

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Introduction: American Indian Languages in Unexpected Places

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9mk0t4c2>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 35(2)

ISSN

0161-6463

Authors

Webster, Anthony
Peterson, Leighton

Publication Date

2011-03-01

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

Introduction: American Indian Languages in Unexpected Places

Anthony K. Webster and Leighton C. Peterson

This special issue of the *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* brings together a set of essays that integrate two seemingly disparate intellectual trends in the humanities and social sciences. On the one hand, there is Philip Deloria's work about American Indians in "unexpected places."¹ On the other hand, there is the work of linguistic anthropology. Deloria's writings have been integral to the growing corpus of critical approaches to the study of Native peoples, including the ways in which representational practices of the past continue to resonate and the ways in which (de)colonization of indigenous histories and structural (in)equities are intertwined.² We say "seemingly disparate" because this line of scholarship, including Deloria's work, is concerned with the naturalization of inequalities, the ways in which expectations about Native American peoples have led to a denial of coevalness.³ However, there is also a tradition in linguistic anthropology that has sought to understand the ways in which linguistic inequalities are naturalized and circulated. Our intervention is to place linguistic anthropology in a meaningful dialogue with contemporary indigenous studies.

Deloria's *Indians in Unexpected Places* challenged the representational "expectations" and "anomalies" of American Indians in history and popular culture. Deloria called for examining why certain imageries and practices have been

ANTHONY K. WEBSTER is associate professor of anthropology at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. He earned his PhD in anthropology from the University of Texas at Austin and is the author of *Explorations in Navajo Poetry and Poetics* as well as numerous articles on Navajo language and culture. Leighton C. Peterson is assistant professor of anthropology at Miami University and a producer for TricksterFilms and Native American Public Telecommunications. He earned his PhD in anthropology from the University of Texas at Austin.

considered “unexpected” and how the obscuring stereotypes of American Indian life have helped fashion such representations. Deloria countered this received wisdom at the horizon of American Indians activities during the early twentieth century, showing that the “anomalous” was not anomalous at all and that what was “modern” was a refashioning of modernity. In the articles that compose this issue, we explore how received expectations can be thwarted by understanding historic and contemporary American Indian linguistic practices in relation to popular culture, and especially Native American peoples as producers of verbal art, mediated representations, and social critiques in a variety of genres and in a multitude of codes. Our approach to Indian languages in unexpected places engages the lived realities and multisited locales of Native peoples and communities and the ways in which they discursively challenge such obscuring stereotypes. By focusing on the misrecognition of indigenous linguistic practices as unexpected, and the ways in which Native American languages and their speakers have become invisible and then visible again through scholarship and representation, we tease out the informing assumptions that make such practices “not anomalous.” Thus, we seek to understand the ways in which contemporary American Indian linguistic practices confront the obscuring stereotypes of Indians in unexpected places as well as the ways in which Native American community members negotiate and reframe such expectations.

Since its founding, linguistic anthropology has been intertwined with Native America—sometimes to the detriment of indigenous peoples and sometimes to their benefit.⁴ The seminal early figures in linguistic anthropology, including Franz Boas, Alfred Kroeber, Edward Sapir, Dorothy Lee, Mary Haas, Benjamin Lee Whorf, Gladys Reichard, Harry Hoijer, Carl Voegelin, and Edward Dozier, all worked with and wrote about Native American languages and cultures. We date the foundational moment of Americanist linguistic anthropology to Boas’s “On Alternating Sounds” (1889), a path-breaking article critiquing previous generations of scholars who had claimed that Native American languages were so “primitive” as to be inconsistent in their sound systems.⁵ Boas argued that it was not Native American languages that were inconsistent, but rather the scholars who had documented them. The problem was that outsiders tended to understand the sound systems of Native American languages through the phonology of their own colonial languages; the alternation was then not an alternation of production but of perception, an early example of what later became known as “linguistic relativity.”⁶ For Boas and his students, a description of indigenous languages must not begin with the assumption that Indo-European was a “natural” model for all languages, in which, for example, Native American languages were seen as deficient or lacking if they organized grammatical features differently than Indo-European languages.⁷ As Boas noted, “thus it happens that each language, from the point

of view of another language, may be arbitrary in its classifications,” for example, how English appears arbitrary in its use of gender marking when compared with Navajo.⁸ Rather, the descriptions of Native American languages should be understood on their own terms.

This early work of Boas and his students challenged the expectations that Native American languages were “primitive” or “simple” in some structural sense.⁹ For Sapir, and more so for Whorf and Lee, the expectations that Native American languages were primitive and deficient were challenged by arguing that English was just one orientation among many. Both Barbra Meek and Anthony K. Webster develop the theme of structural difference as not entailing deficiencies in their articles, discussing such assumptions in relation to American Indian Englishes. From this early Boasian concern developed a tradition with understanding Native American languages on their own terms, an idea oft-associated with the names of Sapir and Whorf. In essence, Sapir and Whorf tapped into a venerable tradition that noted that languages predispose their speakers to orient to the world in certain habitual ways.¹⁰ Furthermore, at a time when many indigenous languages were actively and violently being suppressed, Whorf, Lee, Hoijer, and others were arguing that “mainstream” American society could learn much from understanding Native languages. Whether it was Whorf’s suggestion that modern physics might do well to attend to Hopi verb morphology or Lee’s argument that attention to Wintu ways of speaking might lead to a more humane way of engaging with the world, the argument was clear: Native American languages had much to teach.¹¹ As Whorf noted, “to restrict thinking to the patterns of English, and especially to those patterns which represent the acme of plainness in English, is to lose a power of thought which, once lost, can never be regained. It is the ‘plainest’ English which contains the greatest number of unconscious assumptions about nature.”¹² Whorf’s argument, which continues to resonate, was to challenge an expectation that Native American languages were remnants of an earlier “evolutionary” stage, perpetually premodern and somehow backward or useless in a contemporary modern world, a theme developed in this issue in the articles by Erin Debenport, Leighton Peterson, and Wesley Leonard.

