

7-1-1981

The Truth about Pueblo Indians: Bandelier's Delight Makers

Russell Saxton

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr>

Recommended Citation

Saxton, Russell. "The Truth about Pueblo Indians: Bandelier's Delight Makers." *New Mexico Historical Review* 56, 3 (1981). <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr/vol56/iss3/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in *New Mexico Historical Review* by an authorized editor of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact amywinter@unm.edu, lsloane@salud.unm.edu, sarahrk@unm.edu.

"THE TRUTH ABOUT THE PUEBLO INDIANS":
BANDELIER'S DELIGHT MAKERS

RUSSELL S. SAXTON

ADOLPH FRANÇOIS ALPHONSE BANDELIER was an extraordinary man—a talented historian, archaeologist, and scholar. He brought to his studies great personal discipline, a strong intellect, and a host of philosophical questions. At the center of his life's work were the American Indians, and his treatment of them reflects Bandelier's understanding of the values of nineteenth-century science and Christianity.¹ In the last hundred years, standards of cultural criticism have changed considerably, and most of Bandelier's anthropological work has been reevaluated in the light of contemporary social science.² However, this is not true of Bandelier's novel, which has never received much critical attention.³ The purpose of this study is threefold: to place *The Delight Makers* within the context of nineteenth-century American letters, to examine the image of the Pueblo Indians presented in the novel, and to suggest how this image relates to Bandelier's scholarly work.

The editors of Bandelier's *Southwest Journals* refer to him as a "pioneer" among American anthropologists; however, his reputation as an Americanist is also based on his work in history.⁴ Because of Bandelier's roles as anthropologist and historian, some disagreement exists among social scientists as to the proper classification of his scholarship. One critic notes that "Bandelier has been called an archaeologist by the historians, and a historian by the archaeologists."⁵ This statement captures a central truth about Bandelier's work—while it is generally recognized as important, neither camp wishes to claim him exclusively as its own. Doubtless this is due to the breadth of Bandelier's intellectual interests and the fact that he employed the techniques of documentary investigation to justify anthropological arguments.⁶ The disagree-

ment among critics as to the meaning of Bandelier's work and its place in American intellectual history, however, goes beyond the question of classification—an interesting problem, which will be taken up at the end of this essay.⁷ Typical of this confusion is the fact that of all Bandelier's publications it is his novel, *The Delight Makers*, that has been most widely read. This work has become "a minor classic of American literature," adding to Bandelier's reputation as anthropologist and historian that of novelist.⁸

The Delight Makers has a curious history. Bandelier wrote the first version in German, then translated the text into English. Although he had some difficulty finding a publisher, both versions were printed in 1890, the German text as a serial, the English version in book form.⁹ Initially, *The Delight Makers* was not a success; in fact it was not until the twentieth century that American readers showed a sustained interest in the work, not because of its quality as fiction, but because of its anthropological appeal. In his preface to a second edition issued in 1916, F. W. Hodge noted this change in attitude:

Because not understood, *The Delight Makers* was not received at first with enthusiastic favor. It seemed unlike the great student of technical problems deliberately to write a book that the layman might read with interest and profit; but his object once comprehended, the volume was received in the spirit in which the venture was initiated.¹⁰

Although technically a novel, *The Delight Makers* presents Bandelier's image of the Pueblo Indians "with more archaeological truth than distinction in plot and character."¹¹ The novel is not good fiction, and literary critics have dealt with it briefly as an example of popular anthropology without attempting to criticize its scientific content. On the other hand, social scientists have avoided *The Delight Makers* because it is fiction. Over the years, however, the work has become a significant document in American intellectual history—a novel read for its scientific value. Bandelier believed his image of the Indian to be a true one; Hodge agreed, as have many subsequent readers. Yet despite the book's recent popularity and its status as a minor American classic, it has yet to be subjected to serious criticism.

The Delight Makers combines science and romance; therefore, to criticize the novel, one must check the accuracy of the author's description of Pueblo society and analyze his plot. Fact and fiction come together in an "image" of the Indian—a term used in this essay to refer not only to the information Bandelier presents about the Pueblos, but to the values associated with that information. This distinction is crucial, for while much of the anthropological detail Bandelier makes available in his novel is new—the result of his investigations—the attitudes that color his interpretation of Indian culture did not spring from the same sources. They were formed in reaction to the images of the Indian current in the latter half of the nineteenth century. The novelty of Bandelier's portrayal of the Indian can best be viewed against this background.

At that time, many scholars believed that the American aborigine was doomed to extinction, and attitudes toward the Indian tended to coalesce around this supposed fact, depending on whether one saw the disappearance of the Indian as good or bad.¹² This issue was a hot one, and there was little middle ground. The ranks of those sympathetic to the plight of Indians grew as the century advanced, and there developed a sizeable body of popular literature pleading their cause. Nostalgia for the grandeur of the aboriginal past was a signal feature of such works.¹³ Cooper's *Leatherstocking Tales* are a good example; they elaborate the theme that along with the Indian, something noble was tragically passing from the American continent.¹⁴ Although Bandelier claimed to be a "sincere admirer" of Cooper, he intensely disliked the sentimental image of the Indian portrayed in Cooper's novels.¹⁵

American historians turned to the study of aboriginal history in the belief that it had to be recovered and preserved while still possible. Men such as Prescott and Parkman combined artistry with scholarly diligence, writing in a style that sought to convince the reader through rhetoric as well as logic—a style the twentieth century has called "literary history."¹⁶ Bandelier believed Prescott guilty of presenting Aztec society as much more advanced materially and morally than it really was, due, in part, to Prescott's uncritical reading of the early Spanish chroniclers. He considered Prescott to be a "romantic"—a purveyor of "historical fiction"—

and published a series of articles on the "Ancient Mexicans" to set the matter straight.¹⁷

