tribes. Identifying with colonial culture may have been easier for Indians when they realized that the invading Europeans, like Indians, were interested in trading. Before Europeans arrived in North America, Indian tribes already traded goods over a nearly continent-wide network. Copper mined in northern Michigan was found among Indians near Jamestown; obsidian for arrowheads was found among Atlantic coast Indians, 1700 miles from its source; and multicolored slate from the Atlantic coast was traded to Indians on the Mississippi (Jennings 85-86). With one exception, all tribes traded, often specializing in a local commodity such as catlinite, mica, tobacco, or maize. "Only one tribe in all of North America has ever been

discovered that did not possess objects obtained through trade with other tribes; the exception was the Polar Eskimos, who lived so isolated an existence that they believed themselves to be the only people on earth” (Jennings 86). With trading as a point of relation, Indian tribes could readily identify with the colonists’ culture. In fact, once a colony established trading protocols with a neighboring tribe, the Indians often treated this trade relationship as a monopoly, defending their exclusive right to trade with the Europeans, and insisting on acting as middlemen if colonists and more-distant tribes wanted to trade.

Occom’s text, because it alone of the autobiographies describes some of the author’s life before conversion, tells us about his tribe’s trade contact with colonists. “My Parents Livd a wandering life, for did all the Indians at Mohegan, they Chiefly Depended upon Hunting, Fishing, & Fowling for their Living and had no Connection with the English, excepting to Traffic with them in their small Trifles” (12). At this point, Occom’s tribe is only minimally a part of the colonial economy, engaging in minor trading. At this level of interaction, the Indians retained a measure of freedom because their livelihood was not based on their economic relations with colonists. The Indians at this time still relied on hunting and fishing for their living.

But it was not long before trading moved to another level, and the Indians began to trade their physical presence for material items. Occom writes, “Once a Fortnight, in ye Summer Season, a Minister from New London used to come up, and

the Indians to attend; not that they regarded the Christian Religion, but they had Blankets given to them every Fall of the Year and for these things they would attend” (12). The Indians exchanged their presence at religious meetings for goods. By this they took a big step into the colonial economy, because they were not bartering “small Trifles”; they were bartering their behavior. Attendance at Christian religious meetings put the Indians into jeopardy of trading their traditions, because assenting to Christianity entailed giving up the tribe’s religion. I have noted previously that some Indian tribes adopted beliefs and practices from other spiritual traditions and added them to their own existing ones. But the colonists’ Christianity excluded other traditions, rejecting them as at best erroneous and at worst demonic. For the Indians to trade their physical presence at religious meetings for blankets was their entrance into their dependence on the colonial economic system.

Moving toward more entangling relations with colonists, the Indians began to participate in a debt economy, a costly way to identify with the English. Indebtedness arises as a topic in several of the letters of the six Indian writers, pursuing them as they work to cancel its effects. Ashpo at one point owes various people almost £ 27, but, as one of his creditors complains in a letter to Wheelock, “like most oyr [other] Indian took on where he could get creditt, and did not much take thought how he could pay” (McCallum 42). Ashpo does not mention his debt in his letters, and may have been unconcerned about it. However, £ 27 was almost as much as Fowler estimated he would need per year to support his schoolmaster

position among the Oneida (Fowler 94); and £ 27 was almost twice what Occom received annually to support his work as teacher and preacher at Montauk (Occom 15).

Because Fowler's aging father was in debt and needed assistance, a young Fowler left Wheelock's school without permission (87). On returning to school, Wheelock wrote out a confession of disobedience that Fowler was required to sign. Perhaps it was this experience that taught Fowler himself to avoid indebtedness, as none of his letters speak of him owing money to anyone.

The power of debt to direct the course of human action is made manifest in the situation that Shattock responded to. The Narragansets' sachem (ruler), Thomas Ninigret, had run up large personal debts and decided to pay them off by selling the tribe's land one farm at a time. Ninigret had persuaded the Rhode Island General Assembly to repeal laws limiting the sale of reservation land. Perhaps his persuasive power was increased by the fact that many of his creditors were members of the Assembly and would thus be repaid. But many Narragansets resisted Ninigret's move and petitioned the Assembly to stop sales as they feared their lands would be completely lost (Simmons and Simmons xxxii).

Shattock entered this debate, joining the group that opposed the sachem. He wrote letters to Wheelock, Sir William Johnson, and other colonial administrators, and he lobbied in person when he could, working to prevent the sachem from selling off the tribe's land. Shattock's letters to Wheelock ask him to contact anyone

influential to help in the fight. Wheelock wrote to Sir William Johnson, and he also offered Shattock admittance to the Charity School. Shattock attended for about a year, then left when the Indian Council of the Narragansets recalled him to continue the opposing the sachem (McCallum 201). Shattock wrote to Wheelock, “The general Assembly, at the last Sessions appointed five Trustees, & past an Act, that there shall be as much of our Land sold, as will remit ye Sachems debts, & cost of Conveyance, which in my apprehension will ruin ye Tribe” (Shattock 208). The Narragansets opposing Ninigret wanted to send Shattock and his brother to England “but whether we can raise money sufficient I can’t tell: the want of that may prove a final stop to us” (Shattock 208). When a white shipowner offered free passage “to lay our Misery before his most Sacred Majesty & his most Hon: Privy Council” (Shattock 209), Shattock and his brother were able to sail. However, Shattock died of smallpox in Edinburgh, Scotland.

The debt that motivated Shattock and others to action was part of the colonial economic system that drew in the Indians until they were inextricably part of its network. Shattock and the other opponents of the sachem do not suggest ignoring or defaulting on the debts, rejecting them as not a part of Narraganset culture and therefore irrelevant. Instead, once the Indians made their first steps into the system, they sought redress for its failings by applying more of the system’s features. That is, once Ninigret’s debts become destructive to the tribe, the tribe

seeks relief through first the colonial and then the imperial governments. To the extent they do this they have identified with the Euro-American culture.

Johnson used the colonists' debt economy to further the ends of both Christians and Indians. In keeping school and traveling between tribes to help organize the Brothertown exodus, he incurred burdensome personal debts. Beginning in October 1773 and continuing to February 1775, his letters to Wheelock and others report his debts and his requests for money. After applying to Wheelock for help to pay his debts and not getting a timely reply, Johnson traveled to New York City, preaching three times in fifteen days and receiving enough money in donations to pay off his debts and help him buy provisions (185). His desperation over his debt was strong enough to send him seeking donations, without invitation or permission from the church leaders in that area. Such a move could have had disastrous consequences for Johnson personally and could have reflected badly on Johnson's teacher, Wheelock. Church leaders were very territorial about their congregations and quite resentful of interlopers trespassing on their domain. If Johnson's character had been attacked by the august church leaders of New York, his damaged reputation could have hurt the Brothertown project.

Besides debt, another feature of the colonial economic system was, of course, the salaries and wages that could be earned. For the Indian teachers and preachers, salaries came from Christian societies that supported proselytizing the "heathen" Indian tribes. This employment was not open to everyone, but was reserved for

those who had worked their way up through the system, proving themselves educable, convert-able, malleable, and loyal to the colonial education system. When he stood to gain such a position, Johnson wrote that he could potentially “obtain for my help, & Encouragement, fifty Pound Sterling *Per Annum*” and asked Wheelock to send off a letter of recommendation (186). Fifty pounds per year would have been sufficient to support Johnson and his small family. Fowler estimated that he would need “30 [pounds] lawful money per Annum as the least that will be necessary will not be too much for my Support for the three first Years” (94). At this time, Fowler was not married, so he did not have the expense of a family, but he did live “far from an English Settlement” where he wanted to buy provisions (94).

