Pelagie Faribault’s Island: Property, Kinship, and the Meaning of Marriage in Dakota Country

Catherine Denial
The easiest facts to discover about Pelagie Faribault are life markers: she was born in 1783, married in 1805, and bore eight children. These are the commonly shared milestones by which a woman’s importance is often understood and communicated in western culture: she was fathered by someone; she married a man; she gave him heirs. Yet nothing about Pelagie’s inner life survives in these details or in the documentary record of the region.

She was, like many women of her time, illiterate. If she spoke her life story aloud, it has long since faded into silence. Testimony to her existence is found only in documents created by men for quite different ends: trade narratives, wills, legal briefs, and military plans for imagined contingencies.

It was in one of these documents that I encountered Pelagie for the first time—a name in a clause at the end of a treaty penned in 1820. On August 9 of that year, Col. Henry Leavenworth welcomed interpreter Duncan Campbell, Indian Agent Lawrence Taliaferro, fur trader Jean Baptiste Faribault, and 22 local Dakota men to the place he called Camp Coldwater, the temporary

Pike Island, strategically located between Mendota and Fort Snelling at the juncture of the Mississippi and St. Peter’s rivers, portrayed in Edward K. Thomas’s view of the fort, about 1850

Catherine Denial, assistant professor of history at Knox College in Galesburg, Illinois, is at work on a manuscript about the American project of nation-building in preterritorial Minnesota, as expressed through ideas about marriage, family life, and Native kinship structures.
home of the U.S. Fifth Infantry just above the juncture of the Mississippi and St. Peter’s (Minnesota) rivers. The goal of the meeting was to finalize an agreement for the construction of a permanent fort in the Upper Midwest. By the day’s end, the assembled Dakota had signed a contract gifting a 15-acre reserve overlooking the rivers to the U.S. military, and within a month, construction of Fort St. Anthony (renamed Fort Snelling in 1825) had begun.¹

Jean Baptiste Faribault and kin to Little Crow’s band.²

A shallow reading of the treaty document tells us little about the region into which the United States had begun to expand, or, crucially, the opinions of the people already living there about this intrusion. The document is dry, the prose spare and bureaucratic. It provides a handful of certainties: that 32 men conducted business on this spot on that day. In the histories of the region that followed American settlement, it was seen as uncomplicated and pivotal: the United States had arrived; more Americans would follow; more edifices would be built. The treaty signaled the beginning of the end for established patterns of living among the region’s native and mixed-heritage inhabitants.

Yet Pelagie Faribault’s presence in the document greatly complicates that story. If the 1820 treaty gave notice that the American state had its eyes set upon the Upper Midwest, it also indicated—through Pelagie—the strength of the cultural systems already in place there and the ability of native and mixed-heritage individuals to frustrate the transformation of Indian country into an American state. In Euro-American law and custom, Pelagie should not have received land in her own right. But she did, and she not only received it but maintained ownership even as Euro-Americans became more populous in the region and insisted that a woman of French and Indian ancestry should own nothing at all. As late as 1858, the U.S. government paid Pelagie’s heirs $12,000 for land that it continued to recognize had belonged to her and not her husband—even though Congress never ratified Leavenworth’s treaty.³ It is through Pelagie’s life, and the lives of other women like her, relegated to the fringes of the documentary record, that we discover a more complex story than conventional histories would have us believe.

The contract signed by Leavenworth, six of his officers, Taliaferro, Faribault, Campbell, and the Dakota leaders was short but precise. The Dakota, by inking the document with their marks, were considered to “have given, granted, conveyed, and confirmed” title to a military reserve to the U.S. government. The boundaries of the acreage were described with reference to a number of markers—rivers, caves, the military’s temporary encampment, and the villages in which Dakota leaders Little Crow, Black Dog, and White Bustard lived. Finally, the contract acknowledged two other grants from the Dakota: a one-square-mile tract of land to Duncan Campbell, interpreter and kin to several local Dakota people; and ownership of Pike Island in the middle of the Mississippi River to Pelagie Faribault, wife of trader

In Euro-American law and custom, Pelagie should not have received land in her own right. But she did, and she not only received it but maintained ownership even as Euro-Americans became more populous in the region and insisted that a woman of French and Indian ancestry should own nothing at all.