Although there was considerable interest in the American Indian at the time Bandelier began his studies, he was one of the few North American scholars who did not rely on translations. He turned to Spanish documents of the sixteenth century, teaching himself the language in the process. About the time he began this work, he made the acquaintance of Lewis Henry Morgan, widely considered to be the father of modern anthropology.¹⁸ Morgan's influence on Bandelier's development was decisive, for it was not as a historian but as an anthropologist that Bandelier made his first contribution to American science.¹⁹ Later, it was through Morgan's influence that Bandelier was sent to New Mexico by the Archaeological Institute of America to study the Pueblo Indians.²⁰ His devotion to the elder scholar is evident in the letter he wrote to Morgan while on his way to the Southwest in 1880:

Our object must be to link together all kinds of tribes through the establishing of those general laws which you have deduced from your intimate knowledge of the condition of certain tribes and which form the immense everlasting service rendered by you. My duty it is to prove "in situ" that these laws are general and hold good among the highest as well as among the lowest Indians as far as I can reach them, and that their past has been spent in a condition ruled by these laws.²¹

Bandelier's journals indicate that the source for much of the novel's material was his initial contact with the people of Cochiti Pueblo, where he took up residence shortly after arriving in New Mexico in 1880.²² He lived there from 7 October until 15 December, and returned for brief visits a number of times during the next decade. But it was not love for the Pueblos or dismay concerning their condition that inspired his novel. No emotion similar to that which fills the pages of Helen Hunt Jackson's *Ramona* is found in *The Delight Makers*. His intent in writing the novel was both didactic and polemical, as he explained in a letter to his friend, Janvier:

We have, Mr. Morgan, and I under his directions, unsettled the

Romantic School in Science, now the same thing must be in literature on the American aborigine. Prescott's Aztec is a myth, it remains to show that Fennimore [sic] Cooper's Indian is a fraud.²³

As a novelist, Bandelier continued his campaign against the romantic image of the Indian; armed with science, he set out to meet the enemy on his own ground, the realm of popular fiction. The central concern of *The Delight Makers* is an intellectual one. As Bandelier put it in his preface: "By clothing sober facts in the garb of romance I have hoped to make the 'Truth about the Pueblo Indians' more accessible and perhaps more acceptable to the public in general."²⁴

Although the satirical novel has a long history as a vehicle for debunking popular attitudes, Bandelier did not set out to write satire. Instead he created as naive and "romantic" a narrative as any written in nineteenth-century America.²⁵ The following plot summary is intended for the reader who has not read the novel, and who is urged to persevere, bearing in mind that the book is interesting in spite of the plot.

Set in the Tyuonyi Pueblo in northern New Mexico before the coming of Europeans, *The Delight Makers* leads up to a moment of crisis, when a large part of the population abandons the settlement. Bandelier recreates the possible circumstances of this event to illustrate the workings of Pueblo institutions and explore what might be called "Indian psychology." The intrigue is complicated, weaving threads of love, patricide, ambition, and treachery through a woof of institutional tensions within the pueblo itself.

The novel opens with a threat against Say Koitza's life by the head warrior, Topanashka (also her father), who warns her that she is suspected of practicing witchcraft. If true, this charge will warrant her execution at his hands. Although it never comes to this, Say is guilty. Under the influence of Shotaye, her friend, she engaged in an act of witchcraft against one of the principal religious societies, the Koshare. The person responsible for the deed is Shotaye, the sorceress, who was seeking revenge against her ex-husband, Tyope.

Tyope hates Shotaye too, but his ambition is not limited to revenge against his ex-wife; he covets the position of the head warrior and hopes to have Topanashka murdered in order to take his

place. Because Tyope is not the man to do his own dirty work, he depends on the Navajo, Nacaytzusle. Raised as an adopted son in Tyope's household, Nacaytzusle ran away as an adolescent but has returned to haunt the woods around the pueblo in hopes of carrying off Tyope's daughter, Mitsha. In a secret meeting, Tyope proposes to give Mitsha to Nacaytzusle if he will murder Topanashka and denounce Shotaye for witchcraft. But the Navajo proves irascible, backs out of the plan, and threatens Tyope's life.

So Tyope himself decides to denounce Shotaye. Associating the charge of witchcraft with a recent drought, he seeks to embroil the tribal council in an attempt to force at least one of the clans to abandon the pueblo, leaving their cultivated land to the rest. Realizing the danger she is in, Shotaye arranges to escape to a neighboring pueblo, escorted by Cayamo, one of the Puye's principal warriors. There follows an interlude of trysts in the woods. Then suddenly, inexplicably, disaster strikes the pueblo; Topanashka's dead body is found in the woods next to one of Cayamo's sandals. Great plans are made for revenge. Tyope is elected the new head warrior and leads a raid against the neighboring pueblo. But Shotaye has gone, unnoticed, to warn the Puye, who rout the Tyuonyi warriors.

There is one final twist. It turns out that Cayamo was not the only Indian lurking in the woods, for it was not he, but one of Nacaytzusle's Navajo companions who killed Topanashka. While the warriors of Tyuonyi are off seeking vengeance, the Navajos attack and devastate the pueblo. The settlement is destroyed, Tyope's ambitions dashed, Shotaye is revenged, and the clans are scattered. So ends what one critic has called "Bandelier's charming story about Pueblo life."²⁶

In his preface to *The Delight Makers*, Bandelier recommends his book to the reader for its scientific content, but the work is not an objective treatise on the Indian. Bandelier narrates in one voice, that of the omniscient author, and comments on his story in another, that of the anthropologist. The second voice merges with yet a third, that of the moral philosopher. The novel contains a great deal of detail about Pueblo social customs, the least of which invites moral interpretation. To give but one example, the question of the Indian's apparent reticence in front of strangers leads Ban-

delier to conclude that in aboriginal societies, "individualism, or the mental and moral independence of the individual, has not attained the high degree of development which prevails among white races." Bandelier's underlying interpretation is everywhere the same: the Indian is not the moral equal of the European.²⁷

Bandelier's description of and commentary on Pueblo institutions present a negative image of Indian life, and this is not merely the result of his anthropological data; the plot, too, seems to support this conclusion. Does the drama of Pueblo life presented by Bandelier the omniscient author justify the negative view of Pueblo society expressed by Bandelier the anthropologist? Although he states that the plot is his, Bandelier suggests that it, too, is substantially "real," for he has witnessed "most of the scenes described." He further claims a source for his plot in a "dim tradition preserved by the Queres of Cochití."²⁸ Inasmuch as the plot is the source of the incidents that illustrate Bandelier's anthropological commentary and his philosophical conclusions, it is important to determine whether the narrative is based on a correct picture of the workings of Pueblo institutions.