Payment was an issue of contention for many of the Indian teachers and preachers. When Calvin abandoned Wheelock’s school and accused Wheelock of withholding education from Indian students, misappropriating supplies meant for the students, and so on, one of Calvin’s accusations is that the students who worked on Wheelock’s farm were not paid for their labor (Calvin 65). And Occom’s autobiography climaxes with the complaint that a white missionary received £ 180 for one year’s work and expenses but Occom, because he is an Indian, received only £ 15 per year (Occom 17-18). In Occom’s eyes, his inequitable salary is the result of racism, and not without reason. Wheelock predicated his plan to use Indians as missionaries partly on the practical advantages of sending teachers and preachers who would not cost as much to support: “an *Indian* Missionary may be supported

with less than half the Expence, that will be necessary to support an *Englishman*, who can't conform to their Manner of Living" (Wheelock; qtd. in Szasz 235). Wheelock argued, for example, that the Indians wouldn't need interpreters and could live on their host tribe's diet, not requiring English food that would be expensive to transport into the wilderness. However, when the Indians identified with colonial culture, they did not exclude money but developed capitalist views, hence their arguments of equal pay for equal work. "I can get Payment as well as white Man," Fowler writes (103).

When the Indian writers claim that their work is worth the same amount of money as whites' work, their claim is a way to identify with whites, using money as the equal sign. At the same time, by making this claim they effectively distance themselves from any traditional Indian roles. Identifying with the colonists and distancing from Indians, they reinforce their move to a space between these two cultures.

In examining the autobiographies to find motivations for the authors' rhetoric, we see repeatedly that writing a life of the self involves both identifying oneself and distancing from what one is not or from what one doesn't want to seem to be, e.g., "a perishing soul," "a heathen savage," or "a lazy Indian." Over the years, as relations between Indians and Europeans in New England ranged from open warfare to peaceful mutual tolerance, some Indians found good reasons to accommodate themselves to the culture of the colonists. Many kinds of situations

appeared to motivate the Indians to distance from Indianness, impelling them to go even as far as switching identities from Indian to white, especially during periods of conflict or rapid cultural change. Motivating situations included the need to defend oneself, one's family, and one's tribe against harassment or violence; the basic need to earn a living; an opportunity to work in and influence the dominating culture's political system; the struggle to keep tribal lands intact; an opportunity to receive an education in the oppressor's schools; and a conversion to a different religion.

Historians such as Neal Salisbury, David Blanchard, Cornelius Jaenen, and Bruce Trigger argue that the Indians' conversions to Christianity were fake or at best only superficial (Axtell, *After Columbus* 102-04). They suggest that the Indians would agree with any missionary "as long as they were offered a pipe of tobacco, a nip of brandy, a new shirt, trading privileges at the company store, or military protection" (Axtell, *After Columbus* 106). Axtell attempts to refute these arguments, claiming that lasting conversions were made, and, furthermore, that conversion was the tribes' best hope for survival: "Even though it entailed wholesale cultural changes from the life they had known before contact, it preserved their ethnic identity as particular Indian groups on familiar pieces of land that carried their inner history" (Axtell, *After Columbus* 51). If the Indian tribes saw conversion, or faked conversion, as a last resort to keep the tribe's land and culture relatively intact, they may not have balked at adding Christian beliefs and practices to their existing religious worldview. At any

rate, the Indians' conversions, fake or authentic, are evidence supporting an argument that there must have been some motivation for converting.

An urgent economic reason also prompted Indians to identify with whites. As colonies became more self-sufficient, the Indians faced a poorer material life. Unable to rely on trade or on the crops and game from land that whites were taking, nearly eliminated by diseases, and struggling against alcohol, some tribes, desperate to insure future of the tribe's children, turned to the "free board and room available in a charity school, a solution which offered the only hope for some families that their children would survive" (Szasz 6). Cultural conversion for the sake of survival is a desperate measure that offered hope for the future of a tribe's existence, at the cost of losing some of the tribe's traditional identity. But many Indians, collectively or individually, made that exchange, trading some of their pride, and their children's physical presence in white schools, for survival.

One of the most important ways the Indian writers distance from their traditional culture and identify with a Euro-American one is by trading their native languages for English and their oral communication traditions for writing. Putting aside one's first language may be done in stages or abruptly, but either way one's identity is altered. The Indian writers produced their discourse in written English, using an alien language and communication medium. The switch to English and the adoption of writing were part of the larger paradigm shift of identifying with Euro-American ways. Learning to speak English, then to read it, and finally to write it,

were not ends in themselves for the Indians, but they were important steps toward identifying with the invading culture, and thus surviving.

By writing in English, the six writers' distancing from Indian identities always takes place in a Euro-American context, medium, and vocabulary. White colonizers imported and maintained the cultural playing field, so from the first the Indians' distancing is already expressed in terms of a non-Indian identity. One supporting piece of evidence for this is that the Indians wrote in English. If, in writing their letters, the Indians had used words from their own languages, Wheelock's British benefactors would have seen that his school was failing to civilize the students and that the Indians were not really ready to become Christians, let alone missionaries. Probably, then, Wheelock's financial support would have disappeared completely.

The Indians were aware that their letters had monetary value as writing samples to be sent to England. In their letters, they apologized to Wheelock for errors in the texts that would decrease their value. Errors included misspellings, misapplied punctuation, ungrammatical sentences, and illegible handwriting. In one letter, Calvin writes, "I hope you will [*sic*] overlook the many Blunders I have made in my haste" (51), and Fowler explains one of his letters' problems this way: "Sir, I hope you won't let this Letter be seen, I have no Table to write upon, besides I have not writ so long my Hand's out of order" (Fowler 91). In another letter, Fowler adds a postscript to explain, "I hope you will overlook all my imperfections in this Letter for I wrote the biggest Part of it in Darkness" (Fowler 100). Johnson also apologizes,

more than once, for hastily composed letters: he writes on 2 May 1768, “P.S. please sir to overlook my hast, and the many Blunders which I suppose are in this paper. I have no time to write it over or correct it. dont Expose it. so I remain your Humble Servant” (Johnson 133). And six years later, on 2 May 1774, he writes, “P.S. I began this Letter I believe it was about ten o’clock this evening and I am in such a great hurry that I can’t write over again” (Johnson 177). These apologies are not merely for hurriedly written letters. The Indian writers knew that for Wheelock to be able to forward their letters overseas, he must re-copy and correct their writing. For example, the manuscript of one of Fowler’s letters to Wheelock (24 June 1765) has several interlinear corrections and one completely revised sentence written in Wheelock’s hand (Fowler 96).