The work of Dell Hymes has also figured prominently in understanding the ways that linguistic and social inequalities have been naturalized. Although earlier understandings of “fashions of speaking” or “ways of speaking” often meant the grammatical structures of a language, Hymes was concerned with the interplay of such grammatical structures with actual language use in context, in actual ways of speaking and writing.¹³ Hymes repeatedly called for understanding how Native Americans actually used languages and the ways outside institutions and practices misrecognized, marginalized, and silenced those speakers, an important precursor to much current linguistic

anthropological investigation.¹⁴ The classic work of Susan Philips, for example, applied a Hymesian analysis of the ways of speaking among Warm Springs community members to the manner in which such ways of speaking were misrecognized or devalued in Anglo-dominant education settings.¹⁵ Although the article by Meek directly engages these issues through discourses of First Nations language revitalization, the relationship of linguistic misrecognition to structural inequality is a recurring theme in all of the articles herein. In a related vein, Hymesian ethnopoetics was also meant as a way to show something of the ways Native American storytellers created meaningfulness, uncovering a more “authentic” narrative voice, that is, a glimpse and overt acknowledgment of something of the individual narrator’s poetic achievements.¹⁶

This recognition of voice was the recognition of the ways in which narrators can actually tell their stories in their own style, using all their preferred expressive options.¹⁷ Narratives collected by a prior generation of linguistic anthropologists, published as block prose under headings such as “The Tonkawa Origin Story,” hid the poetic structuring involved in producing the narrative and—more importantly—the actual identity of the storyteller. For Hymes, it was no longer a matter of a nameless Tonkawa narrator; rather we were forced to acknowledge the individual artistry of John Rush Buffalo. The Hymesian ethnopoetic perspective has had, we believe, an important and beneficial influence on the ways in which Native American verbal art—as well as narrative more generally—is approached in linguistic anthropology. Coupled with the work of Dennis Tedlock about the use of pause structure, prosody, and performance in ethnopoetic research as well as the more recent merging of Hymes’s and Tedlock’s perspective through a discourse-centered approach to language and culture, linguistic anthropologists have attempted to understand the poetic structurings and verbal artistry that are at the core of the individual, language, and culture nexus.¹⁸ In the articles that follow, this Hymesian approach to ethnopoetics and the recognition of voice are most fully articulated in the article by Webster.

During the 1970s, building on the work of Whorf and Hymes, Michael Silverstein brought a concern with “language ideologies” to the forefront. For Silverstein, language ideologies were “any sets of beliefs about language articulated by the users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use.”¹⁹ Paul Kroskrity has more recently defined language ideologies as “beliefs, or feelings, about languages as used in their social world,” and we see Kroskrity’s engagement with the feelings about languages that speakers have as an important addition to what has become a major research agenda in linguistic anthropology.²⁰ If the Hymesian approach to ways of speaking and ethnopoetics added actual use of the grammatical structurings located by Boasians to linguistic anthropological investigations, these recent perspectives

on language ideologies add the values, beliefs, and feelings that speakers have toward the uses and structurings of languages. That is, where Hymes was concerned with the functions of languages in use, a language-ideological approach investigates the assumptions behind what makes such functions possible. Native American communities (as do all communities) often reflect multiple and competing language ideologies, and linguistic anthropologists have begun to attend to the beliefs, values, and feelings that indigenous peoples have toward their languages.²¹ Without this attention to multifaceted linguistic ideologies, as Kroskrity and Margaret Field have noted, we “cannot hope to understand Native American languages and the ways speakers use them, change them, and renew them.”²²

One way to think about Deloria’s concern with “expectations” is to see those expectations as articulations of Western-language ideologies, and much linguistic anthropological research into language ideologies has sought to understand the often-conflicting assumptions about the nature and use of “languages” between colonizers and colonized subjects.²³ For example, Richard Bauman and Charles Briggs have described the development of a modernist Western ideology of language, through John Locke, that sees languages as an abstract system, primarily about reference, and largely homogenous, as being complicit in the reproduction of inequalities.²⁴ Another Western-language ideology, this time through Johann Herder, sees an isomorphic mapping of one language on one people. In both cases, actual linguistic practices—and individuals—are erased.²⁵ Here, for example, the Kaska who speaks English and not Kaska is seen as anomalous (it is assumed that real Kaska speak Kaska and not English), and the non-mainstream English that that Kaska speaks, influenced by Kaska, is seen as dysfluent and as violating a “homogenous” or monoglot view of language.²⁶ Although Hymes long ago noted this problem of conflating languages with “tribes,” the conventional image, found in language maps for example, of language equaling bounded lands and identities persists.²⁷ The article by Lisa Philips in this issue reveals such oft-misrecognized multilingualism among First Nations and Native American speakers in historical context, and all of the articles—in one way or another—engage this question of the relationship between the Western-language ideologies and actual heteroglossic linguistic practices discussed below.²⁸ Assumptions of homogenous-language ideologies should be as suspect as expectations about homogenous languages.

Building on concerns regarding Western-language ideologies, Jane Hill has initiated an important research agenda that seeks to understand the ways racism is reproduced through everyday discursive practices.²⁹ For Hill, racism means the reproduction of structures of inequality, which posit some groups as unmarked and others as marked and, hence, as “suspect,” and the languages of

minorities are always, to invoke Bonnie Urciuoli's felicitous phrasing, "objects of scrutiny."³⁰ Hill's research has focused on routine parodies of Spanish, African American English, and Native American Englishes that simultaneously maintain "white virtue" and stigmatize and marginalize minority ways of speaking and writing.³¹ As Meek notes in this issue, such routine forms of discursive racism can then "pass" as mere "expectations," as though they are not created and reproduced by the dominant society but are merely normative (that is, commonsense) assumptions about "what others [insert minority here] do."³² This is not to say, however, that indigenous peoples have not resisted such ethnocentric linguistic displays, which is well illustrated by Keith Basso's classic examination of the ways in which Western Apache peoples have used forms of English as emblematic displays of improper behavior.³³ However, the Western Apache portraits differ significantly from the kinds of examples described by Hill; in the Apache case, such forms are used as critiques of the dominant Anglo society and challenge and reframe the naturalness of inequality. Nonetheless, understanding the ways that such expectations of Native American languages are created, and the various discursive, institutional, and everyday practices that reproduce social inequalities through assumptions licensed by such expectations, is a crucial nexus for understanding Native American languages in unexpected places.

