

THE IMPORTANCE OF NATIVE ORATORY

ROTA LISTER,
Department of English,
University of Waterloo,
Waterloo, Ontario,
Canada, N2L 3G1.

ABSTRACT/RESUME

The author presents examples of Native oratory and examines their significance as a basic cultural process in times of social change and stress. The paper analyzes the structures and themes of these statements and attempts to determine the nature of the times when they were made. They are then compared with examples of oratory from the European tradition.

L'auteur présente des exemples d'oratoires Indiennes et elle examine leur signification comme une base d'un processus culturel dans le temps de changement social et de stress. Cet ouvrage analyse les structures et les thèmes de ses déclarations et s'attend à déterminer la nature du temps quand ils ont été fait. Ils sont ensuite comparés avec des exemples orales de la tradition de l'Europe.

When Chief Joseph of the Nez Perch spoke his unforgettable lines of courage and dignity in the face of overwhelming disaster, he gave to that occasion the expression of the triumph of the human spirit over that which seeks to crush it:

I am tired; my heart is sick and sad. From where the sun now stands I will fight no more forever (Jones, 1965:111).

These are words of peace and serenity addressed to a relentless adversary who would accept no other political and military solution; the kind of moving and simple poetic lines we associate with the final scene of a classical tragedy or a Shakespearean history play; lines as splendid as those mournful words Iras addressed to her royal mistress during the last moments of Antony and Cleopatra: "Finish, good lady, the bright day is done, / And we are for the dark."¹ Such lines combine in a peak moment words of affective communication, social cohesion and social control for the benefit of the handful of heart-sore survivors: a verbal structuring of Native values in the face of the destruction of Native society.²

In exploring the significance of Native oratory as a basic cultural process employed during moments of heightened historical and social awareness and change, this paper will attempt to determine the nature of some of these critical moments, the structures and themes of some major orations and the values which emerge from such a study. Some comparisons will be made with examples taken from the European rhetorical tradition.

Three basic types of significant occasions emerge from such a study of Native orations: speeches addressed to council meetings; emergency responses to enemies; and verbal elaborations upon treaties made with the white conquerors. The use of ceremonial and deliberative oratory on these occasions marks the Native leaders' determination to uphold their values and cultural traditions in the face of continuing social pressures, tribal and cultural conflicts and catastrophes inflicted by an aggressive invader.

Three early council speeches, for example, by Pontiac, Red Jacket and Joseph Brant, exhibit the valiant efforts of the Native leaders to cope with various aspects of the white threat and invasion in accordance with their perceptions of the situation. Thus Pontiac, in an address to a council held at the River Ecores in 1763, before the siege of Detroit, sought to arouse his followers to effective resistance and action against the colonists by means of an allegorical story advising a shift of attention from trade goods to the traditional spiritual values of the Ottawas; a questing Brave is brought face to face with the Great Spirit who counsels him as follows:

I am the Maker of heaven and earth, the trees, lakes, rivers, and all things else. I am the Maker of mankind; and because I love you, you must do my will. The land on which you live I have made for you, and not for others. Why do you suffer the white men to dwell among you? My children, you have forgotten the customs and traditions of your forefathers. Why do you not clothe yourselves

in skins, as they did, and use the bows and arrows, and the stone-pointed lances, which they used? You have bought guns, knives, kettles, and blankets, from the white men, until you can no longer do without them; and, what is worse, you have drunk the poison fire-water, which turns you into fools. Fling all these things away; live as your wise forefathers lived before you. And as for these English - these dogs dressed in red, who have come to rob you of your hunting-grounds, and drive away the game - you must lift the hatchet against them. Wipe them from the face of the earth, and then you will win my favor back again, and once more be happy and prosperous" (Vanderwerth, 1971:27-28).

The insistence upon a separate Native reality, upon a return to the traditional ways, demonstrates a very effective employment of language and imagery for the sake of tribal identity preservation and of religious associations for the structuring of a political purpose.