A different kind of error that would make the letters unsuitable for Wheelock’s fundraising project is found in some of their topics. In one letter, Fowler writes, “I am very sorry I cain’t write you a Letter, which can be seen abroad. because M^r Kirtland is so much hurrid to get down: but he can give you a proper Idea of my School and my own Affairs.—I believe I may venter [venture] to write my secrets to you as I wont to do. since I have so often seen and felt your tender Cares and Affections” (Fowler 102). The “secrets” that he writes about concern his courting a certain woman and his request for good cloth to make his wedding clothes. Such a letter would be of interest more as the target of a voyeuristic gaze from those curious about marriage customs among colonized natives than as

evidence that Wheelock was successfully converting and educating Indians. At the end of this letter full of personal news Fowler writes, “Sir. Dont be angry with me for write so bold and foolish. I hope you will not expose me” (Fowler 102). Here Fowler means by “expose” to put on display, or make public. To expose the text, which has replaced its author, is to expose the author. Fowler’s allusion to Wheelock’s anger is an admission that this personal letter, which does not even once mention Fowler’s missionary work among the Oneida, is valueless to Wheelock’s fundraising project because it cannot be exposed to potential benefactors.

On the other hand, Johnson’s letter of 2 May 1768, despite its spelling errors and grammar miscues, contained information that probably helped Wheelock raise money. In this letter, Johnson has harsh words for French Catholic missionaries—he calls them “french friers” (132)—who were offering a more sensuous version of Christianity than puritanical New England Protestants shared. Such a letter, warning that Jesuits from Canada were travelling south to make new converts, would be exactly the kind of information Wheelock could use to rouse the anti-Catholic Protestants in Great Britain to send even more money. Furthermore, Johnson’s letter, in its hostility to Roman Catholicism, would have been reassuring evidence for donors that Wheelock was not only converting Indians, he was also converting them to the right kind of Christianity.

The texts that the six writers produced remain behind as a memoir of their performances of distancing and identification. The writers learned the rhetorical

moves of eighteenth century written English, then applied their new skill to producing the discourse typical of the colonists' culture. As I discussed in Chapter III, a text, as an object in the world, is a presence that speaks for, or stands in for, its absent author. A text functions as a sign of an absent author's existence and identity. Recall Foucault's claim that texts *replac*e their authors, that the presence of a text allows us "not only to circumvent references to an author, but to situate his recent absence" (182). The Indians' writings, present before readers when the authors were miles—or even an ocean—away, spoke in the writers' absence. The voice of the text replaced the voice of the writer.

These textual discourses, as objects in themselves and separate from the writers, were converted to goods exchangeable in a marketplace. Wheelock treated the Indians' letters as commodities, placing them on exhibit in Britain in exchange for money (Murray, "Pray Sir" 29). The Indians' letters were thus instrumental in showing that Wheelock's school was successfully reaching the heathen, and this translated into financial support for the school. The texts represented aspects of "Indianness" to Wheelock's benefactors in Britain. This ability of the texts' voices to represent Indians freed Wheelock from the expense of sending shiploads of mendicant Indians to Britain. (One important exception would be Samson Occom, whose two-year fundraising tour of Great Britain gave Wheelock's financial donors direct contact with a Christianized Indian. See Chapter III where I discuss Occom and Whitaker's tour that netted Wheelock's enterprise £11,000.)

How do Foucault and fundraising relate to Indians distancing from Indians? “Wheelock needed model students to people the narratives he sent overseas to solicit funding” (Murray, “Pray Sir” 29). It was important that the “model students” be model *Indian* students, but, because the letters’ voices represented the writers’ voices, it was also important that the letters display an Indianness that had been converted to Christianity and European culture. To show this conversion, and thereby show Wheelock’s success, the model students would be expected to denounce their former heathen way of life, as well as the heathen practices of other Indians. This denunciation would of course need to be spelled correctly and written in grammatical sentences, as further evidence that Wheelock was successfully educating the Indians. The Indians’ letters, as replacements for the authors, needed to give enough textual evidence of the writers’ denunciation of a heathen Indianness in order for the letters to have monetary value.

In their letters, the Indian writers use almost no words from their native languages. (In contrast, late twentieth-century and early twenty-first-century Indian writers using an autobiographical form often use words from Indian languages, with or without translating them.) Not using their languages was a logical rhetorical choice for the eighteenth-century writers since the primary audience for their texts was Wheelock, who neither spoke nor wrote Indian languages. Moreover, for most of these Indians, Wheelock functioned as the employer to whom the Indians reported when they wrote about their teaching and preaching, so it would have made

little sense to use Indian words when writing to him. And using native languages in the letters would have created a paradox for readers in Britain: using Indian terms would have proved the Indianness of the authors; however, the letters were being shown to this secondary audience, the British, to prove not only that Wheelock was teaching the Indians English, but also that his school was on the road to civilizing them.

Civilizing the Indians was not an afterthought tacked on to missionary work. On the contrary, Europeans firmly believed that the Indians must be civilized *before* they could make an authentic conversion to Christianity. As long as the Indians were “still in a state of ‘savagery’ or ‘barbarism,’ which every civilized person knew to be an ‘infinite distance from Christianity,’” they remained “too ‘degenerate’ for religion to flourish or for the Word to work its magic” (Axtell, *European* 44). Civilizing the Indians therefore meant teaching them to read and write at least one European language, changing their grooming, attire, and dwelling customs, and moving them from a hunting-gathering life to a cultivated-crops economy.

The colonists called their civilizing project *reducing* the Indians to civility (Axtell, *European* 45). “Time and again, from the sixteenth century to the American Revolution, it was said that the first goal of the English was to ‘*reduce*’ the Indians from savagery to ‘civility.’ The phrase is puzzling because we would expect a people with a superior self-image to attempt to *raise* their inferiors, rather than *reduce* them, to their level. To my knowledge, only two missionaries during the whole colonial

period ever expressed their goal as one of elevation—both only once and both well into the eighteenth century—and even their aberrance was wholly out of character” (Axtell, *European* 45-46). Seventeenth-century missionary John Eliot wrote that his goals were to “bridle,” “restrain,” and “humble” the Indians in order to civilize them (Eliot; qtd. in Axtell, *European* 61). Thus, as Axtell puts it, “becoming a Christian was comparable to assuming the posture and character of tame cattle—docile, obedient, submissive. [. . .] The ‘savage’ would give way to the ‘civil man’ by repressing his native instincts, habits, and desires and quietly taking the political bit in his teeth and the religious yoke upon his neck” (Axtell, *European* 61). Reducing the Indians’ freedom and pride was an ambitious step in transforming them into imitations of Englishmen.

The transformations required to reduce the Indians to civility touched on every aspect of their way of life. For example, educators preferred to train Indian youth in schools that were “sexually segregated, morally guarded, classically oriented, rigorously disciplined, patriarchally dominated and, until the eighteenth century, located in English territory, far from the contagion of traditional habits, families, and friends” (Axtell, *After Columbus* 59). All of these characteristics of English education were decidedly non-Indian. Children raised in a tribal environment were not segregated by gender, were not closely restricted morally, did not study Greek, Latin, and Hebrew texts, were seldom disciplined, and (especially among the Oneida from whom Wheelock took most of his students) lived in tribal groups whose male chiefs

were selected by clan matriarchs. Furthermore, keeping the children in schools far from their tribes did prevent Indian students from being contaminated and back-sliding into heathenism, but, more importantly for their teachers, the children served as hostages whose presence was thought to deter Indians from rash acts of war; “chiefs’ sons were especially welcome as students for this reason” (Axtell, *European* 67).

