

UDC: 821.111(729).09-13 Волкот Д.

## ■ TIME, HISTORY AND THE NATIVE AMERICAN GENOCIDE SEEN THROUGH CATHERINE'S EYES: A STYLISTIC ANALYSIS

**ELISABETTA ZURRU<sup>1</sup>**

University of Genoa,  
Department of Linguistic and Cultural Communication,  
Genoa, Italy

Autorka rada analizira lik Ketrin Veldon iz epske poeme *Omeros* Dereka Volkota napisane 1990. godine. U njenim rečima lako se prepoznaje posebna koncepcija Vremena i Istorije, koja govori o genocidu nad američkim Indijancima. U radu je predstavljena stilistička analiza jednog dela pesme kako bi se na primeru objasnila ova koncepcija i njena povezanost sa masakrom počinjenim nad Indijancima kod zatona Ranjeno koleno.

Ključne reči: Derek Volkot, Ketrin Veldon, Vreme, Istorija, genocid nad američkim Indijancima, *Omeros*, stilistička analiza.

### INTRODUCTION

Catherine Weldon was a widow who left Brooklyn in 1889 and travelled West to Standing Rock, Sitting Bull's reservation in the Dakotas, in order to help him defend his land against the US Government's claims.

Her figure, whose tracks had been almost completely erased by the American society of the time (Pollack 2002: 15), has been included by Derek Walcott in two of his works, namely the 1990 poem *Omeros*, which was followed by the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1992, and the play entitled *The Ghost Dance*, which was published in 2002. In particular, her persona is referred to in books IV and V in *Omeros*, where she is one of the invited outsiders populating the poem, and becomes the main female character in *The Ghost Dance*.

It is undoubtedly noteworthy that Walcott has chosen to rediscover and rewrite the story of this woman in two different works. Indeed, through her inclusion in *Omeros* and *The Ghost Dance*, Walcott has the chance, on the one hand, to recall the massacre of the Native American population – which, in turn, allows him to evoke the massacre of the indigenous population of his Caribbean native island; on the other hand, through Catherine's words and deeds, a particular conception of Time and History is expressed: they

1 Kontakt podaci (Email): elizurru@hotmail.com

are both depicted as unstoppable forces – indeed, Catherine did not succeed in avoiding either Sitting Bull's death or the subsequent massacre at Wounded Knee Creek, during which about two hundred Native Americans were killed by the US army (Pollack 2002).

The aim of this paper will be to analyse the conception of Time and History appearing through Catherine's words and through the description of the Native American genocide, which is recalled thanks to the insertion of her story in the poem.

In order to do so, the tools provided by stylistics (Culpeper *et al.* 1998; Douthwaite 2000; Semino/Short 2004; Short 1996) will be deployed.

As pointed out by Short (1996: 1), stylistics is prototypically understood as a framework which allows the critic to carry out *linguistic* analyses of *literary* texts. In particular, stylistics is interested in describing (*viz.* analysing) the "linguistic features in the text [...] which *constrain* readers from inferring unreasonable meanings and *prompt* them towards reasonable ones" (Short 1996: 8; original emphasis). In other words, stylistics is focussed on trying to explain *how* the meaning of a text is constructed or, to put it differently, on how writers guide, through certain linguistic selections in their works, readers' interpretation and response.

If deconstructionist and post-structuralist critiques suggest that there exists more than a slight possibility that both readers and critics draw inferences unintended by the writer, stylistic analyses of literary texts tend to decrease the possibility of such 'unintended inferences', by focussing in a detailed and systematic way on the linguistic element, which even Barthes, in his famous essay "The Death of the Author", identified as the only element which truly "speaks" in the text (cf. Barthes 1967).

Therefore, the paper will show how the conception of Time and History which appears through Catherine's words is not only conveyed but also *constructed* linguistically.

For reasons of space, only one excerpt from *Omeros* has been selected for scrutiny.

