On Nanbé Tewa Language Ideologies*

Evan Ashworth
University of New Mexico

The heritage language at Nanbé Pueblo (hereon referred to as Nanbé Owîngeh), New Mexico—Nanbé Tewa—has been spoken in the same place for several centuries. Having withstood foreign political and linguistic hegemony for many generations, the language survives yet today, even in the face of growing external pressures.

Like many North American indigenous languages, the status of the heritage language at Nanbé is grim, but although this community has been increasingly experiencing language shift for multiple generations, this shift is far from deterministic. Community initiatives such as developing language programs and youth projects, practicing tribal dances, and supporting community awareness gatherings reinforce the grassroots collaborative spirit that has sustained the heritage language at Nanbé for so many years. The Pueblo's unique sociopolitical context affords the student of language ideologies an opportunity to investigate the nature of Tewa metadiscursive practices and the extent to which they index specific social relationships in Nanbé.

This paper represents a preliminary attempt toward outlining potential areas for investigation of language ideologies at Nanbé Owîngeh and presents several organizational frameworks through which such analyses might proceed. First, some demographic information concerning the pueblo as well as a brief typological overview of Nanbé Tewa is presented; second, I will discuss the history of ideology and language ideologies as emergent concepts in anthropological linguistics; third, I will explore language ideologies in relation to notions of landscape and grounded experience; fourth, I will discuss how social policy has impacted language practice in Nanbé Owîngeh; fifth, I will discuss the import of language ideologies in ongoing language preservation efforts in the Pueblo; and lastly, I will present further directions for future research of language ideologies in Nanbé Owîngeh.

1. Nanbé Pueblo and Nanbé Tewa

Nanbé Owîngeh is located approximately twenty miles north of Santa Fe, New Mexico, and its language—Nanbé Tewa—is among the most endangered indigenous languages in North America. Fewer than forty native speakers remain at the Pueblo, and the heritage language is rarely—if at all—passed down to children as a first language. Most fluent speakers are over the age of 65, which places Nambé Tewa in category C in the model proposed by Krauss (1992). Most recent estimates (as of March 2006) cite approximately 640 tribal members, with 400 reservation members (residing in the Pueblo) and 240 non-reservation members (residing outside the Pueblo).

Nanbé Tewa, a Kiowa-Tanoan language, exhibits a great deal of synthetic morphology, although one could argue for its polysynthetic status given the presence of obligatory marking of person, number, aspect, and mode on the verb and the productive noun-incorporation process. Nanbé Tewa has an unmarked past tense, which, as Bybee (1985) notes, is cross-linguistically rare, as well as a dual-marking number system.[1] The

language has three tones: high, low, and rising-falling. While this paper is not primarily concerned with the typological aspects of the Nanbé Tewa language, the reader is referred to the works of Harrington (1910, 1912), Dozier (1949, 1953), Hoijer and Dozier (1949), and Spiers (1966) for detailed analyses of Tewa structure.

Notions of ideology and linguistic ideologies are not easily separable because the jurisdiction of the ideological domain is itself not easily delimited. First, a brief history will be presented of the term "ideology" and its development as an enterprise for scientific study, followed by a discussion of the emergent field of language ideologies.

2. Ideology and language ideologies

Idéologie, as first conceived by Destutt de Tracy, was a science of ideas whose theories and methodologies required the same systematic attentiveness as any other –ology. Born out of the spirit of the French Enlightenment, *idéologie*, according de Tracy, considers the nature of ideas as structures through which internalized concepts are socially mediated—or an externalization of these concepts through systems of articulated signs (Silverstein 1994:123). By proposing its inclusion as a subfield of zoology, de Tracy sought to legitimize the ideational domain as a valid object for scientific study. While not privy to discussions in modern semiotics, de Tracy anticipated many current issues in the study of metadiscourse and second-order indexicality in language.

Although de Tracy's vision of a "science of ideas" was essentially lost during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries through somewhat limited definitional connotations of ideology as linked solely to relations of power (i.e., between the bourgeoisie and working class), the term has since enjoyed a rebirth. Current interpretations explore ideology more neutrally as an organic, embodied system interwoven into the fabric of discursive practice rather than as an independent structure prescribed through hegemony.