Another pervasive expectation that Deloria challenged regarding Native American peoples was that they were "technologically incompetent."³⁴ This expectation of technological incompetence also played into Western-language ideologies that conflated alphabetic writing, civilization, and rationality.³⁵ Because linguistic anthropology (or anthropological linguistics) was often imagined as work with "the languages of peoples who have no writing," as Hoijer noted, there has been a persistent trend of "documenting" (that is, writing down) Native American languages.³⁶ "Writing" was here narrowly and exclusively understood as "alphabetic writing." Such beliefs about writing actively erased indigenous inscriptive practices from Tohono O'odham calendar sticks to Lakhota winter counts, as well as such emergent literacy practices of Sequoyah and the Cherokee or Parker McKenzie's Kiowa alphabet, or Silas John Edwards and the Holy Ground Movement among the Western Apache and Mescalero Apache.³⁷ Communicative technologies are not limited to literacy; Bennie Klain, Peterson, and Lisa Philips Valentine have shown that radio has played an important role in Native communities, especially as it relates to issues concerning language vitality, lifeways transformations, and ways of speaking.³⁸ David Samuel's work on the Western Apache's feelingful engagements with rock 'n' roll and country music, including the kinds of musical instruments, amplifiers, and public-address systems used in performance, foreground the role of technology in contemporary Western Apache

music.³⁹ Imagining Native people as uninterested in or incompetent with literacy, emergent media, and technology is to deny Native peoples coevalness, and a number of articles in this issue challenge the view of Native Americans as technologically incompetent. Webster takes up the issue of writing in his article, while Peterson, Debenport, and Leonard describe Native American engagements with media from film to instant messaging.⁴⁰

Today, many Native American languages are often described as “endangered languages” or “threatened languages,” and the venerable tradition of documentation seems to have come full circle. The tradition of documenting Native languages has often been seen as useful for Native communities; the early Boasian concern with “documenting” Native place-names has become a useful resource for Native communities in debates concerning land claims.⁴¹ However, the neutrality of the term *documenting languages*, that is, writing and recording languages, has also been seen as problematic in some Native communities, especially as orthography and dictionary development has often been intertwined with colonial agendas.⁴² Although Walter Ong may have suggested that putative “oral cultures” (and we are suspicious of this term) are everywhere and always eager to achieve “literacy,” this reflects a particular Western-language ideology that again conflates writing with permanence, rationality, and civilization.⁴³ Writing, as by now it should be clear, is intertwined with Western- and Native American–language ideologies. That, for example, poetry can be written in the Navajo orthography, but poetry is less common in the Cherokee syllabary developed by Sequoyah, reflects different historical trajectories and language ideologies about the role of certain writing systems as the medium for creativity.⁴⁴ Some communities have been or have become reluctant to write down or record Native languages or specific genres in Native languages for language-ideological reasons.⁴⁵ The question of which orthography is to be used in language programs is often deeply implicated in the language ideologies of outside linguists, local-language activists, and Native American community members.⁴⁶ Linguistic anthropologists have done much to challenge such received expectations about writing and literacy—or of cameras and computers—as mere “technologies,” in order to encourage people to see them, instead, as fully entangled in often-competing language ideologies.⁴⁷

The trope of the “vanishing Native American language” has, today, replaced the earlier trope of the “vanishing Indian.” It has become a pervasive expectation by which to understand indigenous languages, and a growing literature of publications by linguists decrying the loss of Native American languages exists.⁴⁸ Normally, the rhetoric of “endangered languages” means that the traditionally understood indigenous language is not being spoken by young people at a rate that will ensure its continued “viability,” which is reckoned in terms of notions of “fluency.” The articles in this issue do not dispute the structural and

physical violence that has led to the marginalization, stigmatization, and loss of lexical-grammatical codes (that is, languages). However, we are also interested in languages as sets of practices, or ways of speaking, writing, and communicating.⁴⁹ The biological metaphors of “language death” or an “extinct language” seem to reproduce expectations of the vanishing Native American: once they are gone, they are gone.⁵⁰ The use of metaphors such as *vanishing* also naturalizes the process of language shift, mystifying what are actually complex human activities, activities that are linked with colonialism and the structural and physical violence associated with colonialism and racism. Linguistic anthropologists have begun to critique such discourses about “language endangerment.”⁵¹ Kroskirty has urged scholars and language activists to engage in “ideological clarification” about their own tacit assumptions regarding language and language ideologies in “language renewal activities” and about how—or whether—language-vitality programs should be engaged.⁵² Leonard’s article reminds us that many Native peoples might prefer other metaphors (sleeping languages) and might have other expectations about the processes of language shift and renewal, asking more fundamental questions about what it means for Miami peoples to have a language such as *myaamia*.⁵³

Another persistent dominant expectation is that “authentic” Native people speak “authentic” Native languages, the Herderian conceit—often linked to misinterpretations of the work of Sapir and Whorf—that lashes identity to language, and only pure languages and pure identities at that.⁵⁴ All of the articles in this issue ask questions about what is to be counted as a Native American language and what such ideologically loaded counting practices may mean to indigenous identities, and the expectations about the American Indian Englishes that many Native communities now speak and write are brought to the fore in articles by Meek, Webster, Leonard, and Peterson.⁵⁵ “English” and Native American Englishes are important ways of speaking and writing for many Native communities.⁵⁶ These do not just include communities in which the traditionally understood Native language is no longer spoken, but also communities like Kaska and Navajo, in which traditionally understood Native languages are spoken alongside of—or in conjunction with—Navajo English or Kaska English. Contemporary Native American communities are immersed within heteroglossia. As Hill notes, “we should assume speakers confront ‘heteroglossia,’ which is not necessarily sorted out into a clearly delineated system of codes.”⁵⁷ Not only do the expectations about Native peoples imagine them as technologically incompetent, but also such racist expectations imagine Native people as “linguistically incompetent,” or unable to maintain heritage languages, speak multiple languages, or speak correctly in colonial languages. Native Englishes are often devalued or stigmatized by way of “standard language ideologies” as “failures” of English.⁵⁸