Like attendance at a colonial school, looking European was also a sign of a civilized Indian. “[T]he infallible mark of a Protestant ‘praying Indian’ was his English appearance: short hair, cobbled shoes, and working-class suit. So important was European clothing as a badge of ‘civility’ that an Indian’s degree of acculturation could almost be read in his appearance” (Axtell, *European* 59). Not coincidentally, this adoption of English apparel brought the Indians’ into the colonists’ economic system. No longer making their own attire, civilized Indians became consumers of manufactured clothing and footwear within a capitalist system that replaced individual craft work with specialization.

As the Indians became civilized customers in the colonists’ economic system, they were also pressured to become settled, productive citizens earning their money by laboring like the English. Wheelock arranged for his Indian students to apprentice on his own farm or with blacksmiths, bookbinders, and so on, in order to learn how to do paying labor in the colonial economy. Even Wheelock’s Indian students who worked as teachers to more-distant tribes were expected to eventually

arrange to be paid by those tribes and not be perpetually supported by European charity. Yet this kind of financial arrangement would prove difficult for those tribes still operating outside of the Euro-American capitalist economy. “‘Towns they have none,’ wrote an English visitor with England in mind, ‘being always removing from one place to another for conveniency of food’” (Axtell, *European* 47). Typically, Indian tribes “commuted” seasonally for food and supplies. In warmer months, tribes might live along the seacoast, fishing. They would plant and harvest corn, then they might pack up and move elsewhere to hunt or gather wild fruit. This roving unsettled colonists, who often suspected hostile intentions if a group of Indians suddenly disappeared into the forest (Axtell, *European* 47).

One large benefit to civilizing Indians became obvious after the colonists had more experience in dealing with roving tribes. By reducing the Indians to a settled life, “vast tracts of real estate” that had once been used exclusively by Indian tribes commuting for food became available “for the ‘civilized’ use of the English” (Axtell, *After Columbus* 109). The growing colonies were able to start new towns, log new forests, plow previously untouched land—all with less fear of facing hostile Indians who might have claimed the land as part of their traditional territory. But the civilizing effect of missionaries, reducing the Indians to limited landholdings in towns or on farms, contributed to opening up new frontiers for colonists’ exploitation.

The project to reduce the Indians to civility can be discussed usefully in terms of Louis Althusser's Marxist theory of repressive and ideological State apparatuses. As I noted in Chapter III, Althusser uses the term "(repressive) State apparatus" (RSA) for one unified set of entities, "the Government, the Administration, the Army, the Police, the Courts, the Prisons, etc." (16-17). The entities of the RSA are related, he notes, because each one functions primarily by violence, whether physical or non-physical (17). Althusser argues that while there is one unified RSA, there are several Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs): religious ("the system of the different Churches"), educational ("the system of the different public and private 'Schools'"), family, legal, political ("the political system, including the different Parties"), trade-union, communications ("press, radio and television, etc."), and cultural ("Literature, the Arts, sports, etc.") (17). The ISAs function primarily by ideology and secondarily by repression (19).

If a nascent form of capitalism is functioning in 1760 in the British North American colonies, how will new participants in this system in 1770, 1780, 1790, and so on, be trained to accept, support, and function in capitalism? (New participants would be new immigrants from Europe, Euro-American children growing up in the colonies, Indians converted to the capitalist system, et al.) The answer lies in the RSA and ISAs, which are working in part for "the reproduction of labour power" (Althusser 4). To secure a future supply of workers, managers, and capitalists, the RSA uses violence to control the population and the ISAs use ideology to train it.

For example, Althusser argues that children at school “learn the ‘rules’ of good behaviour, i.e. the attitude that should be observed by every agent in the division of labour, according to the job he is ‘destined’ for: rules of morality, civic and professional conscience, which actually means rules of respect for the socio-technical division of labour and ultimately the rules of the order established by class domination” (6). All of the ISAs—religious, educational, etc.—teach “*subjection to the ruling ideology* or the mastery of its ‘practice’” (7; Althusser’s emphasis).

In a homogenous society, the ISAs would teach complementary practices so that all trainees could subject themselves successfully to the ruling ideology. The Indians writers learned “the rules of the order established by class domination” by means of the secular and religious training given them at Wheelock’s school, the educational and religious ISAs. The Indian students were in a special situation in regards to the family ISA. Because the Indians were taken away from their natural families, the teachers at Wheelock’s school and the masters to whom the Indians were apprenticed acted as family in terms of training the students to accept the colonists’ ideology. All in all, the Indians who were educated at Wheelock’s school received training in a unified point of view that argued in support of the established royal European and colonial governments, Christian religion, laws, Euro-American economic system, and so on.

One benefit of using Althusser’s critique is that it highlights what some cynics might call ulterior motives. That is, when regarded from Althusser’s point of

view, educators, legislators, judges, and even artists no longer appear to work, benevolently, for the public good. Instead, they work in service to the State, impelled by secret, or at least overlooked, motives. They function unsuspected, hidden in plain view, until their existence and operation are pointed out. Using a neo-marxist critique of the culture focuses attention on the plurality of apparatuses, and they are no longer seen as discrete, unrelated endeavors but as parts of the larger colonizing scheme.

The colonists' motives are worthy of close examination.

From the time they secured their colonial charters from the Crown to the winning of independence, the English maintained that their “principall ende” in coming to America was “to bringe the Indians to the knowledge of the gossell” through teaching and personal example. Yet the conversion the English had in mind was not simply religious, for religion in that day, as in ours, was culture-bound, ringed about with social habits that passed for eternal truths. In a society ruled by divine-right monarchs, affairs of the spirit were inseparable from affairs of state. Since the goal of colonization was to transplant a segment of English society in America, religion was expected to play a tactical role in coping with its novel human environment. (Axtell, *European* 265-66)

The conversions of the Indians was part of the proclaimed plan announced by European justifications of colonization. While European monarchs claimed, granted deeds, and sold territories at will, their exercise of power over the land amounted to an ownership and disposition of the inhabitants of those lands as well. Every state Apparatus available was called into use to subdue and re-train the Indian populations; failing that, the next solution was to exterminate the tribes.

Despite the apparatuses at work in the British colonies, the Indians could never be fully identified with the English. Racism made this failure inevitable. Most Euro-Americans were colonizers, not missionaries (Jennings 178). They were interested in enterprises that returned a profit; if that could be accomplished using Indian labor, so much the better. If Indians balked or were innocently in the way, the colonizers used all means available to remove them.

Converting would not save them; they had evidence of that in colonial history. More than 1,000 Christian Indians who lived in fourteen “praying towns” were displaced and the towns erased during King Philip’s War in 1675-76 (Washburn 113). “Demoralized and dispirited remnants of formerly large Indian communities sank ever deeper into subjection and debauchery” (Jennings 325). Some survivors fled west, finding sanctuary with other tribes.

Another massacre, at Gnadenhütten in Ohio territory in 1782, illustrates the dangers of converting. Ninety Delaware Indians, converts to a Moravian, pacifist form of Christianity, were “unresistingly massacred” by “backcountry Euramerican

thugs, also Christian after a fashion, who were rather less ready to attack the old-fashioned pagan sort of Indian that fought back” (Jennings 150).

Why, in light of the murderous racism that threatened all Indians, even those Christianized and civilized in towns, would the six Indian writers submit to the colonists, if not, apparently, for the hope that this time it would be different, that this group of Christians could be trusted, and that the tribal traditions could be preserved? What level of desperation led the Indians to identify with the culture that sought to erase them? Reaching for the survival of their traditional culture, their tribes, and their families, they took a chance on the new discursive space that they created between the old culture and the new, exploring that new borderland in hopes of discovering a land of their own.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

I told y^o y^t y^e Eyes of all Europe & America w^{re} Upon y^o & me too.