Woolard (1998) analyzes the term as including four strands (which can no doubt be further separated into several sub-strands): 1) ideology as mental phenomena (as De Tracy first conceived the term)—the domain of the ideational and conceptual; 2) ideology as the foundation of metapragmatics; 3) ideology as linked to positions of power through discursive practice—the struggle to acquire and/or maintain power (in this strand, one can speak of 'your ideology' or 'my ideology'); and 4) ideology as distortion or illusion—maintaining the relations of power by disguising or legitimating these relations (see Thompson 1984). This fourth strand conforms most closely to the most commonly (mis)understood meaning of ideology as the rose-colored glasses though which one views the world (e.g., Marx's *camera obscura*—see Eagleton 1993: 76).

Of course, all four strands contribute greatly to the overall understanding of ideologies about language; however, it would appear that the second strand, in which, Woolard considers ideology "... as derived from, rooted in, reflective of, or responsive to the experience or interests of a particular social position" (1994:6) is particularly amenable to studies of the relationship between ideology and language (for further discussion of ideology, see Woolard & Schieffelin 1994, Eagleton 1991, and Williams 1977).

One commonly accepted definition of language ideologies as "…any sets of beliefs about language articulated by the users as a rationalization or justification of

perceived language structure and use" (Silverstein 1979:193) is a productive starting point. Language ideologies extend beyond the realm of referentiality to address language through its indexical nature—to understand language not merely in terms of its semantic denotata (de Saussure's *signifié* and *significant*), but rather as mappings of relationships in the broader social matrix. Such ideological systems, understood as constitutive of a language's metapragmatics, hold far-reaching implications for studies of community discourse practices as well as for appreciating the political context in which these languages are seated.

The term "ideology" itself is subject to the very metapragmatic phenomena it describes. Just as socioeconomic class registers are responsible for differences in pronunciation between *v*[ei]*ses* and *v*[az]*es*, as has been examined in variationist sociolinguistics, pronunciations of the term may vary from [I]deology to [ai]deology according to the practices of particular speech communities (see Silverstein 1994:130). We will return this idea later in section 5.

Given the pervasive nature of linguistic ideologies, these practices can be considered significant acts of social symbolism. Yet the social domain is not the only domain of which language is considered emblematic; one particularly good example of linguistic ideology at Nanbé Owîngeh involves discussions of the landscape surrounding the community. Community language practices can, in addition to map the social matrix, index an important relationship between community members and their native environment.

3. Landscape

3.1 Land and place

Notions of "land" and "landscape" have too often been treated—whether implicitly or explicitly—from externalist, absolutive positions regarding studies of local environments (e.g., geography, ethnobotany) and autochthonous social, cultural, and linguistic systems as separate and unrelated. A growing body of literature has recently emerged from subjective associationist frameworks that are more amenable to analyses of landscape through embodied experience and grounded perspectives.

In *Yellow Woman and a Beauty of the Spirit*, Leslie Marmon Silko observes that "viewers are as a much a part of the landscape as the boulders they stand on" (1996:27). The relationship of language and landscape must be approached not merely from the standpoint that raw physical geography, e.g., geographic isolation, is involved in the form and use of language with that isolation responsible for dialect formation and other processes of language change. Rather, this relationship is based on subjectively-experienced local environments mediating social context through language. That is, landscape is not merely the setting in which language takes place, but an actor whose involvement in language is as intimate as those who use it. Traditional approaches to the relationship between language and landscape are defined in static terms through which landscape is considered only insofar as its physical features and associated consequences on language use are concerned, whereas more recently this relationship has come to be defined more dialectically as the interaction between a community's language practices and the native physical environment in which such practices are borne out.

For example, Silko cites an interesting Acoma greeting, *Nayah, deeni*, or, "Mother, upstairs!", which was used long ago when Pueblo homes were several stories high and were entered from the top (ibid. 54-55).[2] On one level, this expression resembles the modern English greeting "Honey, I'm home"; however, Silko's example carries further significance beyond its function as a domestic greeting and implies a deeply rooted symbolic link between the speaker and the environment in which the speaker experiences the world. Similarly, Basso (1996) stresses that in Apache society certain concepts can only be completely understood in the context of particular physical locations. His discussion of place names brings to bear the fundamental symbolic nature of local landscape and its impact on a community's heritage language practices (see also Basso 1990).

