Writing (and Speaking) in Tongues: Zitkala-Ša's American Indian Stories

Julianne Newmark

Language, by its very nature, has been used as a vehicle of domination to form policy and effect political, social, and religious change. One primary example is the Christian Bible. During the conquests of both Mexico and the United States (these names are of course the "new" names), the written "Word," as recorded in the pages of the Bible, was taken as the signifying marker of authority. Guided by this Word, European men ransacked existing cultures and plundered their lands and people. As poignantly demonstrated in numerous accounts of the conquest of Mexico (Bernal Diaz's and Bartolomé de las Casas's, for instance), the conquistadors took to shouting out the *requerimiento*—originally a written legal document—to the Amerindians prior to violence against them. The *requerimiento* suggested that the natives abandon their "false" images and thereafter pay sole tribute, on both social and religious grounds, to the King of Spain and to the Christian God. Moreover, the *requerimiento* was usually shouted in Spanish, a language unknown to the Native Americans. According to Anthony Pagden, the *requerimiento* was created in 1513 as an attempt to "silence any protests" from native peoples in the Indies but also extended to dissenting Spanish voices as well (xxiv). The *requerimiento*, then, demonstrates the use of language as an authorizing agent of conquest and violence; written or spoken, it served to justify colonial behavior, however ghastly. These are the circumstances under which the Native American people's mistrust of the White man's written words began.

Nearly four hundred years after the original drafting of the *requerimiento*, a Yankton Sioux woman named Zitkala-Ša (Gertrude Bonnin) contested the authenticity and authority of the White man's words by appropriating those very words herself. Zitkala-Ša's *American Indian Stories* (1921) provides an intricate investigation of the ways in which Native Americans have been persistently misled and disenfranchised by the agency of words written on paper—promises made but never kept. Like the Indians of Mexico in the early sixteenth century, Zitkala-Ša's fellow Sioux were dispossessed of their land and culture by words often no more familiar to them than those of the *requerimiento* were to the Amerindian peoples of centuries past. While Zitkala-Ša's text is composed of English words held together by structured grammatical rules (a marker of "civi-

lization"), she undercuts the assumed primacy and authenticity of this written language by using it to lodge a veiled attack. Therefore, she establishes herself as an empowered literary trickster. Her trickster-like literary behaviors serve as echoes of the mythic Iktomi of Sioux legend. Yet, unlike Iktomi's schemes, many of Zitkala-Ša's literary "tricks" are successful. She ensures that she is rhetorically effective to foreground the urgency of her own and her culture's story. In producing autobiographical accounts, Zitkala-Ša hopes to serve as a regenerated voice for herself and for others who have suffered similar dispossession.

American Indian Stories is part autobiography, part storytelling, broken up into ten chapters including "America's Indian Problem." However, even though the six chapters which conclude the text (excluding "America's Indian Problem," which reads as a motivated and linear political tract) do not seemingly adhere to the "established" tenets of traditional autobiography, *American Indians Stories* can serve as a coherent autobiographical piece when read as a unified whole. As Roumiana Velikova suggests, Zitkala-Ša indeed vacillates between political and autobiographical discourses, sometimes significantly blurring the divisions between the two (51). The series of mytho-historical and culturally inflected stories that follow the four introductory chapters of autobiography enhance Zitkala-Ša's indictment of the "palefaces" who have attacked the integrity of her people and destabilized an entire culture. These stories introduce exemplary components of Sioux beliefs and traditions, thus explicating the pernicious effects of the encroaching Anglo culture. By providing personal examples in accessible prose throughout all of the chapters of the text, Zitkala-Ša enables her readers to perceive the deeper effects, on a more pervasive level, of the attempt to civilize or Americanize her Sioux tribespeople.

Zitkala-Ša's early autobiographical essays offer a trained focus on the circumstances of Sioux life and the following stories increase the scope. Her ability to widen the literary lens beyond the primary concern with herself as agent only further validates the pervasive truths expressed in the introductory personalized ("autobiographical") accounts. In effect, Zitkala-Ša excises herself from her text in the stories to enforce further the perceptual clarity and agency of her authorial eye ("I"). This I/eye is forthrightly affixed to the discourse in the opening chapters of *American Indian Stories*, yet paradoxically Zitkala-Ša removes herself as agent in the concluding stories while still orchestrating a kind of cohesive linearity which bolsters the claims she introduces in her autobiographical accounts.

The three autobiographical essays, "Impressions of an Indian Child-

hood," "School Days of an Indian Girl," and "An Indian Teacher Among Indians," were first published serially in January, February, and March of 1900 in *The Atlantic Monthly*. In 1921, Zitkala-Ša collected these accounts, made a few minor changes, and added six stories (including "The Great Spirit," a slightly modified version of an essay previously published in 1902) and the political tract "America's Indian Problem" under the new title *American Indian Stories*. The autobiographical essays provide seemingly sentimental and reflective memories of her life as a "wild little girl" running free across the plains of her South Dakota homeland. By referring to her childhood self as wild, Zitkala-Ša almost invites comments such as those made by *Harper's Bazaar* in 1900. In a section titled "Persons Who Interest Us," *Harper's Bazaar* informed its readers that until her "'ninth year [*sic*],'" Zitkala-Ša "'was a veritable little savage, running wild over the prairie and speaking no language but her own'" (qtd. in Bernardin 214–15). By attaching the marker "wild" to her own younger self (being fully aware of its popular association with savage, uncivilized, ignorant), Zitkala-Ša undermines the very structure of the Anglo use of the term. To her, wild means nothing short of free, and this is the very freedom and wildness that those who call her a "'veritable little savage'" in the pages of their magazine take away. From the first essay of *American Indian Stories*, Zitkala-Ša begins dismantling the linguistic structures designed to hem her in. Indeed, she effectively inverts the Anglo meaning of the term *wild*:

> I was a wild little girl of seven. Loosely clad in a slip of brown buckskin, and light-footed with a pair of soft moccasins on my feet, I was as free as the wind that blew my hair, and no less spirited than a bounding deer. These were my mother's pride,—my wild freedom and overflowing spirits. She taught me no fear save that of intruding myself on others. (8)

