

11 * *The Ecology of Language Evolution in Latin America: A Haitian Postscript toward a Postcolonial Sequel*

MICHEL DEGRAFF

In [Iberian Imperialism and Language Evolution in Latin America](#), edited by Salikoko Mufwene, published by University of Chicago Press, 2014.

While reading the preceding chapters in this volume, on *Iberian Imperialism and Language Evolution in Latin America*, I kept trading two distinct hats on my bald head: one for the theoretical linguist interested in the cognitive aspects of language contact and language evolution, the other for the MIT professor challenged by social injustice in language policy and education in my native Haiti and other Creole-speaking communities. These communities, like many others in the world, including the United States, still suffer from insidious colonial and neocolonial imperialist prejudices and practices. By the time I finished those chapters, I realized that the two hats are fundamentally made of the same material.

As a theoretical linguist, I was fascinated by the contributors' insightful illustrations of the complexity of language contact in Latin America—complexity in sociohistorical, ecological, and linguistic-structural dimensions. As a Haitian and a Haitian Creole-speaking linguist, I was curious as to how language shift, language change, language endangerment, and (meta-)linguistic correlates of social hierarchies in Iberian America may help us better understand related phenomena in the Caribbean, and vice versa.

I've used the phrases *Latin America* and *Iberian America* with some trepidation, as I realize that the chapters to which I am responding have focused exclusively on areas of Latin America that were colonized by the Spanish or the Portuguese, leaving aside Latin American territories that were or are still under the control of France. Now consider my native Haiti, where both French and a French-derived Creole are spoken; Haitian Creole is spoken by virtually everyone there, and French by a small minority, no more than 10 percent (Dejean 2006). Taking the *Latin* in *Latin America* in its linguistic genealogical sense, we can then consider Haiti at least as "Latin" as Mexico, Bolivia, Peru, Brazil, and so forth.

Those who still subscribe to the classic dogma that Creoles derive from pidgins and therefore fall outside the scope of the comparative method and its associated *Stammbaum* ("family tree") model for language change

should confront these views head on with the extended argument that Haitian Creole is genealogically related to French and strictly within the scope of the comparative method (Weinreich 1958; Mufwene 2008; DeGraff 2009; DeGraff et al. 2013; Aboh and DeGraff forthcoming-a, forthcoming-b). It may seem ironic that, on linguistic genealogical grounds, Haiti, where everyone speaks at least one Romance language (namely Haitian Creole, or Kreyòl), is more “Latin” than some of the areas studied in other chapters of this volume. Those areas include communities that, by and large, speak Indigenous languages such as Maya, Quechua, and Nheengatu, which are not genealogically related to Latin.¹ Furthermore, and unlike Haiti, communities can be found in the Andean highlands and in the Amazon where no Romance language is spoken as a *native* language (Hornberger and Coronel-Molina 2004; Godenzzi 2008; various chapters in this volume). Also of note is that Kreyòl, with more than 10 million speakers in Haiti alone, is the third-largest Romance language spoken in Latin America (Mathieu 2005). Lastly, Haiti bears the distinction of being the first nation in Latin America to rid itself of its European colonizers. There is thus some poetry in having this volume end with a postscript that treats Haiti as one important case study in our joint investigation of the consequences of European imperialism on language evolution in Latin America.

In section 1, I raise basic questions about language contact and language change in Latin America. Then I turn in section 2 to the often insidious and too rarely discussed relationship between knowledge and power in studies of language evolution. In sections 3–7, I examine the politics of Creole studies (e.g., Creole Exceptionalism) and of language and education in Haiti; then I use Haiti as a case study to help us better apprehend related methodological issues vis-à-vis the rest of Latin America, as well as the effects therein of (neo)colonialism on language vitality and endangerment. Comparing Creole Exceptionalism to its counterparts with respect to the rest of Latin America may shed new light on some of the common sociohistorical roots of various myths about Creole and Indigenous languages and about their speakers. In section 7, I also compare language shift across the Caribbean and Iberian America, with a detour about the role of cultural subjectivities in language shift. Then in sections 8 and 9, I consider some of the book’s insights about the impact of cultural subjectivities on language evolution. These insights raise constructive, but still unanswered, questions about Creole formation in the Caribbean. Sections 10 and 11 turn to the future and consider lessons from the past that we have yet to apply in order to counteract some of the hierarchies that most affect social justice in Latin America. Sections 12 and 13 are an optimistic plea for a “sequel” where North-South collabo-

ration among linguists and educators can improve social justice in Latin America and beyond. From my own experience as a Haitian linguist at MIT with both personal and academic ties to the Caribbean, I feel that linguists and educators from both the Global North and the Global South have a great deal to learn from, and contribute to, each other's academic and political agendas.

1. Who? Where? Why? How? When? What?

On the linguistic empirical and theoretical fronts, the data and observations throughout this book should convince us of the futility of applying a cookie-cutter approach to the results of language contact, including the languages that linguists have labeled Creoles. It seems to me that this book's insights support the general approach that I have advocated in previous work (e.g., DeGraff 2009). Let's assume, *a priori*, no more than what we know to date about universal constraints on language variation across the human species. Then, let's further examine local historical particulars such as those investigated in this book, and let's try to understand how they may have influenced the contingencies of specific language-contact situations. No matter the range of contingent ecological factors, the outcome of language acquisition across what may seem wildly differing circumstances must still fall within the range of grammatical structures that is bounded by our species' biological endowment for language.

The scientific challenge posed by the vast range of contingent ecological factors affecting the outcomes of language contact may be best illustrated by comparing the chapters with one another. But that seems to me a boring thing to do. Instead I'll let my own hunches about language-contact phenomena and my work on language and education in my native Haiti guide my meditations about the contributions to this volume. My basic working assumptions are "Cartesian-Uniformitarian" (DeGraff 2009), whereby language change is the result of the interaction between contingent historical factors and invariant biological constraints on language. This interaction is best apprehended by examining as diverse a range of historical factors as possible.

On that score, John Lipski's chapter on Spanish dialect diversification in Latin America insightfully illustrates the diversity of historical factors that influenced the changes affecting one set of speech varieties that together often pass as belonging to one language labeled "Spanish." What Lipski suggests is that certain diachronic patterns in various local varieties of Spanish in the Americas are reflexes of analogous tendencies of Spanish in Europe. In Lipski's scenario, it took at least a couple of centuries for the evolution of Latin American varieties of Spanish to become

decoupled from structural changes affecting their cousins in Europe. Lipski posits that one key factor for this decoupling was the advent of big cities in Latin America, and they did not exist until the 1700s. Once Latin American cities surpassed a certain demographic threshold to start functioning as “big cities,” the specific linguistic norms for the corresponding urban varieties became stable and robust enough to achieve autonomy and acquire relative immunity to potential influence from the speech of newly arriving settlers and migrants from Europe. In a somewhat similar fashion, big cities also played a formative role in the role of Quechua as *lingua franca* in the colonial Andes (Durston, chap. 9, this volume). In the evolution of Hawaiian Creole as well, it’s been argued that it is in cities, and not on plantations, that Hawaiian Creole achieved its stable norms as an autonomous speech variety (Roberts 1998; Mufwene 2008). In contradistinction, it’s in rural areas that the most restructured varieties of Brazilian Portuguese are found, but that too is a reflex of historical contingencies, which in this case involve the geographic specifics of the language-contact situation in Brazil (cf. Mello, chap. 6; Clements, chap. 7, this volume).

For Lipski, another crucial factor affecting the evolution of Spanish in the Americas is the constant contact between Spanish and various other languages. From a mentalist perspective, this “contact” takes place in the minds of those who speak Spanish as a second language or those who are native speakers of both Spanish and some other language. Spanish thus came in contact with Amerindian languages such as Quechua and Aymara and with the Niger-Congo languages of the enslaved laborers from Africa such as Yoruba and Kikongo in colonial Cuba (also see Clements’s and Mello’s chapters). Spanish also came into contact with other European languages spoken by non-Spanish settlers, such as Italian in Buenos Aires and Montevideo in the nineteenth century. In the Dominican Republic from the nineteenth century up to the present, Spanish has found itself in contact with Haitian Creole, another product of colonial contact.

The details of the periodization and demographics of these overlapping layers of contact phenomena varied from locale to locale, thus rendering the overall historical scenario extremely complex. This complexity is reflected in an impressive range of “innovative hybrid patterns” found across Latin American Spanish varieties, as surveyed by Lipski. Compare, say, these three classes of contact-induced phenomena: (1) Quechua and Aymara influences on the morphological markers of evidentiality in Andean Spanish; (2) Italian influences on the “long-fall” pitch accent of Buenos Aires and Montevideo Spanish; and (3) Bantu influences on double negation markers (with both pre- and postpredicate *no*) in certain varieties of Dominican and Afro-Cuban Spanish.

As it turns out, similar instances of pre- and postpredicate negation can also be found in both Haitian Creole and Haitian French, as in, respectively, *Mwen pa kontan, non* and *Je suis pas content, non* 'I am not happy, no'. The Haitian Creole (HC) fact is duly noted by Lipski, who then considers the possibility that HC could have been a conduit for these double-negation patterns into Dominican Spanish. (Bantu influences on Portuguese are likewise documented in Clements's and Mello's chapters.)

It's worth noting that such cases of contact-driven syntactic innovation are amenable to constructive theoretical analyses. In the case of Andean Spanish varieties with morphological markers of evidentiality, Sánchez (2004) proposes a "functional convergence hypothesis" whereby interpretable features in the complementizer domain are the loci for syntactic changes via the idiolects spoken by Spanish-Quechua bilinguals: the innovation arises when functional features in the two grammars (i.e., the I-languages that underlie the Spanish and Quechua idiolects of the bilinguals) assume common values. In Sánchez's hypothesis, "interpretable features are the locus of permeability between grammars in the bilingual mind" (2004, 147).

Related increments of complexity in historical and demographic patterns, with concomitant increments of complexity in patterns of structural innovation cum "hybridization," obtain in the history of the American varieties of Portuguese, English, French and Dutch, alongside the multitude of Indigenous and contact-language varieties of the Americas, namely, Yucatec Maya, Carib, Arawak, Tupí-Guaraní and Jê languages, the contact varieties known as "Lengua/Língua Ge(ne)ral," the Caribbean Creoles, and so on. Regarding Portuguese, see the aforementioned chapters by Clancy Clements and by Heliana Mello. As for Yucatec Maya, Barbara Pfeiler's chapter is equally informative. The chapters by Christopher Ball, Alan Durston, Denny Moore, and M. Kittiya Lee provide useful information on the "Lengua/Língua Ge(ne)ral" varieties of the Andes and the Amazon. The latter four chapters remind us that language contact, as entailed by migrations, explorations, and conquests, prevailed in the Americas long before the arrival of the Europeans. Indeed, long before contact with the Europeans, population movements among the Maya, the Tupí-Guaraní, the Tukanoan people, and the Incas, among others, were already spreading their respective languages and producing new Indigenous contact varieties.

The chapters on Amerindian languages are particularly informative in highlighting one aspect of history that is too rarely discussed: the roles of certain Indigenous peoples in the Americas (e.g., the aforementioned Tupí-Guaraní and Quechua speakers) as sophisticated agents of exploration and conquest, rather than merely as victims of European imperial-

ism. It is in fact the routes already taken by these Indigenous expansionists that the European colonizers often followed in order to build their own Latin American empires.

Then again, Ball's chapter highlights fascinating insights about the various ways in which linguistic phenomena such as plurilingualism and language mixing, alongside certain attendant complex ideologies (e.g., about language "purity"), enter into Amerindian peoples' definitions of personhood and their senses of community membership, social networks, and social classes. As argued by Ball, these "cultural ideologies of subjectivities" may have impacted the outcome of contact, both among certain Amerindian languages and between Amerindian and European languages. In particular, these ideologies have to do with beliefs and attitudes toward monolingualism versus plurilingualism, as well as the role of language in defining gender roles, social classes, intermarriage practices, and the relationships between geography and identity. In Amazonia, one such set of beliefs relates to whether full personhood is culturally defined as requiring competence in no more than one single language, as in the Upper Xingu area, or in more than one language, as in the Vaupés area. Upper Xingu "ideology . . . attributes purity of ethnicity to individual monolingualism. Monolingualism and ethnic group endogamy are the norm," whereas the Vaupés manifests "connection to both kinship and plurilingualism, especially the exogamy and virilocality that ensure multilingual communities through marriage" (Ball, chap. 10, this volume, p. 258).

Here too, the book constructively forces a reversal of our traditional views of Indigenous people as victims of "loss" that is "caused" by contact with "dominant" Europeans. According to Ball, language "loss" by certain Amerindian groups can be analyzed as part of a concerted response to (re)negotiate identity, power, and conquest, coupled with conscious strategies for maintaining one's own culture, including its mating practices. In Amazonia, certain recurring patterns of language shift (with monolingualism or plurilingualism), as mediated by exogamy and migration, can be part and parcel of the very cultures that are being maintained. Indeed language mixing and language shift are experienced differently by, and mean different things to, an Amerindian whether it's monolingualism or plurilingualism that is valued as a criterion for personhood. (In other sections I will have more to say about this and other insightful observations in Ball's chapter).

On the linguistics front, many of the resulting "innovative hybrid patterns" that are surveyed in this book could be taken to have *added* a certain degree of local complexity (i.e., complexity in *certain* domains) to the pool of grammatical structures available in the language-contact

situation (for related discussions, see DeGraff 2001b, 250–259; 2009, 963n8; Aboh 2009; Aboh and DeGraff forthcoming-a, forthcoming-b). There are certainly other innovations (e.g., so called morphosyntactic “loss” and morphological “erosion” in inflectional paradigm) that may suggest a contact-induced decrease in complexity. But such decrements, it seems to me, are of a *local* nature as well and do not necessarily entail an *overall* decrease in complexity, contrary to still popular claims in Creole studies (see DeGraff 2001b, 2009; Aboh and DeGraff forthcoming-a, forthcoming-b, for overviews and counterarguments). I cannot think of any documented case of a natural language becoming simpler in *all* modules of grammar at once. At a more fundamental level, I have yet to see a rigorous measure of complexity that applies to an entire language—its lexicon, phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and so on (DeGraff 2001b, 265–273; Deutscher 2009).