When Col. Leavenworth entered the Upper Midwest in 1819, he did not speak the Dakota language. He was confronted with ready evidence of the continued influence of British traders in the region, and yet he was armed with orders to “gain the confidence and friendship of all the Indian tribes with whom you may have any intercourse . . . [and] hold treaties of friendship with the tribes within our limits” (emphasis in the original).⁴ It was, under these circumstances, Leavenworth’s personal decision to negotiate for land on which to build a United States fort. Such an agreement had technically been hammered out 14 years before, when Zebulon Pike signed a treaty with the Dakota bands of the Minnesota River region. That treaty, however, was never proclaimed by the president.⁵

When Leavenworth decided to enter into a treaty with Little Crow’s, White Bustard’s, and Black Dog’s bands, he acted as the agent of a powerful, if fledgling, empire whose imperial designs he well understood.
Yet his actions were also shaped by more mundane concerns. Three days before the August 9 treaty signing, he had endured a torrential thunderstorm in the inadequate shelter of an ill-constructed log cabin. His company had been drastically depleted by scurvy during the winter of 1819, and he was operating in a region where strong ties to the trade system were the surest avenue to influence and power. Viewed from the vantage point of the banks of the Mississippi River, the U.S. government’s belief in its own imperial destiny—and its policies to facilitate American ascendency across the continent—meant little. The young nation’s goals could not be met by the simple assertion of power and a theoretical cultural superiority. It would take friendship, family connections, and personal relationships between Leavenworth and individuals like Pelagie Faribault for any transformation to occur.

Since her birth in 1783, Pelagie Faribault had been intimately connected to all the groups with whom Leavenworth needed to establish strong relationships in 1820. Her father, Joseph Ainse, the son of French parents, was born on Mackinac Island in 1744. He entered the Upper Midwest as a fur trader and fathered Pelagie with a Dakota woman whose name is lost to us, solidifying his trade connection to his wife’s band. Ainse’s work was greatly facilitated by the kinship ties he could claim with local Dakota groups, while his ability to speak the Dakota language and familiarity with their cultural practices helped him land the position of Indian agent under the British. He was called upon to negotiate what peace he could between several Dakota and Ojibwe communities in 1786 and 1787.

Pelagie’s own marriage perpetuated these connections between kinship and trade. In 1805 she wed Jean Baptiste Faribault, a French Canadian born in 1774 in Berthier, Canada. Faribault had entered the fur trade as an employee of the North West Company in 1798 and began his career trading at the mouth of the Kankakee River in present-day Illinois. The following year, he relocated to a more western post on the Des Moines River, where his primary trading partners were drawn from Dakota bands. In 1804 Faribault renewed his contract, established a post at the juncture of the St. Peter’s and Mississippi rivers and then, in accordance with Dakota custom, took Pelagie as his wife.

The glimpses of Pelagie’s life that survive in the historical record suggest her importance in facilitating Jean Baptiste’s success as a trader. She bore eight children during her marriage, and by the time the 1820 treaty was being negotiated, the eldest, Alexander, was old enough to assist his father with his fur-trade business.

In addition, Pelagie and Jean Baptiste often lived apart, a typical arrangement for established fur-trade couples. While Jean Baptiste traveled to trade, Pelagie maintained permanent residences with their children on lands at Prairie du Chien, then Pike Island, and finally at Mendota, the township across the river from Fort Snelling.

Jean Baptiste’s prestige in the region owed something to his ability to act as a host to travelers and other traders, an ability that rested upon the labor of Pelagie. The nuts and bolts of hospitality—sleeping accommodations and food—were her responsibility, whether by reference to the tenets of Euro-American culture, the blended, mixed-heritage communities of the Upper Midwest, or the Dakota community in which she was raised.

