

The Expendable Citizen:
Patriotism, Sacrifice, and Sentiment
in American Culture

by

Sara Megan Humphreys

A thesis
presented to the University of Waterloo
in fulfillment of the
thesis requirement for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in
English

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 2007

©Sara Megan Humphreys 2007

AUTHOR'S DECLARATION

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis. This is a true copy of the thesis, including any required final revisions, as accepted by my examiners.

I understand that my thesis may be made electronically available to the public.

Abstract

This study argues that the American citizen's choice to perform or not perform sacrificial national duties has been heavily mediated by sentimental representations of sacrifice in popular narratives. Through an analysis of the American captivity narrative from its origins in the seventeenth century up to its current state in the contemporary period, this project also asserts that race plays a central role in defining the type of citizen who should perform the most traumatic and costly of national sacrifices. Based on the implied reader's sentimental identification with the suffering, white female captive, clear racial and cultural demarcations are made between the captor and the captive. These strong demarcations are facilitated through the captive's choice to perform sacrifices that will sustain her social and racial status as a privileged and authentic identity. Her successful defense of her cultural and racial purity from a racialized threat heightens her ethos, investing her marginalized identity with power and influence.

This representation of the suffering, sacrificial female captive who gains legitimacy via her fulfillment of national duty offers a sentimental model of civic duty for American citizenry to emulate. In addition, the sentimental representation of sacrifice in the captivity narrative not only stabilizes an authentic national collective, but also suggests to marginalized persons that national sacrifice can supply legitimacy and privilege. In opposition to this narrative representation of legitimacy gained through sacrifice, Indigenous authors Mourning Dove and

Leslie Marmon Silko depict the sentimental performance of sacrificial duty as a dangerous discourse that internally colonizes those who desire legitimacy in the United States. These Indigenous counter-narratives show clearly that the narrativization of sentimentality and sacrifice more often than not defines America and its authentically pure citizens as worth the price of death.

Acknowledgements

I can't possibly thank everyone who helped me to complete this dissertation; however, a short list must include my supervisor, Dr. Victoria Lamont, and committee members, Dr. Kevin McGuirk and Dr. Shelley Hulan, who commented on drafts and provided vital suggestions for improvement. I am also grateful to Dr. Mary Chapman who made excellent editorial suggestions for my introduction. Thanks must also go to Dr. William Plumstead, who encouraged me to study American literature. I am also grateful for the funding supplied by the Social Sciences and Research Council of Canada, the Ontario Graduate Scholarship, the PEO Scholars Award, and the University of Waterloo President's scholarship.

I must express my sincere thanks to the Dissertation Divas, Dr. Catherine Scott and Dr. Veronica Austen, whose support was invaluable. I am also grateful to my in-laws, in particular Evelyn Lawrence, whose emotional and financial support went well beyond the call of duty.

This project is dedicated to Randy and Max whose love kept me going

Table of Contents

Mapping Sacrifice and Sentiment in American Culture.....	1
The Sentimental and Sacrificial Lessons in Puritan Captivity Narratives.....	41
The Continuing Economy of Sentimental Sacrifice.....	83
Repudiating Sentimental Sacrifice	124
Conclusion.....	198
Bibliography.....	205

List of Figures

Figure 1 Hannah Duston Statue (Haverhill)	70
Figure 2 Haverhill Statue close-up.	72
Figure 3 Penacook Statue.....	73
Figure 4 the capture	74
Figure 5 the slaughter.....	75
Figure 6 the escape.....	75
Figure 7 Hannah Duston Penacook statue as a Jim Beam whiskey bottle.....	76
Figure 8 Illustration from Mary Rowlandson's Captivity Narrative, 1770 Edition	79
Figure 9 Apache children on arrival at the Carlisle Indian School.....	136
Figure 10 Apache children four months later.	136

Mapping Sacrifice and Sentiment in American Culture

“If there are necessary sacrifices to be made for human progress, is it not essential to hold to the principle that those to be sacrificed must make the decision themselves?”

Howard Zinn

In the United States the relationship between the citizen and the nation is based on an exchange of responsibilities that have been notoriously difficult to define. Debates over the civic responsibilities of the American citizen and how to best fulfill these national duties comprise two main positions: a “rights based, self-directing individualism” versus “a civic existence grounded in the formative experience of community” (Allman x). Both sides of this debate presuppose a citizen who *chooses* to perform civic responsibilities in exchange for certain rights and freedoms. Implicit within the concept of civic or national duty is the performance of sacrifice for the national good, explains Charles V. Willie, a professor of education and urban studies at Harvard University, who sums up the American ideal of civic responsibility thusly: “To be a person for others, we must learn how to sacrifice on behalf of the community. To be a person for others, we must learn how to suffer with others in the community” (Willie). In this project I

argue that the individual's choice to perform or not to perform sacrificial national duties has been heavily mediated by sentimental representations of sacrifice in popular narratives from the colonial period up to the contemporary period. Further, I assert that sentimental representations of sacrifice in popular narratives not only mediate a citizen's choice to perform national sacrifices, but also mediate the type of citizen who should perform the most costly of national sacrifices that often involve physical and psychological trauma. In order to explore the function and endurance of these sentimental representations of sacrifice, or what I call sentimental sacrifices, I will examine the sentimental sacrifices commonly found in the captivity narrative.

Because the captivity narrative crosses genres and historical contexts, it offers the opportunity to trace the value of sentimental sacrifice in American culture. That is, the captivity narrative repetitively communicates certain national ideals, such as authenticity and purity, across centuries, yet the captivity narrative has not been able to resist the diachronic forces of change. Rather than excluding diachrony in favour of structure and system or vice versa, I study how the ideals of sacrificial duty that captivity narratives convey retain value across time. Ferdinand de Saussure explains the operation of value in language through an analogy using the game of chess: the knight in a set of chessmen will not become a "real, concrete element" until value is "wedded to it" (279). The knight cannot retain and hold the identity of "knight" until its value is applied. The chess game, like a

narrative formula, will obey certain “fixed rules” but “the notion of identity blends with that of value and vice versa” to create different meanings, depending on the social and historical context (Saussure 279).¹ This concept that mutable contexts, identities and value(s) blend with “fixed forms” to communicate certain meanings within a given culture best describes my approach to studying how the captivity narrative communicates sacrificial national duty. The captivity narrative follows certain fixed rules, which identify it as a formula, yet how the captivity narrative is valued depends upon its form and function within specific contexts.

The basic formula of the most enduring and popular captivity narratives involves a white female who is captured by often racialized enemies from the safety of her home. Based on this formula, captivity narratives engineer relationships among, but not limited to, race, colonization and patriotism. Beginning with two of the most consistently reproduced captivity narratives - Mary Rowlandson’s account of her captivity, entitled *A True History of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson* (1682); and Cotton Mather’s account of Hannah Duston’s captivity, entitled “A Notable Exploit wherein, Dux Faemina Facti” from *Magnalia Christi Americana* (1702) – I argue that these particular captivity narratives continue to fascinate and influence American culture because the female captive sells a particular brand of national sacrificial duty

¹ Saussure provocatively claims that while studying and classifying linguistic units has importance, “it is better to approach the problem of units through the study of value, for in my opinion value is of prime importance” (279).

through the power of sentimentality. I then trace this brand of sentimental sacrificial duty through a comparison between the captivity narratives embedded in James Fenimore Cooper's *The Last of the Mohicans* (1826) and Joss Whedon's *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* (1997-2002). Such a comparison between two contextually and generically disparate popular narratives reveals the enduring cultural work sentimental sacrifice performs in furthering specific ideas regarding who should sacrifice what in the name of national duty. After tracing the cultural function of sentimental sacrifice within the captivity narrative, I closely read Mourning Dove's *Cogewea* and Leslie Marmon Silko's *Ceremony*, each of which depicts the apparently noble sentimental sacrifices within captivity narratives as logical fallacies. Through a blend of Western and Aboriginal storytelling traditions, Mourning Dove and Silko each writes a novel that teaches powerful lessons regarding the particular brand of national duty that sentimentality and sacrifice sell. Indeed, Mourning Dove and Silko make clear that while fulfillment of sacrificial duty promises to confer legitimacy to the person who performs the sacrifice(s), this promise is a fallacy. That is, both Mourning Dove and Silko produce strong counter narratives that ask the reader to consider if national sacrifice has any validity at all. They argue that the act of sacrifice creates a bond through sentimental tears among the beneficiaries of the sacrifice, but confers only fleeting legitimacy to the sacrificed person: a point that is exemplified through the main characters in *Cogewea* and *Ceremony*.

The American captivity formula provides an excellent opportunity to explore the connected ideals of racial purity and national legitimacy, because the American captivity narrative defines legitimate and illegitimate national identities through sentimentality and sacrifice. Michelle Burnham asserts that the sentimental tears shed for the white female captive invite the implied reader to join with a national collectivity whose belief in its own exceptionalism excuses and justifies the violent colonization of Native land (5). Captivity narratives also help to propagate the white fantasy of racial superiority, claims Louise Barnett (49). In addition, Richard Slotkin argues that “[t]he great and continuing popularity of [captivity] narratives, the uses to which they are put, and the nature of the symbolism employed in them are evidence that captivity narratives constitute the first coherent myth-literature developed in America for American audiences” (95). The critical consensus regarding the cultural work captivity narratives perform can be distilled into three main conclusions: (1) The captivity narrative supplies a legitimated identity to the captive and degraded identity to the captor; (2) the captivity narrative justifies violence; (3) the captivity narrative perpetuates the concept that an exceptional American nation, and, by extension, its occupants, is under constant threat of attack.

I expand on these conclusions by closely analyzing the act of sacrifice that incites the sentimental response necessary for readers² to emotionally invest in the lessons captivity narratives supply. The acts of sacrifice the female captive must perform, from transgressing her femininity to killing in the name of a greater good, heightens her ethos, which, in turn, makes her words extremely powerful. In fictive captivity narratives that are usually embedded within popular genres such as the frontier romance, the scene of sentimental sacrifice positions the female captive as a powerful identity who commands respect, obedience, and sentimental identification. The sacrificial captive's speech operates to produce a sentimental response that forms a type of social contract between the characters who witness and benefit from the sacrifice, and the sacrificial victim. If the reader has bonded through sentimental identification with the sacrificial character, then he or she will also be part of the sacrificial contract legitimated by the act of sentimental

² Whenever I use the term "reader," I mean the type of reader Wayne Booth discusses in *The Rhetoric of Fiction*: "[t]he author creates, in short, an image of himself and another image of his reader; he makes his reader...and the most successful reading is one in which the created selves, author and reader, can find complete agreement" (Booth 138). The real or flesh and blood reader may well not agree with the textual intentions of the author; however, the endurance and popularity of a literary work speaks to the successful synchronization of moral values among reader, text, and context. In addition, when I discuss the reader of a particular work, I am referring not only to the readership within the context of the work, but also to the readers who are presented with, for example, Mary Rowlandson's captivity narrative some 400 years later. If I am speaking of a specific readership, I will modify my references accordingly.

sacrifice. Sentimental sacrifice provides the “accuracy and morality” required to produce powerful speech-acts that affect the reader (Austin 10). J.L. Austin explains in *How to Do Things with Words* that utterances alone do not instil belief in the speaker’s words: the speaker must follow through with his or her speech-acts; otherwise, the speech-act is a “false promise” (11). The sacrificial character within captivity narratives exemplifies national duty through her actions and words; therefore, her sacrificial acts as part of this duty supply power and force to her words. Indeed, words are “instruments of actual change in the world” (DiNova 4, 13), which means that words are not simply representational, but performative. The words within the scene of sentimental sacrifice compose a performative speech-act driven by the social anxieties and moralities of a specific context. The sacrificed character’s apparently necessary death and/or mutilation strongly reinforce the sacrificial character’s speech-act, usually performed just prior to the sacrifice. Because the sacrificial character willingly makes sacrifices, which, presumably, the other characters benefit from, the character’s pre-sacrifice speech has the power to demand certain behaviours post-sacrifice. I propose that this narrative representation of sentimental sacrifice originates in the Puritan captivity narrative formula established by Mary Rowlandson’s account.

The captivity narrative enabled Puritan leaders, such as Increase and Cotton Mather, to successfully convince their readership that the violence required to colonize Native land in order to create a “new Jerusalem” in the Americas was

not only worthwhile but also sanctioned by God. Sacvan Bercovitch argues that Puritan biblical rhetoric turned the geography of the Americas into a “Christianography” where “metaphor becomes fact, and fact, metaphor” (71). That is, the Puritans interpreted the world through the diegetic universe of the Bible, which, in turn, shaped everyday reality. Since sacrifice is central to both the Old and New Testaments, sacrifice as a national ideal has become embedded within American culture through the influence of the many Christian sects that populated early America. However, it is fair to say that Puritan publications, such as Mary Rowlandson’s captivity narrative and Cotton Mather’s *Magnalia Christi Americana*,³ were so popular and widely read that Puritan values have had a major influence on the formation of a distinctly American culture. The “media-savvy” Puritan sect used print media to “constitute itself by publication [and] declare itself a nation by verbal fiat” (Bercovitch 70). Writing and reading formed an anchor of identity for the Puritans, who were forcefully dislocated from the familiar and thrust into a world completely foreign to their cultural and geographical frame of reference. The written word, specifically the Bible, provided a frame of reference

³ Dorothy Baker writes that Cotton Mather’s *Magnalia Christi Americana* “captured the imagination of its audience” and was considered valuable enough to warrant stealing (3). In addition, Mather’s eight volume history of New England is still made available for purchase through such mass market book sellers as Amazon.com, which also speaks to the continued cultural value of Mather’s work.

through which to “see” the world. The documented promise of God’s covenant to provide a nation for his people gave the Puritans divine justification to claim an already populated land. Through representations of Calvinist sacrifice, the Puritan captivity narrative justified violence and promoted burgeoning national ideals to a wide readership. However, for any reader to believe the lessons and/or ideals represented in a text, the reader must believe the diegetic world has efficacy.

Paul Ricoeur’s interpretation theory explains why readers can believe that the diegetic universe of a text is real. If a narrative can achieve a state of reality for a reader, the narrative can actually change a reader’s moral beliefs or even perception. Ricoeur argues that texts have the ability to produce physical or behavioural actions from the reader because textual action and lived experience are difficult to define and separate. So difficult, in fact, that we require modifiers and modal auxiliaries to help separate fact from fiction; for example, if we are being told a story that does not have the proper modifiers that categorize the story as fact or fiction, we will ask “is that true?” Ricoeur’s assertion that factual or fictional narratives are the main conduits through which humans interpret the world underpins the methodology of this dissertation.

To prove his assertion that narratives shape human reality, Ricoeur explains that the process of turning real or fictional experiences into language requires the categorization of each experience from non-sense into sense. Non-sense is experience without order; the brain is unable to categorize information

into linguistic structures that translate the experience coherently. Therefore, “sense” is the term that represents experience when it is translated into a communicable event. “Sense” is an ideal structure and a term of approval that affirms an experience as acceptable thereby allowing for the application of meaning to the event (Ricoeur 20). When a person states, “that makes sense,” he or she uses the term “sense” to apply validation to the event in question. However, the transference of an event, fictional or non-fictional, from experience into language is not smooth and seamless. As stated earlier, we require linguistic modifications that tell us when an event is real or not. The reader is under constant pressure to mediate between the real and the unreal, and, in turn, categorize the textual event as sense, nonsense, fiction, or non-fiction. To achieve proper classification, the reader must connect the phenomenon and the concept. The concept organizes the phenomenon into a form that makes sense within the reader’s social, political and historical context. For instance, Harriet Beecher Stowe’s *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* contains a famous example of sentimental sacrifice that no longer has the phenomenological ability to hold the reader transfixed in a heightened emotional state. From the publication of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* in 1852 until the early twentieth century, Tom’s sacrifice generated the tears necessary to create a sentimental bond among readers who mourned his death. However, by the mid-twentieth century, the social and political conditions that made Tom’s scene of sentimental sacrifice compelling and somehow real ended. Similarly, Cora

Munro's melodramatic sacrifice to save her sister's life in *The Last of the Mohicans* (1826) has also lost its currency in contemporary American culture; however, in *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* (1997-2002), Buffy Summer's sacrifice to save her sister's life maintains credibility because the representation of her sacrifice makes sense within the current cultural context and even seems plausible despite the fantastical storyline. Buffy's audience can categorize her sentimental sacrifice as sensible and correct because of the constant dialogue between viewer, language, reference, meaning, sense, and experience that work to create a diegetic world for the viewer to exist within.

In addition to Ricoeur's theory of text, action and interpretation, socio-linguistics provides the tools to closely read scenes of sentimental sacrifice in captivity narratives. Roger Fowler suggests that literary analysis needs to "treat literature as a discourse" in order to "see the text as mediating relationships between language-users: not only relationships of speech, but also of consciousness, ideology, role and class" (*Literature* 80). Fowler's theory that narrative is "answerable and responsible" within a particular context speaks to the agency of narrative to shape reality for a readership (*Literature* 80). Once the narrative is transmitted into culture by an author or speaker, the narrative may well perform cultural work that the author did not intend, particularly if the narrative is extremely popular.

This slippage between authorial intention and cultural reception allows for counter narratives and reformulations of sentimental sacrifice to flourish. Indeed, the captivity narrative with its suffering, sacrificial female captive has yet to lose value in American culture, either as the subject of criticism or the subject of praise. The continued representations of Mary Rowlandson and Hannah Duston as national icons are testaments to the strong influence of the Puritan captivity narrative on American culture. By understanding the belief system that produced the Puritan captivity narrative, the endurance of the female captive as a representative of sacrificial duty becomes more understandable.

The Origins of Sentimental Sacrifice

The following overview of Puritan and Calvinist philosophies of the emotions, the self, and civic duty sheds light on the forces that shaped sentimental sacrifice as a narrative means to communicate civic responsibility. The narrative that communicated Puritan and Calvinist values most widely, I argue, was the Puritan captivity narrative, in which the suffering female captive illustrated sacrifice as a desirable form of national duty. Moreover, there are strong connections between current sacrificial national ideals in the United States and Puritan philosophies regarding emotion and sacrifice. The beliefs that shaped Puritanism and, in turn, Puritan reality did not die out, but became part of the epistemology of American culture. In a lecture given at Princeton University in

late 2006, historian, Mark Noll stated that Calvinism is “the strand of moral reasoning that has been well-represented in Black and White American churches and in secularized terms more broadly in society” (Noll). Ann Douglas admits that “[u]nder ‘Calvinism’ we can place much of what rigorous theology Protestant Americans have ever officially accepted” (6). Clearly, secularized versions of Calvinism have become entrenched in American culture through the repetition of its fundamental tenets in popular cultural forms, such as the captivity narrative.

Within contemporary American culture, Calvinist forms of sacrificial duty operate to produce subjects who *feel* they are responsible for protecting and upholding various national ideologies, no matter what the bodily or psychological cost. Throughout the history of the United States the boundary between religion and ethics has been tenuous at best. Indeed, Noll notes that while American churches and religious movements have little to do with American politics per se, they have everything to do with the ethos of American politics and social life (Noll). Derrida discusses this “more than problematic” relationship between religion and ethics through a consideration of the responsibility a subject feels to protect and defend religious ideals:

The concept of responsibility, like that of decision, would thus be found to lack coherence or consequence, even lacking identity with respect to itself, paralyzed by what can be called aporia or an

antimony that has never stopped it from “functioning,” as one says. On the contrary, it operates so much better, to the extent that it serves to obscure the abyss or fill in its absence of foundation, stabilizing a chaotic process of change in what are called conventions. (Derrida 84)

Derrida questions not only the operation of responsibility within the epistemological framework of Western religion, but also the purpose, and even efficacy, of such devotion to intangible ideals. The strong sense of responsibility to uphold cherished ideals provides an illusory foundation upon which to build a social order. Within the American context, the apparently natural feelings of responsibility for national and/or religious ideals find their strongest origins in the Calvinist base of the Puritan colonies. In the colonial Puritan context the responsibility to uphold sacred values and beliefs was a stabilizing force in the hostile New World.

It is important at this point to enter into a short discussion regarding Puritanism, Calvinism, and the American context. There are slight differences between Puritanism and Calvinism that need to be explained - for while “John Calvin had more impact on worship in America than any other single individual,” he was “not a Puritan, out to change all worship traditions” (Conklin 188-189). “Puritan” was a label originally given by Charles I to all Protestant reformers,

Calvinist or not (Conklin 36). However, in America most Puritans did not follow Calvinist philosophy to the letter; for example, New England Puritans, such as Mary Rowlandson, followed a “covenanting” tradition that began in England. These covenanting Puritans “dominated the mass exodus to Massachusetts Bay in 1630-31 and gave a distinctive shape to New England” (Conklin 36). The covenants were binding contracts that unified the congregational members and their relationship with God. Each member had to agree to this binding union or risk expulsion. Such an approach to relationships among the self, community, God, and state allowed the Puritans “through careful screening and rigorous exclusion” to remain homogenous and “pure” much longer than the non-Puritan colonies, which, in turn, enabled the Puritan colonists to solidify their power base more fully than other Christian sects (Conklin 48). Eventually, the Puritan grip on homogeneity gave way to other religious and cultural groups, yet the solid Calvinist foundation of the colonial Puritans remained a strong “strand of moral reasoning,” dictating “a mission to purify the community and uplift the state” (Noll). But what are the Calvinist philosophies that enabled the Puritan colonists to believe so strongly in their superiority over not only non-Puritan colonists, but also the First Nations? One of the most important of these exclusionary philosophies is the correct interpretation of experience, which is gauged through emotion.

Calvin's doctrine that the emotions must be controlled in order to produce a good, dutiful Protestant helps to explain why sacrifice and sentimentality are integral to the production of American culture and identity. Calvin's philosophies deeply influenced Puritan colonists, most of whom followed Calvin's strict and unyielding rules for living the correct form of Protestant life. On the one hand, Calvin demands that a good Protestant will control the emotions that seethe under the surface and threaten to explode into sinful behaviour. On the other hand, great emotion is necessary to champion the moral fight against perceived evils that threaten the very fabric of society. In order to correctly channel emotions that are potentially threatening, a good Calvinist must sanctify his or her emotions because "[o]nly by sanctification of will, understanding and emotion can believers present themselves as living sacrifices to God" (Fedler 1). In terms of civic responsibility, the idea of presenting oneself as a "living sacrifice" might suggest obedience, but because Protestantism requires that each individual cultivate a relationship with God, Puritan church leaders could not demand blind obedience in God's name. "Obedience" in ecclesiastical terms suggests submission to church authority, which contradicts the hard-line Reformed Protestant stance to obey God's authority via the Bible rather than ecclesiastical authority.

"Responsibility" is a more apt term to describe the relationship between the Puritan, Church authority, and God, explains Kyle Fedler (1). Fedler's work resonates with Derrida's conceptualization of responsibility and sacrifice. Puritans

who followed Calvinist philosophy needed to know how to behave in certain circumstances according to God's will, which can only be known through meditation, study and prayer. A good Christian life as per the tenets of Calvinism is not "self-realization or self-development, but the glorification of God through proper response to God's actions in the world" (Fedler 3). A believer must subordinate will, cognition and affective life to God in a kind of psychological sacrifice:

For Calvin, God is the central actor in the human drama; the central moral question is "how am I to respond to God's actions?" This model therefore places great emphasis on human contingency, divine sovereignty, and the prior proper discernment of God's actions in the world. And according to Calvin, the ongoing discernment of God's will involves theological commitments and beliefs, which, in turn, generate emotional response. (Fedler 11)

A Puritan's emotional life consists of constant vigilance to ensure that his or her world is interpreted properly, which translates into a philosophy of correct interpretation via heavily mediated emotional response. That is, a subject gauges if an action or event has been read or responded to properly through evaluation of emotional response. The Puritan subject must practice an extreme form of self-

reflexivity, whereby the Puritan subject measures his or her lived experience through Calvinist biblical interpretation.

The Puritan worldview is shaped and defined through Calvinist biblical interpretation, in which the idea of sacrifice as a necessary service is central. Perhaps the most salient discussion of Calvin, sacrifice, and biblical interpretation is Deborah Shuger's *The Renaissance Bible: Scholarship, Sacrifice and Subjectivity*. Shuger, who studies the "sociocultural imbrications of religion" (2), is particularly interested in the cultural work of sacrifice:

[S]acrifice – the sacrifice of Christ – is the mythic centre of a civilization rather than a specific topos like *carpe diem* or the problem of future contingents; the various dramatic, homiletic, exegetic, and systematic rewritings of this story do not share an intertextual genealogy but instead are diffusely embedded throughout their cultural field. (9)

By way of the various Christian sects that composed colonial America, the central discourse of Christian sacrifice was transplanted into America and helped to define the settler-colonists' role in this strange and often terrifying New World. Sacrifice for a greater good can alleviate anxiety by removing the focus from immediate, everyday problems to an ideal (national or religious) that promises rewards for

such sacrificial service. Considering the hardships caused by colonial conditions, it is not far-fetched to infer that Christian sacrifice became even more central to creating a patriotic identity than in Europe or England.

The scene of sentimental sacrifice in Puritan captivity narratives, I argue, is deeply influenced by Calvinist interpretations of the Passion narrative. Shuger states that Calvin articulated Puritan identity politics through his exegesis of Christ's passion, and, in turn, Calvin's interpretation of Christ's sacrifice influenced how Puritan settler-colonists perceived both their "selves" and others. The Passion narratives, in general, were used to "encode the Renaissance's confrontation with the alien and its construction of self" (Shuger 9); consequently, Christ's sacrifice was "a resonant and volatile symbol for psychological and social exploration" (5). The Calvinist interpretation of the Passion articulated a perception of self and other in a rather complicated way. Analogous to the Freudian super-ego, the Calvinist conscience is the "faculty of self-torment... 'the internal executioner'" that exacts internalized violence on the believer (106). We can read this agony of self-torment in Mary Rowlandson's captivity narrative, in which Rowlandson is a conflicted self, who - in her struggle to accept Christ-like affliction as confirmation of her membership in God's elect - feels the intense pain and pleasure of being the "living sacrifice." In essence, pain is pleasure as the suffering Puritan emulates the suffering "righteous servant" of God (Isa. 53:11). This Calvinist self comprises "antithetic parts, including sweetness/bitterness,

rests/troubles, rejoices/shudders” from which Puritan captivity narratives build a uniquely American narrative that articulates the agonies associated with maintaining the sanctified self (Shuger 105). The Puritan self is fashioned from pain and suffering: “ye must either kill or die,” writes the seventeenth-century Calvinist Joseph Hall, “Kill your sins or else they will kill your souls; apprehend, arraign, condemn them; fasten them to a tree of shame, and if they be not dead already, break their legs and arms” (qtd in Shuger 106). This series of violent metaphors for sin as an invading army illustrates the Calvinist faculty for self-torment that helped Puritan settler-colonists to deal with the pain and suffering implicit in the colonizing process.

The Calvinist interpretations of the Passion narratives enabled the Puritans to create analogies between the suffering of the elect and the suffering of Christ. Biographies of exceptional people who had suffered and sacrificed provided guidelines for correct action and behaviour. In colonial literature, various authors, such as Cotton Mather, wrote about exemplary Christ-like persons, such as Puritan governor John Winthrop, for others to emulate (Bercovitch 9). In *The Puritan Origins of the American Self*, Sacvan Bercovitch does not include the female captive in his discussion of influential Puritan lives, but these captives certainly provided examples of an exemplary Puritan subject who suffered and sacrificed for the Puritan community. In essence, like the Passion narratives, the captivity narrative encodes colonial Puritan “confrontations with the alien and [the]

construction of self” (Shuger 9). Through suffering in service to God, the sacrificial captive can claim a legitimate, superior identity.

The Puritan “self” is only one part of the self-fashioning process; there must also be a space where the self can be imagined. The Puritan diaspora produced a dislocated people searching for the sacred space promised by God: a place within which the self can identify as superior through opposition and negation. Puritan resettlement in America furthered the Calvinist principle of ideal selfhood through exclusion because of the Native presence. The Natives represented sin, and as Joseph Hall stated so forcefully, sin had to be eradicated. The Calvinist philosophies that drove the Puritan movement provided an excellent recipe for the colonization of First Nations land. The Calvinist theology of the Puritan colonists was well-suited to formulating the suffering, sacrificial cultural identity needed to justify and rationalize the colonization of Native territories. The Puritan captive articulated this suffering, sacrificial selfhood to the reading public and continues to do so in embedded fictional captivity narratives or in reproductions of the original narrative.

Sacrifice and Sentimentality

In fictional and non-fictional narratives from the colonial to the contemporary period, the female captive’s sacrifice and suffering *moves* readers emotionally through sentimental identification. The word “moved” expresses the power of

sentimental sacrifice. To “move” someone emotionally is to put them into another position: it is a shift in cognition from one perspective to another. The scene of sentimental sacrifice, I argue, in which the female captive plays a central role, persuades the reader that certain actions and behaviours are fundamental to protect national ideals. The sacrifice evokes the sentimental feelings required to create an emotional attachment with the reader, which, in turn, enables moral perception to be engaged.

In order to make moral judgements regarding a particular situation or event, we must be able to perceive another as either worth or not worth empathy. Moral perception is difficult to study because the object, event, or phenomenon that triggers empathy or emotional attachment is often taken for granted (Vetlesen 7). In western culture, for example, non-profit organizations are able to request donations by triggering the correct moral perception through which a potential donor *naturally* recognizes a situation or person(s) as deserving empathy. Philosopher in ethics and moral issues, Arne Vetlesen, writes, “[moral perception] requires attentiveness which is made possible by receptivity, by the capacity to view oneself as ‘addressed’ by some situation or incident ”(8). From this point of view, Americans must learn a type of patriotic receptivity that allows American citizens to perceive their nation as a sacred space worth sacrificing certain social members to protect. How does an American come to feel “addressed by some situation or incident” and, in turn, connect the situation, incident or person to

national importance - often to the point of believing violence is required to save the nation and its ideals?

In part, citizens learn patriotic receptivity through various cultural and state apparatuses that habituate a populace to appropriately value and categorize certain cultural symbols, signs and signifiers as universally American in nature. In *Imagined Communities*, Benedict Anderson explains, in part, how citizens come to believe that they are part of a national community. He mainly attributes the formation of national communities - in which a nation is unified and delineated via imagination – to the advent of print capitalism (44-46). Specifically, Anderson attributes the spread of nationalism to the ability of mass-produced popular narratives to connect diverse peoples, who “might find it difficult or even impossible to understand one another in conversation, [but are] capable [through popular narratives] of comprehending one another” (44). However, Anderson’s theories do not explain how citizens come to *value* the national ideals expressed in mass produced narratives. French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu’s concept of the habitus explains how a human being becomes integrated within a particular culture to the point where national values and beliefs are considered natural. The habitus describes how a person is “impalpably inculcated...through a long and slow process of acquisition” into the cultural markets of a certain national sphere (51). The habitus is a process that continually generates implicit practices and perceptions throughout a lifetime, including the emotional life of a citizen. In

order to explain the processes by which emotional attachments between citizens and the nation are formed, Shirley Samuels uses Bourdieu's concept of the habitus to reframe sentimentality as a cultural process that taught nineteenth-century readers how to feel like Americans (Samuels 6). While Samuels locates her argument in nineteenth-century culture, there is evidence that the habitus of sentimentality has continued into the twenty-first century. For example, the symbols and signifiers that comprise memorials to American heroes communicate American patriotic values through strong sentimental attachments. In chapter two, where I discuss how Puritan captivity narratives teach sacrificial duty via the female captive, I analyze two monuments produced in honour of the Indian captive, Hannah Duston, who slaughtered ten Native men, women and children and then scalped them. The artist rendered Duston as a larger-than-life figure of heroic, grim determination with an axe in one hand and scalps in the other. Her story is further narrated through plaques located at the bottom of the sculpture that describe her violent capture and her subsequent deeds. Through violent images of familial destruction and Hannah's equally violent escape, her narrative excites sentimental identification with a viewer and/or reader, who can properly decode the visual language of the memorial thanks, in part, to a lifelong education in the signs, rules, and codes of sentimentality.

