

were typically those whose race or ethnicity might cast doubt on the “Indianness” of the group as a whole—whites, blacks, and individuals of mixed race.

Each of the six groups developed its own criteria for citizenship that reflected the tribe’s individual history, circumstances, and relationships with the federal and state governments. Requirements included residency on the reservation, cultural affiliation, gendered kinship, and racial identity. Inclusion brought tangible and often extensive benefits. The Pamunkeys used citizenship to preserve their land rights and bolster their political status in the eyes of whites. In doing so, they distanced themselves from African Americans to avoid being classified as “colored.” The Catawbias negotiated with state officials to determine citizens who were eligible to receive per capita payments. The Mississippi Choctaws manipulated federal concepts of race to create a new tribe, define citizenship requirements, and regain resources. The Eastern Cherokees established criteria to protect tribal resources and preserve their sovereignty. And the Seminoles and Miccosukees of Florida used citizenship to assert their right to self-determination.

This is a thoroughly researched study, including seventy-six pages of footnotes and a helpful sixteen-page bibliography. Adams’s work makes an important contribution to a body of scholarship produced in the last decade on southern Indian identity, citizenship, and sovereignty by Jessica Cattelino, Kirsty Gover, Ariela Gross, Brian Klopotek, Sarah Krakoff, Malinda Maynor Lowery, Katherine Osburn, Suzianne Painter-Thorne, Circe Sturm, and Fay Yarbrough. It is a beautifully written, well organized, tastefully illustrated, and carefully edited book—analytical, thoughtful, synthetic, and comparative.

I would encourage Dr. Adams to turn her attention next to the Cherokees, Chickasaws, Choctaws, Creeks, and Seminoles that were relocated to Indian Territory (now Oklahoma). Tracing citizenship questions within the removed affiliates of four of the remnant groups in her current study would be a natural extension. Their histories include rich layers of nuance and complexity arising from their experiences with African slavery, black and white intermarriage, factionalism, immigration and emigration, the Civil War, reconstruction treaties, and enrollment and allotment under the Dawes Commission. Although affecting relatively large Native populations, the histories of the Five Tribes after removal remain in need of a scholarly study of the type Adams has completed with *Who Belongs?* The consequences of momentous citizenship decisions made in both the distant and more recent past continue to benefit those included as citizens of the Five Tribes, and negatively impact those defined as not belonging, to the present day.

*Kevin Mulroy*

The Claremont Colleges

**World-Making Stories: Maidu Language and Community Renewal on a Shared California Landscape.** Edited by M. Eleanor Nevins. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2017. 248 pages. \$60.00 cloth; \$30.00 paper.

This book represents a major collaborative accomplishment and what the late linguistic anthropologist Dell Hymes would have approvingly called a “mediative” achievement

of the first order. It is collaborative in that it is the product of many Maidu language and culture experts as well as several linguists and anthropologists spanning many generations. Nevins uses her skills as a linguistic anthropologist to critically review the history of Maidu text collections and to selectively use insights and resources gained from the previous compilations in order to create a wonderful new collection which prioritizes the needs of those concerned with Maidu language revitalization. In collaboration with the Weje-ebis Maidu Project team, she has produced an especially user-friendly collection designed also for a secondary audience of “residents and visitors to Maidu homelands” and a tertiary one representing “the global audience for Native American and Indigenous languages, literatures, histories, and ecologies” (11).

Organizationally, the book is divided into three main parts. The first, “Community Renewal,” includes three chapters. The second contains four chapters comprised of four Maidu texts presented in a bilingual format with illustrations. Finally, part three consists of two brief chapters by the late William Shipley, a linguist with a long history of working with the Mountain Maidu community, that contain a pronunciation guide and several beginning lessons he designed but did not publish. Permissions to publish these useful resources were granted by Shipley’s estate.

