

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

The Chippewa Landscape of Louise Erdrich. Edited by Allan Chavkin.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3rs2b0tb>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 24(3)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Ware, Amy M.

Publication Date

2000-06-01

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

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

As is often the case with a good story, the beginning and the end of this one are its strengths. I found the discussions of James Fenimore Cooper, dime novels, and Buffalo Bill's film *The Indian Wars* both surprising and well written. The final discussion of contemporary Native filmmakers was informative and provocative. The interceding analyses of fifty-some films, while useful, sometimes read slowly. I found myself imagining Kilpatrick watching hundreds of hours of offensive film footage and wishing she had stopped sooner. The films certainly provide ample evidence, however, for her claims. I knew I could not be wearier of the discussion than she was of the harm these films had been doing for so many years.

Celluloid Indians is not just a good book. It is a good book with multiple uses. Assign it in your classes. Buy it for your father. Recommend it to your local libraries. Better still, send a copy to your favorite Hollywood production company.

Julie Tharp

University of Wisconsin, Marshfield/Wood County

The Chippewa Landscape of Louise Erdrich. Edited by Allan Chavkin. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1999. 213 pages. \$34.95 cloth; \$16.95 paper.

A collection of critical essays examining Louise Erdrich's fiction and poetry is long overdue. The Chippewa/German author's contribution to American and American Indian literature is enormous and her ability to create tremendously complex novels and story cycles is unprecedented. Still, critiques of her work have until now been limited to journal articles and book chapters that oftentimes focus on larger literary themes.

In *The Chippewa Landscape of Louise Erdrich*, Allan Chavkin (whose work includes *Conversations with Louise Erdrich and Michael Dorris*, a collection of interviews) brings together several in-depth analyses of Erdrich's work by critics such as Robert F. Gish, Catherine Rainwater, Nancy J. Peterson, and A. LaVonne Brown Ruoff, whose afterword brings the book to a well-rounded conclusion. While the collection covers a wide variety of issues regarding Erdrich's writings, the focus and frame make the book palatable and easy to digest. And while there are no bridges transiting between sometimes difficult to connect topics (carnival and hunting in Erdrich's novels, for example), the book leaves the critical theory lover with feelings similar to those of the fiction aficionado at the conclusion of *Love Medicine*: slightly overwhelmed by the breadth of the text but cognizant of its significance.

The book's most obvious downfall is its failure to consider the topic promoted on its cover—Erdrich's use of the Chippewa landscape. A detailed analysis of Erdrich's use and representation of Chippewa landscape, world-view, mythology, and folklore does not exist in this book. Furthermore, the Turtle Mountain Reservation in particular (where Erdrich's Chippewa roots lie) is mentioned a mere four times in the text (pp. 10, 37, 112, 178 n.3).

Instead, overarching phrases such as “indigenous cultures,” “Native Americans,” and “American Indians” are used throughout the book to mark the writer’s place in the American literary canon. While such classifications are at times unavoidable, there are countless methods Erdrich employs, making use not only of a Native American literary style, but also—and perhaps more importantly—of ample stories, beliefs, lifestyles, and *landscapes* specific to the Chippewa and, even more precisely, to the Turtle Mountain Chippewa. Such an oversight is problematic at best, and leaves the text with an obvious and rather large hole through its alleged core.

Still, the various essays present ideas and examinations that are both fresh and comprehensive. Most stunning is Catherine Rainwater’s “Ethnic Signs in Erdrich’s *Tracks* and *The Bingo Palace*” (pp. 144–160). Rainwater’s innovative approach to Erdrich’s literature perhaps is rivaled only by Paula Gunn Allen’s landmark examination of American Indian literature at large. Her argument that *Tracks* “converts ‘reader’ to ‘listener’” and that *The Bingo Palace* transforms reader to voyeur is grounded in easy-to-swallow theory and superb textual analysis (p. 145). It becomes clear in this persuasive essay that Erdrich’s writing truly is tribal and “countercolonial,” as Rainwater defines, “designed to change her audience’s ways of seeing, hearing, and knowing” (p. 157).