There is scattered evidence that suggests Pelagie performed this duty skillfully. Fur trader Philander Prescott rested with the Faribaults during a journey upriver in 1820 and enjoyed his welcome to such a degree that he would have stayed longer, had he not feared that Native groups (who had set up camp by the Faribaults’
home) would steal the goods he had left outside. In 1819, Col. Leavenworth also stayed with the Faribault family in Prairie du Chien and later fondly recalled “the very polite and hospitable manner in which I was treated while with you.”

We have no way of knowing what interaction occurred between Pelagie and Leavenworth during his stay with the family, but it is certain that a friendship flourished between the colonel and Jean Baptiste. Leavenworth recorded that he had learned much about the Dakota from the latter, so much so that he encouraged Jean Baptiste to accompany him upriver as an interpreter and also promised military assistance if needed. Faribault, through trade and kinship ties, was a known quantity to the Dakota who lived near the St. Peter’s and Mississippi rivers—a man who spoke their language, understood their cultural practices, and, through Pelagie, was acknowledged as family. Faribault was more useful to Leavenworth than individuals like Lawrence Taliaferro, the Indian agent who had arrived in the region with the Fifth Infantry in 1819. Taliaferro’s previous experience in the Upper Midwest had been a short stint as a member of the Third Infantry at Chicago in 1816 and an even shorter stint at Green Bay the following year. Despite his commitment to establishing positive relations, he preferred to remain in civilization as a result of his experience.15

In effect, Jean Baptiste’s power was owed to Pelagie and, as a result, it was appropriate in Dakota eyes for her to gain a gift from the proceedings in acknowledgement of her work.

Faribault would settle close to the proposed fort. In the period between Leavenworth’s departure for the Upper Mississippi and Faribault’s move north, Jean Baptiste proved himself even more indispensable when he directed the colonel to the hemlock that grew at Lake St. Croix. With scurvy decimating his forces, Leavenworth wrote to “assure you that the hemlock is considered of the greatest consequence to us, and the only thing that can save the existence of our men and officers.”14

By the summer of 1820, then, Leavenworth had incurred an informal debt of gratitude to Jean Baptiste. It was largely because of his help that Leavenworth could claim success in making friendly overtures toward the local Dakota communities. Faribault, through trade and kinship ties, was a known quantity to the Dakota who lived near the St. Peter’s and Mississippi rivers—a man who spoke their language, understood their cultural practices, and, through Pelagie, was acknowledged as family. Faribault was more useful to Leavenworth than individuals like Lawrence Taliaferro, the Indian agent who had arrived in the region with the Fifth Infantry in 1819. Taliaferro’s previous experience in the Upper Midwest had been a short stint as a member of the Third Infantry at Chicago in 1816 and an even shorter stint at Green Bay the following year. Despite his commitment to establishing positive relations, he preferred to remain in civilization as a result of his experience.15

Such was the context in which Leavenworth negotiated with the Dakota on August 9. The treaty, though an imperfect expression of the United States’ goals, was made possible by connecting webs of families and friends. Jean Baptiste Faribault occupied a singularly powerful position at the negotiations. His power came not from military might or any particular expression of wealth, but from the friendship he had forged with the Fifth Infantry’s commanding officer and the cultural and linguistic knowledge he possessed. All of these things were made possible by his wife: by her family connections, her language skills, and her labor as a hostess. In effect, Jean Baptiste’s power was owed to Pelagie and, as a result, it was appropriate in Dakota eyes for her to gain a gift from the proceedings in acknowledgement of her work.16

The transaction likely looked quite different from Leavenworth’s perspective. In Euro-American society, a woman’s property became her husband’s on the occasion of their marriage. The laws of coverture suspended a woman’s legal identity within that of her husband, granting him control over her land and earnings while they were wed.17 Within the cultural system Leavenworth best understood, the Dakota grant to Pelagie was in every sense a grant to her husband; Leavenworth likely expected the land to be governed and controlled by Jean Baptiste. Faribault’s contemporaries, as well as subsequent historians, interpreted the transfer of Pike Island to Pelagie Faribault in much the same way Leavenworth did: it was a gift to the husband, made through the body of his wife.