In this vein, Denny Moore’s chapter is a fascinating study of Nheengatu, the lingua franca that was seeded by contact between Tupínamba and other Amerindian varieties in the Amazon. In his documentation of contact-induced diachronic patterns, Moore describes structural innovations based on Indigenous morphemes: the emergence of ‘to have’, the emergence of nominal plural markers, the replacement of nominalizations by relative clauses, and so forth. He argues that these innovations are “constructions which do not exist in Portuguese and probably did not exist in Tupinambá.” Thus, if anything, these would signal an *increase* of complexity if complexity is taken simplistically to be a matter of bit-counting (DeGraff 2001b, 265–273).

As for the cases of “loss,” Moore argues that “most [of the lost features] could be said to be relatively difficult to learn as an adult,” and he analyzes these diachronic patterns as the result of general processes of language acquisition. These patterns are similar to the effects of second-language acquisition in better-studied cases of contact-induced language change where “morphological erosion” reduces the size of certain morphological paradigms. These are cases of “local simplification” that have long been observed in the evolution of various languages, including Creole languages (Bunsen 1854; Meillet 1914; Weinreich 1958; I discuss related cases in a section titled “Local Simplicity” in DeGraff 2009, 957–958; also see Aboh and DeGraff forthcoming-a).

To borrow and adapt a quip from John Lipski’s chapter, the “who’s,” “where’s,” “why’s” and “when’s” in the demography, geography, sociology, and history of language contact in the Americas are acutely varied and even more varied when we add the “how” questions that are suggested by Christopher Ball’s chapter. These questions are too diverse for a uniform answer. They challenge any hypothesis whereby the results of

language contact would all fall into some prototypical mold and would all congregate toward the bottom of some still ill-defined and arbitrary hierarchy of grammatical complexity.

The enlightening studies in this book thus invite us to look deeper into the fine details of linguistic, demographic, ethnographic, and historical patterns in order to develop a rich and nuanced narrative for language change in the Americas. My hunch is that the elaboration of empirically adequate narratives of contact-induced language change in the New World has been hampered by a propensity on the part of many observers, especially in the colonial period, to describe, or even prescribe, particular speech varieties of their choice and use them as tools for imperialism—a topic to which I now turn.

2. Colonial Power, Colonial Knowledge, and Linguistic Imperialism

One of the common threads in narratives of language change in the Americas is the mutually sustaining relationship between, on the one hand, the production and transmission of knowledge about the ethnic groups brought into contact by colonization, enslavement, and forced migration and labor and, on the other hand, the production and transmission of hierarchies of power among the groups involved. One core domain for such production of colonial knowledge is constituted by the descriptions, analyses, and uses of diverse speech varieties in the colonial milieu, especially those spoken by the groups at the bottom and in the middle of these colonial hierarchies of power. These varieties have traditionally been described by scholars at the top of the hierarchies. Interestingly, these scholars were among those most invested in keeping the other groupings in a subordinate position, and their writings have promoted a series of structural shibboleths in order to create, then separate and control, subaltern categories of people. Scholarly and scholastic activities and beliefs relating to the speech varieties of those speakers in socioeconomically and politically subordinate positions have played a key role in the creation, negotiation, and transmission of power and in the distribution of symbolic and material capital, within and across these groups.

Such relationships between, on the one hand, linguistic and metalinguistic knowledge and, on the other hand, competition for power and capital and the resulting hierarchies are best apprehended in the chapters that deal with either of the following issues: (1) the fate of Indigenous and African languages in Latin America; (2) the varying degrees of intellectual development that are ascribed to the nonwhite populations of the Americas. These populations' intellectual development is often

measured by their respective degrees of fluency in the relevant European languages—usually the ones spoken by those who put themselves in charge of ethnographic cum linguistic description, education, socioeconomic development, and the like. In other cases, such as in the colonial Caribbean, intellectual development is equated with some arbitrary measure of *perceived* linguistic complexity on the part of the nonwhite populations.

As a matter of fact, these hierarchies of power and their correlates in *perceived* hierarchies of linguistic, cultural, and intellectual differences are still with us today, with often brutal consequences for social justice or, more precisely, the lack thereof. In the sixteenth century it was claimed by European colonists that the Amerindians were “so brute that they [did] not even have words” (Couto, chap. 3, this volume, p. 83), and now in the twenty-first century it is still claimed, even by linguists (e.g., McWhorter 2001), that Creole languages have the simplest grammars of all natural languages. (See DeGraff 2001a, 2005a for responses to these claims and for historical surveys of these and related views in Creole studies and their impact on Creole-speaking societies.)

The next five sections (3–7) examine the politics of linguistics, language, and education in Haiti as a looking glass to help us analyze the ecology of language evolution in the rest of Latin America, especially the effects of colonialism and neocolonialism on the vitality of Indigenous languages. I argue that the interaction in Haiti between linguistics and education is not part of an isolated case of Creole Exceptionalism (in the sense of DeGraff 2005a) but that it reflects, in a rather spectacular fashion, local and global political struggles that are quite similar to those that have affected education and language evolution in the whole of Latin America, especially after the advent of European imperialism (cf. Devonish 2007; Roberts 2008; Migge et al. 2010). This comparison will provide us with empirical and epistemological tools to demystify various linguistics- and education-related myths about Indigenous languages and their speakers in the Americas and beyond (Martínez Cobo 1987).

3. Language (Mis)management, (Mis)education, and Poverty in Haiti

My own native Haiti is the country where the raw manifestations of social injustice with linguistic correlates are perhaps the most blatant and crushing. In this (in)famous homeland of mine, the entire population of some 10 million speaks Haitian Creole (locally known as Kreyòl), but, in effect, French has been, for more than three centuries, the dominant language of administration, law, education, business, and so forth, especially

in the highest echelons. One of the most common arguments invoked to favor French over Kreyòl is that French grammar is more developed and more adapted to the modern world than Kreyòl grammar, whose structures are claimed to be exceptionally simple. Like the grammars of other Creole languages, Kreyòl's grammar has been considered a "handicap" for its speakers, thus unsuited for education and other formal domains that presuppose it. (See DeGraff 2001a, 2005a; Devonish 2007; Roberts 2008; Migge et al. 2010 for historical overviews of such claims.) Another popular argument invoked in favor of French over Kreyòl is that the former, unlike the latter, provides an expansive window to the world outside Haiti, and that Kreyòl isolates Haitians from the rest of the world.

This ethnographic situation of French in relation to Kreyòl in Haiti seems somewhat similar to that of Spanish and Portuguese in relation to the Indigenous languages of Latin America discussed in previous chapters in this volume, but with the notable distinction that in Haiti the local language is spoken by virtually every Haitian. As such, it is Kreyòl, and not French, that offers a common window, and a common means of communication, to *all* Haitians in Haiti. This key characteristic of Kreyòl in Haiti—as a truly *national* language in practical terms—rules out certain arguments that have typically been offered as a common explanation for the language-based inequities that obtain throughout Latin America.

The ethnographic status of Kreyòl as the sole national language in Haiti preempts the argument often invoked against Indigenous languages, namely, that they prevent communication across ethnic groups within national boundaries. In Haiti, it is striking that the domination of French persists even after Kreyòl was proclaimed an "official" language in the 1987 Haitian Constitution and is unquestionably the only language that "bonds" all Haitians together.

In a related vein, the language was accorded an official orthography in 1979, and since the early 1980s the country's official programs for education have prescribed the use of Kreyòl as the initial language of instruction in primary schools. But in practice most books and most exams are still in French, even though the language is spoken by less than 10 percent of the population. Students from communities where only Kreyòl is spoken (by far the most typical situation) have little chance to succeed in school and even less chance to make it to university. This linguistic cum educational apartheid seems reflected in the following statistics: out of ten children who start primary school, at most one will successfully complete secondary school (Groupe de Travail sur l'Education et la Formation 2010, 151). This apartheid and the concomitant failure of the school system are, in turn, among the factors that seem correlated with Haiti's overwhelming poverty (Dejean 2006; Dejean and DeGraff 2013). Indeed, it has been

convincingly argued that, by and large, countries that do not use their populations' native languages as the generalized media of instruction are those with the worst records of academic achievement and the worst levels of national development (Walter 2008; Hebblethwaite 2012).

The prominence of French in schools and exams presents one additional and major challenge to those students who come from Kreyòl-only speech communities. These students are typically excluded from the successful minority who make it to university—no more than 10 percent of those who enter the first grade (Groupe de Travail sur l'Education et la Formation 2010). This is a most brutal case of “élite closure” (Myers-Scotton 1993) where lack of fluency in French is a steep barrier to academic and socioeconomic advancement for the majority of the population. As for those who are born among the tiny proportion of families that speak both French and Kreyòl (less than 5% of the population), they will automatically acquire both languages as mother tongues, whereas another 5 percent will manage to learn French as a hard-won second language in school (Dejean 2006; Dejean and DeGraff 2013). It is these bilingual Haitians who, by and large, are likely to become successful professionals and dictate the future of the country's governmental, academic, economic, and cultural institutions. It is thus that native(-like) fluency in French has become a jealously guarded birthright to elite membership.

4. Linguistic Correlates of Colonial Hierarchies of Power in the Americas

In Iberian America as well, language barriers are key instruments for elite closure, and these barriers have roots in colonial hierarchies of power as described, for example, in Heliana Mello's chapter on Portuguese in Brazil. There we read about the origins of elite closure and its linguistic and ethnographic correlates among the slaves: the *Negros Ladinos* 'acculturated blacks' who could speak Portuguese were favored over the *Negros Boçais* 'bozal/stupid blacks' who could not speak Portuguese. “The *ladinos* had higher status owing to their linguistic skills, which were an important asset and helped some move up in the colonial population structure” (Mello, chap. 6, this volume, p. 171). The perceived superiority of Ladinos over Boçais in Brazil is analogous to that of Creole blacks over Bossal blacks throughout much of the colonial New World, including the Caribbean. The perceived superiority of Creole was most famously quantified by Moreau de Saint-Méry, who assigned to the Creole slaves “worth [that] is always a quarter more than that of the Africans” (1797, 1:40). I return to this issue in section 8.

It's noteworthy that the linguistic markers of *Ladinos* versus *Boçais*

were relatively independent of literacy levels: illiteracy was a general characteristic of the colonial population at that time, *across racial groups*. As noted by Mello, most of the early Portuguese settlers in colonial Brazil were themselves illiterate, with no formal education. So their fluency in any language was not a matter of schooling or an index of intelligence, but a mere reflex of where they had grown up and who they had the opportunity to interact with in their everyday lives. Here I am reminded of the Haitian saying *Pale franse pa vle di lespri* ‘Being able to speak French doesn’t mean that one is intelligent’. But, among the blacks in colonial Brazil, the *Negros Ladinos* (i.e., those who could speak Portuguese) were considered intellectually superior to the *Negros Boçais* even though their linguistic skills were generally due not to schooling or any intellectual prowess, but to contingent factors such as the length and circumstances of their exposure to Portuguese speakers. The *Negros Boçais*, like the *Bossales* in the Caribbean, were considered less intelligent simply because they were born in Africa, had recently arrived in the New World, and were less acculturated than the locally born and seasoned slaves.

This ascription of superiority to *Ladinos* over *Boçais* is echoed by the superiority that is (self-)assigned to the very small percentage of contemporary Haitians who are fluent in both French and HC and have maintained an approximation of the stratification that was current during the colonial period, although the colonial stratification, unlike the post-colonial one, included the French-born colonial settlers and their Creole descendants at the top of the socioeconomic hierarchy. Furthermore, in Haiti one often hears the argument, among policymakers, intellectuals, educators, and parents, that those Haitians who do not speak French are, to put it politely, cognitively or socially handicapped (see Mathieu 2005, 2008, 2010; Zefi 2011; Saint-Fort 2011). What is often not taken into account is that fluency in any language, even for children, requires adequate exposure to that language, either via instruction or via immersion (i.e., extensive contact with fluent speakers of the language). These conditions do not obtain for the majority of Haitians in Haiti with respect to French; neither did they obtain, with respect to Portuguese, for the *Negros Boçais* in colonial Brazil.

5. “Creole Exceptionalism”—from the Caribbean to the Andes?

As recently as June 2010, one very prominent Haitian intellectual and politician, historian and former president, Leslie Manigat, described Kreyòl as an “infirmité” (Mathieu 2010; Zefi 2011). When a foremost Haitian intellectual, speaking in French, calls a bona fide language an “infirmity,” he is illustrating both the depth of anti-Kreyòl ideology among Haitian

élites and the aforementioned Kreyòl saying *Pale franse pa vle di lespri* ‘Being able to speak French doesn’t mean that one is intelligent’. Manigat’s statement also brings to mind the common assumption that Creole languages constitute an exceptional linguistic/cognitive handicap for their speakers because of their alleged utmost morphological simplicity. In earlier work (DeGraff 2001a, 2005a) I have surveyed and provided rebuttals to various versions of this assumption that came to light through the colonial and postcolonial periods. Documenting empirical and theoretical lapses in these claims, I argued that we still lack a rigorous set of criteria for assigning to Creole languages, as a class, an invariant set of structural templates characterized by utmost grammatical simplicity (DeGraff 2001a, 2001b, 2005a; Aboh and DeGraff forthcoming-a, forthcoming-b). As for the “infirmité” that has often been attributed to monolingual Kreyòl speakers in Haiti, it seems more accurately analyzed as a socioeconomic and political “infirmité” cum marginalization that is imposed on monolingual Kreyòl speakers by the exclusionary use of French on the part of intellectuals, politicians, administrators, educators, and so on (see Devonish 2007; Roberts 2008; Migge et al. 2010 for an overview of related issues in Creole-speaking communities).

