UCLA
UCLA Previously Published Works

Title

Designing a Dictionary for an Endangered Language Community: Lexicographical Deliberations, Language Ideological Clarifications

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/91z3n2n8

Author

Kroskrity, Paul V

Publication Date

2015

Peer reviewed

Designing a Dictionary for an Endangered Language Community: Lexicographical Deliberations, Language Ideological Clarifications

Paul V. Kroskrity

University of California, Los Angeles

Dictionaries of endangered languages represent especially important products of language documentation, in part because they are usually the most familiar and useful genre of linguistic representation to endangered language community members. This familiarity, however, can become problematic when it is accompanied by language ideologies that equate dictionaries with word lists ('words for things'), prescriptive linguistics, and researchers' neoliberal assumptions regarding the circulation of knowledge. Recent and ongoing research in the Village of Tewa (N. Arizona, Kiowa-Tanoan language family) designed to produce a practical dictionary in support of the community's language renewal efforts provides some examples of the need to contextualize the project within the community and to understand the pervasive role of language ideologies when working collaboratively. This research project aims to promote and fortify lexical documentation so that the practical dictionary is an adequate guide for future community members, while still conforming to cultural protocols about lexical representation and circulation, both within and outside the language community.

1. INTRODUCTION.[1] Dictionaries are of obvious importance to endangered language communities and they are, as John Haviland (2006:129) has cogently observed, the linguistic genre that is most familiar to the general public. Importantly, this general public typically includes a concerned indigenous public that is especially interested in the representation of its heritage language. This concerned indigenous public consists not only of indigenous language activists and practitioners (e.g., language planners, indigenous linguists, language teachers) but also of members of the community who seek to use documentary materials as either a student in an educational setting or merely as a speaker consulting reference materials on his or her heritage language. At a time when the awareness of the significance of a heritage language is growing in most endangered language communities, this concerned indigenous public is expanding. The familiarity of indigenous communities with the dictionary genre is, of course, very significant because it promotes a documentary product that is readily recognizable and usually valued by the community. However, as Ulrike Mosel (2011:337) has demonstrated, the dictionary projects of major nation-states and minority and/or indigenous languages often differ dramatically in their scale and scope. Whereas many nation-states can consistently provide abundant personnel and financial resources

---

into the dictionaries of their standardized languages, many indigenous language dictionaries are produced with limited resources on a correspondingly restricted time frame and by few dedicated project staff. But in addition to the positive attributes mentioned above, a familiarity—on the part of language community members—with the dictionaries associated with national languages may produce expectations of standardization, prescriptivism, and even neoliberal assumptions about the circulation of knowledge that do not accord with the language ideologies of the indigenous community (Debenport 2010). For endangered language community members, as well as for those working collaboratively with them, it is important to remember that dictionaries have been historically associated with both colonial and missionary activity, and that the hegemonic influence of nation-states can produce a comparable level of outside cultural influence which may or may not be desired by community members who are concerned with both honoring and developing indigenous alternatives (Hanks 2010, Errington 2007, Meek 2010, Schieffelin 2000). Though a more complete treatment of this topic is beyond the scope of this article, there is considerable evidence to suggest that dictionaries and other language resources have been designed by colonizers, missionaries, and agents of nation-state supported assimilation campaigns in ways designed more to control and subvert than to enhance indigenous resources. Dictionaries, like other products of outsider 'research' may therefore be distrusted by indigenous communities. This article attempts to explore the methodological necessity of confronting the language ideologies of both endangered language communities as well as those of the documentary linguists who study them in order to produce maximally adequate documentation that follows the cultural protocols of the heritage language group (Collins 1998). It is based on my participation in a project designed to produce a practical dictionary for the Village of Tewa.

In order to provide resources for what is locally viewed as a linguistic crisis, members of the Village of Tewa (First Mesa, Hopi Reservation, Northern Arizona), have embarked on a plan of language documentation and revitalization in which I would provide professional linguistic expertise based on prior and ongoing research (e.g., Kroskrity 1993, 2012) in their community. A Kiowa-Tanoan language (Kroskrity 2005), Arizona Tewa is closely related to other Tanoan languages still spoken in Northern New Mexico—the original homeland of the ancestors of the Arizona Tewa prior to their dislocation in the post-Pueblo Revolts of 1680 and the 1696 diaspora to their contemporary location in North-eastern Arizona as extremely close neighbors of the Hopi. One of the resources most needed by this community as it attempts to shift Tewa language transmission from informal home settings to more formal classroom contexts, is a dictionary written in an orthography that represents its Tewa language and not that of other Tewa-speaking pueblos in New Mexico where the Rio Grande Tewa language is spoken.[2] Inspired by the *Hopi Dictionary/Hopiikwa Lavaytutuveni* (Hopi Dictionary Project 1998) and guided by scholarship on dictionary making (e.g., Frawley, Hill & Munro 2002), I want to selectively present some collaborative successes and challenges that have emerged in the early stages of this ongoing dictionary project for the Arizona Tewa language, highlighting some instructive instances of what is appropriately viewed as language ideological 'give-and-take.'

Though the dictionary that was produced by the inspiring Hopi Dictionary Project is widely regarded as one of the very best dictionaries ever produced for a Native American Language, its development and publication were very controversial and included numerous ideological conflicts between dictionary researchers, native experts, tribal authorities, and

---

[2]There are at least two Tewa languages—Arizona and Rio Grande Tewa but it is possible that Santa Clara Tewa represents a third. More comparative research is needed.

the university press contracted to publish the final product (Hill 2002). Though only a small minority of Village of Tewa people seemed to be aware of the Hopi dictionary controversy, local debates within the Village had already made a possible Tewa dictionary a contentious topic. Why was I at the center of these debates? Several college students from the Village who were aware that I had performed a considerable body of research in their community over a period of two decades, beginning in 1973, had contacted me and requested that I return in an effort to provide the community, especially its youth, documentary materials that might be used in a program of revitalization involving reference and textbooks as well as language instruction.

