

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

All Intimate Grammars Leak: Reflections on "Indian Languages in Unexpected Places"

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8zz4j5s4>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 35(2)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Kroskirty, Paul

**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

## COMMENTARY

# All Intimate Grammars Leak: Reflections on “Indian Languages in Unexpected Places”

*Paul V. Kroskrity*

I want to begin by thanking the editors for inviting me to comment on these thoughtful and thought-provoking articles and to thank the *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* for publishing a special issue on Native American languages in which the authors took inspiration from the trope of Philip Deloria’s pathbreaking book, *Indians in Unexpected Places*, and its imaginative reframing here to focus on the important but neglected topic of American Indian languages.<sup>1</sup> As a commentator, I enjoy the delightful yet difficult task of exploring these articles in a manner that somehow does some descriptive and analytical justice to each while recognizing a collective pattern or two. Allow me to begin by briefly mentioning two cross-cutting patterns and move on to some more particular observations, leaving it in part to you, dear readers, to weave this warp and weft together more securely than I can do in these brief remarks.

The first, a kind of an appropriation of a venerable W. E. B. Du Bois’s 1903 concept, is the relevance of something like a “double consciousness”

---

PAUL V. KROSKRITY is a professor of anthropology, applied linguistics, and American Indian studies at UCLA. He chairs the Interdepartmental Program in American Indian Studies and is an active researcher in the areas of Native American verbal art and language renewal.

imposed on Native Americans that variously constrains and complicates their own linguistic identity productions through heritage languages—hybridized languages like Navajo English and a reclaimed Miami, patterns of multilingualism, and hybridized speech products like Tiwa soap operas—and even the internalization of English dominance and the delegation of heritage languages to “second-language” status.<sup>2</sup> I would prefer to reframe this, playing with linguistic anthropologist Edward Sapir’s famous quote and Anthony Webster’s syncretic borrowing of “intimate grammars” as the law that “all intimate grammars leak.” No measure of compartmentalization protects the private linguistic worlds from contact—whether caressing, crudely abrasive, or otherwise—with one’s position in a social world riddled with political-economic inequality.<sup>3</sup>

My second pattern could be construed as a critique of all the authors’ work including my own. This pattern concerns the need for greater highlighting of the critical linkage of expectation and power, which I will reframe and regloss, following Antonio Gramsci’s important analytical distinction, as both “force” and hegemony.<sup>4</sup> Expressed in the words of Philip Deloria, “I would like for you to think of expectations in terms of the colonial and imperial relations of power existing between Indian people and the United States.”<sup>5</sup> Why is this especially important? I think Deloria’s book suggests a way of appreciating Native American agency in actions and activities that are often dismissed, derided, or otherwise erased. But to appreciate Native agency we must realize that not everyone’s projects are equally attainable—that the powers and resources (or their lack) that provide ready access to some, can block, obstruct, and deter others.<sup>6</sup> The agency of Native Americans and many indigenous and minority others must be understood as expressed through and despite such often-obstructive regimentation by nation-states.

Barbra Meek’s “Failing American Indian Languages” is critically centered on the linkages of “expectations” with power and social inequality. She cites an important observation by Deloria: “expectations tend to assume a status quo defined around failure, the result of some innate limitation on the part of Indian people.”<sup>7</sup> Deloria was quite correct in viewing popular culture as one of the key sites of the production of expectations and in understanding the role of mass media in the production and amplification of the dominant society’s national narrative. Mass media representations of inevitably doomed and incompetent Indians have long provided a rationale for further neocolonial exploitation and derogation by majority members, including those who have little firsthand knowledge of Indian people and those with what would seem like a substantial amount. In Meek’s article in this issue and in an earlier publication on Hollywood Injun English (HIE), she has carefully detailed the linguistic construction of a not-so-covert racist project that freely and typically negatively stereotypes Indians as incapable of conforming to what scholars

