

- *Jennifer Roth-Gordon*
- *Norma Mendoza-Denton*

University of Arizona

jenrothg@email.arizona.edu

nmd@email.arizona.edu

Introduction: The Multiple Voices of Jane Hill¹

Introduction

This volume celebrates the scholarly contributions of Jane H. Hill, who retired as Regents' Professor of Anthropology and Linguistics from the University of Arizona in 2009. An internationally renowned linguistic anthropologist, Hill's nearly 50-year career in academia (B.A. 1960, University of California, Berkeley) includes contributions to the study of Uto-Aztecan, Native North American languages, historical linguistics, language endangerment and revitalization, sociopolitical contexts of multilingualism, language ideologies, white racist language, and language and political economy. Notable among her many honors and awards, Hill was elected as a fellow to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1998, and she is also a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. From 1997-1999, Hill served as President of the American Anthropological Association, and in 2004, she received the Wenner-Gren Foundation's prestigious Viking Fund Medal in Anthropology. In 2009, she was awarded the Franz Boas Award by the American Anthropological Association, for distinguished service to the field of anthropology. In what follows, we briefly summarize some of the highlights of Hill's scholarly publications and then discuss the themes from her work that reverberate in the contributions to this special issue.

Jane Hill began her research trajectory with the study of the grammar of the Cupeño language, at first drawn to the linguistic urgency of an endangered language. Decades of research culminated in the publication of *A Grammar of Cupeño* in the prestigious University of California Publications in Linguistics Series in 2005 (Hill 2005a). Her interests in language obsolescence, endangerment, and maintenance also prompted her to extend her inquiry into the Nahuatl language (also known as Mexicano, see Hill and Hill 1986, translated into Spanish in 1999) and into the Tohono O'odham language (see Hill and Zepeda 1998, 1999). She is now a pre-eminent scholar of Uto-Aztecan languages, moving easily between analyses of grammar, historical linguistics, and sociopolitical contexts of language use (Hill 1983, 1992, 2001b, 2008a).

In addition to Uto-Aztecan and historical linguistics, Jane Hill insightfully drew on Bakhtinian notions of dialogism (1981), describing multilingual situations as linguistic struggles waged "within people as well as within their communities, between languages and the social worlds they symbolize" (Kroskrity, this issue). Hill helped pioneer sociopolitical investigations of language endangerment (Hill 1979, 1993b, 2002), bilingualism, the study of language and political economy (Hill 1985), and the field of linguistic ideologies (Hill 1998b). Decades later, these themes have become

some of linguistic anthropology's most fruitful areas of inquiry, allowing for strong cross-fertilization with the subfield of cultural anthropology. In addition to the many bridges her work creates within and beyond the discipline of anthropology, one of the foundations of Hill's work is a deep personal and academic commitment to blending scientific study with the goal of social justice, or in the words of Alessandro Duranti, to engage in "*changing the world . . . by affecting what speakers believe that language is or does*" (2008).

Jane Hill's residence in Tucson, Arizona led her to a third substantial body of work on "Mock Spanish" (Hill 1993a, 1995a, 1998a, 2001a, 2005b, 2008b). This term (since adapted by others to a variety of linguistic contexts, see Barrett 2006; Carris 2011; Chun 2009; Meek 2006; Ronkin and Karn 1999) describes the frequent and often ungrammatical tokens of Spanish used by otherwise fiercely monolingual speakers of English. Taking examples from both popular culture and everyday speech, including the Terminator machine's use of "Hasta la vista, baby" in the film *Terminator 2* (see Roth-Gordon, this issue), Hill began with a simultaneously obvious and controversial question: Why, within a larger sociopolitical context of English-Only legislation and immigration panic, would white English speakers choose to use so much Spanish? Her answer, a detailed semiotic analysis of how such "trivial" linguistic tokens actually index and reproduce deep prejudices against Mexicans and Spanish speakers, led her to the 2008 publication of *The Everyday Language of White Racism* (Hill 2008b). This larger series of linguistic investigations into everyday racism positioned Hill as one of the leading scholars on the intersections of race, language, and whiteness.

The authors in this volume engage with all of these strands of Hill's work, and we summarize their contributions according to four main themes: multivocality, typification, circulation, and racialization.