[I told you that the eyes of all Europe and America were upon you
and me too.]

Eleazar Wheelock to David Fowler

26 August 1766

Like his Indian students, Wheelock also felt the behavior-shaping gaze of ideology. As Fowler prepared to be married, he asked Wheelock for new clothes for himself and his bride. However, after learning what Fowler bought, Wheelock complained that Fowler's tastes were above his station, and he lectured Fowler. Fowler explained that he thought Wheelock had allowed him to buy costlier items, and he reacted against Wheelock's post facto dressing down:

I think it very hard that I must be blam'd so much as I have been since my Return from home, and all for taking up those things at M^r Breeds [a trader], when I have Orders from M^r Wheelock to get them, for which I am now accounted a Devil or Proude as the Devil. After you have repeatedly and manifestly told me that I should have whatsoever I wanted; If you denied me when I came to ask for them;

I should not feel half so bad as I do now, or if you told me in a mild Manner when I got home: those things which you got were too good and too costly, you must not have them, I should not resist you—. You know, Sir, I have always been governd and advis'd by you with all ease imaginable. (Fowler 103)

In reply, Wheelock pointed out Fowler's unacceptable behavior, and then revealed that he himself is also under surveillance:

y^o [. . .] affect to cloath yslf & Hannah like Courtiers & wⁿ y^o knew y^t I had been already reproached thro' y^e Country, as I ha' been only for lett^g y^o Wear an old velvet Coat y^t was given to y^o—I told y^o y^t y^e Eyes of all Europe & America w^{re} Upon y^o & me too. & y^e Eyes of thousands w^o are unfriendly & will not fail to Catch at any occasion to reproach me & y^e Design. (McCallum 104)

[You affect to clothe yourself and Hannah like courtiers and when you knew that I had been already reproached through the country, as I have been only for letting you wear an old velvet coat that was given to you—I told you that the eyes of all Europe and America were upon you and me too, and the eyes of thousands who are unfriendly and will not fail to catch at any occasion to reproach me and the design.]

Wheelock here acknowledges, and warns Fowler about, the forces of the State apparatuses that observe and stand ready to take action if anyone attempts to circumvent ideology's power. Proscribed circumventions include appearing in public wearing clothing inappropriate to one's position in society. Wheelock polices himself and reminds Fowler to do the same. One sign of effective apparatuses is that they work most efficiently when everyone in the society is participating in self-repression and ideological self-policing (Althusser 55-56). (And an effective rhetorical critique of both the message of ideology and responses to that message will highlight the choices writers made when they resisted or succumbed to ideology. For example, whether the six Indian writers identified with or distanced from an Indian identity, they made choices—of wording or of topic—that, upon analysis, begin to reveal their identities to us. The Indian writers entered Burke's parlor and participated in the dialogue. In writing this rhetorical analysis, I have entered the parlor and talked about their talk.)

Wheelock's criticism of Fowler reflects the general current of thinking. The exotic Indian was not to be allowed an identity on par with Englishmen. Stallybrass and White, writing on transgressive acts at nineteenth-century fairs in England, discuss the exotic animals who performed parodies of human "civilizings," such as monkeys that smoked pipes, doffed their caps to the audience, danced, drank out of cups, and so on. Stallybrass and White then explain, "We might say that these token transgressions model the double process of colonialism. The Other must be

transformed into the Same, the savage must be civilized (like the wild creature who smokes a pipe ‘as well as any Christian’); but at the same time, the Other’s mimicry of the polite is treated as absurd, the cause of derisive laughter, thus consolidating the sense that the civilized is always-already given, the essential and unchanging possession which distinguishes the European citizen from the West Indian and the Zulu as well as from the marmoset and manteger” (Stallybrass and White 41). The “always-already given” attitude of nineteenth-century British fair-goers is also notable in editor James Dow McCallum’s twentieth-century introduction to the writings of Wheelock’s Indians. McCallum, who edited the letters of Ashpo, Calvin, Fowler, Shattock, Johnson, and others, has this to say of them: “Many of the letters are quaint; some are humorous; a few are of importance historically—all are misspelled. The reader who is not accustomed to such material will be amused at first as though he were watching some captive animal performing his tricks” (McCallum 11). Nothing new here from McCallum; whites have been calling Indians “beasts” for hundreds of years. It is disappointing that McCallum merely repeated, apparently unselfconsciously, these banalities, or perhaps we should be grateful that he did, thus permitting us to see the history of such racism. Edward Said, writing in *Culture and Imperialism* about Joseph Conrad’s *Nostromo*, argues that in his novel “Conrad seems to be saying, ‘We Westerners will decide who is a good native or a bad, because all natives have sufficient existence by virtue of our recognition. We created them, we taught them to speak and think, and when they rebel they simply

confirm our views of them as silly children, duped by some of their Western masters” (xviii). Said’s comments, applicable to a discussion of American natives as well as African ones, remind us that the Indians’ texts are their responses to multiple, intersecting exigences. The Indians’ identifying and distancing occurs in a Euro-American context—in English, in writing, in a Christian missionary vocabulary—and the Indians shaped their discourse to fit the exigences as surely as a potter shaping a bowl. Their identifications of themselves as Indian, Europeanized Indian, or cultural hybrid rely on their mastery of European rhetoric. And writing about themselves from the point of view of the hybrid self they created, they take a Euro-American notion of what’s “civilized” to be the standard, with everything else deviating from that.

In terms of rhetoric, citizens of the dominant culture, the owners of the culture’s discourse playing field, wield the power to say who is a beast, who is human, who is civilized, and who is Christian. However, at times the dominating elite split into factions that compete for control. For example, two competing groups of Christians in southern New England debated Occom’s religious and ethnic identity. When Wheelock was preparing to send Occom to Britain to solicit funds for his charity school, another charitably funded missionary group tried to intervene. The Boston Commission of the London Society believed Wheelock was deceptively taking credit for missionary work he had not done. Both Wheelock and the Boston Commission had given some financial support to Occom, so both could fairly claim

partial responsibility for encouraging his successes. However, the Boston Commission thought Wheelock was misrepresenting himself to donors in Britain: “Annoyed that Wheelock was apparently taking sole credit for Occom’s successes, they concluded that he was preempting credit more generally for Indian mission work [throughout New England]. Their response was a campaign to defame *Occom*, spreading rumors that he was not an authentic convert or even a Mohegan Indian” (Nelson 46; emphasis in original). The Boston Commission used its presumably considerable rhetorical skills to undercut Wheelock and Occom. The Commission’s method re-enacts Columbus’s rhetorical power: Columbus called the people of the New World “los Indios” and his appellation—even though an error—is still applied 500 years later. The Boston Commission’s rhetoric did not have as much power as Columbus’s, so its error did not persist. But its audacity in appropriating to itself the privilege of re-creating Occom’s identity harkens back to the greater audacity of Columbus.