Yet Pelagie and Jean Baptiste were not married according to the dictates of Euro-American law. It was as a Dakota woman, married according to the “custom of the country,” that Pelagie facilitated her husband’s entry into Dakota culture. When viewed from within the boundaries of that culture, Pelagie’s
grant had a particular resonance. It formalized (rather than created) the Faribaults’ residency in the area, for while Pelagie had spent most of her married life in Prairie du Chien, her early years had been among the Mdewakanton, and her husband frequently lived among the Dakota at the mouth of the St. Peter’s River as he traded. In addition, the grant (whether Leavenworth understood this or not) acknowledged Dakota cultural practices, wherein home and hearth were controlled and owned by women. Tipis and bark lodges, the raw materials used to create clothes and bedding, and the means to process and cook food were all women’s purview. The grant of land on which a domestic residence might be established was congruent with gendered Dakota practice.

That the 1820 treaty captured the complexities of the moment and the fragility of the United States’ position in the region may sound logical to modern ears, although earlier historians did their best to write such uncertainties out of the record. Yet even more telling than the situation in 1820 was the situation in 1838, when the U.S. government set about buying Pelagie’s land.

While the American population of the region was still small in 1838, it had grown since 1820 and the increases were manifest in very particular ways. The garrison at Fort Snelling was now complete. The stone structure on the bluff overlooked the rivers was capable of sheltering almost 250 members of the Fifth Infantry, their families, servants, and slaves. The river valley had become home to American traders such as Henry H. Sibley and Joseph R. Brown, traders who had chosen not to enter into lasting “custom of the country” marriages to facilitate their work. A number of missionaries from the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions had also settled in the region—the first in 1829. Acting with the blessing of the War Department, they set up homesteads with the intent of assimilating Native people into American society and converting them to Christianity. As many as 365 civilians lived around the Fort Snelling area: missionaries, employees of the Indian agency, fur traders, early settlers, general laborers, and their families.

Nationally, the U.S. government’s relationship with Indian people had swung toward a policy of removal. Locally, the potential for land cessions from the Dakota and Ojibwe was extremely attractive to American settlers. The eastern side of the Mississippi River was pine country, and American settlement in upper Illinois and southern Wisconsin had created an insatiable demand for timber to use in construction. Fur traders favored the negotiation of treaties to help cover the debts incurred by local Indian communities, debts that had escalated as the eastern shores of the Mississippi became overhunted and prices for staples such as muskrat furs tumbled in the East. Native communities came to believe that, by virtue of the annuities and services offered to them, the treaties would help mitigate that season’s failed wild rice harvest, clear their debts, and aid them in continued tenure on their remaining lands.

These circumstances—national, regional, and local—came together to create the moment in 1837 in which the U.S. government negotiated treaties with the Dakota and Ojibwe communities that had land east of the Mississippi River. In return for land cessions, the Dakota and Ojibwe were promised financial settlements, agricultural equipment, and the assistance of blacksmiths and farmers in practicing both crafts. The latter provisions represented a clear attempt on the part of the federal government to pressure the communities into making adaptations to American culture and suggested the nation’s increasing power to dictate the fashion in which the region would develop.

Yet Pelagie’s island stands, again, as testimony to the uncertainties surrounding U.S. expansion. Since she was a French-Dakota woman who had received Pike Island as a Dakota gift in an agreement that Congress never ratified, her land occupied something of a precarious position during treaty negotiations. Although tangible practices—including the construction of Fort Snelling on land demarcated by Leavenworth’s treaty—suggested that the agreement was observed in spirit, if not in law, the Faribaults feared that the 1837 treaty with the Dakota might supersede the 1820 agreement, especially since no protective clause suggesting otherwise had been entered into the new docu-
The Faribaults felt it prudent to engage Samuel C. Stambaugh and Alexis Bailly (both ex-fur traders, the first a close friend of Jean Baptiste and the second married to the Faribaults’ daughter Lucy) to lobby key figures in Washington for the protection of the Pike Island claim.26