As for the Indigenous languages studied in this volume, for example, Maya, Quechua, Aymara, Tupí-Guaraní, and Tukano, linguists would be hard-pressed to claim that they too are all at the bottom of some stipulated hierarchy of grammatical complexity. Yet in these cases as well, there is an assumption that Amerindian Indigenous languages fall outside the structural range of “normal” languages—a view that Bloomfield (1925) eloquently argues against, in spite of his own exceptionalist attitudes regarding Creoles (DeGraff 2001a, 111n25). The Library of Congress codifies this exceptionalist view of Creole and Indigenous languages by including these local languages in their “PM” subclass “Hyperborean, Indian, and Artificial languages”! Fortunately, we find local educators/activists, in the Caribbean and elsewhere, who view their native languages as *normal* languages and who are working for a future in which these languages will, at last, be integrated as media of instruction and communication at all levels, including higher education and public administration, and as instruments for socioeconomic advancement in their communities, on a par with European languages.

Quechua and Aymara are cases in point. Like Kreyòl in Haiti, these languages are often perceived as exceptional linguistic “handicaps” by politicians, administrators, intellectuals, educators, and parents. Some Bolivian parents have even threatened to burn pedagogical materials in Indigenous languages after “Intercultural Bilingual Education” became Bolivian law in 1994. These materials were designed to promote Quechua

and Aymara speakers' linguistic and cultural rights as well as to improve pedagogical practice, but parents were concerned that teaching literacy in Indigenous languages would hamper their children's learning of Spanish, increase discrimination against them, and lessen their chances for upward mobility (Parackahua Arancibia 2011). It is often believed that teaching literacy and content to Quechua-speaking children in Quechua will disadvantage them. Similar beliefs are prevalent about Kreyòl in Haiti. These beliefs persist despite decades of research and multiple UNESCO proclamations supporting instruction in the mother tongue. (See also King and Hornberger 2004; García 2004; Godenzzi 2008; McCarty et al. 2008, for related observations about parents' rejection of bilingual education programs that include Indigenous languages alongside Spanish. Resistance to bilingual education is also prevalent in the United States, with the striking exception of elite parents who can afford private "international" schools, exchange programs abroad, etc., for their children.)

The officialization of bilingual education in Andean countries and related post-1970 laws making Indigenous languages "official" or "national" (see Godenzzi 2008 for a survey) suggest that the ideological climate around these languages has improved since the times when they were considered "animal languages" (King 2004, 337). Yet, as in Haiti, there is a wide chasm in Iberian America between the rhetorics of bilingual education and the practice of exclusion via the use of dominant European languages. This chasm opposes the laws that declare Indigenous and other local languages "official" or "national" to the fact that these languages and their speakers are still being discriminated against on a daily basis (Godenzzi 2008; Dejean 2006; Saint-Fort 2011; Dejean and DeGraff 2013). Andean children born to Quechua-speaking families are among those most likely to fail in school or drop out of school (Laurie and Bonnett 2002; Godenzzi 2008). Thus an age-old colonial tradition is perpetuated, whereby Indigenous populations have, for the most part, been excluded from full participation in the school system and from other avenues of socioeconomic development. There certainly are examples of Indigenous individuals who have become successful professionals, such as Aymara-speaking Evo Morales, current president of Bolivia, but these are among a small minority. (I return to this issue in sections 10 and 11.)

6. Local Languages, Contact Languages, "Standard" Languages . . . Tools for Hegemony?

There are also fascinating differences between the fates of Creoles in the Caribbean and the fates of Indigenous languages in Latin America, notwithstanding the sociohistorical parallels between the two geographical

areas. We'll delve into these differences to sort out the fundamental mechanics of power that have been at work. Such fundamentals should be factored into the design of more effective language policy. Compare, say, the history of Quechua in the Andes, Tupí-Guaraní in the Amazon, Maya in the Yucatán, and Kreyòl in Haiti. Unlike Kreyòl, these three Indigenous languages were vibrant languages and even served as *lingua francas* among certain Indigenous groups long before the arrival of the European colonists. In Haiti, the Amerindian population and their languages, by and large, quickly vanished through genocide and disease after the Spanish arrived with Columbus in 1492. Today Haiti's population, unlike that of Iberian America, is almost completely of non-Indigenous stock; the people are primarily of African ancestry, with small percentages of people of European and Levantin ancestry and an even smaller percentage of people of Amerindian ancestry (see Fouchard 1972; Price-Mars 1956; Dubois 2011, for additional details and references).

In what is now Iberian America, Quechua-, Tupínamba- and Maya-speaking communities included many groups whose role and fame as rulers or conquerors predated that of the Europeans, as noted by Hildo do Couto, Alan Durston, M. Kittiya Lee, Denny Moore, and Barbara Pfeiler in this volume. Upon their arrival in the Andes, in the region that is now Brazil, and in the Yucatán, the Europeans initially enlisted these Indigenous languages as tools to advance their imperial expansion and control and to strengthen their own nascent power, including Christian conversion.

Take Brazil in the sixteenth century as described by Couto: "What the Portuguese called *Língua Brasileira* or *Língua Geral* became so important in the first days of Portuguese colonization that Luís da Grã (1523–1609) imposed its study among the Jesuits of the present State of Pernambuco" (chap. 3, this volume, p. 83; see also Moore, chap. 4, this volume). Ditto regarding Maya in the Yucatán: "Although stigmatized since the Spanish conquest, the Maya language was used by missionaries and plantation owners in their efforts to achieve social and religious domination" (Pfeiler, chap. 8, this volume, p. 205). Similarly, Spanish colonial authorities in the Andes codified their own "standard" version of written Quechua, produced an official description for it, introduced it for study at the university level, and used it as a *lingua franca* in religious, administrative, and legal matters. They even made fluency in Quechua a requirement for holding clergy posts in Indian parishes (Durston, chap. 9, this volume, p. 234). European colonization may have helped instrumentalize and standardize Quechua and even spread it beyond its former boundaries within the Inca Empire, thus expanding its spread as a regional *lingua franca*, continuing the Inca language policy that was in force before the arrival of

the Europeans. These observations are consistent with those made about Yucatec Maya, *Língua Geral*, Nheengatu, and other major Indigenous *língua francas* in the chapters by Pfeiler, Couto, Lee, and Moore.

Yet, as explained by Alan Durston (chap. 9, this volume), the Spanish missionaries' very codification of Quechua at the onset of Spain's colonial enterprise was a "reinvention" of the language. This codification *did* serve the colonizer's geopolitical expansion: the written Standard Colonial Quechua (SCQ) that they produced through their linguistic "description" was not equivalent to any version of Quechua that already existed. On the contrary, their SCQ corpora, mostly catechisms and liturgical texts, was elaborated toward an "ideal" Quechua based on the attitudes, standards, and agenda of the Spanish. Their main priority was speedy indoctrination of Quechua speakers into a uniform set of a beliefs and practices. Such uniform doctrine was to rest partly on a uniform *língua franca* that would be easy to acquire, especially for those having to learn it quickly as a second language, including the Spanish themselves.

In Durston's analysis, key domains of this codified *língua franca* (e.g., liturgical terminology) were *easiest* to acquire for the Spanish since the terms therein were borrowed from Spanish. This "standard" Quechua, with key terms influenced by Spanish, "served to shore up clerical authority" and was "designed as an instrument of control and restriction rather than wide communication." Indeed there was little communication in SCQ on the part of Indigenous parishioners, who "were only to 'speak' SCQ in the form of oral performances of memorized texts" (Durston, chap. 9, this volume, pp. 238–39).

These texts in SCQ are an early example of the sort of prescription that is camouflaged as description; what was done with SCQ is similar to the cases of "description as prescription" documented by Bourdieu (1982) and is reminiscent of the contemporary use of European languages for "control and restriction rather than wide communication" in many Creole-speaking communities. In the specific case of Haiti, many a student is reduced to "speaking" French "in the form of oral performances of memorized texts." Although the two originated from distinct ecologies, both written SCQ in the colonial Andes and French in postcolonial Haiti—in contrast to vernacular Quechua and Kreyòl, respectively—can be analyzed as tools to implement elite closure, giving a "home" advantage to the respective elites of these two countries.

Durston (chap. 9, this volume, p. 230) mentions the possible contributions of colonial cities to the differential status of various Quechua varieties as potential *língua francas*. He describes Spanish attitudes toward urban versus rural varieties, with preference given to varieties associated

with “urban centers of power, wealth, and learning.” This observation adds fascinating socioeconomic and geographic dimensions to these early explicit efforts at language planning. It brings to mind John Lipski’s observations about the (unplanned) contributions of big cities to the divergence of Latin American varieties of Spanish away from their European counterparts. This pattern of evolution is also similar to the emergence of Hawaiian Creole in S. J. Roberts’s (1998) Creole-formation scenario whereby cities played a key role in the divergence and crystallization away from English.

The history of SCQ as documented in this volume thus reveals important traces of subservience to power: as already mentioned, the written variety that is found in the early Spanish missionaries’ liturgical corpora did not exist prior to the Christian expansion in the region, but it reflects the European writers’ own preferences and it was codified to best fit Europe’s *mission civilisatrice* (Durston, chap. 9, this volume). Couto, Lee, and Moore report similar facts about the adoption of certain Indigenous contact languages (e.g., *Língua Geral Paulista* and *Língua Geral Amazônica* a.k.a. Nheengatu) as *lingua francas* by the Portuguese Jesuit fathers in sixteenth-century colonial Brazil. The Spanish and Portuguese colonists were all too aware of the geopolitical advantages of these Indigenous languages, instead of their native European languages, as *lingua francas*. Another factor in such choices may have been the Europeans’ belief that the Indigenous populations were cognitively unable to learn European languages (Couto, chap. 3, this volume, p. 83). From this perspective, the best option was for the Europeans themselves to learn the Indigenous contact languages so they could carry out their *mission civilisatrice* as promptly and broadly as possible. In any case, in the Yucatán, the Andes, and the Amazon of the sixteenth century, Indigenous languages like Maya, Quechua, and the Brasília had functionality that Spanish and Portuguese didn’t. Witness, for example, the appellations *Lengua General* for Quechua (Durston, chap. 9, this volume) and *Língua Geral Amazônica* for the contact language that emerged out of the Brasília as it became the *lingua franca* across Indigenous speech communities in the Amazon (Couto, Lee, and Moore, this volume). These languages became “emblem[s] of European occupation” (Couto, chap. 3, this volume, p. 91).

Consider, again, Quechua, whose history is richly documented in the chapters by Durston and Lee. Notwithstanding any racial prejudice against Amerindians, what the Spanish who first arrived in the Andes quickly understood was that there was already a vast swath of territory occupied by Quechua speakers that they could reach and colonize through Quechua. The missionaries instrumentalized the language through the production of catechisms, sermons, and sacramental texts in SCQ (Durston, chap. 9,

this volume). The colonial administrators used the few individuals who spoke both Quechua and Spanish to interface between them and the Indigenous populations they would “civilize.” Thus, the Spanish adapted to a particular power structure and its metalinguistic hierarchies, using the relevant language varieties to help build a profitable empire under their political control. So, how did the promotion of Quechua come to an end? The story, as documented by Durston (chap. 9, this volume) is complex. But one reason, among others, for the eventual fall of Quechua is that it became one overt symbol of nationalist anticolonial resistance, as in the rebellion led by Túpac Amaru II. Starting in the early eighteenth century, the Spanish started promoting Castilianization, and eventually they banned Quechua linguistic and cultural practices in the public sphere (García 2004; King and Hornberger 2006; Durston, chap. 9, this volume).

A related argument can be made about the status of Tupí-Guaraní languages in the Amazon at the time of the Europeans’ arrival. The Europeans’ initial use of Tupí-derived contact languages (e.g., *Língua Geral Paulista* and *Língua Geral Amazônica*, a.k.a. *Nheengatu*) as *lingua franca*, before the ascendancy of Portuguese, has been taken to reflect the status of Tupí-Guaraní traders as conspicuous explorers, conquerors, and power brokers in the Amazon. Here it seems worth quoting M. Kittiya Lee at length: “The elevation of the Tupi-Guarani languages from the mother tongues of coastal Indians to the unofficial *lingua franca* of the colony and the subsequent proliferation of grammars and catechisms in the Brasília underscore the ongoing involvement throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries of native speakers of Tupi-Guarani with religious agents of European colonization” (Lee, chap. 5, this volume, p. 157).

Couto offers a related observation: “From the language of a dominated people (the Tupinambás) it [*Nheengatu*] became an instrument of colonization through the missionaries, colonists, and others. In fact, it became an emblem of European occupation” (chap. 3, this volume, p. 91).

These observations remind me of two related remarkable facts from the history of Indigenous languages in North America: (1) the first Bible ever published in the Americas, by John Eliot in 1663, was in the Algonquian language Wampanoag; (2) this first Wampanoag Bible contained sentences like the following: *Pomantamwaheuhkon pauwau* ‘Do not allow a “witch” to live’. That Wampanoag verse is a translation from Exodus 22:18 (King James Version): “Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live.” In Eliot’s Wampanoag translation, ‘witch’ is translated as *pauwau*, which nowadays is more familiar to us as the *powwow* ‘medicine man’ in Wampanoag culture. Thus, Eliot’s translation can be interpreted as an exhortation that the converted Wampanoag Christians go in earnest and kill

the powwow, their Indigenous medicine men. In a related fashion, the colonial Spanish eventually reinterpreted the “morally neutral” Quechua word *supay* ‘spirit’—a key word in Quechua metaphysics—into the Spanish *demonio* ‘demon’ (Harrison 1989, 47–48, 136–137).²

Semantic drift has also affected the Haitian word *Vodou*, etymologically related to the Gbe word for ‘spirit’. For millions of adepts in Africa and the Americas, “Vodou” is an umbrella term for a family of African and Afro-Caribbean religions, but it has now been (mis)used in U.S. popular culture to refer to evil spirits, sorcery, spells, magic, hoaxes, frauds, and the like. Such uses are found in George H. W. Bush’s put-down of Ronald Reagan’s economic policy as “voodoo economics,” in titles of trade books such as *Voodoo Science: The Road from Foolishness to Fraud*, and even in children’s picture books like Dav Pilkey’s *Ricky Ricotta’s Giant Robot vs. Voodoo Vultures of Venus* (read in prekindergarten to my then four-year-old son Nuriel). What we see here—in North America, the Andes, and Haiti—is a global phenomenon in which religious concepts from outside Europe are demonized when translated into European languages.