In addition, Rainwater confronts some deeply challenging questions such as that starting her first paragraph: “What makes a novel ‘Native American’?” (p. 144) The author delves deeply to answer such vague and politically charged questions, including one defining ethnic signs, making the essay exciting and slightly jolting. Approaching issues that frighten most scholars in American Indian literature make this short piece both specific in its ability to discuss precise aspects of Erdrich’s writing and comprehensive in its attempts to promote a deeper understanding of American Indian literature in general.

A second essay worthy of mention is “Vision and Revision in Louise Erdrich’s *Love Medicine*,” the editor’s comparison of the two published versions of this novel. In this piece Chavkin approaches a topic that seems of little relevance to most scholars who fail to differentiate between the two versions. The topic, however, is an immensely important one, particularly in regard to defining authoritative literature and the importance of multiple versions, or, as Chavkin writes, “‘textual pluralism’—the idea that there is no one version of the text that is ‘correct,’ ‘most authoritative,’ or ‘best’” (p. 87). Chavkin argues, in conclusion, that these two versions represent two distinct authorial intentions. While not exhaustive, Chavkin’s essay challenges some strongly held literary staples and deepens our understanding and approach to *Love Medicine*.

Other highlights in *The Chippewa Landscape of Louise Erdrich* include John Purdy’s study of chance and Nancy Peterson’s examination of humor, two crucial aspects of Erdrich’s fiction that are underrepresented in scholarly study. And while the essays do not explore Chippewa trickster stories, gaming, and humor as they should, they restart a dialogue rarely mentioned since Kenneth R. Lincoln’s 1993 *Indi’n Humor*.

Annette Van Dyke's study of women and power in Erdrich's novels shows the problems of applying Euro-American women's theory to American Indian women's issues. The essay falls short of examining American Indian literature—particularly those works written by American Indian women—as defined and represented by themselves and for themselves. Van Dyke plays the good woman/bad man game so prominent in larger US feminist writings and fails to dig deeper into Chippewa religion and culture to understand why or exactly how this is the case. She writes that Erdrich's "feisty women characters exemplify a kind of power central to life on the reservation . . . [while] the males must seek to find power and place" (p. 131). However, it is important to explore the literary methods Erdrich employs—the essay looks specifically at the female characters' sexuality—to help introduce American Indian gender and sexuality issues to scholars recently interested in American Indian women and literature. The essay is problematic in its approach, but relevant in its ability to open a much-needed dialogue regarding Native women's issues and study concerning their place in tribal systems.

Despite its drawbacks, the book contains several valuable examinations of Erdrich's work, each very different in its approach. Included at the end of most articles are extensive bibliographies, showing in-depth research and well-supported arguments that are accessible to those who may find theory dry. Chavkin's work, despite its inaccurate title, hopefully marks the beginning of further research on Erdrich's complicated and inextricable style.

Amy M. Ware

University of California, Los Angeles

The Cold-and-Hunger Dance. By Diane Glancy. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998. 109 pages. \$22.00 cloth.

Diane Glancy published her first poetry collection in 1986 and since has published five more, in addition to three novels, three collections of short stories, a play, and three collections of essays. Given the autobiographical implications of *The Cold-and-Hunger Dance* and the ambivalence in her insights into the obsessions of multiculturalism, its publication may provide an opportunity for a tentative understanding of how she has reached this point in her brief but prolific career and the direction her writing might take in the future.

Glancy's definition of herself as a Cherokee writer—accepted by publishers and largely accepted by the Native American studies professoriat—is based on her descent from a Cherokee great-grandparent, her father's maternal grandfather. But that Cherokee identity has always seemed more a matter of will than emotion. Her one clearly Cherokee work, the product of substantial historical and ethnological research and an exploration of the Cherokee language and the syllabary of Sequoyah, is her historical novel about the Trail of Tears, *Pushing the Bear* (1996). But when we read in *The Cold-and-Hunger Dance* that the novel was the work of eighteen years we may wonder why she said in an autobiographical essay in the Brian Swann and Arnold Krupat collection