But before that research could begin, I needed to earn the community's approval. I made several presentations to well attended town hall meetings in the Village of Tewa and answered questions from community members about the project as best I could. Finally in the summer of 2012 and after a process lasting several years, a dictionary project was formally approved by the Village of Tewa Board of Directors—elected members representing the Village. Shortly thereafter, research began involving me, as principal investigator, and six Tewa speakers. This research team began to collect new data and check on materials that had been previously recorded during my earlier research. These data provided fuel for a number of discussions about the linguistic representation of specific lexical items. These discussions, which are ongoing, really amount to the practice of *ideological clarification* (Kroskrity 2009) in which beliefs and feelings about language are externalized by the different participants in an attempt to bridge differences that emerge as obstacles in the production of effective language revitalization products and efforts. A snapshot of this early stage of a multi-year project suggests two areas of difference between me, the researcher, and language community members. As an external advocate/expert, I have found myself needing to renegotiate the community's 'familiar' notions about dictionaries in order to expand the level of linguistic detail necessary, on the one hand, and to honor indigenous notions of regulating cultural knowledge, on the other. In both these activities, an attention to the language ideologies of both researcher and community members is critical.

Accordingly, three topics will receive treatment here since space permits only a selective treatment of the many important dictionary-making issues. First, I will address tensions between academic and non-academic functions of bilingual dictionaries (Hinton & Weigel 2002) and highlight the importance of recipient-designing lexicons for indigenous communities and their need to view dictionaries as cultural resources in the service of language preservation and renewal. Second, I will turn to some critical linguistic issues by addressing the form that lexical entries for verbs must take (Munro 2002) since recognizing the specific argument structure of specific verbs is a critical complement to any grammatical preoccupation with capturing productive syntactic and morphological rules (Munro 2002, Hale & Salamanca 2002). A third and final emphasis will be on the representation of nouns including those that represent culturally sensitive concepts (such as those concerned with religious ceremonies.) Since this is often a linguistic domain in which native awareness is especially robust, this issue will also return the discussion to local language ideologies and the way that community based dictionaries are locally construed as a particular type of authoritative text. This involves the exploration of the interrelated local ideologies of literacy, knowledge control, linguistic variation, linguistic representation, and cultural authority.

2. THE VILLAGE OF TEWA AND THE NEED FOR LANGUAGE IDEOLOGICAL CLARIFICATION. As part of the first discussion and preparatory for the others, I want to first analyze a relevant concept that I have yet to define precisely here—the concept of *language ideological clar-*

ification. This concept has been deployed by scholars such as Joshua Fishman (2001:17) and Nora Marks Dauenhauer (Tlingit) and the late Richard Dauenhauer (1998), to highlight the need for reducing tensions within speech communities in which the heritage language is deeply threatened and yet the community response is divided and plagued by contradiction. Such contradictions, even among those nominally in support of language revitalization efforts, result in a "broad gap between verbally expressed goals, on the one hand (generally advocating language and cultural preservation) and unstated but deeply felt emotions and anxieties on the other (generally advocating or contributing to abandonment)" (Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer 1998:62-3). I have argued that the notion of language ideological clarification was recognized as a critical need by these scholars but never adequately explicated and theorized (Kroskrity 2009a). Following the theoretical emphasis on 'language ideologies' (e.g., Silver 1979, Schieffelin, Woolard & Kroskrity 1998, Kroskrity 2000, Kroskrity 2010a), I redefined the concept as follows:

> Language ideological clarification is the process of identifying issues of language ideological contestation, including both beliefs and feelings that are indigenous to that community and those introduced by outsiders (such as linguists and government officials), that can impact—either positively or negatively—community efforts to successfully engage in language maintenance and renewal.

Following this emphasis, we can view language renewal activities as 'sites' (Silverstein 1998a) of ideological production and explication wherein contending views greatly enhance the process of identifying and raising consciousness about linguistic and discursive issues. Recognizing the importance of those beliefs and feelings about language as well as their variability within and across communities enables appropriate 'clarifying' discourses to occur between community members, or between members and either linguists or government officials who have differing opinions. It is reasonable to expect that these discourses would promote actual resolution—a clarification achieved—or at least foster a tolerable level of disagreement that would not inhibit language renewal activities. Since the Arizona Tewa dictionary that is 'under construction' is a work that is designed for the heritage language community and its project of language renewal and not merely a work of linguistic documentation designed for academic elites, the notion of 'language ideological clarification' is an appropriate and useful tool for avoiding and resolving some of the problems that can be anticipated, not just in language renewal activities in general, but on the basis of actual experience in developing dictionaries with groups such as their Hopi neighbors (Hill 2002), groups that have very similar language ideologies.

About 700 descendents of the Southern Tewa live in the Village of Tewa, First Mesa, Hopi Reservation, and in neighboring villages, descendants of those who moved to the Hopi area after refusing to resettle their home villages after the second Pueblo Revolt of 1696. This community, as I detailed in earlier research (Kroskrity 1993), has retained a discrete cultural identity and is the only group of more than 100 post-Spanish colonial occupation-diaspora groups to maintain its heritage language rather than opting for complete assimilation with a host group. This fact is not lost on most Tewa who recognize the language as an important symbol of their identity in many ways but perhaps most notably in their expression *Naavi hiili naavi wowats'i na-mu* 'My language is my life'. But today despite the importance of the heritage language, few young people are acquiring it. When I first conducted research in the Arizona Tewa community in the 1970s, half of all Tewa homes were raising children with some regular exposure to the Tewa language. But by 2007, the number

of Tewa homes in which the heritage language was regularly used had dropped from 50% to less than 10%. It was now obvious to all, or at least most, that the community's distinctive heritage language was now severely threatened.

A key element in my interactions with community members was the 'give and take' that allowed us to communicate important relevancies from our different perspectives. As a linguist, I needed to get the message across that the dictionary would be a record of the language and one that needed to include linguistic details of grammar and morphology that many speakers took for granted or disregarded as unimportant. But as members of their community, they successfully communicated their beliefs about the importance of limiting the flow of lexical knowledge and, more generally, about the circulation of reference works about the language. As an academic who had been brought up in a neoliberal environment in which most linguistic knowledge circulates freely, I was made aware that many Tewa people saw their language more as a cultural property that needed to be maintained—but also controlled.

One of the stipulations of documentary research in the Village of Tewa was that none of the published, documentary materials in the Tewa language be allowed to circulate outside that community. Since documentation was much more important than publication, I consented to these conditions in order to begin the project. For the Village of Tewa, I interpreted the need for ideological clarification as especially important for two major reasons—one to honor cultural protocols about language and cultural representation and transmission and the other, to ensure a level of linguistic detail in the documentation that would better serve future community members.

