

An American Indigenous perspective in what we label the study of language in culture: Is it “Anthropology” or “Linguistics” and does it matter?

Paul R. Tamburro
(Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana)

Introduction

In 1980 I first began my scholarly study of linguistics in graduate school. At that time my goal was to develop skills in working with peoples of diverse language and cultural backgrounds. My central belief was that people should be able to retain their cultural and linguistic differences instead of the “melting-pot” approach endorsed by U.S. immigration policies in the 20th century. I hoped to participate in the maintenance or revival of languages and cultures being assimilated into the socially Euro-centric United States. I was concerned about language loss for American Indian peoples and the likelihood of this happening for the next generation of incoming Southeast Asian refugees, especially Lao and Hmong. In my new graduate school environment I encountered the separation between the study of language use in context and the study of language structure. Twenty years later, in 2000, I entered graduate study again and I found that this separation still exists between structurally oriented linguistics and those whose study includes language and its associated cultures. The split still exists, and the emphasis is seen in what labels are used

【Keywords】 language, culture, anthropology, indigenous community, sociolinguist, ethnography

for the study. With the diversity in both language and culture being threatened by global homogenization, an understanding of the differences in academic focus may be critical in order to establish research priorities.. In this paper, I examine the separation of language and culture in academic study.

Social scientists in North America, especially anthropologists, folklorists and linguists, who focus on the study of language use and its connection to society, use a variety of labels to describe what they do. Among the best known are “anthropological linguistics”, “linguistic anthropology”, and “sociolinguistics”. All of these labels imply that their focus is on the study of language usage in society and culture for their teaching, research and publications. In this paper I am examining the intellectual issues and history that underlie the differences in the labels. I will discuss the differences and similarities that characterize them. I use American Indian examples in the illustrations and examples because this population was central to Americanist beginnings and is my continuing area of area of field research.

The first section of this paper is a historical overview focused on the work of Boas, Sapir and Whorf in the beginning half of the 20th century. However, there were many contributors to the field during this period which have been described in other places (an excellent summary of anthropologists with significant writings on American Indian languages was made by Dell Hymes [1964] in *Language in Culture and Society*).

The second section of this paper is an overview of the split in linguistic study beginning around 1960. The field of sociolinguistics expanded to respond to the separation of linguistics study from social context complete with the founding of new departments of linguistics, separate from the social sciences. I will also highlight some of the major developments, especially by linguistic anthropologist, Dell Hymes.. Hymes developed the label “Ethnography of Communication” in an attempt to keep linguistics and anthropology united

during the early 1960s..

The third section will review some of the more recent developments in linguistic anthropology by providing an historical overview of the connections from Boas to the present. Developments after the 1970s especially in study on the link between language and performance, by Richard Bauman (1977, 1986, and 2001) and others are foregrounded. The terms “linguistic anthropology” and *anthropological linguistics* will be compared and contrasted. The paper ends with my conclusions about the use of labels in this field and implications they have for academics working with indigenous communities.

The 20th Century Beginnings of the American Study of Language and Culture

It is often pointed out that anthropology and linguistics share a common genealogy and have shared origins. This includes a 19th century focus on philology, especially in Sanskrit, Greek, and Indo-European studies, combined with folklore studies (Barfield 1997:289). Jacob Grimm, in his pioneering of folklore, focused on language and discovered sound shifts among the various related Indo-European languages now called “Grimm’s Law”. Historical linguistics is a field that developed from this insight (Crowley 1997). Building on these ideas, an interest in language constructions fed the field labeled “structuralism” and in which Ferdinand de Saussure is considered a central founder (Saussure 1959). It was from this foundation that the American linguistic anthropology developed. In American anthropology language and culture were closely connected until the 1950s (Barfield 1997:289).

The current separate disciplines of linguistics and anthropology shared common beginnings over one hundred years ago in America emerging out of

the work of Franz Boas and his students, especially Edward Sapir. This work was intimately connected to American Indian¹⁾ languages and their documentation, because it was thought these languages would soon become extinct. Linguistics was then seen as a necessary part of the training for anyone planning to do ethnographic study. Since the first half of the 20th century there have been many changes.

In the Smithsonian Institutions publication, *The Handbook of American Indians* (Goddard 1996) three figures are named as “important” in the history of American Indian language study: Franz Boas and Boasians (pg 43), Edward Sapir and Sapirians (pg 47), and Leonard Bloomfield and the Bloomfieldians (pg 49). Boas and Sapir are centric to anthropology while many of Bloomfield’s students helped develop the “new field” of linguistics discussed in the next section. Bloomfield was more of a descriptive language “structuralist” than most anthropologists were: “Like Boas and Sapir, Bloomfield was dedicated to the systematic approach to understanding a language structure....In the interest of rigor, he felt it necessary to define the field of linguistics more narrowly than had Boas or Sapir...” (Mithun 1996:50)..

Franz Boas, early in the 20th century emphasized linguistics as part of formal anthropological study. There are at least four reasons that can be found for the emphasis Boas put on linguistic study for ethnological purposes. First, was a need for the “investigator who visits an Indian tribe” to be able to communicate

1) I will use the term American Indian as my designation for the original inhabitants of North America. Occasionally I will substitute Indigenous, First Nation or Aboriginal mainly when my intent is more focused on being inclusive for Canada, Mexico and other areas where indigenous language issues are important to the discussion. American Indian is preferred in the case of this writing for two reasons, first it is easily defined historically and second it is the term conventionally used in US land right and legal cases. Aboriginal and indigenous are terms often used in Canada and Mexico respectively. Since there are legal issues in regard to the land base here in the US, I will use retain American Indian.

first hand rather than through interpreters (Boas 1911:15). Boas discussed the difficulties with time needed to learn the language, but felt it was still of major importance:

Our investigating ethnologists are also denied opportunity to spend long continuous periods with any particular tribe, so that the practical difficulties in the way of acquiring languages are almost insuperable. Nevertheless ... a command of the language is an indispensable means of obtaining accurate and thorough knowledge, because much information can be gained by listening to conversations of the natives and by taking part in their daily life, which, to the observer who has no command of the language will remain entirely inaccessible. [Boas 1911:16]

Boas also emphasized that the ideal for “a collector” of texts or any other cultural information was to be “thoroughly familiar with the Indian language and with English...in all these cases the service of language is a practical one - a means to a clearer understanding...” of the cultural group (Boas 1911:16-17).