## 1. THE TEXT

The choice of the extract which will be subjected to stylistic analysis has fallen on the last but one 'conversation' involving Catherine – the argumentation built up in this exchange is reinforced in the final conversation, but no significant new information is added.

### THE TEXT (WALCOTT 2003: 368)<sup>2</sup>

<<[1] This was history. [2] I had no power to change it.  
[3] And yet I still felt that this had happened before.  
[4] I knew it would happen again, [5] but how strange it

was to have seen it in Boston, [6] in the heart-fire.  
[7] I was a leaf in the whirlwind of the Ordained.  
[8] Then Omeros's voice came from the mouth of the tent:

2 Clauses have been numbered for ease of reference.

“[9] We galloped towards death swept by the exaltation  
of meeting ourselves in a place just like this one:  
[10] The Ghost Dance had tied the tribes into one nation.

[11] As the salmon grows tired of its ladder of stone,  
[12] so have we of fighting the claws of the White Bear,  
[13] dripping red beads on the snow. [14] Whiteness is everywhere”>>.

[15] Look Catherine! [16] There are no more demons outside the door.  
[17] The white wolf drags its shawled tail into the high snow  
through the pine lances, [19] the blood dried round its jaw;

[20] it is satisfied. [21] Come, [22] come to the crusted window,  
[23] blind as it is with ice, [24] through the pane’s cataract;  
[25] see, [26] it’s finished. [27] It’s over Catherine, [28] you have been saved.

## 2. THE ANALYSIS

### 2.1. THE THREE-PART STRUCTURE

A glance at the graphology of the extract – first and foremost the arrows and the inverted commas, which are usually employed by writers to signal Direct Speech ([DS]; Short 1996, Semino/Short 2004) – induces readers to believe that this is a conversation between Catherine and the protean character Omeros, who appears throughout the poem conversing with other characters and/or with the author/narrator<sup>3</sup> Walcott.

A closer look at graphology reveals a three-part structure. The first section begins at [1] and ends at [14], and it is opened and closed by double arrows (<<’ and >>’). The second section begins at [9] and finishes at [14], and it is signalled ‘traditionally’ by inverted commas. The third section starts at [15] and ends at [28], and it is distinguished from the preceding two because of the absence of the arrows and/or inverted commas. In other words, in [15]-[28], there are no graphological signals flagging DS.

In particular, that the first section of the excerpt appears to represent the first turn in a conversation between Catherine and Omeros is signalled by a) graphology (the arrows and the inverted commas), b) the brevity of the sentences employed (a ‘typical’ sign of conversation), and c) their simplicity (another sign of conversational

3 Three different stories are included and interwoven in *Omeros*: that of Helen, Achilles and Hector on the one hand, that of Plunkett and Maud on the other, and, finally, that of the author himself, who regularly appears in the poem as narrator (cf. Tomasi 1999: XLIV-XLV). In actual fact, more than one narrator can be identified in *Omeros*: Omeros himself, Homer’s alter-ego who has regained his Greek name, which has been translated into standard English as ‘Homer’; Seven-Seas, a blind singer who, in turn, represents Omeros’ alter-ego; and the author himself, who often calls himself “Derek”, and is called in this way by many other characters, including Walcott’s father (cf. Walcott 2003: 314). It could be argued, at this point, that the narrator in the passage above might be either Omeros or Seven Seas, rather than Walcott. However, when this is the case in the poem, their names are clearly specified. On the other hand, when no introduction of any of these two characters is present, then the narrator may safely be taken as representing Walcott himself.

style): sentences [1], [2], [3], [7], [8] are all simple sentences, as defined by Aarts and Aarts (1982); [4]-[6] is a compound sentence constituted by two main clauses, ([4] and [5]) conjoined by the coordinating conjunction “but”, and a prepositional phrase ([6]) upshifted to the level of clause. Nonetheless, in this case rankshift does not perform one of its standard, general functions, namely that of making the text more complicated, since the compound sentence [4]-[6] still appears to be easy to understand.