Such heteroglossia found in contemporary Native communities could be read as a recent phenomenon. Here too, however, is a rather pervasive expectation, echoes of the Herderian legacy that imagines the “natural” state of the world as bounded monolingual territories.⁵⁹ Contemporary language maps reproduce such monoglot-centric views of Native Americans, in which the blue shading on the map equals Navajo, green shading equals Lakota, and pink shading equals Hopi. Such maps erase the multisited locales of indigenous communities, plurilingualism, and multilingualism, including, for example, Navajo speakers living in Phoenix or Afghanistan, or a *lingua franca* such as Plains Indian Sign Talk, or among those in the Village of Tewa, who live on the Hopi Reservation and speak or spoke not just Tewa but also the unrelated languages of Hopi, Navajo, Spanish, and English.⁶⁰ Philips’s careful analysis of Native American multilingualism in the British and American borderlands during the 1780s through the 1850s should remind us that such heteroglossia, multilingualism, and fluid geographies are not recent issues for Native communities. As Silverstein has noted, basic assumptions about “stable, language-bounded, one-language cultural units” is a persistent form of the misrecognition of Native speech communities as language communities.⁶¹ That such cultural units have then been conflated with contemporary indigenous communities and identities also needs to be recognized and reevaluated.⁶²

For example, nothing unexpected exists in seeing the Navajo protagonist of Navajo and Pueblo author A. A. Carr’s novel *Eye Killers* speak Navajo, English, and Keres; a Pueblo man speak Navajo in Navajo poet Laura Tohe’s poem “Sometimes Those Pueblo Men Sure Be Coyotes”; or Navajo actors speaking Navajo, Navajo English, and Apache in Norman Patrick Brown’s feature film *The Rainbow Boy*.⁶³ In these cases, Native American multilingualism is the norm, and the Western-language ideology of monolingualism is found wanting. To see such multilingualism and plurilingualism as unexpected is to confirm historian Jennifer Nez Denetdale’s point that “Navajos continue to be understood within Western frameworks, thereby contributing to the ongoing distortion of the realities of Native lives, cultures . . . histories” and, we would add, languages.⁶⁴ The in-depth analyses of specific discursive practices in contexts that our contributors put forth directly engage and explore something of the linguistic realities of Native lives, cultures, histories, and ways of speaking and how those realities have been either misrecognized or erased. Here we clearly see our work as in dialogue with the indigenous scholarship of Denetdale, Deloria, and others who have sought to highlight the ways that inequalities toward indigenous peoples have been naturalized through racist and colonizing expectations. It is our hope that these articles suggest ways that the methods and theories of linguistic anthropology, which has a long history

of investigating inequalities, may be of some use in destabilizing those persistent racist and colonizing expectations.

We begin this issue with Lisa Philips and her detailed analysis of “Unexpected Languages: Multilingualism and Contact in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century North America,” an analysis of cultural contact and multilingualism in First Nations and Native American communities of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This investigation starts with assumptions of almost universal multilingualism, moving beyond typical political, militaristic, or economic explanations for cultural contact and heteroglossia, and revealing how a multitude of (unexpected) languages have been found in circulation for a very long time. Next, Meek puts forth a series of episodes in her article “Failing American Indian Languages” that highlight discursive representations of mythical speech across a range of media which engage misconceptions of First Nations linguistic practices as dysfluent failures. Meek invokes the work of Deloria and Hill in examining how such perceptions recreate racism and other structural inequalities, and how these discourses come to be embedded and encoded in a range of aboriginal language-renewal activities. Webster continues this theme of dysfluent Englishes in his article, “Please Read Loose’: Intimate Grammars and Unexpected Languages in Contemporary Navajo Literature,” with a Hymesian ethnopoetic analysis of Navajo writer Blackhorse Mitchell’s poetry and introductory materials about his acclaimed novel *Miracle Hill: The Story of a Navajo Boy* (1967). Webster pays close attention to the performances and discourses surrounding Mitchell’s work and his tenuous “collaboration” with his former teacher, clearly showing how Mitchell’s English was misrecognized and the ways in which Mitchell reasserts authorship of the novel through his use of Navajo English aspect marking.

Debenport takes the theme of mediated representations further in “As the Rez Turns: Anomalies within and beyond the Boundaries of a Pueblo Community,” exploring how youth from the fictional Tiwa-speaking San Antonio Pueblo negotiate and reframe intratribal expectations of linguistic practices and ideologies. Debenport invokes the work of Silverstein and Bauman on intertextuality and genre to show how language students utilize associated “anomalies” as discursive resources in order to assert rights to socially controlled linguistic and cultural resources in a new medium through pedagogical and popular cultural forms. Peterson continues this engagement with indigenous peoples as cultural producers, building on the work of Deloria, Kroskrity, and Faye Ginsburg in his analysis of “Reel Navajo’: The Linguistic Creation of Indigenous Screen Memories.” Here Peterson explores the language ideologies and representational practices involved as Navajo filmmakers create “screen memories” in Navajo; that is, as Navajo filmmakers engage the filmic resignification of Navajo histories and ways of speaking,

creating intimacy with local audiences by representing and negotiating a range of linguistic ideologies and realities. Finally, Leonard's article, "Challenging 'Extinction' through Modern Miami Language Practices," deftly confronts a range of Western-language ideologies and expectations about indigenous languages and peoples by examining how contemporary *myaamia* speakers maintain core Miami values in second-language, bilingual contexts. Leonard reminds us that the expectations of indigenous communities may counter those of linguists and anthropologists. Kroskrity ("All Intimate Grammars Leak: Reflections on 'Indian Languages in Unexpected Places'") and Deloria ("On Leaking Languages and Categorical Imperatives") then provide useful commentary about the articles and point toward new directions of research.

This is an opportune time to engage wider debates regarding Native American representational practices, histories, and self-representation through the lens of linguistic anthropology, bridging studies of indigenous languages, histories, peoples, and practices. Just as important is the hope that broader debates on postcolonial histories, indigenous studies, and (self-)representational practices can inform work on language ideologies, linguistic vitality, and emergent communicative practices in postcolonial contexts. Ultimately, the recognition of Native American languages in unexpected places—which are, in the end, not terribly unexpected in the communities in which they occur—reveals the obscuring and racist stereotypes of a dominant and dominating society. All the articles in this issue attend to upending such commonsense expectations of Native American languages that have led to various nefarious structuring inequalities and to the ways in which indigenous peoples continue to counter and reframe such expectations.