The second reason Boas gave to do ethnographic linguistic work was under his section titled “Theoretical Importance of Linguistic Studies”. Here he writes: “If ethnology is understood as the science of dealing with the mental phenomena of the life of the peoples of the world, human language, one of the most important manifestations of mental life, would seem to belong naturally to the field of work of ethnology...” (1911:17)..

The third reason for language study was the emphasis Boas put on a theory which could help with understanding the relationship between language and thought. Out of this came his fourth reason for study which dealt with the “unconscious character of linguistic phenomena” (1911:16-18). Boas developed his interest in cognition through his own field work:

It is...conceivable that an Indian trained in philosophic thought would proceed to free the underlying nominal forms from the possessive elements and thus reach abstract forms corresponding to the abstract forms of our modern languages. I have made this experiment for instance, with the Kwakiutl language of Vancouver Island, in which no abstract form ever occurs without its possessive elements...I found it perfectly easy to develop the idea of the abstract term in the mind of the Indian...I succeeded, for instance, in isolating the terms for *love* (*halix*) and *pity* (1911:18).

Here we see the beginnings of questions that later linguistic anthropologists would explore again after the 1950s. During this period most sociocultural anthropologists that followed Boas described both languages and cultures. Separating language study from anthropology seemed to be a contradiction in terms. Edward Sapir, the student of Boas most known for language study, pointed out the importance of the language/society relationship:

Eliminate society and there is every reason to believe that he [a human] will learn to walk, if, indeed, he survives at all. But it is just as certain that he will never learn to talk, that is, to communicate ideas according to the traditional system of a particular society....Speech is a human activity that varies without assignable limit as we pass from social group to social group, because it is a purely historical heritage of the group, the product of long-continued social usage. [Sapir 1921:4]

Most of the work on language done during this period was descriptive rather than theoretical. An exception was one of the best known of Sapir's students, Benjamin L. Whorf, who helped to develop universal theories of languages, shaping the way ones worldview or socio-cultural knowledge. Sapir and Whorf built on the earlier foundation of language study with American Indian languages.²⁾ Whorf's theory of the connection of language and culture has been

called the “Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis” (or at times the “Whorfian Hypothesis”).

The influence of Franz Boas can be seen in the current work in languages and culture. This “continuity” has occurred because of the legacy of his students: “there has also been a remarkable continuity of community over the years, a community that began largely with Franz Boas and his students, then students of these students. Members of the last generation now have students of their own who are engaged in field work and meet regularly to exchange ideas” (Mithun 1996: 43).

In the Boasian tradition, language was seen as a central focus and a means to define cultural units. There was an emphasis on describing languages in terms of their uniqueness and their connection to the culture rather than on grammatical analysis separate from the culture (DeMallie & Ortiz 1994: 4-5). The push to disconnect language from culture and the resulting formation of separate fields of linguistic inquiry distinct from anthropology are covered next.

Overview of Splits in Linguistics and the Beginning of Socio-Linguistics

Reevaluation of language theory by social scientists occurred during the 1950s partly due to the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. However, there were other trends in language theory in this time period. The controversy for anthropologists in the 1960s and 1970s built on the theoretical and language classification work of Boas and his students. This expansion of the Americanist

2) Most of the work done by Sapir and Whorf was drawn on work from American Indian languages. The most well known and perhaps best example is in Whorf's development of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis because of the obvious difference in world view that the Hopi exhibited which could be found reflected in the Hopi language. [For some understanding of Sapir and Whorf's perspectives see: Whorf, 1939 and Sapir, 1933]

study of language from its origins in anthropology to that of sociology, folklore and the new field of linguistics was influenced by new debates in linguistics. The widespread acceptance of Chomsky's 1957 work, *Syntactic Structures* fueled opposing views on the connection between language and culture:

From...early in this century, modern linguistics has slighted the study of the use of language. Ferdinand de Saussure's twin conceptions of *la langue* and *la parole* have commonly been interpreted to mean that linguistics has for its object only *la langue*. Recently Chomsky has substituted... "competence" and "performance".... The improvement, however, has remained nominal. [Hymes 1974: 130]

The distinction between the form of language and its social function is not new. Early in the 20th century descriptive linguists believed that there was a clear-cut basic code, which would be the same universally. De Saussure (1959) warned linguists to distinguish between "parole" (the way people speak in conversation) and language (in its abstracted form) and to avoid sociological and psychological data. It was felt by structuralists that linguists should be less concerned with the variable and seemingly irregular processes of verbal interaction and communication and more concerned with the pure code underlying these processes (Bloomfield 1933). This "code" was a focus on the structural form of languages such as morphology and sound systems. What was new, in the 1960s, was the academic split that occurred because of the new "transformational" grammar approach discussed by Chomsky.

The branch of the linguistic study called "sociolinguistics" expanded during this period as a reaction to the new linguistics of Chomsky beginning in the late 1950s. Attempts to define the connection to social usage became this new field which linked "society" and social usage with linguistics. Even the descriptive linguistic studies, mainly on American Indian languages, as done by Boas, Sapir

and many others were seen as outside of the new linguistics. Chomsky in “1961...referred to early materials in American Indian languages as ‘false’” (Hymes 1983: 131). This reference to “false” was related to belief that language and culture were separate and the purpose of linguistics was to understand the workings of language without reference to culture. The field of linguistics split between the Transformational-Generative approach of Noam Chomsky and the “sociolinguistics” of other linguists such as Dell Hymes. According to Chomsky, linguistic study must be conducted on languages that the researcher knew intuitively. Otherwise informants with the intuitive understanding were sought. However, the initial goals were to gain understandings of language universals so any language would do for theory. Since most language researchers shared only English as a first language, most Chomskian linguists worked with English: “consensus had it that the locus of language was the mind. Thus anything theoretically interesting about language was thought to derive either from its internal logic as an autonomous system or from properties of the mind” (Sankoff 1980: xvii). The new linguistics was seen as a branch of cognitive psychology in terms of underlying universal structures. It was not viewed in terms of culture, knowledge and conscious thought..

Due to Chomsky’s theoretical disinterest (he uses the term “uninteresting”) in the “surface” structure of language, his students conducted little or no research on social or cultural topics (Chomsky 1977). Whole departments of linguistics completely separate from folklore, or anthropology, or sociology developed. Much study focused on English and other European languages in order to discover psychological universals. Discovering the rules of universal grammars became the goal of the new Chomskian or “generative” linguistics. Linguistic fieldwork was almost abandoned in favor of searching for “syntactic structures” that “would be shown to be direct emanations of the neural structures of the brain” (Barfield 1999: 291). The focus was on the discovery of the rules of

grammar and theory about what constitutes “linguistic competence” within the “underlying structure” of the mind, rather than social communication.