However, if this really were a conversation between these two characters, the first set of arrows signalling Catherine’s turn should be opened at [1] and closed at [8], before Omeros’ turn starts at [9] and ends at [14]. This is not the case in actual fact, since both the arrows and the inverted commas are closed at [14], one set after the other.

Furthermore, the discourse marker ‘Then’ opening [8] signals a change in the course the conversation has taken so far. Three other linguistic markers contribute to signalling this change: a) a new human subject, substituting the first person pronoun “I”, is introduced, namely “Omeros”; b) the colon at the end of [8]; and c) the opening of a new set of inverted commas at [9]. These four syntactic and graphological devices warn readers that what they are about to read, ([9]-[14]), is not Omeros’ reply to Catherine’s preceding turn, or, to put it another way, it is not part of a conversation which is taking place at the same time as the narration, but is a reporting of Omeros’ words on the part of Catherine.

This device makes it clear to the readers that sections 1 and 2 identified above are actually two sub-sections of the initial section, which therefore starts at [1] and comes to a close at [14]. This leads to the further conclusion that no conversation is taking place in [1]-[14]: only the first character, Catherine, is talking, and she reports the words of the second character, Omeros, from [9] to [14], with [8] representing the reporting clause which introduces Omeros’ words.

But, when readers no longer expect any conversation to take place, given the absence of arrows and/or inverted commas in the remaining part of the extract following [14], they are presented in [15] with a clear instantiation of Free Direct Speech [FDS].<sup>4</sup> Indeed, in [15], the imperative form of the verb ‘to look’ and the vocative ‘Catherine’ are clearly employed by the narrator as phatic signals to start a conversation with the character. As already mentioned, no graphological devices introducing DS are inserted in this case, for the author/narrator is often involved in exchanges with characters and readers throughout the poem without the conversational exchange taking place being signalled by any explicit graphological or syntactic signals (a secondary norm in stylistic terms: Douthwaite 2000: 193).

Ambiguity is thus a feature of this passage. In particular, the effect of ambiguity is achieved at a psychological level: readers do not expect a conversation to have the structure

arrows (+ inverted commas) + narration

in *lieu* of the more standard structure

arrows + arrows (or inverted commas + inverted commas)

4 The distinction between DS and FDS referred to here follows Semino and Short’s 2004 framework, namely it identifies prototypical FDS as speech devoid of either quotation marks or a reporting clause.

In other words, they are led by the arrows and inverted commas to interpret what is inserted between them as conversation, and discover only in [15] that the real conversation is not taking place between Catherine and Omeros, but between Catherine and the narrator, who, in turn, apparently replies with an instantiation of external narration, ([15]-[28]), given the absence of the arrows and/or inverted commas. However, the external narration immediately appears to be conversation, given, just to start with, the imperative form used as theme in [15].

Having identified the three sections into which the Text above can be divided, and their overall textual function – that of presenting three different viewpoints – I now turn to a more in-depth stylistic analysis of the excerpt.

## 2.2. A CLOSER CONSIDERATION OF THE TEXT

[1] starts with a deictic form, “This”, referring back to something which we presume must have happened. The reference is in fact to the Massacre at Wounded Knee Creek, described previously in the poem, the aftermath of which Catherine appears to have witnessed.

At Wounded Knee Creek the US Army killed about two hundred Native Americans, including women, children and old people, who had already surrendered (Pollack 2000: 280). The massacre followed the attempt by the reservation police to arrest Sitting Bull, who had been accused of having supported and contributed to the spreading of the Ghost Dance religion, (which the US government had attempted to repress), during which the Lakota chief was killed. After his death, a few hundred Sioux left the reservation, and were consequently considered hostile by the American troops. The US Army soon caught up with the runaway natives while they were spending the night near Wounded Knee Creek, where the massacre subsequently took place (*ibid.*; “Wounded Knee”).