The Delight Makers is essentially a tale about the disintegration of a Pueblo settlement. This disintegration is expressed as four separate occurrences: the murder of the head warrior; the defeat of the pueblo's warriors at the hands of a neighboring settlement; the devastation of the Tyuonyi pueblo by the Navajo while the war party is absent; and the disappearance of a large number of inhabitants during the Navajo raid. These events, each of which is associated with a specific subplot, unite in a final debacle that destroys the unity of the tribe. Does Bandelier indicate that the pueblo was ripped apart by its own institutions? This seems to be his intention. In developing the plot, he carefully explains the workings of tribal government and assigns a number of his chief characters prominent institutional roles.

Topanashka is the *maseua*, the leader of the pueblo in wartime. He is the father (*nashtio*) of the eagle clan. In addition, his character raises him above other men of the village. "He was highly respected for his skill and bravery, and for his stern rectitude and obedience to strict duty" (p. 36). An impeccable leader, he was "calm and absolutely brave. His life was nothing to him ex-

cept as indispensable for the performance of his duty" (p. 240). His murder subverts the patriarchal authority he represents.

Tyope, the man most responsible for the military destruction of the pueblo, is a prominent Koshare; his ambition and intrigue are directly associated with an illegitimate move to extend the power of that esoteric group. The same is true of his partner in intrigue, the head of the Koshare, who hopes to gain for himself the position of principal medicine man. Bandelier clearly states that these two are working to divide the tribe, and a good deal of the novel is taken up with the workings of this institutional intrigue (pp. 225-28). Tyope and the head of the Koshare manage to bring before the tribal council a demand for more land, coupled with a charge of witchcraft against Shotaye.

Bandelier carefully identifies this woman as a sorceress and insists upon the importance of the institution of witchcraft within Pueblo culture. Shotaye is guilty of using her arts in an attempt to injure the Koshare, and the fact that she did not act alone in her attack against the delight makers but enlisted the participation of Say Koitza, further complicates the institutional intrigue. In their argument before the tribal council, Tyope and the head of the Koshare link the matter of their clan's lack of land to the issue of a drought caused by witchcraft; the fact that one of the people responsible for this evil is the daughter of the head warrior, Topanashka, weakens his authority and creates an explosive situation in which a number of smaller clans may be forced to abandon the pueblo. To emphasize this danger, Bandelier has Topanashka "begin to see the truth" (p. 293). It occurred to him "his daughter . . . was also implicated, and with this thought came a flash of light. Not one clan alone, but several, were to be removed" (p. 294). If the wisest of the Pueblos finds that the proceedings of the council meeting represent a danger to tribal unity, so must the reader. With this conclusion, he must accept another: to the degree that the machinations of Tyope and the head of the Koshare provoke disaster, Pueblo institutions are to blame.

Having carefully prepared this institutional intrigue, however, Bandelier leaves it hanging, for the four-fold devastation of the people of Tyuonyi does not come about as a result of the dissension that Tyope and the Koshare Naua creates. Topanashka's death is

unrelated to the outcome of the council meeting; the defeat of the war party, though complicated in its implications, has nothing to do with sorcery or questions of land tenure; and the attack of the Navajos in the absence of the warriors is completely unrelated to the deliberations of the tribal council.

To understand the meaning of Topanashka's death, the defeat of the war party and the attack of the Navajos, the reader must turn his attention to Tyope, not as representative of his clan and prominent Koshare, but as a treacherous, ambitious individual who operates outside traditional Pueblo institutions to achieve his ends. It is the Navajos who murder Topanashka and who attack the pueblo while Tyope and the warriors are away. Tyope's relationships to these "hereditary foes" of the Pueblos has much more to do with the destruction of the Tyuonyi village than his representations to the tribal council.

Bandelier painstakingly presents the intricacies of Tyope's "Navajo connection" early in the novel. One dark night Tyope leaves the settlement to meet with Nacaytzusle. In the course of their conversation, the Koshare reveals an elaborate and treacherous plan. The reader learns that Tyope has asked Nacaytzusle to spy on Shotaye and kill her if possible, and that he has spoken of having the Navajos attack the pueblo while the Koshare are meeting in their kiva; they are to be sure to kill Topanashka so that Tyope can take his place as head warrior. He has further suggested the "propriety of converting the isolated murder into a butchery of the adult men as far as possible" (p. 226). But having explained this complicated plan, Bandelier immediately has Tyope repudiate it.

Bandelier is curiously ambivalent on the issue of Tyope's guilt. Despite the change of plans, it was Tyope who first proposed both the murder of Topanashka and the Navajo raid on the pueblo. Bandelier later remarks: "Everything he . . . thought of and planned took place, but the results did not coincide with his expectations." Tyope does not profit, however, from these events even though they are "strictly the consequences of what he had schemed and done" (p. 420). His desire is realized in such a way that he is discredited and humiliated for his scheming. This kind of justice is more typical of guilty dreams than human events, and

even Tyope understands his fate to be the work of the gods, not of Pueblo institutions.

It is easier to determine responsibility for the massacre of the war party than to say who is ultimately responsible for the attack of the Navajos. Bandelier writes that Shotaye, on learning that she was to be accused of witchcraft, immediately thought of revenge: "With armed men from the Puye [pueblo] she intended to return in the stillness of the night. . . .The Tehaus would reap many scalps" (pp. 309-10). Though her plans change on learning of the death of Topanashka, Tyope's defeat is due to Shotaye's treachery and, apparently, has nothing to do with the institutions of Pueblo society.