like Rosina Lippi-Green and James and Lesley Milroy have called the nation's Standard Language Ideology.<sup>8</sup> Such linguistic constructions represent Indians as not merely linguistically different but rather as cognitively deficient, and the pejorative "othering" of Natives thus ironically becomes their representation as "foreign victims" or as living anachronisms indexically linked to defeat and failure in national pasts that justify their continuing marginalization and erasure in the present and future. But HIE's representation of Indians as alien, deficient, and anachronistic—obsolete persons in today's world—is merely the most flamboyant caricature of what linguist Nancy Dorian has described as "language ideologies of contempt" aimed at subordinated minorities by speakers who enjoy political and symbolic domination.<sup>9</sup> We have seen this pattern before in educational discourses under the well-known rubric of "blaming the victim." Meek demonstrates that such practices are all too "alive and well" in Aboriginal Language Services (ALS) assessments and in the practice of local teachers' misrecognition of the English-language competence of heritage-language-speaking students, in this case the Kaska language. Here, institutions and individuals greatly misrecognize the complexity of such complicating factors as symbolic domination, social inequality, conflicting language ideologies, local discourse norms, and linguistic convergence within individual linguistic repertoires in favor of what they expect: deficiency and inevitable failure.

In her summary and conclusions, Meek notes the importance of how successful revitalization will require a transformation of local language and communicative structure and practice, and she cites Jane Hill's notion of negotiation over code differentiation and code contextualization as a "site where the structures of oppression and the structures of language are articulated through local practice."<sup>10</sup> I strongly agree that new discourses and practices—as in the unexpected revival of *myaamia* discussed by Wesley Leonard in this issue—must occur, and that these must transform even as they build from the indigenous and colonial language ideologies that have been interacting for long periods of time. I have elsewhere called these discourses attempts at "language ideological clarification," in which explicit discourses between contending members—elders and youth, community "haves" and "have-nots," my kiva group and yours—can bridge gaps and rifts stemming from ideological contestation within Native American communities.<sup>11</sup> It is Native agency—the willingness to engage in new forms of discourse about language and communicative practices—that is not expected because, in the dominant view, "deficient" Indians could not possibly change their dysfunctional traditional customs. ALS misrecognizes conflicting language ideologies within some First Nations communities in the Yukon as a lack of individual motivation and dedication to heritage languages, and ALS projects such deficiencies into a prognosis of

failure. This position erases any role of social inequality and political-economic oppression in its various manifestations of force and hegemony.

Webster treats a case of literary misrecognition in “Please Read Loose’: Intimate Grammars and Unexpected Languages in Contemporary Navajo Literature.” Expectations, as we see in his article, powerfully shape not only what may surprise or shock us but also what it is possible to see and hear. The uneasy collaboration of Blackhorse Mitchell and Terry Allen, which Webster develops through a kind of linguistic anthropological “slow reveal,” becomes inscribed as a telling moment in Navajo-Anglo interethnic relations. Mitchell’s “felt attachment” to Navajo English, despite the stigma linked to it by Allen and many reviewers of his pioneering poetry, was foundational to his construction of “The Drifting Lonely Seed.” It is composed and later performed using Navajo English, using the intimate grammar of his world and perhaps those who shared his experience of boarding school, as a way of celebrating a partially imposed hybridity and “owning” this form possibly as a type of “counterlanguage” to be preferred over more standardized English forms, at least on certain occasions, because of its special identity-making resourcefulness.<sup>12</sup> Allen’s own language ideologies inform her derogation of Mitchell’s hybridity and his orality, his “trying to learn our words by ear.” His preliteracy, or illiteracy—to use the “professional language ideologies” of that period, could only produce deficiency and incompetence.<sup>13</sup> Failure to be fully literate, as evidenced by conventional standards of literacy, appears to have rendered Mitchell, in Allen’s view, as incapable of either a hybridized Navajo English or the agency behind authorship and literary achievement. What Mitchell offers as a heartfelt “critique of oppression at boarding schools” is praised by Allen as “great writing” not because of any real sympathetic understanding of it but because of its superficial conformity to standards of literacy: its “beautiful handwriting” and the use of correct (that is, Standard English tense) grammar. This misunderstanding, although microcultural and micro-interactional in its original context of production, is ideologically founded on what Deloria calls the “astonishing inequalities,” not only in the distribution of resources—including political-economic power—but also in “notions of who has been active . . . and who has been acted upon.”<sup>14</sup> In Allen’s world, this celebration of approved writing is as much a narrative of heroic teaching—a conversion story for the partial success of achieving or, perhaps, receiving the “sacrament” of English language literacy.