Catherine had predicted what would happen if Sitting Bull did not refrain from adhering to the Ghost Dance religion, namely that it would be used as an excuse by the US Government to attack him and all the Native American tribes. Sitting Bull refused to listen, since, as the chief of the Lakotas, he was supposed to support his people rather than a white woman coming from the East. She left the reservation, aware of the fact that there was nothing she could do to make him change his mind or prevent the last act of the Native American genocide (cf. Pollack 2002).

Let us now turn to the Text. In [1], the noun “history” is linked to the subject through the copula verb “was”, thus performing the function Subject Attribute (SA; Aarts/Aarts 1982). Through the deictic “This”, the SA is in turn deictically linked to ‘what has happened before’, namely Wounded Knee Massacre – the SA “history” is, in the final analysis, synonymic with ‘massacre’. Cohesion (Halliday/Hasan 1967) is thus one of the subtle linguistic devices Walcott employs to make the notion of History, conceived of as a sequence of episodes inevitably implying some kind of loss for one or more of the parties involved, become transparent for his readers.

Note that the change of the subject in [2] concurrently signals a change in the focus of the speech: narration in the third person gives way to first person narration, which, together with the ideational content, is meant to manifest Catherine’s will to express

her own participation in the event. As already clarified, both [1] and [2] are simple sentences. However, while [1] is constituted by 3 words, (Subject [SUBJ] + Predicator [PRED] + SA), [2] is constituted by SUBJ + PRED + Predicator Complement [PC], which is realised by a noun phrase [NP] postmodified by a verbless clause. Furthermore, [1] is a plain assertion, in which the copula, which in general conveys little information compared to lexical verbs, expresses an essential characteristic of the entity referred to, its very existence: “this *was* history” appears to leave no room for objections. After such a strong assertion, a negative sentence is expressed in [2] instead, with the negation employed in a slightly less standard usage, namely to negate the noun “power”, (in *lieu* of the ‘canonical’ negation of the lexical verb, as in “I did not have”). Since the noun “power” bears in itself a whole range of connotative meanings (strength, action, success – to be powerful means to have a high degree of probability in succeeding in what one wants to achieve), Catherine is thus implicitly denied any probability of success – which is exactly what happened in 1890: she did not manage to change Sitting Bull’s fate and was even held partly responsible by the press of the time for both Sitting Bull’s death and for the subsequent massacre at Wounded Knee Creek (Pollack 2002: 5). Interestingly enough, what she is denied power to do is to change things, ‘change’ being the main feature implicitly assigned to History and Time in the following two sentences.

Having placed the conjunction “And” in thematic position, [3] immediately signals cohesiveness (Halliday/Hasan 1976) with [2], which increases the statistical possibility that coherence is implied too, so that thematic progression is at hand.

In [3], indeed, Catherine links ‘history’ with ‘time’, both through syntax and semantics: the circularity of history, in which what has happened in the past returns in the future, is described both through verb tenses (“had happened”, “would happen”) and through the selection of time adverbials (“before”, “again”). Furthermore, this circularity is described as being the result of two mental processes (Halliday/Matthiessen 2004) whose senser is Catherine: she feels, [3], she knows, [4]. In particular, both mental processes are described using the past tense, expressing a consciousness which has by the time of the narration become a matter of fact for the character. This is confirmed by the co-text, for going back to Book IV we read: “She had believed in the redemptions of History,/ that the papers the Sioux had folded to their hearts/ would be kept like God’s word” (Walcott 2003: 296). The reference here is to the treaties signed by both the US Government and the Native American tribes to put an end to the conflicts between the two parties, which have constantly been violated by the US Government (Pollack 2002). Also in this quotation the tense of the verb is revealing, (the past perfect – “had believed”), signalling an action which is over at the moment of the narration, implying that Catherine’s hope in the reversibility of the natives’ doom soon ceased to exist. In the later work *The Ghost Dance* the impossibility of exerting a direct influence over history is expressed even more explicitly, with Catherine claiming: “I thought I could change things, but I can’t” (Walcott 2002: 204).