Part one introduces the interwoven themes of Maidu language renewal and the politics of Maidu indigeneity. As the subtitle of the volume and the indication of its secondary audience portend, the first chapter links Maidu stories to the lands of Northeastern California. The history of anthropological text collection dates back to Roland Dixon’s 1898 research with the Mountain Maidu storyteller and ceremonial leader Tom Young, whose Maidu name was Hác’ybyjim. Dixon recorded Young’s creation narratives of the Maidu as well as other stories and presented these in his 1902 *Maidu Myths*—a text collection produced in accord with the Boasian goal of documenting linguistic and cultural data for future researchers—and for the fledgling science of anthropology. Though this anthropological publication was not intended for an indigenous audience, Hác’ybyjim used the opportunity to provide narratives that both represented dispossession of Maidu by Euro-American invaders and, even more importantly, located Maidu as people who belonged in their homelands, as people placed there by Worldmaker. Though Dixon’s scientific interest in the texts mostly ignored these discursive strategies in favor of understanding these texts as a form of natural history, the narratives would be incorporated by the linguist William Shipley, a student of Mary Haas at the University of California, Berkeley, into a larger set of texts he had collected from Maidu speakers in the 1960s. Nevins produces an ambivalent portrayal of Dixon as professionally desensitized to ethical concerns for displaced Maidu yet providing an enduring means for hearing Native voices from that period through the texts he collected. The second chapter, “Placing Stories on a Maidu Landscape,” explores the power and richness of Mountain Maidu place-names; it also examines them as a site of cultural conflict. Kóm Jamáni, or “Snow Mountain” in Maidu, has been replaced by the settler state’s Lassen Peak—named after a Danish blacksmith who, among other things, participated in the 1849 Gold Rush. Hác’ybyjim’s narratives were full of Mountain Maidu place-names to demonstrate the knowledge and priority of that area’s indigenous people. While colonizing forces worked to erase an

indigenous presence, these narratives represented the alternative histories and counterhegemonic accounts of indigenous voices. Nevins and the collaborative team have worked effectively to recover those voices and to incorporate them into the community's cultural and linguistic revitalization. A third chapter in this section is written by Weje-ebis member Kenneth Holbrook and it is devoted to offering a brief history of the Maidu Language Keepers. One of the keys to "living with the language" is to tie teaching and learning the language to a place-based educational philosophy. Teaching Maidu is viewed as a way of "extending Maidu environmental stewardship with respect to traditional Maidu lands" (61). Holbrook also critiques the "extractive" character of much past research on his heritage language and credits the many Maidu people who have worked to maintain their heritage language over the years.

Representing half of the total number of pages, part two of the volume contains the creation narratives of Hānc'ybyjim/Tom Young. These appear not in Dixon's original orthography but rather in one developed by Shipley in the linguistic text collections that he published in his 1963 *Maidu Dictionary and Texts* and again later republished and to some extent reframed as "high art" in a rare edition of four volumes published between 2002 and 2005. Perhaps inspired by the early ethno poetic collections of scholars like Jerome Rothenberg or the Beat poet Gary Snyder, this set of myths was illustrated by original woodblock prints by the Santa Cruz artist Daniel Stolpe and was priced at \$10,000. Fortunately, Stolpe agreed to using these illustrations to accompany the narratives for the present collection so they are able to reach a much wider audience. Though Nevins uses Shipley's orthography, she explicitly returns to the Maidu originals in order to recover details that were ignored in previous collections. Two of these changes are especially consequential. One, she restores passages that evoke a sun-wise sequence involving five directions—adding northwest to the four cardinal directions that are conventionally recognized. This is important since five not only represents an important "pattern number" for the Maidu, but it affects the narrative during episodes when the world is being stretched out in five directions and being populated by people who are told by Worldmaker to go in each of those directions. Two, she recovers the productively used sentence-final quotative *ac'ójam* as a structuring element to be used in representing lines of both Maidu and English translation text even though both Dixon and Shipley ignored its ethno poetic role and instead dismissed it as a redundancy best erased. To honor this Maidu feature, Nevins retains it in untranslated form at the end of each translated sentence. Similar to narrative quotatives in other Native American traditions, this means "it is said" and its repeated occurrence both traditionalizes and indigenizes the translated narratives. The net effect of the two columns of text-first Maidu and then the corresponding English with periodic woodblock prints of Worldmaker, Coyote, and other characters is a beautiful representation of the Maidu myths and an inspiring model for how texts once collected in the name of US nation-building and the science of anthropology can be made to speak again for the very communities from which the texts originated.

*Paul V. Kroskrity*  
University of California, Los Angeles