But we must remember that behind Allen’s tropes of symbolic domination were very real and unjust forms of political-economic domination involving not merely the attraction of the dominant society and its economic rewards but also the brute force of imposed change, especially in educational contexts targeting children. (One can hear, for example, the anguished voices of many

Navajos expressing the lived trauma of their boarding-school experiences in Deborah House's *Language Shift among the Navajos: Identity Politics and Cultural Continuity*.)<sup>15</sup>

In Erin Debenport's "As the Rez Turns: Anomalies within and beyond the Boundaries of a Pueblo Community," we hear very different voices as she provides an ethnographic view of a surprising set of activities done in the name of linguistic revitalization by the tribal language program of the fictive Pueblo of San Antonio. As one who has worked in Pueblo communities during most of my thirty years in the profession, I must confess a reaction not of surprise but of outright shock to many of the ethnographic particulars that Debenport describes. Clearly this linguistic project occurs, at least temporarily, within the freedom of a liminal space between an American English-speaking, urbanized, globalized world and a Tanoan-language world of especially local concerns. Constructed in a place between linguistic worlds and in the medium of verbal art, this liminal space permits a language play and a play of languages that reproduces some of the experimental delight with linguistic novelty that drives early childhood language learning and frees its participants to engage in an overt social critique that would be otherwise deemed highly inappropriate.<sup>16</sup> These language activists and language learners, especially the young adults, defy expectations in a variety of ways.

Much of this can be viewed as a celebration of their hybridity. In their discourse, we find abundant code mixing and the juxtaposition of a Tanoan language text, and its associated links to a traditional past, with the "modern" target language for a locally situated soap opera—a decidedly non-Pueblo genre. The content of this soap opera, like the borrowed genre, represents the contemporary world of the Pueblo and the hybridized "primary text" of their social lives, in which ceremonial activities coexist in the same conversational exchange as casino parties and off-rez activities designed to index their affluence and worldliness. Shocking is the social organization of entextualization in this language program, which permits the young adults an authoring role with the older fluent speaker content to translate such nontraditional texts. But as Debenport indicates, all this hybridity, heteroglossia, language play, and linguistic empowerment of young language learners not only defies the expectations of outsiders to San Antonio but also defies the expectations of most insiders. One can also recognize a bit of ideological contestation within the group when Debenport notes that, for the highly fluent speaker, "joking in Tiwa is a comfortable activity but joking about it by those that cannot fully inhabit the language is not."<sup>17</sup> What is especially interesting here is how what Debenport calls a "hybrid space"—or what I would prefer to emphasize as a liminal space between languages—becomes a resource for a larger social critique of the Pueblo's enrollment and membership practices and

for commentary on rapid social change. I might point out that the apparent boldness of some of these moves, despite their nontraditional form, is very consistent with local performative ideologies including local tropes that view narratives as “morality tales” and as having strategies of diffusing responsibility for one’s words (especially critical ones) to a larger and typically antecedent group by using evidentials such as “so they say.”<sup>18</sup>