A second specimen, taken from Red Jacket's address to the council of Seneca chiefs held at Buffalo Creek in 1805, is a response to the missionary Cram's plea to be allowed to Christianize the Six Nations. The "silver-tongued" Sagoyewatha ("he who keeps his tribe awake") (Jones, 1965:51-53) alerts his fellow chiefs and his people to the danger brought to them by this seemingly friendly and harmless young missionary:

Brother: You say you want an answer to your talk before you leave this place. It is right that you should have one, as you are a great distance from home, and we do not wish to detain you. But we will first look back a little, and tell you what our fathers have told us, and what we have heard from the white people.

Brother: Listen to what we say. There was a time when our forefathers owned this great island. Their seats extended from the rising to the setting sun. The Great Spirit had made it for the use of Indians. He had created the buffalo, the deer, and other animals for food. He had made the bear and the beaver. Their skins served us for clothing. He had scattered them over the country, and taught us how to take them. He had caused the earth to produce corn for bread. All this he had done for his red children, because he loved them. If we had some disputes about our hunting ground, they were generally settled without the shedding of much blood. But an evil day came upon us. Your forefathers crossed the great water and landed on this island. Their numbers were small. They found friends and not enemies. They told us they had fled from their own country for fear of wicked men, and had come here to enjoy their religion. They asked for a small seat. We took pity on them, granted their request; and they sat down amongst us. We gave them corn and meat; they gave us poison in return.

The white people, Brother, had now found our country. Tidings

were carried back, and more came amongst us. Yet we did not fear them. We took them to be friends. They called us brothers. We believed them, and gave them a larger seat. At length their numbers had greatly increased. They wanted more land; they wanted our country. Our eyes were opened, and our minds became uneasy. Wars took place. Indians were hired to fight against Indians, and many of our people were destroyed. They also brought strong liquor amongst us. It was strong and powerful, and has slain thousands.

Brother: Our seats were once large and yours were small. You have now become a great people, and we have scarcely a place left to spread our blankets. You have got our country, but are not satisfied; you want to force your religion upon us We are told that your religion was given to your forefathers, and has been handed down from father to son. We also have a religion, which was given to our forefathers, and has been handed down to us their children. We worship in that way The Great Spirit has made us all, but he has made a great difference between his white and red children. He has given us different complexions and different customs Since he has made so great a difference between us in other things, why may we not conclude that he has given us a different religion according to our understanding? The Great Spirit does right As we are going to part, we will come and take you by the hand, and hope the Great Spirit will protect you on your journey, and return you safe to your friends (Stone, 1866:273-76).

What is particularly striking in this rejection of the missionary's offer is the use of oral history to enforce the wisdom of keeping a separate religion to give cohesion to a separate view of the world and way of life unlike Pontiac's use of mythology, it does not counsel a return to stone-age customs but merely recalls the tribal past in its actuality in order to repel any further encroachments. This employment of oral history constitutes an instance of language of social control, giving directives with collective sanction and exhibiting several of the characteristics cited by Hayakawa (1972:88-95) in this category of public language: the presence of affective connotations, "so that people will be appropriately impressed and awed" (ibid:94), an appeal to a supernatural power, and, of course, the special ceremonial occasion, in that the council was called together expressly in order to hear and respond to the missionary's plea.

Finally, a selection from Joseph Brant's oration to a council meeting in an Onondaga village on Buffalo Creek, held in 1794, displays that leader's masterly tact and restraint in reminding the white military leaders present, Colonel Butler and General Chapin, that all is not well between the Six Nations and the people of the United States:

Brother: We have borne everything patiently for this long time

past; we have done everything we could consistently do with the welfare of our nations in general - notwithstanding the many advantages that have been taken of us, by individuals making purchases from us, the Six Nations, whose fraudulent conduct towards us Congress has never taken notice of, nor in any wise seen us rectified, nor made our minds easy. This is the case to the present day; our patience is now entirely worn out

Brother: We are of the same opinion with the people of the United States; you consider yourselves as independent people; we, as the original inhabitants of this country, and sovereigns of the soil, look upon ourselves as equally independent, and free as any other nation or nations. This country was given to us by the Great Spirit above; . . . We have told you our patience is worn out; but not so far, but that we wish for peace, and, whenever we hear that pleasing sound, we shall pay attention to it (Vanderwerth, 1971:52-53).