Stambaugh and Bailly were successful, impressing upon Secretary of War Joel R. Poinsett that Jean Baptiste “is a very respectable old man, a Frenchman, and has resided among that tribe forty-two years.” As ever, behind the invocation of Faribault’s name lurked Pelagie, their representatives making specific reference to the importance of kinship in the social fabric of the region. “[T]he Ferribault family is the most powerful and influential among the Sioux Indians,” wrote Stambaugh to Poinsett in January 1838. “It is families of this description who do much good or much evil among the Indians, with whom they are connected by bonds of blood; and [the] Government would save much blood and treasure, if proper pains were taken to secure their friendship.” Poinsett was convinced. Stambaugh and Bailly secured his promise that “the rights of Pelagie Faribault to the island in question should not be prejudiced by their not being inserted in the treaty.” Two things are notable in this promise: Poinsett gave weight to the unratified 1820 agreement, and he did not mention Jean Baptiste’s name.

Treaty Considerations
aside, the government still remained interested in controlling Pike Island. That interest was twofold: to finish the work of extinguishing all forms of Indian title to lands east of the Mississippi, and to meet the practical and security needs in controlling land so close to Fort Snelling. As Stambaugh described it, “The head of the island is separated from the walls of the fort by a small slough, about fifty yards, in width. . . . [B]y damming this slough, or throwing a wall across it at both ends, the island can be made a part of the main land.” Taliaferro claimed he had, as early as 1820, suggested to Leavenworth that “in times of difficulty or danger from the tribes, the post would require the island (though small) as a place of safety for the public cattle and horses (being directly under the guns of the fort).” In 1838, Maj. Joseph Plympton, the commanding officer of the fort, wrote that the military should “embrace Pike’s Island, which I consider to be of vital importance to this Fort as a pasture.” While pastures may seem a mundane consideration, livestock were often targeted by Native groups during periods of hostility. The loss of milk and beef cattle was a particularly troubling prospect for a fort still dependent on external suppliers for most of its subsistence needs.27

Convinced of the island’s value to the military, Congress took up the issue of the Faribaults’ claim in 1838, and on April 25 a joint resolution authorized the Secretary of War to contract with the Faribaults for the purchase of Pelagie’s land.28 Poinsett finalized negotiations on March 12, 1839, agreeing to buy the island for $12,000 (about $239,000 today), subject to congressional approval. No objection was raised by the War Department or Congress to Pelagie’s ownership of the land, despite her status as a married woman. A Euro-
American woman of the same era could be gifted property while she was married, but the property would only remain hers (as opposed to her husband’s) if her family could afford to create a trust for the property’s protection. It would be many years before a married Anglo woman could independently sell, contract, or rent out her own land. Pelagie’s ownership of Pike Island, however, depended upon her being Dakota; at least part of her value as a marital partner rested on the same. She lived outside the boundaries of coverture, had been married by the custom of her own community, and owned all that related to the home. By their actions, the men who sat in judgment upon Pelagie’s case upheld Dakota gender practice, regardless of their intellectual and ideological understanding of marital law.

The decision was not met happily at Fort Snelling. Taliaferro immediately wrote to the Secretary of War, arguing that Dakota title to the land had been extinguished by Pike’s treaty in 1805, and—even if that agreement were overlooked—completely extinguished by the treaties of 1837. Taliaferro rounded out his tally of offenses by bringing up the issue of residency: no one had made a permanent home on the island for 15 years. Maj. Plympton sided with Taliaferro, adding that Jean Baptiste was a Canadian and “alien.” The fort’s commanding officer also forwarded a letter he had received from Taliaferro, which pointed out that Jean Baptiste had no claim to the land before 1820: He had not taken up residence there until after Leavenworth had suggested he do so.