But this analysis does not take account of the fact that both Shotaye and Tyope are representatives of important Pueblo institutions; Bandelier purposely emphasizes this opposition, identifying it with the personal struggle between Tyope and Shotaye. They were once husband and wife, until Shotaye repudiated Tyope because he was too often away from home. Bandelier explains that there was a "little cloud of marital inconstancy on both sides." As a result of this rupture "the two were mortal enemies" (p. 42). Tyope is not merely a husband "averse to monotony in conjugal life" (p. 42), he is a prominent Koshare, whose religious function is to propitiate the gods of propagation, dramatizing the sexual act. Shotaye, for her part, is a witch.

It is significant that Bandelier identifies witchcraft as a female institution; in fact, his portrayal of Shotaye has little to do with Pueblo tradition.²⁹ He chooses to make his sorceress dramatically credible to the reader by associating her capacity for evil with her sexual power. "If Shotaye be a witch, she certainly is far from displaying the hag-like appearance often attributed to the female sorcerer. There is even something decidedly fascinating about her" (p. 107). Bandelier emphasizes her attractiveness and identifies her sexual conduct as the source of her power. "She often received visitors of the male sex. She despised men most thoroughly, but accepted their attentions if profitable" (p. 174). Her sensuality is complemented by a lack of redeeming moral qualities. "She was heartless, cold-blooded, merciless, remorseless, in everything that concerned her relations to others" (p. 183).

The sexual conflict between Shotaye and Tyope is raised to the level of institutional conflict by an act that pits women against the men, wives against husbands. Shotaye and her accomplice, Say, engage in sorcery against the Koshare. This act, ostensibly an attempt to relieve Say of a malingering illness, is also an attack on the potency of the guardians of the sexual mystery.³⁰ Tyope himself considers the attack successful; charging Shotaye with witchcraft before the tribal council, he holds her responsible for the drought of the previous summer.

Shotaye's vengeance, too, is expressed in sexual terms. As Tyope and his warriors are being driven back, he turns and catches sight of Shotaye at the side of her new lover, the head warrior of the enemy tribe. "He understood now the connection of events, the unexpected ambush. He saw that it could not have happened otherwise" (p. 407). Tyope raises his bow to kill her but lets it fall to his side.

A change came over Tyope,—a change so sudden and so complete that he was henceforth another man. Hope, ambition, revenge, vanished from his thoughts, and with them all energy left him. The appearance of that woman crushed him utterly (p. 408).

At this point, Bandelier the anthropologist intervenes to explain that Tyope's impotence is a consequence of his religious beliefs. However this may be, it is through sexual power that Shotaye accomplishes her ends, and Bandelier the novelist depicts her as a goddess of vengeance and an emasculator of men. Surrounded by gore, Shotaye feels her victory a hollow one because Tyope has escaped.

Corpse after corpse she scrutinized, turning over the ghastly bodies, peering into the lifeless features, raising the mutilated heads to see more closely, more distinctly. In vain; Tyope was not among them. . . . Her revenge was sterile; it had fallen on the least guilty (p. 412).

While Bandelier's novel contains no overt sexual encounters, his death scenes are full of erotic allusion.



Adolf F. Bandelier, 1892. University of New Mexico Library, Special Collections Department.

As she scanned the bloody, distorted features of the men of her tribe, in the expectation of gloating over those of . . . [them] against whom she had schemed, she recognized more than one of whose company she had agreeable recollections, more than one whom in her coldblooded, calculating way, she had made her tool for a time (p. 412).

As an Indian she cannot feel guilt, only "something like regret." Bandelier explains, "It was remorse, but she did not know it" (p. 412). But Shotaye's revenge is the instrument, not the cause of the destruction of Tyuonyi Pueblo.

At the heart of the novel is the murder of Topanashka, which interrupts the institutional intrigue, giving Tyope the chance to ascend to the rank of head warrior; the witchcraft proceedings against Shotaye are forgotten, and plans are made for warfare. The event is an enigmatic one. Of the protagonists, Tyope, Shotaye and Nacaytzusle, none commits the act, but all are guilty. The "real" murderer is an unidentified companion of Nacaytzusle.

A number of interpretations are possible—all equally valid. Tyope's desire is realized, albeit by coincidence and unknown to him; still, he profits by the murder and is indirectly very guilty. Topanashka is not completely innocent, for he observes Shotaye's meeting in secret with Cayamo, her warrior-lover, and his death expiates this sin: no one observes the sexual intrigues of Shotaye with impunity. As for Nacaytzusle, he is revenged for the murder of his parents years before.

While these interpretations may be valid, they are trivial. The death of Topanashka is important primarily as a symbol of the crime of patricide. The *maseua* is the most important of the fathers, the representative of a great patriarchal principle, and when he is overthrown, the forces of ambition, lust, and vengeance destroy the tribe.

For all the talk of the importance of Pueblo social structure, the community of Tyuonyi is essentially identified with a single figure: Topanashka. The plot is developed as a series of threats against this father by two pairs of children—Say and Shotaye, Tyope and Nacaytzusle. Through Say, Topanashka confronts the power of Shotaye; he threatens Say with death by his own hand if she is proven guilty of witchcraft. Although he never directly con-

fronts Shotaye, he does witness her secret meeting with Cayamo; Topanashka is killed immediately afterward while following this warrior through the woods.³¹ The deed of patricide is carried out, but Bandelier cannot assign guilt. By a series of contrived coincidences, the patricidal children are absolved of responsibility but punished for their deed—all except Shotaye. Say dies in exile; Nacaytusle is killed trying to abduct Mitsha; Tyope is defeated and humiliated.

Metaphorically, the power of the law of the fathers, represented by Topanashka, is pitted against the power of nature, represented by the Navajos and Shotaye. In *The Delight Makers*, the destruction of the pueblo is not the result of the political machinations of Tyope, but of the faulty religious inspiration of Pueblo society.³² Bandelier believed the Pueblos worshipped nature as a principal of sexual generation, thus the importance of the title of the novel, his expression of disgust at the rites of the Koshare, and his insistence on the treacherous sexual power of Shotaye.³³ The struggle between Tyope and Shotaye represents the conflict between male and female sexual principles; Shotaye's victory stands for the victory of sexual nature over chaste patriarchal law. Shotaye, like nature itself, is immoral and invincible, and the ubiquitous Navajo lurking in the woods represents another aspect of this same power.