Here formal language is employed in a very direct emotional communication, the expression of collective grievances and of the limits of endurance of unjust treatment. This very direct expression of strong disapproval resembles the tone and style employed by the Greek Demosthenes in his oration "On the Crown", in which he defends himself against the slanders of Aeschines and hurls at his detractor some properly indignant retorts:

Whatever mentioned or not mentioned in his catalogue of slander, there are laws for such things, and punishments, and trials, and judgments, with sharp and severe penalties; all of which he might have enforced against me; and had he done so - had he thus pursued the proper method with me, his charges would have been consistent with his conduct. But now he has declined the straightforward and just course, avoided an proofs of guilt at the time, and after this long interval gets up, to play his part withal, a heap of accusation, ribaldry, and scandal (Demosthenes, 1965:106-117).

To adopt Hayakawa's classificatory endeavours, we might term this use of language for public purposes the language of cultural confrontation, in which, while the official verbal conflict may be between two individuals, the goals and values of a whole society are implied. Like the language of social control and social cohesion, it constitutes an attempt to shape the goals and directions of a society and to ward off what is detrimental to that society.

Emergency responses to situations created by enemies are essentially of two kinds, the heroic exhortation to courage and brotherly mutuality against the common enemy and the dignified summing up of the outcome of a battle. Here are some of Tecumseh's words, directed at the Choctaws and Chickasaws in 1811, in an attempt to arouse them against the white colonists:

The annihilation of our race is at hand unless we unite in one

common cause against the common foe. Think not, brave Choctaws and Chickasaws, that you can remain passive and indifferent to the common danger, and thus escape the common fate. Your people, too, will soon be as falling leaves and scattering clouds before their blighting breath. You, too, will be driven away from your native land and ancient domains as leaves are driven before the wintry storms.

Sleep not longer, O Choctaws and Chickasaws, in false security and delusive hopes. Our broad domains are fast escaping from our grasp. Every year our white intruders become more greedy, exacting, oppressive and overbearing. Every year contentions spring up between them and our people and when blood is shed we have to make atonement whether right or wrong, at the cost of the lives of our greatest chiefs, and the yielding up of large tracts of our lands (Vanderwerth, 1971:63).

The poetic imagery of the first paragraph resembles very closely a famous Homeric simile:

As is the generation of leaves, so is that of humanity.

The wind scatters the leaves on the ground, but the live timber burgeons with leaves again in the season of spring returning.

So one generation of men will grow while another dies (Homer, 1951:157).

The similarity is surely not fortuitous: many are the stately orations delivered by the Achaean and Trojan leaders to their respective warriors throughout the twenty-four books of the *Iliad*. And again and again the bard sums up the effect of these speeches with formulaic precision: "So he spoke, and stirred the spirit and strength in each man" (ibid:322). What emerges clearly from Tecumseh's and Homer's words is the strong cultural parallel between the two societies represented, the pattern of two heroic ages.³ In the one case, the immediate words of the warrior chief, the other, the poet's reconstruction. The parallel also reminds us of Shelley's and Vico's discovery that "In the infancy of society every author is necessarily a poet, because language itself is poetry" (Shelley, 1952:429-35). This formal use of the language constitutes, of course, a cultural patterning, an "idea pattern" in Clyde Kluckhohn's theorem (Kluckhohn, 1941: 109-30).

Another battle oration, Black Hawk's address to the Sauks of April 1832, relies similarly upon concrete visual imagery to stir up a strong and patterned emotional response and action pattern:

Head-men, Chiefs, Braves and Warriors of the Sauks: For more than a hundred winters our nation was a powerful, happy and united people. The Great Spirit gave to us a territory, seven hundred miles in length, along the Mississippi They are now running their

plows through our graveyards, turning up the bones and ashes of our sacred dead, whose spirits are calling to us from the land of dreams for vengeance on the despoilers. Will the descendants of Nanamakee and our other illustrious dead stand idly by and suffer this sacrilege to be continued? . . . Then let us be again united as a nation and at once cross the Mississippi, rekindle our watch-fires upon our ancient watch-tower, and send forth the war-whoop of the again united Sauks, and our cousins, the Masquawkees, Pottawattamies, Ottawas, Chippewas, Winnebagoes and Kickapoos, will unite with us in avenging our wrongs upon the white pioneers of Illinois (Vanderwerth, 1971:86-89).