3. ON THE EDGE OF NATIVE AWARENESS: LEXICAL ENTRIES FOR ARIZONA TEWA VERBS. While language ideologies about 'access' and language and identity are often very explicitly stated in the Village of Tewa, not all 'beliefs, feelings, and conceptions about language structure and use' (Kroskrity 2010a:192) pertinent to making a dictionary are part of speakers' discursive consciousness (Giddens 1984, Kroskrity 1998). Though words, especially 'words for things' or words that perform an obvious referential/denotational function are often really those aspects of language endowed with the most Native awareness and importance (e.g., Silverstein 1979, Moore 1988, Collins 1998), the awareness of words is not distributed evenly across lexical categories. Like many speakers, Tewa Villagers are much more culturally preoccupied with nouns and the nominal categorizations of their sociocultural lives that they represent. Despite the emergence of a revalorizing discourse among many other Southwestern US indigenous groups in which the polysynthetic verbs of their language are ideologically highlighted by speakers as the basis of their 'action-oriented' and verb-centered languages (Gomez de Garcia, Axelrod & Lachler 2009), the Tewa language community at present does not seem to express this view, although they do evaluate speakers who are capable of habitually using polysynthetic verbs as more fluent than those that do not. Still, in contrast to nouns, especially those that denote cultural things, speakers devote far less attention to verbs. From a linguistic perspective, this relative inattention does not diminish the critical importance of dictionary representations of verbs, especially for the majority of Native American languages in which verbs show a high degree of polysynthesis (Munro 2002:87). While theoretical linguists have tended to marginalize the lexicon 'as a repository of otherwise anarchic facts' (Haviland 2006:130), lexical entries can be very important for speakers, especially those who are acquiring their heritage languages as second languages, precisely because they treat the interface of semi-productive grammatical

patterns and idiosyncratic lexical properties and thereby allow speakers access to the fluent use of these linguistic forms.

The basic morphology of an Arizona Tewa verb is represented in simplified form in (1) below. I use the linguistic convention of deploying hyphens to represent morpheme breaks between these units of meaning and parentheses to represent optional elements.

(1) PREFIX-(ADVERB)-(NOUN)-VERB-(VERB)-(TENSE/ASPECT)

This description states that every Tewa verb must contain a pronominal PREFIX and at least one VERB stem. In Arizona Tewa grammar, pronominal prefixes come in five series. Two are intransitive and primarily involve a single subject-topic: Stative-existential (STA) and Possessive (POS). Three are transitive: Active (AC), Reflexive-reciprocal (REFL), and Inverse (INV). For most of these series, the language provides a discrete prefix for each person, 1st ('I, we'), 2nd ('you, you all'), and 3rd (he, she, it, they) but also adds a *dual* category to the *singular* and *plural* found in a language like contemporary English. Arizona Tewa thus, for example, has prefixes for 'we two' that are different than 'we (>2)'. See Tables 1 and 2 below for a more complete view of all these prefixes.

TABLE 1. Pronominal Prefixes (excluding inverse)[3]

	Subject Person and Number								
	1sg	**1du**	**1pl**	**2sg**	**2du**	**2pl**	**3sg**	**3du**	**3pl**
POS	dín	gáh	gíh	úh	déh	óh	úú	den	doo
STA	o	ga	gi	'u	da	i	na	da	di
RFL	déh	an	íbí	bi	den	óbí	'i	den	díbí
ACT	dó	'an	íí	náá	den	obíín	mán	den	díí

Note: For purposes of economy, this table excludes benefactive prefixes. For some prefixes there is no distinction between second and third persons.

The other obligatory constituent of the Tewa verb is a verb stem such as *-k'enu-* 'to throw'. Many verb stems can be compounded to create other related verbs. For example, speakers can precede the verb 'to throw' with the verb *-khwii-* 'to tie' to produce: *-khwii-k'enu* 'tie-throw,' meaning 'to lasso.'

The optional elements of the verb include ADVERB information such as the manner in which something is done or qualifications like 'only,' 'again,' or 'while going away.' Tewa verbs, like those of other Native American languages exhibiting 'noun incorporation,' permit nouns to optionally occur within the verb. For example, *Dín-waayu-'én* 'I have a horse' is composed of the verb inflected with the 1st person possessive prefix, followed by the lexeme for horse, and concluded with the stative verb stem meaning 'to sit'. 'To me a horse sits' is the Tewa expression for 'I have a horse'. The final required element is at least one TENSE-ASPECT suffix. Such suffixes are actually required for all transitive verbs—verbs that are conventionally understood to have a subject and an object and that express some relationship between the two. These TENSE-ASPECT suffixes supply information

---

[3]The orthography follows that of the current practical dictionary. This orthography mostly follows practical application of an IPA type alphabet but with the following exceptions: ['] represents a glottal stop and in conjunction with other voiceless stops, it represents a glottalized consonant. [;] marks nasalization of the preceding vowel. Long vowels are orthographically doubled. A mid-front vowel [ɛ] is represented as [ae] or [aee] if the vowel is long. The affricate [c] is represented as [ts].

TABLE 2. Inverse prefix series

Person of Subject-Patient	Person of Agent		
	1	**-1 (2 or 3)**	**3**
1		dí	
2	wí		
2sg			wóó
2du			wóóbén
2pl			wóóbé
3sg			óó
3du			óóbén
3pl			óóbé

like the past-, present-, or future-orientation of the event described, or they express ideas about actions being performed either duratively, habitually, or according to obligation.

Even this simplified account should suggest that any dictionary representation of the Tewa verb, or better any lexicographically responsible description of the verb, must include some grammatical information. Grammatical rules and subcategory labels alone will not provide sufficient information to represent what speakers tacitly must know about each verb. Thus, each entry must include a representation of the knowledge that fluent speakers display in their linguistic practice, even though they may lack the discursive consciousness, or linguistic awareness, to verbally explicate these typically intricate patterns at the interface of grammar and lexicon (Kroskrity 1998). As a linguist, I would contend that this information is critical to represent especially for younger speakers who may need to turn to the dictionary rather than relying on the stock of linguistic knowledge gained through primary language socialization. Though several speakers' discussions of sample representations involving this information often met with relative disinterest to many fluent speakers, those speakers forgot that their 'so what!' reaction is not a definitive commentary on the worth of information but rather the inevitable reaction when someone merely reconstructs the logic of everyday linguistic practices that many speakers have learned to effortlessly produce. What such speakers forget in their relative dismissal of this linguistic knowledge is that many of the linguistic patterns they have so completely internalized and now see as common sense knowledge or 'what everybody knows' are actually not shared by younger and less fluent speakers and that current patterns of intergenerational use do not provide a medium for them to learn it.