In this concise paragraph of idyllic reverie, Zitkala-Ša insists that her wildness can only mean freedom. As if she anticipated the reaction that such a description of herself would invite, she attempts to interrupt the thinking of her reader and to question the understood meanings of the term *wild* as used to describe her (or her childhood self) and her fellow Sioux people. To counter the dominant disparaging stereotypes, she establishes a stereotype to subsume the one in use by the Anglo culture. Zitkala-Ša invents an "Indian" in the world of her text, a world in which the word *wild*, for example, takes on specific crucial meanings. Such meanings are the (re)visionary components of her autobiographical and ethnographic project. Being wild allowed her to exist as a part of the nat-

ural world—as free as the wind and as spirited as a deer, able to bring joy to her mother and maintain a kind of peace-of-heart. As a seven-year-old, Zitkala-Ša surely had no idea that there was a culture that would damn her for this freedom (and would commit the sin of intruding itself upon her—something her mother warned her against). As an adult writing the memories of her own childhood in a new language of dominance, Zitkala-Ša knew only too well the inversion (or the bastardization) of the image of wildness as she and her people had known it. For those who read her stories in the pages of popular magazines, being wild could only connote savagery and lawlessness. By so forcefully placing the term *wild* in the fourth paragraph of her first story, Zitkala-Ša boldly foregrounds the kind of linguistic play she will continue to practice throughout the rest of her literary work.

Considering that the written word historically served as the authorizing force of conquest and domination, native peoples logically developed a general distrust of the written English language. If one chose to write, there was a risk of the assumption that one was in league with one's own foes and in agreement with their dominant ideologies. Nevertheless, Zitkala-Ša finds a way to maneuver past this inherent literary problematic. In *American Indian Stories*, the reader is met with what appears to be an unusual kind of autobiography that (as demonstrated in the paragraph cited before) reads like a children's tale. Zitkala-Ša deftly posits a commentary on the appropriation and ownership of language in this text, and she does so in deceptively simple prose which looks as if it was written by someone who was indeed an amateur or naïf at writing the English language. She employs a fake amateurishness to enforce the erroneous nature of certain cultural assumptions regarding her people. She adopts the stereotypical images of moccasin-clad, long-haired Indians and places them in the very foreground of her account. Her language is direct. In but a few sentences she is able to capture the fleeting images of "savage Indians" as they were depicted and imagined by the White American populace. Her language seems controlled and matter-of-fact. The sentences are brief and grammatically flawless. There is little embellishment and lengthy description. An example of heavily embedded meaning in simple-structured prose is the first sentence of "The School Days of an Indian Girl": "There were eight in our party of bronzed children who were going East with the missionaries" (47). This sentence provides a microcosm of her experience. Here she shows a restraint which implies that she perhaps felt suspicious of both the language in which she wrote and of the readers who would pour over her text with admiration of the literary talents of a mere "savage." Indeed, how could she fully

embrace a language that had disenfranchised her people, a language that was not trusted by her own mother?

During Zitkala-Ša's "eighth year," she knew only "one language, and that was [her] mother's native tongue" (39). Yet she developed the desire to go east to taste of the "red, red apples" of the "palefaces" and to ride the "iron horse" to the school in Indiana. Zitkala-Ša's mother reacts to this development with great trepidation: "'Don't believe a word they say! Their words are sweet, but, my child, their deeds are bitter'" (41). This is a warning of the duplicity of the White man's words delivered to Zitkala-Ša in her native language through the familiar tone of her mother's voice. With characteristic style, Zitkala-Ša weaves an internal critique of the dubious nature of the White man's written words into this seemingly straightforward sentence. Her mother tells her that while there is certainly an alluring quality to the spoken words of the White man, the written words are altogether different and more dangerous. "'Their deeds are bitter,'" says Zitkala-Ša's mother. This chain of four words is easily read through, but upon further examination, Zitkala-Ša's linguistic inversion is apparent. Her use of "deeds" works on two levels. Deeds are actions, of course, and perhaps her mother meant that the behaviors of the White men were much more harmful than their sugar-laced words. However, she was also aware (as she reveals in "The Widespread Enigma of Blue-Star Woman," for example) that deeds were also written legal documents used to deprive Indians of their ancestral lands. So, to be sure, the written deeds of White men were as bitter as their spoken words were sweet. This warning, however, does not resonate in the mind of the eight-year-old Zitkala-Ša, and, with the heavy-hearted sanction of her mother, she departs for White's Manual Institution in Wabash, Indiana, where she learns through experience the distance between her and her mother, between her language and the White man's, and between the spoken word and the written.

The White man would eventually prevail, even distancing and severing Zitkala-Ša from her own mother. White's Manual Institution ruptures Zitkala-Ša's connection with her mother: she is no longer the protector of language, freedom, and truth. The young Zitkala-Ša was tempted by "red apples" (the edenic symbolism is certainly not accidental) and goes away with the palefaced missionaries. After begging her mother to open the door to the missionaries, she falls victim to the ultimate manipulation. She reveals, "Alas! They came, they saw, and they conquered!"; indeed they did (41). Her mother-tongue would soon be ripped from her just as she was ripped from her mother. But even before she boards the train eastward, she defies her mother's wishes in favor of her own desires

to attend the White man's school: "This was the first time I had ever been so unwilling to give up my own desire that I refused to hearken to my mother's voice" (43). The temptation to join the White man's school, eat of his red apples, and learn his words caused her to cease her habitual deference to the will of her mother. However, Zitkala-Ša eventually fought back with words of her own.

Zitkala-Ša's mother represents the powerful tradition of ambivalence regarding the written word within native cultures. Zitkala-Ša's narrative, collected as an autobiography in *American Indian Stories*, reads as an elementary account of the life of a Sioux child as told by a grown woman who is in many ways tortured by her own past. This implicit duplicity causes great discord within the text that can only be sensed within the numerous absences in the text. The White man's written words, while acting as a primary agent of destruction, cannot fully serve as an agent of redemption. Words can only be possessed up to a point; they cannot bring her childhood back and cannot repair the insuperable breach between Zitkala-Ša and her own mother. Furthermore, Zitkala-Ša is well aware that written deeds can surely deprive Indian peoples of their lands and that in practice written deeds are irreversible. Deeds can serve to write the fate of Indian peoples yet Native Americans are not allowed equal access or privilege to the written word. She learns that the written word in the hands of an Indian doesn't wield as much weight as it does in the hands of a White man (as her brother's inability to retain his job despite his Christian assimilationist education later proves). Thus, Zitkala-Ša develops an entirely new way to effect ownership over her use of words since she understands that she cannot possess them in the same way that the White man possesses and uses them.