This semiotic, cultural approach to the study of sentimentality became popular in the late twentieth century when scholars in American literature and

culture, such as Lauren Berlant and Philip Fisher, published work that credits sentimentality with significantly shaping contemporary American culture and national identity. Prior to the late twentieth century, sentimentality was described as a mainly nineteenth-century form of writing that “battalions of women novelists” used to create a more benevolent, gentle, and, therefore, feminine world (Brown 281). Partly because the sentimental novel was classified as women’s writing, this genre held little credibility as a worthwhile aesthetic form for most modern critics, including Leslie Fiedler, who charged the “earliest novelists” in America with paying allegiance to “that secret religion of the bourgeoisie in which tears are considered a truer service of God than prayers” (45). Robert Penn Warren and Cleanth Brooks defined sentimentality in literary terms as “[e]motional response in excess of the occasion; emotional response which has not been prepared for in the story in question” (Howard 75). The shift in critical attitude from sentimentality as a debased and inauthentic literary form to a subject worthy of serious academic study did not occur until after the publication of Ann Douglas’ *The Feminization of America* (1977) and Jane Tompkins subsequent critical response to Douglas in *Sensational Designs* (1985) (Chapman 9). Douglas accuses classic works of nineteenth-century sentimental fiction, such as Harriet Beecher Stowe’s *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* (1852), of commercializing emotion through such characters as Little Eva. This commercialization of sentiment, claims Douglas, disintegrated intellectual traditions to the point where in the twentieth century,

“Americans are...the first society in history to locate and express many personal, ‘unique’ feelings and responses through dime-a-dozen artefacts” (5). For Douglas, sentimentality is a pervasive literary infection that devalues women by marketing ideals that “guaranteed, not simply the loss of the finest values contained in Calvinism, but the continuation of male hegemony in different guises” (13).

In contrast to Douglas’ assertions, Tompkins argues that American literary criticism engages in mainly evaluative criticism that studies texts according to canonical status. Tompkins claims that sentimental texts only appear deficient because they do not meet the criteria laid out by literary critics, including F.O. Matthiessen, who defined the literary elements that should comprise American masterpieces. Sentimental narratives, argues Tompkins, “did not seem at all deficient to their original audiences” (xii). She suggests that critics must study the cultural work a sentimental text performs within a particular context. When this approach is engaged, a sentimental text can no longer be viewed as a “degraded attempt to pander to the prejudices of the multitude, but as providing men and women with a means of ordering the world they inhabited” (xiii). Using this methodology, Tompkins asserts that *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* does not debase or feminize American society through sentimentality, as Douglas claims, but uses sentimental attachments to revalue women as powerful citizens and slaves as human beings.

While Douglas and Tompkins appear to be in complete opposition with each other, what becomes apparent upon close examination of the Douglas-Tompkins debate is that sentimentality cannot be contained as a literary genre or mode of expression (Chapman 9). When Douglas claims that sentimentality is inextricably linked to the decline of American society into mass consumerism, she is attributing sentimentality with the power to shape America's ethical and economic destiny. Equally, when Tompkins claims that sentimentality can invest devalued identities, such as the slave, with power, she implicitly defines sentimentality as a discourse that can shape identities (146). Through their respective works, Douglas and Tompkins imply that sentimentality helps to either positively or negatively structure American culture.

The Douglas-Tompkins debate has been attributed with opening the way for scholars to study sentimentality as more than a nineteenth-century literary genre. Still, scholarly focus has remained largely fixed on nineteenth-century, female-authored representations of sentimentality. While such a focus might suggest that sentimentality actually is a nineteenth-century phenomenon that characterizes female communication in this period, Mary Chapman and Glenn Hendler do not agree with this separate spheres ideology that places men in the public and rational sphere of influence and women within the irrational realm of emotion and domesticity. Further, Chapman and Hendler argue that contemporary feminist criticism has "perpetuat[ed] [the] gendering of sentiment by constructing

what amounts to an alternative canon of popular but critically marginalized texts written for, by and about women, thereby ignoring the ways in which canonical male writers, such as Brockden Brown, Cooper, Melville, Hawthorne, Whitman, Holmes, Norris, and Dreiser, all deploy the discourse of sentiment in their works” (7). Indeed, sentimentality is not simply a female form of expression, but a discourse that continues its important cultural work beyond the nineteenth century.

According to Philip Fisher, sentimental representations of devalued identities, such as the exploited child, that were popular in the nineteenth century retain value well into the contemporary period (95). Sentimentality’s status as a discourse rather than a set of literary conventions explains the continuance of popular sentimental representations in contemporary American culture. Moreover, if, as Mary Chapman and Glenn Hendler claim, sentimentality is a discourse, then sentimentality cannot be confined “to the more limited structure of text” but “reflects the whole complex process of people interacting with one another in live situations and within the structure of social forces” (Fowler, *Linguistic Criticism* 93). Cultural critic and theorist, Mieke Bal explains the ways in which discourses, including sentimentality, shape cultural reality:

Discourse implies a set of semiotic and epistemological habits that enables and prescribes ways of communicating and thinking that others who participate in the discourse can also use. A discourse

provides a basis for intersubjectivity and understanding. It entails epistemological attitudes. It also includes unexamined assumptions about meaning and about the world. Language can be part of the media used in discourse, not the other way around. (3)

As a discourse, sentimentality can create intersubjective connections across racial and cultural boundaries; “traverse many cultural forms” (Chapman 9); and gloss over complex realities to produce naturalized, simplified representations of everyday life (Berlant, *After Great Pain*). Sentimentality is readily available to be inserted into multiple modes of media, but one of the most efficient methods to circulate discourse is through narrativization, which allows discourses to be communicated in “stories of everyday life” (Bal 5). Sentimentality has been successfully narrativized through such tropes as “the dying child; the destruction of families by death, slavery, poverty, and intemperance; and the unnecessary suffering of marginalized figures” (Chapman 9). The sentimental tropes of the afflicted family and the suffering, marginalized figure each play an important role within captivity narratives to create sentimental attachments with the reader.

Each of the tropes that narrativize sentimentality involves the different social means by which the family can be destroyed. It is little wonder, then, that the captivity formula can be considered one of the powerful narrative means through which sentimentality is communicated. In the captivity formula, the

female captive's family is often brutally maimed and/or killed by the captors. In both Hannah Duston and Mary Rowlandson's narratives, the horrific deaths of their youngest children are graphically detailed. Moreover, the destroyed family indicates that the home is similarly fractured. As the central figure and representative of the home, the female captive will make sacrifices that ensure certain values and ideals survive. Her desire to return home with her cultural ideals intact not only privileges her cultural sphere above her captors' but also creates powerful sentimental attachments with the reader, who empathises with her violent domestic losses.

Domesticity, sentimentality, and sacrifice are often bound together in American popular culture for good reason. Domesticity defines a sphere in which a social agent can feel safe and protected from an encroaching "outside." The domestic space or home is associated with powerful relationships, usually including a person's first passionate attachments. *Home* is fetishized in American popular culture as the space within which an ideal normality should reside. In both early and contemporary texts, the American home is valued through modal auxiliaries such as "should," "ought," "have to" and "must," which define home as an area of responsibility and duty. From the *Godey's Lady's Book*⁴ to *Oprah*, self-help books, advice columns, and domestic novels use modalities of domestic

⁴ An enormously successful periodical published in the mid-nineteenth century that dispensed domestic advice.

responsibility to assign levels of value to the objects and/or subject they modify; thus, the emotional attachment to home is characterized via the moral feelings that modals supply. If this emotional attachment to home is paired with violence, then the level of sentimental attachment increases exponentially. Indeed, in the captivity narrative, the sentimental representation of the invaded and destroyed home metaphorically produces the moral perception of the national home as a vulnerable sacred space that *must* to be defended. The female captive performs patriotic sacrifices in order to sustain the cultural superiority of the American home. The captivity narrative blends this Calvinist ideal of sacrifice with sentimental tropes to powerfully communicate the importance of protecting the national home and its privileged occupants.

In contrast to the female captive in Puritan captivity narratives, who often holds a privileged position within her social world, the sacrificial female captive in popular fiction is frequently a marginalized figure in both her captors' world and in her own culture. Her marginalization depends on the context within which the captivity narrative is produced. In *The Last of the Mohicans*, Cora is marginalized because she is a mixed race female and in *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*, Buffy Summers is marginalized because she cannot conform to normative social standards set for femininity and behaviour. Each of these characters is defined by the logic of sentimentality, in which the marginalized person may well be presented as noble and valuable, but still cannot be part of normal life (Gould

117). This logic of sentimentality works harmoniously with the economy of sacrifice, in which the sacrifice, like the suffering marginalized figure of sentimentality, must also be a marginalized figure who is valuable enough to warrant sacrifice, but marginal enough to be expendable.

In the economy of sacrifice, the sacrificial act often intensifies the emotional reaction to sacrificial figures, such as the female captive. The sacrifices the female captive either endures or commits are frequently graphic and violent. Although most violent acts, fictional or not, will produce emotion of some kind, violence is often theorized broadly as a primarily masculine activity or a pandemic that must be cured, rather than an act responsible for producing sentimental identifications (Shen 99). The concept of violence in this dissertation is informed by Foucault's formulation of pain as a necessary part of forming identity. Foucault envisioned identity in western culture as a physical and psychological experience and not simply as an abstraction. Instead of conceiving the mind as the conduit through which our social identities are moulded, Foucault theorized that both the body and the mind are shaped into social identities through discipline and punishment. That is, our very biological workings are ordered to meet the demands of social norms and values, such as the complete subordination a prisoner must endure in the penal system, where even the prisoner's bodily functions are set to the institutional clock. While Foucault focuses on the concept of body and mind (and/or soul) as a type of prison habituated to control and repress desires, this

project draws from Foucault's insistence that repetitive, well-ordered categories and behaviours form and reinforce various social systems. From this point of view, violence is not random and chaotic; rather, violence is organized into various strictly controlled, repetitive forms, particularly in narrative formulas. American citizens are habituated to tolerate, despise, punish or value certain forms of violence, such as the pleasurable forms of violence anticipated in popular westerns and horror films.

While violence, even the most apparently chaotic, has purpose in a text, not all forms of violence in a narrative produce sentimental attachments. Sergio Leone's westerns build tension in the audience until there is an intense desire for violence, but his characters do not always generate sentimental response, even when enduring intense violence.⁵ Certain novels, such as Bret Easton Ellis' *American Psycho*, use violence to distance or alienate the reader from the main character. This distance precludes the close engagement with the text that is, again,

⁵ Leone's *Once Upon a Time in the West* is a notable exception to my claim; however, I base my rather contentious assertion on Clint Eastwood's nameless character, known as "Blondie," who would seem to be the sacrificial, sentimental hero in three films - *A Fistful of Dollars*; *For a Few Dollars More*; and *The Good, The Bad and The Ugly* – however, the titles of the first two films tell a tale of financial gratification rather than sentimental sacrifice. Blondie does not perform self-sacrificial deeds without receiving significant payment from the beneficiaries of his sacrifice. He acts as a type of trickster figure, performing righteous acts while manipulating the situation for his benefit.

necessary to generate sentimental response. I am not arguing that scenes of violence in horrors and westerns do not evoke emotion; rather, I am claiming that these genres do not usually elicit strong sentimental identifications between the reader and the main characters. In order to evoke sentimentality, the violence in narratives must be of a sort that calls forth sympathy, empathy, compassion, and, often, mourning for the loss or potential loss of a valued person or even object. The sacrificial character who dies to protect a greater good creates a strong emotional bond between the reader and the sacrificial victim. In these terms, sacrifice in a narrative is a system of necessary violence that requires the emotional investment of the audience in order for the sacrifice to have power. If the emotional investment in the character is not developed or fails, then the death will lack value and, therefore, influence.

In *The Scapegoat* Rene Girard argues persuasively that a sacrificial victim can only be labelled as such if he or she has special, valuable traits that classify the victim as outside the social norm. These traits assign value to the victim, thereby explaining to the social collective why this particular person must be sacrificed. Therefore, the victim's loss can be mourned collectively and the victim's sacrifice can be celebrated without guilt, because the victim was not a full member of the collective. However, Girard is not interested in studying how sacrifice effects and affects specific communities and identities: Girard universalizes sacrifice as a founding force for all human cultures, a perspective that tends to elide the

complexity of individual, local and national identities that struggle within western society for legitimacy.⁶

While Girard's anthropology of sacrifice informs this dissertation, Jacques Derrida's analysis of sacrifice as a transaction or exchange that solidifies and sustains communal ideologies is more central to this study. Derrida's *The Gift of Death* explains how the concepts of responsibility, religion, and sacrifice operate together in western culture. According to Derrida, conversion to Christianity

⁶ I must address my exclusion of Giorgio Agamben's *Homo Sacer*, a study that would appear to have importance to my work. While his argument regarding the devaluing of life in order to define sovereign power is stunning in its breadth and scholarly weight, I do not believe his work is integral to this study. Agamben is more interested in discussing how a person comes to hold subaltern status. My study is about the construction of value through sacrifice, which is in opposition to Agamben's focus on the unsacrificable: those who are available to be killed without consequence or justification (Agamben 73). Cultural value is conferred to the killer and not to the victim, according to Agamben's research. In addition, my study explores specifically American forms of Christian sacrifice while Agamben is much more focussed on European constructions of the individual. I will hazard to draw a direct parallel between Agamben's theories of dehumanization with George Orwell's theories in *Down and Out in Paris and London*. In both Agamben's and Orwell's texts, they define a class of persons who have been judged to be less than human. This classification is clearly part of American culture, but my study is about the promise of value through sacrifice, which is quite different from Agamben's and Orwell's study of the subaltern.

requires the sublimation of Dionysian, demonic desire, which allows the Christian subject to behave responsibly and ethically. The literal definition of conversion is a “turning toward” an object or concept (19). Christianity demands a “turning toward” or conversion that positions a subject in such a way that the subject appears to freely choose to obey God’s will, even if the interpretation of God’s will seems illogical or even criminal. One of the most compelling examples of this paradigm is the Old Testament story of God’s test of Abraham’s obedience. For Derrida, God is the name of absolute power that demands obedience through the act of sacrifice, by which a person must exchange a valuable object or person for continued membership as one of God’s chosen people. Abraham felt such responsibility or indebtedness to God that he was willing to obey God’s demand that he repay the debt by sacrificing his son.

Similarly, one of the foundational beliefs of Christianity is the assumption of responsibility or indebtedness for the death of God’s only son. Sacrifice is a gift loaded with the hidden expectation of repayment. Because he depicts death as a transaction in western culture, Derrida’s analysis helps to explain the operation of sentimental sacrifice in American culture. The Passion narratives have taught Christians in western culture that if a death is sacrificial, then service and/or obedience is required to repay the self-less sacrifice. In predominantly Christian, capitalist societies such as the United States, sacrificial death functions as a powerful currency. Most Americans are implicitly and/or overtly trained in

Christian discourse and ethics,⁷ and, as a result, an American readership will most likely understand that the sacrificial acts in fictional narratives require service in exchange for the sacrifice.

My focus on Calvinist interpretations of sacrifice diverges from current scholarship on sacrifice. There is little work on a specifically American mode of sacrifice, possibly because sacrifice is often identified as a prehistorical cultural activity. As well, sacrifice is usually viewed as a general phenomenon rather than part of a national schema. For example, Mark Pizzato discusses sacrifice as a universal cultural form that “gives context and sense to losses of life, gradual and sudden, in each spectator’s particular death drive” (2). Pizzato characterizes sacrifice as a pressure valve for the death drive that finds outlet in the melodrama on screen, stage and sport spectacle. Scholars such as Pizzato and Nigel Davies focus on connecting ancient sacrificial rituals to modern forms of sacrifice. Jane Caputi also locates her study of sacrifice and violence against women in the area of ancient ritual through her use of such terms as “blood sacrifice” and “ritual

⁷ The idea that church and state are separate may be solidified constitutionally, but the hearts and minds of the nation are decidedly Christian, particularly under the current Republican administration that is openly Christian and evangelical. America is a Christian nation, and even apparently secular modes of communication are laden with Christian reference and rhetoric. Words such as “God Bless” and “providence” are not empty phrases but represent the epistemological thrust of the nation.

sacrifice.” Considering the prevalence of Christianity in western culture, it is curious that current studies in sacrifice, beyond Girard, tend to draw from Aztec, early African, and Greco-Roman sacrifice to explain current sacrificial paradigms.

Unlike Pizzato, Caputi and Davies, who investigate a type of universalized sacrifice drawn from ancient ritual, Susan Mizruchi studies specifically American forms of Christian sacrifice in *The Science of Sacrifice*. Mizruchi began her investigation as a study of the late nineteenth and early twentieth-century aesthetic and philosophical movements of naturalism and realism. Over the course of her research, Mizruchi recognized “a common preoccupation with religion and sacrifice” (5). As Mizruchi read such works ranging from Herman Melville’s *Billy Budd* to Toni Morrison’s *The Bluest Eye*, she realized that “sacrifice was the main event” in American literature (5). While Mizruchi examines sacrifice as a continuing discourse in American culture, she focuses on a specific time period, examining how sacrifice functioned as a way for scholars in America’s fin de siècle to maintain religious ideals while engaging in scientific study. For Mizruchi, sacrifice is more of an epistemological trope than a discourse that shapes American identity. I build on Mizruchi’s excellent analyses by investigating the function of sacrifice and its inseparability from sentimental feeling. In Mizruchi’s primary texts, someone or something is sacrificed, and the characters who benefit from the sacrifice are *moved* emotionally to a point where a

moral perspective is solidified further or exchanged for another perspective entirely.

While Mizruchi mainly contains her study within the early twentieth century, she notes that “there were examples [of sacrifice] from American literary works from earlier and later periods” (5). Puritan captivity narratives tenaciously remain within the American cultural field, whether as memorials, such as Hannah Duston’s statues, or reprinted in popular anthologies, such as in Norton’s most recent anthology of American literature. Time and again scholars – from Richard Vanderbeets to Christopher Castiglia - credit the Puritan captivity narrative with inspiring the belief that American national identity translates into the rightful possession of a superior cultural identity. My contention is that Puritan captivity narratives circulated a specific type of Calvinist sacrificial duty with which readers sentimentally identify and this representation of sacrificial duty has become a conventional part of popular narratives.

Conclusion

This chapter has provided the methodology to approach sacrifice and sentimentality as interconnected discourses rather than separate fields of study in American culture. Sentimental sacrifice is only one of many discourses that function within the complex systems of discourses and master discourses that form American identity. There is a danger inherent to over-generalizing identity of any

kind. American identity does not have a stable definition because of such mitigating factors as region, religion, ethnicity, and gender. Each of these factors can change the shape of American identity depending on which person or social group produces the definition. However, this dissertation is concerned with showing how sacrifice and sentimentality help to produce an authentic American identity that allows a subject to declare him or herself a universally good American within a collective. There are fundamental precepts for a person to define him or herself as an authentic American, one of which is patriotic feeling. This study will not only show how sacrifice and sentimentality work together in support of patriotic ideals, but also analyze how such over-generalizations of identity, such as a national identity, are perpetuated through narrative formulas.

The Sentimental and Sacrificial Lessons in Puritan Captivity Narratives

“I beseech you therefore, brothers and sisters, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your spiritual worship. Do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your minds, so that you may discern what is the will of God - what is good, and acceptable, and perfect. ” (Romans 12:1-2)

This chapter traces sentimental, sacrificial patriotic duty to its origins in the Puritan captivity narrative. Specifically, I will take up two early captivity narratives that have endured in American culture: Mary Rowlandson’s *A True History of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson* and Cotton Mather’s account of Hannah Duston’s captivity. Increase Mather, who sponsored and published Mary Rowlandson’s narrative (1682), and his son, Cotton Mather, who included Hannah Duston’s narrative in his opus, *Magnalia Christi Americana*

(1702), produced captivity narratives as a way to imprint Puritan authority and unify the community under a universalized power (Burnham 65, Derounian – Stodola 5). Both Rowlandson and Duston represent a suffering self who remains loyal to a greater good, thereby supporting “a stable and divine authority that [colonial] individuals internalized through the private process of reading” (Burnham 65). I shall argue that Rowlandson and Duston’s narratives created an enduring sacrificial character, whose sacrifices for a universalized authority continue to be internalized privately and publicly.

I specifically chose to study Rowlandson and Duston because their stories of captivity have been in constant circulation from the late seventeenth century up to the present day. Across a span of over four hundred years, these two stories have not only been reprinted, but Rowlandson and Duston have been reproduced as iconic national figures via memorials and merchandise. Thus, these white female captives do not comfortably stay within a distant past, but continue their didactic enterprise to model heart-felt national duty. I will closely read Rowlandson and Duston’s narratives in order to investigate the literary devices that enabled these narratives to speak so powerfully to a colonial audience. Such an analysis will clearly illustrate the means through which these narratives helped to entrench patriotic ideals in contemporary American culture.

Specifically, these early captivity narratives co-opt biblical representations of sacrifice not only to characterize each captive’s suffering, but also to deploy

authoritative moral perceptions of certain social groups. The importance of suffering and sympathy as an essential part of Puritan identity and moral perception should not be underestimated since “[c]ommunal functioning [was] dependent on members’ feeling of sympathy for and with one another,” causing “an awareness of a deep similitude between observer and observed” (Duane 63). The suffering captive performs as a type of connective tissue that binds the social body through each reader’s sentimental identification with her suffering.

The female captive is particularly powerful as a type of social fixative, because she represents the fracture of home. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Early Modern subjects – including (perhaps especially) those living within the American colonies - feared conversion and transformation. While both the Europeans and the English were colonizing land at a rapid rate, they were also under threat of being colonized, or even eradicated, by, respectively, First Nations tribes and Ottoman Turks (Zinn 16; Vitkus 146). Even though settler-colonists in the New World were the aggressors in that colonists took Aboriginal lands indiscriminately, the fact was that First Nations offensives, such as King Philip’s war, seriously drained the resources of the settler-colonists (Zinn 16). Further, under the influence of Early Modern ideas regarding the environment, settler-colonists believed that alien soil posed very serious physical threats to those foreign to the land (Duane 66). Through the Early Modern perspective, both the land and the Indigenous peoples of the New World threatened settler-colonists

with conversion, transformation and death; therefore, the land and the Indigenous population needed to be aggressively tamed and/or purified. Since America is arguably still a settler-colonist nation, it is hardly surprising that neurotic obsessions regarding national security and racial purity remain part of American culture. Both the Puritan settler-colonists and current settler-colonists fear external threats to their illusory position of power, which is centred in concepts of domesticity. Indeed, Puritan settler-colonists and contemporary Americans have a great deal in common in terms of perceiving the nation-as-home: “[T]he metaphor of the house-as-polity held... sway in seventeenth-century political thought,” just as it underlies current responses to terrorism, such as homeland security (Duane 65).

Consequently, the capture of Puritan women and children from the sanctity of home was not simply a tragic event but represented the dissolution of the colony. Through the power of narrative, the suffering female captive became a proto-national figure of sympathy, performing sacrifices in order to ensure the survival of the social body. Indeed, the female captive still operates as a conduit for the discourse of American patriotism, a point which will be discussed more fully in the last half of this chapter. The various forms that Rowlandson and Duston take within contemporary culture provide evidence that these late seventeenth-century narratives clearly helped to institute sacrificial duty as a desirable model for national behaviour. That is, the female captive moved from

performing specific cultural work within her historical context to eventually becoming a transhistorical national icon for sacrificial duty.

However, if neither Rowlandson nor Duston die within their respective narratives, then what does either captive sacrifice? Rowlandson and Duston model the *willingness* to sacrifice themselves and others for a higher authority; thus, they each perform as the Calvinist living sacrifice. Moreover, because Duston and Rowlandson are both thrust into the liminal role of patriotic hero, each sacrifices her feminine social role within the home as the producer and civilizer of the future Puritan enterprise. During their ordeals, Rowlandson and Duston ensure the continuance of their assumed cultural superiority via actions that transgress their stereotypical feminine roles. Scholars such as Michelle Burnham argue that the liminality of the female captive affords her the opportunity to cast off patriarchal oppression. In particular, Christopher Castiglia defines female captives through Victor Turner's concept of the liminal subject and the marginal subject: the liminal subject positively experiences life outside her social group while the marginal subject occupies two incommensurable social groups, resulting in conflict and negative experiences (45). Castiglia argues that such a traumatic shift between social roles allows the captive to become a cultural critic,⁸ such as Sara Wakefield,

⁸ The captivity formula does not have one purpose, but is multi-valent. As stated in the introduction, this thesis uses discourse analysis as its analytical base. Discourses cannot be contained in a Hegelian unity of purpose, but follow many paths and purposes.

a nineteenth-century captive who critiqued First Nations and Anglo-American interaction. Mary Rowlandson and Hannah Duston's narratives, I argue, should not be read as a critique of early settler-colonist gender and racial politics. Such readings only become available when the biblical intertextuality and allusions in each narrative are not considered. The biblical allusions and intertextuality strongly situates both Rowlandson and Duston as the exiled members of the elect, whose recognition and, in turn, performance of sacrificial duty transforms them from passive victims to sacrificial patriots.

Rowlandson's narrative packages her as the living sacrifice: the good Puritan subject who suffers greatly but remains loyal to a higher authority. Her story of struggle and survival helped to unify a community where suffering proved a believer's allegiance to God. Her narrative is set in 1676 in Lancaster, Massachusetts just prior to an attack by the Narragansetts, who were at war with the colonists. Rowlandson depicts the attack on her garrison house and the deaths of her family and friends in graphic detail. Eventually, she is captured along with three of her children: her two eldest children are enslaved and her youngest dies tragically.

Rowlandson was wounded by a bullet that passed through her side and into the abdomen of her youngest daughter, six-year-old Sarah. After a march without food or adequate water, Sarah dies. After Sarah's death, Rowlandson begins to transform from victimized wife and mother into a patriotic member of the elect,

ready to suffer and sacrifice in support of her community and its ideals. At first, Rowlandson does not understand her duty to remain loyal and resolute in the face of despair, but through her identification with sacrificial biblical figures, such as Job and Isaiah, Rowlandson comes to understand her sacrificial duty.

In contrast to Rowlandson's rhetoric of the suffering patriot, who maintains her identity through internal struggle, is the less common, but no less powerful, representation of external sacrifice, in which others are sacrificed for the greater good. Hannah Duston's⁹ narrative positions her as a wife, mother and sacrificial soldier, who will protect her community at any price. Hannah Duston's home was raided by the Abenaki during King William's war in 1697. There was money to be made in the "scalps and prisoners" market, and both the Natives and settler-colonists participated in this brutal form of free enterprise. The Abenakis were "encouraged by French bounty offers for English prisoners and scalps" and so captured Hannah Duston and her nurse Mary Neff (Derounian-Stodola 55). Duston had given birth a week earlier, but the baby was killed by an Abenaki warrior. Duston's husband, Thomas Duston, was able to escape with the surviving seven children.

Shortly after her capture, Hannah Duston apparently masterminded a plan, along with her nurse, Mary Neff, and a captive boy, Samuel Leonardson, to

slaughter the small community of Aboriginals who had enslaved all three (Derounian-Stodola 55). Her violent action made Duston a heroic figure, so much so that she became the first woman in the United States to have a statue erected in her honour (in 1874). While Rowlandson and Duston's shared experience of captivity would appear to be the only relationship between these two women, each represents a powerful form of sacrificial logic that continues to influence current perceptions of national duty.

Biblical Intertextuality and Sacrificial Duty

In Mary Rowlandson and Hannah Duston's narratives sacrificial duty is expressed using biblical analogies and language. Rowlandson uses scripture to sustain her role and identity as the Calvinist living sacrifice. As well, she performs acts of linguistic violence by sentencing her captors to death through references to scripture in which God promises to vanquish enemies in exchange for dutiful service. In Hannah Duston's case, Cotton Mather uses scriptural examples of sacrificial violence to justify Duston's vigilante rampage. Rowlandson and Mather draw upon a highly valued compilation of narratives, the Bible, to not only make sense of their world, but also to legitimate and establish their authority at the expense of a pre-existing Aboriginal authority. Exploring the biblical

⁹ I am using several versions of Hannah Duston's narrative and so will only refer to her story as "Hannah Duston's narrative," except when discussing an author's specific adaptation of her experience.

intertextuality within these captivity narratives provides unique insight into the construction and legitimation of American sacrificial duty.

Historically, both Rowlandson and Duston's narratives are set at a time when Puritan attitudes toward Natives shifted from conversion and assimilation to full-force, biblically sanctified genocide (Bross 335). Even though it was considered sheer madness to "become an Indian," there were defectors, mainly captives, who refused repatriation into colonial society (Axtell 304). These defections threatened the perceived superiority of the Puritan settler-colonists, who, in response, packaged captivity narratives to justify the continued colonization of Native lands. Indian attacks and captivities were interpreted through a Puritan framework that characterized these events as divine tests of faith. In addition, the Puritans also justified colonization by claiming to be potential victims of Native attack - a rhetorical stance that captivity narratives legitimated (Zinn 16). That is, the Puritans believed they were not the aggressors, but simply defending what was rightfully theirs, a position that seems to underpin current American foreign policy. In his description of an attack on a Pequot village, William Bradford, famed Puritan governor of the Plymouth colony, sums up not only the attitude of the colonists toward the Natives, but also the role of Christian sacrifice in justifying violent acts:

Those that scaped the fire were slaine with the sword; some hewed to peeces, others rune throw with their rapiers, so as they were quickly dispatchte, and very few escaped. It was conceived they thus destroyed about 400 [Natives] at this time. It was a fearful sight to see them thus frying in the fryer, and the streams of blood quenching the same, and horrible was the stincke and sente there of, but the victory seemed a sweete sacrifice, and they [the British army] gave the prayers thereof to God, who had wrought so wonderfully for them, thus to inclose their enemies in their hands, and give them so speedy and victory over so proud and insulting an enimie.” (Bradford qtd in Zinn 15)

Bradford describes the slaughter of the Natives as a “sweete sacrifice,” which frames the extreme violence of this infamous attack within a model of justifiable violence. Bradford’s Calvinist interpretation of Christian sacrifice defines the Natives as necessary sacrifices for the holy colonizing mission of the Puritan settler-colonists. Such a paradigm of loss allows the settler-colonists to feel remorse¹⁰ for killing, which is a mortal sin, yet justify the “sweete” act of murder in the name of a higher authority.

Puritan interpretations of sacrifice expressed through captivity narratives provided the building blocks for a proto-national narrative. The central figure of the narrative, the female captive, supplied a sacrificial, suffering body around which the community could unify through sentimental identification. Mary Rowlandson's body represents a national body that is legitimated by the rhetoric of sacrificial suffering. The female body is a central trope for Puritan rhetoric, explains David Leverenz. While researching his book, *The Language of Puritan Feeling*, Leverenz initially expected to find tracts describing a wrathful, masculine God, but instead discovered that the "intimate and flexible imagery of the female body" permeates Puritan writings (1). Images of the Puritan minister suckling at the breast of God and, in turn, sharing this evangelical nutrition with the brethren are found repeatedly in Puritan sermons. Such imagery depicts the female body as symbolic of the colonial body, which identifies Mary Rowlandson and Hannah Duston's bodies as sites of domesticity and divinity that must be protected at any cost. As Calvinist doctrine requires, Rowlandson and Duston are written as part of a Godly community that must continually prove its worth and holiness by fighting the forces of evil. In more secular, national terms, Rowlandson and Duston are

¹⁰ Arguably, the Puritan settler-colonists do not need to feel remorse because their actions are legitimated by God; however, the word "sacrifice," implies that the beneficiaries of the sacrifice should feel regret and remorse over an apparently necessary act of violence.

self-rescuers, who protect the national body by ensuring their own bodies are not penetrated and colonized by their captors.

Mary Rowlandson's enduring captivity narrative provides an example of how narrative and moral perception can recreate and reinforce privileged concepts of home and the self in an unfamiliar and dangerous world. Her¹¹ biblical interpretations act as a type of filtration system that selectively sieves data from real events, creating a diegetic world in which the Puritan purview is sanctified. Rowlandson's text confers upon her implied reader a privileged self-hood that is decidedly white and Christian. Even though the biblical language and linguistic frameworks within early captivity narratives will no doubt affect a contemporary reader differently from a colonial reader, the popularity of Rowlandson's narrative entrenched the ideals of sacrificial national duty and cultural superiority in contemporary popular culture. In essence, what the Bible was to Mary Rowlandson, so Mary Rowlandson's narrative, to a lesser extent, became for subsequent authors and readers. Her story not only "renews its significance over time," but also instituted the captivity narrative as a popular American formula (Derounian-Stodola 5).

¹¹ While I am using the pronoun "her" to refer to Mary Rowlandson, I am not attributing authorship solely to her. Her text was heavily mediated.

The popularity of Mary Rowlandson's narrative can be explained, in part, through her construction as a sacrificial character. Rowlandson's narrative persona masterfully wields biblical rhetoric, creating a character who, much like Job and Isaiah, accepts affliction as part of her service to God. Without biblical intertextuality, Rowlandson's narrative might be classified as eyewitness testimony and catalogued as a cultural, anthropological, and historical artefact instead of a powerful fusion of fiction and fact. Rowlandson ventriloquizes or speaks through a series of powerful biblical figures, a strategy that supplies ethos and shapes the semantic landscape of the narrative. When she aligns herself with sacrificial biblical characters, her biblically-informed readership perceives Rowlandson as an exemplary living sacrifice, who not only accepts affliction, but also reinforces the superiority of her community at the expense of her captors' community.