Acknowledgments

All but one of the articles in this issue was originally presented at a panel at the 108th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association (Philadelphia, 2009). We would especially like to thank the contributors for working so hard to revise their articles for publication, and it is with no small amount of gratitude that we thank them for making our jobs much easier. We would also like to thank those in attendance in Philadelphia for a number of engaging and thought-provoking questions. We would also like to thank Paul Kroskrity for his guidance and insightful comments on all versions of these articles. The article by Philip Deloria was written specifically for this special issue. We thank him for his willingness to engage with these articles. Finally, we would like to thank Pamela Grieman at the *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* for her encouragement and support for putting this special issue together.

NOTES

1. Philip J. Deloria, *Indians in Unexpected Places* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2004).
2. On representational practices, see, e.g., Stephen Greenblatt, *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991); Pauline Turner Strong, *Captive Selves, Captivating Others: The Politics and Poetics of Colonial American Captivity Narratives* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1999); James C. Faris, *Navajo and Photography: A Critical History of the Representation of an American People* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1996); Leah Dilworth, *Imagining Indians in the Southwest: Persistent Visions of a Primitive Past* (Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1996).
On (de)colonization, see, e.g., Devon A. Mihesuah and Angela Cavender Wilson, *Indigenizing the Academy: Transforming Scholarship and Empowering Communities* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004); Jennifer Nez Denetdale, *Reclaiming Diné History: The Legacies of Navajo Chief Manuelito and Juanita* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2007); Margaret Kovach, *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations and Contexts* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009); Waziyatawin Angela Wilson, *Remember This! Dakota Decolonization and the Eli Taylor Narratives* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005).
3. We borrow the term *coevalness* from Johannes Fabian, *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983).
4. Vine Deloria's *Custer Died for Your Sins* (New York: Macmillan, 1969), a critique of anthropology, has had important ramifications on the ways many anthropologists conceive of their work in relation to Native communities; see, esp., the essays in Thomas Biolsi and Larry Zimmerman, *Indians and Anthropologists* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1997); Thomas Biolsi, *A Companion to the Anthropology of North American Indians* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2004); and Pauline Turner Strong, "Recent Ethnographic Research on North American Indigenous Peoples," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34 (2005): 253–68. Dell Hymes, "Custer and Linguistic Anthropology," *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 1 (1991): 5–11, takes up the relationship between Deloria's concerns and the role of linguistic anthropology. See also Dell Hymes, ed., *Reinventing Anthropology* (New York: Random House, 1972) and, esp., Ken Hale, "Some Questions about Anthropological Linguistics: The Role of Native Knowledge," in Hymes, *Reinventing Anthropology*, 382–97. For basic orientations and a critique of the Americanist tradition of anthropology and linguistic anthropology, see Charles Briggs, "Linguistic Magic Bullets in the Making of a Modernist Anthropology," *American Anthropologist* 104 (2002): 481–98; Lisa Philips Valentine and Regna Darnell, *Theorizing the Americanist Tradition* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999); and Regna Darnell, *Invisible Genealogies: A History of Americanist Anthropology* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001).
5. Franz Boas, "On Alternating Sounds," *American Anthropologist* 2 (1889): 47–53. Although our primary focus is on the Americanist tradition, for a slightly different view of the development of linguistic anthropology, see Alessandro Duranti, "Linguistic Anthropology: History, Ideas, and Issues," in *Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader*, ed. Alessandro Duranti (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2001), 1–31.
6. I.e., one's sound system predisposes us to hear in certain ways, misrecognizing the sounds of another language as the sounds of one's own. On linguistic relativity, see John Leavitt, "Linguistic Relativities," in *Language, Culture, and Society*, ed. Christine Jourdan and Kevin Tuite (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 47–81.
7. Franz Boas, introduction to *Handbook of American Indian Languages*, vol. 1, Bureau of American Ethnological Bulletin 40, ed. Franz Boas (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1911), 31.
8. *Ibid.*, 22.

9. See, esp., Edward Sapir, *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1921).

10. Leavitt, "Linguistic Relativities," unpacks a bit of the history of what has often been uncritically termed the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis. For a recent useful application of the Whorfian perspective of the language/culture relationship, see Sean O'Neill, *Cultural Contact and Linguistic Relativity among the Indians of Northwestern California* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2008).

11. For Whorf's concerns, see Benjamin Lee Whorf, *Language, Thought, and Reality*, ed. John Carroll (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1956) and for Lee, see Dorothy Lee, "Conceptual Implications of an Indian Language," *Philosophy of Science* 5 (1938): 89–102. It should be stressed that Whorf and Lee wrote for larger nonlinguistic audiences. The rhetoric of the "universal" value (or ownership) of Native American languages is not unproblematic; the argument that Native American languages are of import because they can "teach" linguists about the nature of "language," e.g., has been usefully critiqued by Jane Hill, "Expert Rhetorics in Advocacy for Endangered Languages: Who Is Listening, and What Do They Hear?" *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 12 (2002): 119–33. E.g., for many Puebloan groups of the Southwest, languages are forms of "cultural property," or, rather, access to languages are restricted within Pueblo communities and within the larger American society, see Paul Kroskrity, *Language, History and Identity: Ethnolinguistic Studies of the Arizona Tewa* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1993); Paul Kroskrity, "Narrative Reproductions: Ideologies of Storytelling, Authoritative Words, and Generic Regimentation in the Village of Tewa," *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 19 (2009): 40–56; Peter Whiteley, "Do 'Language Rights' Serve Indigenous Interests? Some Hopi and Other Queries," *American Anthropologist* 105 (2003): 712–22; and Erin Debenport, "The Potential Complexity of 'Universal Ownership': Cultural Property, Textual Circulation, and Linguistic Fieldwork," *Language and Communication* 30 (2010): 204–10.

12. Whorf, *Language, Thought, and Reality*, 244.

13. See Dell Hymes, *Ethnography, Linguistics, Narrative Inequality: Toward an Understanding of Voice* (Bristol, PA: Taylor and Francis, 1996); and "Tonkawa Poetics: John Rush Buffalo's 'Coyote and Eagle's Daughter,'" in *Native American Discourse: Poetics and Rhetoric*, ed. Joel Sherzer and Anthony Woodbury (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 17–61. See also Joel Sherzer, "A Discourse-centered Approach to Language and Culture," *American Anthropologist* 89 (1987): 295–309.