Zitkala-Ša can appropriate certain words which will resonate with her White readers, but she cannot complete, or permanently invert, the understood meanings (as demonstrated with her use of the word "wild"). Zitkala-Ša uses the terms "animal" and "brute" to describe herself and her peers in circumstances of great duress, but for her these terms illuminate that it is the foreign boarding school environment and the treatment she receives there that renders her and her Indian classmates essentially inhuman (56, 66). Thus, there is a gap between her use of a word and the way in which her reader understands and uses it. She is conscious of the impossibility of bridging this divide, so she leaves the chasms gaping wide. The cultured America in which she found herself was preoccupied with notions of an originary link to nature—a kind of purity—that was compromised with the continual progression of civilization. Thus, to Zitkala-Ša's readers, the native person was (whether positively or nega-

tively) closely linked with what was considered natural. Zitkala-Ša, however, shows that the tools with which the White man has armed her have only served to make her removal from her natural culture permanent. She cannot find harmony in ancestral tribal ways, and with this realization her adopted language becomes spare and tinged with sorrow as the English words break down. Reflecting on her return to the reservation after her first three years at White's Manual Institution, Zitkala-Ša recalls that she was inconsolable and dislocated: "My mother had never gone inside of a schoolhouse, and so she was not capable of comforting her daughter who could read and write. Even nature seemed to have no place for me" (69). In these two sentences, Zitkala-Ša represents a great chasm which is both symbolic and very real to her. She articulates the painful distance between herself (who now belongs to reading and writing) and her mother (who still belongs to nature). Reading and writing in English are the antitheses of the Indian world as represented by her mother and by nature (which, as she says, has no place for her). The period that falls between these two sentences which present facets of two very distinct worlds is the symbolic barrier between Zitkala-Ša and her native culture. There is no examination, no explanation, in this paratactic style. The words sit upon the page as bare, lifeless symbols, lined up as testaments to the salience of Zitkala-Ša's personal and cultural crisis. There is no movement from one sentence to the next in this passage; the period offers no transition or compromise.

There are glimmers of engagement with and devotion to written language that emerge in Zitkala-Ša's text. These glimpses of expressive language usually coincide with discussions of nature and her tribal homeland. Such instances of a more liberated prose style suggest that Zitkala-Ša is ardently (re)committed to her people. This passion emerges out of the alienation and desperation she felt in 1899 when she originally was inspired to record her autobiographical accounts. In her description of her return to South Dakota as a young adult, she allows the natural imagery to breathe a kind of vitality into her text (even though this vitality is somehow restrained and almost despondent). She says, "All the morning I looked about me, recognizing old familiar sky lines of rugged bluffs and round-topped hills. By the roadside I caught glimpses of various plants whose sweet roots were delicacies among my people" (87). To describe the initial impression she felt after returning home, Zitkala-Ša creates sentences full of shapes and tastes and descriptive words, demonstrating a kind of engagement with her surroundings entirely absent in her description of the environment at White's years earlier: "The first day in the land of apples was a bitter-cold one; for the

snow still covered the ground, and the trees were bare. . . . And though my spirit tore itself in struggling for its lost freedom, all was useless" (52). In such sentences the sorrow is so dense that only coldness and numbness remain. To struggle against these words is "useless." These White words cannot express the pain of a young girl dispossessed of her mother, her language, and her ancestral homeland. It appears that for Zitkala-Ša, the White man's words have done the greatest harm in depriving her of her mother and tribe. Thus, there is a staggering challenge ahead of her as she devises a way to use these same words to reconstitute her life and attempt to represent her past and the problems which have plagued her people.

In the gaps between words, between the simple-flowing sentences of Zitkala-Ša's narrative, the fundamental schisms of her cultural history emerge. If in her written accounts she cannot express herself in her

Gertrude Käsebier. *UNTITLED.* (Zitkala-Ša in New York Society Dress.) Ca. 1898. Photographic History Collection, National Museum of American History, Smithsonian Institution, negative number 81-9565.

mother tongue (or her mother's tongue—which she has textually forsaken), can she express herself at all? To what end is this self-expression? This autobiography? In *Monolinguism of the Other*, Jacques Derrida discusses the nature of writing in an adopted tongue and the crises that emerge from alienation from one's own "mother tongue." Derrida's discussion here illuminates Zitkala-Ša's use of the White word. How is she to write her autobiography? She retains both her mother tongue and her mother as traces and over this she writes in her new language—she writes the story of how she came to write in this new language. As Derrida succinctly notes, "One cannot speak of a language except in that language. Even if to place it outside itself" (22). For numerous reasons, she can only tell her story in the language of dominance; in order to reach an audience, she must write in English. In order to receive payment for her

Gertrude Käsebier. *UNTITLED*. (Zitkala-Ša in Native American Dress.) Ca. 1898. Photographic History Collection, National Museum of American History, Smithsonian Institution, negative number 85-7209.

words, she must write them in English. These are the choices she ultimately makes and since she recognizes the irreversible loss of her mother and mother tongue, she is reincarnated in print within the English language. Derrida writes of his relationship to French, and perhaps Zitkala-Ša would express the same sentiment regarding English: "'*Yes, I have only one language, yet it is not mine*'" (2). As an author, she becomes a practitioner of one language for she has realized (as *American Indian Stories* makes clear) that, as Derrida says, "what you are calling your mother tongue will no longer even respond to you" (34). She may have been forcibly removed from her mother and her mother tongue, yet she produces a distinct textual echo in her works. Deep within her, the severance was not complete; the latent murmurs of ancestry, heredity, and maternal affinity are inescapable for Zitkala-Ša. While she writes in only one language (as is her only authorial option), she knows that for her, there was once another and her knowledge of this loss haunts her text.

By appropriating the White word—the English language—as her own authorial language, Zitkala-Ša directly critiques the assumed benefits of a hegemonic system by clearly displaying its pernicious and personal effects. She develops the ability to be both original and originary; she starts to manipulate a language to make it suit her. However intricate her intention to create a text using these English words in a subversive and inverted way, she feels she must finish this project. And, indeed, she has her mother to thank for this conviction. She explains how, when she was a child, her mother "required of [her] original designs for [her] lessons in beading" (19). As an adult, she uses words, not beads, to make interesting and complex designs; in fact, the historical importance of beads and words is not dissimilar. Like English words, glass beads were originally used in colonial times to entice native peoples to trade their valuable gold with White men for the virtually worthless yet beautiful beads. While as a child Zitkala-Ša attempted to restrain herself from designing patterns too complex for her to finish, as an adult she ultimately forges ahead, setting out a linguistic design that is so intricate that she cannot perhaps imagine its completion. To be sure, for Zitkala-Ša there can be no completion of her enterprise with English words; they cannot effect a return to youth and innocence for her, nor can they allow for a regeneration of her lost mother and mother tongue. She cannot go back; she cannot regenerate.