Accordingly my goal in this section is to provide a selective sketch of some of the kinds of information that must be regarded as appropriate in a dictionary of Arizona Tewa designed to serve both heritage language community needs and those of community of descriptive and historical linguists. In outlining what she regards as the key criteria in lexical entries for verbs, Pamela Munro (2002:86) writes "a full entry may need to contain inflectional information, irregular forms, examples, an etymology, and cross-references to related forms or other items of interest." Here, I will focus on selected issues in the representation of verbs involving inflectional information, irregular and suppletive forms, and what might be termed their conceptual argument structure. I will provide Arizona Tewa language examples to illustrate the relevance of these grammatical observations in a lexical entry. My discussion about the inclusion of semantic-thematic information as well as case and other

morphosyntactic marking is adapted from Fillmore (1968a, 1968b)—one of many possible typological schema.

Each lexical entry for verbs must include information about what are permissible prefix series for that particular verb. There are some verbs that can co-occur with all prefixes as in the case of -*hee* 'be sick'.

Table 3. Arizona Tewa -*hee* 'be sick'

Pronominal Prefix Type-1st Person	Example	Translation
STATIVE	*o-hee*	'I'm sick'
POSSESSIVE	*dín-p'on-hee*	'My head aches'
POSSESSIVE	*dín-eenu-hee*	'My son got sick on me.'
ACTIVE	*dó-hee-an*	'I sickened her/him/it.'
REFLEXIVE	*díí-hee-an*	'I made myself sick.'
INVERSE	*dí-hee-an*	'I was made sick'

Note that this verb co-occurs with all prefix types and that its occurrence with the Possessive prefix set produces two distinct 'senses' depending upon the noun that is incorporated between the prefix and the verb. When a noun indicating a body part, like 'head,' is included, the designated body part becomes the site of the illness and/or its symptoms for the person identified in the prefix: 'my' head aches. But when the incorporated noun signifies an animate being like a person or an animal, the sense produced is: that person or animal became ill while the person identified by the prefix had responsibility for him/her/it. 'My son got sick on me' thus indicates the permanent responsibility between kinsmen whereas if *waak'a* 'cow' were incorporated instead of 'son' the reading would be that 'My cow got sick on me while I was temporarily in charge of it.' Thus, in addition to which prefixes co-occur with particular verbs, lexical entries also need to specify whether or not they incorporate nouns and, if they do, what semantic roles those nouns perform.

But there are other verbs, such as -*hey* 'to kill' that can only occur with the transitive verb-compatible prefixes. Consider Table 4 below.

Table 4. Arizona Tewa -*hey* 'to kill'

Pronominal Prefix Type-3rd Person	Example	Translation
ACTIVE	*mán-hey-an*	'S/he killed him/her/it'.
REFLEXIVE	*'íí-hey-an*	'He killed himself.'
INVERSE	*'óó-hey-an*	'He/she was killed.'

This verb stem also pragmatically presupposes a singular 'object'—the victim. Therefore the entry for this verb would need to be cross-referenced to its suppletive verb stem (for number), *tahaana* 'to kill (many), to massacre', where the object is obligatorily two or more. Note that for this verb, the mapping of semantic arguments to grammatical roles and morphosyntactic marking differs with each prefix type. Examples 2–4 display sentences with the same verb inflected with each of these prefix types.[4]

---

[4]Note that the following abbreviations will be used in glosses: 1, 2, 3 = First, second or third person; 1/3 = First person agent/ third person patient; AC = ACTIVE/TRANSITIVE Verb Prefix; du = dual number; DUB = Dubita-

(2) *he'i sen mán-waayu-hey-an*
that man 3/3.AC-horse-kill-PST

'That man killed a horse.'

(3) *ba kwiyo íí-hey-an*
EV girl   3.REFL-kill-PST

'They say the woman killed herself.'

(4) *ne'i waayu he'i sen-di/   he'i athu-di   óó-hey-an*
This horse   that man-OBL/ that car-OBL 3/3.INV-kill-PST

'This horse was killed by that man/ with that car.'

Example (2) illustrates a typical transitive sentence in which the subject is the AGENT and the object is the PATIENT. Any noun incorporated into this verb is interpreted as the PATIENT argument—the recipient of the action and, in this case, the victim. This incorporation is grammatically optionally and the object can appear as independent noun or noun phrase. In example (3) involving the Reflexive-Reciprocal prefix, the noun cannot be incorporated and the subject is interpreted as both the semantic AGENT and RECIPIENT. Though this is not lexically ambiguous in the singular, the predicate becomes so when inflected for dual or plural number (e.g., 'They killed each other' or 'They killed themselves'). In example (4) we find a more complicated situation, in which subject status is afforded the PATIENT (and not the AGENT as in (2)), and AGENT and/or INSTRUMENT arguments are syntactically marked as oblique, indicating their lesser prominence. This indication of the semantic roles assigned, and the syntactic marking required, differs from verb to verb and across prefix types and is therefore important to include in a verb's lexical entry.

To further illustrate this lexical complexity involving prefixes, semantic arguments, and syntactic marking, we can consider the Arizona Tewa verb *-t'ó*, 'to know', 'to learn'. Though this verb, as used in its second sense of 'learn', translates into a transitive verb in English with apparent AGENT (learner), OBJECT (what was learned), and SOURCE (learned from) conceptual arguments, in Arizona Tewa the verb stem co-occurs only with the stative-existential (or STA) prefix set. Though the verb does not permit noun incorporation, it does co-occur with a range of semantic arguments and syntactic marking. Example (5) illustrates a basic sentence in which the subject EXPERIENCER is indexed by the prefix but otherwise not overtly realized. The object GOAL argument is unmarked. In terms of Tewa grammar, it cannot be the subject because it does not agree with the person indexed as subject by the prefix.

(5) *Tewa hiili   o-t'ó.*
Tewa language 1.sg.STA-know

'I know (the) Tewa (language).'

Example (6) illustrates that when the verb is used in its 'learn' sense, it can also add a SOURCE argument that is syntactically marked with the postposition *-i'idi* 'from.'

(6) *Tewa hiili   naa-bi yíyá-bi-i'idi   'o-t'ó.*
Tewa language I-POS mother-REL-FROM 1.sg.STA-know

'I am learning/have learned Tewa from my mother.'

tive, EV = evidential particle; INV = inverse prefix; OBL = oblique marker; pl = plural number; NEG1, NEG2 = discontinuous Negative Morpheme; POS = possessive verb prefix; PST = past tense; sg = singular number; STA = stative verb prefix; SUB = subordinate clause marker.