As mentioned earlier, Nanbé Owîngeh is located roughly twenty miles north of Santa Fe, and while the Sandia Mountains are not directly visible from the Pueblo itself, the Nanbé do have a term for the Sandias, *oku p'iin* or 'turtle mountain.' What is particularly striking about this term is that from the northeastern part of New Mexico (in which the back of the Sandias are visible), the western side appears to raise smoothly to its peak and drop off abruptly on the eastern side. Thus, whereas the Sandia ('watermelon') Mountains were so named by the Spanish due to their shape and color at sunset, the Nanbé have adopted the same strategy, but have applied it more specifically to the mountains' position in relation to the Pueblo by imagistically encoding its gestalt into a place name. Understandably, Sandia Pueblo, a Tiwa-speaking tribe located at the base of the eastern side of the Sandias do not regard these mountains as resembling the shape of a turtle because they have a much different perspective on the mountains' physical geography.

However, geography plays another role in Nanbé Tewa, which effects discursive practices more than language form. As a result of the areal organization of Nanbé Owîngeh and implementation of HUD housing, landscape carries a more indirect, though no less significant, effect on language practices in Nanbé Owîngeh.

3.2 Effects of Housing and Urban Development

The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has had a long and important role in Native American communities, and while a complete history of the department cannot be outlined here, two of its most noticeable pieces of legislation are the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 and the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970. The former established the department at the Cabinet level, and the latter approved more substantial subsidy programs aimed to provide further financial support to lower- to moderate-income households. The basic goal of HUD is to provide affordable housing while maintaining acceptable standards of living and thereby reduce levels of homelessness. While HUD is a large governmental department, I will here concentrate on HUD with respect to its implementation in indigenous communities.

The traditional layout of Nanbé Owîngeh was that of closely-knit living arrangements localized around the Kiva, which served (and continues to serve) as the spiritual nucleus of the Pueblo. This long-established pueblo design that promoted intimate communal relationships has since become dispersed through the introduction of

HUD housing. This decentralization of the Pueblo into more geographically separated housing has two significant consequences for heritage language practices in Nanbé.

First, from a strictly geographic perspective, the move from higher population density in traditional pueblo societies to more diffuse pueblo housing decreases social access. If one's neighbor is located five hundred yards away rather than fifty yards away, this by nature provides neighbors with fewer opportunities for interaction (after all, it is difficult to greet, let alone engage in conversation, with a neighbor who is outside of earshot).

Second, while HUD housing may have raised the standard of living for its occupants, many families are forced to work harder to maintain this standard of living. Therefore, because families must work more hours, this increase in time away from home detracts from familial interaction, such that parents will have fewer opportunities to interact with their children in the heritage language. While it is not my intention to criticize HUD practices, as their financial and health advantages are numerous, there are nonetheless unforeseen repercussions incurred by its occupants—specifically that heritage language preservation is adversely affected by the dispersal of housing. Longitudinal study into the effects of HUD housing will be necessary to understand the relationship between housing situations and language shift.

The need to understand the impact of native landscape on heritage language practices calls for an investigation of what constitutes a given community's "ideoscape". To this end, Silverstein (1994, 1998, 2000) investigated the significance of "sites" as places where social groups articulate the ideological through institutionalized ritual. Sites may serve to promote language practices positively, as in Arizona Tewa Kiva speech (Kroskrity 1992, 1993, 1998) or negatively as in women's *kros*-talk in Gapun (see Kulick 1992, 1993). It is important that the notion of site not be limited to the symbolization of physical structures, but that the goings-on within the walls of these structures serve to index specific social relationships. For example, the extent to which Nanbé Tewa is used in Tribal meetings (or its absence, for that matter) could reveal much about the sociopolitical environment in which the heritage language is seated. Further, while Silverstein defines sites in terms of the ideological as articulated through ritual, this by no means restricts its influence to the religious or the traditional spheres, as the educational, domestic, and governmental domains are also possible candidates for ideological sites.

This idea of sitedness in many cases extends beyond the boundaries of the local community and becomes subject to outside interests. In the case of Nanbé, valid sites outside the Pueblo might include university classrooms or grant workshops, in which the use of the heritage language becomes influenced by external pressures. Such pressures could arise as a result of both the local and global sociopolitical environments, particularly with respect to issues of language policy.

