

The Sparrow and the Shaking Tent: Containing the Convert in Two Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Ojibwe Conversion Narratives

John Moffatt
University of Saskatchewan

Although Christian teaching insists that the moment of conversion is a rebirth into a new life, writers of evangelical histories sometimes find it necessary to contain the extent of the convert's transformation. These narratives necessarily address a dual audience, which has marked implications for an analysis of their rhetoric, since the audience is to be understood as part of what Kenneth Burke identifies in dramaturgic terms as the Scene (*Grammar* xvii). An internal audience whose conversion reifies the purpose of the discourse constrains the message in form and content; at the same time, the rhetor implicitly addresses an external audience, whose religious views and experience are necessarily distinct from the internal one, and with whom the rhetor establishes a distinct relationship. This paper will examine how evangelical historians can deliberately leave the internal audience's conversion incomplete, as part of a persuasive strategy directed at the external audience. Moreover, following Burke's principle that identification "implies division" (*Rhetoric* 45), the rhetor builds identification with the external audience by drawing attention to an imbalance of the Aristotelian appeals of ethos, logos, and pathos (Cf Aristotle 1.2) in the missionary discourse to which the internal audience responds.

Two examples of such narratives, representing vastly different social and cultural circumstances, are to be found as episodes in the *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* (The Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation) written in 731 CE by the Northumbrian historian and hagiographer Bede, or Bæda, and in *History of the Ojibway Indians; with especial reference to their conversion to Christianity*, written by the Mississauga Anishnaabe (Ojibwe) missionary

Peter Jones (Kahkewaquonaby¹), and published posthumously in 1861. These two texts may appear an unlikely match, on the surface of things. Their composition is separated by more than a thousand years of history; their authors are separated by language, by cultural background, and by religious ideology. Bede was an Anglo-Saxon in the literal sense, who wrote in the Latin of the mediaeval Church; Jones was the son of a Welsh-American land surveyor and a Mississauga woman. Bede was a Benedictine monk, raised within the monastic and scholarly tradition of first-millennial Roman Christianity, while Jones, ultimately an ordained Methodist minister, was raised in Ojibwe traditionalism, learning English late in his childhood (Smith 41), and only as a young man embracing an American Methodism “marked by easy-to-understand and highly emotional services” (Smith 56). While Bede’s reputation derives from his writings, Jones was also celebrated in his day as a speaker, especially in the popular genre of the sermon, the ideal composition of which was, as Penny Petrone puts it, “a typical blend of straightforward exposition and practical admonition, a mixture of spirituality and practicality expressed in balanced prose” (40). Despite these obvious differences, there is a striking similarity in their agendas as evangelical historians.

In both exempla to which my title refers, the authors ostensibly depict the decision to embrace Christianity as an enabling strategy for the convert who constitutes the internal audience. Christianity liberates the individual from isolating taboos and practices, and permits him or her to enter more fully into the life of the society at large. I would like to explore the construction of this stance in more detail, in terms of what it means to our understanding of the internal audience as a means of persuading the external audience. To do so, it is necessary to compare first the role of the authorial, missionary ethos in the two texts' presentation of the

¹Jones’ Ojibwe name translates roughly as “Sacred Feathers.” NB: Ojibwe terms appearing in or relevant to Jones’ text appear in the orthography that Jones himself used.

missionary exigence, and then the structure of each narrative. We will see how each writer constructs the nature of the Church's confrontation of traditionalism differently in terms of pathos. At the same time, both concur in according primacy to logos in the crucial moment of conversion, an imbalance which is fundamental to each author's appeals to the external audience.