The Bible provides the framework through which Rowlandson articulates and attaches meaning to the various experiences that shape her character. Rowlandson is not simply using the Bible as a tool to express figurative meanings; rather, the Bible is a means to sustain Rowlandson's Puritan identity. Her biblical interpretations create a diegetic space that supports her moral perception of the Natives as evil and the Puritan settlers as righteous. This binary opposition between the Puritan settlers and the Natives creates a dominate/subordinate relationship, through which Puritan settlers claim the right to colonize the land and

build a “New Jerusalem” as per God’s promise in the Bible. In essence, through biblical intertextuality and allusion, Rowlandson constructs an early form of national narrative.

Dawn Henwood suggests that when Rowlandson receives a Bible from her captors, it becomes her protection and acts as a “mirror of the inner self” (179). In contrast to the Native world that Rowlandson is forced to occupy, the Bible provides a world from which Rowlandson can construct a powerful self through identification with such figures as Job and Isaiah. Rowlandson uses the Bible to build an “amazon on paper,” an approach that teaches the reader how to sustain the self outside of one’s homogenous community, which, in turn, reinforces the idea of home as a sanctified zone (Henwood 180). Her fidelity to God while under threat of death and torture gives her the ethos to call upon the covenant, or binding contract, of the elect with God in order to make demands of God. She will often express her traumatized feelings, using phrases such as “I cannot express to man the sorrow that lay upon my spirit” (33). Often the next line will encompass a plea to the Lord, which, in turn, causes a biblical passage to suddenly “come to [Rowlandson’s] mind” (19, 30, 32, 33, 34, 48). Rowlandson internalizes the scripture that defines her responsibility and duty as a living sacrifice. That is, she accepts her responsibility to serve the greater good of God and her community, which, in turn, enables her to become an authoritative exemplar of national duty.

In addition, Rowlandson's articulation of her experience as a captive who avoided cultural (and, presumably, literal) penetration and dissolution spoke powerfully to a community desperate for stability. David Sewell writes, "the captive transforms a brute experience where he was weak and the savage strong into a narrative where the Indian is verbally created, described, and judged, always subject to his former prisoner's interpretation of events" (43). The reverse is also true as the captive is transformed rhetorically into a victim whose strength lies in righteous violence enacted through divine force. Thus, not only is the Aboriginal subject to literary construction, the female captive is equally a rhetorical construct.

Rowlandson's role as an exemplar for correct moral perception and communal duty is clearly illustrated shortly after she receives a Bible from her captors. Significantly, the first page she turns to in her Bible is the fifth book of Moses, Deuteronomy Chapter 28. This chapter resembles a behaviour manual, in which the reader learns the rewards and punishments for certain modes of conduct. Within the context of Rowlandson's narrative, Moses' narrative can be interpreted as a strong warning for Puritan readers to avoid assimilation and remain obedient to Puritan authority via the edicts of God. If the captive is true to her culture, then blessings will ensue and the captors will face violent justice; however, the reverse will be enacted if the captive assimilates. As a good Puritan, Rowlandson implicitly defines obedience as her responsibility to recognize and, in turn, perform God's will. She is reminded by Moses' narrative that her responsibility as

a living sacrifice requires that she accept her child's death as part of a greater plan, but if she despairs then her punishment will be severe: "Thy sons and daughters shall be given unto other people, and thine eyes shall look and fail with longing for them all the day long: and there shall be no might in thy hand" (28:32). After her daughter's death, Rowlandson contemplates suicide, but attributes her decision not to use "violent and wicked means to end my own miserable life" to the goodness of God (17). Instead of suicide, she endures a deep depression. To communicate her pain, she equates herself with Jacob, who also lamented over the loss of his youngest child. Like Jacob, who despairs that "all these things are against me" (Genesis 42:36), Rowlandson describes herself as "overwhelmed with the thoughts of [her] condition" (18). She confesses to indulging in "melancholly" over the loss of her children, which invites the reader to identify and sympathize with her state. Her Puritan readership would certainly sympathize with her, but would also read her emotional indulgence as a sign of disloyalty to God, and, by extension, her community. Thus, when "it comes into her mind" to first turn to Chapter 28 of Deuteronomy, the lesson is not only for Rowlandson, but for all Puritan readers to remain loyal to a superior cultural identity, no matter what the cost:

[I]f we [Rowlandson and her community] would return to him [God], by repentance: though we were scattered from one end of the earth to the other, yet the Lord would gather us together, and turn

all those curses [captivity and attendant violence] upon our
Enemies. I do not desire to live to forget this Scripture, and what a
comfort it was to me. (19)

Rowlandson draws upon the Bible to curse her captors and predict their destruction, which conjures intense emotions in the reader who desires retribution against an enemy who kills women and children, the valued occupants of home (Henwood 174). Her perceptual conduit for determining levels of humanity - that is, who qualifies as fully human and who does not - runs between God, the covenant, herself and the Puritan community. She must remain loyal and true to her community and faith in order to retain her status as a covenanted Puritan, thus teaching the reader to recognize who has the correct taxonomy and belief system to possess membership in the elect. While Rowlandson does eventually learn to live within the Narragansett community, the last line of her curse firmly defines her moral perspective. Rowlandson finds great comfort that her captors will suffer extreme violence as promised by God, including pestilence, madness, famine, rape, and genocide (Deuteronomy 28:21-64). Her interpretation of this particularly violent section of Deuteronomy instructs Rowlandson that she must subordinate her desires, even her trauma, to the will of a higher power and, if she does so, she will be rewarded.

Rowlandson builds a righteous self, who can survive inside or outside the boundaries of the national home with her identity intact. Her identification with Job helps to build this righteous self (Rowlandson 23). Job teaches the importance of correct response to and acceptance of sacrifice as opposed to the actual act of sacrifice. Unlike Abraham's sacrifice, which is a test of faith in which no one dies, Job must watch his children die, and then find a way to maintain his faith while suffering intense grief and trauma (Bakan 106). Job must learn to not only channel emotion properly, but also to subordinate himself to God's power, a lesson that provides instruction regarding sacrificial duty. Like Job, in the end, Rowlandson is able to offer herself completely to her belief system without question, thereby enacting the covenant between the chosen and God, which enables her restoration. Rowlandson's final words reinforce the Job-like lesson that she learns:

[W]e must rely on God himself, and our whole dependence must be upon him. If trouble from smaller matters begin to arise in me, I have something at hand to check my self with, and say when I am troubled, It was but another day, that if I had had the world, I would have given it for my Freedom or to have been a Servant to a Christian. (51)

Rowlandson summarizes her experience in terms of her changed worldview. She clearly understands her duty as a living sacrifice, which is to subordinate herself to the greater good.

Rowlandson's narrative exhibits what Lauren Berlant calls the "subject of true feeling" – a person who can channel emotions in such a way as to fit into dominant, privileged models of American national identity ("The Subject of True Feeling" 73). While Rowlandson would not have called herself an American, she locates herself as part of a superior community, whose needs are greater than her own. This is the idealistic model that sustains American patriotism. The paradigm that Berlant outlines in "The Subject of True Feeling: Pain, Privacy and Politics" is analogous to Calvinist models of "true feeling," in which feeling is not private but publicly controlled. Berlant shows how "true feeling" trumps rational thought as the dominant mode to enact social and political change in the United States. She pointedly asks what it means to judge injustice and justice on the basis of "good" and "bad" feelings? Mary Rowlandson would likely answer that acceptance of pain and affliction allows the chosen to judge all from a position of righteous virtuousness, even when the chosen behave unethically (Berlant 57). Her location as an afflicted, privileged citizen of her Puritan colony (or New Jerusalem) gives her apparent expertise over how the world needs to be perceived, which also teaches the reader his or her position in the hegemonic order. In addition, Rowlandson's identification as a living sacrifice, who possesses divine moral

perception, allows her to transform the invasion of Native land into divine providence.

Not only is the invasion of Native lands defined as providence, the Natives are characterized as necessary sacrifices to further colonial ends. The Book of Isaiah provides Rowlandson with strong support for her imperialistic moral perceptions, particularly the following quotation used twice by Rowlandson during her enslavement: “Isai. 54.7. *For a small moment have I forsaken thee: but with great mercies will I gather thee*” (32). This quotation creates an envelope structure in the text, in that the quotation is stated once on page 32 and again at the end of page 33. When first used, Rowlandson states that God “made good to me this precious promise [the promise of “mercies” or rewards for good behaviour],” a claim which, again, enacts her contract with God (32). She has behaved properly; thus, she is rewarded with a visit from her enslaved son. However, this mercy is short lived, because he is subsequently beaten and then resold to another master. After her son’s visit, Rowlandson had “[m]any sorrowful days...in this place,” but through introspection, she realizes that her sorrow is God’s punishment for her past behaviour as a “careless creature,” who was not patriotic enough toward her community and God (33). After her lesson in proper duty, she notes “that comfortable Scripture would often come to my mind, *For a small moment have I forsaken thee, but with great mercies I will gather thee*” (33). Enclosed

within God's promise to reward her living sacrifice, as outlined in Isaiah, Rowlandson rests assured in her cultural supremacy.

While the meaning of this quotation appears quite straightforward, chapter 54 of Isaiah from which this quotation is drawn reads like a handbook for colonization, changing the straightforward meaning of merciful redemption into something more complex. Rowlandson uses Isaiah to forward her status as a privileged person, who enjoys a sacrificial covenant with a Superior Being, entitling her to cast judgment and curse her captors. Further, chapter 54 comes directly after chapter 53, verse 12, which is marked as "unique in biblical prophecy," in which Isaiah locates "healing and victory through the vicarious suffering" of "the servant of the Lord" (Sawyer 327). It is unlikely that even modern believers with some knowledge of the Bible would miss Rowlandson's reference, and certainly her contemporaries would not. Within the narrative, this reference clearly indicates that the suffering and sacrifice endured by the Puritans will ensure that they will colonize the land rapidly and violently:

Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the curtains of their habitations: spare not, lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes: For thou shalt break forth on the right hand and on the left; and thy seed shall inherit the gentiles and make the desolate cities inhabited. (Isa. 54: 2-3)

The Puritans believed that they were the chosen people prophesized in the Old Testament. As such, they not only trusted that Isaiah's prophesy of total colonization applied to their colony, but also fully accepted Isaiah's use of marriage as an analogy to describe the Israelite covenant as indicative of their relationship with God. God was not only on their side, but penetrated the Puritan soul spiritually and physically to create a holy, fertile union:

For the Lord hath called thee as a woman forsaken and grieved in spirit, and a wife of youth, when thou was refused, saith thy God. For a moment have I forsaken thee: but with great mercies will I gather thee. (*Holy Bible* Isai. 54:6-7)

Rowlandson quotes passages from Isaiah that eroticise the relationship between God, the settler-colonists and the Natives. The colony is transformed into a fertile, maternal force that will absorb the Natives or destroy them. As well, the language used by Isaiah envisions the chosen people encompassing and swallowing foreign territory. This is an orgiastic vision that has deeply disturbing connotations.

The Puritans consistently use the female body as a metaphor for the social and political body; thus the feminine imagery Rowlandson intertextually employs in her narrative is not feminist or empowering to women, but instead expresses the

Puritan relationship with God, in which the settler-colonists are married to a divine power that penetrates the fertile Puritan body politic to populate the land.

However, this image of maternal imperialism is a double-edged sword. Not only can God penetrate the maternal colony, but invading forces can also enter. The fear and anxiety of “double” penetration is brought into play by the actual event of Indian captivity. Rowlandson is able to assuage these anxieties through her representation of the captive and, by extension, the colony, as a victim who will be rewarded for fulfilling her sacrificial duty. Her reward is the continued prosperity and superiority of her community.

Rowlandson’s narrative provides one perception of the “suffering servant of the lord,” while Hannah Duston’s narrative presents another more explicitly violent perception of sacrifice and suffering. Her brutal capture by Abenaki warriors and subsequent escape facilitated by a well-executed plan to kill all ten of her captors, including women and children, made her a controversial figure in American history. The reception of Duston’s narrative has been much more complex than Rowlandson’s, whose narrative was, by the nineteenth century, considered a literary classic (Derounian-Stodola 3). In contrast, Duston’s exploits received scathing criticism in the nineteenth century, perhaps none more famously than that of Nathaniel Hawthorne who called her a “bloody old hag” (136). Hawthorne’s dislike of Duston is countered by those, such as John Greenleaf Whittier, who commended her deeds (Whittier 129). Both Hawthorne’s scathing

criticism and Whittier's praise are representative of the current critical debates regarding Duston's place within American culture.

Critics who study the many versions of Duston's exploits grapple with the durability of Duston's narrative. Indeed, her popularity seems odd considering that her narrative is only one of many captivity narratives that Cotton Mather includes in an appendix to the seventh volume of the *Magnalia Christi Americana*. For a narrative of only two pages in length contained within an appendix, Duston's captivity narrative has achieved remarkable fame, which, I argue, speaks to the important cultural work her narrative achieves. Critics, however, are divided as to the cultural work or even cultural significance of Duston's narrative. For example, Cynthia Brantley Johnson dismisses the relevance of Duston's "myth" in a world where "[w]hite settlers have long since 'civilized' the country and pushed surviving Indians onto reservations" (32). Johnson limits Duston's influence to pre-twentieth-century moral perceptions of Natives as evil insurrectionists in God's country. However, Duston's story did not die out at the end of the nineteenth century, as Johnson assumes, but lives on as a nostalgic commodity and as a literary influence for current sacrificial heroes, such as Buffy Summers in *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*. Robert Arner also limits Duston's influence by claiming that Duston is no more than a regional hero whose story died out in the mid-nineteenth century. However, the replication of Duston's image as a Jim

Beam whiskey bottle sold nationally in 1973 and as a hero in the Wonder Woman comic book series in 1957 disputes both Arner's and Johnson's claims.

I propose that Duston's popularity is due to Mather's representation of her as a warrior fulfilling her sacrificial duty. Mather's equation of Duston to Jael, a biblical figure, provides further insight into the enduring cultural work of Duston's narrative. Even though Jael appears only briefly in Judges 4:17-22, and she appears to be nothing more than a tool to kill Sisera, oppressor of God's chosen people, her character teaches the importance of sacrifice as a means to sustain cultural superiority. Like Rowlandson's calculated use of certain biblical books to exemplify and channel her worldview, Mather chooses Jael as an avatar for Duston in order to quell early American anxieties regarding conversion and dissolution. Jael is instrumental in helping to defeat the enemies of the Israelites. Jael is not an Israelite but a Kenite; thus, she is able to successfully trick Sisera into believing he is welcome in her tent, but after he falls asleep, she drives a nail into his temple. Her action allows the "children of Israel" to prevail against their enemies. This section of Judges is about conquest through proper conversion. Like Jael, Duston is not of the "chosen people,"¹² but her actions make her one of

¹² Jael was not Israelite and, at the time of the slaughter, Duston was not Puritan. She converted after her abduction.

the elect, which certainly taught Mather's contemporary readers that one could become chosen if they adopted this particular worldview. However, what is most disturbing about this narrative is Sisera's belief that the tent is a space of comfort and safety when it is actually a lethal space. This scene depicts the domestic space as a place of death and destruction for those who are not legitimate.

When Duston is captured and enslaved by a small group of Abenaki, she must learn to live in a culture distinct from her own. However, even though Duston must live in the home of the Abenaki, she is a representative of the Euro-American domestic domain. Not a separate sphere, this domain is a movable sacred space that provides meaning and solidity to the concepts of a national identity (Kaplan 185). She is mother, wife and defender of the colonial homefront. In essence, she always carries the homefront with her as part of her iconic taxonomy. According to Whittier, Duston contains "a spirit within her which defied the weakness of the body" (129). In Whittier's reconciliation of Duston's actions with nineteenth-century assumptions of female ability, he depicts Duston's body as possessed by the spirit of patriotism: She serves her community beyond the limits of her stereotypical femininity. In addition, because Whittier tries to legitimize Duston's actions, her narrative must provide some kind of "pay-off" to the nineteenth-century reader. Much like Rowlandson's narrative, Duston supplies

justification for colonization and genocide while simultaneously modeling sacrificial duty.

Whether Hawthorne is lambasting her, Whittier is praising her, or Thoreau is marvelling at her deeds, Duston is marked as occupying a special position in the social order (Thoreau 342-344). Similar to Mary Rowlandson's, Duston's experiences transform her from wife and mother to a woman with special powers that defy her conventional "weakness of body" (Whittier 129). While both Rowlandson's and Duston's narratives teach sentimental, sacrificial duty, the lessons are markedly different. Rowlandson articulates absolute obedience to a higher authority. Such obedience defines her as the living sacrifice (or a sacrifice-still-living) who is willing to suffer and/or die for the greater good. Duston is the living sacrifice put to the ultimate test, in which she commits "sweete sacrifice[s]" to protect her community (Bradford qtd in Zinn 15).

In addition to the worldview that Rowlandson's and Duston's narratives helped to popularize, female captivity narratives also retain cultural value in contemporary America. Many critics identify specific historical moments when captivity narratives in general lost popularity and influence. For example, David Minter pegs 1875 as the demise of the captivity narrative (335). To give Minter his due, the Indian captivity narrative did die out in the late nineteenth century after over two hundred years of continuous popularity, but, as Castiglia

convincingly argues, the captivity narrative endures as a popular and durable formula in American culture. For example, Lois Lenski's recently reissued award-winning¹³ adaptation of Mary Jemison's tale of captivity speaks to the continuing influence and popularity of the captivity narrative. Further, the representations of the captivity and restoration of Private Jessica Lynch in the news media and in various paperback accounts reveal that the captivity formula has central value in American culture. Whether non-fictional or embedded within a fictional narrative, the captivity narrative continues its important cultural work.

Even Duston's and Rowlandson's seventeenth-century narratives remain part of contemporary American culture. Duston's name, story, and likeness have been used in the twentieth century to sell mass market products, such as postcards and whiskey. Towering monuments have been erected in Duston's honour. Similarly, Rowlandson's narrative lives on in anthologies to American literature. In survey courses on American literature and courses dedicated solely to the captivity narrative, Rowlandson's narrative is a mainstay. Her name is memorialized in public schools and websites that post her story. In the following section, I argue that Rowlandson's and Duston's narratives remain part of American culture because they still communicate patriotic beliefs regarding sacrificial duty.

¹³ Lenski's novel is a Newberry Honor book winner. Her book is geared to the nine to twelve year old demographic.

Packaging and Marketing Sacrificial Duty

Rowlandson and Duston did not simply engender narrative formulas and characters and then fade away; they have remained as part of American culture, indicating a complex relationship between literary influence and material culture. That is, Rowlandson's and Duston's popular narratives not only influenced authors, such as James Fenimore Cooper, but also circulate in American culture as icons. The iconic status of these female captives, of which only Rowlandson has canonical status, defies the concept that literary history follows a linear progression, whereby authors and works progressively evolve from one point to the next. While Rowlandson's and Duston's narratives are not as popular as they were in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Rowlandson's and Duston's captivity narratives still circulate within the national body in various forms. Therefore, the scene of sentimental sacrifice and the character that inhabits that scene, discussed more fully in the next chapter, are not drawn from the vestiges of a dying discourse but from cultural signifiers and symbols that are part of a living past within the present. Hannah Duston's captivity is memorialized in two massive, detailed statues: one is located in the city of Haverhill, Massachusetts from which Duston was captured (see fig. 1) and the other can be found on the site where she slaughtered and then scalped ten



Figure 1 Hannah Duston Statue (Haverhill)

Native men, women and children near Penacook, New Hampshire (see fig 3).

These statues visually narrate Duston's story via a concrete medium. Like gruesome sentinels, Duston's likeness towers over her viewers as a grim reminder of national duty.

Monuments such as Duston's may appear innocuous, but national monuments provide a visual map of cultural values and ideals:

The critics who called [monuments] meaningless were dead wrong.

Though nobody spent much time looking at them, nobody needed

to: [monuments] were simple forms, immediately understood, that worked precisely because they condensed life and death issues (what it meant to live and die for a community and a nation) into the most banal and uncontroversial form possible. (Savage 211)

The visual rhetoric of each statue communicates a clear and powerful message of national sacrificial duty. For example, the statue located in Haverhill holds an axe in one hand while the other hand gestures toward an unknown object (see fig. 2). In narrative terms, her posture and the apparent forward motion of her head and body indicate impending, violent action. The spectator is placed in the position of being directed by Duston's pointing finger (see fig 2). In the relief from which the statue is modeled, Duston is directing her partners, Mary Neff and Samuel Leonardson, to kill the sleeping Native men, women, and children (see fig 5). The larger-than-life replication of the plaque's image in figure 5 was strategically chosen to convey power and force of Duston's determination to return home at any price. Viewers are, therefore, analogously positioned as Mary Neff or Samuel Leonardson, in order to learn their patriotic, sacrificial duty.



Figure 1 Haverhill Statue close-up.

The Penacook statue communicates an even more violent message than the Haverhill counterpart, even though Duston is portrayed in the Penacook version as a sexually vulnerable woman. Rather than the long, uniform-like dress she wears in the Haverhill version, the Penacook Duston sports a low-cut, clinging gown, and her hair flows over her shoulders in curls. While both versions of Duston feature her wielding an axe, only the Penacook Duston holds ten scalps in her hand (see fig. 2 and 3). The main difference between these statues concerns narrative time: in the Haverhill version, the axe signifies her impending deed, while the Penacook statue is set after she has gathered the scalps. In contrast to the Haverhill statue, in which Duston resembles a general ordering her troops, the

overt sexuality of the Penacook statue is akin to the sexualized Puritan body politic discussed earlier in the chapter.



Figure 2 Penacook Statue

That is, the Penacook statue portrays a white woman who has committed a heinous act in the name of a greater good, an act that ensures that her inviting body - and, by extension, an equally appealing national body - remains unsullied by those who desire to transgress her borders.

Kirk Savage's assertion that memorials condense national duty accurately describes the purpose of these statues. Hannah Duston's body is displayed as an example of sacrificial duty, which is narrated via a series of plaques at the base of each statue (see fig 4, 5, 6). Presumably, the extreme violence portrayed in these plaques would be revolting if not for the "banal and uncontroversial" genre within which these scenes are produced (Savage 211). Yet, surely it is not simply the genre that renders the extreme violence these statues and plaques display as acceptable? Hypothetically consider a memorial to the Abenaki warrior who killed Hannah Duston's infant: The thought only appears revolting because the value system within which Duston's statue was produced is inverted. Duston's memorial seems innocuous or even anachronistic because the violence is directed toward a devalued social group.



Figure 3 the capture



Figure 4 the slaughter



Figure 5 the escape

These plaques not only “convey what is meant to live and die for a community and a nation,” they also reinforce American cultural superiority because they justify violence toward Aboriginal groups (Savage 211). Duston’s influence is not limited to monuments: her image has more recently been circulated as merchandise. In 1973, Jim Beam issued a commemorative bottle of whiskey in her honour (see fig

7). In addition, the Haverhill Public Library currently sells t-shirts and mugs bearing Hannah Duston's image.



Figure 6 Hannah Duston Penacook statue as a Jim Beam whiskey bottle

Duston has been packaged and merchandised not only as a commodity, but also as a cultural object that sells a particular brand of sentimental, sacrificial national duty.

Mary Rowlandson has not been marketed in the same way as Duston. Duston's image has been reproduced as part of the American mass market while Rowlandson's narrative, rather than image, is circulated mainly through

anthologies. Perhaps Duston's narrative is more amenable to the mass market, since the action runs through three short, brutal stages: capture, murder, and return. Duston's explicit violence renders her narrative easily digestible in a short period of time. In contrast, Rowlandson's narrative was written in autobiographical form, providing intimate detail as to Rowlandson's psychological state, which allows her narrative to be more easily described as literary. Rowlandson's narrative regularly attracts the evaluative vocabulary of the traditional canon, including such terms as "classic" and "archetypal" (Derounian-Stodola 3; Slotkin 102).

Even though Rowlandson and Duston have been marketed in divergent forms, both communicate enduring, similar ideals within various contexts. For example, Duston was praised in the mid-to-late nineteenth century, a period in which several genocidal policies were enacted against the Aboriginal population. The image of Duston slaughtering the "savages" who destroyed her blissful home represented her, and by extension settler-colonists, as victims rather than aggressors, who were forced to perform the "sweete sacrifice(s)" necessary to protect the national home (Bradford qtd in Zinn 15). Similarly, Rowlandson was characterized in the American revolutionary period as a strong female heroine ready to violently defend her principles (see fig 8).¹⁴ Her popularity in this period soared because her narrative articulated and assuaged the anxieties of the colonists,

who “increasingly saw themselves as victims of British oppression” (Burnham 65). Rowlandson’s oppression by her Native captors and her determination to perform her civic duty to remain pure and faithful no matter what the cost offered a model of behaviour for the colonists who sentimentally identified with Rowlandson’s marginal position. According to Michelle Burnham, this eighteenth-century interpretation of an oppressed, victimized Rowlandson is in opposition to the colonial image of a “pious Mary Rowlandson delivered from captivity by the hand of God” (65). Even though Rowlandson characterizes herself as a pious individual divinely delivered, it is her articulation of a victimized, superior cultural identity that resonated within the eighteenth century and beyond.

¹⁴ Burnham argues that this particular frontispiece to the 1770 edition represents the public opposition to colonial authority. While this reading has validity, it also ignores the Natives that Rowlandson is clearly targeting.



Figure 7 Illustration from Mary Rowlandson's Captivity Narrative, 1770 Edition

For example, the Mary Rowlandson Elementary School in Lancaster, Massachusetts has posted an interpretation of Rowlandson's story on the school website, where Rowlandson is characterized as the first woman author and an early American hero. Conversely, the Natives are described as willing to convert to Christianity, except for those who "did not want their customs and way of life to come to an end," implying that, indeed, the Aboriginal way of life was terminated (Mary Rowlandson Elementary School). The reality of Indigenous life in the twenty-first century disputes this reading. Although Indigenous cultures suffered

damage due to colonization, their “customs and way of life” did not come to an end. Indeed, the Puritans and other English colonies were arguably under an equal threat of annihilation/assimilation¹⁵ than were the Natives in the colonial period (Zinn 16). Thus, the negative portrayal of Natives as peacefully assimilating or “vanishing” into Anglo-American society and the positive representation of settler-colonists as sacrificial heroes clearly continues in current national discourse.

Further, even though Rowlandson and Duston’s monuments and stories betray a regional affiliation, their stories are marketed to students and consumers nationally and even internationally. Rowlandson’s and Duston’s narratives shape the central idea implicit in American patriotism: the necessity of protecting the national home from invasion, conversion and dissolution. The literary trope of the sentimental and sacrificial female¹⁶ captive is not only embedded in American fiction and film, but is part of the nation’s visual and commercial cultural material. The continued importance of both captives in American culture is not surprising since both Rowlandson’s and Duston’s narratives express an attitude toward

¹⁵ This comment needs to be put into context. The Puritans were not innocent victims because they were actively colonizing Native lands.

¹⁶ The female body as national body has been discussed extensively in Lauren Berlant’s *The Anatomy of National Fantasy*, Christopher Castiglia’s *Bound and Determined*, and Shirley Samuel’s *Romances of the Republic*.

Aboriginal culture in the seventeenth century that still serves to define perceived threats to national security.

Conclusion

How does this moral perception of heartfelt, sacrificial national duty endure?

Through powerful signifiers organized to create a specific worldview for a reader habituated to value these signifiers. As Foucault asserts in “What is an Author?”, when a cultural function works successfully, the name of the function may change to suit varied social and political contexts, but the cultural function will remain.

Even though the contextually specific markers, signs and signifiers that influenced Rowlandson’s and Duston’s audiences do not translate easily into twentieth and twenty-first-century American culture, the values and ideals that were supported and furthered via biblical intertextuality remain intact.

The representation of the suffering female captive satiated a public hungry for reassurance that the settler-colonist enterprise was strong and solid, which calmed fears of conversion and transformation. This fear remains entrenched within the national psyche, particularly when the concept of a cohesive, coherent nation is threatened by external or even internal forces. In the revolutionary period, the captivity narrative changed to meet the ideological needs of an aggressive, burgeoning nation, as exemplified in political cartoons that portray America as a woman under attack by Britain (Samuels 10 – 12). These political cartoons imply

that the female captive will righteously overcome her oppressors because she is not the aggressor but the victim. In other words, the victimized female body provides metaphoric parallels to a feminized national body under threat of violation, a threat that influences readers to perceive sacrifice as a viable means to protect national ideals.

The next chapter continues to trace the sacrificial function of the captivity narrative and the figure of captivity into the nineteenth and twenty-first centuries. We shall see how the female captive's sentimental sacrifice continues to be part of the symbolic network that sustains the patriotic ideology of national threat. While the revolutionary period produced captivity narratives from varied politico-religious groups, in the early nineteenth-century the captivity narrative moves into the realm of popular fiction as an embedded narrative within the frontier romance. Within the early national period, immigration to the new nation and, in turn, expansion into Indian territories began in earnest. The fear of transformation and conversion that plagued the early modern and colonial sense of self equally plagues the early national Anglo-American, but rather than a fear of religious or cultural conversion, this is a fear of racial conversion.

The Continuing Economy of Sentimental Sacrifice

“America I’ve given you all and now I’m nothing.”

Allen Ginsberg, “America”

In this chapter, I argue that contemporary captivity narratives embedded within fictional forms continue the cultural work begun by their Puritan originators. Both Hannah Duston’s and Mary Rowlandson’s continued material and textual presence in contemporary American culture show clearly that versions of the Puritan living sacrifice continue to model correct national duty. This chapter develops this argument more fully through an analysis of the sacrificial female captive in popular fictional works. Although the captivity formula permeates American literary and visual culture, providing a wide range of examples to discuss, I will compare two works that contain clear examples of sentimental sacrifice: the fifth season of Joss Whedon’s *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* (1999-2000) and James Fenimore Cooper’s *The Last of the Mohicans* (1826). These texts are generically and contextually disparate, yet share striking similarities in the expression of sacrificial national duty as a means to protect a racially pure national home. Cora Munro and Buffy Summers, the main characters in *The Last of the Mohicans* and *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* respectively, suffer and sacrifice to protect the embodiment of domestic purity as represented by their captive sisters, Alice

Munro and Dawn Summers. Through the comparison of Whedon's and Cooper's texts, I suggest that Duston's and Rowlandson's¹⁷ lessons in sacrifice and suffering as a necessary part of civic duty continue to inform the fictional, embedded captivity narrative. However, I am not correlating Mary and Hannah to Cora and Buffy. Rather, Mary and Hannah must be understood as cultural objects that performed specific cultural work within their social and historical contexts. Each character – Hannah, Mary, Buffy and Cora - participates in the narrativization of the ideals associated with national duty, which includes sacrifice of self and other for the greater national good. The following comparison between Cora and Buffy is not an attempt to prove that Cora and Buffy are analogous in heroic status, but to illustrate that each character continues to market sacrificial national duty within a specific context to meet certain national agendas.

¹⁷ In the last chapter, I used Mary Rowlandon and Hannah Duston's last names to discuss them as real persons whose life stories were documented in a sentimental format. I intentionally omitted reference to their narratives as autobiographical because the captivity narrative does not heavily invest in representation of reality, but, instead, operates in the register of fictional reality to convey ideological concerns. Arguably, all autobiographical works function to produce such effects, but most autobiographies claim the ethos-laden mantle of historical fact, whereas the captivity narrative does not usually appropriate such authority. In this chapter, I use Mary Rowlandson's and Hannah Duston's first names to indicate their role as literary characters, since it is literary convention to discuss characters using first names and flesh and blood persons using last names.

In order to prove such a wide-ranging argument, I build upon the connections Christopher Castiglia makes in his book *Bound and Determined* between early and contemporary captivity narratives. Castiglia argues that female-authored captivity narratives from Rowlandson's *A True History of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson* (1682) to Patty Hearst's *Patty Hearst: Her Own Story* (1982) are an integral part of a feminist literary tradition in American literature. He provides evidence that convincingly links colonial anxieties concerning cultural conversion and dissolution to similar anxieties expressed in twentieth-century American popular culture (88). In addition, Castiglia defines female-authored captivity narratives as supplying a strong and capable subject position for captive women, who used the captivity narrative to critique their patriarchal worlds. While my argument draws from Castiglia's important assertion that captivity narratives must be "a central part of current investigations into the construction of gender, race and nation," my work diverges sharply from his study of captivity narratives as a literary tradition that empowers women (3). I am interested in the enduring material function of the captivity narrative and its leading female character to further ideals of sacrificial duty, whether the narrative is female-authored or not.

I argue that nineteenth, twentieth and twenty-first century fictive captivity narratives, such as those found in *The Last of the Mohicans* and *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*, market a brand of righteous, sacrificial American identity through blatant

racial divisions. The suffering female captive proves to be a fundamental factor in maintaining concepts of racial purity. The imagined potential for the captive to be raped and/or assimilated is equated with a violation of national space; thus, the female captive is a powerful rhetorical tool to further a type of nationalism that requires ranking citizenry based on ideals of purity and authenticity. Of course, defining who is authentic and/or pure and who is not can be troublesome when people do not readily fit into stereotypical categories, particularly in America, where miscegenation has occurred since first contact between settler-colonists and Indigenous peoples. In the United States, the stakes involved in claiming an authentic identity have been historically very high because of slavery and colonization, both of which require separating people into distinct categories of dominance and subordination.