Research in new linguistics departments saw this search for “linguistic universals” as primarily psychologically based. In contrast, the sociolinguists pointed out that universalism was always a concern of anthropologists but in a less limited form than that of the new linguistics. Sapir’s work was seen as a past example of this emphasis. He spoke of the universality and equality of humankind through language:

There is no more striking general fact about language than its universality. One may argue as to whether a particular tribe engages in activities that are worth of the name religion, or of art, but we know of no people that is not possessed of a fully developed language. The lowliest South African Bushman speaks in the forms of a rich symbolic system that is in essence perfectly comparable to the speech of the cultivated Frenchman. [Sapir 1921:22]

Dell Hymes, along with other sociolinguists, hoped to sway linguists as a whole. By 1974³⁾ he seemed discouraged that most “pure” linguists would not look at any “external” factors simply because Chomsky had “proven” the importance of “internal” underlying structures. In an attempt to keep linguistics in the social sciences, Hymes devoted much of his work in the 1960s and 1970s

3) Despite this there remained departments of Anthropology faculty such as the Voegelins at Indiana University, but more and more linguistic work would shift away from Anthropology Departments. Doug Parks (personal communication November 2000) described to me the process of the split in linguistics and anthropology as being the late 1960s and that a few schools continued to try to hold on to an emphasis on language and culture in their departments. However the split can be plainly seen in institutions such as Indiana University as those with PhDs in linguistics studying American Indian languages end up in the Anthropology Department and those studying African languages end up in the Linguistics Department. Those interested in semiotics and sociolinguistics may end up in either.

to “sociolinguistics”.. For example in 1974 Hymes writes:

Sociolinguistics merits our attention just insofar as it signals an effort to change the practice of linguistics and other disciplines, because their present practice perpetuates a fragmented, incomplete understanding of humanity. In many minds, the term “function” in the study of language has become associated with behaviorism as espoused by B.F. Skinner....A commitment to an ethnographic “mentalist”, however does not require one to avert one’s eyes from functions....The trouble with Skinner is that lacking linguistics, he has no way to specify and analyze....Skinner may make a convenient target Sociolinguistics, so conceived, is an attempt to rethink received categories and assumptions as to the bases of linguistic work, and as to the place of language in human life.. [Hymes 1974: vii]

As Hymes addressed the problem between the social sciences vs. the new linguistics (i.e. which one “owns” linguistics?), he encountered the divisions within the social science disciplines. The problem that Hymes foregrounded that if no linguists were interested in the relationship between culture and language, then who is best left to research the field? In 1964 Hymes used the label “ethnography of communication” to rename the “sociolinguists” who combined anthropology and language study. The Biennial Review of Anthropology, in the following year, devoted more space to linguistic topics. There was a great deal of reevaluation:

The very basis of our ideas regarding the scope of linguistic inquiry, the nature of language design, the place of language in the system of social symbols by means of which human groups cooperate...the re-examination of fundamentals, moreover, promises to reduce the gap between linguistics and other social sciences. Of particular significance is Hymes’ call (1964) for a reintegration of linguistics into the study of man. [Siegel 1965:84-120]

Sociolinguists such as Gumperz, Hymes and Labov claimed evidence that additional social factors were necessary in language science. For example in *On the Mechanism of Linguistic Change*, Labov introduced a large body of sound changes that occur in the context of marking social status. In both New York City and Martha's Vineyard, Labov demonstrated that sound change was unpredictable if one did not develop theory taking into account the social context. People were found to change the way they spoke based on social interaction (Gumperz and Hymes 1972). Labov felt that many researchers looking for underlying structures were making overgeneralizations in their grammars and that those looking to social phenomena also over generalized. He spoke of the need for linguistics to be a "joint enterprise" (Labov 1975: 56).

During the meeting of the American Anthropological Association in 1958 a symposium was held on urbanization and standardization of language. Many people who were working on similar problems came together. Topics and attendees included bilingualism (Havgen and Weinreich), Pidgin and Creole (R. A. Hall), class difference in language (S. Z. Klausner and J. L. Ficher) and other well known scholars such as Twaddell and Mead, all under the heading of "Sociology of Languages" (all these cited in: Siegel 1959: 185-209).

Starting in the late 1960s and going through the 1970s those interested in the social aspect of language continued to refer to themselves as "sociolinguists". There arose a need for clearer definitions of labels for those studying "performance" of language compared to structural linguists. In 1974 Hymes described three themes he considered fundamental to sociolinguistics:

First, that there is a mode of organization of language that is a part of the organization of communicative conduct in the community, whose understanding requires a corresponding, new mode of description of language, second that recognition of this mode of organization leads one to recognize that the study of

language is a multidisciplinary field, a field to which ordinary linguistics is indispensable, but to which other disciplines, such as sociology, social anthropology, education, folklore, and poetics are indispensable, as well; third, that study of this mode of organization leads one to reconsider the bases of linguistics itself. One might say that the three themes have to do with the scope, the dependencies, and; ultimately, the foundations of linguistics. [Hymes 1974: vii-viii]

Sociolinguists were mainly interested in what could be discovered in the social structures of human groups including race, class and gender studies. The actual diversity of areas studies were concerned with, were quite large. These areas included bilingualism, African American vernacular or non-standard English (Fasold et al. 1987, Green 1998, Labov 1972, Montgomery et.al. 1995, and Mufwene 1993) and sexism in language (Chambers 1995, Coates 1997, Eckert 1989, Labov 1990, O'Barr and Atkins 1980, and Romaine 1984). An interest in discourse analysis and communicative styles, developed out of study in the ethnography of communication.

Research was conducted on perceptions of how we are seen by others through ethnic stereotypes that are indexed through language use. In Canada, Wallace Lambert (1967) found that both Anglophones and Francophones showed a bias, in that French speaking people were seen as less positive than English speakers.. This serves as an example that personal characteristics, speaking to a sense of identity, are indexed by the language we choose to speak. This also holds true for people speaking the same national language but using different varieties. For example, Ferguson (1959) studied situations with two or more varieties of the same language are used under different situations, one form for formal speech and another in common daily speech. Fishman (1972) and Gumperz (1964, 1982) also discuss the difference between functionally different language varieties. In situations where more than one language is understood by a group

of people, code switching was noted as part of normal social use in conversation (Gumperz 1982). The importance of using language as an identity marker and for social differentiation has been researched in terms of differences between men's and women's languages use. Combined languages where an Indian and European language becomes a new language are also discussed in the literature (Thomason and Kaufman 1988). The importance of language choice has been increasingly studied due to the global phenomenon of language death. For example, Crauss 1992 reports that only 10% of the present world languages are "safe" from extinction. Research on semi-speakers, those who fail to develop full fluency (Dorian 1982) and decisions to not use a language because it is not seen as economically and socially viable (Gal 1978) have all been looked at in terms of language survival.