As Hayakawa points out in his chapter on "The Language of Affective Communication," poetic diction, metaphor and simile "are bound to occur whenever we have strong feelings to express. They are to be found in special abundance, therefore, in all primitive speech, in folk speech, in the speech of the unlearned" (1972:106), that is, wherever language is in close contact with the primary process.⁴

A single example of a surrender speech may suffice, since this discussion was begun with a quotation from Chief Joseph's moving words of resignation. The following example of placating oratory represents the attempts of Chief Geronimo of the Apache to impress his white conquerors with his good intentions following a prolonged series of fierce skirmishes around 1886:

There are very few of my men left now. They have done some bad things but I want them all rubbed out now and let us never speak of them again. There are very few of us left. We think of our relations, brothers, brothers-in-law, father-in-law, etc., over on the reservation and from this on we want to live at peace just as they are doing, and to behave as they are behaving. Sometimes a man does something and men are sent out to bring in his head. I don't want such things to happen to us. I don't want that we should be killing each other (Vanderwerth, 1971:239).

These words, direct and plain, resemble the forceful immediacy of Joseph Brant's reproof to Colonel Butler and General Chapin, quoted earlier and classified tentatively as language of cultural confrontation. The context is as emotionally powerful as that represented by the battle orations of Tecumseh and Black Hawk, but the audience, occasion and mood differ sharply. To reach the white victors, impatient to be done with the Native resistance, stirring poetic diction is quite out of place and forceful words of emotional immediacy are appropriate. To bridge the cultural gap, no chance can be taken with flowery language and elevated diction.

To save time and space, allow me to refer you to Lawrence C. Wroth's 1927 article on "The Indian Treaty as Literature" and to quote from his conclusion:

We know that the Indian had small regard for his plighted word

unless it was given in treaty, and that the English practised sophistry upon them in treaty and out. I am not, however, concerned here with the self-interest of both sides that the Treaties reveal but with their importance as a neglected literary type that arose without conscious artistic design from the conflict of two distinct civilizations on the same soil - a type in which one reads the passion, the greed, and the love of life of hard-living men brought into close relationship without parallel conditions in the history of either race to guide its conduct. In it are displayed certain raw human emotions: on the part of the Indians the fear of extinction, the desire to keep what the hand holds, the love of life, of ease and security. Seething in the same pot with these were the white man's passion to acquire and till the land, to build, to fill the left hand with more and more of the stuff that the right hand has grasped. All this is in the Indian Treaties, and in dramatic form.⁵

In turning now to an exploration of some structures and themes to be found in Native oratory, I cannot, of course, do more than suggest certain fundamental recurrences which might be studied in greater detail in a separate paper. The following are some of the structural consistencies found in the orations referred to earlier by Pontiac, Red Jacket and Joseph Brant:

1. Opening invocation of or reference to the Great Spirit or the Great White Father of the United States, depending upon subject and context;
2. Statement of the problem or specific occasion which has led to the present public gathering and the oration;
3. Narration of historical or mythological antecedents to the present occasion and causes of the present difficulties;
4. Arrival at some kind of climactic or core statement regarding the problem under consideration;
5. Summing up of the Native position with regard to the problem and rejection or modification of the alternative considered;
6. Final words to the visitors or implied outsiders whose alternative has been rejected.

It seems appropriate at this point to recapitulate the basic structural units of traditional European rhetoric. According to Aristotle, the two main parts of an oration are the statement of the case and proof of the case, to be subdivided into four subsidiary units, the proem or introductory statement, statement, argument and epilogue.⁶ Renaissance arts of rhetoric, such as Thomas Wilson's *The Arte of Rhetorique*, provide a few further sub-divisions:

- i. The Enterance or beginning.
- ii. The Narration.
- iii. The Proposition.
- iiii. The Devision or severall parting of things.