The virulent denigration of Haitian Vodou may well be ultimately related to the (perceived) role of Vodou in fomenting slave revolts in late-eighteenth-century colonial Haiti, in the military victory of the Africans against the French Napoleonic army at the turn of the nineteenth century, and in the creation of the first Black Republic in the Americas—an “unthinkable” event, given the world order at the time (Trouillot 1995). Already at the turn of the eighteenth century, Père Labat was warning against what he saw as the joy and lasciviousness and the potential for rebellions in the slaves’ Vodou dances (Labat 1722, 4:466–467). These warnings were repeated at the turn of the nineteenth century by Moreau de Saint-Méry, who thought that Vodou celebrations were a front for disgusting bacchanalian secret meetings where weaker souls could be corrupted and led to sinister ends (1797, 1:49–51). In sections 8 and 9 we look at Vodou in the ecology of Creole formation.

The Indigenous languages and cultures of the Caribbean, in contrast to those in North and South America, were not used as instruments of expansion and control by European colonial authorities. In Haiti and most other locations in the Caribbean, the Amerindian languages of the pre-colonial Indigenous people vanished with the genocide of their speakers, shortly after Columbus’s arrival in 1492. Amerindian languages are, by and large, no longer spoken in the Greater Caribbean, although they still persist as minority and endangered languages in some Central American countries, such as Belize, among the descendants of the Garifuna people deported there from the Caribbean island of St. Vincent in the eighteenth

century (Devonish 2007, 193–195, 233–241). But where there is a parallel between the Caribbean and the rest of Latin America is in the politically astute co-opting of the most widespread local languages as *lingua francas* and as (contested) tools for control.³

For example, the use of Indigenous languages as “*lingua franca[s]* [and] useful communicative and symbolic tool[s] in different ways for different groups,” as described by King and Hornberger (2006, 184) for Quechua, is similar to the use of Kreyòl during the Haitian Revolution (1791–1803) by both the black leaders fighting for liberty and the proslavery French emissaries of Napoleon Bonaparte. The black leaders, whose troops were made up mostly of African-born soldiers from different ethnic groups, co-opted Kreyòl and certain African languages in order to be understood by all their troops and constituencies. In a related vein, the proclamations distributed by Napoleon Bonaparte’s emissaries to the blacks during the Haitian Revolution were among the first official documents ever to be written in Kreyòl. These proclamations aimed at countering the anti-slavery and anticolonial spirit that was spreading throughout the colony. They were meant to be read in public squares in order to reach the greatest numbers of people. This use of *Kreyòl* was thus motivated by the need of the *French* to maintain their colonial authority over the disfranchised majority fighting for their freedom. Thus, both blacks and whites were using Kreyòl as an indispensable tool for hegemony—on a par with the use of certain Indigenous languages during Europe’s conquest of the Americas and Africa. For instance, Quechua was used in the eighteenth century for its communicative and symbolic power both by the Spanish colonizers and by rebellious Incas fighting against the Spanish (García 2004; King and Hornberger 2006; Durston, chap. 9, this volume). Similar uses of Indigenous languages are also found in the history of Europe’s occupation of Africa (see Samarin 1986 for the history of Lingala as a *lingua franca* in the Congo). I revisit the early uses of Kreyòl in colonial Haiti (known then as Saint-Domingue) in the section 7.

7. Linguistic Ideology, Language Shift, and Language Endangerment

Another language-evolution parallel between the colonial Andes and colonial Haiti relates to the fact that through its expansion in and beyond the (former) Inca Empire, Quechua, even when it became dominated by Spanish, also dominated, then caused the extinction of, many languages with fewer speakers, such as the Jaqaru, Puquina, and Uro-Chipaya languages (King and Hornberger 2006, 185; also see Durston, chap. 9; and Couto, chap. 3, this volume). Similarly, Kreyòl in Saint-Domingue, al-

though it was less prestigious than French, became by far the most widely spoken language, while the ancestral languages of the Africans (the least prestigious in the colonial milieu) eventually vanished from the ecology of language contact there. In fact, according to Mufwene (2008, chap. 11), Creole formation in the Caribbean and the Indian Ocean can be viewed as a concomitant of language shift among the enslaved Africans. Mufwene relates the speed of loss of ancestral languages to various factors, including the competing socioeconomic values of the languages in contact. According to him, these differing values are among the reasons why the loss of ancestral languages proceeded faster among the Africans in the Caribbean than among the Amerindians in the Andes and in the Amazon. In turn, the shift to Kreyòl on the part of Africans and their descendants in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Haiti is similar to the shift in sub-Saharan Africa to urban vernaculars like Sango, Swahili, Lingala, and Kituba. As Mufwene reminds us, the shift to urban vernaculars, with the concomitant loss of the demographically or socioeconomically “smaller” languages in the contact situation, also occurred in the history of Europe, North America, and Australia (chap. 1, this volume, pp. 14–15).

As a matter of fact, according to Christopher Ball and Hildo do Couto (chaps. 10 and 3, this volume), Tupí-Guaraní and its contact-language descendants and other major vernaculars such as Tukano can also be viewed as “threats” to smaller Amerindian languages in the Amazon. What is also documented, so insightfully, in Ball’s chapter—which deserves an expository detour—is that the adoption of Portuguese and Tukano by (former) speakers of, say, Arapaço and Piratapuya is embedded in a set of concerted practices aimed at accumulating power or at preserving key aspects of Arapaço and Piratapuya ethnicity and ancestral cultures. The latter include deeply rooted senses of identity and gender- and marriage-related practices, some of which are intricately related to communal attitudes and beliefs about language purity, language mixing, language transmission, and so on. In one such practice, the male Arapaço maintained *and* adapted his plurilingual exogamous cultural identity by shifting to plurilingualism in Tukano and Portuguese (through forced relocation) instead of plurilingualism in Arapaço and some other language (through exogamy).

As for the Piratapuya, their stated reason for shifting to Tukano and Portuguese is a culturally rooted aversion to language “corruption” through language mixing in mission schools—language mixing outside of the traditional bounds of exogamy. In this case, “Indigenous language mixing, outside of the prescribed exogamic and hierarchical constraints, [is] the reason for intergenerational language shift.” One Piratapuya father felt that “he had better teach his children Tukano well than a version of Piratapuya corrupted by mixing in the school environment.” Piratapuya’s

cultural subjectivity puts high value on the correct use of each language in a speaker's plurilingual repertoire. This father was thus being *culturally* Piratapuya even as he was teaching Tukano, instead of Piratapuya, to his children. In such cases, "social transformation and language change, including language shift, do not necessarily entail the loss of culturally specific norms of subjectivity" (Ball, chap. 10, this volume, pp. 255–57).

Ball also documents the critical role played by gender roles in these processes of social transformation and language change, with women helping to maintain both plurilingualism (at the individual level) and multilingualism (at the communal level) via virilocal exogamy (i.e., the practice of local men marrying female outsiders speaking nonlocal languages). These female outsiders perform their exogamous cultural practices in innovative ways when they are married to Portuguese in big cities and when they produce racially mixed children who inherit, from their *fathers*, Portuguese as their "mother" tongue, alongside a (colonial? quasi? neo?) Portuguese identity.

Yet, cultural inheritance is not straightforward. These Amerindian women with Portuguese husbands do not strictly follow their cultures' dictates: they contradict patrilineal patterns of cultural transmission somewhat "by investing effort in having [their] children incorporated as members of [the mothers'] paternal sib, both by bringing [the mothers'] own fathers or other paternal relatives to town to reside with their nuclear family and by enacting sib-specific naming rituals to confirm mixed children's sib membership" (Ball, chap. 10, this volume, p. 259). These women are thus critical agents of cultural and linguistic pluralism in their households. This is yet another way in which cities play a decisive role in patterns of language change, this time through modification of Indigenous women's gender-related cultural practices. These women are still exogamous, in keeping with their culture: they have moved out to big cities, where they marry outside their groups. Yet they make choices that contravene traditional patriarchal patterns by enabling their children to maintain their Indigenous identity through European-inflected "hiccups in transmission" (Ball, chap. 10, this volume, p. 260) that, in effect, produce plurilingual Portuguese-cum-Amerindian households, thus new ecologies for linguistic and cultural contact.

To end this fascinating expository detour about the role of cultural subjectivities in language shift in the Amazon, let's note that the role of exogamous women in language contact and language shift in the Amazon as described by Ball is somewhat similar to that of the mestizos (children of Amerindian women and European men) discussed by Couto (chap. 3, this volume); they were an important vector in the spread of Portuguese in colonial Brazil.

We've now compared, on the one hand, the threats that major Indigenous languages have posed to smaller languages in the Andes and the Amazon to, on the other hand, those threats that Caribbean Creoles posed *and* carried out, with respect to a variety of Niger-Congo languages in the colonial Caribbean. The locally born (or "Creole") descendants of the enslaved Niger-Congo speakers did eventually switch to the next available Creole or European language for the familiar ecological reasons of economic and political power (Mufwene 2008). In Guyana, it is a Creole language (in this case, Guyanese Creole, a.k.a. Creolese) that, after superseding its African ancestor languages, has now become a threat to local Indigenous languages such as the Arawakan language Lokono; in Belize, it's Belizean Creole that poses a threat to Garifuna, although the latter is not truly "Indigenous" to Belize (see note 1), having been transported from St. Vincent (Devonish 2007, 193–195, 233–241).

One notable difference between Creoles in the Caribbean and the Indigenous contact languages studied in this book is that the latter predated the arrival of the Europeans, whereas the former came into existence as the initial cohorts of Africans in the Caribbean colonies were progressively shifting to the locally available varieties of European languages. Another key difference has to do with the available evidence and the methodological approaches in studies of language evolution in colonial Iberian America and in the colonial Caribbean. This is the topic of section 8, where I take inspiration from Christopher Ball's chapter as I delve into a timid and tentative exercise in linguistic anthropology to try to shed light on one understudied factor in language change in the Caribbean, namely, the role of linguistic ideologies in language shift.

8. Cultural Subjectivities and Language Shift among the "Incas" of Haiti

One sort of research that is sorely missing in work on language evolution in the Caribbean is detailed ethnographic study on a par with Ball's investigation of language shift by Amerindians in the Amazon. For example, research on linguistic ideologies among Africans in the colonial New World would shed light on the ways in which language shift and language change in the Caribbean may have been influenced by the Africans' own cultural subjectivities.

In lieu of full-fledged ethnographic studies of Africans in the colonial Caribbean, what we do have are extensive reports of Europeans' attitudes vis-à-vis the Indigenous, African, and Creole languages spoken in the colonial Caribbean (see DeGraff 2001a, 2005a, for overviews and references). In the case of Haiti—itsself an Amerindian name meaning "land

of mountains”—European observers considered the Creole-speaking Africans as an improvement over those who spoke only African languages.

One such observer is Saint-Méry (1797), who presents a hierarchy of Creole varieties based on their proximity to French: the best Creole, in his opinion, is the variety that is closest to French and furthest away from the influence of African languages. This is the Creole variety that creolists characterize as “acrolectal.” Saint-Méry saw the non-Creole people (i.e., those born outside the Caribbean, whether African- or European-born) at a linguistic disadvantage: the Creoles spoke native Creole varieties that were superior to the nonnative varieties, especially those spoken by the African-born slaves, the “Bossals.” According to him, “this [Creole] language . . . is often unintelligible when spoken by an old African; one speaks it all the more fluently if one learns it at a younger age” (1797, 1:64).

This linguistic advantage, based on an accident of birth, conferred upon the numerical minority of Creole blacks an allure of superiority over the African-born majority. As Saint-Méry assessed it, quite arithmetically, “for all tasks, it is the Creole slaves that are preferred; their worth is always a quarter more than that of the Africans” (1797, 1:40). Saint-Méry’s rationale for this comparative advantage reminds us of Mello’s description of the perceived superiority of the *Ladino* blacks over the *Boçais* blacks. In Saint-Méry’s terms, “Creole Blacks are born with physical and moral qualities that truly give them the right to be superior over Blacks that have been brought from Africa”; “domesticity has embellished the [black] species” (1:39). This allure of superiority may have played a key role in the relatively rapid spread of the linguistic features associated with the speech of Creole blacks (DeGraff 2002, 378–382).

Saint-Méry created race- and ethnicity-based hierarchies that applied to both the mixed race (the mulattoes) and the African populations of Saint-Domingue. The etymology of *mulatto* (from *mule*) is related to the fact that the hybrid offspring of mixed-race couples was considered as defective as the sterile mule. On the ethnographic and linguistic front, Saint-Méry took the Congos to be docile, joyful, easiest to assimilate to the colonial milieu, good learners of Kreyòl, and well suited for domestic life and skilled trades, whereas the Aradas were considered the worst language learners among the Africans (1797, 1:29–32). Saint-Méry’s hierarchies also include spectacularly biased ethnographic details, as in his description of the Mondongues (1797, 1:33): hideous and feared by all and, worse yet, *aficionados* of human flesh, especially that of babies, including their own!

Unfortunately there is no counterpoint from the African side about their *own* metalinguistic attitudes and ideologies and for their *own* fashioning of identities.⁴ As I look for some window—*any* window—on the

cultural subjectivities of Africans in the colonial Americas, I will now try to extrapolate from popular sayings in contemporary HC, with the provisional assumption that the metalinguistic attitudes and beliefs that are revealed through these sayings may go back to colonial times or ancestral cultural practices. Better yet, I'll examine early reports of metalinguistic attitudes among prominent blacks in the colonial Caribbean.