The impetus for the new studies and their methods drew heavily from the works of Ramon Jakobson and the Prague School:

One can see here important points of contrast with the Prague tradition. The Sapir tradition recognized expressive and other functions of language, and occasionally described them, when they became salient in ordinary descriptive work, but mainly it was concerned to write basic grammars of languages little known. The Prague School, on the other hand, worked to a considerable extent with languages well known to it, and could, given the appropriate perspective, penetrate further into their functional complexity. The Sapir tradition worked mostly with the languages of American Indians, whose societies showed relatively little differentiation and no class structure. [Hymes 1983:342]

In the early years of his career Hymes writes that many things had changed in his field of study. These changes were a strong influence on his direction of work focus:

The years 1950-55 are almost pre-historic for many younger linguists today, at least in the United States. They are the years “B.C.”, “Before Chomsky”, before the publication of *Syntactic Structures* in 1957. A common image of those years would be of the dominance of the “neo-Bloomfieldian” or “Yale school”, a school characterized by hostility to “mentalism”.... [Hymes 1975]

In the second half of the 20th century the field of American anthropology continued to expand its geographic focus and there was a decrease in the emphasis on American Indian languages. Since North American anthropological studies were tied to the work of salvaging American Indian languages, the shift to other parts of the world, combined with the new linguistics, encouraged more separation of language study. However, there was a continuing focus in some schools, and among a few anthropologists on American Indians, often referred to as “Americanist” anthropology:

...the early unity of these 3 fields [of Boasian Anthropology] in the study of the American Indian was sustained as a dominant interest ...in these years after the Second World War, much of anthropology was turning away from the American Indian to study other parts of the world; and many American anthropologists were finding their traditional obligation to understand linguistics an increasing strain, when confronted with the new rigor of linguistic method.... [Hymes 1983: 332]

Language connected to culture seemed to be “a natural” for some anthropologists. As other fields such as linguistics and sociology took parts of language study, linguistic anthropology remained a part of American anthropology. However, the differences in emphasis between structural or cultural language studies remain strong today even within anthropology.

“Anthropological Linguistics” and “Linguistic Anthropology”

As part of his new approach, Hymes brought “ethnographics” to the forefront of text analysis methodology. This was a field developing in the 1970’s and was given a push from the concept of ethnography of communication. The work of Dell Hymes focused on the re-analysis of American Indian texts gathered in the first half of the 20th Century.. He maintained a strong interest in cross-cultural communication as could be found by analyzing these perceptions. He describes this in his 1962 essay on the history of linguistic anthropology:

The field investigation of informant’s perception of the study of their group by various and successive field workers would be in itself a fascinating type of study in ethno science. Combined with library research, it would be an invaluable kind of lead both for the ethnohistory of the group concerned, and as a special vantage point on the history of anthropology. [Hymes 1962:15]

The nature of his work from the 1950s onward involved the development of a methodology and approach to the texts gathered by Boas and others. It also involved a form of historical, as well as cultural analysis:

Regarding use of materials, their correct interpretation, regarding orthography, organization, and technical terms requires knowledge of the general development of method at the time, and of what was available to the source of the materials. (Thus to determine the phonemic system of Kathlamet Chinook, not extinct and recorded substantially only by Boas, it was necessary for me to trace the development of Boas’ orthographic practice and knowledge). [Hymes 1992:15]

In “ethnopoetics” terms from the more mainstream study of literature and poetry are used. What Hymes meant by “ethnopoetics” is discussed by Foley in

Anthropologist Antiquity:

The use of rhyme, alliteration, and meter were framing devices, indexicals, for English poetic genres, and we might expect that, while some other verbal traditions may also make use of these framing devices poetry, others may not. The study of how other traditions of verbal art frame their performances of oral poetry is the study of ethno-poetics. [Foley 1997:67]

Examples of his text analysis methods can be found in additional works by Hymes (1979, 1980 and 1992). Hymes writes that the focuses in the “rhetorical” text analysis involves:

....relations among verses and stanzas. The quotative is a principal marker of such relations. The spoken lines of the narrative in question vary greatly in length and makeup and the same is true of a Zuni telling of a related story....Vocal and grammatical marking of relations must be shown separately. The later show a formal coherence that reflects a deep-seated competence [Hymes 1992: 42]

A focus on text analysis versus new field work is encouraged, however, he does emphasize that field work, with a strong background in linguistics and approach free of preinterpretations of the culture, is necessary for both cultural anthropologists and sociolinguists (see Hymes 1976). Dell Hymes’ motivation to continue doing text analysis is seen as critical because:

The fact is one cannot depend upon most published versions of Native American myths. Even if the native language is preserved it is two steps away from what was said....If however one takes the myths to be a form of poetry, to involve cultural ways of relating lines and groups of lines to be organized in terms of verses, stanzas, scenes, and acts, then something missing, something untranslated,

may indeed matter. [Hymes 1998: vii]

The accurate analysis of text combines issues of identity, worldview, culture, and history. Also, an emphasis on the patterns of discourse may be seen as an attempt to better understand the diverse cultures themselves, through the speech styles of speakers in the texts, not solely the word and sound structures. Language communities can be large or small and literate or oral. The identity of a people or nation is tied to the use of language and some genres of language performance are specifically developed to express culture (see Bauman 2001).. This sense of cultural belonging comes to us through a connection to an oral tradition of some sort that ties us to a past. Richard Bauman points out the “oral literature of a people was both the highest and truest expression of its authentic national culture” (1986: 1).