Occom responded to this rhetorical situation with a one-page letter designed to set the record straight: “Since there is great miss Representation by Some Concerning my Life and Education; I take this opportunity to give the World in few Words, the true Account of my Education” (Richardson 70). Dated November 28, 1765, the letter gives a condensed history of the first 23 or so years of his life; three years later he would expand this in the first section of his longer autobiography, dated September 17, 1768. He informs his readers that he was born at Mohegan of

parents who were “altogether Heathens” and who “led a wandering Life up and down in the Wilderness, for my Father was a great Hunter” (70). At 16 he first heard about Christianity and began to inquire into it, going at 19 to learn how to read from Wheelock so he could read the Bible.

The “owners” of the discourse of civilization may deny that an Indian is an Indian, may call the colonized population “beasts” or “silly children,” may claim authorship of the identity of the colonized, may privilege their own definitions of the Other, but theirs is a tenuously held position, ultimately indefensible. Over and over, Indians manage to slip into Burke’s parlor and join the conversation; they adapt the invaders’ discourse to their own ends, redefine themselves and their rhetorical situation, and author new identities for themselves and, sometimes, their white listeners. This has been a recurring theme in my study and will likely remain a recurring theme in the cultural history of American Indians.

Thus, in light of the invasion and occupation of their continent by representatives of a hostile, alien culture, the six American Indian writers found ways to cope with the new dominating ideology. In particular, their written discourse appropriates the language and rhetoric of the encroaching Euro-American culture as they define themselves in relation to that culture *and* make their own voices heard. As far as they are able to make symbolic connections between their traditional culture and the immigrating European culture they are able to participate in the colonists’ rhetorical situation. Their texts stand then as what Pratt would call

“autoethnographic,” which she defines as “a text in which people undertake to describe themselves in ways that engage with representations others have made of them” (35). The example of an autoethnographic text that Pratt discusses in her essay is a 1200-page letter to the king of Spain, dated 1613, written in Quechua and Spanish by an Incan who had adopted some elements of Christianity and who wrote to protest Spanish treatment of Incas. In an autoethnographic text, a colonized writer uses “idioms of the metropolis or the conqueror” which are “merged or infiltrated to varying degrees with indigenous idioms to create self-representations intended to intervene in metropolitan modes of understanding” (Pratt 35). But, unlike the Incan writer, the six American Indian writers use almost no indigenous idioms in their English-only texts; instead they use almost exclusively the conqueror’s idioms, although, as I have discussed in this study, often in opposition to the conqueror.

I have presented several examples of Indian texts that show at least some features of autoethnographic discourse. In Chapter II I discussed the Indian writers’ appropriation of the conqueror’s language and production of autobiographical responses to their respective rhetorical situations. While some critics find it controversial that the autobiographies of five of the writers consist mostly of personal letters, I argued that self-life-writing can be performed in epistolary texts as well as in impersonal texts written intentionally for a wider, relatively anonymous audience. In my study, I critiqued Brumble’s categorization of the texts as

autobiographies as I addressed this formal issue. As a result, I am able to support his conclusion that these texts may count as, if not autobiographies in the modern sense, at least autobiographical discourse constituting one stage of development toward producing the literary form we now call “autobiography.” At any rate, the Indian writers, while producing the texts that their conquerors taught them to make, were able to use the conqueror’s forms of literacy to further a variety of Indian projects.

The issues around identification that I discussed in Chapter III also relate to autoethnography. In that chapter and the next I analyzed the rhetorical workings of identification and distancing in the American Indians’ texts to show how these six writers used opportunities to create their own identities. The six Indian writers do use the conqueror’s idioms “to create self-representations intended to intervene in metropolitan modes of understanding” (Pratt 35), but in response to the rhetorical situation—the exigences, audiences, and constraints—that disfavors and even punishes the use of Indian language and rhetoric, they avoid using indigenous idioms. As the Indian writers imitate the rhetorical moves of an alien language and culture, they still manage to voice an Indian identity. By speaking their identity, they are telling themselves who they are, addressing their rhetoric of identification to themselves perhaps more than to others. The identity they describe to themselves remains strongly Indian as they resist complete assimilation.

In Chapter IV I discussed ways the Indian writers redefine themselves as residents of a new cultural space. Far from “selling out” their identities, when the six

writers distanced from Indianness and identified with the English, they created a new discursive space and new identities with which to occupy that space. Drawing upon their own traditional culture and the new culture imported by the colonists, their words built up a new topography of common ground between the cultures of the Old World and the New. As they acquiesced in part to the Indian role devised for them by white invaders, the writers also distanced themselves from a full identification with Indianness. This resisting stance creates a space for self-definition: “While subordinate peoples do not usually control what emanates from the dominant culture, they do determine to varying extents what gets absorbed into their own and what it gets used for” (Pratt 36).

Future work on this project could produce much-needed additional criticism of these texts. A number of approaches could yield useful results:

- Broadening the scope of the work to include the autobiographical writings of other eighteenth-century Indian writers.
- Examining the manuscripts themselves for more information that may have been missed in transcription (I used published versions of their texts because the originals are at Dartmouth and the murky, faint, practically unreadable microfilms are not widely available.) Issues related to handwriting and literacy could be addressed, for example.

- Analyzing the Indians' texts in relation to their tribal languages. That is, what role did their languages play—if any—in the production of their texts?
- Researching the question of the authenticity of their conversions (a topic of strong debate among some critics).
- Finding what texts Wheelock used in teaching the Indians and whites at his Charity School, and then analyzing to what extent the students' writing was shaped by them.
- Broadening this study by including critiques of texts written by Wheelock's white students. Wheelock educated white students at his Charity School alongside the Indian ones, both for the same purpose and mission. This broadening would allow a bigger sampling of the students, Indian and white, to compare and contrast their backgrounds, how they did in school (e.g., the Indians learned English; how fluent did white students become in Indian languages?), how and what they did after leaving Wheelock, i.e., did they teach and preach to the Indians on the frontier, and how much did everybody get paid for their efforts?
- Including more information on the particular "pagan" beliefs of each of the tribes. Their letters reveal almost nothing about the Indians'

tribal religious traditions. Instead, the Indians merely repeat whites' prejudiced concepts back to white readers.

- Analyzing the writings and their context of production in terms of second-language acquisition and literacy. This task would be well-served by using Ong's *Orality and Literacy* as well as theories of applied linguistics to inform a discussion of the Indians' move from a primarily oral culture and worldview to a foreign culture and worldview highly dependant on writing, documents, records, and signifying artifacts with voices of their own.

In terms of future work on related projects, I would propose that the kind of analysis that I have undertaken here could be applied to any number of texts that were produced in similar rhetorical situations. That is, the method that I have used is appropriate for other texts produced as a result of colonial transformation of a culture. In that light, a productive study could be made on other writers of the eighteenth century to find which of their sets of texts could be labeled "autobiography" too. A discussion of their rhetorical situation of writing from a newly constituted discursive space would broaden our understanding of the Indians' special role in colonial writing practices. Another related project would extend this research into the earliest years of the nineteenth century, and other writers' texts from this slightly later time could be examined, such as Hendrick Aupaumet, William Apes, George Copway, and Paul Cuffe.