Let's start with the Haitian saying that contrasts Kreyòl as *lang rasin* 'root/ancestral language' with French as *lang achte* 'purchased language' (Valdman 1984, 82; DeGraff 2005a, 570). The Kreyòl word *rasin* (literally 'roots') is often used as a modifier for terms in the Vodou religious domain, as in *lwa rasin* 'ancestral spirits' and *mizik rasin* 'ancestral rhythms'. *Rasin* endearingly evokes (imagined notions of) family heritage with "roots" that go back generations, all the way back to *Ginen* 'Guinea' (i.e., the mythical Africa of ancestral origins). The *lwa rasin* are seamlessly transmitted from parents to children through home and communal practices. In Vodou's cosmology, the *lwa rasin* are inherited from the ancestors in Ginen or bequeathed by the spirits of eighteenth-century black leaders of the Haitian Revolution such as Jean-Jacques Dessalines (Dayan 1995). Dessalines was a former slave who fought and won against the French's Napoleonic proslavery army in the battles that led to the independence of Haiti in 1804. It was the only nation created out of a slave revolt—and the first nation to break free of the Europeans' colonial empires in Latin America.

Ginen is a mythical symbol for those who practice Vodou. In the context of Amazonian cultural subjectivities, *Ginen* brings to mind the "up-river" original location of the founding ancestor Unurato, who looms so large in the Aparaçó myth of creation (Ball, chap. 10, this volume, p. 254). In Vodou's own mythology, the *lwa rasin* 'ancestral spirits', also known as *lwa fanmi* 'family spirits' or *lwa eritaj* 'heritage spirits', are considered benevolent and are trusted to give lasting strength and to promote individual and communal wholesomeness. In contrast, the *lwa achte* 'purchased spirits', also known as *lwa djab* 'evil spirits', are not part of one's ancestral lineage. They are costly, foreign, and satanic "manmade" spirits that impose heavy demands on those who acquire them—often for malevolent purposes. The *lwa achte* may be efficacious for certain selfish purposes, but they are immoral and untrustworthy spirits that eventually undermine the individual and the community's well-being.

There are three other, even more popular, Haitian sayings that attribute positive communal and communicative values to Kreyòl as compared to the limits and disruptive power of French. Consider the saying *Kreyòl pale, kreyòl konprann*. Its literal, and perhaps original, meaning is 'Creoles speak, Creoles understand' which can be interpreted as "We

Creoles understand one another.” Nowadays it is often taken to mean ‘Creole spoken, Creole understood’, that is, ‘the Creole language facilitates mutual understanding’. This latter interpretation is related to two other sayings: *Sispann pale franse* (literally, ‘Stop speaking French’) ‘stop obfuscating’ and the aforementioned *Pale franse pa vle di lespri* ‘Being able to speak French doesn’t mean that one is intelligent’.

These four Kreyòl sayings illustrate linguistic ideologies related to the contemporary comparative values of Kreyòl versus French. They make one wonder about the enslaved Africans’ attitudes and beliefs about French as they were learning the latter as a second language and thus seeding the varieties identified today as Kreyòl—and as they were fashioning early forms of Vodou out of their ancestral African religious practices in negotiation with the dogmas of Christianity to which they were exposed. These negotiations between African religions and Christianity may have started in Africa as early as the fifteenth century, long before the Africans arrived in the Americas (Heywood 2002; Heywood and Thornton 2007).

Both Kreyòl and Vodou helped create a community in Saint-Domingue, where there was none among the Creole and African-born blacks with diverse ethnic origins and ancestral languages. The Vodou blood-oath ceremony of Bwa Kayiman in 1791 has often been described as one of the most important symbolic overtures to the Haitian Revolution (e.g., Fouchard 1981; Fick 1990; Dayan 1995; Dubois 2011; Beauvoir-Dominique 2011; but see Geggus 1991, 2002). Kreyòl as lingua franca was certainly a key instrument for communication on the battlefronts on all sides, and necessarily so at a time when the multilingual African-born population was the majority in the colony. Yet there seems to have been a certain ambivalence vis-à-vis both Kreyòl as colonial lingua franca and the Creole blacks themselves even though—or perhaps because—the latter, especially the free Creoles, generally held the most social and economic power among the black population—a power that included a certain amount of control over the Bossal slaves (some of the free Creole blacks even owned slaves). This ambivalence around Kreyòl can be deduced from three sources, among others: (1) reports about the language attitudes of two of the most famous revolutionary leaders: François-Dominique Toussaint Louverture (1743–1803) and Jean-Jacques Dessalines (1758–1806), former slaves who spearheaded the war against the French (see, e.g., Jenson 2011 for a comprehensive summary); (2) Vodou songs warning about the ambivalent allegiances and religious beliefs of the Creole blacks (see, e.g., Beauvoir 2009); and (3) descriptions of class-based ideological, political, and military struggles opposing Creole and African-born blacks, including reports of persecution of Vodou practitioners by Creole leaders (see, e.g., Fouchard 1953; Fick

1990; Thornton 1993; Trouillot 1995; Beauvoir and Dominique 2003; Ramsey 2011).

Here we'll take a brief look at reports about language attitudes on the part of revolutionary leaders in Saint-Domingue. Toussaint Louverture, for one, would sometimes berate those who addressed him in Kreyòl. Yet that's the language that he himself would sometimes use to scold or persuade (e.g., Descourtiz 1809, 3:245–246, 251; Saint-Louis 2006, 160; Fick 1990, 116; Jenson 2011, 65). He is also “said to have spoken fluently the language of his ‘Arada’ (Ewe-Fon) father . . . and to have enjoyed speaking it with other slaves of his father’s ethnic group” (Geggus 2002, 16). Perhaps he perceived, as many still do in contemporary Haiti, that those in positions of power must speak, and be spoken to, in French in order for them to extract respect and maintain authority. On occasion, he would even affect aristocratic “old régime ideology” through, say, the use of Latin (Saint-Louis 2006, 160). Yet Toussaint himself was not perfectly fluent in French: he spoke what Haitians today would call a *français marron* ‘Brown French’ (Jenson 2011, 65), that is, Kreyòl-influenced French of the sort that is often ridiculed by middle- and upper-class Haitians.

As for Dessalines, he was reported to berate those who spoke *French* to him and to exhort them to speak their *lang rasin* or, in Dessalines’s own words (according to Descourtiz 1809, 3:281), the *langue à vous* ‘your own language’. Although there are conflicting reports as to what languages Dessalines actually spoke (Dayan 1995, 21), some historians believe that he didn’t speak French (Geggus 2002, 293) and that he enjoyed “coarse Creole” (H. Trouillot 1962, 90). It has even been reported that Dessalines would kill those who would answer him in French instead of Kreyòl (Dayan 1995, 22) and that he would use differences in the pronunciation of certain Kreyòl words in order to distinguish between light-skinned Haitians with African ancestors, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, French settlers with similar complexion—only the latter were targeted for execution after Haiti’s independence in 1804, and Kreyòl was used as a source of shibboleths to single out the French (H. Trouillot 1962, 23). According to Descourtiz (1809, 3:281), Dessalines indeed hated the French language, especially after the arrival in 1802 of Napoleonic troops who came to try to suppress the revolution and reestablish slavery in the colony in revolt. In the new Haitian state’s first official proclamations in 1804, Dessalines and his secretary Boisrond-Tonnerre clearly expressed their government’s beliefs that the French colonists had used their “horrible language” against the blacks as an instrument of dehumanization and to hide France’s crimes against humanity (Daut 2009, 48; Jenson 2011, 134). This is what Dessalines called “the deceitful eloquence of the

Proclamations of [French government] agents” (cited in Jenson 2011, 134; also see Casimir 2011, 34n15).

There is another fascinating philological connection with one of the main themes of the volume—about the fate of Indigenous peoples and their languages in Latin America. For some time during the revolutionary war in Saint-Domingue, Dessalines called his forces “Army of Incas” and “children of the Sun” (Madiou 1847, 2:357, 421). In the Declaration of Independence dated January 1, 1804, and signed by generals of the “Indigenous Army,” Dessalines rejected the colonial French name *Saint-Domingue* and baptized the independent nation with the Amerindian name *Haiti* to commemorate the island’s native Amerindians; then in April 1804, Dessalines proclaimed that that he had “avenged America.” (See Jenson 2011 for sources, original passages, and their translation into English.) Yet it is in French that the new republic’s first proclamations were written, even though the Haitian Revolution had been led and won in the field mostly in Kreyòl. In sections 9 and 10 I return to some of the reasons for the use of French in these official proclamations of Dessalines.⁵

9. The Colonial Linguistic Market and Language Shift: Haiti Again as a Case Study of *Normal* Language Change

Recall that Vodou may have played an important role in bonding the blacks together against the French in battle, as in the aforementioned Bwa Kayiman ceremony in 1791. This Haitian religion has its ancestral roots mostly in Africa but is infused with Christian elements (Hurbon 1988), somewhat on a par with indigenized varieties of Christianity in Africa from the fifteenth century onward (Heywood 2002; Heywood and Thornton 2007). Recall that the word *Vodou* itself is from the Gbe word *vodũ* ‘spirit.’ The Gbe-Kreyòl etymological and associated cultural links are additional reminders that “simple equations of the loss of language with the loss of culture are often misguided” (Ball, chap. 10, this volume, p. 258). Then we have the fact that Kreyòl emerged as *lang rasin* in the Caribbean, far away from Ginen, with massive input from French, and then supplanted the African ancestral languages, even as key concepts of West and Central African religious beliefs and rituals found new expression in Kreyòl (cf., e.g., Hurbon 1988; Heywood 2002; Montilus 2006; Heywood and Thornton 2007; Beauvoir 2009; Beauvoir-Dominique 2011). Such facts remind us that language loss, as in Amazonia, studied by Ball, can indeed happen *without* total loss of identity—or of the perceived ‘roots’ thereof. Indeed Kreyòl became the de facto linguistic badge of identity of the new Haitian nation from the nineteenth century onward: it became its new *lang rasin* with newly grown Creole ‘roots’.

From such a perspective, the saying *Franse se lang achte* ‘French is a purchased language’ reveals a sobering view of Haiti’s linguistic market, in which French, like Spanish and Portuguese in Iberian America, has the greatest socioeconomic power—at the greatest cost. The comparison of French to a *lwa achte* suggests that it often comes at great sacrifice and is viewed as a factor of malevolence for the community. Indeed, the reality is that, for the vast majority of Haitians, French as *lang achte* is strictly outside the ancestral community culture. As such it is learned by the select few who can afford the better schools or who grow up in the very few homes where French is fluently spoken—no more than 10 percent according to certain estimates (Dejean 2006). The sayings *lwa achte* and *lang achte* seem to express a mistrust of entities (whether spiritual or linguistic) perceived as relatively “foreign” and an attachment to cultural items that can be perceived as related to ancestral values (such as the *lwa rasin* from *Ginen* and the Kreyòl language as *lang rasin*) and that can smoothly become part of a Haitian “socioculturally-constructed personhood,” in the spirit of Ball’s chapter.

Notwithstanding these popular statements of attachment to ancestral Africa, the structures of Kreyòl itself, even as *lang rasin*, are not exclusively of African ancestral roots. Instead Kreyòl structures can be reasonably considered the normal outcome of language change affecting seventeenth- and eighteenth-century varieties of French as enslaved Africans with their own ancestral languages were shifting to French in the Caribbean (DeGraff 2002, 2005b, 2009). This scenario is similar to the history of early French as the outcome of language contact and language shift. Indeed, the seeds of early French were sown as Latin was being appropriated by speakers of Celtic and Germanic languages (Mufwene 2008, chap. 3). Among HC structures, we find contributions both from French (in greater part) and from African ancestral languages, alongside innovations (Fattier 1998; DeGraff 2002, 2005b, 2009; Aboh and DeGraff forthcoming-a, forthcoming-b). These language-change patterns are reminiscent of the sort documented in the history of, for instance, Nheengatu by Denny Moore and Latin American Spanish varieties by John Lipski. In terms of linguistic ideology, and as Max Beauvoir carefully explains (pers. comm., December 2011), what makes Kreyòl a *lang rasin* is the fact that it’s spoken by *all* Haitians as their mother tongue, whereas French as *lang achte* is learned only by a small minority, most of whom struggle to learn it in school as a relatively distant second language.

Through the detailed studies by historians, sociologists, and anthropologists, we have learned a great deal about the origins and cultures of the various groups of Africans who were forcibly taken to the Americas and whose ancestral languages contributed to the emergence of Kreyòl

as *lang rasin* via “hiccups in transmission” of French. “Hiccups in transmission” are also characteristic of the history of Spanish and Portuguese in the Americas (Ball, chap. 10, this volume, p. 260), as well as of the earlier emergence of these Romance languages from Latin in Europe: all these developments instantiate contact-induced language change. In the case of Saint-Domingue, we even have archival reports, including first-hand reports, about what black leaders such as François-Dominique Toussaint Louverture and Jean-Jacques Dessalines allegedly said and believed about Kreyòl and French in Saint-Domingue (Jenson 2011). My hope is that as these studies deepen, we will learn more about the sociocultural histories of the Africans’ attitudes and beliefs about geography, migration, language transmission, language mixing and language shift, language purity, intermarriage patterns, and so on—as we have learned in Ball’s chapter about the Eastern Tukanian.