The "paleface" words effected a severance from her native tongue and Zitkala-Ša's description of her own native linguistic dispossession prompts visions of surgery (emblematically similar to the removal of one's tongue with a medical implement). While Zitkala-Ša was not operated

on, her torture was no less real. During her first day in the "land of apples," she experiences a moment of psychic torment, a bewilderment caused by "the constant clash of harsh noises, with an undercurrent of many voices murmuring an unknown tongue" (52). She explains that these threatening foreign noises were "a bedlam within which [she] was securely tied," from which there was no escape (52). At this point in her struggle, she has no voice to confront the perpetrators of violence who have deprived her of agency—the agency of a little girl. Her silence here suggests that she has no voice, no "tongue." Certain aspects of her identity were removed.

Soon after she arrives at White's, she hears that the "paleface woman" will "[cut her] long, heavy hair" (54). As demonstrated in the opening paragraphs of *American Indian Stories*, Zitkala-Ša's hair is an important marker of her identity and her wild freedom. She states, "Our mothers had taught us that only unskilled warriors who were captured had their hair shingled by the enemy. Among our people, short hair was worn by mourners, and shingled hair by cowards!" (54). She directly relates the events of this transformative haircutting and the feelings of loss that accompany it:

> I cried aloud, shaking my head all the while until I felt the cold blades of the scissors against my neck, and heard them gnaw off one of my thick braids. Then I lost my spirit. Since the day I was taken from my mother I had suffered extreme indignities. . . . And now my long hair was shingled like a coward's! In my anguish I moaned for my mother, but no one came to comfort me. Not a soul reasoned quietly with me, as my own mother used to do. (55–56)

The haircutting episode is emblematic of the emotional violence which ensues due to cultural disorientation and forced dislocation. The passage is charged with physical words of aggression which evoke images of bodily harm and severe injury. The young Zitkala-Ša "crie[s] aloud" as she is carried downstairs to have her braids cut off. Yet, after the cutting is over all she can do is moan (perhaps as a "primitive" form of expression).[1] She cannot articulate a scream for her mother, and if she could, it would be useless. Her braids and her tongue, her agency, have been cut from her. Indeed, her braids were actually removed and her tongue (her language) was symbolically removed. With no words to articulate her pain, and with the realization that screaming would be futile, the eight-year-old Zitkala-Ša merely "moaned for [her] mother." Zitkala-Ša moans/mourns for her lost mother and for her lost mother tongue. This violent episode

signifies the aggressive process of civilization, yet again Zitkala-Ša only offers her readers a glimpse and leaves the rest of the discourse silent as she allows the image of herself as a terrified, crying child to fade away as the chapter ends. Thus, as she was repressed by the "paleface woman" who cuts off her braids, she represses her own text and removes the real violence (the unutterable emotional violence) from the audience. As with classical drama, the violence in Zitkala-Ša's text happens behind a screen, or "off stage." She has learned this important facet of the civilized world; Zitkala-Ša leaves her reader to confront (or, conversely, read through) this abstract dark moment that is, for her, beyond words.

This traumatic childhood experience serves as a kind of awakening for Zitkala-Ša. After having her braids cut—the braids which represented her freedom, her courage, and her spirit—she becomes "one of many little animals driven by a herder" (56). As an animal, she is again without language. The only way to become empowered once more is to acquire language anew, to transcend above the level of "animal" to which she had been relegated. The violent analogy of the severing of one's tongue can serve as an apt symbol of what it meant for Zitkala-Ša to be dispossessed of her means of speaking her native language and belonging to her tribe. The removal of her braids, while functioning as a demonstration of loss, also serves as a point of resurgence within this new context. A certain indelible mark scars her from this moment on, making it impossible for her to ever rejoin her tribe completely with full confidence or an equality of spirit. She can no longer tell the Sioux stories as if they were her own. She must tell them with a newly regenerated tongue in a new language. These stories become filtered through a mind which has been traumatized by experiences of forced acculturation. It is only logical that a certain anger, an amplified rage, would be the result of these traumatic childhood experiences. Her anger is evident in the hyper-control she forces upon her narrative. In order to emerge in print, Zitkala-Ša knew that she had to temper her own adult rage and utilize anecdotal evidence from her childhood to demonstrate her own mature(d) pain.

After having her tongue taken from her, Zitkala-Ša had to learn to write; she had to enter into the realm of written and printed communication as her own agent. She was forced, yet she also realized the necessity and urgency of the skill of writing. She knew that she needed to learn to write if she hoped to express herself and reveal the emotional and physical violence which marked her permanently. Moreover, the mechanism of autobiography allows her to subvert the dominant ideology from within. Autobiography allows her to privilege the authority of her personal experience (again, her eye/I) while disclosing the circum-

stances of her arrival at a space in which she was privileged to have the opportunity to tell her story *by herself*. Autobiography allows Zitkala-Ša to place herself as a figure with historical agency operating in a particular moment in real historical time. By using the form of autobiography, she becomes a participant in a decidedly Western enterprise—the telling of one's own life story. Even as she was forced to participate in the Anglo-European culture, she subverts its established norms by manipulating the form of autobiography to suit her purposes and to facilitate a critique at her assailants. As Georges Gusdorf states in "Conditions and Limits of Autobiography," autobiography occurs when "man knows himself [as] a responsible agent." Furthermore, according to Gusdorf, "the appearance of autobiography implies a new spiritual revolution: the artist and the model coincide, the historian tackles himself as [an] object" (31). Indeed, Zitkala-Ša as a historian and autobiographer tackles herself as *object*—she can see herself ironically because she has been entirely objectified by a dominating culture. She has become dominated, but possessing autobiography allows her to tell her story and place herself at its center.