Another anthropologist, Keith Basso, combines language with culture in his work and demonstrates an example of how this can be done in Anthropology (Basso 1969, 1970, 1979, 1990, 1996).. Basso uses the “folk classifications” from the language itself to develop a framework for his discussion. These classifications are possible due to a culturally grounded understanding of linguistic terms (Basso 1969: 32). Similarly in *The Cibecue Apache*, in order to outline the “world view” and their relations “between men and supernatural ‘powers’” (Basso 1970: viii), Basso depended on the linguistic classification system used by the Western Apache themselves. Thus, there is a description of *gan biyi?* (“Gan Power”) and others with explanations such as:

Hymes’s conception of the field rests on the premise that, in any society, the proper object of inquiry is the full range of communicative functions served by speech, and therefore, that adequate ethnographic interpretation requires close attention to speaking in all its forms (Basso 1979: xxi).

Lisa Valentine, an anthropologist working primarily with Canadian Indian language communities, has addressed the ambiguity about what term to use to describe the field of study in which both anthropologists and linguists were part. Valentine writes that “after, and perhaps resulting from the Second World War, studies of languages outside of Native North America began to dominate, particularly those within the South Pacific and African areas” (Valentine 1995:5).. It became clearer that the work needed to be cross-disciplinary and not squarely in one field, but Americanist roots of language combined with culture study remained in anthropology. In a recent review of the history of Indian language work Lisa Valentine seems to echo Hymes in the following comment on the ethnography of speaking or communication:

The ethnography of speaking is not a field of discipline; rather, it is a perspective, an orientation towards the relationships among language, culture, and society. The development of the ethnography of speaking is closely tied to the unique history of anthropology and of linguistics in the United States. At the turn of the century, the major force in American anthropology was Boas, who, among his students...studied both language and culture. [Valentine 1995:4]

By the late 1980s our present division of linguistics into separate areas had been established as the norm. Three labels have developed and are seen to describe a separate emphasis; they are “sociolinguistics”, “linguistic anthropology” and “anthropological linguistics”. In a recent text titled *Linguistic Anthropology* is found the following description of the relationship between sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology:

Among the disciplines in the social sciences... sociolinguistics is the closest to linguistic anthropology. In fact, looking back at the history of the two disciplines, it is sometimes difficult to tell them apart. Although many sociolinguists favor

quantitative methods and tend to work in urban environments where most linguistic anthropologists tend to work in small scale societies, the over-all goals of their research agendas appear similar very similar to outsiders especially as ...anthropologists turn their attention to urban contexts. [Duranti 1997:13]

The content of this text on “linguistic anthropology” contains sections on theories of culture, linguistic diversity, ethnographic methods, transcription, meaning in linguistic forms, and discussions regarding conversational exchanges. Many of these topics are indeed similar to those of the sociolinguists from the 1960s to the 1980s. Interestingly there is another late 1990s text with the title *Anthropological Linguistics*. It defines the discipline as:

Anthropological linguistics is that subfield of linguistics that is concerned with the place of language in its wider social and cultural context, its role in forging and sustaining cultural practices and structures. As such it may be seen to overlap with another subfield with a similar domain, sociolinguistics, and in practice this may indeed be so...I will make a distinction between the two sub-fields along the following lines. Anthropological linguists views language through the prism of the core anthropological concept, culture, and, as such, seeks to uncover the meaning behind the use, misuse or non-use of language, its different forms, registers and styles....to find cultural understandings. Sociolinguistics on the other hand, views language as a social institution....it seeks to discover how linguistic behavior patterns ... with the variables defining social groups, such as age, sex, class, race, etc. [Foley 1997:3]

In this larger text there seems to be a greater number of categories included under the definition of this “sub-field”. For instance after a description of symbolic and cognitive anthropology, the author includes a section on paleoanthropology and the evolution of language including debates about primate language. This is followed by sections on both the structure and

cognitive functions of anthropology as they relate to philosophy, ethno-biological taxonomies, kinship, and color categorization. Other sections include discussions on relativism as seen in a cultural context including “Neo-Whorfism” and ideas of classifications of space and other models. This is followed by a section titled “ethnography in speaking” which includes the areas of race, class and gender as discussed in the days of sociolinguistics but adds the concepts of poetics and verbal arts as discussed in social semiotics. Culture and language change completes this chapter’s topics.

It is interesting that the usual perception of the terms used: linguistic modifying anthropology vs. anthropological modifying linguistics is often seen by both linguists and anthropologists as simply stating that linguistic anthropologists are anthropologists using “some linguistics” for their field work and conversely anthropological linguists are simply linguists interested in sociolinguistics.⁴⁾

Is there an accurate label for language in the study of culture?

A useful resolution to the distinctions between the various terms is discussed in the conversations Dell Hymes had on the topic during the 1960s and 1970s. The link to the social sciences was often confusing. For clarity, Hymes divided the labels into linguistic components and related them to meanings. He then combined this with his understanding of the history of their usage. In doing this, he pointed out what was “central” was the concept of “linguistics” to the various fields:

4) As an example of the diverse approaches to language study consider the titles of three journals in use today. Each uses a different combination of terms to describe its purpose: Anthropological Linguistics, International Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, and the International Journal of American Linguistics.

The form of these terms—ethnolinguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics—shows that it is linguistics, its concepts, methods and prestige, that has become central. (Hence “ethnolinguistics”, not “anthropology of language”, for a field of research; and “anthropological linguistics”, not “linguistic anthropology”, as the prevalent term, even among anthropologists, for the subdiscipline.) To be sure, Malinowski had, much earlier, spoken (1920:69) of urgent need for an “ethnolinguistic theory” to help to elucidate native meanings and texts, but neither the term nor the theory received sustained attention. “Ethnolinguistics” first emerged into prominence in the late 1940’s, followed by “psycholinguistics” in the early 1950’s, and by “sociolinguistics” in the early 1960’s. (2) The sequence reflects the successive impact of recent linguistics, first on anthropologists, who had helped to nurture it, then on psychologists and most recently, on sociologists. [1974: 84]

In choosing a term to use, Hymes often wrote with a focus on “sociolinguistics”.. He did this to maintain a connection to sociology and what it has to offer the field of language study. He felt that sociology had already taken on many of the questions leading to solutions to problems in future society. It was important to keep this study interesting to sociologists:

The components of “functional” linguists, like the components of sociolinguistic description are patently sociological in nature. Yet they might be taken as anthropological, or social psychological as well. Why sociology? The answer is in part that sociolinguistics needs all the participation it can get; but in part the answer is that the nature of the world in which sociolinguistic description will be done points increasingly toward a major role for sociologists, role conflict; of stratification; ethnicity; sampling; convariation; in sum, of a kind of descriptive work, which, if ethnographic, allows no clear distinction between social anthropology and sociology as its context. The work is increasingly a matter of ethnography of settings, situations, events, roles, groups, in complex societies of the sort typically studied by sociologists. And not only does one find American sociologists turning to work in other societies that is likely to involve them in

linguistic experience of the sort that may lead to sociolinguistics; one also finds that the concepts necessary to a comparative and evolutionary perspective in sociolinguistics are developed as much, if not more, in the sociological tradition. [Hymes 1974:78-79]