[5] begins with a contrastive conjunction immediately suggesting the change in the direction of the argumentation. That this change is going to be a ‘peculiar’ one is also made explicit through semantics, the adjective “strange” constituting the head of the adjective phrase [ADJP] which follows the conjunction: readers discover at this point in Catherine’s speech that in actual fact she did not witness the massacre, or its

aftermath, but that she must have imagined it, for she was in Boston at that time.<sup>5</sup> This is an implicature which readers calculate exploiting their knowledge of the world [KOW], because [5] does not explicitly state that Catherine was not there, the apparent illocutionary force being that of expressing surprise. It seems highly improbable, however, that anybody could witness the killing of hundreds of Native Americans while finding themselves on the other side of the continent.

In this respect, in [6], the prepositional phrase [PP] upgraded to the level of verbless clause, (hence a grammatical unit whose information value has been increased), is particularly important, conveying the image of a person whose imagination is abstracted in watching the fire. Furthermore, since Walcott has the snow, and related lexemes, dominate the setting of the massacre, (cf. [11]-[14]) the description of a fireplace aims to distance her from the place and time of the event. The implicature that reader should draw at this point is that Walcott is creating a parallel between Catherine and himself, which might also explain one of the reasons lying behind the choice of retelling her story: just like Walcott, who can only imagine the massacre of the indigenous populations of his native island which he is writing about in *Omeros*, for he was not there, Catherine also has to imagine what must have happened, because her 'failure' has led her away from those she had tried to help. But, through her story, the steps of the genocide of the Native Americans can be recalled, (in particular, the "Manifest Destiny" and the "Trail of Tears"; cf. Walcott 2003: 296, 300), and a comparison between this genocide and that of the Aruacs (cf. Walcott 2003: 278, 352), the native population of Walcott's island, by the French and English colonizers, can be traced on more than one occasion.

That Walcott has been creating a parallel with this character, almost building Catherine as one of his many alter-egos, is again confirmed by the co-text: not only is Catherine defined as his guide ("*<<Somewhere over there>> said my guide <<the Trail of Tears / started>>*"; Walcott 2003: 300, my emphasis), but they are also depicted as sharing the same body ("*<<This was the groan of the autumn wind in the tamaracks/ which I shared through Catherine's body>>*"; Walcott 2003: 352, my emphasis).

[7] represents the last sentence with a first person narration and deploys a metaphor aiming at describing the impotence Catherine felt. The noun "leaf" functions as SA, and therefore bestows on the subject its denotative and connotative meanings, in particular those related to autumn, to leaves falling from the trees, incapable of opposing this natural fact and doomed to fall prey to the wind. In fact, "leaf" collocates with "whirlwind", which reinforces the idea of an entity subjected to external factors. The metaphor is further developed by the contiguity between "whirlwind", conveying the denotative meaning of an atmospheric event and connotative meanings such as 'fury', 'violence' and 'impetus', and "Ordained", which conveys the image of ordered, prefixed, regular rows or ranks. The spatial proximity of these two lexemes appears to suggest the violence connected with the forced respect of the pre-established order of things (in this case, that the natives had to be fought to be converted and assimilated [viz. "Ordained"] into 'the order'), while concurrently underlining Catherine's weakness stemming from her non-respect of that order.

5 When Sitting Bull died and the subsequent massacre at Wounded Knee Creek took place she was actually in Kansas City (Pollack 2002: 279).

From this moment on, metaphorical language becomes a recurrent feature of the selected extract.

The metaphor in [8], (“the mouth of the tent”), placed in end-focus<sup>6</sup> and thus rendered more salient, takes us back to the natives’ camp at Standing Rock. That the facts related to the massacre are reported in [9]-[14] as having been recounted by Omeros to Catherine underlines again her *geographical* distance from the events (her *emotional* proximity having never been put into question): she seems to have gone back to her imaginary world, to Standing Rock, and she is the one in charge of retelling what she has been told, but which she has not experienced first hand.