When comparing Bede and Jones' approach to the conversion process, it is important to stress the crucial differences between the social and cultural situations in which they were working. If each one works on some level to accommodate aspects of traditional belief in the evangelical project, the non-identity of their respective traditions, both pre-Christian and Christian, is not to be ignored. We know little of Germanic polytheism and must not assume that it operated on the same basis as Algonkian shamanism. Bede, for his part, seems to have felt little inclination to play the role of ethnographer by inscribing the details of what he considered devil-worship into the permanent record of written history, and his near-total silence on the particulars of Anglo-Saxon religion is one of the reasons that we know next to nothing of pre-Christian belief in England. His silence addresses the external audience, and implicitly reassures them that they don't need this data. Bede's rhetoric here makes clear use of the enthymeme, or rhetorical syllogism, which, according to Aristotle, "must consist of few propositions, fewer often than those which make up the normal syllogism. For if any of these propositions is a familiar fact, there is no need even to mention it; the hearer adds it himself" (1.2). For Bede, the premises of his enthymeme are: The *Historia Ecclesiastica* preserves and transmits historical and doctrinal truth; "heathen" beliefs constitute false doctrine. Therefore, Bede as historian cannot in good conscience include them in his work. That Bede hardly needs to spell out these details attests to the extent to which he can rely on the reader to supply them. At the same time, however, this suppression of the non-Christian side of the argument facilitates the triumph of

Christian logos appeals.

This effective silencing of the opposition may strike us today as a cynical act of propagandistic cardstacking, but we should bear in mind that the enthymeme imposes certain constraints on the rhetor who wishes to establish and maintain ethos. If, as Aristotle puts in in the *Rhetoric*, it is “absolutely true where exact certainty is impossible and opinions are divided” that “we believe good men more fully and more readily than others” (1.2), then the rhetor’s good character is critical to the effectiveness of the enthymeme. Moreover, if we accept the premise that Bede’s history is to be a permanent record of the truth, then he must suppress “falsehood” in order to maintain his ethos. His practice accords with Aristotle’s later observation that “both the acquisition of good things and the removal of bad things must be good” and that “the acquisition of a greater in place of a lesser good, or of a lesser in place of a greater evil, is also good” (1.6). Bede’s hard line is therefore consistent with his message.

Seth Lerer, in his book *Literacy and Power in Anglo-Saxon Literature*, casts Bede’s omission of such details in a slightly different rhetorical light. Discussing Bede’s failure to provide the specifics of certain pagan magic spells in his account of the miraculous freeing of Imma in 5.22, Lerer writes that “Bede remains deliberately vague on the specifics of this magic not because he wishes to deny the details of forbidden craft, but rather because he needs only to evoke in the reader’s mind the impressions of a superstitious belief” (37). While Lerer’s approach is not explicitly rhetorical, his attention to Bede’s religious purpose makes a rhetorical interpretation implicit, by focusing on the strategic nature of Bede’s omissions in addressing the external audience on a sound religious footing. As Lerer puts it, “these charms do not survive within the story on the written page, nor should they live within the conscious memory of a Christian audience. They exist, if they exist at all, purely in the world of rumor or of lore” (39).

Lerer's interpretation modifies the enthymeme slightly, so that what here is a clearly suppressed premise is not allowed to rise to the status of a competing, albeit flawed logos; rather, as a rumour or impression of past superstition, the content which the reader may supply is likely to be at least partly emotional in nature. The Christian logos outweighs heathen pathos, as Bede's Christian reader will assume.

Peter Jones represents a different stance. He was interested in what, as a Victorian, he might have considered "Indian antiquities"; moreover, being in the main a nineteenth-century rationalist (despite his views on shamanism, as we shall see), he felt able to take a cavalier tone with traditionalism, believing that its shortcomings would speak for themselves. He characteristically concludes any description of traditional religious practice with a formula such as: "In this way the poor dark-minded Indian ignorantly worships the creatures of his own imagination" (84). He concludes that "in fact everything that strikes the dark untutored mind of the Indian with awe and astonishment becomes to him an object of dread and adoration" (85). Jones portrays traditional religion as operating exclusively through pathos; the "certain frame of mind" (Aristotle 1.2) to which it appeals here is one of fear and childlike wonder. We should note that here Jones clearly addresses a non-aboriginal audience, acknowledging an ethno-cultural barrier between the internal and external audience which doesn't exist in Bede. However, his vocabulary overtly signals an equally enthymematic rhetorical approach to the pre-Christian condition to that which Bede communicates through his silence. If anything, Jones' use of enthymeme here is more implicitly rhetorical than Bede's, in that Jones encodes assumptions about persuasion itself, which reflect conventional assumptions about a desirable balance of rhetorical appeals. We may identify the premises of Jones' governing enthymeme in this regard as: a) traditional religion favours irrational, emotional response over a considered

acceptance of faith; b) Christianity invites belief on the basis of reasoned arguments in favour of faith. Thus, the acceptance of Christian faith implicitly favours a more equal balance of appeals than does traditionalism. Jones' implied association of Christianity with the audience's likely self-identification with reason stacks the cards against any consideration of possible merit in traditional religion as firmly as does Bede's reticence.