Here are some of the questions we would love to ask of future ethnographic studies of the Africans in the colonial Caribbean: Were the enslaved Africans more like the Tukanian peoples in the Vaupés or more like those in the Upper Xingu? Or were they more like the Arapaço or the Piratapuya? How did they come to terms with their own “dissociation of language from ancestral place”? How did the Africans’ diverse cultures each accommodate the pressures toward language mixing and language shift? In what ways did the biracial children of African women and European men become vectors for cultural and linguistic shift versus maintenance? Was this in any way similar to the situation of Amerindian exogamous women mating with Portuguese men in certain big Iberian American cities and renegotiating their gender roles vis-à-vis patriarchal patterns of cultural and linguistic affiliation?⁶ To what extent, if at all, did Africans from various ethnic groups wish for their children to maintain their ancestral languages and/or learn Kreyòl or French? How did they analyze the power and prestige being ascribed to French- and Kreyòl-speaking blacks (the “Ladinos” of the Caribbean)? Or were they purists who, like the Piratapuya speakers in the Amazon (Ball, chap. 10, this volume, pp. 256–57), did not want their children to speak varieties of their ancestral languages that had been “corrupted by mixing”? Or, given their respective cultural subjectivities, did (some of) these Africans want their children to be plurilingual with, at least, mastery of the language(s) that would give them power as cultural and linguistic brokers?

How did these cultural factors filter various sorts of potential substrate influence (from, e.g., Fongbe or Kikongo) into the emerging Creole? For example, if women played any major role in language contact, then the comparison of sex ratios across ethnicities would constitute a related factor. Such studies may thus help us understand why certain African lan-

guages had greater influence than others on the structures of Caribbean Creoles (see, e.g., Geggus 1989 for some relevant data and observations about gender demographics in Saint-Domingue).

These are some of the many fascinating questions that the present volume invites us to ask about the colonial Caribbean and the ecology thereof. What we know, for now, is that by the late eighteenth century, Kreyòl in Haiti—as a language genealogically descended from French with various influences from Niger-Congo languages—had accumulated enough prestige and socioeconomic and political clout to become the generalized target of language shift. Thus it led to the eventual disappearance of the ancestral African languages and became the new nation’s sole *lang rasin* from then until today.

10. Managing Power and Managing Languages in the (Post)colonial Americas

In the colonial Andes, the language-policy switch from the use of Indigenous languages to Spanish as *lingua franca* occurred in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, with concomitant efforts to suppress the rise of Indigenous languages (Durstun, chap. 9, this volume; García 2004). The goal of “Castilianization” was to make the Indigenous languages “disappear” by teaching Spanish to the Indigenous peoples. Yet these efforts were ambivalent, since Indigenous laborers without formal education were more helpful to the colonists than their educated counterparts. However, after the rebellion of Túpac Amaru II in the late eighteenth century and his use of Quechua as an instrument and symbol of Indigenous nationalism and resistance against the colonial regime, the Spanish colonial administrator José Antonio de Areche found it necessary to promulgate decrees explicitly banning the Quechua language and culture from the public arena, further strengthening the Hispanization mandate of the Bourbon Reforms started earlier in the eighteenth century.⁷ At this point, Quechua was viewed more as a liability than an asset for Spanish domination. This ban lasted for some two hundred years, until the language reform of the latter half of the twentieth century (García 2004).

In a similar fashion, by the mid-eighteenth century, *Língua Geral Amazônica* (LGA) was given second-class status when a Portuguese colonial law (the *Regimento das Missões*) “aimed at promoting Portuguese and eliminating LGA. One reason for this was to claim more territory by showing the presence of Portuguese speakers there” (Moore, chap. 4, this volume, p. 119). In the Yucatán, “usage of Maya as a legal language was discontinued in the nineteenth century and increased importance was given to reading and writing in Spanish” (Pfeiler, chap. 8, this volume, p. 206).

These Indigenous lingua francas have survived the various sorts of bans imposed by the colonial Europeans and their postcolonial descendants. But not all Indigenous languages have survived with equal vitality. Quechua and Maya now fare much better than Nheengatu and most other Indigenous languages in Latin America. Today Nheengatu is spoken by a mere eight thousand people (Lewis 2009), while Quechua is spoken by some 8 to 12 million (Hornberger and Coronel-Molina 2004). With about the same number of speakers as Kreyòl in Haiti, Quechua is thus still very much alive, and it is the majority language in the rural Andes, although it must be noted that Quechua is actually composed of a family of languages with substantial differences (Durstun, chap. 9, this volume). Along with a variety of Indigenous languages, Quechua has even become an “official” language (somewhat nominally), with various provisions, in the constitutions of Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Colombia. So has Maya been recognized as a “national” language. In Brazil, it is now the law that “regular elementary education shall be given in the Portuguese language, the Indian communities also being ensured the use of their native languages and specific learning procedures” (Brazil’s 1988 constitution with amendments, online at www.servat.unibe.ch/icl/br00000_.html).

Yet, as in Haiti, the de facto status of these Indigenous languages contrasts with their de jure status: in practice, all these local languages have been relegated to second-class status. Thus, Indigenous parents and educators in Iberian America, like their Caribbean Creole-speaking counterparts, often think of their native languages as burdens to get rid of, seeking European languages as the only ones that will give them the tools they need for socioeconomic success. After national reforms in 1994 promoting bilingual education, rural Andean communities started receiving urban teachers who would come for a week or a month at a time to reside at the school and teach, returning home on weekends. One such teacher, appointed as the new director of a school during the education reform in Bolivia, was denied entry by parents because she had proposed to teach their children to read and write in their native Quechua in addition to Spanish. Only after the passage of time was she able to win them over (Parackahua Arancibia 2011). These parents’ refusal of bilingual programs and their desire for the European language as the exclusive medium of instruction reflect the anti-Indigenous discrimination they have experienced and wish to avoid for their children. This story and many others like it throughout the Americas bring to mind Pecola, the black girl in Toni Morrison’s story *The Bluest Eye*, who hates her blackness and wants blue eyes because of the signs she sees all around her that promote whiteness over blackness. Indeed, European languages throughout

Latin America and the Caribbean continue to be invested with symbolic capital—linguistic “bluest eye”—that best serves the interest of the ruling class.

Another case in point is that of Peruvian children, for whom literacy “is not only equated with learning how to read; it is equated with learning how to read in Spanish, and disassociated almost entirely from Indigenous languages” (García 2004, 359). This situation is a negation of the precolonial Inca world order, in which Quechua was the de facto official language. Now, parents’ insistence upon Spanish as the language of instruction makes sense to them in light of the fact that it is fluency in Spanish, not Quechua (and not Aymara, Maya, and so on), that opens up opportunities for higher education and better jobs, a point well articulated by Barbara Pfeiler (chap. 8, this volume).

The comparison between Amerindian languages in Iberian America and Kreyòl in Haiti brings up an ironic twist: it may seem that the victorious Túpac Amaru of Haiti—namely, Jean-Jacques Dessalines, the first president of independent Haiti—chose to relegate Kreyòl to second-class status as he used French, instead of Kreyòl, for the newborn country’s first official declarations. However, he too, very much like Túpac Amaru and his Spanish adversaries, was using both language and metalinguistic knowledge for political purposes. In Dessalines’s resistance against European imperialism, his written proclamations in French were directed not toward his (mostly illiterate) Haitian compatriots, whom he verbally addressed in Kreyòl, but toward audiences overseas, including (1) France, which he was warning never again to try to take over Haiti, and (2) other foreign audiences to whom he wanted to promote the new country’s historical achievements against colonization and slavery, as well as Haiti’s viability as a trade partner and otherwise. (See more detailed arguments in Jenson 2011.) Yet Dessalines’s and subsequent Haitian governments’ exclusive use of French in the official business of the new nation and in its school system doubled as an instrument of class differentiation, helping to keep power in the hands of the few for control over the disfranchised majority (e.g., Hoffmann 1984, 57–63; DeGraff 2005a; Dejean 2006; Saint-Fort 2011; DeGraff 2013a, 2013b; Dejean and DeGraff 2013). Ever since then, speaking French—Haiti’s own linguistic “Bluest Eye” or a linguistic symptom of “bovarysme” in Price-Mars’s (1956, 136) terminology—has been an instrument for, and a reflection of, power even as it’s widely accepted that *Pale franse pa vle di lespri* (‘Being able to speak French doesn’t mean that one is intelligent’).

The promotion of, and the production of knowledge about, certain languages and their speakers in the history of the Americas seem to have always been conditioned by the ways in which capital, goods, and other

limited resources are allocated to competing groups. Those of us who are struggling to promote native-language instruction in our communities—whether in the Americas, Africa, Australia, or elsewhere—may stand a better chance of making inroads with our projects if we pay attention to “positive initiatives” that can effectively shift the allocation of desirable resources in order to match the promotion of the use of local languages in schools. This is a tall order!

11. “Positive Initiatives” against Language-Based Discrimination in the Americas

“Positive initiatives” in favor of Amerindian languages include the creation in 2001 of the Institute for Development of Mayan Culture in the Yucatán state and the passing in 2003 of the federal law for the linguistic rights for the Indigenous people (Pfeiler, chap. 8, this volume, p. 220). Similar initiatives have been reported by Godenzzi (2008) and Morales (2010) for Bolivia and Peru. These and related efforts all aim at the “recognition and protection of the linguistic, individual and collective rights of indigenous communities, and the promotion and development of indigenous languages” (the 2003 federal law for the linguistic rights of Indigenous populations, as quoted by Pfeiler, chap. 8, this volume, p. 220). Similar human-rights efforts, on the part of both the state and grassroots organizations, are taking place throughout Indigenous communities in Latin America. In Bolivia the most recent constitution (2009) makes all thirty-six Indigenous languages “official” alongside Spanish; it encourages the usage, protection, development, and study of Indigenous languages; and it makes it mandatory for government employees to demonstrate proficiency in Spanish and at least one Indigenous language (Morales 2010; Political Database of the Americas 2011). One effort to connect linguistics with grassroots activism in the rural Andes—one that I am personally familiar with through colleagues involved therein—is the *Proyecto Yachay q’ipikuna*, supporting Quechua as language of instruction in Bolivia’s and Peru’s rural highland (Chacón et al. 2011). The papers in Hinton and Hale (2001), King and Hornberger (2004), and Haboud and Ostler (2011) provide a comprehensive overview of similar projects throughout the world and their potential benefits and limitations.

I now put on my activist-educator hat to describe some of my own work, in collaboration with colleagues at MIT and in Haiti, on Kreyòl as a language of instruction in Haiti toward facilitating technology-enhanced active learning in science and mathematics in high schools and universities. (In April 2013, this work received the support of the Haitian state through an agreement between our MIT-Haiti Initiative and Haiti’s Min-

istry of Education.) One lesson I have learned in the course of this work is that laws from the state are often insufficient to stop language-based discrimination and to effectively promote local languages (DeGraff 2010; DeGraff and Ulysse 2011; DeGraff 2013a, 2013b). Consider, for example, two now familiar facts, which stand out in the history of language evolution in the Americas: (1) Kreyòl is the one single language that is spoken by all in Haiti; (2) constitutionally, Kreyòl has been an official language in Haiti, on a par with French, since 1987. Yet, in practice, French is still being promoted as superior to, or more useful than, Kreyòl in schools and universities, courts, public offices, the written press, and so on. In many schools, speaking Kreyòl in the classroom often triggers costly and often shameful penalties, physical or otherwise. This stigma, which is often enforced from the highest echelons of the schools' administration, seems the toughest obstacle to projects like the MIT-Haiti Initiative that promote deep and active learning through the use of the one language that is most familiar to most Haitian students. Yet schools usually offer classes on Kreyòl composition, because the sixth-grade official exams include one exam on Kreyòl. But some of these same schools forbid the use of Kreyòl in their other classes! To date, the majority of the state's official exams (to enter secondary school and university), the better paying and prestigious jobs, the court systems, and so on, still function, in effect, for the exclusive advantage of those who speak French—that is, those who, by privilege of birth, have grown up in homes where French is spoken, usually alongside Kreyòl, and those with enough luck or talent to learn French in school. Although the 1987 constitution requires that every law or decree and all other state communications be published in both French and Kreyòl, the vast majority of state documents are still published in French only. A recently proposed amendment to the 1987 constitution was written in French only, even though the constitution was promulgated in two official versions, French and Kreyòl. It's only in July 2013 that for the first time the Parliament voted a law in Kreyòl only: the law to establish a Kreyòl Academy, as provided for by the 1987 constitution. So there are encouraging signs of progress ahead. But meanwhile the vast majority of the population (the monolingual Kreyòl speakers) cannot understand most of the laws that they must abide by.

Our various projects on the promotion of mother tongues as languages of instruction—whether in the Yucatán, the Andes, the Greater Amazonia area, or the Caribbean—are not just linguistic educational projects. They are, above all, political and socioeconomic projects for social justice (Martínez Cobo 1987; McCarty et al. 2008). Indeed, in order for stigmatized local languages to be effectively promoted as languages of instruction in the classroom, there must be some clear and relatively di-

rect socioeconomic advantages that result from the use of these native languages *outside* the classroom. If literacy in Indigenous or Creole languages does not help students pass state exams and obtain viable lifelong employment, then the use of these languages as media of instruction is a doomed proposition.

To elaborate on this predicament and make it more concrete with an example that I know firsthand, consider the vast majority of families and communities in Haiti—those in which only Kreyòl is spoken. Those parents may well be aware that their children will learn better if they can be taught in their native Kreyòl. But they are certainly smart enough to observe that those who pass the state’s official exams and who accumulate the most political and economic capital usually come from the group of French-Kreyòl bilinguals. Therefore, Haitian parents, even those who speak Kreyòl only, want their children to learn (in) French even if that means that their children will end up learning, in most cases, only a much reduced version of French, which will constitute yet another language barrier on their way to state exams and better jobs (Groupe de Travail sur l’Education et la Formation 2010, 149). The few students who pass the state exams do not necessarily have any deep understanding of the corresponding disciplines: rote memorization is the most prevalent method in preparing for these exams.

The very few from Kreyòl-only homes who, because of great talent, a lot of luck, and great sacrifices, manage to succeed at school and move up the class system fuel the hope that such an exceptional feat is likewise possible for the masses. The latter, in turn, waste an extraordinary proportion of their meager income on schools that fail their children: these schools “teach” in a language that most of the students and even teachers are not fluent in, a language that most Haitians are rarely, if ever, exposed to in their everyday lives outside of school. Similar challenges obtain in many other parts of the world where Indigenous or local languages are losing the battle with international European languages as languages of instruction and socioeconomic advancement (Mufwene 2008).