This high stakes economy in authenticity and purity has yet to dissipate as nineteenth-century anxieties over race and national identity parallels similar concerns in twentieth and twenty-first-century America. Scholars such as Stephanie Wardrop and Jane Tompkins have extensively discussed racial purity, specifically whiteness, as a marker for authentic American identity in antebellum American culture, and as Vincent Cheng writes, contemporary western nations “still cling to notions of authenticity and authentic identities”(3). Popular television shows such as *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* and *24* often incorporate the captivity narrative as a way to contain and control the “increasingly globalized and

hybridized world” that threatens to dissolve authentic national identities (Cheng 3). Moreover, the rhetoric of multiculturalism and globalism that came to prominence in the late twentieth century may have changed the ways in which discourses of purity are expressed but did not eradicate racial purity as a desirable cultural goal in America. While this desire to use racial purity as a sign of cultural superiority is easily locatable in *The Last of the Mohicans*, contemporary versions of this discourse are disguised through figurative representations, such as the metaphoric parallels that can be drawn in *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* between the vampires who are human/demon hybrids and multi-raciality.

Although the promise of American citizenship with its attendant virtues of rights and freedoms is offered to all those who are born into or enter the United States legally, the scene of sentimental sacrifice embedded within fictional captivity narratives delineates the ideal citizen, who is usually white, affluent, and heterosexual. Citizens who fall short of this ideal are taught that if they make sacrifices for the national good, they too can gain status. The sacrificial character within the narrative formula of sentimental sacrifice provides powerful lessons in the varied levels of legitimate and illegitimate citizenship. This character often attributes his or her inability to meet the ideals of fully legitimate citizenship to a transcendent duty to be a sacrifice for the greater good of the nation, thereby justifying the exclusion of certain social members and allowing those who benefit

from the sacrifice to appear virtuous and wholesome in their grief. This economy of sentimental sacrifice is habitually expressed through the captivity formula.

While Rowlandson and Duston were privileged members of their community whose sacrifices taught a certain type of behaviour, fictional forms of the female captive allow for greater flexibility in representation. That is, the Puritan female captive who was constituted as a living sacrifice via biblical intertextuality and allusion still informs sacrificial female captives in later fiction, but the language and cultural codes have changed to suit the social context. Indeed, as David Haberly notes, the novel as a fictional form allowed Cooper to cosmetically characterize his female captives as mixed-race and white in order to direct the reader's sympathies (437). Further, Cooper fused historical facts drawn from autobiographical captivity narratives and the French-Indian wars with fictional material to create a powerfully realistic diegetic universe in *The Last of the Mohicans* that communicated "self-less patriotism" to an early national audience (Gould 116-117). Like Cooper, Whedon also fuses fact with fiction to construct a realistic fictional universe where the contemporary viewer can easily recognize patriotic virtues set in a contemporary context, such as Buffy's joint effort with the U.S. Army to battle evil in the fourth season. In addition, cultural critic Kent Ono charges Whedon with cosmetically constructing his characters in such a way that they participate in the "larger contemporary neo-colonial rhetoric in media culture. This pervasive rhetoric serves to remind viewers subtly and not

so subtly that U.S. culture typically treats any social difference as a justification for waging campaigns of violence, destruction and annihilation against those labelled *different*" (168). However, Ono's otherwise excellent analysis of race in *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* does not fully explain why Buffy must "pass as normal" but be anything but normal (Chen 100). Similarly, why is Cora "prey to the three [nineteenth-century] moral perils –defeminization, rape and Indianization," yet she is given "the gifts" of "unwomanly seriousness and strength of character"? (Haberly 437). I will address these questions by suggesting that while both narratives teach all citizens to be patriotically civic-minded, not every citizen must die to protect the national home. Almost all of the characters on the side of good in Cooper's and Whedon's texts offer to sacrifice themselves to protect the purity of Alice and Dawn, yet Cora and Buffy emphatically insist that they must be the ones to die. Cora and Buffy both represent the ambiguities inherent to claiming a privileged, authentic identity because they are valued for their heroic patriotism, yet are devalued for their inability to fully meet the ideals of femininity and race. Through their sacrificial deaths, Cora and Buffy ultimately contain these ambiguities.

Buffy and Cora are both female captives and rescuers who obediently serve a higher purpose, which is to preserve and protect the domestic and racial purity that their sisters symbolize. In *The Last of the Mohicans* the main narrative follows the dangerous travels of Cora and Alice through the wilderness of the

1757 American frontier. Cora is described early in the narrative as “not brown, but [her complexion] rather appeared charged with the color of the rich blood that seemed ready to burst its bounds” (9). Cora’s rich blood - which will naturally “burst its bounds” to, perhaps, infect her racially pure companions - starkly contrasts her sister’s “dazzling complexion, fair golden hair, and bright blue eyes” (9). While this early description suggests that Cora and Alice do not share the same racially pure origins, full disclosure of Cora and Alice’s origins is not provided until a third of the way through the novel, a fact that will be discussed later in the chapter.

Through the course of the narrative, Cora and Alice are held captive twice by Magua, who represents evil incarnate. Hawkeye, Chincachgook and Uncas are able to save the captives once, but the second rescue attempt fails, and Cora ends up sacrificing herself to save her sister. Cooper constructs Cora as a female captive who is culturally superior to her Native American captors, yet beneath her sister’s “dazzling” racial superiority (Cooper 9). Throughout the story, Cora, not Hawkeye, is designated as the protector of her sister. Within Cooper’s fictive captivity formula, pure, white Alice is designated as the beneficiary of the sacrifice and mixed-race Cora is the sentimental sacrifice. Each of these captives contrasts the “bad” Indians, who cause Cora to perform her sacrificial duty.

Similarly, in season five of the popular television series, *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*, Buffy must save her sister from being taken captive by a fugitive Hell-God

named Glory, who is exiled on earth in human form. Dawn is not born naturally; instead, she is created through a combination of Buffy's blood and "pure energy" and is, in turn, brought into existence through the prayers and incantations of Christian Monks (Episode 2). The pure energy from which Dawn is brought into being is a type of mystical key that can unlock the boundaries between worlds. Dawn is not only human and immaculately conceived, but also contains the power of this key in her blood. She is completely unaware that her blood holds the power to unlock dimensional boundaries. Buffy's entire diegetic world changes to suit Dawn's sudden appearance as an unsophisticated post-pubescent girl in the second episode of season five, entitled "Real Me." Dawn narrates this episode as she writes in her diary while sitting on her four poster bed, further positioning her as a normal girl in a fully realistic setting. Only the viewer is aware that Dawn is a new addition in Buffy's family while the other characters fully believe that Dawn has always been Buffy's sister. Eventually, Buffy discovers Dawn's origins after speaking with a dying Monk who sacrifices himself so that Dawn can be protected by Buffy. Buffy discovers the Monk while investigating a warehouse that she suspects holds some sort of evil presence. Buffy's suspicions are confirmed when she comes across the bound and gagged Monk, who has been severely beaten by Glory. After Buffy saves the Monk from Glory's clutches, the Monk explains to Buffy that Glory held him captive in order to find out where he and his brethren hid "the key," which the Monks transformed into Dawn. He does not tell Glory

that Dawn is the key; instead, he sacrifices his life to protect Dawn from Glory. His last words instruct Buffy, and the viewer, to not only regard Dawn as an innocent human, but also to shield her from Glory because Dawn is “human...now human...and helpless. She is an innocent in this. She needs you” (Episode 2). As the sacrificial captive who dies for a greater good, the Monk can now bind Buffy to his purpose.

Through the power of sentimental identification with the Monk’s sacrificial act, Buffy promises to protect her sister from Glory, who plans to capture and sacrifice Dawn in order to unlock the gateways between worlds and return to “the hell-fires of home” (Episode 5). If the boundaries between worlds are dissolved, then a hybridized environment will be created, where humans must live with demons. In order to reconstitute the boundaries between worlds, Buffy gives her life to save her sister. Unlike Cora, who accepts her duty without question, Buffy struggles to accept her civic duty as a sentimental sacrifice. Eventually, she comes to understand that it is her destiny to sacrifice herself to save her sister.

Buffy and Cora willingly sacrifice themselves because they understand that their sisters are valued not only as immediate family, but also as the future promise of the national home and family. The connection between family, nation, and colonization in America has been well-documented by Amy Kaplan, who explains that the term “domestic” in America holds a double meaning that encompasses both the familial home and the nation, where domesticity is a mobile colonizing

force that “travels in contradictory circuits both to expand and contract the boundaries of home and nation to produce shifting conceptions of the foreign” (185). In other words, home is a conceptual, patriotic national space that draws in those who wish to reside within its sacred borders and spreads the ideals of home and hearth abroad, often violently. The *inside* and *outside* of home create a space that is constantly exited and entered but only welcomes those who are domesticated and/or inculcated into specific national value systems. The nation-as-home implies that those who claim to be domestic have attributes, traits, and knowledge that separate them from those defined as foreign. This scale of national membership is reminiscent of Puritan differentiations between the elect and the heathen in early captivity narratives. As well, there are varying levels of domestication as some citizens have full membership in the social order while others may reside in the sacred space of the nation but are not fully members.¹⁸ They are uncharacteristic in some way when compared to an ideal and so traverse between the inside and the outside and can reside within what Homi Bhabha calls the “interstitial passage” or the liminal, connective space in between borders (2).

Ono explains that the liminality of the heroes in *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* draws “distinctions between heroes whose marginal position makes them heroes and the villains whose social [and racial] difference justifies their characters’

violent exclusion from the show” (164). Buffy struggles to deal with her liminal and marginalized position as a heroic character who would much rather “curl up on Mom’s lap and not worry about the fate of the world” (Episode 2). In contrast, Dawn does not understand Buffy’s sacrifices and in her innocence, “gets to be a kid” (Episode 2). That is, because Buffy must continually protect the world, she does not have the privilege of participating in the events and experiences that define normalcy in American culture. Her powers allow her to traverse between everyday, normal life and the supernatural world, an ability that represents positive liminality. Yet, as the most popular girl in high school reminds Buffy continually, she is “weird.” Because she is the Slayer, Buffy has been wanted for murder and expelled from school. For these reasons, Buffy is a marginalized and liminal character: she is not evil but also not normal; therefore, she must stay on the outside of her domestic space, staring enviously at the privileges that her sister enjoys.

In *The Last of the Mohicans*, Cora is also liminal and marginal. Shirley Samuels writes that “Cora has inherited at once a racial and a national identity and can [dangerously] transmit these identities [as a female of child-bearing age]”; as a result, she is inherently different, valuable, and dangerous (107). Hawkeye comments numerous times that Cora is heroic and of great help to the party of

¹⁸ The ability to obtain and sustain “full membership” as a privileged American citizen is based on adherence to sets of rules and regulations as well as physical conformity to preordained characteristics defined as normal.

travellers. Her father extols her worth to Major Duncan Heyward in his office claiming that “Cora Munro is a maiden too discreet, and of a mind too elevated and improved, to need the guardianship of her father” (145). Yet, her blood that threatens to “burst its bounds” defines Cora as marginal (9). Her final speech regarding Alice’s spotless purity and natural superiority clearly depicts Cora, like Buffy, as a liminal and marginal character, who is both valuable and expendable (298).

Buffy and Cora’s status as sacrificial citizens contrasts Hannah and Mary’s status in their narratives. Hannah and Mary are both transformed into sacrificial heroes through the grace of God, but once they are rescued, they leave their heroic status behind and return to everyday life. Cora and Buffy must be consistently and naturally heroic and powerful. For example, Buffy inherits super-strength, second sight and a death-defying attitude as a Slayer, and Cora is described as a courageous “noble-minded maiden” (278). Cora even gains the admiration of the misogynistic Hawkeye, who wishes he had men like Cora who feared death as little as she (130 and 278). Their gifts separate them from an idealized mainstream and keep them from the normative actions of domesticity, consisting of marriage and child rearing, which is the domain available to their sisters. Buffy and Cora’s natural gifts define them as sacrificial victims who are naturally chosen to protect and defend the nation. Moreover, they inherit their status biologically, creating the illusion of unchangeable identities and destinies. This sense of biological certainty

that privileges binary opposition rather than gradation and complexity is historically entrenched in the United States:

These prevarications and inconsistencies in U.S. racial classification are the result of the long and complicated legacy of black slavery and segregation [and, presumably, the legacies of Indian Removal and Tribal Status¹⁹], specifically of the “one-drop rule”: that is, anyone who has even a single drop of black blood (whatever that means)—or a single black ancestor—is considered black, regardless of the degree of white ancestry (or “white blood”) involved. The rule was instituted to make sure that the mixed-race offspring of black slaves and white masters would remain enslaved—and the result is a bizarre binary approach to race that imagines everything in black and white and rejects anything in-between, effectively denying the existence of the category of “mixed race” and of racial gradations altogether. (Cheng 130)

¹⁹ In order to prove one’s identity as a First Nations person, there must be a genealogical trace. Even then, if Indian status is proved, the Aboriginal person must belong to a federally approved tribe. To complicate matters further, each state has different rules regarding status. Thus, while Tribes have gained some control over ancestry and status, the government still retains control over who can claim a racial identity. (<http://www.doi.gov/ancestry.html>)

Within the binary terms for racial authenticity that Cheng outlines, Cora's multi-raciality renders her as available for sacrifice while her heroic gifts define her as worthy of sacrifice. As a sacrifice for her sister Alice, Cora instantly becomes an object to mourn while leaving the nation cleansed of racial gradation. Buffy, on the other hand, would appear to fit the category of whiteness, but for the fact that Dawn exceeds Buffy's purity. Because Buffy's gifts mark her, like Cora, as available for sacrifice, this construction of *whiteness* (Buffy) compared to *exceeding whiteness* (Dawn) exposes "whiteness" as an illusory category that defines itself via opposition and negation. In summary, within the captivity formula, Buffy and Cora are juxtaposed with their racially pure sisters to provide a viable definition for privileged white American identity. In the following analysis, the function of Cora's and Buffy's act of sentimental sacrifice to define authenticity and purity is brought into sharper focus.

Cora Munro Saves the Nation

Captivity narratives became source texts for writers of frontier romances, allowing authors like Cooper to fuse the historical romance and the captivity narrative into a specifically American genre. In *The Last of the Mohicans*, for example, the paradigm of capture, self-sacrifice and rescue established by Puritan captivity narratives circulates within the framework of the historical romance. While non-

fiction captivity narratives are somewhat constrained in that the events and characterizations must be at least similar to the real event, captivity narratives embedded within a fictional form can more fully shape the narrative to answer cultural anxieties, such as the fear of miscegenation.

Indeed, in the early national period the debate over who possessed the physical attributes to lay claim to economic, social, and political power became as central an issue as it was during King Philip's War near the end of the seventeenth century. While the abolition movement to free enslaved black bodies gained momentum in the early nineteenth century, Indian removal - proposed by Thomas Jefferson in 1801 and culminating in Andrew Jackson's 1830 Indian Removal Act²⁰ - enforced the actual removal of unacceptable bodies, enabling privileged Anglo-Americans to benefit from the natural resources of Indian land. Similar to abolitionist arguments, the debates over the Indian Removal Act used the body as the point of definition to ascertain who could claim national rights and privilege (Zinn 138). Clearly, in the early national period, the body politic and the personal body were conflated in order to express national anxieties concerning authentic identity. In addition, although the constitution of the United States uses "abstracted and bodiless terms," such as "persons," to obfuscate the abjected bodies of

²⁰ Jackson passed the Indian Removal Act after only one year in office. "In 1829, gold was discovered in Cherokee territory," explains Howard Zinn, thus, the removal of the Indian was not the fault of frontiersman or encroaching civilization but the rampant greed of corporate interests (134-138).

racialized peoples struggling for recognition, the fact is that “[t]he human body has always served as an emblem for conceptions of the body politic” in American national discourse (Sánchez-Eppler, *Touching Liberty* 3). Entering into these debates via the popular novel, Cooper argues for continued Anglo-American supremacy, using the sentimental sacrifices contained within the captivity narrative as the logical outcome for his argument.

Cora’s sentimental sacrifice makes clear that Alice’s spotless, authentic national essence is superior to Cora’s special gifts, which are marred by the stain of race. Cora must be sacrificed in deference to Alice.²¹ Based on this logic, Cooper builds his diegetic universe, in which racialized characters meet with a grisly end, are sacrificed, or vanish peacefully into a misty past. *The Last of the Mohicans* reflects the social perception of miscegenation in the early national period as “an anathema to the American project of nation-building” (Wardrop 62). The women and children in *The Last of the Mohicans*, explains Shirley Samuels,

²¹ Karen Sánchez-Eppler argues that “[a]uthority derives from simulating the impossible position of the universal and hence bodiless subject. All the ‘men’ who, Thomas Jefferson declared, ‘are created equal’ shed their gender and their race; in obtaining the right to freedom and equality they discard bodily specificity. The problem, as feminists and abolitionists surely suspected, was that women and blacks could never shed their bodies to become incorporeal ‘men’” (3) Indeed, it is Alice, Cora, Uncas and Magua’s bodies that are used to define the purity of the nation and not Heyward or Hawkeye’s.

are violently killed in order to figuratively express the fear of impure or racially mixed generations (109). In *Sensational Designs*, Jane Tompkins examines Cooper's almost neurotic obsession with purifying the seemingly endless ethnic diversity of America. She perceives *The Last of the Mohicans* as Cooper's answer to the question of how to maintain purity in the early national period when the fledgling nation "required a rationale for dealing with non-white peoples" that justified westward expansion and chattel slavery (Tompkins 109). Just as Puritan captivity narratives privilege a "chosen people," Cooper uses *The Last of the Mohicans* to rationalize the natural superiority of authentic whiteness. Alice's purity that is of little use in Cooper's uncivilized frontier of 1757, delineates a proto-normality that will only survive if the abnormal or subnormal is removed and/or domesticated. Cora and Alice's captivity communicates the sentimental and sacrificial means by which the social order can be purified. As a literary character in the realistic form of the novel, Cora appears to be person-like; that is, she seems to possess free will. Her self-possession and independence persuades the reader that Cora rationally recognizes Alice's natural superiority; thus, Cora *chooses* to rightfully sacrifice herself for that which is greater than she.

Yet, critics have struggled to explain Cora's narrative function within *The Last of the Mohicans*. Tompkins describes Cora as the embodiment of a litany of social conflicts (106). Ruth Morse surmises that while Cora is not as good as Alice, she is clearly superior; thus, Cooper implicitly suggests that Cora "ought to

be the mother of nations” (84). As Tompkins and Morse suggest, Cora is both a devalued and valued character: she represents a terrible asymmetry, so to speak, because she upsets the binaries that define American nationhood. The revelation that Cora is multi-racial, revealed by Colonel Munro to a stunned Heyward almost a third of the way through the novel, informs the reader that recognizing purity or impurity is tricky. Tompkins argues that Cooper attempts to contain this inherent ambiguity by naturalizing the sexual attraction between characters of the same race; for example, Heyward is attracted to Alice but mysteriously not to Cora, until his preference is explained by Munro during a meeting at Fort William Henry (103).

The scene at Fort William Henry not only encodes Cora as a valuable, yet necessary, expense, the scene also designates Alice, who represents early nineteenth-century ideal femininity, as the future “guarantor of American cultural superiority” (Sánchez-Eppler, “Raising Empires” 413). It is in Colonel Munro’s quarters in Fort William Henry - an overt representation of the home-front - where the reader learns that Alice and Cora are divided by race. The scene is focalized through Heyward, who is an officer commanded to protect Cora and Alice. Heyward enters Munro’s quarters to find Munro and his daughters, Alice and Cora, in a touching domestic scene:

Major Heyward found Munro attended by his only daughters. Alice sat upon his knee, parting the grey hairs on the forehead of the old man with her delicate fingers; and, whenever he affected to frown at her trifling, appeasing his assumed anger by pressing her ruby lips fondly on his wrinkled brow. Cora was seated nigh them, a calm and amused looker-on – regarding the wayward movements of her more youthful sister with that species of maternal fondness which characterised her love for Alice. Not only the dangers through which they had passed, but those which still impended above them, appeared to be momentarily forgotten in the soothing indulgence of such a family meeting. (143)

The family scene in Munro's quarters delineates each character's position and worth within the story. The omniscient narrator presents the scene through Heyward's eyes; as a result, Heyward's point of view is privileged above Cora or Alice's perspective. Alice is placed at the centre of the domestic scene, as she sits upon her father's knee while Cora, Heyward, and Munro gaze upon Alice as the object of desire. Alice is the fantasy of domestic perfection: she represents the perfect daughter, wife, and sibling. In addition, the female presence within Munro's quarters transforms the stereotypically masculine space of war into a private and safe space in which anxieties are "momentarily forgotten." Thus,

Cooper deftly defines what is about to be lost to the “dangers impended above them”: the sanctified home and its valued occupants. Once Cora and Alice leave Munro’s quarters, the sense of security vanishes as Munro and Heyward discuss the siege of Fort William Henry by the French army.

However, just before Heyward and Munro discuss the impending doom of the fort, Heyward expresses interest in marrying one of Munro’s daughters. Munro mistakenly believes that Heyward is talking about Cora and is greatly offended by Heyward’s surprise at the suggestion that he might marry Cora. From this conversation, the reader learns that Cora is of mixed race, which, as stated earlier, explains Heyward’s natural attraction to Alice and not Cora. Moreover, the spatial arrangement of the previous domestic scene subtly devalues Cora by setting her apart from Munro and Alice while simultaneously locating Alice as a domestic goddess. The scene in Munro’s office prepares the reader to accept Cora’s fate as a sacrifice for Alice, who is defined through Munro’s, Cora’s, and Heyward’s love and admiration as worth the price of death.

Cora’s tearful acceptance of her sacrificial fate signals to the reader that Cora is the suffering, marginalized sentimental figure. Her racial status and willingness to selflessly sacrifice herself in deference to Alice’s racial purity creates a sentimental character for the reader to mourn, yet the reader recognizes Cora’s loss as necessary. The events that lead to Cora’s sacrifice do not occur until after the attack on Fort William Henry, when Magua uses the confusion and

horror as a cover to recapture Alice. Cora pursues Magua and, as a result, also becomes Magua's captive. Magua is desperate to capture and defile Alice and Cora as an act of revenge against Colonel Munro, who is Magua's sworn enemy. Because Alice embodies "piety [that] had never worn a form so lovely," Magua knows that her defilement will cause great pain and suffering (92). Cora inherently understands that "the curse of my ancestors [she is remotely descended from West-Indian slaves] has fallen heavily on their child"; in other words, Cora knows that she must sacrifice herself to save Alice, who "is too good, much too precious to become the victim" (355). Cora's sentimentally charged acceptance of her fate provides a model of civic duty for readers to value.

Cora will not allow Magua to pollute her sister's purity through miscegenation. After a bungled rescue effort by Hawkeye, Uncas, and Heyward, all are brought before the sachem of the Lenape, Tamenund, for formal judgment. Magua pleads his case to keep Alice and Cora as captives. Tamenund grants Magua the right to keep his prisoners and pass through Tamenund's land unharmed. At this point, Cora falls to her knees and asking nothing for herself, she begs Tamenund to allow Alice to go free. Alice is granted freedom, but not Cora. Neither Uncas nor Hawkeye is able to convince Tamenund that Cora should also be freed. When Hawkeye steps in and says he will be Magua's captive in exchange for Cora, and even though Magua agrees, Cora replies, "Generous hunter, from my soul I thank you. Your offer is in vain, neither could it be

accepted; but still you may serve me, even more than in your own noble intention” (298). Because the economy of sacrifice demands that the victim must be both liminal and marginal, Hawkeye cannot be a sacrificial character. Unlike Cora, whose marginal status is defined in the Fort William Henry scene where Heyward rejects her, Hawkeye *chooses* to live in the liminal space of the frontier as an exceptional person “without a cross.”²² He embodies the positive definition of liminality as a person who lives within two social orders. Cora, however, does not positively straddle both masculinity/femininity and blackness/whiteness, because she cannot live within different social spheres as a person “without a cross.” Cora not only biologically embodies valued and devalued identities, but she also defines herself as expendable in the face of Alice’s exceeding racial purity.

Through Cora’s acceptance of her sacrificial fate, her words are charged with the power of sentimental sacrifice. If Cora had accepted Hawkeye’s offer to be sacrificed in her place, then she could not successfully perform the speech-act that compels Hawkeye, and the other characters, to fulfil Cora’s desire that Alice be protected at all costs. Even though Hawkeye detests the unstoppable domestication of his beloved frontier, he cannot refuse Cora’s request that he live on to protect Alice, who represents the civilized future of America. Cora explains to Hawkeye that his “noble intention” is not the best service that he can perform for the communal good; rather, his civic duty is to protect Alice and her purity

²² “without a cross” is Hawkeye’s repeated mantra that he is of pure blood.

after Cora's death, which will ensure that the frontier is civilized and populated with authentic and pure citizens.

Cora's actions and behaviour lead the reader to believe that certain citizens are not only available for sacrifice, but also *want* to be sacrificed. The "Coras" of America and their sentimental sacrifices are part of a grander design that supports an American nation that privileges purity. This perception of a pure nation is analogous to the organization of self and other in Puritan captivity narratives, in which God has made others to be expendable, and even individual members of his chosen people are expendable in order to sustain the sanctified collective. Cora's speech-act just before Magua takes her away to certain death reinforces the moral perception of Cora as a necessary expense to ensure the authentic purity of America's population, which is promised through Alice's survival. Cora uses the power of sentimentality and sacrifice to control Hawkeye's actions by convincing him to protect Alice. Because she sacrifices herself, Cora can sentimentally bargain with Hawkeye to ensure Alice's safety: "Look at that drooping humbled child [Alice]! Abandon her not until you [Hawkeye] leave her in the habitation of civilised men" (298). Once she has secured Hawkeye's agreement to fulfil his duty, Cora then approaches Duncan:

"I need not tell you to cherish the treasure you will possess. You love her Heyward; that would conceal a thousand faults, though she

had them. She is kind, gentle, sweet, good, as mortal may be. There is not a blemish in mind or person at which the proudest of you all would sicken. She is fair – Oh! How surpassingly fair! Laying her own beautiful but less brilliant hand, in melancholy affection, on the alabaster forehead of Alice, and parting the golden hair which clustered about her brows; “and her soul is pure and spotless as her skin! I could say much – more myself - ” Her voice became inaudible and her face was bent over the form of her sister. After a long and burning kiss, she arose, and with features the hue of death, and without even a tear in her feverish eye, she turned away, and added to the savage, with all her former elevation of manner, “Now, sir, if it be your pleasure, I will follow.” (298)

Cora lists the traits that make Alice the domestic ideal who must be defended. Her speech regarding Alice’s purity stands as a warning to Duncan to guard her and know her worth. Cora’s “less brilliant” hand reminds the reader that Cora is impure by comparison. Cora’s heroism and self-sacrifice endear her to the reader, who already mourns Cora as the “hue of death” mars her features. Cora’s death, like Buffy’s (as I will explain below), acts as a unifying principle whereby the main characters shed communal tears and pledge to protect the social order represented by Alice and Dawn. Buffy’s and Cora’s final words place Dawn and

Alice as representative of America's future promise, which must be defended. However, while Alice and Dawn appear to be of foremost importance, it is Cora's and Buffy's sacrifices that unify each group. Buffy's and Cora's speech-acts and personal realization of purpose delineate those who are impure but are not worthy enough to be sacrificed, those who are impure yet have enough worth to be sacrificed, and, finally, those who are privileged members of the national family and benefit from sacrifice.

Buffy Summers Saves the Nation

In the introduction to this chapter, I suggested that despite the historical distance and the difference in genre and form between *The Last of the Mohicans* and *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*, these works are linked through the embedded captivity narratives in each text that circulate ideals of sacrificial duty. I argue that *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* articulates America's continued desire for authentic and pure identities to occupy a national home where family values and strict moral codes reign. *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* teaches the viewer that "hierarchies of race, class, gender, nation, and sexuality are normal and necessary and that changing those relations would be messy and ultimately undesirable" (Ono 169). Evil in *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* and *The Last of the Mohicans* is defined as social difference, and justifies "waging campaigns of violence, destruction, and annihilation against those labelled as *different*" (Ono 168). In addition, like the hidden Indians in

Cooper's narrative, who take the uninitiated by surprise, evil is only detectable in *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* by those educated in the signifiers and symbols of evil. The one sanctuary in Buffy's world is her home, which vampires cannot enter without an invitation. *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* soothes continuing anxiety over maintaining the sanctified normality of home while under the constant threat of invasion, conversion and dissolution from perceived enemies. More specifically, the normal occupants of home are those defined as racially pure and threatened by encroaching racial diversity.

Anxiety over diversity and heterogeneity is as much an issue in contemporary American society as it was in the early national and colonial periods: "The large age cohort born between 1977 and the present," explains Scott McLean, "are children of the baby boomers but also of the 1970's wave of 'new immigrants' who came from Asia, Latin America, and Africa" (150). This second generation of "visible minorities" increasingly define themselves not primarily as "Asian," "Latin American," or "African" but as multi-racial, which will presumably lead to the de-privileging of whiteness and racial purity (150). The effect of this de-privileging causes "members of the dominant culture who have viewed their nation as both their cultural group and...their political group" to understand such transformation as a "disturbing loss" (Craig 46). To counteract this loss, "[s]ome [self-defined pure citizens] respond by accepting diversity as natural" states Betty Jean Craig, "others, by promoting nationalist patriotism; still

others, by attempting to exclude or reject from the nation they take to be theirs individuals who do not conform” (46). I would like to add to this list of responses certain popular contemporary narratives that use figurative language to subtly represent the cultural dominance of an authentic, racially pure and normal American home.

The entirety of *Buffy the Vampire Slayer's* fifth season deals specifically with the invasion and conversion of the world (America) by Glory's demon dimension. After Glory is banished to the human dimension, she hunts for the key to unlock the boundaries that fully segregate dimensions. The dimensions that make up the fictional world of *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* are analogous to nations: each dimension is populated with distinct species and cultures. The key that can unlock the boundaries between dimensions has been transformed into human form, Dawn, as an attempt to hide and protect the key from Glory. She is so desperate to return to “the hell-fires of home” that she does not care if her plan to unlock the boundaries between dimensions destroys Buffy's world (Episode 2). Season five metaphorically articulates anxieties over an increasingly multi-racial and multicultural U.S. population. Clearly, the fear of racial and cultural dissolution that plagued Cooper's upper-class world endures in contemporary America.

In contemporary American society, anxiety over racial and ethnic diversity continues through a type of national prevarication, by which state apparatuses, such as education and government, claim to appreciate and encourage racial and

cultural diversity. In opposition to such claims, certain pop culture icons, like Buffy, resist multi-raciality and diversity. For example, when Buffy discovers that it is Dawn's blood that acts as a key to unlock boundaries between worlds, she tries to contain Dawn's innate power by any means necessary, except that Buffy will not kill Dawn. Even though other characters - such as her mentor, Giles - strongly suggest to Buffy that she might have to sacrifice Dawn, Buffy steadfastly refuses to entertain the possibility of Dawn's death. Her devotion to Dawn seems illogical since Buffy knows Dawn's origins, but her determination to fulfil her national duty is based on two principles: 1) she entered into a sacrificial covenant with the Monk to protect Dawn at any cost and 2) Dawn represents that which Buffy desires most, absolute normality.

Buffy may well be the mythical Slayer chosen as the sole defender of the world, but she is also the quintessential California blonde obsessed with clothes and boys. She and her gang are Anglo-American without a trace of multi-raciality to be found. Like Hawkeye, the heroes in Whedon's diegetic universe are "without a cross." However, Buffy is far from a paragon of classic white femininity. Buffy describes herself as cold, hard, and a killer, whose femininity diminishes as her Slayer powers become stronger. At several points in the series, Buffy wants to quit so she can regain her privileged position within American culture as the object of exchange, who will one day marry and have children. When Buffy repeatedly wishes that she could be normal, she is not only

privileging normalcy, but also defining normalcy through opposition. Dawn and Buffy symbolically represent the normal/abnormal binary pair. Dawn represents all that Buffy could be if she were normal. Although Buffy retains the appearance of normality with her picture perfect good looks and thin figure, she is endowed with super-strength, among other powers. Whedon constructs Buffy as unable to maintain relationships with normal men, who are intimidated by Buffy's strength. Buffy is not multi-racial like Cora, but both she and Cora are characters who do not have the normative feminine markers of weakness and passivity possessed by their sisters. In contrast to Dawn, Buffy has the strength and fortitude usually reserved for males. In the opening scene of episode 22, "The Gift," Buffy saves an adolescent male from a vampire attack. The young man is stunned that Buffy has defeated a large and athletic vampire and says, in bewilderment, "But you're just a girl," to which Buffy answers, "That's what I keep saying." Like Cora, Buffy is revered for her strength and determination, but these same powers are only valued in special circumstances and are not acceptable in everyday life. Buffy recognizes that her sister embodies domestic normalcy. When Buffy accepts her ultimately fatal separation from everyday life in deference to her sister's innocence and purity, she implicitly defines the correct behaviours and physical traits that belong in the normal American home.