As already suggested, the metaphorical dimension becomes the predominant one here: Native Americans “galloped towards death”, rather than towards the US army; they were fighting a bear rather than soldiers (note, here, the synecdoche “the Claws of the White Bear”, so as to signal that the soldiers composing the army, “the Claws”, were only the tool carrying out the order which had been given to them by someone else – “the White Bear”); “red beads”, rather than blood drops, fell “on the snow”.

At a semantic and metaphorical level, the semantic fields of colours and animals represent a cohesive device which links the two tercets dedicated to Omeros with the following two tercets, where the narrator’s voice can be ‘heard’. As the US army, or, to be more exact, the government which had given them the order to attack the natives, was defined by Omeros as a “White Bear”, Walcott defines it first as a “demon” and then as a “white wolf”, (“demon” being associated with an animal in this case precisely because of its collocation with both “White Bear” and “white wolf”), the connotative meanings of these lexemes strengthening one another.

The dehumanizing effect is further accentuated by the insertion in the last two tercets of words and phrases related to the danger represented by the US army, namely “drags”, “shawled tail”, “blood dried”, “jaw”, “satisfied”. The effect is amplified at a third level by the associations created through the semantic field of colours. While the Native Americans, ‘the reds’, are associated with blood, spilled on the snow and dried round the jaw of the murderer, the US soldiers are associated with white, white as is their skin. In general, the connotations of this latter colour are positive (cleanliness, purity, innocence, and so forth). Walcott reverses these connotations, for he has the white, as well as the snow, become a sign of death, the whites themselves being those who bring death in actual fact: “white” is the adjective used to premodify two of the three nouns used to metaphorically define the American soldiers (“White Bear”, “white wolf”); the colour white becomes a metonymy for the snow and the ice: in [22]-[23] the ice makes the “window”, another metaphor for ‘eye’, “blind” (which evokes the whiteness of blind eyes, and might in fact refer to the ‘blindness’ of the American population witnessing the genocide); white is the snow which has fallen down unstoppable, as unstoppable as the US army, to cover the natives’ corpses, so that Omeros had concluded by saying that “Whiteness [was] everywhere”, referring to the final victory of the whites over the Native Americans – the 1890-1891 Sioux war was indeed the last significant Native American war (Pollack 2002: 5).

What is also noteworthy in the last two tercets of the above passage is that the narrator appears to feel the urge to reassure Catherine about the ending of the tragedy. He describes

6 The notion of ‘end focus’ referred to here follows Douthwaite’s (2000) theoretical framework rather than Halliday’s.



the absence of the “demons”, ([16]), the satisfaction of the “white wolf”, ([20]), symbolic of its departure at the end of the massacre, and the end of the massacre itself, ([26]). In this respect, the last sentence ([27]-[28]) is particularly interesting. Its first clause, [27], is a reformulation of [26]. In this way, the maxim of Quantity (Grice 1975) is flouted, since more information is provided than is required, the reformulation constituting a redundant repetition in actual fact – [27] re-proposes what [26] has already conveyed without adding any significant new information. This implies that the ‘repetition’ is not informationally necessary – it has been added for the sake of reinforcement, to underline that the end of the massacre has finally come. The ideational content of [28] is, on the other hand, both positive and negative: Catherine has been saved both literally, (for she was not at Wounded Knee, and, consequently, had her life spared), and metaphorically, (for her name and her involvement in the natives’ cause have been restored). However, the choice of the subject “you” in [28] represents a concurrent exclusion of any other subject: Catherine has been saved, but the same cannot be said for either Sitting Bull or two hundred Native Americans at Wounded Knee Creek.

### 3. CONCLUSION

An extract from *Omeros* has been subjected to stylistic analysis, in an attempt to show that Catherine’s words embody a very precise conception of Time and History. Both are conceived of as invincible forces, over which human beings can exercise no influence even if they try to do so as hard as can be. The inevitable circularity of Time and History, (“[...] this had happened before./ I knew it would happen again”), has also been underlined through an analysis of the linguistic means employed to convey the two concepts.