Since this is an intransitive verb that is 'stretched' to encompass three semantic arguments (EXPERIENCER, GOAL, SOURCE) the verb displays a lexical ambiguity regarding time. Since intransitives do not inflect for tense-aspect, sentences like (6) are temporally ambiguous.

A different type of 'stretching' occurs with the verb *-khuwoona'a* 'to be afraid, to frighten'. This verb occurs with all prefixes as illustrated in Table 5.

TABLE 5. Arizona Tewa *-khuwoona'a* 'be afraid, to scare'

Pronominal Prefix Type-1st Person	Example	Translation
STATIVE	o-khuwoona'a	'I'm afraid'
POSSESSIVE	dín-eenu-khuwoona'a	'My son got scared on me.'
ACTIVE	dó- khuwoona'a -an	'I scared her/him/it.'
REFLEXIVE	díí- khuwoona'a-an	'I scared myself.'
INVERSE	dí-khuwoona'a-an	'I was frightened (by someone).'

While this table illustrates the verb's versatility, it does not reveal the differing argument structure required by the STATIVE and especially POSSESSIVE-prefixed verbs, on the one hand, and the remaining transitive-compatible prefixed ones on the other. Examples (7) and (8) illustrate the differing argument structures.

(7) *Naa-bi 'aayu   pééyu'u-di dín-khuwoona'a*
    I-'s   daughter story-OBL 1.POS-scare

    'My daughter got scared by the story on me.'

(8) *Naa-bi tada   khuyo-di   óó-khuwoona'a-an*.
    I-'s   father wolf-OBL 3/3.INV-scare-PST

    'My father was frightened by the wolf/wolves.'

Example 7 illustrates that, even in its intransitive forms, the verb can take multiple arguments. While this verb does not permit noun incorporation, it does allow for an unmarked PATIENT argument to be realized as a verb-external noun phrase. Such constructions could be viewed as having both a PATIENT argument—the frightened daughter—and an EXPERIENCER argument: the subject, namely the 'responsible' parent, indexed by the prefix. In addition, the intransitively inflected verbs do permit an INSTRUMENT argument that is obligatorily marked as oblique.[5] Only inanimate (including abstract) nouns can occupy this slot.

But in (8), an inverse example in which the PATIENT is the subject, animate nouns may appear as AGENT while INSTRUMENT arguments are also possible although not illustrated here. Whether realized with agentive or instrumental noun phrases or both, each must be marked with an oblique marker semantically indicating 'by' or 'with' and grammatically backgrounding these arguments in favor of the main subject-topic—the PATIENT. Of course, with the ACTIVE and REFLEXIVE prefix series, the AGENT is the subject that is directly indexed by the prefix.[6] But whereas the ACTIVE prefixed sentences are widely

[5]Oblique marking in Tewa is the syntactic addition of a postposition to noun phrases that are semantically indicating instrumentality, source, or agency (in Inverse constructions) (Kroskrity 2010b). At some risk of oversimplification, one could generalize its grammatical significance by saying it marks non-subject-topics.

[6]Note that with Inverse prefixes there is also some indexing of the person and number of the AGENT but these prefixes invariably encode more information about the PATIENT. (See Table 2.)

used and regarded as obviously acceptable, the REFLEXIVE prefixed sentences are understandably more rare because they require some pragmatic context in which a person might be surprised by their own shadow, image, or sound that they might inadvertently make. In the actual practice of members, I have heard the word used when a person is startled in their sleep and wakes up as if from a dream, but further investigation would be required to find out whether speakers find other contexts of use appropriate. In other words, a practical dictionary should not merely highlight what is grammatically possible, it should also be a description of actual patterns of community usage. Thus it is insufficient to merely know which prefix series with which a verb can co-occur, we need to also know the semantic, grammatical, and pragmatic ramifications for each.

In addition to these problems involving the need for lexical entries for verbs to fill the gap between the orderly grammar and the disorderly listing of vocabulary by word class in the lexicon, there is also the challenge of understanding how cultural values saturate even the simplest of verbs. I will provide a couple of examples, one concerning personal comportment and the other a more ecological understanding that emerges from hundreds of years of cultural experience. This cultural distance can make apparent translations problematic even though apparent translation-equivalents may exist. Take the case of *yengi-an* 'to act/become proud or prideful'. Example (9) illustrates the translation suggested to me by several highly fluent consultants.

(9) *he'i sen   i-yengi-an-di   hiwo'i   i-khe-an*
      that man 3.sg.REFL-proud-SUB beautiful/fancy 3.sg.REFL-dress-PST
      'Since that man became proud, he put on his best clothes.'

I have retained the free translation of Tewa consultants to further suggest the gulf between the apparent translation and its local meaning. The English translation and its use of the pivotal word 'pride' seems at worst ambivalent. As common sense social actors, most Euro-Americans usually recognize that pride can be both a good (e.g., to take pride in one's work) and a bad thing (e.g., to be excessively prideful). But for Pueblo groups like the Arizona Tewa, this word is used to describe the excesses of characters like *Bayena-senó* 'Old Man Coyote', and it is not at all ambivalent. Further ethnographic questioning and observation of its actual use in my many years of field research revealed that this term could also be translated as 'admiring oneself' and was much closer to the negative American English notion of 'acting or being conceited.' This example illustrates the dangers of apparent translations when these are not adequately tested against the actual practice of community members in both their narratives and general interpersonal interaction.

My final example of translation in the representation of verbs comes in the form of -*keluná* 'to be scarce.' To my knowledge this verb only occurs with STA prefixes and does not permit noun incorporation. Translation involving the English word 'scarce' does capture an aspect of the Tewa verb, but ultimately does not quite index some key semantic and affective dimensions. My understanding of this term—an understanding that needs further collaborative validation of other community members—is that it can only be applied to critical resources for living, such as food, shelter, firewood. Consider Example (10) as representative of this pattern.

(10) *Koyi' na-keluná hele   we-na-pay-pí-di.*
       seed 3.sg-scarce something NEG_1-3.sg.-mature-DUB-NEG_2
       'Seed is scarce because things [plants] did not get to mature.'