Aside from serving as fodder for further critical writing, the Indians' autobiographical discourse deserves to be more widely taught. The texts—McCallum's collection and Peyer's edition of *Occom*—could be integrated into classroom instruction in a variety of ways. For example, a historical approach, using contextualizing historiography, could focus on broader sociological trends in roles for Indians in the colonies. A postcolonial approach could bundle these texts with others from India, Algeria, Ireland, Mexico, and so on, to investigate colonized writing on a broad scale to draw general conclusions about these similar situations. On a narrower scale, the six southern New England Indians' writings could be compared, as a group, to discourse by another group of American Indians colonized by the British, say from Virginia, the Carolinas, or Georgia, to highlight similarities and differences based on a particular colony's history, the uncertainties of Indian education, and unique tribal situations. On the other hand, if I were teaching these texts in terms of their literary form, the contextual information that would help students understand them would be those works that try to answer the question, "What is an autobiography?" In teaching these texts as autobiography, with other autobiographies, I could use a diachronic approach allowing me to include a diverse group of texts, from Plato's autobiographical "Seventh Letter" to the graphic novel *Maus*, to fully explore and critique definitions of self-life-writing. Another formal approach could focus on American Indian texts, from earliest available examples to today, in which case these texts could stand as early examples of autobiographical

writing actually written by the Indians, before as-told-to and solicited autobiographies became common in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This approach could also help place the autobiographies of Ashpo, Calvin, Fowler, Johnson, Ocom, and Shattock in a prominent position as important works written even as the literary form “autobiography” was being named and described in England. As examples of colonial self-life-writing, these texts present the personal experiences of a population rarely listened to.

Finally, I conclude with an acknowledgement of the potential inappropriateness of my research. As a non-Indian, I have undertaken a study that some American Indian scholars would not have permitted me. For example, Karen Gayton Swisher would not find my enthusiasm for my topic a sufficient reason for me to write: “If non-Indian educators have been involved in Indian education because they believe in Indian people and want them to be empowered, they must now demonstrate that belief by stepping aside” (Swisher “Indian People” *American Indian Quarterly* Internet). If I sought defense in the principle of academic freedom, Daniel Heath Justice undercuts that strategy with a strong warning: “Academic freedom is an important philosophy that deserves protection and acknowledgment, but it cannot—it should not—be used as a club by scholarly poachers to further exploit and dehumanize Indian peoples. When anthropologists, historians, literary scholars, and other academics intrude on Indian people and communities, decide for themselves who we are and were without consultation with us, unearth our ancestors

and engage in destructive testing on their remains, or otherwise wield academic and Euro-American privilege to impose themselves and their ideas on our communities, they are merely replicating the all too familiar pattern of colonialist domination of Indian Country” (265). Devon Mihesuah strikes a moderating tone in her discussion of the issue. She concedes, “Many Indians would be satisfied if only Indians wrote about Indians”; however, she also points out that no one has a monopoly on knowledge: “Indians are not the only people with knowledge about Indians. Not all Indians have been taught all aspects of their histories and cultures, let alone been thoroughly trained in historical and anthropological theories and methodologies” (Mihesuah “Voices”).

As I wrote this dissertation, I tried to do more “stepping aside” than intruding on Indians or dehumanizing them. I hope that I have succeeded. I have written about American Indian autobiography and identity from my point of view as an outsider. I hope that the voices of the insiders will also be heard.

WORKS CITED

- Abbott, Don Paul. *Rhetoric in the New World: Rhetorical Theory and Practice in Colonial Spanish America*. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 1996.
- Alexie, Sherman. "The Unauthorized Autobiography of Me." *Here First: Autobiographical Essays by Native American Writers*. Ed. Arnold Krupat and Brian Swann. New York: Modern Library/Random, 2000. 3-14.
- Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation)." *Essays on Ideology*. London: Verso, 1984. 1-60.
- Ashpo, Samuel. Letters. McCallum 33-46.
- Axtell, James. *After Columbus: Essays in the Ethnohistory of Colonial North America*. New York: Oxford UP, 1988.
- - -. *The European and the Indian: Essays in the Ethnohistory of Colonial North America*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1981.
- - -. *The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures in Colonial North America*. New York: Oxford UP, 1985.
- Berkhofer, Robert F., Jr. *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present*. New York: Knopf, 1978.
- Berner, Robert. "American Myth: Old, New, Yet Untold." *Native American Perspectives on Literature and History*. Ed. Alan R. Velie. American Indian Literature and Critical Studies 19. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1994. 63-75.
- Bitzer, Lloyd F. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Rhetoric: Concepts, Definitions, Boundaries*.

- Ed. William A. Covino and David A. Jolliffe. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1995. 300-310.
- Bourne, Russell. *Gods of War, Gods of Peace: How the Meeting of Native and Colonial Religions Shaped Early America*. New York: Harcourt, 2002.
- Bruchac, Joseph. "Notes of a Translator's Son." *I Tell You Now: Autobiographical Essays by Native American Writers*. Ed. Brian Swann and Arnold Krupat. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1987. 195-205.
- Brumble, H. David, III. *American Indian Autobiography*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1988.
- - -. *An Annotated Bibliography of American Indian and Eskimo Autobiographies*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1981.
- Burke, Kenneth. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1969.
- Calvin, Hezekiah. Letters. McCallum 47-67.
- Foucault, Michel. "What Is an Author?" *Professing the New Rhetorics: A Sourcebook*. Ed. Theresa Enos and Stuart C. Brown. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1994. 178-93.
- Fowler, David. Letters. McCallum 85-113.
- Furst, Peter T., and Jill L. Furst. *North American Indian Art*. New York: Rizzoli, 1982.
- Gilmore, Leigh. *The Limits of Autobiography: Trauma and Testimony*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2001.

- Greenblatt, Stephen J. *Learning to Curse: Essays in Early Modern Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Gusdorf, Georges. "Conditions and Limits of Autobiography." Trans. James Olney. *Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical*. Ed. James Olney. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1980. 28-48.
- Hilden, Patricia Penn. "Displacements: Performing *Mestizaje*." *Here First: Autobiographical Essays by Native American Writers*. Ed. Arnold Krupat and Brian Swann. New York: Modern Library/Random, 2000. 182-96.
- Jaskoski, Helen. "Andrew Blackbird's Smallpox Story." *Native American Perspectives on Literature and History*. Ed. Alan R. Velie. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1994. 25-35.
- Jennings, Francis. *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest*. New York: Norton, 1976.
- Johnson, Joseph. Letters. McCallum 121-99.
- Josephy, Alvin M., Jr. *The Indian Heritage of America*. New York: Bantam, 1973.
- Justice, Daniel Heath. "We're Not There Yet, Kemo Sabe: Positing a Future for American Indian Literary Studies." *American Indian Quarterly* 25.2 (2001): 256-69.
- Kennedy, George A. *Comparative Rhetoric: An Historical and Cross-Cultural Introduction*. New York: Oxford UP, 1998.

- Krupat, Arnold. *For Those Who Come After: A Study of Native American Autobiography*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1985.
- Krupat, Arnold, ed. *Native American Autobiography: An Anthology*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1994.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980.
- Langer, Susanne K. *Philosophy in a New Key: A Study in the Symbolism of Reason, Rite and Art*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1982.
- Leach, Douglas Edward. *Flintlock and Tomahawk: New England in King Philip's War*. New York: Macmillan, 1958.
- Lejeune, Philippe. *On Autobiography*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1988.
- McCallum, James Dow, ed. *The Letters of Eleazar Wheelock's Indians*. Hanover, NH: Dartmouth College, 1932.
- M'Clure, David, and Elijah Parish. *Memoirs of the Rev. Eleazar Wheelock, D.D.* New York: Arno, 1972.
- Mihesuah, Devon A. "Voices, Interpretations, and the 'New Indian History': Comment on the *American Indian Quarterly's* Special Issue on Writing about American Indians." *American Indian Quarterly* 20.1 (1996). 22 Sept. 2003. <<http://80-search.epnet.com.ezproxy.tamu.edu:2048/direct.asp?an=9702070815&db=f5h>>.