Nature is an everpresent, deadly foe, lying just outside the bounds of the village. The situation of the Pueblos of Tyuonyi is symbolic of the human condition.

Nature alone stared them in the face, and Nature has no heart, although it is said that we are one with her. . . . Nature knows but law and force, and whoever depends upon her at a time when her laws will not tolerate the existence of man, falls a victim to the power of her forces (pp. 481-82).

As the preceding quotation shows, Bandelier did not believe that man is "one with" nature. He said that Indians believed in this unity and asserted they could make no greater mistake than in doing so. Referring to their "slavish obedience to signs and tokens of a natural order," he explains: "The Indian is a child whose life is ruled by a feeling of complete dependence, by a desire to accom-

modate every action to the wills and decrees of countless supernatural beings" (p. 208). Through the figure of Shotaye, Bandelier personifies nature as a seductive and vengeful witch, presenting the Indian as a child, helpless and impotent in her hands. As long as the Pueblos refuse to heed the voice of conscience urging them to rise above their sexual nature, they remain willing victims of this heartless mother.

The Delight Makers ends with an anticlimactic sequel to the destruction of the Tyuonyi pueblo in which Bandelier develops the theme of the survivors' search for a higher spirituality. He suggests that some of these people profit from their sufferings to realize that, without spiritual rather than sensual love, there can be no real community. One young couple arrives at a "perfect understanding that betokens a union which even death cannot destroy." In their case "passion has little to do with . . . [their] intimacy; the severe trials of the past have riveted them together on a higher plane" (pp. 478, 479).

In *The Delight Makers*, the reader enters a world of guilty children, fragile fathers, and threatening women; dressed as Pueblos and Navajos, these figures act out a moral allegory about the American Indians and their need for paternal guidance. That the Indian should heed the voice of nature rather than his conscience, Bandelier considered a betrayal of the cause of humanity. The murder of Topanashka and Shotaye's victory over Tyope illustrate the moral consequences of making sexual division a religious idea and a principle of social organization. Although there is a good deal of anthropological fact in the novel, this "science" is extraneous to the plot except for the theme of institutional conflict. This connection is tenuously made, however, and does not hold up. Tyope's intrigue never gets beyond the tribal council, and the tension between Tyope, the Koshare, and Shotaye the witch is a false one, for Shotaye is a European sorceress, not a Pueblo witch. Bandelier loses sight of his own hand in motivating his characters and treats his novel as an artifact, commenting on it as if it were the "Truth about the Pueblo Indians."

This same tendency to confuse the categories of fact and interpretation has also been noted in Bandelier's scholarly work. Despite his voluminous documentary research and extensive field-

work, Bandelier marshalled his facts in support of theoretical constructions often independent of his research. He considered interpretation to be an activity distinct from and superior to the determination of fact—so much so that a number of critics, while praising his mastery of factual material, have come to the conclusion that his interpretations do not spring from “science” as they know it, but from Bandelier’s personality.³⁴ Radin finds much of Bandelier’s work inspired by a sense of “mission.”³⁵ White, comparing Bandelier’s acceptance and defense of Morgan’s laws to religious conversion, claims that Bandelier ignored the evidence of his investigations in order to support Morgan’s theory.³⁶ Bernal agrees with White, pointing out that during his trips to Mexico Bandelier was only interested in “confirming not testing his position.”³⁷

Bandelier was aware of this tendency but thought it was justified in the service of truth. In a letter to the eminent Mexican scholar, García Icazbalceta, he described the defense of Hispano-Catholic policy presented in *Final Report*. Admitting the limitations of his position, he rationalized the fact:

I followed my conscience, although with more sentiment than knowledge of the subject. The lack of documentary sources constantly goes against my desire and leaves me vulnerable for making judgments without supplying, along with them, sufficient evidence, which, I have no doubt, exists in great quantity.³⁸

The kind of truth Bandelier intuited without sufficient documentation is of the same kind as the “Truth about the Pueblo Indians.” Underlying Bandelier’s science, as well as his fiction, is a belief in a moral order—a belief he defends tenaciously throughout his work.

Bandelier’s values were different from those of the majority of Anglo-Americans. In the first place, nineteenth-century America was overwhelmingly Protestant.³⁹ Not only Protestant religious feeling, but expansionism, racial prejudice, and democratic ideology were bound up in the doctrine of manifest destiny, which influenced most branches of intellectual endeavor in America, particularly those dealing with national history and the question of race.⁴⁰ Bandelier shared few of these values. He was born in

Switzerland, raised in the German-speaking community of Highland, Illinois, and never came to feel any deep attachment to the United States; nor was democracy a form of government that he particularly admired.⁴¹ Most important of all, Bandelier did not believe civilization to be largely the result of Protestant industry. Although raised in a predominantly Protestant community, he converted to Catholicism in 1881, and his writing reflects the fact that his primary spiritual allegiance was to the Catholic church.⁴²

Like other North Americans, Bandelier was a firm believer in the idea of progress, but he did not take "progress" to mean the creation of material wealth, nor did he adopt the social and political values generally associated with such worldly power. For Bandelier, progress was a measure of moral development. He was incensed at the notion that a primitive people could have a highly developed moral sense, and not only *The Delight Makers* but also much of his academic writing is inspired by the desire to combat that notion. White and Radin are correct in referring to Bandelier's tendency to organize his facts in support of a preconceived interpretation. Bandelier did have a mission, but then, so did most nineteenth-century scholars; Americans, in particular, were likely to find that Providence intended Protestant, "Caucasian" democrats to lead mankind down the path of progress.

In nineteenth-century American fiction there were essentially two attitudes toward the Indian; he was good or bad.⁴³ On one hand, writers such as Twain belittled the Indian, claiming he was an uncivilized, abysmal human being; on the other hand, authors such as Helen Hunt Jackson idealized the Indian, deploring Americans' insensitive treatment of him.⁴⁴ These attitudes were formed in reaction to the historical experience of Indian people in Anglo America and the Protestant policy of treating the Indian as the enemy of "civilization."⁴⁵ Although Bandelier has been called an enemy of the Indian by at least one anthropologist, most critics caught on the horns of this Protestant dilemma have chosen to associate *The Delight Makers* with the pro-Indian faction of nineteenth-century American authors. The novel is widely believed to present a "sympathetic treatment of Indian life," and one critic even finds in the novel echoes of Chateaubriand.⁴⁶ To the degree that these judgments are rooted in the Protestant perception of the Indian, however, they misunderstand Bandelier.