While Dawn would appear to be cast as the captive and Buffy as the frontier hero/rescuer, Buffy also suffers under the gaze of the captor as much as

Dawn does. Although Glory is unable to literally capture Buffy, who escapes from Glory's grasp in the second episode, she places Buffy under constant surveillance until Sunnydale becomes a prison from which Buffy and Dawn must escape. In episode twenty, entitled "Spiral," Buffy enlists the help of her friends to escape the prison that Glory's gaze creates; however, they cannot escape and end up besieged in an abandoned building by an army of Catholic crusaders who have vowed to destroy the key.²³ After Glory discovers the location of the key/Dawn, she annihilates the Catholic army and kidnaps Dawn in a scene of extreme violence common to the captivity formula engendered by Rowlandson. Similar to Cora's reaction to Alice's captivity, Buffy does not express her distress and grief hysterically. Rather, Buffy reacts to Dawn's capture by first regressing into a catatonic state, indicating to the viewer that she refuses to live in a world without Dawn. With the help of her magical friend, Willow, who provides the supernatural equivalent of the psychoanalytic talking cure, Buffy exits her catatonic state and briefly bursts into tears. From this point on, Buffy is obsessively determined to save Dawn from Glory.

Dawn is Buffy's final link to the normality of home. Throughout the series, her father is notably absent and her mother dies from brain cancer early in the fifth

²³ This sub-plot involving a secret sect of the Catholic Church oddly continues the Puritan characterization of Catholics as a misguided group who are an unwelcome part of American culture.

season. Indeed, Dawn is a domestic metaphor: She is literally a key, implicitly defined as an object to gain access to a privileged space. However, Dawn represents not only the privileged normality of home, but also its possible destruction. Dawn's blood can maintain or destroy the boundaries that sustain the pure, domestic state. Buffy's duty is to prevent this evil by saving Dawn from becoming an agent of destruction and allowing her to fulfill her role as the sublime object of domestic privilege. Dawn's power as a biological key to unlock either desired purity or feared hybridity must be properly contained. The simple solution, of course, is to kill Dawn, but, as stated earlier, this would be a fundamental erasure of Buffy's domestic space, and the normality instituted by the domestic space needs to remain intact for the assumed cultural superiority of Buffy's American sphere to continue.

Like Mary Rowlandson and Hannah Duston, Buffy fights to protect her "national body," represented by Dawn, from an enemy perceived as evil and in need of extermination. Furthermore, Buffy equates herself with Dawn, announcing in the final episode that "she's me, the Monks made her out of me," a statement that identifies Dawn as a purer, and, therefore, more authentic version of Buffy. Buffy's performance of sacrificial duty is narrated through the sequencing of images, the structure of the *mise en scene* and composition of the dialogue. All of these elements comprise a cinematic narrator who "is not to be identified with the voice-over narrator" but should be viewed as a "composite of a large and complex

variety of communicating devices,” such as the treatment of image and visual structure (Chatman 482). Each of these components influence the “semiotic processing performed by the viewer,” who can translate the assembled sequence of words and images presented into a coherent narrative. That is, the viewer, who is trained to “know the rules of language and culture,” will decode the images and visual structure of season five into powerful lessons of duty and sacrifice (Chatman 482).

In Buffy’s scene of sentimental sacrifice, the setting is Glory’s “tower of sacrifice,” which is an unstable scaffold several stories high complete with a platform upon which the sacrificial victim can be tied. While the setting is reminiscent of stereotypical cinematic versions of ancient sacrificial rituals in which a virgin must be sacrificed at a specific time and place, this particular scene has strong Calvinist overtones. It is not Dawn who will be sacrificed in a pagan ritual, but Buffy who neutralizes the pagan ritual by *choosing* to perform her Calvinist sacrificial civic duty. Buffy’s Christ-like actions not only saves Dawn, but also, through the power of sentimental sacrifice, destroys the invading, pagan forces of Glory-the-Hell-God. Buffy’s scene of sentimental sacrifice is located in the last minutes of “The Gift” when the audience sees Dawn tied to the platform and crying for Buffy. Buffy defeats Glory and climbs the tower to save Dawn only to discover that one of Glory’s followers has cut her several times with a knife. After Dawn’s blood begins to spill, demons and monsters start entering through

the breach her blood creates between dimensional boundaries. Now it appears that Buffy must kill Dawn as per the rules of the ritual: If Dawn is dead, the portals will close. At first Buffy appears to accept the growing demonic hybridity of her world: Buffy frees Dawn from her bonds and they run along the platform to freedom, but Dawn escapes Buffy's grasp. Dawn turns back toward the end of platform, intent on jumping to her death in order to stop the boundaries from disintegrating.

Buffy yells at Dawn to stop and in that moment she realizes that she has misinterpreted her role as Dawn's protector. She must not only sacrifice her femininity and social standing to remain a sacred warrior who fights the forces of evil, she must also pledge her body and soul to protect Dawn, who exemplifies domestic happiness and belonging. Buffy looks to the end of the platform and realizes that she must die to protect and preserve Dawn. Her sacrifice will lock Dawn into her role as the sublime object of domesticity:

Dawn. Buffy...(shakes head) No...(starts to cry)

Buffy. Dawny I have to...

Dawn. No!

Buffy. Listen to me, please there is not a lot of time, listen.

Not only is Dawn admonished to listen despite her protests and tears, but also the audience is urged to pay special attention to the speech-act Buffy is about to perform. Before her speech-act can be endowed with the ethos of sacrificial death, she must die. After Buffy repeatedly pleads with Dawn to listen, the camera pulls back for a long shot of Buffy and Dawn on “sacrifice tower” and the sound is removed. We can see Buffy talking but are not privy to the words Buffy says. In slow motion, we witness Buffy running to the end of platform and diving in perfect form into the widening breach amongst worlds. The words we were not privy to earlier are now revealed in first person narration while Buffy plunges to her death. The displacement of time between Buffy’s death and her speech-act not only adds tension but also injects power into Buffy’s speech-act. Without her impending sacrificial death, her words lack the rhetorical fuel to successfully perform her sentimental speech-act. Her voiceover continues as her lifeless body is slowly surrounded by her friends. As they dramatically shed tears, the audience continues to hear Buffy’s narration of her earlier speech to Dawn:

Buffy. Tell Giles - tell Giles I figured it out and I’m okay. Give my love to my friends. You have to take care of them now. You have to take care of each other. You have to be strong. Dawn the hardest thing in this world is to live in it. Be brave. Live. For me.

Buffy's reference to Giles refers to an earlier episode of season five wherein Buffy embarks on a quest to discover her life's purpose. She feels conflicted over her role as a Slayer and wants to quit so she can lead a normal life. Giles tells Buffy that she can find her answers by going on a vision quest. However, the answers that Buffy receives confuse her. She is told her "gift is death" (Episode 22). Buffy interprets the message literally to mean her purpose is to kill. Certainly, this is one interpretation of her purpose, but while Buffy stands on the tower of sacrifice trying to stop the conversion and dissolution of her national home into a monstrous hell, she finally understands that her "gift of death" is the "economy and game of saving" the nation (*The Gift of Death*, Derrida 86). Her realization is articulated through the visual rhetoric of the montage.

The montage narrates Buffy's, and, by extension, the viewer's, reinterpretation of the important events over the season that have defined her sacrificial duty. Analogous to Mary Rowlandson's struggle to correctly interpret her sacrificial duty via biblical interpretation, Buffy reinterprets important events and dialogue through her memories, which are narrated in the montage form. Dawn unwittingly triggers the montage sequence, or "re-memory," when she reiterates that she must die, because her genetic material - her blood - has allowed hybridity to enter the world. Analogous to Cora's introduction as a beautiful creature whose blood threatens to burst its bounds, in this scene Dawn clearly interprets herself as a devalued figure whose blood needs containment. Dawn's

misinterpretation of her worth is rectified through the montage, which opens with a shot from earlier in the episode where Spike says sardonically “It’s always got to be blood,” meaning that blood provides the definition of life and identity (Episode 22). This shot of Spike is then followed in quick succession with shots drawn from two different episodes.

The second shot in the montage is from episode thirteen, entitled “Blood Ties,” where Dawn realizes that she is a key destined to end the world via demonic hybridity. This knowledge traumatizes Dawn to the point that she descends into temporary madness, repeatedly cutting herself with a knife in order to control her destiny. Buffy wrestles the knife from Dawn and assures Dawn that she does own a privileged identity. Buffy then cuts her hand and holds Dawn’s hand, signifying a blood pact. It is this shot of the blood pact between Buffy and Dawn that appears in the montage. In a voiceover, a statement that Buffy makes in the final episode, “she’s me,” narrates the shot in which Buffy and Dawn join hands in the blood pact. The next shot in the montage sequence returns to episode 22 in which Buffy states, “She’s me, the monks made her out of me,” which, in turn, links to the episode in which Buffy enters a vision quest, where she is told “death is your gift.” Using the same voiceover technique as before, the viewer hears “death is your gift” repeated as the montage ends and the camera settles on an extreme close-up of Buffy, who stares knowingly at the platform from which she will plunge. In summary, the narrative sequence of this montage strongly reinforces

Buffy's duty to sacrifice her life in order to protect and sustain the domestic and racial purity that Dawn represents.

In this montage, scenes and dialogue from various episodes or "chapters" within season five are sutured together to create new meaning. The montage focalizes the narrative through Buffy's point of view, which allows the viewer to see her transition from rescuer/captive to sacrificial victim. That is, the viewer is repositioned from one set of meanings supplied to Buffy regarding her destiny to a new set of meanings that redefine her destiny. The seeming narrative inevitability of either Dawn's death or the world's demonic hybridity is restructured as an argument for sacrificial duty. The focus shifts from Dawn as the logical sacrificial victim to Buffy. This change is not entirely a shock, however, because the montage shows the viewer that Buffy has been the sacrificial victim all along. From the time when she enters into the sacrificial covenant with the dying Monk in Episode 2 up to the series of memories expressed via montage that communicate Buffy's sacrificial destiny, the viewer has been subtly prepared to accept that Buffy should give her life for Dawn.

Further, like the Monk, who uses the power of sentimental sacrifice to supply power to his speech-act, Buffy enacts the same power to communicate a crucial message to Dawn: she must remain pure in a world where her authentic identity is under constant threat of attack. Buffy emphatically tells Dawn to "[b]e brave. Live. For me." The words "for me" directly trigger the sacrificial pact,

forcing Dawn to recognize that because Buffy has fulfilled her national sacrificial duty, Dawn must now fulfill her destiny to remain pure. This scene provides the viewer with an example of sacrificial duty and confers responsibility to the viewer to continue the fight to protect the racial purity that supplies an authentic and superior identity.

Conclusion

In *The Last of the Mohicans* and in *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*, the embedded captivity narrative justifies ideals of racial and domestic purity. However, the sacrificial female captive in each narrative is not represented in the same way. Cora is a mixed race woman whose speech patterns and dress conform to nineteenth-century standards of both masculine heroism and feminine charm. Buffy is a character who has supernatural powers, yet fits the ideals for exceptional beauty and heroism in the twenty-first century. The form of each sacrificial character suits the social context of each narrative, but the function of each character remains disturbingly similar. Buffy and Cora are living sacrifices who understand that their civic duty is to protect the greater good embodied by their sisters. As authentic Americans with the power to bear and raise racially pure children, Dawn and Alice are the guarantors of America's continued cultural superiority. In each narrative, the captivity formula and its communication of sentimental sacrifices define and order the correct strata of national identities:

Dawn and Alice are the beneficiaries of sacrifice, Buffy and Cora are the sentimental sacrifices, and the evil Indians and demons must be eradicated. These levels of identity signify who can to enjoy the privileges of full membership within the national home; who is barred from entry into the national home; and those who live in both the inside and the outside and are, therefore, expendable yet valuable enough to be sacrificed.

In the next chapter I argue that Mourning Dove's *Cogewea* and Leslie Marmon Silko's *Ceremony* counter this hierarchy of national identities. Mourning Dove and Silko reframe the legitimate and illegitimate identities that the captivity narrative defines through sentimentality and sacrifice. Each author introduces characters and scenes that fit sentimental conventions, yet these conventions are transformed or even negated. For example, Mourning Dove creates unlikely sentimental characters, such as a stoic cowboy named Silent Bob, who are not usually the subject of sentimentality, and she negates the sentimental attachments that are conventionally made with marginalized, suffering characters, such as her mixed-blood character, Cogewea. Similarly, Silko creates a suffering characters whose grotesque, violent responses to their marginalization precludes sentimental attachment. *Ceremony's* main character, Tayo, expresses his pain through consistent vomiting and hallucinations. His visceral, traumatic suffering does not allow him to become a conventional sentimental character and/or trope. Both

Mourning Dove and Silko write counter-narratives that critically interrogate the discourses that comprise America, particularly sentimentality and sacrifice.

Repudiating Sentimental Sacrifice

“I came back to San Francisco [from active duty in WWII], where they [the army] sent me to a rehabilitation centre, then to a hospital, then home for a month’s leave. I was skin and bones. I came back to Gallup where my father met me. He said, ‘Son, I’m glad you came back alive, I don’t want you to go to town and try to have some fun; I want you to come home with me. I have something for you there.’ So I said, ‘O.K.’ Well, they had a medicine man there for me.”

Anonymous Navajo WWII Codetalker

“I decided the only way to seek justice was through the power of stories.”

Leslie Marmon Silko

During his term as commissioner for Indian affairs in the fifties, Dillon S. Myer attempted to assimilate First Nations peoples into American culture by enacting policies intended to eliminate the “Indian” as a legal category in the U.S. (Nabokov 334). Myer’s termination policies were a form of genocide designed to turn the myth of the vanishing Indian into a reality. Myer’s perception of the “American-Indian” as a static, illegitimate category was refuted during a meeting with First Nations leaders, in which Myer asked rhetorically, “What can we do to Americanize the Indian?”, to which an Elder responded, “how [can we]

Americanize you. We have been working at that for a long time...And the first thing we want to teach you is that in the American way of life, to have respect for his brother's vision" (Nabokov 334). The Elder subtly positions Myer's value system within the framework of First Nations epistemology. By saying "we want to teach you....the *American* way of life [my italics]," the Elder places Myer outside of that which he holds most dear: his identity as a legitimate American citizen. Myer is cast as a person who requires training in the fundamentals of American identity, a position that disputes Myer's assumed superiority. The Elder's rhetorical restructuring of the identity politics between First Nations and Anglo-American authority reflects the means that Mourning Dove and Leslie Marmon Silko use to reframe and reclaim authentic and/or legitimate Indigenous identities and culture in *Cogewea* and *Ceremony*.

In both novels the binary oppositions that order American identity through race, class and gender are set in opposition to an Indigenous worldview that emphasizes the importance of both the community and the individual, because in Indigenous culture "if the community is important, then each individual is also crucial, because the diverse gifts of individuals are integral to the functioning of the community" (DiNova 6). That is, in American culture, citizens are categorized based on income, skin colour and biological traits in order to support certain national ideals. Such an approach to defining the relationships between individuals and their communities is in direct opposition to Indigenous

epistemology, wherein the ability of each member to contribute to the community determines the health of the community as a whole (LittleBear 78-79). In order to analyze the difficult social and cultural imbrications of these oppositional worldviews, Silko and Mourning Dove each create marginalized mixed-blood characters who struggle to live within Indigenous and American cultures. These characters have been “alienated [through various educational and legal systems] from their elders, their linguistic consciousness, and their order of the world” to the point where American ideals, such as self-less patriotism, appear to be of great and enduring value (Henderson 65).

Mourning Dove expresses this colonial paradigm through the popular western genre, in which her mixed-blood characters, Cogewea and Jim LaGrinder, must learn to value their Aboriginal culture rather than the American culture that they have come to believe is universal and normal. Both Cogewea, the ranch-owner’s sister-in-law, and Jim, the foreman, live and work on a ranch located on the Flathead Valley of Montana that is populated by a variety of mixed-blood and Anglo-American characters. Their journey toward decolonization starts when a calculating easterner, Alfred Densmore, joins the ranch as an inept ranch-hand. Densmore metaphorically represents Eurocentric colonization, which is known “among Indigenous peoples” as the “anti-trickster [who] represents the cognitive force of artificial European [and American] thought...ever changing in its creativity to justify the oppression and domination of contemporary Indigenous

peoples and their spirit guardians” (Henderson 58). As the anti-trickster figure, Densmore is figuratively characterized as a serpent and more literally as a dangerous con artist who tries to steal Cogewea’s property and money. Densmore seduces Cogewea into believing he loves her, but his actual intentions are much more sinister. He ends up taking Cogewea captive, and after he realizes that she has little financial worth, he leaves her to die in the wilderness.

Mourning Dove embeds the captivity narrative in her novel not only because the captivity narrative is a conventional part of the popular western formula but also to express the shift in Cogewea and Jim’s cognition from a colonized to a decolonized consciousness. Instead of becoming the sacrificial victim who inspires patriotic duty, Cogewea refuses to be the marginalized female captive, available for sentimental identification. Cogewea’s rejection of her sacrificial role stops Jim from hunting and killing Densmore, an act that would have continued the cycle of sacrificial violence. Cogewea’s refusal, therefore, forecloses the sentimental identification that defines her identity as valuable enough to warrant sacrifice but too marginal to live in Anglo-American society.

Silko similarly provides a means through which to neutralize the colonizing effects of sentimentality and sacrifice. In *Ceremony*, Tayo is a mixed-blood Native who returns to the Laguna reservation from active duty in the South Pacific during WWII, suffering from what appears to be Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). The major narrative arc involves Tayo’s struggle to regain his

mental and physical health. His journey to recovery introduces the reader to several key figures that either help in his recovery, such as the medicine men Ku'oosh and Betonie, or hinder his healing process, such as his fellow veterans. Tayo's journey towards decolonization contrasts Emo's, the antagonist, quest to regain privileged status as a patriotic hero. Emo, a veteran who believes in the superiority of American culture, feels cheated because his sacrifices have not been rewarded. Emo's final attempt to regain the status he once possessed as a soldier involves capturing and sacrificing Tayo, who Emo views as deviant and, therefore, expendable. When Emo is unable to capture Tayo, he sacrifices Tayo's friend Harley in his place. Tayo witnesses Harley's brutal sacrifice, which enables him to clearly see Emo's patriotism as a form of insanity rather than a noble ideal. Further, as the sacrificial captive, Harley does not become a marginalized, suffering sentimental figure; instead, Harley is characterized as yet another casualty of colonization.

The fictional captivity narrative with its scene of sentimental sacrifice concludes each novel. Up to the point where the captivity narrative begins, the reader witnesses each character struggle to reconcile the Indigenous and American worldviews that compete for legitimacy in each character's psyche. Mourning Dove's characters, Cogewea and Jim, and Silko's character, Tayo, each learn to develop a counter-consciousness that decolonizes their respective worldviews. Part of this process of decolonization involves deconstructing the sentimental

convention that in American culture sacrifice and suffering will confer value to a devalued identity. By placing the captivity narrative within the context of Aboriginal epistemology and ontology,²⁴ Mourning Dove and Silko are able to clearly illustrate that the sacrifices made in captivity narratives in the name of authenticity and racial purity are sheer madness. Indeed, the worldview that sentimental sacrifice supports, explains Joanne DiNova, is also the worldview of genocide, nuclear arsenals, and global warming; thus, “it is increasingly important to examine other ways of viewing the world, [and] to examine diverse ways of imagining difference” (15). The concepts of authenticity and purity that the sacrificial captive deploys through the captivity narrative neutralize “diverse ways of imagining difference,” including Indigenous perspectives (15). As Mourning Dove and Silko show through their main characters, even though sentimentality and sacrifice clearly work to colonize Indigenous consciousness, these discourses

24. DiNova writes, “What I refer to as ‘Aboriginal worldview’ can be seen to occur in variations among different tribes across the Americas. Moreover, the similarity in worldview occurs among indigenous peoples around the globe, including the indigenous peoples of Northern Europe, the Saami. It will probably be objected that such a claim – that all Aboriginal peoples share a similar worldview – is pan-Indianism[,]” states DiNova, “In a sense it is; however, it can be countered that the western worldview is an exception to a more widespread – though strikingly similar – worldview witnessed among indigenous peoples worldwide. With this in mind, the fact that indigenous peoples in the Americas share a worldview is not surprising. What is surprising is that the western worldview is so peculiar” (4).

can appear to supply the correct means by which a marginalized person can gain a respectable and privileged identity in American culture.

Sentimentality and sacrifice seem to offer the means to attain and express legitimacy because, as discourses, they imply “a set of semiotic and epistemological habits that enables and prescribes ways of communicating and thinking that others who participate in the discourse can also use” (Bal 3). Discourses mediate relationships among language users; thus, once a person is trained to act and react in certain ways through cultural and social education in the discourses that comprise American culture, sacrifice as a national duty will appear to be a noble and honourable service. Scholars such as Michael Yellow Bird argue that First Nations peoples are internally colonized by discourses that operate to support Anglo-American hegemony. In a recent letter published broadly on the Internet, Yellow Bird characterizes Indigenous involvement in the Iraqi war as another example of First Nations peoples behaving as patriotic, well-controlled, colonized citizens who have forgotten they are sovereign and separate from American national agendas. American discourses, charges Yellow Bird, cause Indigenous peoples to “do and think things they never would if their minds and hearts were free from American colonial rule” (Yellow Bird). Both Mourning Dove and Silko write characters who come to realize that when their “minds and hearts” are under “American colonial rule,” they will be consistently devalued, sentimentalized and sacrificed in the name of American cultural superiority.

In summary, even though Mourning Dove's novel was published in 1927 and Silko's appeared fifty years later in 1977, each novel co-opts the captivity narrative in order to counter and neutralize the main goals of the captivity narrative, which are to divide and define legitimate and illegitimate identities. Such an approach to decolonization, I argue, follows Yellow Bird's "antidotes to colonialism," which include "intelligent resistance, development of a counterconsciousness and discourse, and a fierce critical interrogation of American colonial ideology" (Yellow Bird). Mourning Dove and Silko deploy and, in turn, interrogate the captivity narrative in their novels to teach readers that sentimentality and sacrifice are discourses that define certain citizens as legitimate, authentic, pure and, therefore, privileged.

Cogewea and Jim's Lesson

In *Cogewea* Mourning Dove combines the popular western formula and Indigenous storytelling traditions to "empower Aboriginal thought" (Henderson 249). That is, Mourning Dove does not write a western framed within an Aboriginal lesson story²⁵ in order to teach Anglo-Americans how to treat First Nations peoples (Lamont 376). Quite to the contrary, her lessons involve teaching disenfranchised peoples to "retake possession of their humanity and identity"

²⁵ Many scholars, most notably Dexter Fisher, have discussed *Cogewea* as an Aboriginal lesson story.

(Henderson 249). While most scholarship on *Cogewea* debates the level of influence Mourning Dove's Anglo-American editor, Lucullus McWhorter, had on *Cogewea's* final form, close reading reveals that Mourning Dove's Indigenous worldview significantly shapes the novel's action.

The level of McWhorter's textual involvement is impossible to measure, but most scholars agree that his involvement was likely significant. However, when and where his editorial hand affected the narrative is not clear. Regardless of McWhorter's involvement in *Cogewea's* production, I argue that Mourning Dove powerfully critiques what Henderson calls "the cognitive legacy of colonialism" in which all aspects of Indigenous culture are devalued. She achieves this critique through *Cogewea*, a conflicted character whose intellectual journey to reconcile her mixed-blood heritage is represented through her struggle to choose between two men, Jim and Densmore, who have "mutually exclusive social identities" (Bernadin 489). She is attracted to the mixed-blood cowboy Jim on the one hand, and to the Anglo-American opportunist, Densmore, on the other. Each man represents a competing worldview; however, only Jim is characterized as an authentically ethical person, who dislikes Densmore because *Cogewea* loves him, not because Densmore is white. In opposition to Jim, Densmore is represented as an essentially flawed human being due to his unshakable belief that his race, religion and culture make him superior to Jim and *Cogewea*. Mourning Dove writes Densmore as one of the many Americans who stole land allotted to First

Nations peoples in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century: “[t]here must be wealth somewhere in this new country,” Densmore schemes, “– mines of it among the Indians – requiring only brains and strategy to possess” (84).²⁶ He has no scruples about deceiving Cogwea, because she belongs to a debased group that he perceives to be far beneath “a gentleman of the upper society” (81).

Densmore’s attempt to take Cogwea’s land is “metonymic [of] the colonial appropriation of Native American lands” (Kent 52). When Densmore and Jim are compared, they clearly appear to be oppositional, with Cogwea placed in the liminal space between these two masculine identities. Her marriage to either character would suggest that she must reject one social identity in favour of the other. However, the novel does not readily allow for straightforward binaries, such as between the colonized (Jim and Cogwea) and the colonizer (Densmore). Both Cogwea and Jim are not only of mixed race, but also live within a multicultural environment comprising French, Anglo-American and Indigenous peoples. The multicultural and multi-racial setting of the novel suggests that racial gradation and cultural complexity are part of everyday life. The colonized

²⁶ The series of Land Allotment Acts passed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century suited both Indian sympathizers and land-grabbers: the former used land allotment to assimilate Natives and the latter used land allotment to swindle land (Nabokov 232). With each Land Allotment Act that passed, another opportunity to take Indigenous lands became available to the American citizen, whose mantra is “this is mine” by constitutional right (232).

worldview that causes Jim and Cogewea distress is imposed through various cultural apparatuses, such as boarding schools. These cultural apparatuses have trained Jim, Cogewea, and Densmore to behave and react to each other's racial, economic, and cultural identities in prescribed ways. In contrast, Cogewea's grandmother, Stemteemä represents a decolonized, Indigenous worldview. Instructed by her father to distrust and reject Eurocentric cultures, Stemteemä passes on her father's wisdom to Jim and Cogewea through the power of stories. In her role as Elder, Stemteemä is the guiding force in the novel whose teaching and stories counter Densmore's racist, colonizing ideals. The role and function of each character to teach a different lesson regarding colonization and decolonization is made available through Mourning Dove's use of multi-positional focalization and free indirect discourse.

Each of these characters is mediated through an omniscient narrator who begins the novel in popular sentimental form, hyperbolically describing Cogewea with hair as "lustrous as the raven's wing, falling when loose, in great billowy folds, enveloping her entire form" (15). The narrator positions Cogewea as a classic, marginalized, sentimental character, whose early upbringing by her "primitive" Grandmother was deprived and deficient until she was weaned slowly from the old life through the mechanisms of first the convent school and then the infamous Carlisle Indian School (15-16). Along the lines of other famous sentimental female characters, such as Cora from *The Last of the Mohicans* and

Eliza from *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, Cogewea is a racialized beauty who has been civilized through a Christian education. Soon after Cogewea's introduction, Jim is described as the quintessential cowboy whose good looks, bravery, and skill define him as "the traditional western hero" (Cannata 74). Yet, as the narrative progresses, neither Jim nor Cogewea can be contained within their initial status as stock characters. Cogewea's complexity is revealed earlier than Jim's. While her education at the Carlisle School is ostensibly represented as an asset, it soon becomes apparent that her education in American ideals did more harm than good.

The Carlisle School provided Cogewea enough capital in the American cultural market to elevate her in class and status from Jim, yet there are subtle clues in the novel that the Carlisle School did not fully succeed in assimilating Cogewea (19). Richard Pratt, Carlisle School founder, prided his school on its ability to rapidly assimilate Indigenous peoples into western culture, as exemplified in promotional before and after photographs (see figs 9 and 10).



Figure 8 Apache children on arrival at the Carlisle Indian School.



Figure 9 Apache children four months later.

Mourning Dove's contemporary, Zitkala Sa, worked for Richard Pratt as a teacher at the school until she published her three famous autobiographical essays in *The Atlantic Monthly* in 1900. Pratt summarily fired Zitkala Sa for publishing stories that openly criticized the assimilationist activities at Carlisle, which included shearing Aboriginal hair, forbidding Aboriginal languages and enforcing religious instruction through physical punishment. Pratt was upset that Zitkala Sa would openly identify proudly as an Aboriginal woman after she had successfully completed the program at Carlisle, which advocated "killing the Indian within" (Pratt qtd in Susag). Perhaps Mourning Dove was aware of Zitkala Sa's defiance, because Cogewea, who most definitely would have been given an Anglo-American name at Carlisle, openly defies Pratt and the Carlisle School by proudly identifying through her name as an Indigenous woman. While Cogewea values her assimilationist education, she refuses to use an American name, indicating a clash between worldviews.

By the second chapter, the reader is given further clues that all is not right with Cogewea as her "mind burned with indefinable restlessness. Her longings were vague and shadowy; as something not to be attained through the narrow limits of her prescribed sphere" (22). The "prescribed sphere" refers to what Cogewea perceives to be her limited choices while she remains on the reservation. Her education at the Carlisle School has caused her to come into conflict with her "prescribed sphere." Cogewea's consciousness is "a site of overlapping,

contentious, fragmented, [and] competing desires and values” (LittleBear 85). Colonization, argues Leroy LittleBear, created competing worldviews that “den[y] Aboriginals harmony in their daily lives” (85). Cogewea’s longing and restlessness represent her fragmented consciousness, in which she believes that her Indigenous upbringing holds far less value than her education in American culture. Cogewea expresses her disdain for her Indigenous culture through the harsh words she uses to castigate a snake that spooks her horse, Wanawish, who, as a result, throws Cogewea:

“Miserable creature of a despised race! Look upon the sun for the last time, for you are going to die. I know all about your standing with the tribes. My uncle has told me of your tahmahawis power for doing secret evil to the people. Your ‘medicine’ is strong and my grandmother would not hurt you. But I am not my grandmother!” (26)

She distances herself from her grandmother not only by strongly claiming her autonomy, but also by referring to herself as a “breed,” which “breaks the charm” of the snake’s magic (26). Because she is not a full-blood Indian, Cogewea believes that her Anglo heritage breaks the snake’s hold on her. This scene foreshadows Densmore’s ability to “throw” Cogewea off her path. That is,

Densmore, as Stemteemä repeatedly states, is a snake who is able to use “secret evil” to beguile Cogewea and then brutally hurt her because she believes that her Anglo-American education and heritage give her access to Densmore’s world.

Cogewea must choose between continued marginality if she identifies as mixed-race, which is exemplified through the racism she encounters at the town rodeo races, and Densmore’s promises of privilege if she assimilates into Anglo-American culture (67-68).²⁷ Cogewea suffers from cultural confusion as she yearns for a privileged national identity at the expense of her Indigenous culture. Critics such as Dexter Fisher have attributed this confused voice - that shifts from praise to scorn for American and Indigenous cultures - to McWhorter’s textual mediation (xiii). Susan Cannata concludes that the confused voice in the novel results from McWhorter’s involvement, but his voice “does not subsume [Mourning Dove’s] voice” (704). I would like to enter this debate by suggesting that even if McWhorter exerted his influence to significantly change the text, the editorial contest between Mourning Dove and McWhorter exemplifies the

²⁷ At the Squaw and Ladies races, Cogewea is rejected by the Kootenai riders and the white judges (66-68). As Mary, Cogewea’s decolonized sister, states, “Some of the Indian system is bad but much of it is good; but it must all give place to that of the Shoyahpee [Anglo-American], who arrogantly proclaims of philosophies, his alone is worthy of emulation” (242). Neither worldview is given primacy, but the Anglo-American worldview is interrogated.

competing worldviews within the narrative. However, because Mourning Dove frames her popular western within an Aboriginal lesson story, the competing worldviews within *Cogewea* are heavily mediated via Aboriginal epistemology.

The narrative framework of *Cogewea* is structured through a lesson story identified by Fisher as “Chipmunk and Owl Woman,” in which Chipmunk, who is a free-spirited, young Aboriginal girl, must defeat Owl Woman, a monster who eats children. Through a series of seductive lies, Owl Woman tries to trick Chipmunk into leaving her hiding spot in a tree. Chipmunk, however, is not easily fooled and in an attempt to escape from Owl Woman’s watchful gaze, she tells Owl Woman to cover her eyes. When Chipmunk tries to jump over Owl Woman, she discovers that Owl Woman has only pretended to cover her eyes. Owl Woman reaches out to grab Chipmunk and misses, but still manages to leave three deep claw marks that scar her and her progeny. Victoria Lamont argues that this lesson story “teaches ‘survivance,’ to borrow from Gerald Vizenor’s term, rather than disappearance” (376). Like Chipmunk, *Cogewea* may be scarred by the forces of neo-colonialism, but she continues to thrive despite her struggle. More importantly, the “Chipmunk and Owl Woman” story links Owl Woman’s beguiling lies to the false promises of legitimacy that will be granted to the Indigenous person who assimilates into American culture. Mourning Dove uses the “Chipmunk and Owl Woman” story to create metaphoric parallels between the insatiable appetite of Owl Woman and the devouring force of American

colonization. The forces of colonization, like Owl Woman, require constant surveillance and avoidance. Each of Stemteemä's lesson stories instructs Cogewea on how to avoid being devoured or assimilated into another culture, even if the promised rewards seem to outweigh the risks.