Multivocality

As several contributions to this issue attest (Chernela, Keane, Kroskrity), Jane Hill is to be credited with bringing Bakhtinian notions of heteroglossia under the purview of linguistic anthropology. In critical publications in the mid-80s (Hill 1985, 1986), Hill engaged linguistic analysis to reveal language as a site of struggle in which utterances confront other utterances to convey a point of view, calling our attention to what Keane (this issue) calls "the productivity of the clash of voices." Applying these insights to situations of multilingualism, Hill suggested that the juxtaposition of different linguistic varieties revealed "a translinguistic battlefield, upon which two ways of speaking struggle for dominance" (1985:731). Turning to embrace "voice" as her unit of analysis, Hill reworked "traditional Bloomfieldian units of analysis, [including] nested boxes of idiolects, dialects, and languages . . . to identify social personages in a *relational assemblage*" (Mannheim 2008).

Drawing on Hill and Irvine's (1993) study of voicing, evidence, and responsibility, Chernela explores how speakers of Wanano, an Eastern Tukanoan language, blend rhetorical choice, grammar, and speaker values through the creative use of evidentials in the "brash, derogatory, and bawdy" ceremonial performances of unmarried women. Playing with embarrassing nicknames that draw on animal metaphors as a system of address forms, these women embed intertextual references, reported speech, and dialogic speech into the lyrics of their spontaneous songs. Their verbal duel is filled with examples of reported speech in which they are grammatically obligated to include evidentiary stance in the form of terminal morphemes (in particular, the contrasting *-re* to mark information directly witnessed by the speaker vs. *-yuka* to mark information received by the speaker through hearsay). Reported speech and stance have usefully been analyzed in terms of the distance they create between a speaker and their message, but here Chernela's data complicates direct connections between evidentials and truth-value, commitment, and responsibility. The invented scenarios between metaphorical animals

(representing not only the dueling addressee but also members of the audience, including Chernela) may contain evidential markers of eyewitness certainty, marking for listeners that the utterance is, in fact, not to be believed. As Chernela notes of these cases, “the evidential does not convey truth but it does purport a claim to it. That claim may—and in this case should be—contested by the listeners” (this issue). When the speaker must engage in the socially awkward task of continuing the taunts, which may refer to relative strangers whom she should treat with respect, she opts for indirect speech and an evidential stance of hearsay. The increased distance between speaker and message serves to minimize commitment to the utterance and mitigate possible social offense. In his description of the significance of Hill’s contributions to the study of multivocality, Mannheim notes that Hill describes voices as “social facts . . . [that] occur in between—not within—individuals” (2008). Chernela’s discussion encourages us to locate the truth-value of evidentials similarly in that social space between speaker and audience, between claim and interpretation. Through her linguistic analysis of rhetorical choice, reported speech, and evidential stance, Chernela describes the carnivalesque dialogism of unmarried women’s songs as a form of “back-talk” which parodies the more formal ceremonial speech that has preceded it and offers up a “mischievous form of social commentary.”

Typification

The link between multivocality and typification emerges in a number of the papers in this collection (Philips, Keane, Mendoza-Denton), illuminating the various processes through which voices present in both speakers’ narratives and circulated retellings precipitate into personae or social types (Agha 2007; Eckert 2008; Mendoza-Denton 2008; Silverstein 2003). Inspired by Hill’s (1998b) work on the language ideologies surrounding honorific systems in Mexicano, Philips proposes a distinction in the way that the concept of language ideology is deployed, suggesting that linguistic anthropologists attend to a distinction between *normative hegemonic language ideology* versus *phenomenological metapragmatics*. In order to make this novel distinction, Philips draws specifically on Schutz’s (1970) “biographically determined situation” to argue that Tongan speakers’ individual sense-making of the use and nonuse of honorifics by nobles is mediated by the biographical experiences that users have had not only with honorifics in Tongan, but also with the particular people (as individuals and as types) that are being assessed for the use of the speech forms. Philips stresses that phenomenological interpretation may refer to broader cultural conversations about change, providing us with a link between phenomenological metapragmatics and normative hegemonic ideologies. In contrast to normative language ideologies of honorifics espoused by the Tongan state, phenomenological interpretations are (1) smaller in time and scope; (2) not evenly disseminated to or shared by all adult Tongans (unlike the state’s version of honorific language-usage-equivalence charts); (3) multiple, since there are often several indexical orders being invoked; and (4) fluid, as at any one point, one type of sense-making explanation may easily rise to the surface while others remain in the background. In Philips’ example, her informants’ interpretation of the lack of honorific use by a specific noble was variously articulated in their phenomenological metapragmatics as being due to having a commoner mother, as resulting from a particular type of (Mormon) high school education, or as being due to the increasing westernization and abandonment of traditional Tongan ways by chiefly persons. By widening the analytical lens of language ideologies and considering phenomenological explanation, Philips is able to delve into these attitudes as typifications-in-progress to arrive at a wider generalization: Honorific change among chiefly persons is conceptualized as resulting from ongoing exposure to Western European institutions and influence, and specifically from exposure to English.