Using division to build identification with his own external audience, Jones sometimes mocks native spiritual beliefs by placing them in an economic context, in an example of Burke's "perspective by incongruity" (*Permanence and Change* 69). For instance, he concludes the story of a miraculous escape in which a medicine bundle containing the skin of a saw-billed duck grants a canoe the speed and energy of that bird by stating that "surely this Indian deserved a *patent* for his wonderful propelling power, which would have superseded the use of the jarring and thumping steam-boats, now the wonder and admiration of the American Indian" (Jones 90). The implication is that, were traditional spiritual beliefs and practices valid, material benefits would surely flow from them, if only as evidence of some value beyond the pathos appeal of inducing wonder, in the manner of a stage magician. It is worth noting that Jones tends to favour the word "performance" to describe shamanistic ritual (Cf 143-144).

At the same time, Jones reproaches traditional shamans as much for their materialism as for their doctrine, stating that "the pow-wows are generally paid well for their performances, either by a gun, kettle, blanket, coat, or a gallon or two of whisky" (144). He accuses the St. Clair River shaman of having "obtained most of his possessions by his pow-wowism of the sick" and states that

when [whisky] is demanded and paid, the performance of the pow-wow is sure to be crowned by a drunken frolic, in which the doctor joins with his companions for a whole night, singing, yelling, and beating a drum, much to the annoyance of the afflicted person, whose sufferings are aggravated and his death

hastened by this barbarous custom. (144)

Later scholars such as A. Irving Hallowell, writing in the early 1900s of the Berens River Saulteaux in Manitoba, argued that “it would be erroneous to speak of conjuring as it were a profession, that is to say, the occupation from which a person derives his living” (31). For Jones, however, the “pow-wow” is simply a quack doctor who passes off his charlatanism under the guise of religion.

Jones could also be extremely critical of the materialism of Euro-American society, however. He once wrote: “Will not the blood of the red man be required at [the white man’s] hands, who, for paltry gain, has impaired the minds, corrupted the morals, and ruined the constitutions of a once hardy and numerous race?” (29) He would almost certainly balk at using material gain as an incentive to spiritual improvement in direct contravention of Christ’s teachings on the subject, in addressing a non-Christian member of the internal audience; however, here he addresses the external audience, and in doing so, includes more than a hint that what Burke terms “congregation through segregation” (“The Rhetorical Situation” 268) can run both ways, by suggesting that the Euro-American public who constitute his book’s audience are likely to identify with this appeal, and therefore should be on their guard, lest they fall into the same trap.

This attitude has a striking parallel in Bede’s *Historia*, where the chief priest, Coifi, rejects paganism partly on materialistic grounds. He tells King Edwin:

None of your subjects has been more devoted to the service of our gods than myself; yet there are many to whom you show greater favour, who receive greater honours, and who are more successful in all their undertakings. Now, if the gods had any power, they would surely have favoured myself, who have been more zealous in their service. Therefore, if on examination you perceive that these new teachings are better and more effectual, let us not hesitate to accept them. (Bede 2.13)

Here, one potential convert (Coifi) addresses another, Edwin, thus configuring the internal audience as Scene. Their particular reception of the conversion message sends interpretive signals to the external audience. By depicting the pagan priest as both pragmatic and materialistic, Bede portrays him as doing the right thing for the wrong reason, accepting the truth while misunderstanding the larger moral and spiritual objectives of conversion. Noting this problem, the audience is encouraged to perceive its own superior knowledge of Christian principles. Coifi emerges as a flawed rhetor, whose ethos is brought down by the materialism of his logos and the baseness of his pathos appeal to Edwin's pragmatism and materialism; we have no sense that the "better and more effectual" nature of Christianity to which the priest refers involves any clear moral or ethical dimension, let alone a sense of Christian rebirth. At the same time, as in Jones' text, posing the issue of motivation demands that the audience question whether or not they are in fact better believers than Edwin's cynical chief priest, favouring one appeal over another.