Like Mufwene (2008), Pfeiler makes an observation that supports the aforementioned proposition that, for local languages to be accepted as valid languages of instruction, they must also function as efficient tools for socioeconomic advancement, and we have to make it possible to conceive of these languages as instruments and symbols of power as well: “Currently, it appears that social dynamics are more powerful than governmental initiatives when it comes to determining the extent and frequency of language use in Yucatán State. Use of both languages may be required by law, but as long as Yucatec Maya lacks the prestige that Spanish enjoys and bilinguals are discouraged from using colloquial Maya at work, no linguistic political

strategy will be successful for Yucatán’s Maya community or for Yucatecan society in general” (Pfeiler, chap. 8, this volume, p. 221). Pfeiler’s comment bears on virtually all the local languages in the Americas, Africa, Australia, Papua New Guinea, New Zealand, and so on. To tackle this global challenge, let’s borrow some hints from the Spanish colonists who instrumentalized Quechua as the language of Christianity in the colonial Andes: they made fluency in Quechua a prerequisite to holding certain clerical posts in Indian parishes and they introduced Quechua courses at university. Perhaps most importantly, “the [Quechua] language competence system generated a number of salaried posts for career experts in [Standard Colonial Quechua].” These salaried posts included “instructors working for the Jesuits and the mendicant orders,” “diocesan examiners,” two higher-education posts, one of them being a university chair, initially with “wide-ranging powers [such that] the entire Peruvian clergy were to be taught and examined by him if they hoped to be assigned a parish, or even to be ordained” (Durston, chap. 9, this volume, p. 234). As noted by Godenzzi, “the first chair of Quechua was created in Peru in 1570, 2 years before a chair of Dutch and 4 years before a chair of English” (2008, 323)

Similar measures, *without* the subservience to “mendicant orders,” were implemented in the twentieth century to protect French in Quebec from the “threat” of English. In Quebec, language-policy initiatives that enlisted legislative and socioeconomic measures were crucial to the government’s efforts to promote French (Mufwene 2008, chap. 11). Indeed, “it is an enhanced market value that will really revitalize a language in its vernacular function” (Mufwene 2008, 242).

The successful promotion of Quechua in the colonial Andes and of French in contemporary Quebec demonstrates what can be accomplished through “positive initiatives” in favor of the local languages of Latin America, Africa, Australia—and anywhere else in the world where local languages are dominated by international, typically European, languages. These considerations apply most urgently to the Indigenous languages of Latin America, especially keeping in mind that the majority of them—unlike Yucatec Mayan, Quechua, and Kreyòl—are now moribund, as is made evident by the growing literature on language endangerment (see, e.g., Couto, chap. 3, this volume; Hinton and Hale 2001; Austin and Simpson 2007; Grenoble and Whaley 1998; Haboud and Ostler 2011).

12. Toward a Sequel: Local Languages for Education, Research, and Social Justice

Barbara Pfeiler duly worries that “the current processes of emigration and urbanization in Yucatán endanger the survival of the Maya language.”

She explains, “This development is accelerated by the tendency of young bilingual people to use Spanish to communicate among themselves. The social domains that tended to be separated by exclusive use of Maya or Spanish are increasingly covered by Spanish only. In an increasingly larger number of families Maya is no longer transmitted to children as the mother tongue, and bilingualism is thus transitioning to Spanish monolingualism” (chap. 8, this volume, p. 211). We can start addressing this concern by again looking at Haiti as our case study for language evolution in Latin America. Then we’ll see how the Haiti case bears on the rest of Latin America. The good (and bad) news from Haiti is that the scenario about the endangerment of Maya in the Yucatán is not applicable to HC. Since most families in Haiti speak Kreyòl only, it’s only Kreyòl that is transmitted as native language to most Haitian children. Schoolteachers, by and large, are not fluent in French, even though their main task, as they and the public perceive it, is to prepare their students to pass exams that, for the most part, are administered in French only. This is one of the main reasons why nine out of ten students do not make it through high school. At this time, unlike the Yucatán situation with respect to Spanish, there’s no nationwide tendency in Haiti for people, old or young, to communicate in French among themselves. Even as a bilingual child in Haiti (a statistical outlier by accident of birth), I myself generally did not use French to communicate with my peers; I only spoke Kreyòl to them, except in the classroom. As a child, I considered French to be reserved for school and for other occasions when parents or other authority figures were within earshot—even though those very figures usually spoke Kreyòl among themselves.

If anything, the communicative domains that, in the past, tended to be the exclusive province of French (e.g., TV) now seem wide open to Kreyòl, and we’re finding more and more use of Kreyòl in churches, in newspapers, on the radio, in advertising, in public service announcements, in films, on the Internet, in textbooks, and so on. I myself have been involved, through the MIT-Haiti Initiative, in the production, evaluation, and dissemination of Kreyòl-based pedagogical materials for elementary through higher education, and we now even have high-quality technology-enhanced resources for active learning in science and mathematics in Kreyòl (DeGraff and Ulysse 2011; DeGraff and Driscoll 2011; DeGraff 2013a, 2013b).⁸ Better yet, such materials bring concrete proof that Haitian Creole, on a par with other languages, is structurally adequate for science, contrary to popular belief even among educators and linguists (DeGraff 2001a, 2005a). Furthermore, the use of Kreyòl seems an indispensable ingredient for deep learning in Haiti, from primary school to university, as documented in recent

collaboration between university faculty at MIT and in Haiti (DeGraff 2013a, 2013b).

My hunch and hope is that this trend in favor of Kreyòl is for the better. In October 2011, there was a conference in Port-au-Prince organized by the State University of Haiti to plan the *Akademi ayisyen pou lang kreyòl* ‘Haitian academy for the creole language’, a much-awaited follow-up to article 213 of the 1987 constitution, which prescribes the creation of a Haitian academy “to standardize the Creole language and enable it to develop scientifically and harmoniously.” This institution is to be conceived along the broad lines of the aforementioned Institute for Development of Mayan Culture in the Yucatán state. As previously mentioned, in July 2013 the Haitian Parliament voted (unanimously!) to establish this Kreyòl Academy. This unanimous vote is all the more noteworthy in light of the fact that the promulgation of the law has to date been blocked by the president of the republic because it was presented to him in Kreyòl only.

A note of caution is in order about institutions, such as the French academy, whose priority is to impose “standards” from above without much regard to actual linguistic practice in the lower social strata: When it comes to “standardizing,” we should learn from the limitations of the colonial Spanish efforts to codify a written version of Quechua that few Indigenous people actually spoke; it served the interests of the powerful instead of the people. So we may advise against one task often assigned to language academies: that of creating standards that cater to elitist hierarchies of power and make the “standard” relatively inaccessible to vernacular users of the language. Luykx warns against the neocolonial “standard language” ideology in contemporary efforts to codify Quechua, because she sees “the beginnings of a new sociolinguistic elitism around Quechua” (2004, 152); see Dorian (1998) for a general argument against the sort of “Western ideologies” that undermine “small-language prospects.”⁹

Such prospects may fare better with language academies that shun prescription in favor of description and applications. Academies of this type would function as scientific centers that help the state, along with academic institutions and local communities, make more constructive uses of their countries’ linguistic assets. Such language academies would help survey, transcribe, preserve, and study the richness of local folk traditions (tales, fables, proverbs, songs, prayers, charades, puns, and the like) many of which have immense linguistic, intellectual, historical, scientific, and spiritual value. In the case of Haiti, this plea has long been argued for by Haitian Vodou priest Max Beauvoir, who reminds us that the origins of Greek philosophy are in oral traditions harking back to

Homer and Socrates (see, e.g., Beauvoir 2009; Beauvoir is Chief Supreme of the National Confederation of Haitian Vodou).

It is certainly helpful to have some relatively uniform conventions for written representations of any language (e.g., for ease of communication and digital processing), but standardization should not distract from other valuable priorities that function to promote the language for the benefit of those who use it the most. In Haiti, Kreyòl's official orthography is to be applauded as one of the rare cases in which the "standard" was designed while taking into account the linguistic patterns and the pedagogical needs of the majority population—in this case, the "masses" of monolingual speakers of the local language instead of the bilingual elite (cf. Schieffelin and Doucet 1994).

Besides "standardization," the other goal legally assigned to the Haitian Creole Academy is to "develop" Kreyòl. Here too we may learn important caveats from those sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Indigenous and European leaders who had such a shrewd understanding of the relationship between language and power. In the early colonial period, the Spanish authorities did "develop" Quechua (or Standard Colonial Quechua [Durston, chap. 9, this volume]), and they made fluency in Quechua a ticket for certain well-paying jobs and for heightened social status in the Andes. The well-paying jobs were usually for the European (i.e., non-native) speakers of Quechua. These economic and social benefits now elude most of those who speak local languages only. Thus, "developing" a local language will not serve speakers of that language in the absence of necessary structures for socioeconomic advancement, including an adequate school system with quality pedagogical and reading materials that speakers of local languages can access in their mother tongue (for the Haiti case, see Dejean 2006; DeGraff and Ulysse 2011; DeGraff and Driscoll 2011; DeGraff 2013a, 2013b; Dejean and DeGraff 2013).

"Developing" local languages whose speakers have long been impoverished and stigmatized requires the use of all means necessary to invest the language with scientific, cultural, and socioeconomic capital. These means would include literary contests in the language (such as those organized by the journal *Bon Nouvèl* in Haiti), enforceable requirements that all businesses affecting local speakers be conducted in the relevant local languages, and so on. But, more than any academy, it is the state that must come up with measures to stop "linguistic apartheid" practices. Here too we can find inspiration from the Andes: in Peru, a law that was passed in 2006 penalizes "exclusion for linguistic reasons," and in Bolivia the current government of Evo Morales mandates that all public servants learn an Indigenous language in addition to Spanish (Godenzzi 2008,

323; Morales 2010). In Haiti, all public servants, like every other Haitian, already speak Kreyòl. All they need to do is to make use of it in every verbal or written interaction with the public they serve, the majority of whom Kreyòl only. There's already a model for that in Haiti: When it was under the direction of Suze Mathieu, the National Bureau of Ethnology conducted all its business in Kreyòl. Suze Mathieu has made several pleas, so far with relatively little effect, that other state offices follow suit (Mathieu 2005, 2008). This resistance against Kreyòl may not be surprising when one remembers that, as recently as June 2010 at a public forum titled "National Reconstruction" at the state university, Leslie Manigat, an eminent historian and former president of Haiti, declared that Kreyòl was "not only a limitation, but an infirmity as well."

We linguists can encourage the promotion of local languages by collaborating with local educators and scholars in their ongoing efforts to promote more informed knowledge about the viability of local languages, both as objects of research and as indispensable tools for education and socioeconomic betterment. One way to collaborate, if collaboration is desired, is to help train additional linguists who are native speakers of local languages. Hinton and Hale (2001), Hornberger and Coronel-Molina (2004), and Haboud and Ostler (2011) provide overviews of such collaborative efforts, including "bilingual intercultural" teacher-training and university-level efforts to promote the knowledge and use of Indigenous languages. Such training is especially important in communities—such as in the Caribbean, Meso-America, the Andes, the Amazon, and so forth—where speakers themselves, for (neo)colonial reasons, are at best often unaware of the pedagogical and intellectual values of their local languages or, worse yet, have been persuaded to reject proposals that their native languages be used as media of instruction (King and Hornberger 2004; García 2004; Godenzzi 2008). Another avenue for collaboration is in the production of high-quality and freely accessible pedagogical materials in and about these languages that we linguists often study for our own intellectual *and* socioeconomic betterment. From my own perspective as a Creole speaker and a linguist (a perspective quite different from that of the majority of linguists writing about language evolution), such collaboration to promote education and research in and about local languages is a win-win proposition for at least the following seven reasons:

(1) Linguists who are interested in Latin America and who are affiliated with established institutions in the Global North could ensure that their writings about local languages reach, and enter into dialogue with, the corresponding communities. With the latter's consent ("free, prior, and informed consent" as outlined in United Nations 2009), these lin-

guists could use their influence to help usher in language policies that are beneficial to local communities. In return, the linguists' writings would gain validity as they became more grounded in the actual needs of the people who speak the languages under study.

(2) As linguists, some of us can function as vectors of social justice because our know-how—rooted as it is (for the most part, and for better or for worse) in relatively prestigious Western traditions—can help invest local languages with the sort of intellectual and scientific capital that they have been denied in the past. Keeping in mind the rise in prestige of French and Italian through the writings of Descartes and Galileo, respectively, one can surmise that linguistic capital can be created through the production of literary, scientific, and educational materials of the highest quality for speakers of local languages. As linguists we could contribute some of our expertise to the production of such materials, especially in academic domains to which Indigenous communities have had too little access so far. Ideally, Indigenous educators themselves would produce such materials for their own communities—materials such as school textbooks, online open resources, higher-education academic materials, and so forth (see McCarty et al. 2008, 305–307 for related arguments). Fortunately, the development of materials by native speakers is already occurring to various extents, especially for the “bigger” local languages (Hornberger and Coronel-Molina 2004).

(3) For those of us collaborating on the promotion of local languages as media of instruction in the Americas, Africa, Australia, and so forth, this collaboration can broaden and deepen our understanding of our objects of study and their larger context of use. For example, consider that many of these local languages have yet to be used at universities for academic disciplines such as science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) or in the humanities. Producing materials in local languages for STEM and for the humanities in higher education will require a fair amount of research and ingenuity as we work toward the optimal development of technical and scholarly terminology in these languages. This is the kind of work that would benefit from the advice of linguists with expertise in the corresponding languages. Furthermore, materials for higher education and research in local languages can double as concrete proof against the still popular belief that local languages such as Kreyòl in Haiti are an “infirmity” or cannot express complex abstract semantics because they allegedly “lack the more sophisticated features of languages backed by a rich and extended cultural past and a large, well-organized literate society” (Seuren 1998, 292–293; see DeGraff 2001a, 2005a, for overviews of such claims; also see note 8 to the current chapter for references to recent concrete proofs against such claims in the context of recent work

for the production of resources for university-level science and math in Kreyòl).