A major tension in Jane Hill’s oeuvre is the link between individual action and broader social structures, including grammar (1985). If Philips seeks to address this

tension by adumbrating the way that hegemonic language ideologies are built up from situated biographical understandings, Keane then asks: How are we to understand the linguistic phenomena captured in our narratives and interactions in ways that transcend individual moments of stance-taking or style-shifting? How are we to link these seemingly fleeting social judgments (which Keane argues, *après Bakhtin* (1981), are always undergirded by evaluative dimensions) to larger characterological figures that transcend the time of an individual utterance or semiotic act and that are recognized by others as forming part of the world toward which social actors orient? Keane takes as his starting point the relatively self-contained dramaturgical world of Erving Goffman (1967[1955]), but it is his development of Hill's treatment of the voices of Don Gabriel (1995b) that frames his larger interest in the moral possibilities at play for speakers. Keane reminds us that Goffman's "presentation of self" is actually a kind of "moral work on the self" and that "the objectification of moral possibilities, through such means as staging different voices, plays a critical role in the development of self-knowledge" (see also Mertz 1998:132). Through the staging of different voices, and the conflicts among them, speakers arrive at their affiliations and crystallize their commitments. Of course, this process is never completely finished, as speakers continue evolving in their affiliations and moral connections past the moment of utterance and through "trajectories of stance-taking" (Jaffe 2009:19-20). The linguistic and other semiotic pieces that we capture represent fragments of the process through which speakers engage in the ongoing construction of personae and the social sedimentation of variables and registers. It is as though by embarking on the use of particular linguistic features (or by showing the difficulty of such commitments through dysfluencies, as in Hill 1995b), speakers are not only "choosing different ways of saying the same thing," as the clichéd hand-me-down definition of a variable goes, but crucially, morally assessing different ways of saying the same thing. To cite Keane, "In Hill's analysis, stylistic variations bear moral implications first, because they are choices among options, and second, those choices index both a cast of social figures who manifest distinct commitments and visions of the good, and the speaker's identification with or estrangement from them" (this issue).

Insofar as stance is momentary and fleeting, and yet it accrues and results in crystallized styles, wider enregisterment, and typification, its understanding can and should draw from Keane's and Hill's insights into the moral assessment of linguistic choices. The staging of voices happens through time, and gives new urgency to the examination of variables not as frozen fieldwork snapshots to be compared, but as unfolding assessments in and of themselves. Keane holds that "indexicality which allows one to identify the formal features of a stretch of discourse as a voice depends on a potential or postulated resemblance involving some more durable or systematized imagery." The study of typification raises the question of discrimination between what is figure and what is ground. When we claim that a speaker is staging personae, or "trying them on for size," as it were, how do the speakers select what parts of the persona to focus on, what subset of the constellation of variables (Half Moon Bay Style Collective, 2008) to highlight in their performance? How does innovative staging stand out from some previously presented version of the self? Does it involve the mobilization of a single prominent feature or the wholesale recruitment of a cluster of features? Once typification has already taken place, one can presumably compare features from the persona or frame of reference that is invoked, in phenomenological terms (Eisenlohr 2008; Hanks 1996; Schutz 1970), to those in the evolving staging to answer the latter question. But what about newly emerging personae, those that are perhaps not already recognized as variables co-occurring in a specific style or stance? It is these epiphenomenal personae and styles that are taken up in the contributions by Mendoza-Denton and Gaudio, who describe processes of typification and regimentation as they derive from contexts of language circulation.