14. For a sampling of Hymes's views on Native Americans, inequality, and language, see Dell Hymes, "Speech and Language: On the Origins and Foundations of Inequality among Speakers," *Daedalus* 102 (1972): 59–88; "Particle, Pause and Pattern in American Indian Narrative Verse," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 4, no. 4 (1980): 7–51; *In Vain I Tried to Tell You* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981); *Ethnography, Linguistics, Narrative Inequality: Reading Takelma Tales* (Bloomington, IN: Trickster Press, 1998); and *Now I Know Only that Far* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2003).

15. Susan U. Philips, *The Invisible Culture* (1983; repr., Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 1993). One of Hymes's early goals (Hymes, "Speech and Language"; *Narrative Inequality*) was to examine the language competence that students brought to schools and the ways those competencies were devalued or misrecognized. On Native American language socialization and issues of identity, see Pamela Bunte, "'You Keep Not Listening with Your Ears!' Language Ideologies, Language Socialization, and Paiute Identity," in *Native American Language Ideologies: Beliefs, Practices, and Struggles in Indian Country*, ed. Paul Kroskrity and Margaret Field (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2009), 172–89.

16. For Hymes's work in ethnopoetics, see *In Vain, Reading Takelma Texts*, and *Now I Know*.

17. For useful discussions of the notion of "voice" in Hymes's work and his concern with inequality in his ethnopoetic work, see Jan Blommaert, "Ethnography and Democracy: Hymes's Political Theory

of Language," *Text and Talk* 29 (2009): 257–76; and James Collins, "The Place of Narrative in Human Affairs: The Implications of Hymes's Amerindian Work for Understanding Text and Talk," *Text and Talk* 29 (2009): 325–45.

18. See Dennis Tedlock, *The Spoken Word and the Work of Interpretation* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983), which, besides outlining his views on ethnopoetics, contributes to discussions about representational practices and language ideology. On the discourse-centered approach to language and culture, see Sherzer, "Discourse-centered Approach." On the merging of Tedlock and Hymes, see Joel Sherzer and Anthony Woodbury, *Native American Discourse: Poetics and Rhetoric* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987). For useful applications of ethnopoetics see William Bright, "A Karok Myth in Measured Verse: The Translation of a Performance," *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 1 (1979): 117–23 and "Coyote's Journey," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 4, nos. 1–2 (1980): 21–48; Julie Cruikshank, *Life Lived Like a Story* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1990); Pamela Bunte, "Verbal Artistry in Southern Paiute Narratives: Reduplication as a Stylistic Process," *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 12 (2002): 3–33; Gus Palmer Jr., *Telling Stories the Kiowa Way* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2003); François Mandeville, *This Is What They Say: Stories*, trans. Ron Scollon (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2009); Anthony K. Webster, *Explorations in Navajo Poetry and Poetics* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2009); and Geoffrey Kimball, *Koasati Traditional Narratives* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2010).

19. Michael Silverstein, "Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology," in *The Elements*, ed. Paul Clyne, William Hanks, and Carol Hofbauer (Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 1979), 193.

20. Paul Kroskrity, "Language Ideologies," in *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, ed. Alessandro Duranti (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), 498.

21. See, esp., James Collins, "Our Ideologies and Theirs," in *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*, ed. Bambi Schieffelin, Kathryn Woolard, and Paul Kroskrity (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 256–70. See also the essays in Kroskrity and Field, *Native American Language Ideologies*; and Paul Kroskrity, *Telling Stories in the Face of Danger: Narratives, Ideological Reproduction, and Language Endangerment in Native American Communities* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, forthcoming). See also Tedlock, *The Spoken Word*; Kroskrity, *Language, History*; Keith Basso, *Wisdom Sits in Places* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1996); David Samuels, *Putting a Song on Top of It* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2004); Webster, *Explorations*; Mindy Morgan, *The Bearer of This Letter: Language Ideologies, Literacy Practices, and the Fort Belknap Indian Community* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009); and Barbara Meek, *We Are Our Language: An Ethnography of Language Revitalization in a Northern Athabaskan Community* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2010).

22. Margaret C. Field and Paul V. Kroskrity, "Introduction: Revealing Native American Language Ideologies," in Kroskrity and Field, *Native American Language Ideologies*, 10.

23. For orientating literature concerning language ideologies and issues of inequality, see Schieffelin, Woolard, and Kroskrity, *Language Ideologies*; Paul Kroskrity, *Regimes of Language* (Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research, 2000); Miki Makihara and Bambi Schieffelin, *Consequences of Contact: Language Ideologies and Sociocultural Transformations in Pacific Societies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007). For specific case studies relating to First Nations/Native American languages and communities, see Kroskrity and Field, *Native American Language Ideologies* and Kroskrity, *Telling Stories*.

24. Richard Bauman and Charles Briggs, *Voices of Modernity: Language Ideologies and the Politics of Inequality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

25. On the process of erasure, see Judith Irvine and Susan Gal, "Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation," in Kroskrity, *Regimes of Language*, 35–83.

26. On monoglot, see Michael Silverstein, "Monoglot 'Standard' in America: Standardization and Metaphors of Linguistic Hegemony," in *The Matrix of Language*, ed. Donald Brenneis and Ronald Macaulay (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1996), 284–306.

27. Dell Hymes, "Linguistic Problems in Defining the Concept 'Tribe,'" in *Essays on the Problem of Tribe*, ed. June Helm (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1968), 23–48; and on erasure, see Irvine and Gal, "Language Ideology."

28. Lisa Philips, "Unexpected Languages: Multilingualism and Contact in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century North America," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 35, no. 1 (2011): 19–41.

29. Jane Hill, "Language, Race, and White Public Space," *American Anthropologist* 100 (1998): 680–89; and *The Everyday Language of White Racism* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008).

30. Bonnie Urciuoli, *Exposing Prejudice* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1996), 179.

31. See, e.g., Hill, *Everyday Language*. On the application of Hill's research agenda see Maggie Ronkin and Helen Karn, "Mock Ebonics: Linguistic Racism in Parodies of Ebonics on the Internet," *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3 (1999): 360–80; Rusty Barrett, "Language Ideology and Racial Inequality: Competing Functions of Spanish in an Anglo-owned Mexican Restaurant," *Language in Society* 35 (2006): 163–204; and, esp., Barbara Meek, "And the Injun Goes 'How!': Representations of American Indian in English in White Public Space," *Language in Society* 35 (2006): 93–128.

32. Barbara A. Meek, "Failing American Indian Languages," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 35, no. 1 (2011): 43–60.