Jones' desire to build identification with the external audience at the expense of the internal manifests itself in his attitudes towards other missionaries, especially Catholics. Although he praises the selflessness of Catholic missionaries, he argues that Catholic practice has too much in common psychologically with native ritualism to be an effective agent of conversion; he goes so far as to state that "I have never discovered any real difference between the Roman Catholic Indian and the pagan, except the wearing of crosses" (Jones 172). Such incomplete conversion stands in contrast to the religious position Jones' invites his larger audience to share with him. As we shall see further below, his condemnation of the Catholic missionary appeal, which appears to Jones to favour implicitly the pathos of accommodation over the logos of the life-transforming gospel, also reveals a major difference between his text

and that of Bede in the construction of the internal audience as the scene of rhetorical action directed at the external audience.

The central conflict here is with an evangelical strategy that Bede notes early in his history. In Book I, Chapter 30 Bede records a letter sent by Pope Gregory to the missionary abbot Mellitus, in which the Pope advises Mellitus and his fellow missionary Augustine to accommodate non-Christian observance whenever possible. Gregory advises the Christianization of existing shrines and temples, rather than their destruction, and the reorientation of "heathen" rites and sacrifices to Christian ends since "if the people are allowed some worldly pleasures in this way, they will more readily come to desire the joys of the spirit" (Bede 1.30). Gregory's position has behind it the authority of St Augustine of Hippo's approval in *De Doctrina Christiana* of "despoiling the Egyptians" (2.40.60) by assimilating the best of classical thought into a Christian framework, using a metaphor derived from Exodus 3:21-2. Moreover, the Pope's rhetoric embraces pathos appeals; understanding the audience's attachment to "worldly pleasures" allows the missionary to coax them "into a certain frame of mind" (Aristotle 1.2) in which they are more readily receptive to doctrine.

Gregory can urge Mellitus to offset logos with pathos because he is overtly persuading the abbot towards effective rhetorical practice. His discourse acknowledges both Mellitus' potential unwillingness to accommodate pagan practice and the potential converts' need to meet Christianity halfway. By contrast, both Bede and Jones assume a reading audience for whom pathos is a potentially suspect worldly appeal, inferior to the eternal Christian logos.

Jones' description of the St Clair River shaman "singing, yelling, and beating a drum" as part of a drunken "frolic" clearly deprives traditional ritual of logos, reducing it to a barbarous cacophony of raw sound, but even when he does accord structure and sense of shamanistic

practice, he does so in terms which evoke his Protestant distrust of ritual, describing the prayers learned by initiates into the medicine society (which Jones rather sarcastically labels “the *faculty*”), as “a vain repetition offered up to the master of life” (143). The term “vain repetition” echoes the preface of the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer*, although Jones as a Methodist

had little respect for the Church of England, whose clergy among the Mohawks, he wrote in 1830, “have for a century past been in the habit of administering that holy ordinance to notorious drunkards, Sabbath breakers, and whoremongers.” (Smith 97)

Jones’ condemnation of the permissiveness of the Anglican clergy operates at only a small remove from what Jones saw as the perversity of the Catholic missionaries who

neglect to teach them [the Indians] the depravity of the human heart, and the necessity fo coming to Christ alone for pardon and mercy: in this way they make the Indians ten times more the children of the devil than they were before. (Smith 97)

This “neglect” reminds us of Gregory’s instruction that Mellitus accommodate the Anglo-Saxons’ attachment to “worldly pleasures,” and thereby makes clear the limits that Jones placed on such pathos appeals in the missionary project.

Jones rejects this kind of accommodation in favour of direct engagement, due to his Protestant belief that “superstition” will reveal its own flaws if only one is allowed to look at it dispassionately; his un-Bedelike willingness to record traditional beliefs (Jones 83-104; 143-160 *passim*) is founded on this assumption. Accommodation merely confuses the issue by creating a grey area between pagan and Christian belief. Bede, on the other hand, accepts a Christian supernaturalism, as his loving attention to the miracles worked by saints attests. Nevertheless, despite this difference in perception of the audience's response to accommodation, in the crucial conversion narratives that I wish to highlight, both writers subordinate supernatural power to a rhetoric in which pathos is subordinate to logos.