- v. The confirmation.
- vi. The confutation.
- vii. The Conclusion. (Wilson, 1965:26-57)

A closer look at the details of one of the three Native orations may assist us in determining whether Native oratory resembles more closely the simple or Attic structure or the elaborated Asianic. Here, in some detail, are the words of Joseph Brant, addressed to the Onondaga council and Colonel Butler and General Chapin of the United States:

Brothers: You, of the United States, listen to what we are going to say to you; you, likewise, the King.

Brothers: We are very happy to see you, Colonel Butler and General Chapin, sitting side by side, with the intent of hearing what we have to say. We wish to do no business but what is done open and above-board.

Brother: You, of the United States, make your mind easy, on account of the long time your President's speech has been under our consideration; when we received it, we told you it was a business of importance, and required some time to be considered of.

Brother: The answer you have brought us is not according to what we expected, which was the reason for our long delay; the business would have been done with expedition, had the United States agreed to our proposals. We would then have collected our associates, and repaired to Venango, the place you proposed for meeting us.

Brother: It is not now in our power to accept your invitation; provided we were to go, you would conduct the business, as you might think proper; this has been the case at all the treaties held, from time to time, by your commissioners.

Brother: At the first treaty, after the conclusion of the war between you and Great Britain, at Fort Stanwix, your commissioners conducted the business as it to them seemed best; they pointed out a line of division, and then confirmed it; after this, they held out that our country was ceded to them by the King; this confused the chiefs who attended there, and prevented them from making any reply to the contrary; still holding out, if we did not consent to it, their warriors were at their back, and that we would get no further protection from Great Britain. This has ever been held out to us, by the commissioners from Congress; at all the treaties held with us since the peace, at Fort McIntosh, at Rocky River, and every other meeting held, the idea was still the same.

Brother: This has been the case from time to time. Peace has not taken place, because you have held up these ideas, owing to which much mischief has been done to the Southward.

Brother: We, the Six Nations, have been exerting ourselves to

keep peace since the conclusion of the war; we think it would be best for both parties; we advised the confederate nations to request a meeting, about half way between us and the United States, in order that such steps might be taken as would bring about a peace; this request was made, and Congress appointed commissioners to meet us at Muskingum, which we agreed to, a boundary line was then proposed by us, and refused by Governor St. Clair, one of your commissioners. The Wyandots, a few Delawares, and some others, met the commissioners, though not authorized, and confirmed the lines of what was not their property, but a common to all nations.

Brothers: The idea we all held at our council, at Lower Sandusky, held for the purpose of forming our confederacy, and to adopt measures that would be for the general welfare of our Indian nations, or people of our color; owing to those steps taken by us, the United States held out, that when we went to the Westward to transact our private business, that we went with an intention of taking an active part in the troubles subsisting between them and our Western brethren; this never has been the case. We have ever wished for the friendship of the United States.

Brother: We think you must be fully convinced from our perseverance last summer, as your commissioners saw, that we were anxious for a peace between us. The exertions that we, the Six Nations, have made towards the accomplishing this desirable end, is the cause of the Western nations being somewhat dubious as to our sincerity. After we knew their doubts, we still persevered; and, last fall, we pointed out methods to be taken, and sent them, by you, to Congress; this we certainly expected would have proved satisfactory to the United States; in that case we should have more than ever exerted ourselves, in order that the offers we made should be confirmed by our confederacy, and by them strictly adhered to.

Brother: Our proposals have not met with the success from Congress that we expected; this still leaves us in a similar situation to what we were when we first entered on the business.

Brother: You must recollect the number of chiefs who have, at divers times, waited on Congress; they have pointed out the means to be taken, and held out the same language, uniformly, at one time as another; that was, if you would withdraw your claim to the boundary line, and lands within the line, as offered by us; had this been done, peace would have taken place; and, unless this still be done, we see no other method of accomplishing it.