However, Stemteemä almost fails in her task to guide Cogewea out of her colonized consciousness because she strongly believes in the superiority of her knowledge to Stemteemä's. The process of colonization started in earnest when Cogewea entered school. After she returns to the reservation, she describes her generation as "rising" through education and her Grandmother's generation as "lingering pathetically in the sunset of a closing era" (41). In this section of the narrative, free indirect discourse allows the reader to "hear" Cogewea's perspective: she devalues Aboriginal culture and states openly that she would "prefer to [live] the white man's way to that of the reservation Indian" (41). Although a western-educated reader, particularly in early twentieth century, might see this admission as a logical perspective, this colonizing logic is challenged by Stemteemä's authority.

Stemteemä's ethos increases progressively throughout the novel, which refutes Cogewea's earlier claim that her Grandmother's stories and traditions do not have relevance in the modern world. Stemteemä strongly warns Cogewea, "the romantic 'chipmunk of the Okanogans'" to avoid Densmore, "the cold, calculating business man from the east" (81). Because the reader knows through

free indirect discourse that Densmore will never marry “a breed girl of the Okanogans,” who would not fit the “ball room and social functions of city life,” Stemteemä’s warnings appear particularly insightful (87). Stemteemä tells Cogewea that her relationship with Densmore is the path of living death. In each of Stemteemä’s stories, the concept that colonization turns the colonized into the walking dead is a central theme.

For Cogewea’s part, she does not realize she is being taught by Stemteemä who, the omniscient narrator tells us, is “[a] good judge of character,” refuting, once again, the earlier assessment of Stemteemä as primitive and irrelevant. Quite the opposite, when Cogewea asks Stemteemä to relate stories of the past to Densmore, she craftily agrees to Cogewea’s request, but only if Cogewea interprets. In this way, Stemteemä surreptitiously positions Cogewea into the role of active listener, even though Cogewea believes her role is simply to facilitate Densmore’s understanding of the story. Stemteemä’s story is told in two parts that teach the reader more than Cogewea that Indigenous peoples are perceived as marginal objects in the Eurocentric worldview. Moreover, if the Indigenous person believes that he or she can attain legitimacy and value in the colonizer’s world, warns Stemteemä, then the Indigenous person’s spirit will be devoured.

Stemteemä’s story explains first contact between the Black Robes and the Okanogans, which appeared, at first, to be a benign relationship but turned into something much more sinister due to the incommensurability of each culture’s

worldview. The juxtaposition she creates between the Black Robes and the Okanogans parallels Cogewea's and Densmore's incommensurability. As she does with each of her stories, she guides her listeners/readers to understand the story from a certain perspective. That is, when introducing the first part of the story, Stemteemä provides a warning against the colonizer's texts, invoking a Derridean caution regarding the ability of language to both heal and poison: "He [white culture] will no longer lure our children from us with his smooth tongue and books, which here serves to make them bad by imitating the destroyers of our race" (123). Stemteemä knows that the American symbolic order transforms Aboriginals, through such institutional apparatuses as the Carlisle Indian School, into expendable citizenry. However, Cogewea is inculcated through American culture to the point that she cannot see that Stemteemä is referring to her as one of the children who imitates "the destroyers of our race" (123).

Once she has framed her story within an Indigenous moral perspective, Stemteemä narrates the story of her tribe's medicine man, who has a prophetic vision regarding first contact. During an important festival called "spirit days," the medicine man enters into a death-like state, reviving two days later to communicate his terrifying vision of encroaching colonization. Describing the coming colonists as a plague that will spread across the plains, the medicine man predicts that "you [Okanogans] cannot fight them as you do the common enemies of your tribe" (125). The medicine man tells his people that their only hope is to

acquiesce to the teaching of the Black Robes, who will show his people the path to the “hunting grounds of the future that cannot be taken from you” (126). The medicine man exemplifies the colonized consciousness by advising his community to passively follow the path of suffering on earth for heavenly reward. However, Stemteemä’s father eventually learns that the medicine man was correct in his prediction, but incorrect in his interpretation. Stemteemä does not tell her father’s story to Cogewea and Densmore, but to Jim much later in the novel.

Stemteemä’s story that describes the oppositional nature of Indigenous and European worldviews is reinforced by Densmore’s excessively bad behaviour exhibited in the chapter “Swa-lah-kin: The Frog Woman” (156). This chapter is strategically placed in between Stemteemä’s two part story of first contact in order to provide a strong link between Densmore’s current actions and the actions of past colonizers. This connection argues that colonization of Indigenous lands and peoples has not ended but continues in various forms. Moreover, as the chapter’s title implies, Densmore’s worldview is not what dominates Cogewea’s world; rather, it is an Indigenous worldview that controls the action. Densmore’s ignorant and disrespectful behaviour in this chapter not only furthers Stemteemä’s ethos, but also teaches the reader that Cogewea is not a stock sentimental character. The setting of the chapter is a fishing expedition, in which Cogewea makes a bet with Densmore that he cannot catch the first fish. Densmore loses the first bet and then gambles five thousand dollars on the next cast, which he also loses. He does not

pay either debt. Cogwea playfully dismisses Densmore's actions, instead of seeing his behaviour as a warning that Densmore does not keep his promises. Not only does he not keep his promises, Densmore is greedy, desiring to catch more fish simply for sport, which causes Cogwea to scold him: "we have enough fish already. There are still a few left from yesterday's catch, and it is wrong and wasteful to hook them just for misconceived sport" (159). Densmore ignores Cogwea, replying, "wait a moment! I think there is a big shiner by that rock and I want him," which causes Cogwea to remind Densmore not to be selfish and "[I]eave a few for the next fellow who may really need them" (159). This exchange is, in effect, a dialogue between two divergent epistemological systems: one is represented by Densmore as greedy, selfish, and consumerist, and the other is represented by Cogwea as sharing, responsible and community-oriented.

The final offence involves Densmore toying with a small frog with his fishing pole, "mischevously [turning] it over and over towards her"; clearly, he expects a conventional sentimental female reaction, involving tears and recriminations. Instead, Cogwea patiently explains to Densmore that his actions with the frog will bring a violent storm, to which Densmore argues, "I supposed that you were enough educated to know better than to believe all those ridiculous signs of your people" (160). With these words, Densmore expects to trigger Cogwea's internal colonization, which should cause her to dismiss her Aboriginal worldview and, in turn, respond within the conventional expectations for Anglo-

American female behaviour. However, Cogewea will not conform to his expectations. Soon after the argument, a heavy rain starts to fall, proving Cogewea's story and discrediting Densmore even further.

The rain causes the two to run for cover in Stemteemä's tepee, where she uses the opportunity to tell the story of Green Blanket Feet, who was her best friend as a girl. Stemteemä's ethos and influence has increased to the point that she can be described as a type of dramaturge figure, who strategically releases certain information in order to transform actions and behaviours. The story of Green Blanket Feet builds upon and reinforces the lesson that Cogewea should have learned through Densmore's selfish, greedy and dismissive behaviour in the previous chapter. Stemteemä tells her listeners to "keep [this story] after I am gone," invoking a sense of process and continuance. Stemteemä's articulation of process and continuance sharply contrasts the conventional, sentimental representation of Indigenous peoples as rapidly disappearing. Indeed, even though Stemteemä's tale contains the tropes common to sentimental narratives, she precludes sentimental identification by unsympathetically telling the story in plain language. The story is a harrowing tale of an Indigenous woman who marries a white man and has two children by him. He demands that she and her children leave her people in order to live with him in Europe. After she learns that he has a wife waiting for him in Europe who cannot bear children, she realizes that she has been nothing more than a breeder. Eventually, she manages to escape with one

child, who ends up dying soon after her escape. Stemteemä does not want Cogwea to pity or sympathise with Green Blanket Feet, which are both emotions that would place Cogwea in a superior position to Green Blanket Feet. Rather, Stemteemä gravely warns Cogwea that “the fate of Green Blanket Feet is for you; my grandchild unless you turn from [Densmore]” (176). Stemteemä does not create a sentimental connection between Green Blanket Feet as a marginalized, suffering figure and Cogwea as a sympathetic, yet socially separate listener. Stemteemä uses the story of Green Blanket Feet to explain the logical, realistic outcome of Cogwea’s relationship with Densmore.

Cogwea disrespectfully disputes the story’s value by stating that “the wisdom of Stemteemä is of the past,” a charge that unsuccessfully attempts to define Stemteemä as irrelevant in the modern world (176). As Lamont notes, the omniscient narrator authenticates Stemteemä’s predictions, which supplies Stemteemä with a great deal of ethos (387). After this exchange between Cogwea and Stemteemä, Mourning Dove uses free indirect discourse to relay Cogwea’s conflicting thoughts, in which Cogwea “felt she should respect the words of her venerable monitor, [but] she rebelled at the thought that she must not love the fair skinned easterner too well” (177). Clearly, Cogwea suffers from a colonized worldview that clouds her judgment and causes confusion. In this state, she decides to take Densmore’s offer and live in the white world, sacrificing her people to gain the promised reward of legitimacy.

Stemteemä knows that Cogewea has entered into a colonizing relationship with Densmore rather than a relationship based on trust and equality. In her capacity as a dramaturge figure, Stemteemä influences her world through the power of narrative. She summons Jim to her tepee in order to share the second part of the first contact story. In this chapter entitled, “The Second Coming of the Shoyahpee,” Stemteemä does not refer to Jim as a “breed” but supplies his identity clearly: “[y]ou are an Indian” (216). She recognizes the blood-tie between them, which Jim also invokes with Cogewea when he tries to woo her unsuccessfully (202). Although Arnold Krupat criticizes such blood recognition as essentially racist, DiNova states that such “blood-ties” or “memory in the blood” cannot be understood through western epistemology, but instead must be understood within Aboriginal frameworks that characterize such references as assertions of rhetorical and cultural sovereignty (DiNova 37; Momaday qtd in DiNova 37). Thus, when Stemteemä looks carefully at Jim “as if in doubt about confiding to this strong, determined man – a stranger,” she perceives that “the blood-tie was there, strengthened by a mutual knowledge of language”; therefore, she is not racializing Jim to subordinate him but using blood recognition to claim their cultural and linguistic connection as Aboriginals (216). This is not a form of anti-racist racism, as Krupat suggests, but a cultural strategy that creates community and fellowship (4).

Through Stemteemä's stories, Jim learns to value Aboriginal sovereignty and worldview, which allows him to see clearly where his allegiances should lie. She tells Jim that she will narrate her father's story about his second encounter with white people. This attributive claim sets up a subtle shift in the narrative voice. Stemteemä begins as an omniscient narrator and then she dramatically shifts into her father's voice. Through Stemteemä's dramatic narration of her father's story in the present tense, first person voice, the reader simultaneously occupies two temporal spaces within the storytime of the novel: in the tepee with Jim and with the youthful Stemteemä listening to her father speak. This spatiotemporal connection between two apparently distant time periods supplies her father's story of deception and internal colonization with vitality, power, and relevance in the modern world. This story is a continuation of the first contact story that Stemteemä told to Cogewea and Densmore earlier in the novel. In the first part of the story the medicine man had strongly advised his people to submit to the coming avalanche of culturally superior Shoyahpee or whites. In the second part of the story, the reader learns that the medicine man's advice was incorrect. Stemteemä's father follows the medicine man's advice to passively greet the Europeans, who are fur traders, with open arms, only to discover that they do not respect him or his tribe. He allows his sister to marry one of the fur traders, who then abandons his pregnant wife to return to his country. This behaviour stuns Stemteemä's father who admits, "[b]ut it was my fault for giving her [his sister] to

him [the trader] in the belief he was superior to the common man. I was ashamed for my folly!” (224). In order to teach his daughter the dangers of Eurocentric colonization, her father tells his story to Stemteemä, who passes the story on to Jim. Stemteemä’s stories teach the reader to value an Indigenous perspective. Jim accepts Stemteemä’s wisdom, because he is not as well-trained as Cogewea in American ideals. This contrast between Jim and Cogewea further exemplifies the dangers inherent to a Eurocentric education.

Cogewea has not yet learned that she will always be marginalized in the Anglo-American worldview. Like Major Duncan Heyward’s rejection of Cora Munro as a suitable wife in *The Last of the Mohicans*, Cogewea’s mixed race heritage renders her as an unacceptable wife: she cannot guarantee Anglo-American cultural superiority in the home. When Cogewea returns to Stemteemä for her blessing, she warns Cogewea one last time to “avoid the Shoyahpee as you would the coiled rattlesnake” (248). After Stemteemä refuses to acknowledge Densmore as a family member, Cogewea makes her final decision to reject Stemteemä and to remain with Densmore, a decision that causes Cogewea to sit “rigid, seemingly oblivious to her surroundings”; she speaks “listlessly”; and when Stemteemä takes Cogewea’s hand, it lies “limp and lifeless” in Stemteemä’s own (248-250). Clearly, Cogewea is no longer the playful chipmunk of the Okanogans, but the lifeless fiancé of Densmore. Stemteemä’s worst fear is realized as

Cogwea loses her “old self-confidence and balance of mind” to the ravages of internal colonization (253).

Through Stemteemä’s objections and stories, the world that Cogwea desires to live in has been made clear: she will be marginalized and destroyed in Anglo-American culture. However, Mourning Dove reverses Cogwea’s fortunes by transforming the narrative conventions of sentimentality. Instead of Cogwea playing the role of the suffering marginalized figure, the person who comes closest to fulfilling this sentimental convention is an Anglo-American cowboy named Silent Bob. Silent Bob is introduced, like all of Mourning Dove’s characters, with his full name and affiliation, Robert Morgan of Virginia; thus, he is not simply a worker on the HB ranch, but a man with social ties who is “[t]rue as steel [and]... would fight for a friend.” (36). Upon learning that his fellow cowboys, Rodeo Jack and Celluloid Bill, have played a dangerous prank on Densmore that will cause Cogwea harm, Silent Bob breaks the cowboy code of silence by telling Jim that Celluloid Bill and Rodeo Jack lied to Densmore about Cogwea’s wealth. Both Jim and Silent Bob know that once Densmore discovers that Cogwea is poor, he will likely hurt her. When Celluloid Bill finds out that Silent Bob told Jim about the prank, he becomes very angry, because, according to famed cowpuncher, Charles Siringo, Silent Bob has broken “the unwritten law among the punchers to never give away a pal” (Siringo qtd in Weston 8-9). Because Silent Bob breaks this code, he sacrifices his status in the crew as a trusted companion. Silent Bob

tearfully explains to Bill that “it ain I am wantin’ to butt in on no body’s biz’! It’s cause I like th’ little gal an’ I want Jim to win this here race... I hater see him [Densmore] get ‘way with so good a gal; I hater see her get th’ wo’st of th’ deal” (272). Silent Bob, in a rare display of emotion and rhetorical skill, recognizes that Cogwea will get “th’ wo’st of th’ deal” if she marries Densmore. Moreover, Silent Bob’s tearful explanation renders him the suffering character with which the reader should sentimentally identify. Through his sacrifice and tears, his words regarding Cogwea’s and Jim’s worth gain credibility and strength.

After Jim finds out from Silent Bob about Celluloid Bill and Rodeo Jack’s tall tale, Jim asks Stemteemä for guidance. Jim turns to Stemteemä because he has grown to respect his culture. He undergoes decolonization not only through Stemteemä’s stories but also by helping to build her a sweat house. The sweat house experience provides Jim with the wisdom and support to overcome his bitterness and regret over losing Cogwea to Densmore. Through the process of building the sweat house with Mary, Cogwea’s decolonized sister, he decides to stop “tryin’ [so] hard to be Shoyahpee [white]” (242). In another instance of free indirect discourse, Mary’s perspective regarding Jim’s decolonization is given voice: “[Jim] had not scorned the sweat house! He had not thrown aside the beliefs of his Indian forefathers, as had so many of the educated bloods” (241-242). Mary is referring to “educated bloods” like Cogwea, who completely buy into the idea that they have access to privileged Anglo-American citizenship (241-242). Even

though Stemteemä has explained to Cogwea the consequences of such belief through the lesson of Green Blanket Feet, Cogwea assumes that because she is educated and half-white that she can have access to all aspects of American culture.

Cogwea's difficult lesson that she will always be a marginal, devalued identity in Anglo-American culture is not fully learned until Mourning Dove reframes the sentimental scene of sacrifice in the captivity narrative. From the time Cogwea and Densmore leave the ranch to elope, Cogwea is Densmore's captive. At first, she still believes that he means to marry her as an equal partner, never suspecting that he has ulterior motives. However, after Densmore learns that Celluloid Bill and Rodeo Jack lied to him about Cogwea's wealth, he proceeds to interrogate her, savagely beat her and then steal her travelling money. In this captivity formula, the man "without a cross" is not the frontier hero but the serpent-like captor reminiscent of Magua from *The Last of the Mohicans*. Thus Densmore's legitimate identity is degraded through his "perverted nature," which is fully revealed after he captures Cogwea (265). Densmore explains to Cogwea that the law is on his side in this matter, a fact that clearly characterizes Densmore's world as unjust (264). Even though he is the savage captor, her marginalized identity renders her voice silent and powerless to the white authorities who only recognize Densmore as a legitimate person (264). It is his violent behaviour rather than his status as an Anglo-American "gentleman of the

upper society” that classifies Densmore as an outcast (81). On the HB ranch, there are Anglo and Euro-American male characters, two of which are Cogewea’s brothers-in-law, who live symbiotically with the Indigenous characters. There is conflict, but the fights that occur are not based on race or assumed cultural superiority. Therefore, Densmore’s marginalization is based on his criminal behaviour and not his race.

Mourning Dove also transforms the role of sacrificial female captive. When Densmore threatens to break the leg of Cogewea’s horse, Wanawish, Cogewea screams to scare the horse away, causing Densmore to beat her, gag her, tie her to a tree and leave her to die. After Jim finds Cogewea and frees her, he vows that he will kill Densmore, claiming that “they [white authorities] can hang old Jim, ‘cause all counts is then goin’ be settled” (278). Jim has not been completely decolonized because he still values life based on an American balance sheet of value. Jim will settle Densmore’s debt to Cogewea through his sacrifice in the name of justice. This cost is too high for Cogewea, who uses her sentimental, sacrificial power as a suffering captive to order Jim not to sacrifice himself on her behalf. Instead of furthering sacrificial violence, Cogewea refuses to participate any further in the sentimental and sacrificial discourses that support white hegemony. Cogewea’s refusal is reinforced in the final chapter, where Jim once again declares that he wished he could have killed Densmore for his crime, after which Cogewea reminds Jim, and by extension the reader, that Densmore’s

world is an “impossible fearfulness! A dreadful hallucination! A nightmare of lies! It is dead!” (283). Cogewea’s references to hallucinations and nightmares metaphorically describe her internal colonization by American ideologies that clouded her judgment and caused her to reject her Indigenous culture. Mourning Dove makes clear that Cogewea’s education in American culture heavily mediated her choices throughout the novel. It is only after she nearly dies as Densmore’s captive that Cogewea gains the clarity of mind to repudiate the colonizing discourses that prescribe her marginal and expendable role in American society.

Tayo’s Refusal

Like *Cogewea*, *Ceremony* sharply critiques the colonizing discourses of sentimentality and sacrifice. Perhaps *Ceremony* is even more overtly critical because Silko’s narrative is written after several wars in which First Nations men sacrificed their lives in the name of an American greater good. Michael Yellow Bird asks why so many First Nations peoples “have ‘outsourced [their] thinking’ to the United States with respect to when and why we should or should not go to war”(Yellow Bird). Silko addresses this question by suggesting that First Nations peoples are beguiled by the promise of legitimacy offered via national sacrifice. Through *Ceremony*, Silko argues that Indigenous peoples must learn new ways to resist the lure of legitimacy that national sacrifice offers. That is, pre-contact ceremonies and stories transmit a sense of identity, but are not strong enough to

eradicate internal colonization, a fact that Mourning Dove explains through Cogewea's relationship with Stemteemä. Each discourse of internal colonization, such as sentimentality and sacrifice, must be removed through new narrative practices that will enable cultural healing.

Most criticism on *Ceremony* can be classified as either relating the novel's action to historical events or arguing that the novel celebrates and/or exemplifies cultural healing. Peter Biedler and Robert M. Nelson connect the plot and setting of the novel to real events and places, providing photographs of the sites that Silko depicts. Connie Jacobs discusses the historical relevance of the Jackpile mine where Emo sacrifices Harley as Tayo looks on. Alexandra Ganzer posits the hybridity expressed in Silko's narrative as a representation of the healed rift between Anglo-American and First Nations peoples. Troy Bassett argues that both Rocky and Tayo suffer from colonization, but are rejuvenated by the end of *Ceremony*. Similarly, Jace Weaver argues that Tayo suffers from the disease of colonialism, which is cured by Tayo's "re-membering himself in the collective" (216). My argument builds on the work done by Bassett, Ganzer, and Weaver regarding Tayo's decolonization. Like Cogewea and Jim, I claim, Tayo must undergo a process of decolonization that culminates in a scene of captivity and sacrifice. This climactic scene teaches Tayo to recognize, watch, and avoid the discourses of colonization, including sentimentality and sacrifice.

Sacrificial patriotic duty is represented in *Ceremony* as an infection that spreads through the lifelong process of internal colonization. Both Albert Memmi and Frantz Fanon assert that colonizers use similar techniques to oppress and infect the colonized internally. Each colonizing nation in the contemporary period deploys similar modes of neo-colonial power that are rooted in deeply valued narratives, such as constitutions, legislation, and national literatures. These modes of neo-colonial power ostensibly offer a deracinated, civilized life to a colonized people, who are trained to believe that the colonizer's race and culture are superior. This paradigm functions in the United States through promises of full citizenship with all its associated material and social privilege if Aboriginals serve the nation by willingly sacrificing their lives to sustain the neo-colonial status-quo.

In *Ceremony*, when First Nations peoples believe in American patriotism, the result is physical, psychical, and social death. This dangerous belief is exemplified through Tayo, who loses the majority of his friends to the ravages of sacrificial, patriotic duty. These sacrificial deaths are juxtaposed with natural deaths, such as that of Tayo's Uncle Josiah, who contributed to the community and then died naturally, which is the order in which life should unfold. In contrast, Indigenous soldiers, such as Tayo's cousin Rocky, who is described as Tayo's spiritual brother, are deluded into believing that because they serve the U.S., they will reap rewards, such as social acceptance and material goods. Rocky sentimentally identifies with the image of the patriotic soldier fulfilling his

national duty. Rocky's sentimental identification glosses over the reality that war is not desirable but destructive, painful, and rarely just. This reality is exemplified through Rocky's gruesome death (11). Even First Nations soldiers who return physically unharmed in *Ceremony* are represented as socially dead, drinking themselves to death. In the midst of the depressing realities of post-war reservation life, Tayo's renewed sense of value, which is gained through the ceremonies and stories of Ku'oosh and Betonie, offers a small window of hope. *Ceremony* strikes a balance between cultural critique and healing narrative. As Betonie repeatedly states, healing the People and achieving balance is not easy, and this effective use of litotes strongly implies that Tayo's cure is only one positive case out of a litany of losses (125, 152). Tayo's difficult his journey or - as Betonie calls it - his ceremony represents the slow process of decolonizing Indigenous consciousness.

Silko communicates Tayo's journey to decolonization through a combination of Pueblo and Navajo stories and the post-modern novel. Silko parallels Tayo's Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) with his struggle to purge colonizing discourses. The arrangement of the text reinforces these parallel plots: the left-justified prose of the novel communicates Tayo's fight to purge the "metanarrative of westering, manifest destiny, and individualism that separates humanity from the world we inhabit" (Owens 175). In contrast, the Indigenous stories are centred on the page and explain how Eurocentric colonization and the

associated ideals of national sacrifice came to infect the world. Based on the textual layout, it is not only the content, but also the form of the novel that communicates the narrative. The centred typesetting places the First Nations narrative as central or at the centre of this textual universe, which supports Silko's assertion through the voice of Betonie that white people do not cause colonization; rather, colonization is a form of witchery invented by Aboriginals in the first place, an assertion that redistributes the power of creation, destruction, and healing from white to Aboriginal responsibility (132). That is, the Aboriginal stories explain the origins of sacrificial duty, which is analogous to the framing of Mourning Dove's popular western within an Aboriginal lesson story. Consequently, both authors empower Aboriginal knowledge. In addition, the textual format of *Ceremony* creates a textual separation between two nations, reflecting the state of lived reality in North America. While the textual design mirrors two related, yet sovereign nations, the content of each narrative reflects two cultures poisoned by the witchery of colonizing discourses.

Silko's novel functions to expose the colonizing rhetoric that masquerades as patriotic duty. American patriotism sells the idea that in order to be a good American, a citizen must be willing and always ready to sacrifice or be sacrificed for the national home. Tayo's brother, Rocky, and his friends on the Laguna reserve believe wholeheartedly that they are part of America; so much so that they fervently desire the illusory privilege offered to them by serving and/or sacrificing

themselves “defending the land they had already lost” (169). Rocky ends up as one of many sentimental sacrifices that U.S. citizens mourn as a necessary loss for the nation, and the decolonized Laguna people mourn as an unjustified loss that affects all social members.

As discussed in previous chapters, sentimental sacrifice articulates an exchange of cultural capital, whereby those who sacrifice for the nation obtain greater status and social recognition, yet this status is often fleeting. If the sacrificial person lives, then he or she must return to everyday life once the crisis has passed. If the sacrificial person dies, then only the beneficiaries of the sacrifice are left to honour the dead. The rewards of national sacrifice would seem to be unappealing, yet the discourse of sentimental, national feeling trains citizens to believe that national sacrifice is a desirable goal. Silko locates this discourse in the pamphlets and words of the army recruiter who uses patriotic sentimental sacrifice as a powerful speech-act to promise Rocky and Tayo elevated social status:

“Now I know you boys love America as much as we [Anglo-Americans] do, but this is your big chance to *show* it! He stood up then, as he had rehearsed, and looked them in the eye sincerely. He handed them color pamphlets with a man in a khaki uniform and gold braid on the cover; in the background,

behind the figure in the uniform, there was a gold eagle with its wings spread across an American flag.

Rocky read each page of the pamphlet carefully. He looked up at Tayo and his face was serious and proud. (64)

Rocky is willing to gamble his life to prove his worth, while Tayo is not fully convinced. The recruiter fervently explains to Tayo and Rocky that Indigenous peoples can join with Anglo-Americans in patriotic status as long as they “*show it!*” The images that encode patriotic duty on the recruiter’s pamphlet are described in plain language. Silko does not state that a proud American soldier stands in front of his flag; rather, she describes the images without fanfare, a technique that neutralizes the ability of these patriotic symbols to create sentimental attachments. However, Rocky’s “serious and proud” expression shows that he has sentimentally identified with the image of the soldier who sacrifices for his country.

It is important to note that before the recruitment scene, Silko reinforces the idea that narratives of any kind have the power to heal or hurt, depending on the motive:

They aren’t just entertainment

Don’t be fooled.

They are all we have, you see,
All we have to fight off illness and death.

You don't have anything
If you don't have the stories (2)

Similar to Derrida's assertion that language is both remedy and poison, Silko exposes for scrutiny the stories that cause Aboriginal destruction, such as the Army recruiter's stock of patriotic narratives, and stories that restore health, such as the narratives provided by Betonie. She explains how the destruction of Aboriginal stories encourages assimilation, because if the stories of a culture are "confused or forgotten," then the culture is materially damaged or destroyed (2). Lee Maracle explains that "words are not to be wasted. They represent the accumulated knowledge, cultural values, the vision of an entire people or peoples. We [Indigenous peoples] believe the proof of a thing or idea is in the doing. Doing requires some form of social interaction and thus story is the most persuasive and sensible way to present the accumulated thoughts and values of a people" (235). One of the foundational components of Aboriginal epistemology is that stories can bring life or death. When colonizing discourses, such as sentimentality and sacrifice, are critiqued within Aboriginal stories, these

discourses are shown to bring pain, suffering, and death to internally colonized Indigenous peoples.

Tayo suffers from a form of internal colonization that causes him to have severe panic attacks. His physical symptoms include vomiting and shaking, which strongly suggest some kind of poisoning, although the doctors at the Veteran's Hospital believe he suffers from battle fatigue. The narrator explains that battle fatigue is not the correct diagnosis:

He could get no rest as long as the memories were tangled in with the present, tangled up like coloured threads from Old Grandma's wicker sewing basket...He could feel the inside of his skull – the tension of little threads being pulled and how it was with tangled things, things tied together, and as he tried to pull them apart and rewind them into their places, they snagged and tangled even more. (7)

Tayo struggles to untangle the poisonous threads of colonizing discourses that categorize, stereotype, and flatten Native peoples into usable objects. Silko's metaphoric description of these tangled discursive threads resonates deeply with Foucault's and Bourdieu's concepts that discourses can constrain individuals within linguistically formed cultural identities. In essence, Tayo is entangled

within discourses that try to transform him into dehumanizing stereotypes, such as the Noble Native who fights to protect the United States of America and then peacefully vanishes, or the Drunk Indian, who vanishes into the malaise of alcohol. In order to communicate the effect these tangled discourses have on Tayo, Silko situates her readers into a narrative that occupies multiple temporalities and spaces.

In the opening scenes of the novel, Silko organizes the spatiotemporality of the narrative into two spaces: the Laguna reserve, in which Tayo is a mentally ill veteran, and the jungles of the Philippines, where Tayo and Rocky are eventually captured by Japanese soldiers. These spaces create a metaphoric parallel between Tayo's captive status within colonizing discourses and his captive status by Japanese soldiers. Both roles require Tayo to believe that he is a member of U.S. society called upon to fulfill his role as a living sacrifice. The necessity of national service has been instilled in Tayo through American narratives from the Pledge of Allegiance to novels and films. While Tayo has been educated in the U.S. school system, he is also a member of the Laguna nation;²⁸ therefore, even though his

²⁸ Prior to 1924, Native Americans did not have the right to vote if they maintained tribal affiliations, but by 1924, most Aboriginal nations residing within the U.S. gained suffrage (Utah was the last in 1956). In essence, Native Americans like Tayo can vote in tribal elections and U.S. elections. However, the issue in *Ceremony* is not how *American* Tayo is, but what the strictures of U.S. nationhood do to Tayo and his community. *Voting Rights and Citizenship*. The City University of New York.

http://www1.cuny.edu/portal_ur/content/voting_cal/americans_chinese.html (August 23, 2006).

outward appearance is of a traditional U.S. soldier who must hate an assigned enemy, in this case the Japanese, Tayo cannot fully or easily conform to U.S. national expectations. That is, his psyche is not only structured by an American national symbolic order,²⁹ but also by the Laguna symbolic order that tells him overtly that the Japanese soldiers he is ordered to kill are not nameless, faceless monsters, but are related to him:

When the sergeant told them to kill all the Japanese soldiers lined up in front of the cave with their hands on their heads, Tayo could not pull the trigger. The fever made him shiver, and the sweat was stinging his eyes and he couldn't see clearly; in that instant he saw Josiah standing there; the face was dark from the sun, and the eyes were squinting as though he were about to smile at Tayo. So Tayo stood there stiff with nausea, while they fired at the soldiers, and he watched his uncle fall, and he *knew* it was Josiah." (8)

²⁹ This Lacanian term is used by Lauren Berlant to describe the tangled cluster of political, juridical, genetic, territorial, linguistic and experiential processes that comprise any nation (*The Anatomy of National Fantasy* 3).

For a western reader, Tayo's inability to distinguish between a Japanese soldier and his Uncle Josiah appears to be a classic case of battle fatigue or PTSD. Later in the novel, Betonie explains to Tayo that he naturally felt a connection with the Japanese people who "thirty thousand years ago...were not strangers" (124). However, Biedler diminishes Betonie's explanation by suggesting that Silko "humanizes the Japanese" because "she felt growing sympathies for the North Vietnamese people who were being killed by American soldiers" (31). In opposition to Biedler, Louis Owens argues that Tayo's apparent misrecognition of the Japanese soldier as Josiah is not a *misrecognition* at all but a *recognition* that "in a crucial sense the executed man was Josiah, that all men and women are one and all phenomena inextricably interrelated" (175). Silko could have assigned the Japanese soldier the identity of Robert or maybe even Auntie, but the choice of Josiah is strategic in order to speak clearly to the level of interconnection there is amongst humanity. Moreover, Silko chooses Josiah to be interchangeable with the Japanese soldier to teach a powerful lesson in the worth of all humans regardless of cultural affiliation.