As Lerer has indicated, Bede does not credit Germanic traditionalists with arguments in favour of their beliefs. Where rhetorical duelling appears, it is between true believers and heretics, like the Pelagians (Cf 1:17; 1:22), and not between Christian and heathen. As a result we do not see in Bede the confrontation between the missionary and the traditionalist that occurs in certain of the Jesuit relations (Cf Thwaites 10:43-9), or even in Jones' *History*, where individuals such as the previously mentioned but unnamed St Clair River shaman described in chapter XII are compared to Elymas the sorcerer who, in Acts 13 (Cf Jones 144-5) was "full of subtlety and all mischief" (Acts 13:10) in his efforts to discredit and discourage the apostles. As a matter of fact, although Bede records Gregory's method as doctrine, we do not really see it put into practice, although as a Protestant, Jones might argue that Bede's fondness for recording miracles is evidence of it.

While learned argument carries the day for Christianity on the surface of things in 2.13 of the *Historia Ecclestica*, the previous chapter lays a supernatural foundation for the event. According to Bede, "the principal factor influencing the king [Edwin] to study and accept the truth of salvation was a heavenly vision which God in his mercy had once granted the king when he was an exile at the court of Redwald, king of the Angles" (2:12). Significantly, Bede locates his account of the visitation of "a spirit" who advises Edwin and lays his hand on his head as a sign to watch for in between two instances of more mundane rhetorical persuasion, namely Pope Boniface's letters to Edwin (2.10) and to his queen Ethelburga (2.11) and the deliberations involving the *witenagemot* and Paulinus (2.13). Calling the vision "the principal factor" enhances the status of the pathos belonging to clearly supernatural religious experience; Bede clearly does not wish to subordinate such direct manifestations of divine power to mere debate.

The Pope's missives prime Edwin and the reader for the experience of the vision and its

confirmation when Paulinus lays his hands on Edwin's head, at which "the king trembled and would have fallen at his feet." The emotion encoded in the response counterbalances Boniface's intellectual arguments; Bede shows strong pathos accompanying solid logoi. Ethos follows immediately in chapter 13, when Edwin tells Paulinus "that it was his will as well as his duty to accept the Faith that Paulinus taught, but said that he must still discuss the matter with his principal advisors and friends."

Edwin's personal conversion keeps the appeals in balance, but we should note that God has taken a direct hand in the process here. When the conversion process shifts into a more worldly forum, the balance of the appeals shifts as well, so that the subsequent instances of conversion are markedly less perfect than that of the king.

Rhetoric carries the day for Christ with Bede's internal audience. The debate is located in a tradition of learned dispute familiar to Bede from his Latin education, and which had begun to make itself felt on the Old English tradition. The principal speaker is the Chief Priest Coifi, who, as previously indicated, accepts Paulinus' teachings on materialistic grounds. Significantly, Coifi does not make the crucial metaphysical argument against pagan belief, which denies the heathen priest an opportunity to establish ethos as a man of insight. Rather it is an anonymous advisor who frames Coifi's point in metaphysical terms:

When we compare the present life of man on earth with that time of which we have no knowledge, it seems to me like the swift flight of a single sparrow through the banqueting hall where you are sitting at dinner on a winter's day with your thanes and counsellors. In the midst there is a comforting fire to warm the hall; outside, the storms of winter rain or snow are raging. This sparrow flies swiftly in through one door of the hall, and out through another. While he is inside, he is safe from the winter storms; but after a few moments of comfort, he vanishes from sight into the wintry world from which he came. Even so, man appears on earth for a little while; but of what went before this life or of what follows, we know nothing. Therefore, if this new teaching has brought any more certain knowledge, it seems only right that we should

follow it. (2.13)

After the unnamed counsellor has made his speech, Paulinus offers a summary of Christian belief, after which Coifi “exclaime[s] ‘I have long realized that there is nothing in our way of worship; for the more diligently I sought after truth in our religion, the less I found.’”