33. Keith H. Basso, *Portraits of "the Whiteman": Linguistic Play and Cultural Symbols among the Western Apache* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979). See also Eleanor Nevins, "'They Live in Lonesome Dove': Media and Contemporary Western Apache Place-naming Practices," *Language in Society* 37 (2008): 191–215; and Sara Trechter, "White between the Lines: Ethnic Positioning in Lakshota Discourse," *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11 (2001): 22–35.

34. Deloria, *Unexpected Places*, 4.

35. See Walter Ong, *Orality and Literacy* (London: Routledge, 1982) for the prototypical example of this conflation.

36. Harry Hoijer, "Anthropological Linguistics," in *Trends in European and American Linguistics 1930–1960*, ed. Christine Mohrmann, Alf Sommerfelt, and Joshua Whatmough (Utrecht, the Netherlands: Spectrum Publishers, 1961), 110. On the documenting impulse, see Robert Moore, "Disappearing, Inc.: Glimpsing the Sublime in the Politics of Access to Endangered Languages," *Language and Communication* 26 (2006): 296–315.

37. On the Cherokee, see Margaret Bender, *Signs of Cherokee Culture: Sequoyah's Syllabary in Eastern Cherokee Life* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002). For the Kiowa and Parker McKenzie, see Amber Neely and Gus Palmer Jr., "Which Way Is the Kiowa Way? Orthography Choices, Ideologies, and Language Renewal," in Kroskrity and Fields, *Native American Language Ideologies*, 271–97; and Laurel Watkins and Daniel Harbour, "The Linguistic Genius of Parker McKenzie's Kiowa Alphabet," *International Journal of American Linguistics* 76 (2010): 309–33. For a discussion of the Holy Ground and Silas John, see Keith H. Basso and Ned Anderson, "A Western Apache Writing System: The Symbols of Silas John," in *Western Apache Language and Culture* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1990), 25–52; David Samuels, "Bible Translation and Medicine Man Talk: Missionaries, Indexicality, and the 'Language Expert' on the San Carlos Apache Reservation," *Language in Society* 35 (2006): 529–57; and Eleanor Nevins, "The Bible in Two Keys: Traditionalism and Evangelical Christianity on the Fort Apache Reservation," *Language and Communication* 30 (2010): 19–32.

It should also be noted that Hoijer actually documented several Holy Ground texts among the Mescalero Apache. So the Mescalero, with whom Hoijer worked during the 1930s, actually had an

indigenous form of writing while he was doing fieldwork, but it did not match Hoijer's expectation of "writing." It should also be noted that the Silas John writing system was to be used only within the confines of the Holy Ground. Samuel E. Kenoi, who was also one of Hoijer's Chiricahua Apache language consultants, wrote numerous letters during the 1930s to various US government officials challenging the treatment of the Chiricahua Apache. These were the peoples that Hoijer worked with, and they clearly did not "lack" writing. Yet, it appears, Hoijer could not see beyond certain received expectations. On Samuel E. Kenoi, see Anthony K. Webster, "Sam Kenoi's Coyote Stories: Poetics and Rhetoric in Some Chiricahua Apache Narratives," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 23, no. 1 (1999): 137–63; and Anthony K. Webster, "Samuel E. Kenoi's Portraits of White Men," in *Inside Dazzling Mountains*, ed. David Kozak (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, in press), 211–35.

38. Bennie Klain and Leighton C. Peterson, "Native Media, Commercial Radio, and Language Maintenance: Defining Speech and Style for Navajo Broadcasters and Broadcast Navajo," *Texas Linguistic Forum* 43 (2000): 117–28; Lisa Philips Valentine, *Making It Their Own: Severn Ojibwe Communicative Practices* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995); Leighton C. Peterson, "Tuning in to Navajo: The Role of Radio in Native Language Maintenance," in *Teaching Indigenous Languages*, ed. Jon Reyhner (Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University, 1997), 214–21.

39. Samuels, *Putting a Song*.

40. For a recent discussions on these issues, see Leighton C. Peterson, *Technology, Ideology and Emergent Communicative Practices among the Navajo* (PhD diss., University of Texas at Austin, 2006); and Patrick Moore and Kate Hennessy, "New Technologies and Contested Ideologies: The Tagish First Voices Project," *American Indian Quarterly* 30 (2006): 119–37. The theme of Native peoples as technologically incompetent is to imagine the recurring trope of Native peoples in the "past tense." As Navajo poet Sherwin Bitsui told Webster in 2001, "I'm tired of being written about in the past tense."

41. The quintessential origin point for this is, Franz Boas, *Geographical Names of the Kwakiutl Indians*, Columbia University Contributions to Anthropology 20 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934). For recent discussions of place-naming and indigenous rights, see Basso, *Wisdom Sits*; David Dinwoodie, *Reserve Memories: The Power of the Past in a Chilcotin Community* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002); Patrick Moore and Daniel Tlen, "Indigenous Linguistics and Land Claims: The Semiotic Projection of Athabaskan Directionals in Elijah Smith's Radio Work," *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 17 (2007): 266–86; and Thomas Thornton, *Being and Place among the Tlingit* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2008).

42. See Rebecca Benjamin, Regis Pecos, and Mary Eunice Romero, "Language Revitalization Efforts in the Pueblo de Cochiti: Becoming 'Literate' in an Oral Society," in *Indigenous Literacies in the Americas*, ed. Nancy Hornberger (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1999), 115–36; Kroskrity, *Language, History*; Kroskrity, "Narrative Reproductions"; Debenport, "Potential Complexity"; and Pamela Innes, "Ethical Problems in Archival Research: Beyond Accessibility," *Language and Communication* 30 (2010): 198–203.

43. Ong, *Orality and Literacy*. One reason to be suspicious of "oral cultures," and there are many, is to recognize the myriad sign languages that Native Americans employed. See, e.g., Brenda Farnell, *Do You See What I Mean: Plains Indian Sign Talk and the Embodiment of Action* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995); and Jeffrey Davis, *Hand Talk: Sign Language among American Indian Nations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010). On the ways "oral cultures" are ideological achievements, see Morgan, *Bearer of This Letter*.

44. On the use of the Cherokee syllabary for poetry, see Bender, *Signs of Cherokee*, 155. On Navajo poetry, see Webster, *Explorations*.