While it is true that Bandelier was sympathetic to Indians—he was no Indian hater—this fact alone does not make *The Delight Makers* an example of pro-Indian literature. After Cooper, most American novelists had been sympathetic to the Indian.⁴⁷ For example, in *Ramona*, Jackson portrays the Indian as a simple, naturally moral being; Ryan's hero in *The Flute of the Gods* is a venerable pagan healer, a severe and just critic of Christianity, and the most moral of men; in *Laughing Boy*, La Farge's Navajo community is spiritually superior to the Anglo-American one.⁴⁸ But Bandelier was not part of this trend; he opposed it. Indeed, the central themes of these works exemplify the "errors" Bandelier wished to correct.

A Catholic intellectual with aristocratic leanings, Bandelier held few of the attitudes common to most North American intellectuals. As a historian he was one of the first to defend the Hispano-Catholic conquest of the New World, arguing that the presence of the Spaniards was justified by the high moral standard of their Indian policy.⁴⁹ This, of course, is what the Church gave as its principal justification as early as the sixteenth century.⁵⁰ If it were true, as is still believed by many in the United States, that the Indian is the moral equal of the European, then the whole Catholic enterprise in the New World could be seen as little more than oppression and exploitation. On the other hand, if it were true, as Bandelier claimed, that the Indian is a child in need of moral training and paternal guidance, then one would have to condemn much of the national conduct of the United States.

Latent in Bandelier's treatment of the Indian, not just in *The Delight Makers* but also in his academic writing, is the conflict between Protestant and Catholic world orders.⁵¹ Perhaps the confusion on the place of Bandelier's work in American intellectual history and the reluctance to endorse his academic work may be partially due to his generally pro-Catholic outlook.

It can be argued that *The Delight Makers* is neither fiction nor anthropology—that it is not really about the Indian. Perhaps it is one of the first books in North America to deal critically with the Protestant idea of the Indian. As such it deserves its reputation as "a minor classic of American literature."

NOTES

1. See Robert F. Berkhofer, Jr., *The White Man's Indian* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978), pp. 49-61, for a discussion of nineteenth-century scientific thought; also, consult Roy Harvey Pearce, *The Savages of America* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1965), pp. 105-34.

2. For a structuralist criticism of evolutionist thought, see Roy Preiswerk and Dominique Perrot, *Ethnocentrisme et histoire* (Paris: Editions Anthropos, 1975), pp. 35-104. On Bandelier, see Benjamin Keen, *The Aztec Image in Western Thought* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1971), pp. 463-508; Miguel León Portilla, ed., *De Teotihuacán a los Aztecas* (México, D.F.: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1972), pp. 263-360; Paul Radin, ed., *The Unpublished Letters of Adolphe [sic] F. Bandelier Concerning the Writing and Publication of "The Delight Makers"* (El Paso, Tex.: Carl Hertzog, 1942), pp. ix-xv; Leslie A. White, *Pioneers in American Anthropology: The Bandelier-Morgan Letters, 1873-1883*, 2 vols. (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico [UNM] Press, 1940); and Leslie A. White and Ignacio Bernal, *Correspondencia de Adolfo F. Bandelier* (México, D.F.: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, 1960).

3. Criticism of *The Delight Makers* is generally brief and widely scattered. See F. W. Hodge's preface to the 1916 edition (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co.); Stefan Jovanovich's preface to the 1971 edition (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich); Carroll L. Riley's review of the 1971 edition, *New Mexico Historical Review* (NMHR) 47 (January 1972): 67-68; T. K. Penniman, *A Hundred Years of Anthropology*, 3rd ed. (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd., 1965), p. 333; Berkhofer, *White Man's Indian*, p. 107; Edwin W. Gaston, Jr., *The Early Novel of the Southwest* (Albuquerque: UNM Press, 1961). Also consult the index of Charles H. Lange and Carroll L. Riley's, *The Southwestern Journals of Adolph F. Bandelier 1880-1882* (Albuquerque: UNM Press, 1966); Lange and Riley, *The Southwestern Journals of Adolph F. Bandelier 1883-1884* (Albuquerque: UNM Press, 1970); Charles H. Lange, Carroll L. Riley, and Elizabeth M. Lange, *The Southwestern Journals of Adolph F. Bandelier 1885-1888* (Albuquerque: UNM Press, 1975); Mabel Major and T. M. Pearce, *Southwest Heritage*, 3rd ed. (Albuquerque: UNM Press, 1972), p. 83; Stanley T. Williams, *The Spanish Background of American Literature*, 2 vols. (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1955), 1: 163-64.

4. For a complete bibliography of Bandelier's publications, see Lange, Riley, and Lange, *Southwestern Journals 1885-1888*, pp. 560-71. His major historical works are *Contributions to the History of the Southwestern Portion of the United States*, Papers of the Archaeological Institute of America, American Series 5 (Cambridge, Mass.: John Wilson & Son, 1890); *The Gilded Man and Other Pictures of the Spanish Occupancy of America* (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1893); and an unpublished manuscript in the Vatican Library, "Histoire de la

colonization et des missions de Sonora, Chihuahua, Nouveau Mexique, et Arizona jusqu'à l'année 1700."

5. Edgar F. Goad, "A Study of the Life of Adolph Francis Alphonse Bandelier, with an Appraisal of His Contributions to American Anthropology and Related Sciences" (Ph.D. diss., University of Southern California, 1939), p. 4, quoted in Lange and Riley, *Southwestern Journals 1880-1882*, p. 3.