In spite of the fact that Catherine did not succeed in preventing the inevitable from happening, it is remarkable that Walcott chose to insert Catherine’s story in *Omeros* and then turned her into the main female character in *The Ghost Dance*. He has thereby given a second life to the story of this woman, whose efforts had been hidden by history. Catherine did indeed die alone, neglected by the society of the time, who considered her behaviour immoral, for having lived for such a long time alone with a neglected ‘indigenous’ man (Pollack 2002). History, with its inevitability, had almost erased any trace of her.<sup>7</sup> Derek Walcott has told the world her story: he has “saved” her from oblivion.

Furthermore, through her voice, he has given voice to the Native American people, one of the many dominated peoples whose identity has been manipulated and almost completely destroyed during a colonizing enterprise.

A people who had been living in what are now the American territories for thousands of moons, before the accelerated rhythms of Western Time reached them.

7 Interestingly enough, in 2007 the American HBO produced a film entitled *Bury my heart at Wounded Knee*, broadcasted on American TV and watched by millions of people, in which the events going from the Sioux’s victory over General Custer at Little Big Horn to the massacre at Wounded Knee Creek are reported. In spite of the great attention devoted to the figure of Sitting Bull in this film, no mention is made of Catherine Weldon, although the character of another white woman, Elaine Goodale, who worked as a teacher in another reservation and did not challenge white morality as Catherine did by living in Sitting Bull’s cabin, is given great emphasis. Catherine’s role in the Sioux’s struggle for their preservation continues to be hidden, even in non-official historiography, which, by dint of being broadcasted on American TV, still represents a powerful means of communication and diffusion of historical events.

## REFERENCES

- Aarts, F. and J. Aarts. 1982. *English Syntactic Structures*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Barthes, R. 1967. The Death of the Author. [Internet]. Available at: <http://www.ubu.com/aspen/aspen5and6/threeEssays.html#barthes> [21.04.2010].
- Culpeper, J., M. Short and P. Verdonk (eds.). 1998. *Exploring the Language of Drama: From Text to Context*. London: Routledge.
- Douthwaite, J. 2000. *Towards a Linguistic Theory of Foregrounding*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Grice, H. P. 1975. Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic, 41-58.
- Halliday, M. A. K. and R. Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Halliday, M. A. K. and C. M. I. M. Matthiessen. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, London: Arnold.
- Pollack, E. 2002. *Woman Walking Ahead: In Search of Catherine Weldon and Sitting Bull*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Semino, E. and M. Short. 2004. *Corpus Stylistics: Speech, Writing and Thought Presentation in a Corpus of English Writing*. London: Routledge.
- Short, M. 1996. *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose*. London: Longman.
- Tomasi, L. (ed). 1999. *Derek Walcott*. Torino: UTET.
- Walcott, D. 2003. *Omeros* (ed. A. Molesini). Milano: Adelphi. Edition with parallel text.
- Walcott, D. 2002. *Walker and The Ghost Dance: plays*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Wounded Knee. *Encyclopædia Britannica Online* 2010. [Internet]. Available at: <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/649293/Wounded-Knee> [21.04.2010].

## SUMMARY

### TIME, HISTORY AND THE NATIVE AMERICAN GENOCIDE SEEN THROUGH CATHERINE'S EYES: A STYLISTIC ANALYSIS

Among the many characters of *Omeros*, the poem in Dantesque third-rhyme written by Derek Walcott in 1990, the character of Catherine Weldon can be encountered. Through her words, a particular conception of Time and History is presented, and the Native American genocide is recalled. In this paper, one extract from *Omeros* will be subjected to stylistic analysis in order to clarify this conception and its link with the massacre of the natives at Wounded Knee Creek.

**KEYWORDS:** Catherine Weldon, Time, History, Native American genocide, Wounded Knee Creek, *Omeros*, stylistic analysis.

(Original scientific paper received 31.01.2010;  
revised 25.04.2010;  
accepted 02.08.2010)