Linking Typification and Circulation

Mendoza-Denton documents, in the twenty-year span since the early 1990s, the widening circulation of *creaky voice* (and its cousins *harsh voice* and *pressed voice*) and the concomitant increasing typification of a “hardcore Chicano gangster” persona. The feature of creaky voice was found in the speech production of gang-involved girls (among others) in California in the early 1990s, but its spread only picked up speed as part of the hardcore Chicano gangster persona once it started circulating through the mediatized formats of movies, popular hip hop songs, and later on in videogames. Circulation of talk and text are important themes in Jane Hill’s work, especially in her later work on Mock Spanish (see Hill 2005b), where she notes that the production and reproduction of white racism relies on the circulation of metaphors, gaffes, appropriations, and imitations of subgroups that may pass unnoticed by the broader population. The lack of metapragmatic awareness of a single feature motivates Mendoza-Denton to argue for the introduction of an analytical distinction: She describes creaky voice as a *semiotic hitchhiker*, a linguistic feature that has no vehicle of its own and is found only co-occurring with other variables (as voice quality and intonational phenomena are prone to do). Mendoza-Denton provides evidence that even though some type of nonmodal voicing is consistently part of the staging of the persona, speakers are hardly aware of it. Gumperz remarks of contextualization cues that they are “habitually used and perceived but rarely consciously noted and almost never talked about directly” (1982:131). The lack of metapragmatic awareness of creaky voice can be seen in Mendoza-Denton’s examples of web tutorials and youtube vlogs on “how to be a Cholo.” Unlike code-switching and discourse markers, which are overtly mentioned in these new media sources, creaky voice is enacted but not included as part of the inventory of attributes of the persona. Having become enregistered within an early narrative context, creaky voice is then catapulted by waves of centrifugal media forces. Ultimately, Mendoza-Denton seeks to illuminate our understanding of processes of typification and circulation that allow the micro- (and, in this case, the metapragmatically invisible) to acquire associations with indexical fields and personae (Eckert 2008).

Gaudio takes up related questions of ideologization and politicization, as he documents the use of Nigerian Pidgin (NP) by Nigerian popular singers, who reflect the various preoccupations of the body politic with racialized, ethnicized, religious, and gendered belonging. Nigerian Pidgin is linked in the popular imagination with ideologies of what it means to be Southern Nigerian: Christian, English-speaking, and more Westernized. Northern Nigeria is associated with the Muslim, Hausa-speaking “core” of Nigeria, much of it under Shari’a law and ambivalent if not intolerant toward musical expression and westernization, let alone toward global hip hop’s overtly sexualizing and materialist orientation. The construction of NP in Nigerian Public Space has strong resonances with Hill’s work on Mock Spanish because the distinction in regionalization of NP is imbued with Nigerian ideologies of race. Gaudio draws on historical and contemporary evidence to advance the claim that one of the reasons that Nigerian Pidgin is less prevalent in the Muslim North dates back to deep-seated perceptions of the cultural (and racial) differences between the North and South, differences that were reinforced by the colonial experience. As Gaudio writes,

“The reason for this, I’ve been told, is that before the White man came, Hausa Muslims had a ‘real’ civilization, marked among other things by literacy and a world religion. [...] Colonialist ideologies [...] did in fact regard Hausa-speaking Muslims as linguistically, ethnically and racially more ‘evolved’ than other ethnic groups.” (Gaudio, this issue)

These historical distinctions are reflected in the greater popularity of musical genres from North Africa, and to some extent South Asia (including Indonesia and Bollywood), in predominantly Muslim North Nigeria, and the greater popularity of Afro-Caribbean and Afro-British musical styles and sensibilities in the Nigerian South.

If Hill and Gaudio draw on the concept of “orderly disorder” (1998a, 2008b) to describe the entertaining appropriation of stigmatized language varieties to construct a racialized national public, then humor, music, and other forms of entertainment are strong candidates for semiotic recruitment in the construction of public spaces that help to uphold the interests of the powerful. The three Northern Nigerian hip hop artists examined in Gaudio’s work have varying levels of engagement with the Black Atlantic tradition, and varying and strategic uses of NP. Circulation of (and the interdiction of songs in) Nigerian Pidgin, Hausa, and other varieties betrays the turbulent state of the Nigerian Public Sphere, as complex laminations of region, race, and language are negotiated in each performer’s repertoire.