6. See Lange and Riley, *Southwestern Journals, 1880-1882*, pp. 3, 41-42.

7. Lange and Riley, *Southwestern Journals, 1880-1882*, pp. 1, 67.

8. Carroll L. Riley, review of *The Delight Makers*, p. 68.

9. Bandelier also began but did not finish another novel in April of 1889, a work he called "Fray Luis the Lay Brother, A Reminiscence of Coronado's March"; Lange, Riley, and Lange, *Southwestern Journals, 1885-1888*, pp. 330-31. See also Hulda R. Hobbs, "The Story of *The Delight Makers* from Bandelier's Own Journals," *El Palacio* 49 (June 1942): 109-24.

10. Bandelier, *The Delight Makers*, p. vii.

11. Williams, *Spanish Background*, 1:164.

12. For an analysis of American "double-mindedness" about the Indian, see Pearce, *The Savages of America*.

13. Berkhofer, *White Man's Indian*, pp. 86-111.

14. Pearce, *The Savages of America*, pp. 196-213.

15. Bandelier to Janvier, in Radin, *Unpublished Letters*, p. 3.

16. George H. Callcott, *History in the United States 1800-1860: Its Practice and Purpose* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1970); Richard C. Vitzhum, *The American Compromise: Theme and Method in the Histories of Bancroft, Parkman and Adams* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1974); Harvey Wish, *The American Historian* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1960), pp. 88-108.

17. Bandelier to Janvier in Radin, *Unpublished Letters*, p. 3. Bandelier, *The Romantic School in American Archaeology* (New York: Trows Printing and Book Binding, 1885). Bandelier, "On the Art of War and Mode of Warfare of the Ancient Mexicans," *Tenth Annual Report of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology* (Cambridge, Mass., 1877): 383-84. Bandelier, "On the Distribution and Tenure of Lands, and the Customs with Respect to Inheritance, among the Ancient Mexicans," *Eleventh Annual Report of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology* (Cambridge, Mass., 1878): 385-448. Bandelier, "On the Social Organization and Mode of Government of the Ancient Mexicans," *Twelfth Annual Report of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology* (Cambridge, Mass., 1880): 557-699.

18. Berkhofer, *White Man's Indian*, pp. 51-52. Lange and Riley, *Southwest Journals, 1880-1882*, p. 11.

19. White says that Bandelier's historical essays—the basis for *The Gilded Man*—were written while Bandelier was preparing his articles on the "Ancient Mexicans." Like *The Delight Makers*, they were originally published in German and did not appear in English until *The Gilded Man* was published in 1893. See White, *Bandelier-Morgan Correspondence*, 1:74, n. 24.

20. Lange and Riley, *Southwestern Journals, 1880-1882*, pp. 18-26.
21. White, *Bandelier-Morgan Correspondence*, 2:199.
22. See *Southwestern Journals* for Bandelier's entries, and the editors' notes under "Die Kõshare" and "Delight Makers."
23. Radin, *Unpublished Letters*, p. 3.
24. Adolph F. Bandelier, *The Delight Makers*, 2nd ed. (New York: Dodd Mead & Co., 1918), p. v. All subsequent references are to this edition, indicated by page number in the text.
25. Gaston, *Early Novel of the Southwest*, p. 30.
26. Penniman, *A Hundred Years of Anthropology*, p. 333.
27. See Pearce, *The Savages of America*, p. 200.
28. See Gaston, *Early Novel of the Southwest*, p. 45; Bandelier, *The Delight Makers*, p. vi.
29. Marc Simmons writes: "The American Indian . . . was becharmed by as many male as female witches and no special prejudice was heaped upon the latter." *Witchcraft in the Southwest* (Flagstaff, Ariz.: Northland Press, 1974), p. 9. Bandelier's portrayal of Shotaye with emphasis on her sexual power follows European tradition, according to which women are naturally lascivious; their carnal (satanic) power is set against spiritual, Christian order. See Jeffrey Barton Russell, *Witchcraft in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1972), p. 62; Jules Michelet, *Satanism and Witchcraft* (Secaucus, N.J.: Citadel Press, 1973), pp. 69-76. Bandelier's condemnation of Indian religion continues a long-standing Catholic tradition; see Simmons, *Witchcraft*, pp. 14-15. Bandelier's emphasis on Shotaye's sexual power is a Victorian version of an old European theme, not a Pueblo one.
30. Say's illness is caused by "want of proper care" (p. 39). Shotaye convinces Say that the Kõshare are responsible for this vague malady, but the argument is hard to follow. When Say dies at the end of the novel, her husband, Zashue, is accused of neglect. Zashue, too, is a Kõshare; as Say's husband, his "neglect" seems to consist of exercising that "freedom of action . . . permitted to the man toward the other sex" (p. 39), reinforcing the theme of sexual struggle and male guilt. In fact Zashue even visits Shotaye (pp. 119-26), who refuses his advances and later mentions the incident, indirectly, to Say, who does "not care to learn about her husband's outside affairs" (p. 188).
31. Although Topanashka does not confront Shotaye, their latent conflict rises to the surface in this scene; "had Topanashka been armed he would have sought to kill her on the spot" (p. 322).
32. In his major anthropological publication on the Pueblos, Bandelier writes, "Among the more private dances of the Pueblos, there are several from which the reproach of gross obscenity cannot be withheld. These are also highly symbolical, and they furnish a deep insight into the real conceptions forming the bulk of what are called the religious ideas of the Indians. It cannot be otherwise where duality in sex is regarded as essential to the idea of creation" (*Final Report of Investigations among the Indians of the Southwestern United States, Carried on Mainly in the Years from 1880 to 1885*, 2 vols., Papers of the Archaeological In-

stitute of America, American Series 3 [1890; reprint ed., New York: Kraus Reprint Co., 1976], 1:299-300).

33. In *The Delight Makers* Bandelier openly expresses his dislike for the Koshare. Their first appearance in the performance of their ceremonial duties is described as "not merely strange, [but] positively disgusting" (p. 134).

34. Lange and Riley, *Southwestern Journals 1880-1882*, pp. 1, 65-67.

35. *Unpublished Letters*, p. xi. In the same introduction Radin writes of *The Delight Makers*: "Manifestly it contains, in a disguised and symbolical form, some part of that very much agitated and strangely unintegrated self that was Adolphe [sic] Bandelier" (p. xv).