The Tewa notion does not just involve scarcity but also the idea that this is especially precious and vital to the wellbeing of the community. Translating in the present at a time when the Tewa community has now long been plunged into the larger cash economy of Northern Arizona and the nation and other associated transformations (Silverstein 1998b), our dictionary team has found it especially important for a younger generation of dictionary users to understand that the lexical semantics of this verb goes back to the subsistence agricultural economy that was indigenous to Pueblo economic adaptation. This term is also indexed to the language and culture of Western Pueblo 'management of scarcity' (e.g., Levy 1992), as well as to cultural linkages between religious practice and agricultural productivity. Certainly language users of today are not required to completely inhabit the ethos and worldviews of an earlier cultural era in order to use the verb effectively, but such information certainly does explain why the verb is so restricted in terms of the nouns that can appropriately be used as subjects. I want to clarify that my recommendation here to include some mention of the indexical senses of the verb should not be construed as my privileging of the past as some touchstone of authenticity (Briggs 1996). Rather, as mentioned previously, practical dictionaries must be grounded in the actual usage of members and ultimately 'collaboratively constructed' (Field 2008). A verb relating to cultural concerns with survival in a subsistence economy is clearly not more authentic than a noun like *athu* 'car' which denotes a critical form of transport in the modern period. But it is also certainly no less worthy of inclusion even though it is not as much a part of the sociocultural experience of younger generations. But of course, as I will discuss in the following section, a utopian inclusion of social diversity, while highly desirable in projects of language renewal, may actually conflict with distinctively local notions of self-determination and honored cultural protocols.

4. WORDS FOR TEWA THINGS.   As we turn from the more grammatical implications of representing Tewa verbs to considerations regarding the documentation and display of more nominal categories, we also move to a linguistic area of considerably more Native awareness or discursive consciousness. I am not, of course, suggesting that speakers do not have perceptual blind spots or that their awareness is necessarily comprehensive or definitive. One area in which speakers often lack awareness is in the area of accidental sound symbolic associations of words. One example of this that was well known to some of the Hopi and Arizona Tewa teachers and aides who deal with younger children were the cultural differences in dealing with spiders depending upon the heritage language of the child's home. It should be noted that both the Arizona Tewa and the Hopi, as well as other Pueblo groups, share a very positive image of spiders in general in part because of the positive associations of the mythical 'Spider Grandmother.' In general, these Pueblo children do not share the arachnophobia of the dominant US society but Tewa children were much more likely to show caution with spiders. Tewa children would often remark, 'They bite' in their English-language explanations without realizing that the Tewa word for spider, *yowaelu*, contains a syllable that is identical to the word for 'tooth, teeth', *-wae*, and provides a basis for a folk etymology and assigned attributes.

Another area where awareness is somewhat inconsistent is also an area of considerable controversy—loanwords. As I have remarked on many occasions (Kroskrity 1993, 1998), Arizona Tewa language ideologies have heavily emphasized indigenous purism. This is hardly a recent innovation for the Arizona Tewa, and indeed I have traced the effectiveness of this language ideological preference back to pre-Spanish colonial origins (Kroskrity 1993, in press). Overall the linguistic history of the Arizona Tewa strongly suggests that

they have very effectively implemented this ideological preference for purism into actual practice and that this has greatly limited the number of loanwords they have admitted even when their contact with other languages, such as Spanish and Hopi, is long-lasting and society-wide. Tewa people, including the prominent elder Albert Yava (1978:1), are often quite outspoken regarding the effectiveness of their compartmentalization and the superior purity of their language to other New Mexican Pueblo languages, where villagers have supposedly hybridized their indigenous languages with Spanish. This raises the question about the representation of loanwords. Since the only Arizona Tewa who know Spanish are those who have lived in New Mexico for some time, awareness of Spanish loanwords is quite limited. This accounts for why Tewa *tsini* is widely recognized as a loanword traceable to Spanish chile, in part because of its salience in larger national culture, but Spanish *cuchillo* 'knife' is not recognized as the source of Tewa *tsiiyo*. While these differences in awareness, and awareness of loanwords itself, are rarely viewed as critical by lexicographers, they are relevant observations for the construction of a community-designed dictionary for a group, like the Arizona Tewa, which so valorizes linguistic purism.

Do the entries of apparent loanwords list the source term and language? This is perhaps less a volatile issue in the identification of Spanish loans since the community has not been in significant contact with Spanish speakers for more than 300 years now, but it may well be more controversial in regard to Hopi loanwords. Linguistic purisms, as comparative sociolinguistic phenomena, are often multitasking projects aimed at both promoting the local culture of the group and minimizing outside influence, particularly from socially or numerically dominant groups (Henningsen 1989). As a minority ethnic group living both with and among the Hopi, the Arizona Tewa have evolved a complex multiethnic adaptation based not on mixing Hopi and Tewa languages and their iconized identities, but rather on maintaining a repertoire of distinct languages and sociocultural identities (Kroskrity 1993:177-212, 2000). Since Tewa language ideologies cultivate maximally distinctive languages and since many Tewa speakers strongly valorize the practice of purism and openly condemn language mixing, the representation of apparent Hopi loanwords is especially problematic. Apart from one term, *kaakhá* 'older sister' based on the Hopi baby talk term *kaaka* (adult form: *qooqa*) (Hopi Dictionary Project 1998:474), Arizona Tewa speakers either will not, or cannot, volunteer additional Hopi loanwords. Indeed, as one who has conducted long term research in the community and sampled a wide range of relatively naturally occurring speech there, there are indeed very few. One apparent example that I found while reviewing notes and recordings from past lexicographical research appears in (11) below.

(11) *dó-yeewa-paa*
      1/3.AC-song-make
      'I composed a new song.'

Two things, concerning both its linguistic form and speaker awareness, are especially remarkable concerning this example. Regarding form, the example basically conforms to Tewa grammar insofar as the inflected verb is concerned. What stands out, however, is that the incorporated noun is a term borrowed from Hopi *yeewa* which denotes several senses: 1) 'a creative plan, idea', 2) 'a new song', 3) 'a creative person, composer' (Hopi Dictionary Project 1998:779). In Hopi, this stem is more versatile, since it can serve as a verb as well as a noun denoting both the creative products as well as the creator of those works. The Tewa term denotes only an original song or some other creative act. More importantly, however, was a key consultant's explicit awareness of this as a loanword from Hopi even though its phonological form is completely in accord with Tewa phonology. Further research will be

needed to determine whether this consultant's awareness of linguistic borrowing from Hopi was unusual or quite normal for Tewa speakers. As an especially well known and talented composer of songs, he may well have had extraordinary awareness. But the critical concern here is that further dictionary research is likely to disclose new loanwords and necessitate discussion about their representation in the Tewa lexicon. Will the dictionary document such words and acknowledge their sources, merely provide entries for them without attributing sources, or eliminate such terms in the name of a linguistic prescriptivism that accords with the community's indigenous purism? There are, of course, very reasonable arguments for each of these options within the context of dictionary making as a project of language renewal. Ultimately, I would contend, actual practice should emerge from discussions aimed to achieve ideological clarification among all relevant stakeholders in the project and many of those conversations are occurring now as part of the project.