In 1966 Hymes proposed a clarification of the labels that may still be true for the definitions, at least in North America. Here, “Linguistic Anthropology” is used as the primary term for anthropologists doing work with language, while anthropological linguistics seems to be a branch of linguistics. This notion seems also to agree with the formulation Duranti (1997) made of the labels in the last section above:

From the disciplinary standpoint, there seems to be only one term that is appropriate to the general characterization, “the study of speech and language in the context of anthropology,” and to the destination of a branch coordinate with other major branches of anthropology, comprising all the interests and activities of anthropologists as they study language, both as linguists and as more than linguists. Only “linguistic anthropology” seems to meet these requirements. (From a disciplinary standpoint, the chief contenders, “ethnolinguistics” and “anthropological linguistics,” again would suggest a branch not of anthropology, but of linguistics.) Is there then no place for “ethnolinguistics”? And what of Tetter’s equation of “ethnolinguistics” with “linguistic anthropology,” an equation that suggests equivalent generality for both? I think there is indeed a place for the term “ethnolinguistics,” and that in some contexts it does have a certain generality, designating a broad involvement of anthropologists in the study of language. The term has its place, and degree of generality, from the standpoint, not so much of discipline as of problem. [Hymes 1966:146-147]

A diagram was developed by Hymes (1966:149) to clarify his point. I reproduce it here:

How to make a choice of terminology

Each scholar may want to look closely what she or he does to decide how to label their work. For others it may just be an exercise in words, but that is part of what I do look at words and their connection to identity in contexts. I choose to refer to my work, in terms of discipline, as “linguistic anthropology”. However, much of what I do could be described under the broad term sociolinguistic (without the hyphen). Also, I choose avoid confusion of research methodology. Socio-linguistics (with a hyphen), in my experience, does act as a branch of sociology with research methodologies tending to be more quantitative rather than text analysis and ethnographic field research focused. Research on discourse, theory on the use of language in context, and the relationships between language, power and voice have all been influential in my thinking about my choice of terms (see Austin, 1962; Bakhtin, 1929; Bauman, 1974, 1977, 1986, 2001; Burke, 1941; Morris, 1994; Williams, 1977). Linguistic Anthropology, as outlined above by Hymes, seems to include these perspectives and the study of both language and culture. I feel this is important today as people define their identities in a context of globalization. Upon meeting scholars involved in the study of language, I have often noted the difference in labels that they have assigned to their professional identity. I found that those who are linguists usually mean they are interested in the theory and structure of languages. Those who use “anthropological linguist” seem to do the same but have as their focus “endangered languages”, while those who use linguistic anthropology are interested in use, context and performance in addition to structure. I should note that the inclusion of linguistic structure is still seen as vital to linguistic anthropologists, since this is necessary to understand its use; it is simply not the end or final focus of the study.⁵⁾

I also am comfortable with an academic ancestry in the “Americanist” tradition because, being an American Indigenous (First Nation or American Indian) person myself, I am interested in what academic language study can contribute to communities reviving or restoring their languages after years of social colonialization and cultural genocide. I see the purpose of past anthropological linguistic text collection shifting today from solely meeting the scholarly needs of non-indigenous anthropologists to an indigenous audience.. The new examination of old texts also is seen by scholars such as Hymes as a form of “repatriation”:

The work that discloses such form can be a kind of repatriation. It can restore to native communities and descendants a literary art that was implicit, like so much language, but that now, when continuity of verbal tradition has been broken, requires analysis to be recognized. (Hymes 1998: vii)

There is plenty of work that can be done in collaborations between Indigenous persons and academics. During the past decade the question of the future of work with Indigenous languages has been taken up by Indigenous Peoples themselves. No longer are Indian people isolated and separate from mainstream society. In the context of this 21st century the purpose of study of American Indian languages is entering a new phase in which linguistic anthropologists can play a vital role. As one linguistic anthropologist, Roger

5) I owe the distinctions here to conversations at Indiana University. I confronted linguistic anthropologist, Richard Bauman, with a concern cited by some linguists working primarily on linguistic structure that those doing discourse and cultural language work were not willing to do the hard stuff meaning phonological and morphological analysis, which does take a lot of time and focus. It was pointed out to me how in reverse, once learning to do the structure analysis, the hard work of tying this into culture and context has just begun.

Spielmann, recently wrote:

Why study Aboriginal languages in a contemporary context? Because they are the key to the survival and growing strength of the nations who have spoken them for centuries. There is a close link between language and the identity necessary for that survival and growth...language provides identity roots to both individuals and nations in concrete, tangible ways. For First Nations peoples, language is the original and most natural way for transmitting traditional stories and the wisdom of generations of elders. To understand the uniqueness, beauty, insight, and power of an Aboriginal language it is not enough to merely know its structure. You have to hear it in its social context, in the places in which it belongs. (Spielmann 1998: 234).

Also there is an increasing feeling among First Nations scholars that it is critical for these studies to be done within the community itself for the purpose of the community. This is especially important given the link between culture and language. Increasingly, some First Nation scholars emphasize a more in-depth study of the language. One of these, Basil Johnson, an Ojibwa speaker, suggests that:

Language is crucial. If scholars are to increase their knowledge and if they are to add depth and width to their knowledge they must study a Native language. It is not enough to know a few words or even some phrases...Without a knowledge of the language, scholars can never take for granted the accuracy of an interpretation...let alone a single word. (Johnston 1990: 11).

Johnson assumes the connection between language, cognition and culture. I have been told by both American Indian people and linguists of frustrations with each other. Those doing linguistic analysis may complain of language informants getting “off track” and talk about cultural “stuff” rather than helping

with structural elements. On the other hand Indigenous people complain of the uselessness of the language out of context. Johnson, for example, approached his elders for an understanding of his culture he was told to look more deeply into his language for hidden meanings:

What I learned was that the words in our tribal language had meanings more fundamental than the primary ones that were commonly and readily understood. To know this character of words is crucial in understanding how the tribe perceived and expressed what they saw, heard, felt, tasted, and smelled in the world and what they thought and how they felt about the world of ideas...And because they could not or dared not define God or the deities, or explain or reduce to human terms certain phenomena, they invented the word *manitou* which at times, depending upon context, might mean spirit, but which in its more fundamental senses meant talent, attributes, potencies, potential, substance, essence, and mystery. (Johnson 1990: 6).