Leighton Peterson’s “Reel Navajo’: The Linguistic Creation of Indigenous Screen Memories” explores, among several things, the dramatic irony of some Navajo filmmakers who feel compelled to make films in Navajo even though they do not control their heritage language. Realism and hyperrealism regarding linguistic representation by most film audiences are now expected cinematic norms. To not use Navajo is to make an inauthentic Navajo film despite the further irony that Navajo communities are experiencing an ongoing language shift and the further complication that, as in Webster’s presentation, hybrid languages like Navajo English have emerged in the repertoires of many speakers. The question for filmmakers is a complicated one involving just what world to represent—the linguistically distressed present or an imagined world involving the reinvention or borrowing of anthropology’s early representational tropes—the imaginary isolation and even more imaginary homogeneity. As one of the more expensive narrative technologies, film imposes the concerns of the audience and the source of funding in ways that other technologies do not. Film productions, especially those requiring significant resources, would seem to provide contradistinctive sites for representation to those of the liminal spaces for language play occasioned by the San Antonio case portrayed by Debenport—less of a chance to take advantage of what Deloria calls “a moment of paradox and opportunity”—a moment in which performance frames and cultural stereotypes can be broken.<sup>19</sup> But if the monetary resources required for Navajo filmmaking partially impose a lack of the type of playful spontaneity we see in the San Antonio collaborative playwriting and performance, the medium still has a special power to represent and re-index threatened languages like Navajo. Linguists who are especially concerned with language revitalization, like the late Ken Hale, join indigenous-language activists such as Stephen Greymorning in their conviction that mass media, like film and radio, provide important opportunities for indigenous languages to participate in technologies typically reserved for national and world languages. In addition to the prestige associations of the medium, it also provides indigenous languages and their speakers with critical opportunities to break through and expand the kinds of communication in which they can engage.<sup>20</sup> The irony is that even film directors with little fluency in Navajo, by insisting on linguistic authenticity in their work for their own purposes of artistic representation, are capable of

influencing language ideologies concerning their heritage language and thereby promoting those languages.<sup>21</sup>

Lisa Philips's article, "Unexpected Languages: Multilingualism and Contact in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century North America," presents us with a graphic reminder of the often-unacknowledged linguistic diversity not only in the Old Northwest and in the old Oregon Territory, which provides the temporal and regional focus of her article, but also of Native America more generally. Close attention to historical sources permits a full and welcome appreciation of the reasons for multilingualism and the ways of becoming bilingual. While it is customary, following the massive genetic-historical linguistic bias of Americanist linguistics, to conceptualize Native American linguistic diversity primarily as a vast multiplicity of discrete languages, and language families, it is exceedingly rare for scholars to acknowledge the internal linguistic diversity that multilingualism represents in most Native American communities. As Michael Silverstein has amply demonstrated in "Encountering Language and the Languages of Encounter in North American Ethnohistory," much of the historical understanding of this type of internal diversity has been erased by our own Andersonian linguistic nationalism with its peculiarly intense emphasis on monolingualism and concurrent iconization of the national language to national identity.<sup>22</sup>

In her article, Philips notes and illustrates the reasons for multilingualism as trade, employment, religious observance and proselytizing, teaching and training, and cultural-brokering political alliances. Though multilingualism clearly provided an important political-economic resource to all members of a given group, the translator, as noted in historical representations and as observed by Philips, is typically a "male who held a recognized position of political, military, and/or religious leadership."<sup>23</sup> The salient exceptions to this rule—such famous but anomalous figures as Pocahontas, Sacajawea, and Sarah Winnemucca—are valorized and highlighted rather than erased because of the special role they performed. As Philips observes, "all the women translators noted previously were involved in negotiations between First Nations and settler governments."<sup>24</sup> The question arises as to whether primary or secondary sources are responsible for other erasures of women interpreters or whether this skewed representation of male interpreters is more the result of local notions of the sexual division of communicative labor and "there and then" local notions of "women's place." Philips later concludes, "Multilingualism in 'frontier' North America crosses lines of gender, ethnicity ('race'), and class, . . . [which] calls into question the appropriateness of such categories as a starting point for explanations of contact and interaction."<sup>25</sup> But returning to the linkage of expectation and power in this case, it is remarkable why we do not expect nonheritage languages in the mouths of others. In addition to