But certainly not all linguistic controversies are due to community relations with outsiders like the Hopi or the dominant Euro-American society. There are many issues regarding social and ceremonial organization that might be locally viewed by Tewa people as sensitive information that should only be dispensed to those who have both a right and a need to know. These values are partially responsible for the well known Pueblo practice of 'internal secrecy' (Brandt 1980). Such concerns can be respected and the dictionary can be constructed so as to include the exoteric knowledge of the group without attempting to represent what the community regards as 'esoteric knowledge.' Based on the comments of Tewa participants, it is safe to include terms like *maatu-t'owa* 'one's maternal clan' and to name the existing and former clans (e.g., *kee-t'owa* 'Bear', *saa-t'owa* 'Tobacco', *nant'owa* 'Sand', and *taali-t'owa* 'Parrot' Clans) but not to provide terms for specific clan altars, paraphernalia, ceremonial regalia, and so on. Similarly, everyone knows the importance of including a word like *puphoonun* 'ceremonial society, sodality' and related concepts like *puphoonun tádá* 'ceremonial father' or *puphoonun yíyá* 'ceremonial mother' in a society where religious ceremonies, and the responsibility to participate in them, pervade kinship, social organization, and the distinctive sociocultural life of the community. But since clans and ceremonial societies 'own' specific ceremonial knowledge and performance rights (and obligations), the boundary between shared cultural knowledge and esoteric, privileged information occurs abruptly. Speakers in the community are less concerned with now defunct ceremonies such as the *kabeena*—a war ceremony once danced by women who belonged to its associated society—or the similarly defunct *hyuhyukhi* 'ground freezing ceremony' (Parsons 1926:209). But certainly living traditions attract much more attention and controversy. There are clearly differences about where to draw the line in attempting to represent the community's linguistic knowledge while respecting long-established norms for controlling the flow of esoteric knowledge and its associated vocabulary. Inspired by the production of the Hopi dictionary, Tewa language community members and I think such community internal debate and contention is a relatively minor cost given the crucial role of such practical dictionaries in language renewal efforts, and the extraordinary interest that the Arizona Tewa community has in renewing the distinctive heritage language that has played, in their own estimation, such a large role in making them who they are today.

5. CONCLUSION: IDEOLOGICAL CLARIFICATION AND DICTIONARY COLLABORATION.   A model of ideological clarification has proven useful so far not only to disclose and resolve community-internal ideological disputes about linguistic representation but also to reveal conflicting ideologies between language scientists and members of endangered language communities. Linguists and linguistic anthropologists do not have a monopolizing, compre-

hensive, scientific, and truthful vision of linguistic structures and practices that can be contrasted with the exotic but deluded, false-consciousness of members. Like heritage language speakers, linguists of all persuasions bring the language ideologies that have emerged from their sociocultural stations. This is a sobering realization and one that may promote a more 'equal treatment' of cultural diversity than postmodern, neoliberal, academic institutions—and their researcher/representatives—can routinely produce (Habermas 2005). In the context of language renewal and language endangerment, this realization of the irreducibility of 'our' language ideologies and 'theirs' (Collins 1998) may also help in combating such intellectual assaults by would-be friends of endangered languages, who profess the 'universal ownership' of the intellectual content of threatened languages (Hill 2001), endorse a globalized one-size-fits-all model of 'language rights' that denies agency to the speakers of these languages (Whiteley 2003), or fetishize the cognitive-intellectual treasures of threatened languages by decoupling them from the political economic contexts of their speakers (Cameron 2007). But the recognition of such ideological differences should be regarded as enabling and promoting collaboration, not dooming it. Linguists' training for linguistic fieldwork is more routinely focused on providing "tools for obtaining accurate and extensive linguistic data, without much concern for social relationships of the impact of the researcher (Ahlers & Wertheim 2009)" (Shulist 2013:2). But an approach which views all linguistic knowledge as 'ideological' may enable a collaborative give and take that more readily allows a diversity of voices to be heard—and to be heard as consequential—in shaping such culturally salient documentary products as dictionaries.

References

Ahlers, Jocelyn C. & Suzanne A. Wertheim. 2009. Introduction: reflecting on language and culture fieldwork in the early 21st century. *Language and Communication* 29(3). 193–98.

Briggs, Charles L. 1996. The politics of discursive Kroskrityity in research on 'the invention of tradition.' *Cultural Anthropology* 11. 435–469.

Brandt, Elizabeth. A. 1980. On secrecy and control of knowledge. In Stanton Teft (ed.), *Secrecy: a cross cultural perspective*, 123–146. New York: Human Sciences Press.

Cameron, Deborah. 2007. Language endangerment and verbal hygiene: history, morality, and politics. In Alexandre Duchene & Monica Heller (eds.), *Discourses of endangerment: ideology and interest in defence (sic) of languages*, 268–285. London: Continuum.

Collins, James. 1998. Our ideologies and theirs. In Schieffelin, Bambi, Kathryn Woolard & Paul V. Kroskrity (eds.), *Language ideologies, practice and theory*, 256–70. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dauenhauer, Nora Marks & Richard Dauenhauer. 1998. Technical, emotional, and ideological issues in reversing language shift: examples from Southeast Alaska. In Grenoble & Whaley (eds.), *Endangered languages: current issues and future prospects*, 57–98. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Debenport, Erin. 2010. The potential complexity of 'universal ownership': Cultural property, textual circulation, and linguistic fieldwork. *Language and Communication* 30. 204–10.

Errington, Joseph. 2007. *Linguistics in a colonial world: a study of language, meaning, and power.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Field, Les W. 2008. *Abalone tales: collaborative explorations of sovereignty and identity in Native California.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Fillmore, Charles J. 1968a. Lexical entries for verbs. *Foundations of Language* 4. 373–393.