Brother: We have borne everything patiently for this long time past; we have done everything we could consistently do with the welfare of our nations in general - notwithstanding the many advantages that have been taken of us, by individuals making

purchases from us, the Six Nations, whose fraudulent conduct towards us Congress never has taken notice of, nor in any wise seen us rectified, nor made our minds easy. This is the case to the present day; our patience is now entirely worn out; you see the difficulties we labor under, so that we cannot at present rise from our seats and attend your council at Venango, agreeable to your invitation. The boundary line we pointed out, we think is a just one, although the United States claim lands west of that line; the trifle that has been paid by the United States can be no object in comparison to what a peace would be.

Brother: We are of the same opinion with the people of the United States; you consider yourselves as independent people; we, as the original inhabitants of this country, and sovereigns of the soil, look upon ourselves as equally independent, and free as any other nation or nations. This country was given to us by the Great Spirit above; we wish to enjoy it, and have our passage along the lake, within the line we have pointed out.

Brother: The great exertions we have made, for this number of years, to accomplish a peace, and have not been able to obtain it; our patience, as we have already observed, is exhausted, and we are discouraged from persevering any longer. We, therefore, throw ourselves under the protection of the Great Spirit above, who, we hope, will order all things for the best. We have told you our patience is worn out; but not so far, but that we wish for peace, and, whenever we hear that pleasing sound, we shall pay attention to it (Vanderwerth, 1971:50-53).

Paragraph by paragraph, these are the functions of the structural subdivisions of Brant's address:

1. Opening invitation to listen to the speech;
2. Declaration of honest intent;
3. Explanation of the importance of the document considered and the delay in the response;
4. Expression of dissatisfaction with the terms offered;
5. Declaration of unwillingness to meet the United States commissioners on their terms;
6. Recall of previous fraudulent conduct displayed by the agents of the United States;
7. Generalization as to the habitual nature of this fraudulent conduct;
8. Recall of the Six Nations' continued efforts to keep the peace;
9. Misinterpretation of good will of the Six Nations on the part of the United States;
10. Reiteration of Six Nations' sincere efforts at keeping the peace;
11. Lack of positive response on the part of the United States Congress;
12. Recall of the many attempts made by Native chiefs to persuade

- Congress to adopt a reasonable policy towards the Native people;
13. Repetition of grievances regarding fraudulent behaviour of United States citizens;
 14. Summing up of political and social philosophies of independence as applicable to both sides of the dispute and reference to the Great Spirit, original grantor of the lands to the Native people;
 15. Reiteration of dissatisfaction and loss of patience on the part of the Native people and closing invocation of Great Spirit as well as reiteration of desire for peace.

These fifteen sections can be classified according to the following larger structural units:

- I. Opening words (invitation to listen; declaration of attitude of sincerity; affirmation of the importance of the occasion).
- II. Narration of grievances (dissatisfaction with terms; unwillingness to accept the opposition's approach; recall of breach of trust by opposition; generalization as to recurrence of breach of trust).
- III. Narration of Native efforts and good will (keeping the peace; misinterpretation of good will by opposition; continued efforts despite lack of success; recall of many personal attempts made by Native chiefs to persuade the United States to a better policy).
- IV. Confirmation as to grievances and confutation as to Native requirement to submit to the terms offered (repetition of grievances; declaration of independence).
- V. Concluding summary (reiteration of peaceful intent, discouragement, appeal to the Great Spirit and continued openness to sincere efforts on the part of the United States, should these ever occur).

The overall patterning, then, is straight-forward and simple, resembling the directness of Attic orations and avoiding some of the digressive patterns of Asianic and Renaissance rhetoric. A contemporary Native oration, Chief Dan George's 1968 address, "My Very Good Dear Friends", displays a similar simplicity of structure, a brief address to the audience, extended recall of the past of the Native tribes, recall of the past disasters inflicted by the superseding industrial society of the encroaching whites, recall of fundamental Native value of individual pride and dignity, return to the present and prescription for the future, closing remarks to the audience along with invocation of the heavenly Father (Waubageshig, 1970:184-88).