Silverstein's point about the obscuring role of our own linguistic nationalism, we can also add the genetic-historical versus areal bias of the Americanist tradition. Much more attention has been devoted to a historical linguistics centered on language families (like Uto-Aztecan or Algonquian) rather than on "contact" linguistics and patterns of areal diffusion.

But other debilitating ideologies, such as ones fostered by many nation-states, including our own, are also to blame. These ideologies of what I would call "impossible and immoral" multilingualism represent multilingual adaptations as either impossibly onerous or outright immoral because they do not conform to the patterns of linguistic assimilation displayed by earlier generations of multilingual immigrants.<sup>26</sup> I take Philips's article as an effective reminder of the power of dominant language ideologies that marginalize multilingualism in the present and the (reconstructed) past.

Leonard's article, "On Setting Expectations: Challenging 'Extinction' through Modern Miami Language Practices," examines the fascinating narrative of what he terms the ongoing "reclamation" of Miami—a language that was extinct, lacking either first- or second-language speakers. What defies outsider expectations here are members of a community speaking a language officially classified as "extinct" and heritage-language speakers reviving this Algonquian language from documentation and adapting it to new, present-day contexts. Another frustration of popular expectation emerges from this group's departure from Herderian models that presuppose the need for a unity among a people, a language, and, ultimately, a national homeland.<sup>27</sup> A multicultural group with significant phenotypic variation, the Miami language community seems to defy expectations based on essentializing tropes and related ideologies of linguistic purism and illegitimate multilingualism.

That Miami-heritage people have achieved significant success in their reclamation of a formerly extinct language certainly works to defy expectations about Indian deficiency and failure, but I fear that much of the agency that might be attributed by outsiders may actually be erased and dismissed by the majority society just because it is such a highly unexpected achievement. Seeing something that is not expected—like a Native American woman in traditional dress in a "beauty shop"—one of Deloria's examples—may, as he suggests, produce "an ideological chuckle."<sup>28</sup> I think this is only one outcome, and it is one that can be seen as context-sensitive to situations involving Indians when those situations do not challenge the political-economic order. Note how another "unexpected" situation may produce a very different reaction. Images of Indians with newfound casino wealth, such as those constructed by mainstream media, typically produce more than a chuckle and can fuel reactions of venomous hatred and morph into refusals to legitimate the authenticity of the very identities that confer the right to engage in gaming. Language reclamation,

I would argue, is an activity somewhere between the beauty parlor and Indian gaming. As long as reclamation activities are perceived as personal transformations, the majority society will view their successes as amusing and unexpected curiosities, but if the Miami community uses its heritage language in a way that would allow it to compete with non-Indian interests, clearly the antipathy associated with Indian gaming would be more expected. Leonard's emphasis on the Miami's need to "set expectations" may thus be only a partially realizable goal. The "double consciousness" mentioned earlier is certainly relevant in a community in which all its speakers know *myaamia* as a second language but who are also profoundly influenced by their membership in a society that speaks Standard English as the dominant language. As Leonard suggests, Miamis need to reclaim their heritage language in a way that makes sense for them and to ignore the ideologies of purism and monolingualism that pervade the larger society. But this is a goal that is, at best, attainable through the ideological transformation of their members—a kind of linguistic decolonization. No matter how internally effective such ideological transformation may be, it is unrealistic to expect that transformation to extend to majority members of the dominant society. Hence, the expectation that can be "set" are those of the Miami, not the larger society and its expectations of a certain kind of linguistic authenticity that is ideologically founded on beliefs that the Miami must change for themselves.