This passage is marked by a profound ambiguity regarding the nature of rhetoric. Christianity proves persuasive, and on the surface of things, in the critical rhetorical moment of public conversion ethos, logos, and pathos seem to be in perfect balance, as they were in Edwin’s individual experience. The speaker’s anonymity lends the metaphor the nature of a universal utterance, spoken from the heart of an Everyman-like figure who still has the dignity of rank; the metaphor’s situation in a familiar natural and social environment constitutes a powerful pathos-appeal, and the speaker can extract the message in simple, direct, unadorned fashion. And yet, Bede’s basic enthymeme regarding hearing the pagans out remains intact: Christianity has triumphed in debate over an anonymous man saying his culture has no argument to make, just as in 1.17 the “empty words” of the Pelagians are no match for “the venerable bishops [who] fed the torrents of their eloquence from the springs of the Apostles and the evangelists, confirming their own words from the word of God.” Bede’s reader is never allowed to forget that in the end, the choice lies between the Christian logos, the “certain knowledge” of “this new teaching”, and its absence. The other rhetorical appeals are clearly subordinated to this assumption.

Bede’s deployment of Coifi’s remarks before and after this crucial speech further emphasizes the limitations of the non-Christian perspective, as the priest has difficulty internalizing the counsellor’s message, despite its apparently sound rhetorical form. Not only does the priest not show the kind of insight or rhetorical skill displayed by the counsellor, but the materialistic and selfish nature of his analysis undermines his ethos still further. He is revealed

to have practised his traditional faith cynically, and to have lacked the integrity or intellect to have challenged the faith himself. Nor is his limited nature irrelevant to Bede's construction of his liberation from the taboo and traditions of traditional faith. While he is integrated into the male mainstream of his society with his weapons and stallion, his display of faith, although "inspired by the true God," does not transcend a destructive mode; Bede does not show Coifi fully assimilated into Christian society, observing the ideals of the Christian priestly class. Significantly, while we see Coifi defiant, we do not see him repentant, penitent, or at worship. Thus, the convert is both enabled and contained at the same time. He is freed from the burden of error, but Bede limits the external audience's ability to accept the pagan authority figure as a model convert; he gains no moral authority. Bede's narrative accords primacy to logos, as Coifi clearly needs to embrace the actual teachings of the church in order to transcend the worldliness of his rhetoric and establish an appropriate Christian ethos. The reader who recognizes this fact is invited to stand with Bede apart from the convert, as more mature believers segregated from neophytes.

Like Coifi, Jones' anonymous conjuror at Lake Simcoe also "does the right thing" in the long term; unlike his counterpart on the St Clair river, this traditionalist makes no apparent effort to attack the Methodist doctrine that Jones and his associates have brought to his community.

Jones writes that, while preaching at Lake Simcoe in August of 1828:

some of the Christian Indians informed me that a certain pagan pow-wow had intimated his intention of consulting his munedoos, to ascertain from them whether it was right for Indians to forsake the religion of their fathers, and take hold of the white man's religion. I requested them to let me know when he would begin his performance, as I wished to go and hear him for myself. (Jones 150)

Jones' first-person involvement represents a significant difference from Bede's historical narrative. Nevertheless, the Methodist missionary's presentation of himself as an observer,

whose overt purpose for attending the shaking tent ceremony is to gather information, and not to provoke a confrontation with the shaman, seeks to reinforce Jones' ethos as a detached witness to truth, despite his obviously partisan stance.

Jones and his companions approach the *jeesuhkon*, the shaman's tent, and place themselves around it stealthily, "wishing to see and hear his performance without his knowing we were present" (151). Unlike the shaking-tent ritual in which Alexander Henry the Elder participated in 1764 (Henry 167ff), or those which Irving Hallowell observed in the early twentieth century (Cf Hallowell 40), the ceremony seems intended to be carried out without an audience. Nor does "the juggler" as Jones terms him, in keeping with standard missionary practice (Bishop Baraga, in his classic *Dictionary of the Otchipwe Language*, translates all terminology connected with "*jeessakiwin*" in terms of "Indian jugglery"), seem to report the results of his colloquy with the spirits to the community in any official capacity, thus emphasizing the isolation and mystery that Jones seeks to condemn in Ojibwe religion. Even the use of the Ojibwe term to describe the tent keeps the artefact linguistically segregated from the Euro-American audience.