Fillmore, Charles J. 1968b. The case for case. In E. Bach & R. Harms (eds.), *Universals in linguistic theory*, 1–88. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Fishman, Joshua A. 2001. *Can threatened languages be saved?* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The constitution of society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Habermas, Jürgen. 2005. Equal treatment of cultures and the limits of postmodern liberalism. *The Journal of Political Philosophy* 13. 1–28.

Hale, Kenneth & Leanne Hinton. 2001. *The green book of language revitalization*. New York, NY: Brill Academic Press.

Hale, Kenneth & Danilo Salamanca. 2002. Theoretical and universal implications of certain verbal entries of the Misumalpan Languages. In William Frawley, Kenneth C. Hill & Pamela Munro (eds.), *Making dictionaries: preserving indigenous languages of the Americas*, 25–59. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hanks, William F. 2010. *Converting words: Maya in the age of the cross*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Haviland, John B. 2006. Documenting lexical knowledge. In Jost Gippert, Nikolaus P. Himmelmann & Ulrike Mosel (eds.), *Essentials of language documentation*, 129–162. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hill, Jane H. 2002. 'Expert rhetorics' in advocacy for endangered languages: who is listening and what do they hear? *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 12. 119–33.

Hill, Kenneth C. 2002. On publishing the Hopi dictionary. In William Frawley, Kenneth C. Hill & Pamela Munro (eds.), *Making dictionaries: preserving indigenous languages of the Americas*, 299–311. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hinton, Leanne & William F. Weigel. 2002. A dictionary for whom? Tensions between academic and nonacademic functions of bilingual dictionaries. In William Frawley, Kenneth C. Hill & Pamela Munro (eds.), *Making dictionaries: preserving indigenous languages of the Americas*, 155–170. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hopi Dictionary Project. 1998. *Hopi Dictionary/Hopiikwa Lavaytutuveni: A Hopi English dictionary of the Third Mesa Dialect with an English finder list and a sketch of Hopi Grammar.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Kroskrity, Paul V. 1993. *Language, history, and identity: Ethnolinguistic studies of the Arizona Tewa*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Kroskrity, Paul V. 1998. Arizona Tewa kiva speech as a manifestation of a dominant language ideology. In Bambi Schieffelin, Kathryn Woolard & Paul V. Kroskrity (eds.), *Language ideologies, practice and theory,* 103–22. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Kroskrity, Paul V. 2000. Regimenting languages. In Paul V. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of language: ideologies, polities, and identities*, 1–34. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research.

Kroskrity, Paul V. 2005. Tewa and the Kiowa Tanoan Languages. In Philipp Strazny, (ed.), *The encyclopedia of linguistics*, vol. 2, 1091–4. New York: Fitzroy-Dearborn.

Kroskrity, Paul V. 2009. Language renewal as sites of language ideological struggle: the need for 'ideological clarification'. In Jon Reyhner & Lousie Lockard (eds.), *Indigenous language revitalization: encouragement, guidance & lessons learned*, 71–83. Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University Press.

Kroskrity, Paul V. 2010a. Language ideologies—evolving perspectives. In Jürgen Jaspers, Jan-Ola Östman & Jef Verschueren (eds.), *Society and language use* (Handbook of Pragmatics Highlights, vol. 7), 192–211. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kroskrity, Paul V. 2010b. The art of voice: understanding the Arizona Tewa inverse in its grammatical, narrative, and language-ideological contexts. *Anthropological Linguistics* 52. 49–79.

Kroskrity, Paul V. 2012. 'Growing with stories: ideologies of storytelling and the narrative reproduction of Arizona Tewa identities. In Paul V. Kroskrity, (ed.), *Telling stories in the face of danger: narratives and language renewal in Native American communities*, 151–183. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Kroskrity, Paul V. In press. Indigenous Tewa Language Regimes Across Time: Persistence and Transformation. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*.

Kroskrity, Paul V. & Dewey Healing. 1978. 'Coyote and Bullsnake.' In William Bright (ed.), *Coyote stories (International Journal of American Linguistics, Native American Texts Series, Monograph 1)*, 162–171.

Kroskrity, Paul V. & Dewey Healing. 1981. 'Coyote-Woman and the Deer Children.' In Martha B. Kendall (ed.), *Coyote Stories II (International Journal of American Linguistics, Native American Text Series, Monograph 6)*, 119–128.

Levy, Jerrold. 1992. *Orayvi revisited: social stratification in an 'egalitarian' society*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research.

Meek, Barbra. 2010. *We are our language: an ethnography of language revitalization in a northern Athabaskan community*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Moore, Robert E. 1988. Lexicalization versus lexical loss in Wasco-Wishram language obsolescence. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 54. 453–468.

Mosel, Ulrike. 2011. Lexicography in endangered language communities. In Peter K. Austin & Julia Sallabank (eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of endangered languages*, 337–353. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Munro, Pamela. 2002. Entries for verbs in American Indian language dictionaries. In William Frawley, Kenneth C. Hill & Pamela Munro (eds.), *Making dictionaries: preserving indigenous languages of the Americas*, 86–107. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Nevins, M. Eleanor. 2004. Learning to listen: confronting two meanings of language loss in the contemporary White Mountain Apache speech community. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 14. 269–88.

Parsons, Elsie Clews. 1926. The ceremonial calendar of the Tewa of Arizona. *American Anthropologist* 28. 208–229.

Schieffelin, Bambi. 2000. Introducing Kaluli literacy: a chronology of influences. In Paul V. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of language: ideologies, polities, identities*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Schieffelin, Bambi, Kathryn Woolard & Paul V. Kroskrity (eds.). 1998. *Language ideologies, theory and practice*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Shulist, Sarah. 2013. Collaborating on language: contrasting the theory and practice of collaboration in linguistics and anthropology. *Collaborative Anthropologies* 6. 1–29.

Silverstein, Michael. 1979. Language structure and linguistic ideology. In Paul R. Clyne, William Hanks & Carol L. Hofbauer (eds.), *The elements: a parasession on units and levels*, 193–247. Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society.

Silverstein, Michael. 1998a. The uses and utility of ideology: a commentary. In Bambi Schieffelin, Kathryn Woolard & Paul Kroskrity (eds.), *Language ideologies, theory and practice*, 123–145. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Silverstein, Michael. 1998b. Contemporary transformations of local linguistic communities. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 27. 401–26.

Whiteley, Peter. 2003. Do 'language rights' serve indigenous interests?: some Hopi and other queries. *American Anthropologist* 105. 712–22.

Yava, Albert. 1978. *Big Falling Snow*. New York, NY: Crown.

Paul V. Kroskrity
paulvk@ucla.edu