4. Language policy

That language practice is in part determined through language policy is not a new idea and is perhaps nowhere more evident than in the unique language situations among indigenous communities of New Mexico. What remains relatively unexplored, however, is the extent to which these policies affect metadiscursive practices within local communities. Among the most controversial English-education enactments passed by the

Bush administration, the *No Child Left Behind Act* may be the most harmful to local heritage language programs.

Meyer (2006) notes that this policy is particularly detrimental to indigenous communities because by defining success in terms of a speedy transition to English, the non-English student's ethnocultural identity is further marginalized. While on the one hand, indigenous students may successfully learn English and conform to the standards prescribed by this policy, they are, on the other hand, acquiring proficiency in English at the expense of the heritage language. This policy, in effect, places the heritage language on the backburner and could potentially marginalize non-English-speaking students not only at school and outside the community, but within the community as well. Thus, students (and their parents) are essentially forced to choose between transitioning to the dominant language which is advantageous for employment or maintaining connections with the heritage language.

Because there are no public schools in Nanbé, schoolchildren must attend nearby Pojoaque public schools. The Pojoaque Public School System offers Tewa classes from kindergarten through twelfth grade for one to two hours a day. These Tewa classes, taught in the Tesuque dialect, fulfill foreign language requirements but are not classified as core curriculum. Despite the wonderful opportunities offered students by Tewa instruction in public schools, there remain several problems.

First, because these classes are not mandatory, many parents choose not to allow their children to take these classes. One reason for this aversion could be related to the previously mentioned fact that such instruction would detract from their children's perceived ability to learn English. Also, due to the grammatical complexity of many Native American languages, parents feel that their children might feel overwhelmed by the subject matter introduced in these classes.

Second, although providing a couple hours of Tewa instruction per day is undoubtedly better than no time at all, this brief class time still limits instruction on the language to a kind of scratching-the-surface pedagogy, in which Tewa structure is only discussed in isolation from its sociocultural context.

Third, while instructors teach in the San Ildefonso and Tesuque Tewa dialects, and all Rio Grande Tewa dialects are for the most part mutually intelligible, our Nanbé consultants report that it is important for students to learn the unique variety of Tewa spoken in Nanbé Owîngeh. Again, while Tewa instruction (in whatever form) is surely positive, students might consider the Tesuque dialect most preferable because this is the variety they experience in the classroom; thus, there could arise an implicit prescriptivist assumption by students that the Tesuque dialect somehow represents "correct" Tewa whereas Nanbé Tewa does not.

Another issue raised by our consultants concerns the process of teacher certification. As Brenda McKenna notes, "The New Mexico State Education Department wants to have certified language teachers for indigenous languages. The pueblos have the authority to certify, and many conclude that if the teacher can speak, this satisfies the requirement of 'certified.'" Also, public school systems might carry additional criteria that prospective language teachers must meet, thus further complicating issues of heritage language instruction.

5. Acts of identity

Before discussing the particulars of language preservation efforts underway at the Pueblo, it will be necessary to present a general overview of the language program at Nanbé. The language program, led by Cora O. McKenna, Evelyn O. Anaya Hatch, Brenda McKenna, and Quella Musgrave, holds classes once a week at the Pueblo for several hours. This program is rather informal and class attendance is not mandatory; students range in age from young children all the way up to Tribal elders. The impetus for this program was borne out of a need for community-level involvement in language education and cultural awareness. Other activities of the language program include an NSF-funded project to compile a dictionary and electronic archive of Nanbé discourse and summer programs for young people (e.g., Youth Conservation Corps, informal summer Tewa classes).

Because the program receives little funding other than generous grants from the National Science Foundation and New Mexico Public Education Department and support from the tribal administration, pedagogical resources are limited, and the language class shares space with the community center located in the Nanbé Owîngeh Tribal Office. Without a space devoted entirely to language education on the Pueblo, the program leaders are essentially forced to work out of the "trunks of [their] cars", as Cora McKenna puts it, transporting materials from home to the community center. Negotiations are currently underway to assign a full-time classroom space devoted to heritage language and cultural education. Such a space would also allow room for a community library of Tewa writings.

It has been noted (e.g., Pieri 2006) that women often shoulder the great responsibility of revitalization efforts. This is particularly evident in Nanbé Pueblo, where all of our consultants are women. Of course, this is not due to an absence of male native Tewa speakers, nor because of their inability or refusal to engage in such work; rather, the prominence of women in language revitalization efforts could be due to a kind of unspoken mutual agreement among community members—a common understanding that certain individuals are more equipped for the rigors and responsibilities of language work than others.