Zitkala-Ša stands defiantly in the middle of the text, drawing a line through herself and taking full responsibility for the articulation of this division. In her text, Zitkala-Ša controls the boundary that she has drawn and delineates the clear categorical markings which define each side of her text; one side is marked Indian and the other is White. She draws this line forcefully so that it cannot be missed—or perhaps so that it can be missed all too easily. Zitkala-Ša's language is coded in such a way that the reader could possibly read right through the many ellipses she provides or simply read her text without acknowledging the codes of language she employs. As with the pair of sentences referenced previously ("My mother had never gone inside of a schoolhouse, and so she was not capable of comforting her daughter who could read and write. Even nature seemed to have no place for me"), Zitkala-Ša often forcibly places a chasm between two structurally simple sentences. This is a trick. Her reader may not pause between sentences to consider the binary opposition between writing and reading the "schoolhouse" language and *speaking* the comfortable language of home and nature (the Sioux language). The problem Zitkala-Ša encounters and reinforces here is that tricks such as these are likely to go unnoticed. Her autobiography and the tales that follow are written in highly coded prose which could only be deciphered and read accurately if stereotypical assumptions (as introduced with the term *wild*) and misleading rhetoric (as demonstrated by privileging writing over speaking) are dismantled by the reader. Zitkala-Ša, then,

left the work to her readers yet doesn't seem to have made the task of interpretation easy for her contemporaries. While she has certainly delineated a certain "line" or forced division in her text, this line can also serve as a gap or a rupture through which the truths of her narrative can slip, thereby increasing the potential for her linguistic inversions and autobiographical play to be missed entirely by her reader. Indeed, she tricks her reader into assuming a false simplicity in her text by providing so many complex ruptures and inversions. Thus, her text becomes a model of innovation born out of personal and cultural crisis. Her text serves as an announcement of a new autobiography, far more complex and subversive than would have been expected by those who introduced her to the written word in English.

According to Martha Cutter, "Zitkala-Ša's work violates traditional notions of autobiography on two levels: it does not put forth a model of triumph and integration, nor does it emphasize the importance of language in the overall process of self-authentication" (31). Language cannot help her retrieve the lost past of her people, nor can it repair the breach between her and her mother or between her and her tongue.

Frances Benjamin Johnston. *LOUIS FIRETAIL WEARING TRIBAL CLOTHING IN AMERICAN HISTORY CLASS*. Ca. 1900. Courtesy Library of Congress, LC-USZ62-38149Q.

Through language and the assertion of an immutable individuality, Zitkala-Ša effectively affirms that she cannot fully assimilate, and thus her only language is a language of difference. Written language cannot make her White. Written language cannot heal her wounds or reintegrate her in a comfortable way with her culture. She remains different, and autobiography, then, becomes her vehicle to assert and affirm her own difference. Furthermore, what written language and the telling of her own story can do is allow for *a final cry* to emerge (perhaps emulating the cry of the cutting away of her native tongue). This is not a final cry of death or defeat; it is a cry of motivation and anger and the affirmation of an immutable difference. It is a cry that emanates from the deepest recesses of her soul, from a place where her very identity—her selfhood—lies.

Zitkala-Ša foregrounds her difference from her readers throughout *American Indian Stories*, and despite her acquisition of English as a written and spoken language, she affirms that her relationship with this language will always be disharmonious. She understands the written and spoken English language that was thrust upon her. In *The Culture of Literacy*, Wlad Godzich articulates the similar notion of a cry which affirms difference. As Godzich notes, "To understand writing requires then that one apprehend the cry and the difference, to apprehend difference as cry, a cry of life against the death that is propagated by the system. Difference, then, is not a word and certainly not a concept; it is a cry" (27). While the circumstances surrounding Godzich's discussion of the "cry" differ from those in which Zitkala-Ša utters and investigates the sensibilities of her own cry, there is clearly a relationship between Godzich's analysis and Zitkala-Ša's employment of this concept. Godzich considers Nietzsche's examination of the cry in Greek tragedy: "Nietzsche examines the relationship of the cry to the concept and sees writing as crying on the surface of the text, the coercion of which it feels itself to be the victim" (27). The concept is the thought which one hopes to express in writing, and Zitkala-Ša hopes to relate the essence of many such concepts. Her cry, then, emerges due to the immutable difference she feels and the seeming futility of her task. As Godzich notes, the system knows how to make the crier disappear, and Zitkala-Ša knows this as well. Thus, she often muffles her own cry, and she, as author, must "replace the crying voice with a disciplined and policed voice" (Godzich 27). However, when her cry does emerge intermittently throughout her narrative, it is not a signal of helplessness. Zitkala-Ša is offering a literary cry that is *not* a cry that connotes forfeit to a dominant ideology of language and culture. Her fight is waged in the words that express her sorrow and

loss, in the words that articulate her cry. Her fight is waged even in the "disciplined and policed voice" she uses for much of her autobiography.

The analogy of "writing as crying on the surface" works well when applied to Zitkala-Ša's oeuvre. This writing-crying is a performative act which progressively manipulates her reading audience via her seemingly simple but highly complex prose strategy. By adopting the language of the White man (forced upon her through trickery), Zitkala-Ša dismantles the structures that have harmed her and her people by placing the structures so forcefully in the front of her discourse that they almost become invisible. These structures of domination lie in every elision in her text—this is the haunting echo of Zitkala-Ša's composite autobiography. Godzich addresses this notion of the echo: "[T]hat which indicates loss and absence carries within it not just a trace or echo but the very presence of that which is absent. Echo can thus be transformed from a symptom of loss into the force of recuperation—but always on the understanding that recuperation does not look backward but advances cumulatively" (30). Zitkala-Ša's words, her new language, recall a life which is now lost not only for her but for her entire culture. She realizes that she is not alone and that she does not epitomize the scarring effects of the civilizing forces of Anglo-America. She recognized this as a child, seeing her fellow Sioux tribeschildren suffer at White's Manual Institution. Similarly, as an adult, she recognizes that there are innumerable native peoples who share her plight and who have forsaken their ancestral culture as she has. She is merely an example of the effects of such crimes, crimes perpetrated exclusively by "the paleface" and crimes of which she is the sole authoress. Zitkala-Ša explains her own culpability thus: "For the white man's papers I had given up my faith in the Great Spirit. For these same papers I had forgotten the healing in trees and brooks. On account of my mother's simple view of life, and my lack of any, I gave her up, also" (97). Thus Zitkala-Ša only hopes to represent the losses which cannot ever be reconstituted; she cannot and does not aim to absolve herself of any guilt.