Throughout the course of the novel, Josiah is the relative who teaches Tayo all he knows. Therefore, when Tayo is asked to commit murder in the name of a greater good, Tayo sees the connection between himself and the Japanese soldier so powerfully that the Japanese soldier is not just transformed into any member of Tayo's Laguna Pueblo community, but into the person who taught Tayo how to

navigate his world. Leroy LittleBear explains that “[t]eaching through actual experience is done by relatives: for example, aunts teaching girls and uncles teaching boys. One relative usually takes a young child under his or her wing, assuming the responsibility for teaching the child all she or he knows about the culture and survival” (81). Therefore, Tayo’s recognition of the Japanese soldier as Josiah is not only a left-wing political anti-war statement, as Biedler suggests, but, most importantly, a lesson that as a Laguna Pueblo, Tayo is not meant to be fighting U.S. wars. His abandonment of his community is tantamount to murdering all Josiah taught him, which equates to murdering Josiah himself.

Rocky does not share Tayo’s sense of deep separation from Pueblo land and values. Even though he is Tayo’s cousin and the two characters identify as brothers, Rocky “has fallen victim to the authoritative discourse of EuroAmerica” (Owens 175). This authoritative discourse comprises a litany of master discourses and supporting discursive clusters: each one obfuscating the interrelated nature of the other in a never ending tangle of discursive deception. Within the tangled structure of “authoritative discourse” in America is the commanding master discourse of patriotism that promotes the desire to serve the American nation as a living sacrifice. In deference to national sacrificial duty, Rocky patriotically sacrifices himself for the greater good of the nation. Rocky’s patriotic rhetoric is instrumental in convincing Tayo not only to enlist with him, but also to play by the rules of national sacrifice. Rocky, much like Cogewea, believes that he is

privileged as long as he plays by the rules of U.S. nationhood, which define Aboriginal epistemology and ontology as irrational:

Rocky had reasoned it out with [Tayo]; it was impossible for the dead man to be Josiah, because Josiah was an old Laguna man, thousands of miles from the Philippines jungles and Japanese armies “He’s probably up on some mesa right now chopping wood,” Rocky said. He smiled and shook Tayo’s shoulders. “Hey, I know you’re homesick. But, Tayo, we’re *supposed* to be here. This is what we’re supposed to do.” (8)

Rocky is caught in a grammar of responsibility that demands acquiescence to U.S. national concerns. The adjectival phrase “supposed to” defines Rocky and Tayo’s responsibility to fulfil their sacrificial civic duty. Rocky explains his position with absolute authority and reason, which Tayo brings into question as he “examine[s] the facts and logic again and again the way Rocky explained it to him; the facts made what he had seen [the Japanese soldier as Josiah] an impossibility” (8). According to Paul Ricoeur, “logic” and “facts” are terms of cultural privilege that value certain discourses above others on a hierarchical scale. The logic of defending American interests abroad makes complete sense to Rocky, who is internally colonized by the discursive logic of American patriotism, but for Tayo

such patriotic fervour clashes with his Indigenous values, causing what appears to be mental illness. Tayo suffers from this tangle of competing worldviews that physically manifest as “shivering,” “a swelling in his belly,” and a “great swollen grief...pushing into his throat” (7-8). These symptoms occur directly after Rocky explains the logic of what they are “supposed to do,” which is to sacrifice themselves for the greater national good (7-8).

Tayo’s symptoms worsen in the Veteran’s Hospital, manifesting as an inability to speak or be seen in the American world. Tayo literally plays the role of the Vanishing Indian, until a doctor opens the lines of communication by asking,

[I]f he [Tayo] had ever been visible, and Tayo spoke to him [the doctor] softly and said he was sorry but nobody was allowed to speak to an invisible one. But the new doctor persisted; he came each day, and his questions dissolved the edge of the fog, and his voice sounded louder every time he came. The sun was dissolving the fog, and one day Tayo heard a voice answering the doctor. The voice was saying, “He can’t talk to you. He is invisible. His words are formed with an invisible tongue, they have no sound.” (15)

In this small scene, the race of the American doctor is immaterial. The point is that the doctor perceives Tayo as a valuable human being with valid beliefs and feelings: a fact utterly ignored by Rocky. Rocky's patriotic words and then sacrificial death for a country that demanded his allegiance but rejected his culture make Tayo realize that he is, indeed, invisible in American culture.

However, the American doctor is unable to cure Tayo with psychiatry, which is a system designed to cure those who do not behave as they should within the American symbolic order, which is not Tayo's symbolic order. Tayo leaves the hospital feeling that he is once again visible to the world, but he is still infected with a sacrificial logic that Tayo tries to literally vomit out of his body, as if purging his body of poison. During his journey home, Tayo violently vomits at the train station, where no one tries to help him except for a Japanese-American woman and her son. Even though the woman tries to comfort Tayo, he categorizes her as one of "those people" who should be locked up (18). Notably, when Tayo is complicit within the discourses of American culture, such as patriotic duty and racism, he becomes physically ill: "he could still see the face of the little [Japanese] boy, looking back at him, smiling and he tried to vomit that image from his head because it was Rocky's smiling face from a long time before, when they were little kids together" (18). Once again, Aboriginal epistemology is in conflict with American colonizing logic as Tayo transforms his Americanized perception

of the Japanese boy as an enemy into the Aboriginal perception of the child as someone intimately connected to him.

Tayo continues to suffer under the strain of these competing worldviews after he returns home from the hospital. His formal education prevents him from valuing his Indigenous education as a necessary and important part of his identity. Similar to Cogewea's experiences at the Carlisle School, Tayo's Anglo-American teachers taught Tayo and Rocky to recategorize Pueblo epistemology as "nonsense" (19). In the introduction to this dissertation, I discussed the term "sense" as a designation of value that characterizes experience as valid or invalid. Tayo's teacher categorizes his cultural beliefs as illegitimate via the term "non-sense." Tayo's Indigenous upbringing by Josiah and his American education compete for primacy in Tayo's psyche, causing what modern psychiatry terms mental illness. However, Aboriginal philosophy defines Tayo's condition as an indication that he has lost his place within the world. In such a condition, it takes a "great deal of energy to be a human being," particularly when a person invests in a culture that has such a narrow view of humanity (25). That is, Tayo is not perceived as fully human in U.S. culture unless he fulfills certain stereotypical expectations and traits that completely contradict the values of his Indigenous community. Over the course of the novel, the reader comes to learn that Tayo may have been held captive by the Japanese, but he has not returned to freedom in the U.S.; rather, he moves from one form of captivity to the next.

Many members of Tayo's family, particularly Rocky's mother, who is Tayo's Auntie, believe in the U.S. economics of sacrifice. She buys into the concept that patriotically believing in God and country will confer social status and validation. For Auntie, Rocky's death is "the accident of time and space: Rocky was the one who was alive, buying grandma her heater with the round dial on the front; Rocky was there in the college game scores on the sports page of the Albuquerque Journal. It was him, Tayo, who had died, but somehow there had been a mistake with the corpses, and somehow his was still unburied" (28). Rocky brought the promise of material comfort and warm acceptance from a nation that demands sacrifice in exchange. While Auntie resents Tayo's survival, she understands the power that Rocky's sentimental sacrifice gives her with "those who count crosses" who "would not count her sacrifices for Rocky the way they counted her sacrifices for her dead sister's half-breed child...his death gave her new advantages with the people: she had given so much" (30). Rocky's sacrifice is also Auntie's sacrifice from which she gains the ethos and power given to those who suffer in the U.S. national sphere. Uncannily similar to the blessings bestowed upon Mary Rowlandson by Increase Mather for her afflictions, Auntie assumes the mantle of suffering and sacrifice to gain privileged access to a community "who count crosses." In the introduction to Mary Rowlandson's narrative, Increase Mather explains that her sacrifices were "the worst of evils working together for the best good. How evident it is that the Lord hath made this

Gentlewoman a gainer by all this affliction” (11). Auntie participates in this long-standing exchange of suffering for gain. As well, the “counting of crosses” metaphorically assigns pain as a measurable commodity, denoting a scale of membership within a privileged community that demands suffering and sacrifice in exchange for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Unlike Auntie, Old Grandma can see that more suffering and sacrifice is not what Tayo requires; he needs the poison of internal colonization to be excised. She calls upon Ku’oosh, an elder and medicine man, to perform the rituals and ceremonies that will heal Tayo’s wounded psyche. In his first meeting with Ku’oosh, the narrative is focalized through Tayo’s colonized consciousness as he describes Ku’oosh’s use of language as “childish,” which makes Tayo ashamed (34). Ku’oosh initiates Tayo’s journey to health through the power of orature and story to “combat evil” and “heal the people” (Weaver 214). Although Ku’oosh is able to give Tayo initial relief, the narrative structure suggests that Tayo, and the reader, need to first understand the nature of the discourse that poisons Tayo and the other veterans before a second medicine man, Betonie, can offer guidance toward permanent relief.

Ku’oosh provides the first part of Tayo’s antidote to colonialism by reminding Tayo that the community is only as strong as its members. He explains to Tayo that the community relies on each member to understand and bear responsibility for “the intricacies of continuing process” that is dependent on

correct interpretation, otherwise chaos, imbalance, and, ultimately, harm to “this fragile world” ensues (35-36). After Silko voices the interrelated importance of the individual and the community through Ku’oosh, she then has Tayo explain the pathology of sentimental sacrifice. Tayo’s expository denouncement of sentimental sacrificial exchange is placed textually after Tayo’s inability to reconcile or, more properly, categorize “the white war” within Ku-oosh’s delicate webs of language: “He didn’t know how to explain what had happened. He did not know how to tell [Ku’oosh] that he had not killed any enemy or that he did not think that he had. But that he had done things far worse, and the effects were everywhere” (36). Ku’oosh cannot comprehend that Tayo’s inculcation into the social and linguistic order of the colonizer’s world has created conflicting worldviews. For example, the western mode of modern warfare that entails “killing across great distances without knowing who or how many had died,” starkly contrasts Ku’oosh’s healing ceremony that demands intimate knowledge of the enemy (36). This kind of dehumanizing slaughter is beyond Ku’oosh’s healing capabilities.

Silko explains Ku’oosh’s failure through a story about the origins of colonization. Within the centred text representing Indigenous philosophy, the narrator explains that the discourses of colonization are the product of witchery, which teaches the reader that neither whites nor Aboriginals have control of this evil that is destroying both worlds. The narrator tells the story of how Europeans

were unleashed on First Nations peoples by a witch who told a story that set colonization in motion. The witch is asked by his fellow witches, who are terrified by the consequences of this story, to retract the story, only to be told “*It’s already turned loose/ It’s already coming/ It can’t be called back*” (138). This description of colonization as a type of witchery and/or power that is not controlled by an overarching dominant group resonates with Foucault’s description of how power circulates:

Power is exercised through networks, and individuals do not simply circulate in these networks; they are in a position to both submit to and exercise this power. They are never inert or consenting targets of power; they are always its relays. In other words, power passes through individuals [transmitted via discourses]. It is not applied to them.

It is therefore, I think, a mistake to think of the individual as a sort of elementary nucleus, a primitive atom or some multiple, inert matter to which power is applied, or which is struck by power that subordinates or destroys individuals. In actual fact, one of the first effects of [European/Euro-American] power is that it allows bodies, gestures, discourses, and desires to be identified

and constituted as something individual. (*Society Must be Defended* 29-30)

Foucault's and Silko's theories intersect at the point where neither theorist assigns power to a particular dominant group, but instead Foucault and Silko describe power as a signifying force circulating to produce and reproduce a certain social order. That is, colonizing discourses are not believed in by choice, but actually constitute identities. In order for Tayo to be decolonized, he must remove the national discourses that are sutured into his being, which explains why his resistance to colonizing discourses causes him so much pain. Ku'oosh can only remind Tayo that he is integral to the community, but cannot undo the sutures that bind patriotic discourse to Tayo's self, because he lacks the knowledge of how this witchery functions: it is Tayo's duty to bring this knowledge to Ku'oosh, and, by extension, the reader.

Silko explains how colonizing discourses can render Ku'oosh unable to help Tayo and cause Tayo and his friends to medicate themselves with alcohol. In a bar that is filled with veterans who suffer from the same physical symptoms of internal colonization as Tayo, including "tight-bellies," and "choked up throats," Tayo and his friends bitterly reminisce about their post-war loss of privilege (40). From this dehumanized position in the bar, Silko uses analepsis to push the reader back into a time when Tayo, Rocky, Harley, and the other Aboriginal veterans

gained status as citizens who sacrificed themselves for the national good. The narrator of this nostalgic story is not clearly defined, suggesting that any one of the veterans could act as the first person narrator:

White women never looked at me until I put on the uniform, and then by God I was a US Marine and they came crowding around. All during the war they'd say to me, "Hey soldier, you sure are handsome. All that thick black hair." "Dance with me," the blonde girl said...They [white people] never asked me if I was an Indian; sold me as much beer as I could drink." (41)

The markers of race that usually produce revulsion are transformed into objects of desire; indeed, the narrator's race is elided completely because no one asks if he is Indian. The narrator's sudden leap from a devalued identity to an excess of cultural capital is enabled by the uniform of national sacrifice, which allows the devalued citizen to buy his way into valued status with the promise of sacrificial death. The final line in this section is "Hey, whose turn to buy," which returns the reader to the present moment in narrative time in order to reinforce the social decay of the First Nations veteran, who constantly returns to a time of acceptance and adoration.

After the story of the social acceptance and privilege conferred via the uniform, the narrative picks up again in a very small section that is set off from the previous narrative sequence, indicating that this event, though small, is pivotal. Through free indirect discourse, Tayo narrates his experience of privilege:

The first day in Oakland he and Rocky walked down the street together and a big Chrysler stopped in the street and an old white woman rolled down the window and said, “God Bless you, God Bless you,” but it was the uniform, not them, she blessed. (41)

This small paragraph illustrates the fatal mistake made by Tayo’s war buddies, Harley, Pinkie, and Emo: it is the uniform of national sacrifice and not the person in the uniform that transmits the discourses of sentimentality and sacrifice. The wealthy white woman decodes the uniform to mean that these Indigenous boys will sacrifice their lives for her. Her sentimental identification with these marginalized figures who will suffer on her behalf confers value to Tayo and Rocky’s devalued identities. However, sentimental identification is based on a superior identity valuing an inferior identity; thus, Rocky and Tayo both gain value through sentimental identification but are still not equal to the white woman.

Directly after this lesson in the operation of sentimentality and sacrifice, Tayo becomes enraged and sickened by the nostalgic reminiscences over patriotic

duty to a nation that honours the symbol of service over the actual service these men performed. Tayo powerfully reminds his friends of their actual roles as soldiers as opposed to their nostalgic fantasies:

“America! America!” he sang, “God shed his grace on thee.”

He stopped and pulled a beer away from Harley.

“One time there were these Indians, see. They put on uniforms, cut their hair. They went off to a big war. They had a real good time too. Bars served them booze, old white ladies on the street smiled at them. At Indians, remember that, because that’s all they were. Indians. These Indians fucked white women, they had as much as they wanted too. They were Macarthur’s boys; white whores took their money same as anyone. These Indians got treated same as anyone: Wake Island, Iwo Jima. They got the same medals for bravery, the same flag over the coffin.” (42)

The first nostalgic story of privilege and acceptance is blended with Tayo’s memory of recognition by the white woman. In this version, Tayo retells the story using language that recasts the original narrator’s experiences as profane and unpleasant. Instead of women fawning over Indigenous soldiers, the “Indians fucked...white whores who took their money the same as anyone,” implying that

the “blonde girl” from the first story was a whore who only slept with Indian soldiers because of the uniform (42). That is, unless the Indigenous person is willing to sacrifice himself for the greater good of the American nation, he has little to no status in American culture. Tayo’s friends ignore his lesson, turning up the jukebox to drown out Tayo. Harley, Emo, and Pinkie’s actions indicate the degree of internal colonization that they suffer, but Tayo will not be stopped as he continues to unravel the deception of sentimental sacrifice:

Tayo yelled, “No! No. I didn’t finish this story yet. See these dumb Indians thought these good times would last. They didn’t ever want to give up the cold beer and the blonde cunt. Hell no! They were America the Beautiful too, this was the land of the free just like the teachers said in school. They had the uniform and they didn’t look different no more. They got respect....I’m a half-breed. I’ll be the first to say it. I’ll speak for both sides. First time you walked down the street in Gallup or Albuquerque, you knew. Don’t lie. You knew right away. The war was over, the uniform was gone. All of a sudden that man at the store waits on you last, makes you wait until all the white people bought what they wanted. And the white lady at the bus depot, she’s real careful now not to touch your hand when she counts out your

change. You watch it slide across the counter at you, and you know. Goddamn it! You stupid sonofabitches! You know!” (42)

After Tayo finishes his speech, the narrative is focalized through his thoughts. He laments for his friends who desire to bring back the glory days, when the uniform elided race and its promise of sacrificial death removed the shame of Indian-ness from them. Tayo wonders why his friends blame themselves for losing this privilege and not the white people who have the apparent power to confer and remove approval. Based on the logic of sacrificial exchange, Tayo and his friends, unlike Rocky, did not die as they were meant to and so the sacrificial exchange is not complete. Therefore, they must return to being untouchables in the caste system of American society. Tayo weeps over his inability to reach his friends, but they do not understand his tears and believe he is crying “about what the Japs did to Rocky,” because tears for Rocky’s sacrifice are legitimate, but tears over the colonized Native veterans are not.

While Tayo correctly defines the fleeting legitimacy that sacrificial duty conferred, Tayo misinterprets the source of Indigenous colonization. He blames the white people, even though the white people are just as much under the spell of patriotic witchery as the Aborigines. Through Betonie’s ceremonies and stories, Tayo comes to understand the breadth and depth of colonization. That is, the discourses that operate to sustain white hegemony are not “applied” by white

people but are diffusely spread across cultural networks. Unlike Ku'oosh who cannot comprehend the discursive witchery of colonization, Betonie can help Tayo because he uses new ceremonies and stories to decolonize Indigenous consciousness. Betonie mixes Aboriginal practice with American cultural artefacts, a methodology that is analogous to Silko's blend of western and Aboriginal storytelling traditions in *Ceremony*. Indeed, Betonie may well be the implied author's voice, because Silko also functions as "a traditional storyteller [remaking] the story, reforming it, moulding it to fit new situations and times, she [and Betonie are] not inventing it. The story, and all of the stories within it, is part of the primal matrix that cycles and recycles infinitely (Owens 170). Tayo must journey through many experiences and lessons taught by a variety of characters who are drawn from Pueblo and Navajo belief, such as Corn Woman, until he understands not only his place in the foundational stories that comprise the world, but also that colonizing discourses are as dangerous, empty and ultimately useless as Ck'o'yo magic.

Betonie helps Tayo to understand that he is not alone in his struggle to fight colonizing discourses; he is part of a larger process that "cycles and recycles infinitely" (Owens 170). The Indigenous stories that parallel his journey to wellness provide support and guidance. For example, the story of how the People angered Corn Woman by "playing around" with Ck'o'yo magic occurs directly after Tayo tries and fails to teach his friends how sentimental sacrifice functions in

American culture. In this story, a false medicine man misleads the People by showing them how to use the flashy and useless Ck'o'yo magic. The People stop caring for the corn altar, because the medicine man promised his magic would give the plants and animals life, but "[t]hey didn't know it was all just a trick" (48). The neglect of the People angers the Corn Mother who pronounces "[i]f they like the magic so much, let them live off it" and so the droughts begin. The People are, of course, sorry they ever played around with the false magic, and their quests to appease the Corn Mother leads to many lessons that directly parallel Tayo's didactic journey. At the preliminary stage of the journey, the trials are difficult, but nowhere near as violent or horrific as later in the novel when the depth and evil of the Ck'o'yo magic or colonizing discourses are revealed.

The scene of sacrifice located at the end of novel, where Harley is sacrificed instead of Tayo by Emo, is explained by literary critic Shamoan Zamir as Silko's attempt at high modernist literary discourse. Because Zamir does not read the novel from the worldview in which it was produced, his reading tends to discredit *Ceremony's* importance. On the one hand, Zamir accuses Silko of abandoning her community in favour of "Western high modernism's reactionary appropriation of a global mythology of sacrificial rejuvenation" (400); on the other, Zamir acknowledges that this scene, and the novel as a whole, encodes a "sacrificial economy gone wild under the impact of the contemporary political economy of colonization" (400). However, because Zamir critiques *Ceremony* as

a high modernist text, he does not accurately critique the purpose of sacrifice in *Ceremony*. Silko may or may not be using the conventions of high modernism, but she is, in reality, writing from an Indigenous perspective. She writes to repair the damage done to her community via colonizing discourses and policies.

Zamir's article is crucial reading for those studying *Ceremony*, particularly his discussion of Laguna's designation as a National Sacrifice Area by the Nixon administration. However, because he analyses *Ceremony* as an object of western intellectual scrutiny rather than an authoritative source of knowledge, he slips into evaluative criticism of Silko's literary techniques. Zamir claims that Silko drew the pivotal scene of sacrifice in the novel from T.S. Eliot's *The Wasteland* and implies that her use of modernist techniques is not true to her Pueblo culture.

Quite to the contrary, Silko's blend of western and Indigenous storytelling traditions help her to communicate the conflicting worldviews that plague not only Tayo, but also Emo.

Emo, who fully believes in the ideals of self-less patriotism, knows that he did not receive the promised payout for his national sacrifice, as he complains, "[w]e fought their war for them...But they got everything. And we don't got shit, do we? Huh?" (55). Emo's bitterness is a result of his internal colonization, but unlike Tayo, who suffers because he fights to value his Indigenous culture, Emo's pain results from his absolute belief in the supremacy of American culture, of which he sees himself as disenfranchised member: "[w]e were the best. U.S.

Army. We butchered every Jap we found. No Jap bastard was fit to take prisoner”

(61). Emo identifies himself as a synecdochic representation of the U.S. Army.

Although he values himself, it is a metonymic value based on the ability of those around him, namely his friends, to identify him as the U.S. Army incarnate, which, in turn, makes him believe that he belongs to “the best.” Through free indirect discourse, the full extent of Emo’s colonized consciousness becomes terrifyingly clear:

Emo had liked what they [the Army] showed him: big mortar shells that blew tanks and big trucks to pieces; jagged steel flakes that exploded from the grenades; the way the flame thrower melted a rifle into a shapeless lump. He understood them right away; he knew what they wanted. He was the best, they told him; some men didn’t like to feel the quiver of the man they were killing; some men got sick when they smelled the blood [such as Tayo]. But he was the best; he was one of them. The best. United States Army. (62)

Emo performs exactly as a savage should: a bloodthirsty, bitter, twisted killer, much like Magua in *The Last of the Mohicans*. Emo’s psychopathic, violent behaviour, which is usually punishable through imprisonment, is rewarded and

encouraged in the army, and his status as a veteran allows him just enough cultural capital to stay free of punishment. In the civilian world of Gallup, Emo understands his role as the drunken Indian vet, but Tayo does not accept this role. He cannot bear Emo's psychopathic ravings, in which he recounts how many Japs he killed. In order to silence Emo, Tayo stabs him, a violent action that would seem to characterize Tayo as the psychopath. However, Emo's collection of human teeth that he keeps as war souvenirs and his assertions that every Jap should have been "blown...off the face of the earth" clearly classifies Tayo as emotionally troubled and Emo as a violent psychopath (61). Unlike Pinkie and Harley who passively accept Emo's cruelty and violence, Tayo can see that Emo's consciousness is fully and dangerously colonized by ideals of American patriotism, but it is not until the end of Tayo's journey that he understands how to repudiate these ideals.

Tayo's repudiation of sacrifice and sentimentality is facilitated by Betonie, who uses hybridity and syncretism to heal internal colonization, and Ts'eh, a female character who reinvigorates and guides Tayo to wellness (159). Upon meeting these characters, Tayo begins to transform into a contributing member of his community, allowing him to fulfil his responsibility to the community as outlined by Ku'oosh earlier in the novel. However, as Tayo untangles his very being from the discursive threads of internal colonization, Emo, Pinkie, Harley, and others in the community assume Tayo is having another mental breakdown.

Implicitly, Silko is suggesting that if Tayo does not follow the edicts for Indian behaviour outlined by the colonizers - such as being a drunken Indian or a subservient Indian - and instead follows the epistemology of his people, then he will be labelled as mentally unstable. Through free indirect discourse, Silko shows that Tayo is on the verge of full mental health, not on Anglo-American terms, but on Aboriginal terms:

The dreams [and his madness] had been terror at loss, at something lost forever; but nothing was lost; all was retained between the sky and the earth, and within himself. He had lost nothing. The snow covered mountain remained, without regard to titles of ownership or the white ranchers who thought they possessed it...The mountain outdistanced death. The mountain could not be lost to them [Pueblos], because it was in their bones; Josiah and Rocky were not far away. They were close; they had always been close. And he loved them as he had always loved them, the feeling pulsing over him as strong as it had ever been. They loved him that way; he could still feel the love they had for him. The damage that had been done had never reached this feeling...the people were strong...and nothing was ever lost as long as the love remained. (219-220)

The word “love” is repeated in a string of sentences that are connected hypotactically through parallelism, semi-colons, and connective words that indicate process and continuance. Tayo recognizes that mourning over loss as a permanent end to something or someone is part of sentimental discourse, where the loss serves national ideals. Tayo breaks free from sentimental mourning, but his journey is not over yet; he must repudiate the most dangerous element of the Ck’o’yo magic: the desire to participate in sacrificial exchange in order to gain acceptance as a privileged citizen.

Emo represents the logical outcome of such belief in the economy of national sacrifice. He wants to capture Tayo and literally sacrifice him, because Emo knows that Tayo’s marginal social and mental status make him available to be justifiably killed. In addition, Emo also fears that Tayo will leave his role as the mentally-ill half-breed. If Tayo refuses to be interpellated as the expendable citizen in the U.S. national sphere, then he will not fit within Emo’s colonized worldview. In essence, Tayo and Emo represent opposing structures of feeling, wherein “experience, immediate feeling, and then subjectivity and personality [are] generalized, categorized and contained” (Williams 129). However, structures of feeling are not static, because there is always the tension between the social order and the person who lives within the social world that allows for movement beyond “a handling of fixed forms and units [of social experience and feeling],” resulting in “frequent tension between the received interpretation and practical

experience” (130). Emo believes fully in the fixed form of patriotic, sentimental feeling that teaches him to hate anyone who opposes his conception of self as the conflicted suffering servant, who simultaneously loves the glory of serving the nation but hates his disenfranchised position. Emo is a study in the circular logic of sentimental sacrifice: he hates whites for taking away his status, yet the status of “whites” is what he wants to regain. For Emo, the way to attain status is to kill in the name of something greater to engender a feeling of belonging. Emo desires the tears and blessings of gratitude, but does not understand that it is only his death in very specific circumstances, such as in times of war, that will engender the right kind of sentimental identifications that will confer the status that he craves.

Tayo, on the other hand, has left sentimentality and sacrifice behind. His emotions are those of continual process and rejuvenation. There is no loss, mourning, or tears for the dead, only appreciation and gratitude for their continuing contribution to the community and, by extension, to Tayo. Tayo’s refusal to participate in the game and economy of sacrifice infuriates Emo, who tells everyone at Laguna that Tayo has relapsed when, in actuality, Tayo continues the work that Josiah started, rebuilding the cattle herd and the land. Robert, Auntie’s husband, comes to warn Tayo that the Army and others will come to look for him. Robert reveals that Emo has been telling everyone that “[Tayo] went crazy” (228). Robert wants Tayo to return to Laguna in order to dispute Emo’s claims and status. Emo desires Tayo to return to his proper place in the neo-

colonial hierarchy of national identity as a marginal citizen. Tayo knows that if he returns, Emo will get his wish.

In addition, Tayo is not concerned that government officials hunt him in cars that “will get stuck in the sand and muddy places” and who will not get out of the cars and “climb these hills” because of the snakes (233). Tayo predicts “[t]he old men will get tired of sitting in the hot sun, watching the white men act like fools [and] [t]hey’ll all go home” (233). Ts’eh warns Tayo that Emo and the others will not leave Tayo alone, but she does not stay to help Tayo. Shortly after Ts’eh leaves Tayo, he falls asleep wrapped in his blanket and when he wakes up, “choking on humid jungle air,” it is clear that the spatiotemporality of the novel has drastically changed (235). Although Tayo is still on the reservation, he is figuratively transported back into the original captivity narrative in the jungles of the Philippines, where Tayo blamed himself for not living up to American standards of national duty. In this version of the captivity narrative, Tayo understands the depth and danger of the economy of national sacrifice.

However, Tayo has not yet learned the extent to which his friends are bewitched by this sacrificial economy. He fully trusts Harley and Leroy, with whom he meets in the hills and, as a result, lets his guard down, declaring that he “needed to rest of a while, and not think about the story or the ceremony. Otherwise it would make him crazy and even suspicious of his friends; and without friends he didn’t have a chance of completing the ceremony” (241).

Tayo's naïve statement regarding the motives of the drunken Harley and Leroy, who did not simply come upon Tayo in the hills, but are, indeed, hunting him to complete Emo's sacrificial ceremony, reveals that Tayo needs to learn one more difficult lesson before returning to Ku'oosh with the antidote for internal colonization. Tayo's sudden realization of Harley and Leroy's betrayal hits him viscerally "in the belly, and spread to his chest in a single surge: he knew then that they were not his friends but had turned against him, and the knowledge left him hollow and dry inside, like the locust's shell. He was not sure why he was crying, for the betrayal or because they were lost" (242). These are not the sentimental tears of gratitude for sacrifice or of sentimental identification, but rather these are tears of frustration and tension that comes out of helplessness. Tayo does not cry for himself or for Rocky anymore; now his perspective has shifted to view Harley, Emo, Leroy and Pinkie as lost souls, who gamble for status that they can never regain.

Emo gambles that national sacrifice will once again confer social status. He hopes to capture Tayo, who is hunted by the white authorities for refusing to behave within the American cultural codes for correct Indigenous behaviour. Through Tayo's capture and sacrifice, Emo can feel the same sense of belonging he once felt as U.S. soldier, killing in the name of something greater than himself. In order to clearly illustrate and divide Emo's colonized worldview from Tayo's decolonized worldview, Silko uses the conventions of the captivity narrative.

Emo's role as the savage captor signifies that Emo represents the stereotypically bad Indian found in nineteenth-century frontier romances and twentieth-century westerns. Tayo does not participate in the captivity narrative; instead, he witnesses Harley play the role of the sacrificial victim in his place. However, the reader cannot sentimentally identify with Harley's sacrificial role. While he is a marginalized figure of suffering, there are two main reasons why Harley cannot excite sentimental identification: 1) he is not torn from a space of domestic and familial peace and love in a similar manner to other classic male figures of sentimental sacrifice, such as Uncle Tom from *Uncle Tom's Cabin* or even Uncas from *The Last of the Mohicans*; and 2) the narrative is neither focalized through Harley nor does Harley speak: He is a silent victim.

In addition, because Emo hunts Tayo to regain his sense of superiority, Tayo has a startling revelation regarding the breadth and influence of national sacrifice:

There was no end to it; it knew no boundaries; and he had arrived at the point of convergence where the fate of all living things, and even the earth had been laid. From the jungles of his dreaming he recognized why the Japanese voices had merged with Laguna voices, with Josiah's voice and Rocky's voice; the lines of cultures and worlds were drawn in flat dark lines on fine light

sand, converging in the middle of witchery's final ceremonial sand painting. From that time on, human beings were one clan again, united by the fate the destroyers planned for all of them, for all living things; united by the circle of death that devoured people in cities twelve thousand miles away, who had never seen the delicate colors of the rocks which boiled up their slaughter.

(246)

Tayo connects the desecration of Laguna land to the Jackpile mine that provided the uranium to build the atomic bomb, ultimately destroying hundreds of thousands of people. These incidents are not separate but are part of the legacy of nationalism that separates people in categories based on a perception of national value. When Silko describes national sacrifice on this international scale, she would seem to suggest that the colonizing discourse of patriotic sacrifice cannot be destroyed. While it is true that deeply felt patriotic duty to protect national interests is an extremely destructive force, Silko offers a means to neutralize the power of national sacrifice. Using the Indigenous story located in the centered text placed just prior to the grotesque scene of Harley's death, Silko translates for the reader that C'k'o'yo magic has a fundamental weakness:

Arrowboy got up after she left.

He followed her into the hills
up where the caves were.
The others were waiting.
They held the hoop
and danced through the fire
four times.

The witchman stepped through the hoop
he called out that he would be a wolf.

His head and upper body became hairy like a wolf
but his lower body was still human.

“Something is wrong,” he said.