The themes and values which emerge from this study are those of Native good win and peaceful intentions and of the white colonists' rapacity and unresponsiveness. They display the kind of polarization of forces and values which have frequently appeared in impassioned political speeches made by widely known European cultural leaders during critical times in their nations' histories. Such in approach and intent are the philippics of Cicero, Milton's "Areopagitica," Edmund Burke's "Appeal from the New to the Old Whigs"

and Abraham Lincoln's brief address at Gettysburg. Always, there is the appeal to the solid civil virtues and old values of freedom, dignity, honour and morality, in determined opposition to some individual, group or social movement which would threaten or destroy these. As in the impassioned oratory of these leaders of white society, the Native speakers' efforts are directed against a massive tide of change which is about to overwhelm the old values, the traditional society and the communal way of life. Despite Cicero's brilliance, the enemies of the Republic triumphed; despite Milton's learning, a kind of royal despotism triumphed; despite Burke's volubility, the revolutionary societies advanced; despite Lincoln's idealism, the values of competition and commercialism overran the society of the United States. Yet they, too, like Chief Joseph of the Nez Percé, proved the superior nobility of the values they celebrated in the face of primitive aggression and self-seeking, corrupt power games and ruthless social Darwinism.

NOTES

1. "Antony and Cleopatra", V, ii, 193-194, in Shakespeare, 1969:1209.
2. See S.I. Hayakawa, 1972 for an extended theoretical discussion of the social functions of language.
3. See H.M. Chadwick, 1912 for a discussion of parallel characteristics of European heroic ages.
4. See Sigmund Freud, "The Interpretation of Dreams" in Freud, 1963 for a discussion of the primary and secondary processes.
5. Wroth, 1927-28. I am indebted to my colleague E. Palmer Patterson II for directing my attention to this article.
6. See Aristotle, 1960.

REFERENCES

- Aristotle
 1960 *The Rhetoric of Aristotle*. Translated by Jane Cooper. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.
- Chadwick, H.M.
 1912 *The Heroic Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Reprinted 1967)
- Demosthenes
 1965 "On the Crown", in George W. Hibbit (Editor): *The Dolphin Book*

of Speeches. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc.

Freud, Sigmund

1963 *Complete Psychological Works*. London: Hogarth Press.

Hayakawa, S.I.

1972 *Language in Thought and Action*. Third Edition. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc.

Homer

1951 *The Iliad*. Translated by Richard Lattimore. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jones, Louis Thomas

1965 *Aboriginal American Oratory: The Tradition of Eloquence Among the Indians of the United States*. Los Angeles: Southwest Museum.

Kluckhohn, Clyde

1941 "Patterning as Exemplified in Navaho Culture", in Leslie Spier, et. al. (Editors): *Language, Culture and Personality: Essays in Memory of Edward Sapir*. Menasha: Sapir Memorial Publication Fund.

Shakespeare, William

1969 *The Complete Works*. Edited by Alfred Harbage. Baltimore: Penguin Books.

Shelley, Percy Bysshe

1952 "A Defence of Poetry", in Walter Jackson Bate (Editor): *Criticism: the Major Texts*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Stone, William L.

1866 *Life and Times of Sagoyewatha, or Red Jacket*. Albany: J. Munsell.

Vanderwerth, W.C. (Editor)

1971 *Indian Oratory: Famous Speeches by Noted Indian Chieftains*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Waubageshig (Editor)

1970 *The Only Good Indian: Essays by Canadian Indians*. Toronto: New Press.

Wilson, Thomas

1963 "The Arte of Rhetorique" in O.B. Hardison, Jr. (Editor): *English Literary Criticism: the Renaissance*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Wroth, Lawrence C.

1927-28 The Indian Treaty as Literature. *The Yale Review* 17:749-66.

THE WINTER

Soft snow glowing in the sun
Still the winter runs
Every quarter of the year
And I have no fear
From the strong blizzards
There stands the wizard
Who keeps me warm all along
In my home where I belong.

Sharon Little