While numerous scholars have proposed that women's involvement in such programs is attributable to their role in the domestic domain ("the keepers of the hearth") as opposed to men, who are traditionally considered the breadwinners of the household, such a distinction essentially promotes an *a priori* disinclination to language preservation work on the part of men. Of course, this is too strong a position; often language programs are spearheaded by men (I am thinking specifically of Tiwa language programs at Sandia and Picuris Pueblos in New Mexico, for example). The ideological implications of gender roles in language revitalization work contain a great deal of interconnections that I will not try to disentangle here, but future research could prove fruitful for discussions of language ideologies and language revitalization work as well.

Some of the most difficult work in language revitalization concerns orthographic choices; these decisions are rarely settled quickly by individuals, let alone through community discourse. As Schieffelin and Doucet observe in Haitian Kreyol, "... metalinguistic terms and ... orthographic debate[s] are deeply rooted in symbolic systems

of representation and in the different and ambivalent meanings ascribed to [ethnic identity]" (1998: 306). This discussion is applicable to the orthographic debate ongoing in the Tewa language program at Nanbé Owîngeh in terms of orthographic type and representation of sounds.

Before a language can be represented in written form, decisions must be made concerning the type of orthography to be used. Decisions whether the language in question should be represented through a logographic, syllabic, or alphabetic system (to name a just a few possibilities) strike at the core of socio-evaluative and metalinguistic issues. While a few communities have adopted non-phonetic writing systems such as the kind implemented for Cherokee in the nineteenth century, most modern language revitalization programs have opted to employ phonetic systems derived from the Roman alphabet. While it might appear an inescapable contradiction to implement writing systems for traditionally orally-transmitted languages—the speakers of which are attempting to minimize or avoid foreign influence (i.e., from English or Spanish) by adopting Western scripts—communities often choose this option because to introduce an altogether different and unfamiliar writing system could mean unnecessarily complicating language instruction and exposing students to further obstacles to learning an already complex language. Indeed, some communities (notably, the Keresan Pueblos of New Mexico) don't want to adopt any script at all, fearing that writing, and its focus on Western educational technologies, will detract from the practice of speaking the language, thereby increasing the number of speakers while also furthering the traditional language practices of oral societies.

Once a general orthographic system has been agreed upon (if these issues are ever truly resolved), the real labor begins as community members and their linguist assistants decide how best to represent a given language's specific phonological inventory using the (generally) accepted writing system. This has proven to be extremely arduous work for those of us involved in the Nanbé Tewa dictionary project. For instance, in the particular system we have adopted, the word for chicken [dii] is represented as "dee". Of course, many linguists would prefer as little disparity as possible between the phonetic transcription of a word and the conventionalized writing system through which it is represented by simply adopting IPA as the *de facto* orthography. However, because the impetus for establishing heritage language orthographies must come from the within the community rather than at the behest of outsiders, the orthographical predilections of linguists are immaterial. Mithun remarks, "Community orthographies must not only reflect distinctions inherent in the language. They must also be easy to learn, which often means exploiting existing literacy skills … They must also be aesthetically pleasing to their users" (1999: 21).

Even in situations where every team member agrees that a certain sound must be represented a certain way in accordance with the conventions dictated by the alphabetic system employed, the feeling that *x* does not look right sometimes arises. While these discussions may appear trivial, they are of central importance to the role of language ideologies in orthographical issues.

Perhaps the most immediate example of ideological import in orthographic issues can be found scattered throughout this very paper—the use of *Nanbé Owîngeh* as

opposed to *Nambé Pueblo*. In the first draft of this paper sent to my consultants at Nanbé, they suggested *Pueblo* be changed to *Owîngeh* because they felt it better represented the spirit of Nanbé. Also, they suggested I use the form *Nanbé* as opposed to *Nambé* because, the former better represents its actual pronunciation. At a fundamental level, the decision by language program leaders to use *Nanbé* instead of *Nambé* and *Owîngeh* rather than *Pueblo* reflects a symbolic preference for that which best represents "Nanbé Tewa-ness". San Juan Pueblo has done much the same thing by officially changing their name to "Ohkay Owîngeh".