“Ck’o’yo magic won’t work
if someone is watching us.” (247)

Although Tayo cannot stop Harley’s death, he does not attack Emo in retribution for his evil deeds as he does earlier in the novel. In this way, Tayo does stop the Ck’o’yo magic by refusing to participate in its economy of sacrifice. As well, when he acts as witness instead of participant, he not only locates himself as separate from this economy of sacrifice, but also makes this ideological, thus “secret” or “seamless,” operation visible. Owens explains that “[t]he clear message [of this scene] is that it is our responsibility to be conscious, to watch and thus

control evil...Tayo's temptation to destroy Emo – a temptation to which he succumbed early in the novel – would have merely fuelled the witchery” (Owens 190). Tayo desires intensely to “stop them [those who use Ck'o'yo magic] and all the suffering and dying they caused” by violently interceding to stop Emo's sacrifice of Harley, but if he does then he will “fuel the witchery.” Tayo knows that to defeat sacrificial logic with sacrificial logic would make him

[A]nother victim, a drunk war veteran settling an old feud; and the Army doctors would say that the indications of this end had been there all along, since his release from the mental ward at the Veteran's Hospital in Los Angeles. The white people would shake their heads, more proud than sad that it took a white man to survive in their world and that these Indians couldn't seem to make it. At home the people would blame liquor, the Army, and the war, but the blame on the whites would never match the vehemence the people would keep in their own bellies, reserving the greatest bitterness and blame for themselves, for one of themselves they could not save. (253)

Silko once again uses free indirect discourse to guide the reader into Tayo's recognition and exposition of how sentimental sacrifice functions to unite the

Anglo-Americans through mourning over the loss of “Indians [who] couldn’t seem to make it.” Silko links the sentimentalism of this loss to the production of a sense of superiority, wherein the white people would feel “more proud than sad,” causing Aboriginals to feel “the greatest bitterness and blame,” which are emotions necessary for the continued internal colonization of Indigenous peoples. Emo is an excellent example of a person who feels great bitterness over his loss of privilege and blames American culture for refusing to give him the legitimate identity promised to him if he served the nation. Because he believes that his Indigenous culture cannot confer an authentic, dominant identity, Emo’s bitter emotions privilege American culture. Indeed, national sacrifice gives just enough privilege to certain Indigenous peoples, thus creating a native elite, such as Rocky and Emo, who seemingly have “marked on their foreheads, with a branding iron, the principles of Western culture” (Fanon 136). Silko offers a method to heal this damaging internal colonization through the refusal of American sacrificial duty: a repudiation that begins the healing process.

Conclusion

In *Cogewea* and *Ceremony* the discourses of sentimentality and sacrifice are deconstructed through Indigenous philosophy and storytelling practice. Jim and Mourning Dove both teach the importance of resistance to the American “semiotic and epistemological habits that enable and prescribe [colonizing] ways

of communicating and thinking” (Bal 3). Without their resistance to sentimental classification and sacrificial exchange, Mourning Dove makes clear that both Jim and Cogewea would have died. Through the guidance of Elders and the support of a community, Jim and Cogewea choose not follow their fate within American culture, but decide to live as valued members of the multicultural and multi-racial culture of the ranch. In contrast to Jim and Cogewea’s sentimental and sacrificial experiences within everyday life, Tayo joins the Army, where he ostensibly enters into a binding contract to sacrifice his life. Tayo’s status as a soldier and WWII veteran widens the scope of my analysis to consider, albeit in a limited fashion, national sacrifice in war narratives. Unlike traditional captivity narratives in which the captive is usually a civilian, Tayo enlists in the Army where such suffering and sacrifice is expected. However, Tayo’s resistance to the sacrificial duty that a soldier is expected to perform provides an illuminating perspective on the colonizing purpose of sentimentality and sacrifice. In both *Cogewea* and *Ceremony*, Mourning Dove and Silko show that sentimentality and sacrifice are not expressions of honourable, patriotic duty in everyday life or wartime, but operate to define and authenticate the racial strata of national identities in the United States.

Conclusion

When I began studying sacrifice and sentimentality as interrelated discourses that shape American patriotism, I was mainly interested in arguing that these discourses were related. Only a handful of scholars had attempted to explore the function of sacrifice in America; therefore, I felt that simply connecting these discourses would be enough of a task. Because sacrifice, as Deborah Shuger explains, is diffused throughout the western cultural field, isolating and, in turn, tracing a specific thread of sacrificial discourse posed a significant challenge (9). Initially, I wanted to research and write a different chapter on each specific type of sacrificial discourse, culminating in seven possible chapters. That is, as I researched my project, I realized that American citizens are expected to sacrifice for a number of different social, political and economic values, all of which characterize America as exceptional. For example, I wanted to research and write a chapter on economic sacrifice, where I would explore the role of sacrifice in such novels as John Steinbeck's *The Grapes of Wrath*. Sexual sacrifice would comprise another chapter on the sacrifices made in the name of heteronormativity in America. I had begun to write this chapter using James Baldwin's *Giovanni's Room* as a central work that deftly explicates the function of sacrifice to maintain privileged heterosexuality. Even as I write this conclusion, I want to explain my position on these subjects further, which illustrates that the vastness and

pervasiveness of sentimental sacrificial discourse threatened to overwhelm my project.

The turning point came when I began to research the comparison between James Fenimore Cooper's *The Last of the Mohicans* and Joss Whedon's *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*. I realized that one of the major threads that link these two apparently disparate texts is the use of captivity to delineate the sacrificial duty required to protect the national home and its privileged occupants. Cooper and Whedon had each designed diegetic worlds with embedded captivity narratives that defined legitimacy via the act of sacrifice. Each work constructs a privileged inside –legitimately occupied by varying levels of authentic identities - and a demonic outside – occupied by marginalized characters who often desire the legitimacy of the inside. Further, each author uses his characters to categorize legitimacy based on levels of purity. This curious connection between Whedon's and Cooper's texts bothered me. Why would anxieties over racial purity endemic to the early national period continue in pre-9/11 contemporary America?

The answer to this inquiry directed my project toward a much different path than I had initially envisioned. Rather than solely prove the existence of sentimental sacrifice thematically, I chose to explore one of the many ideologies that underpin acts of patriotic sacrifice: the continued colonization of First Nations cultures. In fact, instead of broadly connecting genres ranging from science fiction to naturalistic fiction under the thematic umbrella of sacrifice, I traced the

representation of sacrifice and sentiment in one genre, the captivity narrative, from its origins in the seventeenth century up to the contemporary period. By analyzing the captivity narrative in this genealogical fashion, I was able to analyze how the captivity narrative operates within specific time periods to influence perceptions of national sacrifice.

This shift in focus from a broad thematic study to a project concentrated on the functions and motives of sacrifice and sentimentality as discourses within popular culture required a multi-disciplinary approach. I engaged the tools of biblical criticism, historical analysis, linguistic, and literary analysis to study the movement of these discourses across time. Additionally, if I wanted to study sentimentality and sacrifice as colonizing discourses, I had to engage in a different worldview than my own settler-colonist perspective. One of the more difficult and contentious decisions I made while writing this dissertation was to not only include two works by Native authors but to 1) choose works that clearly critique and teach new approaches to relationships between nations and peoples and 2) learn to read these works, as well as the other texts included in my thesis, from the worldview within which these works were produced. Consequently, I not only had to study the work of First Nations intellectuals, but I also had to allow the text to guide my critical thinking. That is, I had to engage a certain type of formalism that privileges the literary text within the context of Aboriginal knowledge. Instead of privileging western criticism and history as the main sources of reliable, accurate

knowledge, Aboriginal stories are the source of authoritative knowledge in my dissertation. This methodology added complexity and depth to my research, which, in turn, produced startling connections between the sacrificial captive in Puritan captivity narratives and the continuing function of patriotic sacrifice to legitimate identity.

As I surveyed my findings, I realized that the secularization of Calvinist principles, such as communal purity, expressed in captivity narratives – fictional or non-fictional - functioned not only to reproduce the patriotic American, but also furthered a logical fallacy through which various cultural groups, such as First Nations peoples, are constructed as naturally inferior when compared to western culture. This evaluation is hardly a revelation after Richard Slotkin's and Louise Barnett's analysis of the literary racism inherent to the captivity narrative. However, my research findings produced two rather interesting conclusions that had not occurred to me when I first started my study.

1. The most popular and enduring early captivity narratives produced a female figure of sacrificial duty. She at once represented the fracture of home and, consequently, the necessity to defend that home by any means necessary. The early female captive's story was told using comparisons to powerful male and female figures of biblical sacrifice. The popular narrativization of anxieties over cultural dissolution and transformation

coupled with a biblically sanctioned solution to sacrifice self and other for the greater good produced an enduring example of sacrificial duty that lives on in memorials and commodities.

2. The secularized representation of the sacrificial female captive in the nineteenth century through popular novels, such as *The Last of the Mohicans*, allowed authors to cosmetically change the sacrificial captive to become the marginalized object of sacrifice who will create unity via mourning. In addition, this sacrificial character will often perform speech-acts just prior to death that commit the other characters, and, by extension, the reader, to behave and/or respond to national duty in specific ways. This paradigm persists in popular television shows, film, and literature.

From attempting to broadly argue for the relationship between two discourses, I ended up researching how sentimentality and Calvinist sacrifice informs American patriotism via popular narratives. Because I argue for the persistence of discourses within popular culture, I had to tread carefully so as not to make grand monolithic statements regarding the interconnections between disparate historical and social contexts.

When entering into a study that makes connections across hundreds of years, there can be a tendency to gloss over complexities that would seem to

overly complicate or even contradict research findings. One such case appeared when I studied the connections between Cora's sacrifice in *The Last of the Mohicans* and Buffy's sacrifice in the fifth season of *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*. The necessity of Cora's sacrifice seemed so much clearer than Buffy's because of Cora's mixed race identity. Only Buffy's supernatural powers seemed to make her available for sacrifice; consequently, the connection between Cora and Buffy's sacrifice seemed tenuous at best until Dr. Lamont suggested that I explore the connections between each text's social context more fully. I learned that the anxiety over defining racial purity that plagued Cooper in the early national period not only persisted into the contemporary period but had also intensified in unsettling ways. The multi-racial and multicultural America of the late twentieth and early twenty-first century had made officially defining whiteness very difficult indeed (Cheng 129). Therefore, Buffy operates as a sacrificial counterpoint to Dawn's exceeding whiteness, which links both Buffy and Cora as narrativizations of the patriotic duty to protect authentically pure identities. I am much indebted to Christopher Castiglia, Michelle Burnham, Shirley Samuels and many others whose excellent methodologies informed my own approach to researching literary patterns across cultural and contextual divides.

While I make no claims to providing a comprehensive study of the ways in which sentimentality and Calvinist sacrifice inform American patriotism, my hope is that this research offers a glimpse into the inner workings of American

patriotism as more than simply love of God and country by patriotic citizens of any creed or colour. The operation of civic duty is complex in that race plays a fundamental role in defining who gets to be labelled as authentically American or not. Certain citizens are naturally authentic while others can only gain such legitimacy via national sacrifice. In the American national sphere, sacrifice legitimates certain identities through sentimental identification. That is, in order for sacrifice to be labelled as such, the witnesses to the sacrifice must sentimentally identify with the sacrifice through mourning for the necessary loss. Thus, sentimentality and sacrifice are intertwined, multi-tasking discourses that stabilize a collective, authentic national identity; instil desire for this authentic identity in marginalized persons; and, finally, eradicate threats and impure identities through sacrifice, usually committed by marginalized persons. In summary, this list of cultural duties underpins the concept that America and its authentically pure citizens are worth the price of sacrifice.

Bibliography

Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen. Ed. Werner Hamacher and David E. Wellbery. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1995.

Allman, Dwight D. Intro. *Cultivating Citizens: Soulcraft and Citizenship in Contemporary America*. Ed. Dwight D. Allman and Michael D. Beatty. Lanham MD: Lexington Books, 2002. ix-xxv.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. and extended ed. London: Verso, 1991.

Apache children on arrival at the Carlisle Indian School (Pennsylvania) wearing traditional clothing. "An Indian Boarding School Photo Gallery." "Louise Erdrich." *An Online Journal and Multimedia Companion to Anthology of Modern American Poetry* (Oxford University Press, 2000). Ed. Cary Nelson. Original source for photograph: www.archaeology.com. 5 May, 2007. <http://www.english.uiuc.edu/maps/poets/a_f/erdrich/boarding/gallery.htm>

Apache children at the Carlisle school four months later. "An Indian Boarding School Photo Gallery." "Louise Erdrich." *An Online Journal and Multimedia Companion to Anthology of Modern American Poetry* (Oxford University Press, 2000). Ed. Cary Nelson. Original source for photograph: www.archaeology.com. 5 May, 2007.
<http://www.english.uiuc.edu/maps/poets/a_f/erdrich/boarding/gallery.htm>

Arner, Robert D. "The Story of Hannah Duston: Cotton Mather to Thoreau." *American Transcendental Quarterly: A Journal of New England Writers* 18 (1973): 19-23.

Austin, J.L. *How to Do Things with Words*. 2nd ed. Ed. J.O. Urmson and Marina Sibsà. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1975.

Axtell, James. *The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures in Colonial America*. New York: Oxford UP, 1985.

Austin, J.L. *How to Do Things with Words*. (1962). 2nd ed. Ed. J.O. Urmson and Marina Sibsà. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1980.

Bakan, David. *Disease, Pain and Sacrifice: Toward a Psychology of Suffering*.

Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1968.

Baker, Dorothy. *America's Gothic Fiction: The Legacy of Magnalia Christi*

Americana. Columbus, Ohio UP, 2007. 21 August, 2007.

<<http://www.ohiostatepress.org/books/Book%20PDFs/Baker%20Americas.pdf>>

Bal, Mieke. *Double Exposures: The Subject of Cultural Analysis*. New York:

Routledge, 1996.

Barnett, Louise. *The Ignoble Savage: American Literary Racism 1790-1890*.

Westport CT: Greenwood Press, 1975.

Bassett, Troy J. "“My Brother”": the Recovery of Rocky in Leslie Marmon Silko's

Ceremony." *American Culture and Research Journal* 28.1 (2004): 35-40.

Bercovitch, Sacvan. *The Puritan Origins of the American Self*. New Haven: Yale

UP, 1977.

Berlant, Lauren. *The Anatomy of National Fantasy: Hawthorne, Utopic and*

Everyday Life. Chicago: The U of Chicago P, 1991.

---. "Reading of John M. Stahl's *Imitation of Life*." After Great Pain: From Sentimentality to Trauma. Graduate course offered at the University of Toronto, winter 2000.

-----. "The Subject of True Feeling: Pain, Privacy, and Politics," *Cultural Pluralism, Identity Politics, and the Law*. Austin Sarat and Thomas Kearns eds. (University of Michigan Press, 1999), 49-83.

Bernadin, Susan K. "Mixed Messages: Authority and Authorship in Mourning Dove's Cogewea, the Half-Blood: A Depiction of the Great Montana Cattle Range." *American Literature: A Journal of Literary History, Criticism, and Bibliography* 67.3 (1995): 487-509.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Biedler, Peter. "Bloody Mud, Rifle Butts and Barbed Wire: Transforming the Bataan Death March in Silko's *Ceremony*." *American Indian and Culture Research Journal* 28:1 (2004): 23-33.

Booth, Wayne. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1961.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Ed. John Thompson. Cambridge MA: Harvard UP, 1991.

Brown, Herbert Ross. *The Sentimental Novel in America 1789-1860*. New York: Pageant Books Inc., 1959.

Bross, Kristina. "Dying Saints, Vanishing Savages: 'Dying Indian Speeches' in Colonial New England Literature." *Early American Literature* 36.3 (2001): 325-352.

Buffy the Vampire Slayer. Created by Joss Whedon. 5th season. Perf. Sarah Michelle Gellar, Nicolas Brendon, Allyson Hannigan, Michelle Trachtenberg, Anthony Stewart Head. Warner Brothers Television. DVD. Original air dates, Sept. 2000- May 2001.

---. "Episode 13: Blood Ties." By Steven S. Knight. Dir. Michael Gershman. 5th season. Perf. Sarah Michelle Gellar, Nicolas Brendon, Allyson Hannigan, Michelle Trachtenberg, Anthony Stewart Head. Warner Brothers Television. DVD. Original air date Feb 6, 2001.

---. "Episode 5: No Place Like Home." By Douglas Petrie. Dir. David Solomon. 5th season. Perf. Sarah Michelle Gellar, Nicolas Brendon, Allyson

Hannigan, Michelle Trachtenberg, Anthony Stewart Head. Warner Brothers Television. DVD. Original air date, 24 Oct, 2000.

---. "Episode 2: Real Me." By David Fury. Dir. David Grossman. 5th season. Perf. Sarah Michelle Gellar, Nicolas Brendon, Allyson Hannigan, Michelle Trachtenberg, Anthony Stewart Head. Warner Brothers Television. DVD. Original air date, 3 Oct, 2000.

---. "Episode 22: The Gift." Written and Dir. By Joss Whedon. 5th season. Perf. Sarah Michelle Gellar, Nicolas Brendon, Allyson Hannigan, Michelle Trachtenberg, Anthony Stewart Head. Warner Brothers Television. DVD. Original air date May 25, 2001.

Burnham, Michelle. *Captivity and Sentiment: Cultural Exchange in American Literature 1682-1861*. Hanover NH: UP of New England, 1997.

Canatta, Susan M. "Generic Powerplays in Mourning Dove's Co-ge-we-a." *The American Indian Quarterly* 21.4 (1997): 703-712.

Caputi Jane. "The Gods We Worship." *Goddesses and Monsters: Women, Myth, Power, and Popular Culture*. Madison: The U of Wisconsin P/Popular Press, 2004.

Castiglia, Christopher. *Bound and Determined: Captivity, Culture-crossing, and White Womanhood from Mary Rowlandson to Patty Hearst*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996.

Chapman, Mary and Glenn Hendler. Introduction. *Sentimental Men: Masculinity and the Politics of Affect in American Culture*. Ed. Mary Chapman and Glenn Hendler. Berkeley: U of California P, 1999. 112-124.

Chatman, Seymour. "The Cinematic Narrator." *Film Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen. New York: Oxford UP, 2004. 473-486.

Chen, Vivian. "Buffy? She's Like Me, She's Not Like Me – She Is Rad." *Athena's Daughter's: Televisions New Women Warriors*. Ed. Frances Early and Kathleen Kennedy. Syracuse NY: Syracuse UP, 2003. 93 – 102.

Cheng, Vincent. *Inauthentic: The Anxiety over Culture and Identity*. New Brunswick NJ: Rutgers UP, 2004.

Conklin, Paul Keith. *The Uneasy Centre: Reformed Christianity in Antebellum America*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1995.

Cooper, James Fenimore. *The Last of the Mohicans* (1826). Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions, 1992.

Craige, Betty Jean. *American Patriotism in a Global Society*. Albany NY: State U of New York P, 1991.

Davies, Nigel. *Human Sacrifice*. New York: William Morrow and Company Inc., 1981.

Deloria, Vine Jr. and Clifford Lytle. *The Nations Within: The Past and Future of American Indian Sovereignty*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1984.

Derounian-Stodola, Katherine. Introduction. *Women's Indian Captivity Narratives*. Ed. Katherine Derounian-Stodola. New York: Penguin Books, 1998. xii-xxxv.

Derrida, Jacques. "Plato's Pharmacy." *Dissemination*. Trans. Barbara Johnson. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983.

---. *The Gift of Death*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1995.

DiNova, Joanne. *Spiraling Webs of Relation: Movements Toward an Indigenist Criticism*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Douglas, Ann. *The Feminization of American Culture*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977.

Duane, Anna Mae. "Casualties of the Rod: Rebellious Children, Disciplining Indians, and the Critique of Colonial Authority in Puritan New England." *Messy Beginnings: Postcoloniality and Early American Studies*. Ed. Malini Johar Schueller and Edward Watts. New Brunswick NJ: Rutgers UP, 2003. 63-80.

Ellis, Brett Easton. *American Psycho*. New York: Vintage Books, 1991.

Fanon, Franz. "The Wretched of the Earth." Preface. *Colonialism and Neocolonialism*. (1964) by Jean Paul Sartre. Trans. Azzedine Haddour, Steve Brewer and Terry McWilliams. London: Routledge, 2001.

Fedler, Kyle. *Living Sacrifice: Emotions and Responsibility in Calvin's Doctrine of the Christian Life*. Ph.D. diss., University of Virginia, 1999.

Fiedler, Leslie. *Love & Death in the American Novel*. New York: Anchor Books, 1960.

Fisher, Dexter. Intro. *Cogweea: The Half-Blood*. Lincoln and London: U of Nebraska P, 1981. v-xxix.

Fisher, Philip. *Hard Facts: Setting and Form in the American Novel*. New York: Oxford UP, 1985.

Foucault, Michel. "*Society Must be Defended*": *Lectures at the Collège De France 1975-1976*. New York: Picador, 1997.

---. "What is an Author?" *Contemporary Literary Criticism*. 4th ed. Ed. Robert Con Davis and Ronald Schleifer. New York: Longman, 1998. 364-376.

Fowler, Roger. *Linguistic Criticism*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996.

---. *Literature as Social Discourse*. London: Batsford Academic and Educational Ltd., 1981.

Ganzer, Alexandra. "Violence, Trauma, and Cultural Memory in Leslie Silko's *Ceremony*." *Atenea* 24.1 (June 2004): 145-159.

Girard, Rene. *Things Hidden Since the Foundation of the World*. London: The Athlone Press, 1978.

Gould, Philip. "Remembering Metacom: Historical Writing and the Cultures of Masculinity in Early Republican America." *Sentimental Men: Masculinity and the Politics of Affect in American Culture*. Ed. Mary Chapman and Glenn Hendler. Berkeley: U of California P, 1999. 112-124.

Haberly, David T. "Women and Indians: The Last of the Mohicans and the Captivity Tradition." *American Quarterly* 28 (1976): 431-43.

Hannah Duston Penacook Statue as a Jim Beam Whiskey Bottle. 10 May, 2007.
<<http://travis.smugmug.com/gallery/2161645/1/87727539#P-2-9>>

Hannah Duston Statue. Haverhill Massachusetts Picture Tour. 12 May, 2007.
<http://members.mva.net/galaca/p16hdstat.html>

Haverhill Hannah Duston Statue. Nathaniel Hawthorne in Salem. North Shore Community College. 3 March, 2007.
<<http://www.hawthorneinsalem.org/Literature/NativeAmericans&Blacks/HannahDuston/Images.html>>

Hawthorne, Nathaniel. "The Duston Family." *Hawthorne as Editor*. Ed. Arling Turner. Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat Press, 1941. 131-137.

Henderson, James (Sákéj) Youngblood. "Akupachi: Empowering Aboriginal Thought." *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision*. Ed Marie Battiste. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press 2000, 248 – 278.

Henwood, Dawn. "Mary Rowlandson and the Psalms: The Textuality of Survival." *Early American Literature* 32.2 (1997): 169-86.

Howard, June. "What is Sentimentality?" *American Literary History* 11.1 (1999): 63-81.

Illustration from Mary Rowlandson's Captivity Narrative, 1770 Edition. Nathaniel Hawthorne in Salem. North Shore Community College May 10, 2007.
<<http://www.hawthorneinsalem.org/images/image.php?name=MMD2015>>

Jacobs, Connie A. "A Toxic Legacy: Stories of Jackpile Mine." *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 28.1 (2004): 41-52.

Johnson, Cynthia Brantley. "Hawthorne's Hannah Dustan and Her Troubling American Myth." *Nathaniel Hawthorne Review* 27.1 (2001): 17-35.

Kaplan, Amy. "Manifest Domesticity." *No More Separate Spheres*. Ed. Cathy N. Davidson and Jessamyn Hatcher. Durham, N.C.: Duke UP, 2002.

Kent, Alicia. "Mourning Dove's Cogwea: Writing Her Way into Modernity." *Melus* 24.3 (1999): 39-66.

Krupat, Arnold. "From 'Half-Blood' to 'Mixed Blood': Cogwea and the 'Discourse of Indian Blood.'" *Modern Fiction Studies* 45.1 (1999): 120-145.
<http://www.jhu.edu.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca>. June 6, 2005.

Lamont, Victoria. "Native American Oral Practice and the Popular Novel; or, Why Mourning Dove Wrote a Western." *Western American Literature* 39.4 (2005): 368-393.

Lenski, Lois. *Indian Captive: The Story of Mary Jemison* (1941). New York: Scholastic, 2004.

Leverenz, David. *The Language of Puritan Feeling*. New Brunswick NJ: Rutgers UP, 1980.

LittleBear, Leroy. "Jagged Worldviews Colliding." *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision*. Ed Marie Battiste. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press 2000, 77–85.

Low, Denise and Peter Biedler. "Preface." *American Culture and Research Journal*. 28.1(2004): 1-4.

Maracle, Lee. "Oratory: Coming to Theory." *By, For & About: Feminist Cultural Politics*. Ed. Wendy Waring. Toronto: Women's Press, 1994. 235-240.

Mary Rowlandson Elementary School. "About Mary Rowlandson." 9 Sept, 2007. <<http://rowlandson.nrsd.net/aboutmary.php>>

Mather, Cotton. "A Notable Exploit wherein, Dux Faemina Facti from Magnalia Christi Americana." (1702). *Women's Indian Captivity Narratives*. Ed.

Kathryn Zabelle Derounian-Stodola. New York: Penguin Books, 1998. 55-60.

---. *Magnalia Christi Americana; or, The Ecclesiastical History or New England, From its First Planting, In the Year 1620, unto the Year of our Lord 1698. In Seven Books.* New York: Russell & Russell. Reproduced from 1852 Edition. 1967.

McLean, Scott. "Patriotism, Generational Change, and the Politics of Sacrifice." *Social Capital: Critical Perspectives on Community and Bowling Alone.* Eds. Scott McLean and David A. Schultz. New York: New York UP, 2002.

Memmi, Albert. *The Colonizer and the Colonized.* New York: The Orion Press, 1965.

Minter, David L. "By Dens of Lions: Notes on Stylization in Early Puritan Captivity Narratives." *American Literature: A Journal of Literary History* 45.3 (1973): 335-47.

Mizuchi, Susan. *The Science of Sacrifice.* Princeton: Princeton UP, 1998.

Morse, Ruth. "Impossible Dreams: Miscegenation and Building Nations."

Southerly: A Review of Australian Literature 48.1 (1988): 80-96.

Nabokov, Peter. *Native American Testimony*. Revised Edition. New York:

Penguin, 1999.

Nelson, Robert M. "The Function of the Landscape in *Ceremony*." *Leslie Marmon*

Silko's Ceremony: A Casebook. Ed. Allan Chavkin. Oxford: Oxford UP,

2002. 139-173.

Noll, Mark. "Race, Religion and American Politics from Nat Turner to George W.

Bush." Stafford Little Lecture Series. Princeton University. 17, 18, 19 Oct.

2006. 23 August, 2007

<http://uc.princeton.edu/main/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1256>

Ono, Kent. "To be a Vampire on Buffy the Vampire Slayer: Race and ("Other")

Socially Marginalizing Positions on Horror T.V." *Fantasy Girls: Gender in*

the New Universe of Science Fiction and Fantasy Television. Ed. Elyce Rae

Helford. New York, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2000. 163-

186.

Orwell, George. *Down and Out in Paris and London* (1933). London: Penguin Classics, 2003.

Owens, Louis. "The Very Essence of Our Lives": Leslie Silko's Webs of Identity." *Other Destinies*. Norman OK: U of Oklahoma P, 1992. 167-191.

"Penacook Hannah Duston Statue." *Nathaniel Hawthorne in Salem*. North Shore Community College. 3 March, 2007.
<<http://www.hawthorneinsalem.org/Literature/NativeAmericans&Blacks/HannahDuston/Images.html>>

Pizzato, Mark. *Theatres of Human Sacrifice: from Ancient Ritual to Screen Violence*. Albany: State U of New York P, 2005.

Ricoeur, Paul. *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*. Fort Worth TX: Texas Christian UP, 1976.

Rowlandson, Mary. "A True History of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson." (1682) *Women's Indian Captivity Narratives*. Ed. Kathryn Zabelle Derounian-Stodola. New York: Penguin Books, 1998. 3-51.

Samuels, Shirley. *Romances of the Republic: Women, the Family, and Violence in the Literature of the Early American Nation*. New York: Oxford UP, 1996.

Sánchez-Eppler, Karen. "Raising Empires like Children: Race, Nation, and Religious Education." *American Literary History* 8.3(1996): 399-425.

----- . *Touching Liberty: Abolition, Feminism and the Politics of the Body*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1993.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. "Identities, Realities, Values" in "The Object of Linguistics" from "Course in General Linguistics." *Contemporary Literary Criticism*. 4th ed. Ed. Robert Con Davis and Ronald Schleifer. New York: Longman, 1998. 266-279.

Savage, Kirk. *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves: Race, War and Monument in Nineteenth-Century America*. Princeton NJ: Princeton UP, 1997.

Sawyer, John F.A. "Isaiah." *The Oxford Companion to the Bible*. Eds. Bruce M. Metzger and Michael D. Coogan. New York: Oxford UP, 1993. 325-328.

Sewell, David R. "'so Unstable and Like Mad Men they were': Language and Interpretation in Early American Captivity Narratives." *A Mixed Race: Ethnicity in Early America*. Ed. Frank Shuffelton. New York: Oxford UP, 1993. 39-55.

Shen, Yichin. "The Site of Violence and the Alter of Phallic Sacrifice in Gus Lee's *China Boy*." *College Literature*. 29 (2002): 99-113.

Shuger, Deborah Kuller. *The Renaissance Bible: Scholarship, Sacrifice, and Subjectivity*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1994.

Silko, Leslie Marmon. *Ceremony*. New York: Penguin, 1977.

Slotkin, Richard. *Regeneration through Violence: the Mythology of the American Frontier 1660-1860*. Middleton CT: Wesleyan UP, 1973.

Susag, Dorothea M. "Zitkala-Sa (Gertrude Simmons Bonnin); A Power(Full) Literary Voice." *Studies in American Indian Literatures: The Journal of the Association for the Study of American Indian Literatures* 5.4 (1993): 3-24. 21 August, 2007.
<<http://oncampus.richmond.edu/faculty/ASAIL/SAIL2/54.html>>

The Holy Bible: containing the Old and New Testaments. The Text Conformable to that of the Edition of 1611 Commonly Known as the Authorized or King James Version. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company.

Thoreau, Henry David. *A Week on the Concord and Merrimack Rivers*. (1839) Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1906.

Tompkins, Jane. *Sensational Designs: The Cultural Work of American Fiction, 1790-1860*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1985.

Vanderbeets, Richard. "Captivity Narratives and the Westward Movement."
American Transcendental Quarterly 29 (1976): 5-7.

Vetlesen, Arne. *Perception, Empathy and Judgment: An Inquiry into the
Preconditions of Moral Performance*. University Park: The Pennsylvania
State UP, 1994.

Vitkus, Daniel J. "Turning Turk in Othello: The Conversion and Damnation of the
Moor." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 48 (1997): 145-176.

Wardrop, Stephanie. "Last of the Red Hot Mohicans: Miscegenation in the Popular
American Romance." *Melus* 22.2 (1997): 61-74.

Weaver, Jace. "Leslie Marmon Silko." *Leslie Marmon Silko's Ceremony: A
Casebook*. Ed. Allan Chavkin. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002. 213-221.

Weston, Jack. *The Real American Cowboy*. New York: Shocken Books, 1985.

Whittier, John Greenleaf. "The Mother's Revenge." *Legends of New England*.
(1831). Facsimile reproduction. Intro John B. Pickard. Gainesville, FL:
Scholars Facsimiles & Reprints, 1965. 125-131.

Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature*. New York: Oxford UP, 1977.

Willie, Charles V. "The Civic Responsibility of Education Proclaimed." Reprint
of address given at the "Certificate Ceremony, Lowell Hall, June 6th 1996."

Alumni Bulletin. 30.1 (1996). 21 August, 2007.

<<http://www.dce.harvard.edu/pubs/alum/1996/fall/6.html>>

[Uncredited] w. [Uncredited] (p) (i). "Fabulous Females." *Wonder Woman*. #89
(Apr. 1957). DC Comics.

Yellow Bird, Michael. "Open Letter to All Indigenous Peoples." *American Indian
Movement of Colorado*. 9 Sept, 2007.

<[http://www.coloradoaim.org/blog/2006/06/yellow-birdopen-letter-to-
all.html](http://www.coloradoaim.org/blog/2006/06/yellow-birdopen-letter-to-all.html)>

Zamir, Shamoan. "Literature in a 'National Sacrifice Area': Leslie Silko's
Ceremony." *New Voices in Native American Literary Criticism*. Ed. Arnold
Krupat. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1993.

Zinn, Howard. *A People's History of the United States*. New York: Perennial
Classics (Harper Collins), 1980.