Racialization

In his contribution to this special issue, Kroskrity outlines three major components of Hill’s work and describes their impact on his own research trajectory. These include a focus on endangered languages and the critical analysis of how these languages are represented by outside advocates; a dynamic interpretation of indigenous individuals as “thoughtful yet constrained” social actors living through situations of socioeconomic upheaval and language shift; and an examination of the role of language in the construction and reproduction of racism. Invigorated by Hill’s strategic choice to “put a face on language shift” by “highlighting individuals as critical figures” in the representation of situations of language endangerment, Kroskrity details the life circumstances of the late Rosalie Bethel of North Fork, California, a biracial Mono woman who nearly lost her Native language and connections to her heritage under the pressures of her German-American father but later dedicated her life to its revitalization. Her personal experiences of enforced language loss run parallel to those of her community, offering opportunities to better understand language shift through extended life histories. Kroskrity’s analysis complements Philips’ and Keane’s turn to phenomenological thought in order to understand the ways speakers’ life histories change their linguistic resources and repertoires. It is through Kroskrity’s involvement with Rosalie Bethel’s language renewal activities that he later identifies “narrative inequality” as a form of linguistic racism that has emerged in his research. Western Mono traditional stories have been described by outside researchers (including salvage anthropologists) as featuring “repetition, lack of metaphorical expression, and simplicity.” The implicit comparisons made to Western styles of narration ignore examples of intertextuality and Bakhtinian dialogism found in the performances, allowing their relative “simplicity” to indirectly index enduring racialized stereotypes of Native peoples as marked by “primitivity, intellectual inferiority, and childishness.” Kroskrity thus aligns his project of “decentering discursive ethnocentrism” with Hill’s goal of revealing the covertly racist linguistic practices of white Americans that contribute to present day U.S. racial hierarchy.

Roth-Gordon takes up Hill’s study of the linguistic construction of racial hierarchy to explore the “permeability of race.” While Hill describes how linguistic forms are racialized through their participation in intertextual chains (Hill 2005b) and their heteroglossic juxtaposition in daily discourse—notably in the register of Mock Spanish, Roth-Gordon asks how the bodies of speakers are racialized through their strategic use of these linguistic features. Here she argues that rather than securing whiteness for individuals, the use of Mock Spanish actually causes white English speakers to “lose whiteness” through implications of cross-racial contact and contamination. Her argument builds on Hill’s notion of “orderly disorder” (Hill 1998a, 2008b), both to define whiteness in terms of the presumed ability to exhibit proper linguistic discipline and bodily control and to rework our understanding of what white people do when they “flirt” with the disorder associated with nonwhite practices. Drawing on examples taken from popular culture and current events, including the reanalysis of the metapragmatic lesson in Mock Spanish offered to the Terminator machine played by Arnold Schwarzenegger, Roth-Gordon describes acts of linguistic

disciplining and disorder that racially transform bodies in and out of whiteness. In the first case, use of English and control over Spanish is used to discipline nonwhite *latino* bodies to make them “less threatening, more controlled, and racially whiter” (this issue). These displays of discipline and control may be state-enforced, as when parents, employees, and students are told to control their Spanish, particularly within institutional contexts such as schools and courtrooms (though the reach of institutions may extend into the home and other “private spaces”). But these “racial improvement projects” may also be embraced by *latino* speakers themselves, as strategic acts of racial assimilation. These moves into whiteness are paralleled by racial transformations that take place when white people lose whiteness through real and imagined connections to *latinos* and Spanish speaking. Here white English speakers may either carefully avoid contact with the Spanish language and Spanish speakers (in patriotic defenses of English-Only legislation or the refusal to hire Spanish-speaking domestic help, for example) or risk “contamination” and the loss of whiteness when they optionally learn Spanish and socialize with Spanish speakers. As Roth-Gordon argues, even use of mock forms of nonwhite language varieties constitute shifts out of whiteness, as speakers temporarily display a “lack of linguistic refinement and control” in order to take on the carefree and laidback persona associated with nonwhiteness.