At another level this orthographic decision offers us a microcosmic view of the language preservation efforts at Nanbé. While language practice no doubt indexes complex social relationships, the written representation of the language further reproduces cultural norms by instantly proclaiming itself as authoritative. This is the reason why, to whatever degree, their suggestion is a successful act of language preservation—the reader will have had to understand *owîngeh* as village or community, if even for the limited time spent reading this paper. To step back and address the ideological import in language preservation more broadly, the metadiscourse that communities engage in when making such critical decisions on orthography issues is a necessary endeavor, and one that must be addressed first and foremost before reversing language shift is even possible (see Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer 1998).

As mentioned, the language program at Nanbé Owîngeh does not yet have a space devoted solely to language instruction or the archiving of various language materials, so there is no centralized location to which interested students can be referred for accessing language resources. Although the idea of language resources often connotes the collection of written documents and audio recordings, this is not necessarily the shape that such resources must assume. To return to the notion of sitedness, the development of language nests in many communities, for example, also provide a space where the ideological is articulated through ritual; by cordoning off a physical location within which particular social and cultural norms are promoted, participants' actions are determined in relation to their expected conformity to the rules of the site. This is what is particularly appealing about language nests—both teacher and student, master and apprentice are subject to the same governing requirements (e.g., "only Tewa can be spoken in this space"), whereas in traditional Western instruction, the teacher is considered the absolute authority on everything inside the classroom. In working out the myriad issues of language preservation, community members want what works best for them because such efforts are an act of claiming identity.

6. Future directions

6.1 Iconization, fractal recursivity and erasure

Irvine and Gal (2000) propose three semiotic processes through which speakers understand connections between linguistic forms and social phenomena: 1) iconization—transformation of the sign relationship between linguistic features and the social signs they are linked to; 2) fractal recursivity—projection of an opposition onto some other level; 3) erasure—the process through which ideology renders some sociolinguistic phenomena invisible.

An example of iconization is the change in rules for unidentified third person in sentences such as *everyone should bring his swimsuit*. Whereas fifty years ago when the rule governing the use of the singular "generic" masculine as anaphoric to the indefinite pronoun was considered inviolable, it has today become generally accepted to use *his or her* or even *their* in this context. This change in prescriptive conventions reflects a broader transformation in social attitudes which has been reintentionalized among many communities of writers.[3]

One can find a similar example of language use reflecting changing social attitudes at Nanbé Owîngeh. In Nanbé Tewa there are two future suffixes: *-hâymáa*, which is generally understood by all Rio Grande Tewa groups to represent future action, and *-gít'óo*, which is also understood as an indicator of future action among all Rio Grande Tewa languages (the San Juan Tewa Dictionary notes this as a possible future form) but exists as a form that, according to Nanbé consultants, is "uniquely Nanbé". While the exact motivations behind Tewa speakers' use of one form over the other remains unclear, such decisions likely involve a recognition of the connotational subtleties attached to the use of each respective form, such that Nanbé speakers might prefer the *-gít'óo* form because it reflects an attempt to promote Nanbé Tewa language practice as separate and special among the Tewa varieties, whereas San Juan speakers might prefer the *-hâymáa* form because it conforms a more general "Tewa-ness", emphasizing solidarity among the different Tewa pueblos.

An example of fractal recursivity presented by Irvine and Gal (2000) is the adoption of Khoi click consonants in Nguni to indicate social distance. Thus, the introduction of a phonological change in Nguni has come to serve as an emblem for more general social relationships between the Nguni and the Khoi (ibid. 46; for further discussion see Phillips 1998). Similarly, in Nanbé Tewa, our consultants often use the Spanish *café* for 'coffee' even though there exists an autochthonous term, *fénp'oo* ('black water'). As most native Nanbé Tewa speakers are trilingual in Tewa, Spanish, and English, one always has a choice of which term for 'coffee' to use, and thus differences at the lexical level can be considered emblematic of differences at the sociological level.

An example of erasure can be found from early twentieth-century accounts of the ethnocultural and linguistic makeup of Macedonia. This region of Europe, which had long received incomplete treatment in mapping and census projects in the writing of outside observers, suffered a kind of historical misrecognition in which the character and range of Macedonian identity was drastically underestimated, and thus, a complete understanding of that identity was rendered invisible (Irvine and Gal 2000: 60-72). Another example can be seen in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Native American boarding schools in the United States which demonstrate the misrecognition by the government of the unique intra- and inter-social history among Indians. Students from various tribes were often grouped together regardless of their inherent cultural and linguistic differences and treated homogenously, thus rendering invisible the socio-historical identity of each individual and tribal group (see Spicer 1966).