Clearly, "expectations" have a great deal to do with power and the marked social inequality that has usually separated Indian and Euro-Americans. As Deloria states, "The key ideologies describing Indian people—inevitable disappearance, primitive purity, and savage violence, to name only a few—have brought exactly this kind of uneven advantage to the social, political economic, and legal relations lived out between Indians and non-Indian Americans."<sup>29</sup>

I conclude, in both of that word's senses, that aside from the occasional chuckle, these ideologies are no laughing matter.

## NOTES

1. Philip J. Deloria, *Indians in Unexpected Places* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2004).
2. The notion comes from W. E. B. Du Bois's *The Souls of Black Folk* (Chicago: A. C. McClurg and Co., 1903), which obviously treats the specifics of what was then referred to as "the Negro problem." The applicability of this concept to Native American groups and individuals suggests the utility of developing this concept to fit the consequences of racialization, racism, and the experience of hegemonic pressure that have affected the indigenous peoples of North America better. I would contend that so much attention has been paid to an "othering" of Native Americans by scholars (and their attendant erasure of social inequality) that there has been a failure to appreciate Native awareness of Euro-American practices and Native syncretic projects involving the combination of different cultures.

3. The famous Sapir quote, from his textbook *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1921, p. 38), was concerned with the internal consistency of languages: “The fact of grammar, a universal trait of language, is simply a generalized expression of the feeling that analogous concepts and relations are most conveniently symbolized in analogous forms. Were a language ever completely ‘grammatical,’ it would be a perfect engine of conceptual expression. Unfortunately, or luckily, no language is tyrannically consistent. All grammars leak.”

But despite the formal linguistic origins of the notion of grammatical leakage, my interest here, as in the case of Anthony Webster’s development of “intimate grammar” is very much social in nature (see Webster, “Please Read Loose’: Intimate Grammars and Unexpected Languages in Contemporary Navajo Literature,” *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 35, no. 2 [2011]: 62). We need, in my view, to develop a relevant notion of leakage that would be maximally useful in contemporary applications. Such a notion would focus on the leakage of languages and identities that occur within linguistic repertoires as well as what I have called “repertoires of identities” in my book *Language, History, and Identity: Ethnolinguistic Studies of the Arizona Tewa* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1993). Webster’s notion of intimate grammars (“On Intimate Grammars: With Examples from Navajo English, Navlish, and Navajo,” *Journal of Anthropological Research* 66, no. 2 [2010]: 187–208) builds upon Elizabeth Povinelli’s “Intimate Grammars: Anthropological and Psychoanalytic Accounts of Language, Gender, and Desire,” in *Language, Culture, and Society*, eds. Christine Jourdan and Kevin Tuite (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 190–206; and Michael Herzfeld’s *Cultural Intimacy* (New York: Routledge, 1997).

4. Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks* (New York: International Press, 1971).

5. *Ibid.*, 11.

6. See Sherry B. Ortner, *Anthropology and Social Theory: Culture, Power, and the Acting Subject* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006).

7. *Ibid.*, 231.

8. See Barbra Meek’s “And the Injun Goes ‘How!’: Representations of American Indian English in White Public Space,” *Language in Society* 35 (2006): 93–128; Barbra A. Meek, “Failing American Indian Languages,” *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 35, no. 2 (2011): 43–60. For more on Standard Language Ideology and its dual function in elevating national “standard” languages while deprecating minority languages, see Rosina Lippi-Green’s *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States* (London: Routledge, 1997); and James Milroy and Lesley Milroy, *Authority in Language: Investigating Language Prescription and Standardisation* (London: Routledge, 1999).

9. Nancy Dorian, “Western Language Ideologies and Small Language Prospects,” in *Endangered Languages: Language Loss and Community Response*, ed. Lenore Grenoble and Lindsay Whaley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 3–21.

10. Jane H. 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), 68–93.

11. Paul V. 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 Louise Lockard (Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University Press, 2009), 71–83.