The shaman chants and the "the *jeesuhkon* began to shake as if filled with wind ... on our approach we heard the *muttering talk* of one of the *familiar spirits*, in answer to questions he had put to him" (Jones 151). Of the four spirits who speak, the first and third endorse conversion; the second condemns it, and the fourth predicts the death of one of the shaman's children, without obviously entering into the religious debate. This final pronouncement's ambiguity in rhetorical terms is striking. Jones does not mention it further, nor does the shaman mention it in his summary to Jones. The sense of tragedy and injustice of the prediction, to say nothing of its evocation of the harsh reality of life in the community, is perhaps best seen as a means of

situating the shaman's religious dilemma in terms of imminent crisis, although whether this pathos appeal originates with the shaman, his spirits, or with Jones is unverifiable from the data.

Jones' own ethos as a non-confrontational voice of reason is further emphasized when he attempts to discourage a companion from "exorcizing" the familiars with prayer. The companion, however, prays in a low voice that the Great Spirit have mercy on the conjuror, and the shaking and "muttering talk" stops "as if the evil spirits had all been put to flight" (151-2). The "juggler" guesses out loud that "the Christian Indians are praying" outside his wigwam, and then reinitiates the rite, causing the *jeesuhkon* "to shake as if it would fall to pieces". One of the spirit voices exposes the presence of the Christians, whereupon the shaman comes out of the lodge to report that some of the spirits have recommended that he "ought to go and hear the missionaries for [himself]".

Jones concludes the episode in terms that confirm the stance outlined above: "I have now stated what came under my own observation in this one instance, and I leave the reader to form his own judgement as to the power by which these deluded Indians perform their incantations. This Indian, according to promise, attended worship the next day" (152). In this conclusion, Jones simultaneously affirms his ethos as dispassionate observer, takes a non-coercive, agnostic position on supernatural phenomena, and expresses disapproval of traditionalism. Once again, though, the structure of his presentation is more telling than the assertions. The friend's decision to ignore Jones and terminate the ceremony through a whispered prayer demonstrates the supernatural superiority of Christianity without a) Jones having to set himself up as a literal dispeller of devils in a low-key wizard's duel which would smack of folktale or of Catholic hagiography, or b) undermining his project of gathering empirical evidence of how traditional conjuring worked. The unnamed friend and the conjuror represent the internal audience who,

like Coifi in Bede, don't yet see the larger picture; in this case, conversion is about finding the most powerful magic available. Jones' own ethos, however, seeks to build identification with the larger audience, by presenting the episode as at once a lively narrative, an ethnological account, and an exemplum demonstrating the spiritual authority of Christianity, balanced in its appeals in ways that are not possible in the appeal to the internal audience.

The fact that Jones informs the reader of the shaman's faithful attendance at Christian worship the next day after presenting his conclusions is significant, especially since he does not go on to reveal whether the shaman became a thorough Christian. Jones instead emphasizes that attending the meeting draws the traditionalist from his isolated pine-grove into a public forum, which is what Jones is seeking to do with regard to the whole issue of shamanism. As Bede portrays Coifi as moving from the empty shell of prohibitive pagan ritual into participation in a larger sphere, so Jones' unnamed conjuror moves from solitary interaction with spirits who seek to tell him what to do, to a stance whereby he is in a position to gather his own evidence and make up his own mind. For this reason, the shaman's reservation of his decision until after he has attended Christian service is crucial to Jones' deployment of this episode. The conflicting voices in the tumultuous *jeesuhkon* can only restate the shaman's dilemma, with the spectre of death raised to add urgency to it. That the shaman does not report the prediction of death to Jones and his companions perhaps suggests how isolating the religious experience of the ritual is to the practitioner. The implications of whichever voice the shaman heeds will be played out in the community, in the world, not in the tent in the isolated grove. The public nature of the meeting that the shaman will attend is implicitly held up as a more appropriate forum for such a decision; the world's problems must be solved in the world. Moreover, the shaman's desire to listen to the missionaries suggests that he requires information; the spirits have only addressed

the problem in terms of pathos. He must now gain access to the ethos and especially the logos of the Christian message. In other words, he must approach the prayer meeting in the same spirit in which Jones has presented himself as approaching the conjuring ritual. Jones' ethos, and the implied ethos of the external audience, is thus implicitly held up as a model.

