UCLA
American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title
The Invention of Native American Literature. By Robert Dale Parker.

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/46v8k0f9

Journal
American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 27(4)

ISSN
0161-6463

Author
Anderson, Eric Gary

Publication Date
2003-09-01

DOI
10.17953

Copyright Information
This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, availalbe at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

eScholarship.org
Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

acknowledgment of the fact that, no matter how ideal a vehicle Neihardt provides us for Black Elk's message, readers and scholars today only have access to memories, transcriptions, and photographs. Although there is no reason to suspect that Ben Black Elk's translations or Enid Neihardt's stenography and typing deliberately changed the original, acknowledgment of the remove through which Black Elk comes to us is essential.

Holloway's discussion of influences of *Black Elk Speaks* uses an exacting literary approach, with emphasis on diction and scenes that recur in the work of later writers. While this credits Neihardt with producing a convincing language and emphasizing epic moments, it misses aspects of inspiration that credit Nicholas Black Elk's vision with the cross-cultural appeal that has kept the book alive. Such tributes to the enduring power of the vision as songs based on the text, the stage production of *Black Elk Speaks*, and the Hoop Dance of Lakota Kevin Locke deserve exploration. (On the Hoop Dance, see Pauline Tuttle, "Beyond Feathers and Beads": Interlocking Narratives in the Music and Dance of Tokeya Inajin (Kevin Locke)" in *Selling the Indian: Commercializing and Appropriating American Indian Cultures*, ed. Carter Jones Meyer and Diana Royer, University of Arizona Press, 2001).

Interpreting the Legacy provides a useful introduction to the study of Neihardt and Black Elk's collaborative text because it contains so much archival material, an extensive annotated bibliography, and summaries, however biased, of important interpretations of *Black Elk Speaks*. Unfortunately, unexpressed arguments and redundancies give the impression of a book constructed out of lectures and conference papers without full-scale revisions. Holloway's defense of Neihardt as a gifted writer and the right conduit for aspects of Black Elk's life story seems better suited to an article than a book-length work.

Martha L. Viehmann
Northern Kentucky University

The Invention of Native American Literature. By Robert Dale Parker. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003. 244 pages. $49.95 cloth; $18.95 paper.

The author of two books on William Faulkner and one on Elizabeth Bishop, Robert Dale Parker has produced a book based on a number of his articles on American Indian literature. As Parker acknowledges early on, he cannot provide a comprehensive literary history of American Indian writing; after all, no one can. Historians and literary critics are beset by conflicts between coverage and preference, between ever-expanding repertoires, stubbornly finite semesters, and publishers' word counts. The inevitable selectivity of any critical study, anthology, or course syllabus makes it more rather than less imperative for those of us who teach and study literature to examine and theorize our selection processes rigorously and skeptically. Trusting his considerable intellectual acumen and pedagogical good sense, Parker does just this, as he examines a carefully selected group of Native writers and texts, focusing on two 1930s novels, John Joseph Mathews' *Sundown* (1934) and D'Arcy

McNickle's *The Surrounded* (1936), as well as post-1975 work by Ray A. Young Bear, Leslie Marmon Silko, and Thomas King.

Parker's chapter-by-chapter arguments are too intricate and multiform to summarize in this review. However, his basic premise posits *Sundown* and *The Surrounded* as "founding works" (p. 79) that triggered a variety of motifs (such as the presence of restless young men with nothing to do) and narrative strategies (such as the integration of oral knowledge into written narrative) that Parker associates with the invention of Native American literature. The preoccupations articulated in these two novels from the 1930s resemble the concerns voiced in later examples of American Indian literature, without quite constituting intentionality; Mathews and McNickle are not Thomas Alva Edisons who set out, blueprint in hand, to invent something as complex and contradictory as a new literature. What changes, especially after1968, is amply evident in the wealth of excellent poetry by American Indians, the distinguished achievements of Native fiction writers, and the gradually intensifying audibility of powerful American Indian intellectuals within a field that is gradually gaining recognition as a field. As Parker puts it, "After the invention of Native American literature, Native writers at last have the liberty to make of Native literature what they will, and—from Silko to King to Alexie to countless others—they are at it with enthusiasm, writing their way into the age of the post-canon" (p. 167). The story this book tells, then, is an optimistic one about the relatively free play of autonomy and adaptation.

Even when allowing for the need to be selective, Parker's list of writers and writings sparks questions about his choices. For example, such early Indian writers as William Apess, Samson Occom, Black Hawk, and Sarah Winnemucca are not considered as possible inventors of Native American literature or even mentioned in the book; and nineteenth-century Native texts receive scant attention, however broad or narrow the definition of "Native" and "texts." Thus Parker does not quite link invention to emergence in either its printed nineteenth-century literary forms or its more venerable and dominant narrative forms. Perhaps these apparent absences reflect a postcolonial attentiveness to the potential problems of glibly or prematurely squeezing varieties of American Indian verbal performance into the category of "literature." In a related vein, Parker reminds us, in a brief last-chapter discussion of *The Life and Adventures of Joaquin Murieta, the Celebrated California Bandit* (1854), that textual production and textual representation are two different things. A narrative by John Rollin Ridge does not easily or inevitably represent the Cherokee Nation, let alone American Indians more generally—particularly when the text in question crosses as many cultural borders as *Murieta*. Likewise, perhaps Apess, Occom, and others published before anyone, Native or non-Native, imagined, let alone invented, a printed literature that circulates but implicitly falls short of representing Native identity.