- Misch, Georg. *A History of Autobiography in Antiquity*. Trans. Georg Misch and E. W. Dickes. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1951.
- Murray, Laura J. “‘Pray Sir, Consider a Little’: Rituals of Subordination and Strategies of Resistance in the Letters of Hezekiah Calvin and David Fowler to Eleazar Wheelock.” *Early Native American Writing: New Critical Essays*. Ed. Helen Jaskoski. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. 15-41.
- Nelson, Dana D. “‘(I speak like a fool but I am constrained)’: Samson Occom’s *Short Narrative* and Economies of the Racial Self.” *Early Native American Writing: New Critical Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. 42-65.
- Nielsen, Donald M. “The Mashpee Indian Revolt of 1833.” *New England Quarterly* 58 (1985): 400-20.
- O’Brien, Lynne Woods. *Plains Indian Autobiographies*. Boise, ID: Boise State College, 1973.
- Occom, Samson. “A Short Narrative of My Life.” *The Elders Wrote: An Anthology of Early Prose by North American Indians 1768-1931*. Ed. Bernd Peyer. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1982. 12-18.
- Olney, James. “Autobiography and the Cultural Moment: A Thematic, Historical, and Bibliographical Introduction.” *Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical*. Ed. James Olney. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1980. 3-27.
- Ong, Walter J. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. London: Routledge, 1989.

- Pascal, Roy. *Design and Truth in Autobiography*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1960.
- Peyer, Bernd, ed. *The Elders Wrote: An Anthology of Early Prose by North American Indians 1768-1931*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1982.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. "Arts of the Contact Zone." *Profession 91* (1991): 33-40.
- Richardson, Leon Burr, ed. *An Indian Preacher in England*. Hanover, NH: Dartmouth College Publications, 1933.
- Saar, Doreen Alvarez. "'How Europeans Become Americans?': Reading Labor into the Code of Consent." *MELUS* (Summer 1991-92): 37-49.
- Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Knopf, 1993.
- Shattock, Tobias. Letters. McCallum 201-18.
- Simmons, William S., and Cheryl L. Simmons, eds. *Old Light on Separate Ways: The Narragansett Diary of Joseph Fish 1765-1776*. Hanover, NH: UP of New England, 1982.
- Slotkin, Richard. *Regeneration through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan UP, 1973.
- Starobinski, Jean. "The Style of Autobiography." Trans. Seymour Chatman. *Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical*. Ed. James Olney. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1980. 73-83.
- Stallybrass, Peter, and Allon White. *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1986.

- Swann, Brian, and Arnold Krupat, eds. *I Tell You Now: Autobiographical Essays by Native American Writers*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1987.
- Swisher, Karen Gayton. "Why Indian People Should Be the Ones to Write about Indian Education." *American Indian Quarterly* 20.1 (1996). 22 Sept. 2003. <<http://80-search.epnet.com.ezproxy.tamu.edu:2048/direct.asp?an=9702070814&db=f5h>>.
- Szasz, Margaret Connell. *Indian Education in the American Colonies, 1607-1783*. Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 1988.
- Vaughan, Alden T. "Trinculo's Indian: American Natives in Shakespeare's England." *The Tempest' and Its Travels*. Ed. Peter Hulme and William H. Sherman. London: Reaktion, 2000. 49-59.
- Washburn, Wilcomb E. *The Indian in America*. New York: Harper, 1975.
- Weaver, Jace, ed. Preface. *Native American Religious Identity: Unforgotten Gods*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1998. ix-xiii.
- Weintraub, Karl. *The Value of the Individual: Self and Circumstance in Autobiography*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1978.
- Wheelock, Eleazar. *A Plain and Faithful Narrative of the Original Design, Rise, Progress and Present State of the Indian Charity-School at Lebanon, in Connecticut*. Boston: Richard and Samuel Draper, 1763. Microfilm.
- Whitaker, Nathaniel. Letter to Eleazar Wheelock. 15 May 1766. *An Indian Preacher in England*. Ed. Leon Burr Richardson. Hanover, NH: Dartmouth College

Publications, 1933.

Whitcomb, Seldon L. *The Study of a Novel*. Boston: Heath, 1905.

Winslow, Donald J. *Life-Writing: A Glossary of Terms in Biography, Autobiography, and Related Forms*. 2nd ed. Biography Monographs. Honolulu: Center for Biographical Research/U of Hawai'i P, 1995.

Wong, Hertha Dawn. *Sending My Heart Back across the Years: Tradition and Innovation in Native American Autobiography*. New York: Oxford, 1992.

Wyss, Hilary E. *Writing Indians: Literacy, Christianity, and Native Community in Early America*. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 2000.

VITA

David Pruett
 3104 Stoneway Dr. #207
 Austin, TX 78757
 jayhawk@neo.tamu.edu

EDUCATION

Ph.D. in English, Texas A&M University, College Station, May 2004
 M.A. in English, Texas A&M University, College Station, August 1994
 B.A. in English, University of Kansas, Lawrence, May 1979

TEACHING EXPERIENCE AT TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY, 1992-2002

English 104, Composition and Rhetoric, 12 sections
 English 203, Introduction to Literature, 3 sections
 English 210, Scientific and Technical Writing, 18 sections
 English 301, Technical Writing, 3 sections
 English 320, Technical Editing and Writing, 1 section (with Dr. Helen Barthelme)
 English 376, Twentieth-Century American Novel, 1 section
 English 410/Linguistics 410, History of the English Language, 1 semester; test writing and grading, HTML coding
 Writing Center, 3 semesters

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS

Swearingen, C. Jan, and Dave Pruett. "Language Diversity and the Classroom: Problems and Prospects, a Bibliography." *Language Diversity in the Classroom: From Intention to Practice*. Ed. Geneva Smitherman and Victor Villanueva. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2003. 134-48.

Book Notice of *The Student's Dictionary of Literary Plains Cree: Based on Contemporary Texts*, by H. C. Wolfart and Freda Ahenakew. *Language* 76 (2000): 946-47.

Book Notice of *ana kâ-pimwêwêhahk okakêskihkênowina: The Counselling Speeches of Jim Kâ-Nîpîhtêw*, ed. and trans. by Freda Ahenakew and H. C. Wolfart. *Language* 76 (2000): 483-84.

Book Notice of *kwayask ê-kî-pê-kiskinowâpahtihicik: Their Example Showed Me the Way: A Cree Woman's Life Shaped by Two Cultures*, by Emma Minde; ed. and trans. by Freda Ahenakew and H. C. Wolfart. *Language* 75 (1999): 866.

Rhetoric, the Polis, and the Global Village: Selected Papers from the 1998 Thirtieth Anniversary Rhetoric Society of America Conference. Ed. C. Jan Swearingen. Assoc. ed. Dave Pruett. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1999.

Columns. 1997. Editor (1996-97) of Dept. of English, Texas A&M U, annual newsletter highlighting academic work of faculty and graduate students.