Zitkala-Ša's text emerges as a piece of literature heavily dependent on the notion of the echo of present-absence, of forward-looking reflection articulated by a cry of violence or loss. Between the cry and the echo emerges yet another gap in Zitkala-Ša's text, a gap which, to borrow Godzich's words, is characterized by "the kind of silence that descends when one cannot even find the words to utter one's anguish" (29). Somehow Zitkala-Ša manages to find words to at least offer some semblance of the kind of anguish she feels at having been dispossessed of her mother, her language, her braids, her courage, her very spirit. While her

text is a reflective account to a large degree in that she examines her past experiences as material for her writing, it also relies on a distinct future for its momentum. In order to write about the past, she must (and does) believe there is a future for her and for her tribespeople. This is a future obscured by the kind of fog that dulls her text and tames her language, which, to concur with Godzich, "advances cumulatively" as it gains momentum drawn from an embattled past.

To use a now-hollow expression, Zitkala-Ša employs the master's tools—she uses the master's language to lodge a scathing critique of his practices. Upon Zitkala-Ša's return to her mother's home, she learns that her brother Dawée has lost his job and cannot find another. Zitkala-Ša's mother laments, "'Dawée! Oh, he has not told you that the Great Father at Washington sent a white son to take your brother's pen from him? Since then Dawée has not been able to make use of the education the Eastern school has given him'" (90–91). These words fall heavily on Zitkala-Ša's ears and heart: "I found no words with which to answer satisfactorily. I found no reason with which to cool my inflamed feelings" (91). By taking Dawée's "pen from him," the "White Father" dispossesses Dawée of the education and language that were forced upon him. Like his sister's, his native tongue was stolen from him, and then he is effectively prevented from using his new language skills. Based on these circumstances, Zitkala-Ša reveals that she can find "no words with which to answer." There are no longer any words to use; her Sioux words are useless to her, as are her English words. Neither language can make sense of this situation, and by stating that no words were available to her, Zitkala-Ša attacks the institutions and culture which force-fed her an ineffective and inherently dishonest language—a language which was violently imprinted on her soul and spirit and which could be ripped away with equal aggression. Significantly, it is in Zitkala-Ša's invocation of her disconsolate mother that her own pain becomes unmistakable. Is this the pain of a lost bond with her mother, or, again, is this the pain of a lost mother tongue—a lost language so true that it does not need to be written to ensure its permanence? She has indeed lost her ability to speak the Sioux language effectively; in it, she can find no words.

Hesitantly, to be sure, Zitkala-Ša employed the language she learned in the White man's schools under conditions of great emotional hardship. Her position was tension-filled and urgent. To relay a message, she had to adopt a form that was readily accessible (and, to repeat, perhaps having lost the ability to speak her native language as if she belonged to it, she had no other recourse but to write, and in fact deliver speeches, in English). The codified language she does use problematizes the potential

reception of her message. There are indeed messages she earnestly hopes to convey, yet they may be missed as they slip through the gaps in her text, gaps that her readers (the readers of *The Atlantic Monthly* and *Harper's Magazine*) would most likely glance through without stopping to ponder her misleading simplicity. As Cutter states,

> Zitkala-Ša gained her audience's attention . . . by using forms with which they would be familiar. Yet Zitkala-Ša undermines these forms by refusing to fulfill their generic criteria. More precisely, her writing sets up certain generic expectations, such as structural movement from disorganization to coherence, or a retrospection in which the autobiographer assembles all the pieces of his or her history into a unified whole, yet then refuses to fulfill these generic expectations. Zitkala-Ša's writing struggles with the predominant (European, male) paradigm of autobiography, creating a narrative which in both form and content rejects the notion of a unified, coherent, transcendent identity achieved through linguistic self-authentication. (33)

Zitkala-Ša indeed rejects this autobiographical tendency to form some final wholeness of identity. This is an absolute impossibility for her because much of her identity has been torn from her and cannot possibly be retrieved through the appropriation of a foreign language through which she may express herself only partially. Lands can be taken through words—the signing of contracts and deeds—but it is much harder for lands to be won back with words, as Zitkala-Ša clearly understands in her early literary works. She recognizes that her use of the White man's words will not turn her homeland back over to her people.

In the stories which follow Zitkala-Ša's three autobiographical pieces, she provides examples of the duplicitous nature of these words and deeds. "The Soft-Hearted Sioux" and "The Widespread Enigma of Blue-Star Woman" are two examples. In "The Soft-Hearted Sioux," the young Sioux's devotion to the Christian Word proves fatal for his own father and for himself. The Sioux returns to his reservation after years of Christian schooling with a heart so "soft" that he cannot kill any animal to save his own starving father. His determination to provide food for his father comes too late and his father's fate, as well as his own, is sealed. The son's deeds were ineffectual and the civilizing education he received was in fact disabling. His soft heart maintains an inability to kill in order to bring meat to his father, and his idle reading of the Bible as his father lies starving and ill signifies the impossible assimilation of these two polar identities: the soft-hearted, Christianized Sioux and the young Sioux

warrior. The words he tries to employ, the spiritual nourishment of the Christian Bible, interfere with the young man's ability to serve as provider, as literal *salvation*, for his own earthly father.

In a moment of similar desperation, the Blue-Star Woman in "The Widespread Enigma of Blue-Star Woman" is convinced to bargain with two young and educated tribesmen. These so-called nephews are in league with White men and hope, like the mythic Iktomi, to serve themselves through trickery and lies (166). Blue-Star Woman's individual name means nothing in a culture that now must rely on documents, deeds, and records kept in books. To save herself from starving, she agrees to pay the two civilized Indian men half of her money and land if they can "'discover evidence'" of her tribal identity (168). In a time when documentation is the ultimate marker of authenticity, the woman is left with few options. Knowing the insuperable breach between lost tribal status and cultural identity, Zitkala-Ša allows Blue-Star Woman's belief in the "unwritten law of her heart" to signify the ultimate futility of her claim: "'I am a being. I am Blue-Star Woman. A piece of earth is my birthright'" (159). In essence, in Blue-Star Woman's—and Zitkala-Ša's—world no unwritten law is viable. Laws of the heart have been rendered utterly ineffectual. "The Widespread Enigma of Blue-Star Woman" and "The Soft-Hearted Sioux" are two fine examples of the way Zitkala-Ša employs Indian stories to illuminate the far-reaching effects of language—its ownership, manipulation, and use—and the ways in which it resonates throughout tribal life.