Only a few local examples of these semiotic processes have been presented here, but it should be clear that such a framework offers insights for the study of language ideologies at Nanbé Owîngeh. I shall now like to turn attention to something not

altogether unrelated to the issues presented in the previous section, which concerns the effects of multiple local language revitalization programs.

6.2 Effects of multiple local language preservation programs

The relative success of such preservation efforts as those in New Zealand among the Maori and in Hawaii among native Hawaiians raises more pressing questions concerning the nature of language ideologies between and within local communities. While many of the problems encountered by the Maori and Hawaiians in their respective language programs persist today, the efforts of each group are nonetheless widely accepted as paragons of language revitalization for several reasons, not the least of which is the political environment in which these native languages exist and in which their language programs develop.

In both the case of the Maori and Hawaiians, each language exists as the lone indigenous language in its particular area. Thus, although these locales are not removed from outside linguistic influence, their physical geographies are such that outside influences are minimized. In addition to New Zealand and Hawaii existing as linguistic islands, their relatively isolated locations offer further geographic advantages for engaging in language preservation work. Because each heritage language is the only indigenous language in its area, there is less contention among communities when applying for funding than would be encountered in areas where several linguistic groups are represented.

By contrast, in the case of Nanbé (and most indigenous languages in New Mexico), the Pueblo is neither geographically isolated nor the lone indigenous language in the area. This unique indigenous language situation presents a suite of problems absent from New Zealand and Hawaii. One of the most apparent difficulties resulting from the areally clustered indigenous languages of New Mexico is the variation of writing systems. While several heritage languages have not introduced writing systems or are relatively closed to outsiders (e.g., Jemez Towa), the communities have often disagreed on issues of standard orthography. Obviously, one of the aims of a local community in implementing a writing system for its heritage language is to represent the specific historico-cultural context as unique to *x* community; however, one consequence of this distinctiveness is the absence of a universal standard orthography. So instead of a unified Tewa orthography, there are multiple generally accepted alphabets (e.g., Nanbé Tewa, Santa Clara Tewa, San Juan Tewa).

This is not to claim that all Tewa-speaking Pueblos should adhere to a universal Tewa writing system—such a goal might ultimately be unattainable (or inappropriate); rather, the long-term ideological implications of such orthographic decisions must be kept in consideration when developing writing systems. Future research could prove fruitful in determining the nature of the relationship between modalities of language revitalization and the ethnocultural, sociohistorical and political context in which indigenous languages exist.

Notes

* I wish to acknowledge Melissa Axelrod, Cora O. McKenna, Evelyn O. Anaya Hatch, Brenda G. McKenna, Quella Musgrave, and the Nanbé Tribal Council, without whose help this work would certainly have not been possible. This research was funded by the National Science Foundation, Grant # BCS-0505107.

1. I note that Nanbé has an unmarked "tense" here because, as Mithun (1999) observes, even though Tewa verbs may in fact mark temporality through aspect, speakers nonetheless treat these as tense distinctions.

2. It is unclear if this expression remains in use today by Acoma speakers.

3. By some, though not all, communities of writers, I mean that many traditionalists continue to use *he* to represent an unidentified third person, while other groups of writers have adopted *he or she*/*she*.

References

Barthes, Roland. 1986. *The Rustle of Language*. Translated by Richard Howard. New York: Hill and Wang.

Basso, Keith. 1990. *Western Apache Language and Culture: Essays in Linguistic Anthropology*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Basso, Keith. 1996. *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language Among the Western Apache*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Bybee, Joan. 1985. *Morphology*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Dauenhauer, N. M. and R. Dauenhauer. 1998. Technical, emotional and ideological issues in reversing language shift: examples from southeast Alaska. Pp. 57-98 in *Endangered Languages*, (ed.) by Lenore A. Grenoble and Lindsay J. Whaley. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Dozier, Edward P. 1949. *Tentative description and classification of Tewa verb structure*. M.A. Thesis. University of New Mexico

Dozier, Edward P. 1953. Tewa II: Verb Structure. *IJAL* 19, 2: 118-127.

Eagleton, Terry. 1991. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso.

Goodwin, Charles, 1994. Professional Vision. American Anthropologist 96: 606-633.

Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. New York: International.

Harrington, John P. 1910. A Brief Description of the Tewa Language. *American Anthropologist* 12, 4: 497-504.

Harrington, John P. 1912. Tewa Relationship Terms. *American Anthropologist* 14, 3: 472-498.

Hoijer, Harry, and Edward P. Dozier. 1949. The Phonemes of Tewa, Santa Clara Dialect. *IJAL* 15, 3: 139-144.

Irvine, Judith T. 1998. Ideologies of Honorific Language. Pp. 51-67 in *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* (ed.) by Bambi Shieffelin, Kathryn A. Woolard, and Paul Kroskrity. New York: Oxford University Press.

Irvine, Judith T. and Susan Gal. 2000. Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation.

Pp. 35-83 in *Regimes of Language*, (ed.) by Paul V. Kroskrity. Santa Fe: Santa Fe School of American Research Press.

Krauss, Michael. 1992. Endangered languages. *Language*, 68, 1: 1-42.

Kroskrity, Paul V. 1992. Arizona Tewa Public Announcements: Form, Function, and Language Ideology. *Anthropological Linguistics* 34:104-116.

Kroskrity, Paul V. 1993. *Language, History, and Identity: Ethnolinguistic Studies of the Arizona Tewa*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Kroskrity, Paul V. 1998. Arizona Tewa Kiva Speech as a Manifestation of a Dominant Language Ideology. Pp. 103-122 in *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* ed. by Bambi Shieffelin, Kathryn A. Woolard, and Paul Kroskrity. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kroskrity, Paul V. 2000. Language Ideologies in the Expression of and Representation of Arizona Tewa Ethnic Identity. Pp. 329-360 in *Regimes of Language*, (ed.) by Paul V. Kroskrity. Santa Fe: Santa Fe School of American Research Press.

Kulick, Don. 1992. *Language shift and cultural Reproduction: Socialization, Self, and Syncretism in a Papua New Guinean Village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kulick, Don. 1993. Speaking as a Woman: Structure and Gender in Domestic Arguments in a New Guinea Village. *Cultural Anthropology* 8, 4: 510-541.

Meyer, Lois. 2006. Methods, Meanings and Education Policy in the United States. Forthcoming in *The International Handbook of English Language Teaching*, Vol.1, (ed.) Jim Cummins and Chris Davison. Norwell, MA: Springer Publications.

Mithun, Marianne. 1999. *The Languages of Native North America*. Cambridge: Cambirdge University Press.

Ortiz, Alfonso. 1969. *The Tewa World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Phillips, Susan U. 1998. *Ideological Diversity in Judges' Courtroom Discourses: Due Process Rights in Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pieri, Katy. 2006. "Women's Roles in Language Revitalization Programs." MA Thesis: University of New Mexico.

Schieffelin, Bambi B. and Rachelle Charlier Doucet. 1998. The "Real" Haitian Creole: Ideology, Metalinguistics, and Orthographic Choice. Pp. 285-316 in *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* (ed.) by Bambi Shieffelin, Kathryn A. Woolard, and Paul Kroskrity. New York: Oxford University Press.

Silko, Leslie Marmon. 1996. *Yellow Woman and a Beauty of the Spirit*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Silverstein, Michael. 1979. Language structure and linguistic ideology. Pp. 193-247 in *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels*, (ed.) by Paul R. Cline, William F. Hanks, and Carol L. Hofbauer. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Silverstein, Michael. 1998. The uses and utility of ideology: a commentary. Pp. 123-45 in *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* (ed.) by Bambi Shieffelin, Kathryn A. Woolard, and Paul Kroskrity. New York: Oxford University Press.

Speirs, Randall. 1966. "Some Aspects of the Structure of Rio Grande Tewa." UMI

Dissertation Services: State University of New York at Buffalo.
Spicer, Edward H. 1962. *Cycles of Conquest*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
Thompson, John B. 1984. *Studies in the Theory of Ideology*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
Williams, Raymond. 1977. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Woolard, Kathryn. 1998. Language ideology as a field of inquiry. Pp. 3-47 in *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* (ed.) by Bambi Shieffelin, Kathryn A. Woolard, and Paul Kroskrity. New York : Oxford University Press.
Woolard, Kathryn A., and Bambi B. Shieffelin. 1994. Language Ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23: 55-82.