In the end, both Bede and Jones deploy an internal rhetorical audience of potential converts as the scene for the larger persuasive act of building relation with the external audience; moreover, that relation involves configuring the external audience as one capable of recognizing the imbalance in the appeals to the internal one. In both texts, the ethos of the traditionalist target audience is problematized, although in Jones the shaman's self-presentation is almost totally eclipsed by ritual, and ultimately appears more as a lack or need, than as a discernible stance. These limitations in ethos are used to create a contrast favourable to the rhetor's construction of ethical identification with the external audience. Similarly, both writers limit overt pathos appeals to direct address to the internal audience, where pathos is presented as appealing chiefly to the crass and weak sides of human nature, as Coifi's materialism and the elements of magic and performance in the conjuring ritual attest. By contrast, both writers consistently foster rhetorical identification (in Kenneth Burke's sense) with the external audience, implicitly prompting them to congregate around a more satisfying equilibrium of ethos, logos, and pathos in their religious discourse than is yet available to the new converts.

Finally, both Bede and Jones depict the traditions which the internal audience is urged to abandon as devoid of logos, being based on the satisfaction of appetites and not on any substantial programme of spiritual improvement. The appeal to the external audience, however, requires the reader to assume Christianity to be intellectually and rhetorically empowering, offering a shared vantage point from which writer and reader can analyse the new converts as a

rhetorical audience. This identification of rhetor and external audience requires the containment of the internal audience, who can aspire only to an improved but unperfected spiritual and intellectual state. On one hand, the decision to convert is constructed as an enabling strategy in social and intellectual terms for the convert, who is invited to join the mainstream community. At the same time, paradoxically, the decision marginalizes the convert, who is realized as an individual in terms of personal limitation and individual insufficiency, and not of spiritual potential. In the end, the rhetorical demands of enabling the broader audience require the circumscription of the transformational act at the centre of the conversion narrative.

Works Cited

- Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. Translated by W. Rhys Roberts. Mineola NY: Dover, 2004.
- St Augustine. *On Christian Doctrine*. Trans. By D.W. Robertson Jr. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1958.
- Baraga, Frederic. *A Dictionary of the Otchipwe Language*. Montreal: Beauchemin and Valois, 1878, 1880; reprinted (as *A Dictionary of the Ojibway Language*) with a new foreword

- by John D. Nichols, St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press/Borealis Books, 1992.
- Bede. *A History of the English Church and People*. Translated by Leo Sherley-Price. Middlesex: Penguin, 1955. Translation based on *Venerabilis Baedae Historiam ecclesiasticam gentis Anglorum, Historiam abbatum, Epistolam ad Ecgberctum, una cum Historia abbatum auctore anonymo*. Edited by Charles Plummer. 2 volumes. London: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- The Book of Common Prayer*. In *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI*. London: The Prayer Book Society, 1999.
- Burke, Kenneth. *A Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.
- _____. *Permanence and Change: An Anatomy of Purpose*. 3rd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- _____. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.
- _____. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Communication: Ethical and Moral Issues*. Ed. Lee Thayer. London: Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, 1973. 263-275.
- Hallowell, A. Irving. *Conjuring in Saulteaux Society. Publications of the Philadelphia Anthropological Society Vol. II*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1942.
- Henry, Alexander. *Travels and Adventures in Canada and the Indian Territories, between the years 1760 and 1776*. New York: I. Riley, 1809.
- Jones, Peter. *History of the Ojebway Indians; with especial reference to their conversion to Christianity*. London: A.W. Bennett, 1861; reprinted Freeport NY: Books for Libraries, 1970.
- Lerer, Seth. *Literacy and Power in Anglo-Saxon Literature*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1991.

Petrone, Penny. *Native Literature in Canada: From the Oral Tradition to the Present*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Smith, Donald. *Sacred Feathers: The Reverend Peter Jones (Kahkewaquonaby) and the Mississauga Indians*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.

Thwaites, Reuben G., ed. *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents: Travels and Explorations of the Jesuit Missionaries in New France 1610-1791*. Cleveland: Burrows, 1896-1901.