However, as Parker points out, such concerns never really go away: King, Silko, Young Bear, and other writers face issues of cultural identity too. And so I suggest that many of the nineteenth-century writers, storytellers, and narratives Parker does *not* select contribute in important ways to the popular transnational emergence of American Indian literature even as—especially

as—they raise vexing questions of authorship, mediation, and invention. What's more, these nineteenth-century American Indian narratives emerged alongside American literary regional fiction that, like many of their Native-authored counterparts, responded critically and even subversively to such inventions as an industrial and technological "revolution" defined as "progress" and secured by patents, copyrights, trademarks, robber barons, architects, and anti-Indian soldiers and politicians.

That is the book I would write. Parker uses a different approach: one which identifies an "earlier invention" that emerges as "a history of ways that Indian literary writing expressed itself as literary and as Indian . . . as Indian writers invented a body of literature that 'we' have come to call Native American literature" (p. 3). As Parker presents it, this early twentieth-century invention is provisional if not improvisational, and occurs without bright bursts of epiphanic light. Then, in the mid- to late-1970s, a sort of Native literary synthesis—perhaps a near relation of Kenneth Lincoln's "Native American Renaissance"—gets underway in earnest, building on key issues identified during the process of invention. Parker alternately sees texts by Young Bear, Silko, and King as "a test of the larger argument" about invention and as a climactic "reinvention" of American Indian literature (p. 7). In a related passage, he points to "two thresholds in Native American literary studies": one in which the body of work "has now reached sufficient mass for critics to move beyond . . . worn generalizations," and the other in which the study of American Indian literature becomes a recognized and accepted field of study that achieves a broader, less provincial status (p. 1).

In working through his argument about the invention of Native American literature, Parker does not acknowledge what James Clifford calls "the invention paradigm." The "invention of X" or "inventing Y" is a familiar, perhaps even a canonical, critical step, calling to mind other steps (such as "The Rise of A" and "The Limits of B"). Given what Parker accomplishes in his superb final chapter on "American Fictions and the Post-canon," it is surprising that he does not have more to say about the ways in which his turn to the invention paradigm both complies with and disrupts this paradigm. Instead, he resists overstating its explanatory force by using it in a fairly relaxed, situational way. He identifies four motifs or themes that help him locate and characterize the invention of Native American literature, "four topics that in overlapping ways address gender, sexuality, stereotype, and the appropriation of Indian cultural and intellectual property." These four topics are "young men's threatened masculinity, the oral, the poetic, and Indian cultures' aloof renegotiations of what the dominant culture understands as authority" (p. 3). Parker seeks more substantive links among these four topics, and of course each has important links with American Indian thinking and writing. However, they do not mesh as richly and suggestively for me as they do for him. The grouping of topics strikes me as a bit too scattershot, and I struggle to see how they converge, how they are all original, and how their convergence stimulated something as remarkable as the invention of Native American literature.

Parker's work is provocative in more ways than one, and he generously and courageously welcomes skeptical responses. In turn, I break with book-review convention by winnowing my summaries of chapters and returning as a skeptic to larger issues of authority and performance. Parker brings a tenacious critical intelligence to his material; he grapples, and I value the opportunity to watch him work. He is mindful of pedagogy, especially in the closing chapter, with its refreshing discussion of post-canon teaching practices that resist tidy multiculturalisms. It is vital, I believe, to situate American Indian literature as he does in a multiplicity of literary and cultural contexts. But his performance throughout this book often strikes me as too dogged; at times he overstates his case, making every last turn of the theoretical screw and exuding a critical confidence, if not certitude, that does not so much work against complexity as take possession of it. Of course, this dogmatism is, in part, a response to the tenacious, searching critical intelligences of some of the most influential critics and theorists in the field: Robert Warrior, Arnold Krupat, Craig Womack, Elizabeth Cook-Lynn, and Vine Deloria, Jr., to name a few. They make strong, directive arguments, as does Parker. But my problem is that I cannot determine exactly with whom Parker is arguing. For a variety of reasons, he does not seem to be addressing persons (such as myself) already established in the field of American Indian literature and reasonably well versed in the territory he covers. Given that Parker does not quite seem to see his readers as co-conspirators, perhaps he has in mind prospective specialists and/or those who are curious about American Indian literature, inclined to read and teach it, but who still need to be persuaded of its relevance and viability.

Much more remains to be discussed. Consider these four examples: Parker catches exactly the right tone in his nicely modulated critique of W. D. Snodgrass's anti-Indian poem "Powwow." He tells us that he will work "often through comparison to African American literary cultural studies" (p. viii), but does not do so. He recognizes the often-overlooked, yet important presence, of the ordinary in American Indian literature. The index lists proper names only. How do these last four observations mesh with each other and with all that I have discussed and overlooked in this review? That is, of course, an unanswerable question. If in posing it I reinvent the conclusion that nothing is conclusive, I hope that I have also suggested how and why this particular strain of "nothing" articulates an ambivalent counterargument to the more decisive conclusions of Parker's book.

Eric Gary Anderson
Oklahoma State University

Keepers of the Morning Star: An Anthology of Native Women's Theater. Edited by Jaye T. Darby and Stephanie Fitzgerald. Los Angeles: UCLA American Indian Studies Center, 2003. $20.00 paper.

Perhaps one way of critically assessing American Indian dramatic literature is to examine the new representations that it calls into being. By this measure,