Building on Hill’s work, then, both Kroskrity and Roth-Gordon demonstrate how the analysis of language use (including metapragmatic commentary) can further goals of racial justice by documenting how dominant language ideologies embed the elevation of whiteness and the subordination of people of color. Many of Hill’s most enduring contributions to the field of linguistic anthropology—from Don Gabriel to the study of Mock Spanish—charted a course for the study of language and political economy. Along these lines, all of the pieces in this special issue turn a critical eye to the study of language within sociopolitical context, where ideas of what speakers know (Chernela and Philips), what speakers value (Keane), and what speakers accomplish through the use of specific linguistic features or speech styles (Gaudio, Kroskrity, Mendoza-Denton, Roth-Gordon) all play a central role in constituting the social world around us.

Several of the papers included here are expanded versions of presentations given at the American Anthropological Association Meetings in San Francisco, in November 2008. Our title, *The Multiple Voices of Jane Hill*, comes from Bruce Mannheim (2008) and foregrounds the three intersecting levels of multivocality to which the articles attend: First, we highlight the multiple scholarly publications and research trajectories that Hill seamlessly wove into one academic career. Second, in addition to Hill’s own voices, this group of authors includes both longtime and more recent colleagues who have engaged in dialogue with Jane Hill and her work. The contributors assembled here thus represent a small subset of the different scholarly voices that have spoken most loudly to her. And finally, we hope that this collection will inspire the continued teaching and appreciation of Jane Hill’s work, both within the field of linguistic anthropology and beyond, as Hill’s voice inspires future generations of scholars.

Note

1. We thank Misty Jaffe for her tremendous efforts on this volume, Sandro Duranti for kicking it all off, the multiple anonymous reviewers who generously provided feedback on individual pieces and the entire issue, Antonio José B. da Silva for his careful reading of all of the contributions including our own, and the nearly two dozen panelists on the 2008 AAA panel honoring Jane Hill who provided the inspiration for this special issue. A large and dedicated group of linguistic and cultural anthropology graduate students at the University of Arizona, including Ashley Stinnett, Joon-Beom Chu, and Dana Osborne, helped organize the AAA panel and festivities. To Jane, we wish a heartfelt, “~Hasta la vista, Ba-by~!”

References

- Agha, Asif
2007 *Language and Social Relations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M.
1981 *The Dialogic Imagination*. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, trans. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Barrett, Rusty
2006 *Language Ideology and Racial Inequality: Competing Functions of Spanish in an Anglo-owned Mexican Restaurant*. *Language in Society* 35:163–204.
- Carris, Lauren Mason
2011 *La Voz Gringa: Latino Stylization of Linguistic (In)authenticity as Social Critique*. *Discourse & Society* 22(4):474–490.
- Chun, Elaine W.
2009 *Ideologies of Legitimate Mockery: Margaret Cho's Revoicings of Mock Asian*. In *Beyond Yellow English: Toward a Linguistic Anthropology of Asian Pacific America*. Angela Reyes and Adrienne Lo, eds. Pp. 261–287. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Duranti, Alessandro
2008 *The Political Attitude*. Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Anthropological Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Eckert, Penelope
2008 *Variation and the Indexical Field*. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12(4):453–476.
- Eisenlohr, Patrick
2008 *Materialities of Entextualization: The Domestication of Sound Reproduction in Mauritian Muslim Devotional Practices*. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 20(2):314–333.
- Goffman, Erving
1967[1955] *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Gumperz, John J.
1982 *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Half Moon Bay Style Collective
2008 *The Elements of Style*. Poster presented at the 35th New Ways of Analyzing Variation Conference, Columbus, OH.
- Hanks, William F.
1996 *Language and Communicative Practices*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Hill, Jane H.
1979 *Language Death, Language Contact, and Language Evolution*. In *Approaches to Language: Anthropological Issues*. William McCormack and Stephen A. Wurm, eds. Pp. 45–78. The Hague: Mouton and Company.
1983 *Language Death in Uto-Aztecan*. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 49:258–276.
1985 *The Grammar of Consciousness and the Consciousness of Grammar*. *American Ethnologist* 12:725–737.
1986 *The Refiguration of the Anthropology of Language*. *Cultural Anthropology* 1(1):89–102.
1992 *The Flower World of Old Uto-Aztecan*. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 48: 117–144.
1993a *Hasta La Vista, Baby: Anglo Spanish in the American Southwest*. *Critique of Anthropology* 13(2):145–176.
1993b *Structure and Practice in Language Death*. In *Progression and Regression in Language*. Kenneth Hyltenstam and Ake Viberg, eds. Pp. 68–93. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1995a *Junk Spanish, Covert Racism, and the (Leaky) Boundary between Public and Private Spheres*. *Pragmatics* 5(2):197–212.
1995b *The Voices of Don Gabriel: Responsibility and Self in A Modern Mexicano Narrative*. In *The Dialogic Emergence of Culture*. Dennis Tedlock and Bruce Mannheim, eds. Pp. 97–147. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
1998a *Language, Race, and White Public Space*. *American Anthropologist* 100(3):680–689.
1998b *Today There is no Respect: Nostalgia, "Respect" and Oppositional Discourse in Mexicano (Nahuatl) Language Ideology*. In *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. Bambi B. Schieffelin, Kathryn A. Woolard, and Paul V. Kroskrity, eds. Pp. 68–86. New York: Oxford University Press.