As evidenced by the two stories discussed here, Zitkala-Ša's use of language may indeed be a highly engineered design created to pose even more complex intercultural or transcultural questions. By veiling her motivating impulses beneath linear and flawless prose, Zitkala-Ša seemingly tricks her reader into believing that she supports the Anglo ideology under which she was taught to write and read in English. Zitkala-Ša develops the ability to possess tools of violence and trickery, which she can in turn use for her own designs. Therefore she too becomes a trickster, in effect emulating an enlightened and effective Iktomi figure. As Dorothea Susag notes, there was a long-standing tradition of such trickery in Zitkala-Ša's ancestral culture. Susag cites Ella Deloria's discussion of the Iktomi figure mentioned earlier: "Iktomi or Ikto is the 'poser,' out to get the best of any situation. 'With no conception of sincerity,' he pretends to have sincere motives while he works the situation to his own benefit" (8). Zitkala-Ša refers to Iktomi in her description of the stories told to her as a child. She recalls begging her mother to ask their venerable guests to "'tell [her] an Iktomi story.'" These stories were the ones she "loved best" (15). For

Zitkala-Ša, even as an acculturated adult, the image of the Iktomi is still alluring, yet as an adult she can no longer lie in her mother's protective and comfortable lap listening to stories about Iktomi figures. Thus, Zitkala-Ša uses Iktomi too in a new way: she employs her own tricks and she illuminates how the traits of the mythic Iktomi are best represented by the White man with no sincerity and by the disloyal Indian "poser" (as with the two nephews in "The Widespread Enigma of Blue-Star Woman"). She complicates even further the already dynamic Iktomi figure by employing her own textual trickery—here she too is Iktomi.

In one guise, the White man with his powerful words becomes in Zitkala-Ša's rendering the deceitful and manipulative Iktomi of her native mythology. This "White Iktomi" proves a very real presence in her adult life, yet by becoming a storyteller in her own right (even if she is telling tales in an adopted language), Zitkala-Ša is able to capture this Iktomi and possess its forces to propel her own discourse. While the Anglo men who took her from her homeland were tricksters of one kind, Zitkala-Ša becomes a new kind of trickster herself. She learns to trick her White readers with their own language, thus outsmarting the White Iktomi. Susag says, "Zitkala-Ša knew how to use the English language of her time, and she tricked her readers into believing she had left behind her Native tongue and culture" (13). In some respects, she generates a new *hybrid* tongue that extends from the tongue which has been cut, severed, made forked—like the tongue of the serpent.[2] The written voice she creates is perhaps not her true voice, but rather, as Susag notes, "the literary voice then becomes the site of contestation between two languages, two systems, two cultures" (5).

In this intercultural space, Zitkala-Ša becomes a new alien being in America and as such, she develops the ability to constitute her own system of linguistic and literary rules. She is a new force to be reckoned with, perhaps a lurking snake eager to tell truths. Zitkala-Ša's is a serpentine language—forked, hybrid, and twisting—that discloses the hypocrisy of the civilizing Christian agenda which brought so much pain and violence to her people under the auspices of benevolence. Her hybrid tongue, however, cannot reconcile certain incomprehensible aspects of her life story, and she does not try to smooth over any disturbing elisions. Her literary language is both forked and entirely fragmented, as is her text.

Despite the many ways that Zitkala-Ša may be read as refusing to fully adhere to the norms of the dominant literary ideology, from the surface of her text emerges a decidedly conservative literary voice. Her success as a published author seemed to substantiate the claim that "savages" could become civilized. In an article in the May 1900 issue of *Outlook*, Jessie Cook argued that Zitkala-Ša was a fine example to follow as she

demonstrated that Indians could "'become Americanized and be of use to the world'" (qtd. in Susag 13). Yet by dismantling Zitkala-Ša's text and carefully reading into it, a contemporary reader detects that she is playing with or tricking her White readership.[3] She does appear, however, to the casual reader (which the readers of the magazines in which she was generally published were) to be fully in support of the premise that Indians are ripe for the civilizing forces of the White man, and her success is emblematic of the truth in such a statement. Hence, her text begs the question: what self is Zitkala-Ša expressing in her *American Indian Stories*? Is this a self put on display for a White readership, a reading audience with certain ingrained assumptions about writing and about Indians (not to mention assumptions about writing Indians)? Zitkala-Ša does employ the language of this reading audience, but in many ways she remakes this language anew. Yet, despite this manipulation of language, she was easily "co-opted" by magazines like *Harper's Bazaar*. As Susan Bernardin states in "The Lessons of a Sentimental Education: Zitkala-Ša's Autobiographical Narratives," "That [*Harper's Bazaar*] marveled over Zitkala-Ša's previous savagism and praised her for her first two installments for displaying a 'rare command of English' and 'much artistic feeling' suggests the ease with which readers glossed over the narrative's incisive critiques" (223). Indeed, readers were inclined to read right through the gaps and elisions in her autobiographical installments. She made it easy for her readers to do so.

Zitkala-Ša's written language is an Americanized English translated through the mind of a woman who represents, at least in part, a beleaguered population. Hence, Zitkala-Ša creates a language which exists in its combination of the words of a dominant culture and the sentiments of a subordinate one. As Derrida suggests, there often emerges a desire in people who have been disenfranchised in one way or another to "invent a *first language* that would be, rather, a *prior-to-the-first* language destined to translate that memory" (61). In many ways, Zitkala-Ša does desire to translate the memories of her Sioux childhood for an Anglo audience that she can only hope may develop some inkling of the circumstances of Sioux life. As if anticipating Derrida's theory, she does invent a new first language for herself, a language of native autobiography.