36. White, *Bandelier-Morgan Correspondence*, 1:11, 47, 55.

37. White and Bernal, *Correspondencia*, p. 91.

38. White and Bernal, *Correspondencia*, pp. 308-9. "Obré según mi conciencia, aunque con más sentimientos que conocimiento de la materia. La carencia de fuentes documentales va siempre en contra de mis deseos y me expone a emitir juicios sin proporcionar a la par pruebas bastantes, las cuales no dudo que existen en gran cantidad." Bandelier believed interpretation to be superior to mere "fact," as he wrote to Morgan: "Lines of thought are superior, in the end, to lines of facts, because fact is dead without the constant action of thought upon it" (White, *Bandelier-Morgan Correspondence*, 2:207, quoted in Lange and Riley, *Southwestern Journals, 1880-1882*, p. 25).

39. See Ray Allen Billington, *The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1938), for a study of American nativism. Callcott, in *History in the United States*, deals with how religion, morality, and race were treated by nineteenth-century historians. See also John S. Haller, Jr., *Outcasts from Evolution, Scientific Attitudes of Racial Inferiority, 1859-1900* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971). An excellent analysis of the attitudes underlying American letters of the period is found in Henry F. May, *The End of American Innocence* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1959).

40. Thomas F. Gossett, *Race: The History of an Idea in America* (Dallas, Tex.: Southern Methodist University Press, 1963); Albert K. Weinberg, *Manifest Destiny: A Study of Nationalist Expansionism in American History* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1935); Wish, *The American Historian*, pp. 70-87.

41. See Bandelier to Janvier, Radin, *Unpublished Letters*, pp. 24, 26.

42. In addition to Bandelier's favorable presentation of the Church in *The Gilded Man* and his defense of the missionaries in *Contributions to the History of the Southwest*, see his defense of Hispano-Catholic policy and its beneficent effect on the Indian in *Final Report*, 1:190-211. Also consult his correspondence with his godfather, García Icazbalceta, as to his "usefulness" to the Church (26 December 1881): "Everything [the Pueblos] have and can do today they owe to the Church" (7 October 1882), White and Bernal, *Correspondencia*. It should be remembered, too, that Bandelier wrote an unpublished history of the missions of northern Mexico, one that Bandelier described to García Icazbalceta as generally having the tone of a defense (*tono . . . apologético*), (3 August 1887).

43. Leslie Fiedler points out in *The Return of the Vanishing American* (New

York: Stein and Day, 1968), that western literature tends to represent the confrontation with the Indian in religious terms. The Indian appeared full-blown to the European mind as the inexplicable other in human form. In fiction this confrontation takes on mythical proportions, for it is through the Indian that the European becomes American—literally transformed by the experience, he sees the child of nature as god or devil.

44. Berkhofer, *White Man's Indian*, pp. 104-11. See the description of the Gosiute in Samuel L. Clemens, *Roughing It* (Hartford, Conn.: American Publishing Co., 1872), pp. 146-47, quoted in Berkhofer, *White Man's Indian*, pp. 105-6. Helen Hunt Jackson, *Ramona* (Boston: Roberts Bros., 1884).

45. Pearce, *The Savages of America*, pp. 10, 48-49.

46. Berkhofer, *White Man's Indian*, p. 107; Gaston, *Early Novel of the Southwest*, p. 33.

47. Berkhofer, *White Man's Indian*, p. 88. As Pearce points out, the American idea of progress predicates the moral inferiority of Indian culture (*Savages of America*, p. 200). The power of the counterculture image of the morally superior Indian stems from the denial of this fundamental belief. Melville, fully aware of this irony, has Queequeg say, "We cannibals must help these Christians" (*Moby Dick* [New York: Harper and Brothers, 1851] quoted in Pearce, *Savages of America*, p. 251).

48. Jackson, *Ramona*. Marah Ellis Ryan, *The Flute of the Gods* (New York: Frederick A. Stokes Co., 1909). Oliver La Farge, *Laughing Boy* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1929).

49. The central theme of *The Gilded Man* is that Catholic moral order reformed the conquistadores and brought civilization to the Indian. Bandelier stresses the novelty and importance of this theme a number of times in his correspondence with García Icazbalceta (White and Bernal, *Correspondencia*, pp. 258, 265, 285, 296).

50. The argument appears in the documentary history of New Mexico, too, although the territory was not colonized until the seventeenth century. See Benjamin M. Read, *Illustrated History of New Mexico* (Santa Fe: New Mexican Printing Co., 1912), pp. 203-8, for the text of Oñate's declaration of possession of New Mexico. Bandelier's argument based on moral paternalism is, of course, one among many in Mexico. A progressive doctrine in the Las Casas-Sepúlveda debates of 1850, it was already a conservative argument during the Mexican reform period, soon to be identified as the voice of a reactionary elite by the *indigenistas* of the Revolution. See Lewis Hanke, *Aristotle and the American Indians* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1959); Charles A. Hale, *Mexican Liberalism in the Age of Mora* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1968), pp. 215-47; Fr. Bartolomé de Las Casas, *Los indios de México y Nueva España*, ed. Edmundo O'Gorman (México, D.F.: Editorial Porrúa, S.A., 1971), pp. xi-xvii; Benjamin Keen, *The Aztec Image*, pp. 463-508.

51. Bandelier comments on this aspect of his unpublished "Histoire de la Colonization et des Missions" in a letter to García Icazbalceta: "In various chapters I have been able to compare the Indian policy of the Spanish govern-

ment with that of the United States. I have not been able to say much in favor of the latter" (White and Bernal, *Correspondencia*, p. 300). The same subject arises in an earlier letter, p. 190, and in *The Gilded Man*: "If we [Americans] can . . . justify our whole systematic robbery and destruction of the Indians under the pretence of progress, then we cannot be judges against the Conquest" (p. 281).

PRICE INCREASE

Because printing costs have risen sharply in the last three years, we are forced to raise our subscription price from \$8.00 to \$10.00. As of 1 January 1982, the annual subscription charge will be \$10.00.

We hope that you understand why we must raise our prices.