My original interest in the study of linguistics was focused on concern for loss of both languages and cultures. I was surprised by the lack specific work being done in direct conjunction with endangered linguistic communities. Perhaps this academic separation between language and the people who speak it can be understood in the light of the separation between physical science and human science. But linguists are often called on as experts on the cultures of people. Pierre Bourdieu in "The Uses of People" (1990[1986]) examines the idea that some people feel authorized to speak for other "people". He points out that there are various fields where people take on authority see themselves as specialists and who "agree at least in laying claim to a monopoly of legitimate confidence, which defines them as such and in reminding people of the frontier which separates professionals from the profane" (p.151). As Bourdieu points out how difficult it is to enter into intellectual endeavors because it is like "a

game in which the dominant determine at every moment the rule of the game (heads I win; tails you lose) by their very existence” (p.153). In this view there would be a naturally seen separation between those engaging in academic study on language and culture from those most needing input, community members themselves. I believe the separation between the studies of language in its context from its structure further encourages this separation. Living people are no longer needed for study because tapes and past texts are sufficient for analysis. Occasionally a speaker with intuitive knowledge of the language is sought but this is strictly done separately from contextual use. In contrast the community might be most concerned with the use of language in its performative aspects such as prayer, song, story telling and other genre. Despite these great resources in terms of academic departmental funding, publications and time are spent in the pursuit of language, study separated from communities that are losing them.

My question is “can we afford this luxury? The urgency of the work on Indian languages is expressed in the fact that most of the language loss by North American Indian tribes today has been occurring only over the past 40 years. For example, in 1951 87.4% of all Indians in North America reported speaking a Native language. Thirty years later, in 1981, the numbers had dwindled to 29%. (Treuter 1997: 10) As Treuter goes on to write:

The facts are chilling. Over 1,200 distinct languages were spoken in the Western Hemisphere when Columbus first arrived. Today, there are still 14 million Indians speaking 500 different languages in South America and 5 million Indians speaking 70 different languages in Central America, but North American Indian languages are in terrible state of decay. There are 300,000 speakers of 148 different native languages in North America but most of those communities are small, with a small percentage of fluent speakers. The Dine (Navajo), Inuit (Eskimo), Cree and Ojibwe are the only large groups showing enough strength to

make it though the next [21st] century. (Treuter 1997: 9).

Perhaps the field of anthropology will have much to contribute in this century to the survival of Indigenous languages. This certainly follows on the work and example of Boas and Sapir and builds on the examples of how to conduct this work as seen in Hymes, Basso, Valentine and Spielmann. Now we find the work continuing in a renewed emphasis on language survival and revival among the Indigenous communities themselves including some new members of the anthropological profession.

The most useful disciplinary terminology if the study of language combined with culture is to be community-centric and not only profession-centric, therefore is: “linguistic anthropology”. I propose that we need to go back to working with communities and find ways to engage Indigenous members more actively in the process. This has continued to be done in certain studies, such as that discussed above, but not yet on a large scale. As I asked in the beginning — does it matter what we call the work we do? I think it does but we are rarely one type of scholar today, but at least for one part I can say “I’m an Indigenous linguistic anthropologist”. Although many in the academy and in my community, including both my academic dean and my mother, may wonder what I mean by that, the label still carries meaning.

Works Cited

- Austin, J. L. “How To Do Things With Words.”, Eds. F. O. Urmson, and Marina Sbisa. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962[1997].
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M., and Valentin N. Voloshinov. “Critique of Saussurean Linguistics.” *The*

- Bakhtin Reader: Selected Writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, Voloshinov.* ed. Pam Morris, 25-37. N.Y., New York: Oxford University Press, 1929.
- Barfield, Thomas, ed. *The Dictionary of Anthropology.* Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1999[1997].
- Basso, Keith. "Western Apache Witchcraft." *Anthropological Papers of the University of Arizona.* Vol. 15. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1969.
- _____. *The Cibecue Apache.* New York: Hold, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.
- _____. *Portraits of "the Whiteman: Linguistic Play and Cultural Symbols among the Western Apache.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- _____. *Western Apache Language and Culture: Essays in Linguistic Anthropology.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1990.
- _____. *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language Among the Western Apache.* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 1996.
- Bauman, Richard. *Verbal Art as Performance.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1977.
- _____. *Story, Performance, and Event: Contextual Studies of Oral Narrative.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- _____. "Genre." *Key Terms in Language and Culture*, ed. Alessandro Duranti, 79-82. Cambridge: Blackwell, 2001.
- Bauman, Richard, and J. Sherzer. *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. *Language.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933.
- Boas, Franz. *Introduction to Handbook of American Indian Languages.* Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1911.
- _____. *Handbook of American Indian Languages Part 2.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1922.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. "The Uses of the People". In *Other Words: essays toward a reflexive sociology*, trans. M. Adamson. Cambridge: Polity; Stanford: Stanford University Press, (1990[1986]: 150-55).
- Burke, Kenneth. "Literature as Equipment for Living." *The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in Symbolic Action*, 293-304. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1941.
- Chambers, J. K. *Sociolinguistic Theory: Linguistic Variation and Its Social Significance.*