In *American Indian Stories*, Zitkala-Ša foregrounds the division between White culture and Indian culture in a way that makes these divisions seem unmistakably clear. Such distinctions were surely not, however, so clear in the reality of her own day-to-day life. There is a conceptual line between native culture and Anglo culture, and Zitkala-Ša appropriates and manipulates this line and draws it through herself to allow for a distinct commentary to emerge. She emblematizes certain physical objects

and allows them to stand in for actual historical discourse. In one compelling example of her elision/substitution model of historical discourse, she references the telegraph poles she sees as she rides the "Iron Horse" to White's Manual Institution and attaches significance to these poles—associating them with pain—because she remembers them from her homeland:

> I was quite breathless upon seeing one familiar object. It was the telegraph pole which strode by at short paces. Very near my mother's dwelling, along the edge of a road thickly bordered with wild sunflowers, some poles like these had been planted by white men. Often I had stopped, on my way down the road, to hold my ear against the pole, and, hearing its low moaning, I used to wonder what the paleface had done to hurt it. Now I sat watching for each pole that glided by to be the last one. (48)

Just as the paleface had harmed her people, as her mother repeatedly told her, a young Zitkala-Ša understood that the paleface had turned columns of wood into moaning, suffering entities. As she rides the train to what she thinks is a place of happiness and hope, she expects these symbols of cultural pain, dispossession, and confusion to disappear soon; they do not. Rather than forthrightly uniting the "painful" and forced modification of a tree into a telegraph pole (as a symbol of industrial advancement and Anglo encroachment), Zitkala-Ša allows a few concise sentences to signify the entire enterprise into which she is about to enter as an eight-year-old. Therefore, these static physical objects (telephone poles, apples) become ciphers for the ills of cultural decimation. Moreover, her text is not without its problematic elisions, yet where these elisions become apparent is in the investigation of the intended effect of her text. As she knowingly forces a recognizable edenic image in front of her reader's inquisitive gaze (the red apples), Zitkala-Ša seems to resist making the symbolic indictment as explicit as she might have done. There are few direct accusations in *American Indian Stories*, and the accusations that do emerge from the text are often delivered by her mother. Her mother was justifiably distrustful of the White interlopers who would take her children from her and transform them into shadows of their former, familiar Sioux selves.

After years of study and digestion of language, Zitkala-Ša was able to articulate the fears of her mother that she was unable to fully comprehend as a small child. In order to examine her own feelings and to provide an outlet for the anger and frustration of herself and her tribespeople, she manipulates the language with which she was manipulated. This

history of manipulation stems back through Zitkala-Ša's brother Dawée's life, through the life of her mother, and through the lives of her ancestors. These cries of language emerged from the lips of the Amerindians in Mexico in the sixteenth century, and four centuries later Zitkala-Ša produced her own act of retribution for centuries of cultural displacement and decimation. She becomes a manipulator, a trickster, a kind of warrior in her own right. She did devote her life to work on behalf of her people as an invigorated and determined leader, an orator, political leader, and lobbyist. While her rhetorical stance in her texts is not unassailable and her motives have often been questioned, it is indisputable that she possessed an understanding of language that enabled her to give voice to the traumas of her own life and, to an extent, the lives of her fellow Sioux people in autobiographical form. She becomes both an autobiographer and an ethnographer. Despite having suffered the loss of her language, her mother tongue, and her mother, Zitkala-Ša emerges as a woman empowered, a woman with a strong understanding of her own agency and the agency of language.

NOTES

1. Gloria Anzaldúa would read this moan perhaps as a kind of protest: "[W]ailing is the Indian, Mexican, and Chicana woman's feeble protest when she has no other recourse" (55). This is in reference to La Llorona's wailing. A similar moan or wail, connoting an ineffable loss, is the young Zitkala-Ša's "feeble protest." See Anzaldúa's "Entering the Serpent," in *Borderlands: The New Mestiza*, for a full account.

2. With a new serpentine tongue, Zitkala-Ša can be seen as a woman of emergent power, a woman who retains a link to the old tribal serpent-women of pre-Columbian North America. Anzaldúa discusses the manner in which the powerful serpent-woman, Coatlalopeuh (earlier, the Mesoamerican Coatlicue), has been covered over, disempowered, made soft (much like "The Soft-hearted Sioux" in some respects) by the piling-up of civilization and Christian images on top of her (the *virgen*, most strongly, has been grafted over her). Zitkala-Ša effectively, if unwittingly, appropriates and becomes empowered by this serpent spirit. For more on Coatlalopeuh and *la Virgen de Guadalupe*, see Anzaldúa, "Entering into the Serpent," in *Borderlands: The New Mestiza.*

3. Jeanne Smith successfully argues that Zitkala-Ša's voice is a trickster voice not only in *American Indian Stories*, but in her 1901 *Old Indian Legends* (in which she retells and adapts Lakota Iktomi tales) as well. Smith writes that Zitkala-Ša "envisions herself as a conductor, a tricksterlike mediator between worlds, a lightening rod to galvanize and direct the anger and frustrations of her people. Her voice, . . . can whisper softly or hiss angrily, in her own language or in a second tongue, according to her purpose" (57).

WORKS CITED

Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands: The New Mestiza*. 1987. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 1999.

Bernardin, Susan. "The Lessons of a Sentimental Education: Zitkala-Ša's Autobiographical Narratives." *Western American Literature* 32.3 (1997): 212–38.

Cutter, Martha J. "Zitkala-Ša's Autobiographical Writings: The Problems of a Canonical Search for Language and Identity." *MELUS: The Journal of the Society of Multi-Ethnic Literature* 19.1 (1994): 31–44.

Derrida, Jacques. *Monolinguism of the Other, or The Prosthesis of Origin*. Trans. Patrick Mensah. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Godzich, Wlad. *Culture of Literacy*. 1956. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994.

Gusdorf, Georges. "Conditions and Limits of Autobiography." In *Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical*. Ed. James Olney. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1983. 28–49.

Pagden, Anthony. "Introduction." *A Short Account of the Destruction of the Indies*, by Bartolomé de las Casas. Ed. and trans. Nigel Griffin. New York: Penguin, 1992. xiii–xlii.

Smith, Jeanne. "'A Second Tongue': The Trickster's Voice in the Works of Zitkala-Ša." In *Tricksterism in Turn-of-the-Century American Literature: A Multicultural Perspective*. Ed. Elizabeth Ammons and Annette White-Parks. Hanover, N.H.: University Press of New England, 1994. 47–60.

Susag, Dorothea M. "Zitkala-Ša (Gertrude Simmons Bonnin): A Power(full) Literary Voice." *Studies in American Indian Literature* 5.4 (1993): 3–24.

Velikova, Roumiana. "Troping in Zitkala-Ša's Autobiographical Writings, 1900–1921." *Arizona Quarterly* 56.1 (2000): 49–64.

Zitkala-Ša. *American Indian Stories*. 1921. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979.