Taliaferro’s and Plympton’s arguments were made squarely from within the tenets of Euro-American culture. They focused their objections on Jean Baptiste, criticizing any claim he could make to the island on the basis of his citizenship and residency. They neither acknowledged nor tackled the question of Pelagie’s ownership of the land, or the fact that she had maintained residency there in Jean Baptiste’s absence until a flood made the island uninhabitable in 1822. Taliaferro and Plympton did their best to make Pelagie disappear. The woman that emerged from their discussions of the island was a woman with no control over her property; a woman subject to the strictures of coverture. This tactic not only served them in trying to argue that the Faribaults should not be made rich by the island’s sale but reflected their larger attempts to stamp the social relations of Euro-American society on the region. The inhabitants of the region, however, were not so malleable, even on paper, as the Indian agent and commanding officer of the fort might wish.

There was policy, there were ideals, and then there was the reality of the national colonial venture. All parties who worked for the U.S. government—Plympton, Taliaferro, Poinsett, and Commissioner of Indian Affairs T. Hartley Crawford—agreed that Pike Island was a valuable, even necessary, holding for Fort Snelling. Yet while Plympton and Taliaferro argued that the U.S. government should ignore the 1820 agreement and simply act as if the land belonged to the nation, the officials stationed in Washington had a different assessment of the situation. Eyeing the unrest among midwestern Indian groups, understanding the scarcity of game in the area, mindful of the power of traders to influence relationships with local Native communities, and—crucially—with no personal investment in the rapid ascendency of American systems of
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**Moving Pelagie Faribault to the center of the narrative is a necessary act. It reveals the uneven application of imperialism’s tenets in the region, the necessity of the American system adapting, for a time, to the cultural landscape of the Dakota, and the power that individuals, too often considered uniformly powerless, could claim.**
I certify that there is due from the United States to
Joseph, Baptiste, Torickault & Felicia, Torickault his wife

For all the right, title, interest & claims of the
said Joseph, Baptiste & Felicia, Torickault, his wife, in
& to his Island, situated at the confluence of the
St. Peter's River, & the Rivers in the Territory of
Minnesota, to be sold & assigned thereof, which was
conveyed by the Chief of the Sioux Nation to the
said Joseph, Baptiste, Torickault in the year 1829 & is
not due to be sold to the United States with the
said Joseph, Baptiste, Torickault, three days of War on
the 16th day of March, 1829; pursuant to a joint
resolution of Congress, approved July 1, 1829, Annexed
on the second day of July, 1839, to the Treaty of
the 29th day of January, 1838. The above conveyance
is executed & signed, as appears from the
statement which herewith transmitted for the
division of the Second Comptroller of the Treasury.

To J. Madison Coles, Esq.,
Second Comptroller of the Treasury.

SECOND COMPTROLLER'S OFFICE.
I admit and verify the above balance, due &
due day of
February 1839.

J. Madison Coles
Second Comptroller.
government at the St. Peter’s, Crawford and Poinsett acknowledged that the United States did not yet possess the power required to dictate the outcome it wanted in the Pike Island matter. In Crawford’s own words, “As a principle of general observance, the United States, in my judgment, cannot recognize such grants [as were made to Pelagie Faribault]. . . . This case, however, occupies a position of its own. . . . The island is wanted for the purposes of the Government. To avoid delay, and difficulty, and controversy, it may be judicious . . . to purchase it. All Indian claim will be put at rest.”

As the events of 1820 and 1838–1839 demonstrate, Pelagie Faribault occupied a legal, social, and cultural space quite different from the standard Euro-American model of the time—an extension of the particular circumstances of the Upper Midwest with its myriad cultures, their different ideas of gendered behavior, and their understanding of land. Yet that story is easily missed if we prioritize the thoughts, actions, and life stories of men over women, literate over illiterate, military over civilian, and Americans over the Dakota and their mixed-heritage descendents. If we permit the narrative of American expansionism to be defined by those who, because of race, gender, wealth, and education, stood most ready to record their participation in the process, we pen an uncomplicated story that suggests—erroneously—how easily this Midwest was won. Moving Pelagie Faribault to the center of the narrative is a necessary act. It reveals the uneven application of imperialism’s tenets in the region, the necessity of the American system adapting, for a time, to the cultural landscape of the Dakota, and the power that individuals, too often considered uniformly powerless, could claim.
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