- Blackwell, 1995.
- Chomsky, Noam. *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton, 1957.
- _____. *Language and Responsibility*. Pantheon, 1977.
- Coates, Jennifer. "Women's Friendships, Women's Talk." *Gender and Discourse*. ed. Ruth Wodak, 245-62. London: Sage, 1997.
- Crowley, Terry. *An Introduction to Historical Linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- DeMallie, Raymond J., and Alfonso Ortiz, eds. *North American Indian Anthropology: Essays on Society and Culture*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994.
- Dorian, Nancy. "Defining the Speech Community to Include Its Working Margins." *Sociolinguistic Variation in Speech Communities*. Ed. Susan Romaine, 25-33. London: Edward Arnold, 1982.
- Duranti, Alessandro. *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- _____, Ed. *Key Terms in Language and Culture*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2001.
- Eckert, Penelope. "The Whole Woman: Sex and Gender Differences in Variation." *Language Variation and Change* 1 (1989): 245-67.
- Fasold, Ralph W., William Labov, Fay Boy Vaughn-Cooke, Guy Bailey, Walt Wolfram, Arthur K. Spears, and John R. Rickford. "Are Black and White Vernacular Diverging?" *Papers from the N.W.A.V.E.-XVI Panel Discussion American Speech*, 1987.
- Ferguson, Charles. "Diglossia." *Word* 15 (1959): 325-40.
- Fishman, Joshua. *The Sociology of Language*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1972.
- Foley, William. *Anthropological Linguistics: An Introduction..* Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1997.
- Gal, Susan. "Peasant Men Can't Get Wives: Language Change and Sex Roles in a Bilingual Community." *Language in Society* 7 (1978): 1-16.
- Green, Elaine. "Reconfiguring Ethnolinguistic Boundaries in AAVE: Conflicting Past and Present Be Paradigms in Coastal Carolina Speech." *N.W.A.V.E., Athens, GA* 27 (1998).
- Goddard, Ives, ed. *Handbook of North American Indians Vol. 17*, Wash. DC: Smithsonian, 1996.
- Gumperz, John. "Conversational Code-Switching." *Discourse Strategies*, 55-99. Cambridge

- University Press, 1982.
- _____. "Linguistic and Social Interaction in Two Communities." *American Anthropologist* 66, no. 6 (1964): 137-53.
- Gumperz, John J., and Dell H. Hymes. *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Basil Blackwell, Inc., 1972.
- Hymes, Dell. "The Pre-War Prague School and the Post-War American Anthropological Linguistics." *Essays in the History of Linguistic Anthropology*. Ed. Dell Hymes. Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publishing Co., 1975[1983].
- _____. "How to Talk Like a Bear in Takelma." *International Journal of American Linguistics* 45, no. 2 (1979[revised1981]): 101-6.
- _____. *In Vain I Tried to Tell You..* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980[1981].
- _____. *Language in Culture and Society: A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology*. Evanston: Harper & Row, 1964.
- _____. "On Anthropological Linguistics and Congeners." *American Anthropologist* 66 (1966: 143-53).
- _____. "Chapter 10: The Scope of Sociolinguistics." *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*, 193-209. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1974.
- _____. *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach..* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1974.
- _____. "Ways of Speaking." *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. Eds. R. Bauman, and Joel Sherzer, 433-51. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- _____. *Essays in the History of Linguistic Anthropology..* Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publishing Co., 1983.
- _____. "Helen Sekaquaptewa's "Coyote and the Birds", Rhetorical Analysis of a Hopi Coyote Story." *Anthropological Linguistics: Florence M. Voegelin Memorial Issue* 24 (1992): 1-4.
- _____. *Reading Takelma Texts*. Bloomington: Trixter Press, 1998.
- Johnston, Basil. *Ojibway Ceremonies*. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, [1990]1982.
- Labov, William. *What Is a Linguistic Fact?* The Peter Deridder Press, 1975.

- _____. "The Intersection of Sex and Social Class in the Course of Linguistic Change." *Language Variation and Change* 2 (1990): 205-54.
- _____. *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1972.
- Lambert, Wallace. "A Social Psychology of Bilingualism." *Journal of Social Issues* 23 (1967): 91-108.
- Mithun, Marianne. "The Description of Native American Languages of North American." *Handbook of American Indians*. ed. Goddard 1996.
- Montgomery, Michael, Janet M. Fuller, and Sharon DeMarse. "The Black Men Has Wives and Sweet Harts [and Third Person Plural -s] Jest Like the White Men: Evidence for Verbal -s From Written Documents on 19th Century African American Speech." *Language Variation and Change* 5, no. 3 (1995[1993]): 335-57.
- Morris, Pam. *The Bakhtin Reader: Selected Writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, and Voloshinov*. New York: Oxford Press, 1994.
- Mufwene, Salikoko, ed. *Africanisms in Afro-American Language Varieties*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1993.
- O'Barr, William, and Bowman Atkins. "'Women's Language' or 'Powerless Language'?" *Women and Language in Literature and Society*. Ed. Sally McConnell-Ginet, Ruth Borker, and Nelly Furman, 93-110. New York: Praeger, 1980.
- Romaine, Suzanne. *The Language of Children and Adolescents; The Acquisition of Communicative Competence*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1984.
- Sankoff, G. *The Social Life of Language*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980.
- Sapir, Edward. "The Psychological Reality of Phonemes." *Selected Writings in Language, Culture, and Personality*, ed. D. G. Mandelbaum, 46-60. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985[1933].
- _____. *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1921.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Course in General Linguistics*. Eds. Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.
- Siegel, B. J., ed. *Biennial Review of Anthropology*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press,

1959.

Spielmann, Roger. *'You're So Fat!': Exploring Ojibwe Discourse*. University of Toronto Press, Buffalo, 1998[1951].

Thomason, Sarah, and Terrence Kaufman. *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1988.

Treuer, Anton, ed. *Oshkaabewis Native Journal* 4 (1): 1-192, 1997.

Valentine, Lisa Philips. *Making It Their Own: Severn Ojibwe Communicative Practices*. Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1995.

Whorf, B. L. "The Relation of Habitual Thought and Behavior to Language." *Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. Ed. J. B. Carroll, 134-56. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1939.

Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

[Abstract]

An American Indigenous perspective in what we label the study of language in culture: Is it "Anthropology" or "Linguistics" and does it matter?

Paul R. Tamburro
(Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana)

Social scientists in North America, especially anthropologists, folklorists and linguists, who focus on the study language use and its connection to society, use a variety of labels to describe what they do. Among the best known are "anthropological linguistics", "linguistic anthropology", and "sociolinguistics".

All of these labels imply that their focus is on the study of language usage in society and culture for their teaching, research and publications. In this paper I am examining the intellectual issues and history that underlie the differences in the labels. The differences and similarities that characterize them are discussed. The author proposes “linguistic anthropology” as the most useful disciplinary terminology if the study of language combined with culture is to be “community-centric” and not only “profession-centric”. He encourages a renewed focus on working with communities. Also, a need to find ways to engage Indigenous members of minority language communities more actively should be a primary goal in the process of “academic” language work. This is important due to the loss rapid extinction of the many of the world’s languages. The author points out that it does matter what we call the work we do, as a label may carry a message of meaning, intent and focus.

접 수 일 : 2004년 4월 14일

심사기간 : 2004년 5월 1일~20일

재 심 사 : 2004년 5월 30일

게재결정 : 2004년 6월 5일(편집위원회)