- 2001a Mock Spanish, Covert Racism, and the (Leaky) Boundary between Public and Private Spheres. *In* *Languages and Publics: The Making of Authority*. Susan Gal and Kathryn A. Woolard, eds. Pp. 83-102. Northampton, MA: St. Jerome.
- 2001b Proto-Uto-Aztecan: A Community of Cultivators in Central Mexico? *American Anthropologist* 103(4):913-934.
- 2002 "Expert Rhetorics" in Advocacy for Endangered Languages: Who is Listening, and What do They Hear? *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 12(2):119-133.
- 2005a *A Grammar of Cupeño*. University of California Publications in Linguistics, Vol. 136. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 2005b Intertextuality as Source and Evidence for Indirect Indexical Meanings. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15(1):113-124.
- 2008a Northern Uto-Aztecan and Kiowa-Tanoan: Evidence for Contact between the Proto-Languages? *International Journal of American Linguistics* 74:155-88.
- 2008b *The Everyday Language of White Racism*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hill, Jane H. and Kenneth C. Hill
- 1986 *Speaking Mexicano*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- 1999 *Hablando Mexicano*. Jose Antonio Flores Farfán and Gerardo López Cruz, trans. México: CIESAS/INI.
- Hill, Jane H. and Judith T. Irvine
- 1993 *Responsibility and Evidence in Oral Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hill, Jane H. and Ofelia Zepeda
- 1998 Tohono O'odham (Papago) plurals. *Anthropological Linguistics* 40:1-42.
- 1999 Language, Gender, and Biology: Pulmonic Ingressive Airstream in Tohono O'odham Women's Speech. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 18:15-40.
- Jaffe, Alexandra
- 2009 Introduction: The Sociolinguistics of Stance. *In* *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Alexandra Jaffe, ed. Pp. 3-28. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mannheim, Bruce
- 2008 *The Voices of Jane Hill*. Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Anthropological Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Meek, Barbra A.
- 2006 And the Injun Goes "How!": Representations of American Indian English in White Public Space. *Language in Society* 35(1):93-128.
- Mendoza-Denton, Norma
- 2008 *Homegirls: Language and Cultural Practice among Latina Youth Gangs*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Mertz, Elizabeth
- 1998 Linguistic Ideology and Praxis in U.S. Law School Classrooms. *In* *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. Bambi B. Schieffelin, Kathryn A. Woolard, and Paul V. Kroskrity, eds. Pp. 149-162. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ronkin, Maggie and Helen E. Karn
- 1999 Mock Ebonics: Linguistic Racism in Parodies of Ebonics on the Internet. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3(3):360-380.
- Schutz, Alfred
- 1970 *On Phenomenology and Social Relations*. Helmut R. Wagner, ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Silverstein, Michael
- 2003 Indexical Order and the Dialectics of Sociolinguistic Life. *Language and Communication* 23(3-4):193-229.