12. I am using the notion of “counterlanguage” developed by Marcyliena Morgan in *Language, Discourse, and Power in African American Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002). Certainly, there are particular historical circumstances that inform the development of African American counterlanguage, such as its use as a deliberately ambiguous code during slavery, that do not

apply to Native American groups. But I think there is a similarity of indexical meanings relating to the production of counterhegemonic cultures and identities that seem to be especially relevant here.

13. On the notion of “professional language ideologies,” or those beliefs and feelings about language that become a part of a field’s disciplinary surround, see my chapter, “Language Ideologies in the Expression and Representation of Arizona Tewa Ethnic Identity,” in *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities*, ed. Paul V. Kroskrity (Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research, 2000), 329–59.

14. *Ibid.*, 6.

15. Deborah House, *Language Shift among the Navajos: Identity Politics and Cultural Continuity* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2002).

16. This liberating effect of verbal art is a rather common feature of many genres that permit their performers to say things that they would not otherwise be able to say. For a well-known example from a far different cultural context, see Lila Abu-Lughod, *Veiled Sentiments: Honor and Poetry in a Bedouin Society* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986).

17. Erin Debenport, “As the Rez Turns: Anomalies within and beyond the Boundaries of a Pueblo Community,” *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 35, no. 2 (2011): 87–109.

18. For discussion of Pueblo storytelling as a moral activity as well as for some discussion about evidentials, see Paul V. Kroskrity, “Narrative Reproductions: Ideologies of Storytelling, Authoritative Words, and Generic Regimentation in the Village of Tewa,” *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 19, no. 1 (2010): 40–56.

19. Deloria, *Indians in Unexpected Places*, 225.

20. See, e.g., Ken Hale, “Strict Locality in Local Language Media: An Australian Example,” in *The Green Book of Language Revitalization and Practice*, ed. Leanne Hinton and Ken Hale (San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 2001), 277–83. See also Stephen Greymorning, “Reflections on the Arapaho Language Project, or When Bambi Spoke Arapaho and Other Tales of Arapaho Language Revitalization Efforts,” in Hinton and Hale, *The Green Book of Language Revitalization*, 287–98.

21. For more on the interaction of indigenous language ideologies with those imposed by those of the nation-state, see Paul V. Kroskrity and Margaret C. Field, eds., *Native American Language Ideologies: Beliefs, Practices, and Struggles in Indian Country* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2009).

22. Michael Silverstein, “Encountering Language and the Languages of Encounter in North American Ethnohistory,” *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 6 (1996): 126–44. *Andersonian* here refers to the views of political scientist Benedict Anderson and his highly influential book *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983). The notion of iconization involves the naturalization of particular languages as symbols of specific identities. For an example, consider standard American English and its use as an icon of US national identity. This notion is developed in Judith Irvine and Susan Gal, “Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation,” in Kroskrity, *Regimes of Language*, 35–83.

23. Lisa Philips, “Unexpected Languages: Multilingualism and Contact in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century North America,” *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 35, no. 2 (2011): 22.

24. *Ibid.*, 23.

25. *Ibid.*, 36.

26. See Nancy Dorian’s arguments about how the “onerous” and “impossible” image of bilingualism, fostered by many nation-states, has destroyed this as a possibility for many would-be minority-language speakers. See also Ronald Schmidt, “Defending English in an English Dominant World: The Ideology of the ‘Official English’ Movement in the United States,” in *Discourses of Endangerment*, ed. Alexandre Duchene and Monica Heller (London: Continuum, 2007), 197–215.

27. For an excellent treatment of Herder and his theories of language and identity, see Richard Bauman and Charles Briggs, "Language, Poetry and the Volk," in *Voices of Modernity: Language Ideologies and the Politics of Inequality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 163–96.

28. Deloria, *Indians in Unexpected Places*, 231.

29. *Ibid.*, 10.