45. See, again, Kroskrity, *Language, History* and "Narrative Reproductions"; Debenport, "Potential Complexity"; and Innes, "Ethical Problems."

46. Neely and Palmer, "Which Way."

47. For a useful overview of these issues that also touches on Tolowa concerns with literacy, see James Collins and Richard Blot, *Literacy and Literacies: Text, Power, and Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003). For an ethnographic and ethnohistorical investigation of the role of literacy and competing language ideologies among the Fort Belknap community, see Morgan, *Bearer of This Letter*.

48. For a general sampling of this literature and to get a sense of the kinds of titles that are used in this literature, see Lenore Grenoble and Lindsay Whaley, *Endangered Languages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Daniel Nettle and Suzanne Romaine, *Vanishing Voices* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); David K. Harrison, *When Languages Die: The Extinction of the World's Languages and the Erosion of Human Knowledge* (London: Oxford University Press, 2007); and Nicholas Evans, *Dying Words: Endangered Languages and What They Have to Tell Us* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010).

49. Some ways of speaking do appear to transfer across lexical-grammatical codes. The assumption should not be made that lexical-grammatical codes are incidental to ways of speaking, as they are often intimately interwoven. For a discussion of the transfer across codes see Margaret Field, "Triadic Directives in Navajo Language Socialization," *Language in Society* 30 (2001): 249–63; and Patricia Kwachka "Discourse Structures, Cultural Stability, and Language Shift," *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 93 (1992): 67–73. For a discussion of the interwoven-ness of linguistic form and ways of speaking, see Anthony Woodbury, "Documenting Rhetorical, Aesthetic, and Expressive Loss in Language Shift," in *Endangered Languages*, ed. Lenore Grenoble and Lindsay Whaley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 234–58. Boas and Sapir made this point early on—see Boas, "Introduction," 58; and Sapir, *Language*. See also Webster, *Explorations*, which takes up the issue in contemporary Navajo poetry of which linguistic forms are felt to be transferable. See also Andrew Cowell, "Arapaho Imperatives: Indirectness, Politeness and Communal 'Face,'" *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 17 (2007): 44–60, for a discussion of the ramifications of the loss of Arapaho politeness forms on the proper doings of Arapaho ritual.

50. Biological metaphors have a long history in linguistics; see Joseph Errington, *Linguistics in a Colonial World: A Story of Language, Meaning, and Power* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2008); and Bauman and Briggs, *Voices of Modernity*.

51. See, e.g., Jeffrey Anderson, "Ethnolinguistic Dimensions of Northern Arapaho Language Shift," *Anthropological Linguistics* 40 (1998): 43–108; Hill, "Expert Rhetoric"; Anne Goodfellow, *Talking in Context: Language and Identity in Kwakwaka'wakw Society* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005); Moore, "Disappearing, Inc.,"; Bernard Perley, "Aboriginality at Large: Varieties of Resistance in Maliseet Language Instruction," *Identities* 13 (2006): 187–208; Shaylih Muehlman, "'Spread your ass cheeks': And Other Things That Should Not Be Said in Indigenous Languages," *American Ethnologist* 35 (2008): 34–48; and Anthony K. Webster, "On Intimate Grammars, with Examples from Navajo English, Navlish, and Navajo," *Journal of Anthropological Research* 66 (2010): 187–208.

52. Paul Kroskrity, "Language Renewal as Sites of Language Ideological Struggle: The Need for 'Ideological Clarification,'" in *Indigenous Language Revitalization: Encouragement, Guidance, and Lessons Learned*, ed. Jon Reyhner and Lousie Lockard (Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University, 2009), 71.

53. Following Leonard's practice in this issue, we do not capitalize the word *myaamia*. See also Wesley Leonard, "When Is an 'Extinct Language' Not Extinct? Miami, a Formerly Sleeping Language," in *Sustaining Linguistic Diversity*, ed. Kendall King, Natalie Schilling-Estes, Lyn Fogle, Jia Jackie Lou, and Barbara Soukup (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2008), 23–33.

54. On Herder, see Bauman and Briggs, *Voices of Modernity*. On a useful introduction to concerns with "purity" see Pauline Turner Strong and Barrik Van Winkle, "Indian Blood: Reflections on the

Reckoning and Refiguring of Native North American Identity," *Cultural Anthropology* 11 (1996): 547–76. See also Circe Sturm, *Blood Politics: Race, Culture, and Identity in the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).

55. See also Anne Goodfellow, "The Development of 'New' Languages in Native American Communities," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 27, no. 2 (2003): 41–59.

56. See William Leap, *American Indian English* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1993).

57. Jane Hill, "Structure and Practice in Language Shift," in *Progression and Regression in Language: Sociocultural, Neuropsychological, and Linguistic Perspectives*, ed. Kenneth Hyldenstam and Åke Viberg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 69.

58. See Meek, "And the Injun Goes"; Silverstein, "Monoglot 'Standard'"; and Rosina Lippi-Green, *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology and Discrimination in the United States* (London: Routledge, 1997).

59. Standard discussions of these issues are Bauman and Briggs, *Voices of Modernity*; Errington, *Linguistics in a Colonial World*; Irvine and Gal, "Language Ideology"; and Michael Silverstein, "Whorfianism and the Linguistic Imagination of Nationality," in Kroskrity, *Regimes of Language*, 85–137.

60. On Navajo, see Peterson, *Technology, Ideology*; on Plains Indian Sign Talk, see Farnell, *Do You See What I Mean*; and on the Village of Tewa, see Kroskrity, *Language, History*.

61. Michael Silverstein, "Encountering Languages and Languages of Encounter in North American Ethnohistory," *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 6 (1997): 127.

62. See, e.g., Sturm, *Blood Politics*.

63. A. A. Carr, *Eye Killers* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996); Laura Tohe, *No Parole Today* (Albuquerque: West End Press, 1999). For a discussion of Tohe's work, see Anthony K. Webster, "Imagining Navajo in the Boarding School: Laura Tohe's *No Parole Today* and the Intimacy of Language Ideologies," *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 20 (2010): 39–62; *The Rainbow Boy*, directed by Norman Patrick Brown (Gallup, NM: Rezwood Entertainment and 220 Productions, forthcoming). Webster thanks Orlando White for pointing him in the direction of A. A. Carr's work.

64. Denetdale, *Reclaiming Diné History*, 19.