(4) From a practical standpoint, such materials will improve educational opportunities for communities where Creole or Indigenous languages are spoken by the majority—these are the communities that have been overlooked the most in terms of quality education material and other resources. Linguists' engagement in the production of these materials will help implement "Education for All" that really includes all. The use of local languages in schools and in academia is not to be considered solely or primarily as a remedy for (potential) language shift toward a dominant language (cf. Luykx 2004 for important reasons why such a remedy may be problematic). Indeed, Kreyòl in Haiti is alive and well, since it is already spoken by all in Haiti, while French, the dominant language in the schools for the past two centuries, is spoken by no more than 10 percent of the population. So there is no current risk of language endangerment in the Haiti case. The goal envisaged here is fair access to education that is constructively rooted in local knowledge, culture, and language: we should aim to achieve education that is really accessible to all, in the language(s) spoken by all students, keeping in mind that instruction is best carried out in the language that students are most fluent in, as recognized by UNESCO a long time ago (UNESCO 1953). Only pedagogical methods that enlist languages in which students are fluent will prepare the students to actively participate in the construction of knowledge and turn them from passive consumers to proud producers (Luykx 1999). For the endangered Indigenous languages of Latin America and elsewhere, preventing language loss also requires reinforcement of the use of local languages at home and in communities, above and beyond any scholastic uses (Martínez Cobo 1987; Dorian 1998; Luykx 2004).

(5) Nowadays education, especially higher education and education in STEM areas and in the law, seems an indispensable tool for development. Yet communities that function primarily in a local language are severely underrepresented in schools and, especially, in universities and research and legal institutions, even though scientists and lawyers are making great profits and advances through the exploitation of natural, cultural, and intellectual resources in Indigenous territories. Consider, say, the huge profits in the exploitation of Indigenous medicinal plants in "ethnobotany and bioprospecting" by the pharmaceutical industry (McManis 2007). Ironically, Indigenous communities in the Americas are among the ones that suffer the most from health disparities; in the United States, of all places, death from tuberculosis among Native Americans is 500 percent higher than in the general population (Indian Health Services 2011). The more Creole and Indigenous speakers can be active in access-

ing, producing, and disseminating scientific knowledge—including their own Indigenous knowledge—in their own languages, the better off their communities and the rest of the world will be in the long run. Consider, for example, the potential benefit of traditional Indigenous knowledge and practices for protecting the environment, with “longstanding connections to and reverence for the land, traditions of sustainability, historical knowledge of the land . . . and expertise in natural resource and wildlife management” (Curry et al. 2011, 22; see McManis 2007 for an overview of related issues; Devonish 2007, 240, links such traditional knowledge to the survival of Indigenous languages).

(6) Now consider what it would take to fully enforce both article 29 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which grants Indigenous peoples the right to the “conservation and protection of the environment and the productive capacity of their lands or territories and resources,” and article 32, which requires states to “consult and cooperate in good faith with the Indigenous peoples concerned . . . in order to obtain their *free, prior and informed consent* prior to the approval of any project affecting their land or territories and other resources” (United Nations 2007, emphasis added). Such consent presupposes unfettered communication between parties and full access to the relevant information. Yet, communication with states and other powerful agents (especially multinational corporations) and access to, and production and dissemination of, information (especially scientific information) are hampered by the imposition of foreign or distant second languages as the media of communication and instruction. This is one of the main rationales for projects in which educators and linguists collaborate for the production of pedagogical materials in local languages. See article 14, declaring the rights of Indigenous peoples to “education in their own languages, in a manner appropriate to their cultural methods of teaching and learning” (United Nations 2007; cf. Martínez Cobo 1987). One must hope that these materials can, in turn, invest additional intellectual and social capital in the local languages and attract additional native speakers as collaborators (Hale 1965, 1972; Hinton and Hale 2001; England 2007).

(7) If respectful collaboration based on “free, prior and informed consent” (United Nations 2009) can be sustained with speakers of local, and often understudied, languages, there is also the exciting prospect that novel knowledge and data from these speakers will enrich science and make way for joint discoveries and for new theories that would be unthinkable in the absence of such diversity of perspectives (Hale 1965, 1972, 1998). In my own field of Creole studies, I am grateful to, among others, scholars from the Caribbean and Africa who have extraordinarily deepened my understanding of Creole languages and their ecologies. If

I may say so myself, I think (or hope) that, once I got through the arduous work of unlearning the exceptionalist dogma of Creole studies, my own insights as a Creole speaker and a linguist have, in turn, enriched Creole studies through, among other things, my analyses of Haitian Creole and my contributions to the dismantling of age-old Creole Exceptionalism tenets (see, e.g., DeGraff 2001a, 2005a, 2005b, 2009; DeGraff and Walicek 2005). From this perspective, we native speakers of Creole and Indigenous languages are not passive consumers of, or informants for, preexisting mainstream theories—in ways that further marginalize them as “others.” Instead, we prefer to become actively engaged as equal partners in the production of analyses and theories that are enriched by diverse contributions from both within and outside the local groups. (For one recent example in theoretical syntax and semantics, see Coon et al. 2011.) The interaction between linguistic theories and fieldwork on lesser-studied languages is indeed most constructive when the latter are studied by linguists from the corresponding Indigenous communities. This fact again points to the need for many more speakers of local languages to become linguists in their own rights and on their own terms—an approach long advocated by my dear late colleague Ken Hale (see, e.g., Hale 1965, 1972). Furthermore, these native-speaker linguists are in the best position to train additional linguists in their own communities (the African Linguistics School [www.als.rutgers.edu] is a recent addition to these efforts). And the more numerous native-speaker linguists become in their community, the more their community, including educators and parents, will become aware of the intellectual and socioeconomic values of their local languages.

13. Envoi

This engagement—of linguists wearing two hats, one theoretical and one applied—seems to me a welcome avenue for mutually enriching North-South collaboration with those communities that have given us linguists such fascinating data and insights to work on, communities whose own linguistic knowledge and behavior have made some of us “rich and famous” (hum, hum . . .). Of course, we need to remember that we all have our limitations, including ideological blind spots, and these can implicitly pollute work with local communities. One limitation is insuperable: “outsider linguists simply do not have the power to create a new generation of speakers”; “only community-based projects have any hope of success” (Speas 2011, 17, 25; also see Dorian 1998; Luykx 1999, 2004, for related caveats). The engagement advocated here will contribute to correcting what Rickford has described as “the present unequal partnership between

researcher and researched [which] is widespread within linguistics” (1997, 161; also see McCarty et al. 2008, 305–307). Rickford’s invitation is echoed by article 31 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: “Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their cultural heritage, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions, as well as the manifestations of their sciences, technologies and cultures. . . . They also have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their intellectual property over such cultural heritage, traditional knowledge, and traditional cultural expressions.” Arguments related to those in paragraphs 1–7 above have been made before, and more eloquently, in inspiring work by many linguists and activists before me, especially Hale (1965, 1972, 1998), Hinton and Hale (2001), and Haboud and Ostler (2011). For two recent examples of linguists’ collaborations with Indigenous communities, consider the work of Makepeace and co-workers (2010) on the Wampanoag case in Massachusetts (online information at <http://wlrp.org/> and at <http://web.mit.edu/norvin/www/wopanaak.html>) and Chacón and co-workers (2011) on Quechua in the Andes. The Wampanoag case is a particularly striking success story, as the language was unspoken for seven generations and has now been revived, acquiring in 2004 its first native speaker in a century: Mae Alice Baird, the daughter of Jessie Little Doe Fermino Baird, an MIT-trained Wampanoag linguist (Fermino 2000). Fermino Baird’s teacher at MIT was Ken Hale, who had a clear understanding of language-endangerment issues from the perspective of linguistics training, an understanding that he summarized as follows: “The future of American Indian linguistics will depend critically on how successful an effort there is to engage American Indians in the active study of their own languages—not as informants as in the past, but as linguists, philologists, lexicographers, creative writers, and the like. To put it another way, significant advances in the study of American Indian languages can be made, in my judgment, only when a significant portion of the field is in the hands of native speakers of the languages concerned” (1972, 87).

Let’s wait for the sequel of this anthology, a sequel that, one must hope, will showcase a healthy share of chapters by Indigenous speaker-linguists writing about successful linguistic, educational, and socioeconomic development programs in their respective communities. (See Haboud and Ostler 2011 for inspiring examples of such programs and future prospects throughout the world.)

I take it as yet another reflex of the socioeconomic matrix of language endangerment that this anthology lacks any contribution from Indigenous linguists from the very communities whose native languages are endangered (see note 1). Notwithstanding such limitation, this book provides

a stimulating and enriching set of lessons for the understanding of the relationships among cultural, historical, socioeconomic, and language-evolution issues in the Americas. It invites those of us who are interested in language contact and its structural, cultural, and socioeconomic outcome to do much better in broadening and sharpening our lenses as we reexamine the complex ecologies for complex scenarios of language shift and language change.

To the contributors to this anthology, *Chapo ba!* ‘Hats off!’—both of those hats.

Notes

I am grateful to Enoch Aboh, Max Beauvoir, Rachel Beauvoir-Dominique, Jean Casimir, Yves Dejean, Elena Geretti, Juan Carlos Godenzzi, Deborah Jenson, Susan Kalt, Kendall King, Suze Mathieu, Salikoko Mufwene, and Nuriel Vera-DeGraff for discussing with me various aspects of this chapter during its gestation, and for opening up many additional avenues for investigation. Special thanks go to Salikoko Mufwene, Susan Kalt, Juan Carlos Godenzzi, and Kendall King for thorough and most constructive comments on an early draft. Of course, no one but me can be blamed for any leftover errors.

1. I use the phrase *Indigenous languages* to refer to the languages of “Indigenous” populations in the geopolitical sense of being there “first,” whereby “Indigenous communities, peoples and nations are those which, having a historical continuity with pre-invasion and pre-colonial societies that developed on their territories, consider themselves distinct from other sectors of the societies now prevailing in those territories or parts of them” (Martínez Cobo 1987, 29). Population movements throughout human history often make it difficult to determine who exactly was there “first.” This difficulty creates a need in certain cases to think of *degrees* of Indigeness, as suggested by Salikoko Mufwene (2001). In the cases at hand, this question is relatively clear-cut: the Amerindian peoples and their languages are (the most) Indigenous to Latin America, because they predate their European, African, and Creole counterparts.

2. I am grateful to Norvin Richards for discussing with me some of his work on Wampanoag and on Eliot’s translation. Thanks are also due to Susan Kalt for alerting me to the theological and ideological parallels between the European renditions of Wampanoag *pauwau* and Quechua *supay*.

3. Here and in subsequent sections, I use the phrase *local languages* to refer to languages such as Creole and Indigenous languages in the Americas, in opposition to European languages that have become “international” through imperial expansion.

4. But, with enough of a critical stance, one can collect helpful hints toward the development of such a database from reports by Labat (1722), Moreau de Saint-Méry (1797), Descourtilz (1809), Price-Mars (1956), Fouchard (1953, 1981), H. Trouillot (1962), Debien (1971), Geggus (1989, 1991, 2002), Thornton (1993), Dayan (1995), Heywood (2002), Trouillot (1995, 2002), Montilus (2006), Midy (2006), Klein (2006), Singler (1996), Heywood and Thornton (2007), Warner-Lewis (2003), Beauvoir and Dominique (2003), Beauvoir (2009), Beauvoir-Dominique (2011), and Jenson (2011).

5. These observations are all about men in power and in battle who had to affirm

and project an identity of authority to their troops and to the early-nineteenth-century world at large, a world mostly hostile to African slaves fighting for their freedom against European armies—at a time when race-based slavery was an engine of wealth for most of the Western world. So it's not likely that these reports can shed much light on the cultural subjectivities of *ordinary* Africans and their descendants in the colonial Caribbean. Yet it can be surmised that the attitudes and beliefs of popular revolutionary leaders such as Toussaint and Dessalines did influence or reflect more general attitudes about Kreyòl and French among the general population. The latter was itself ethnically diverse, and there were certainly ideological differences among the various groups. We also need to stress that most of our available reports about blacks in the colonial era are filtered through the racist subjectivities of white authors such as Moreau de Saint-Méry and Michel-Etienne Descourtilz, who were deeply embedded and invested in the colonial world order. Even the famous proclamations by the Haitian Revolution leaders were written or transcribed by secretaries who were often raised or educated in France (Daut 2009; Jenson 2011). Ambivalent or negative stereotypes about Africa, many of them inherited from European and American scholars, can be found as far as in the writings of pro-Négritude Haitian scholar Jean Price-Mars (e.g., Price-Mars 1956, 41–44). So it is only *indirectly* and with great care that we can glean the ideologies of ordinary Africans and their Creole descendants in the colonial Americas.

6. In a sociologically fascinating passage, Moreau de Saint-Méry reports that African women preferred black men over white men because the blacks were better “physical agents for love,” hinting at, among other things, the fact that white males were often sexually coercive toward black females (Dayan 1995, 236).

7. Areche had also condemned Túpac Amaru II to a most brutal execution (he was hung, drawn, and quartered!).

8. For a sampling of these Kreyòl resources online, see, e.g., <http://haiti.mit.edu>, <http://haiti.mit.edu/resources/>, <http://star.mit.edu/genetics>, <http://star.mit.edu/biochem>, <http://haiti.mit.edu/workshops/august-2013-workshop/august-2013-resources/>. For a wider sample, beyond STEM areas, also see the resources available at <http://www.educavision.com>, www.editionsuniversitecaraibe.com, <http://lactionsociale.com/catalogue.php>, www.editionskonbit.com, www.potomitan.info/vedrine/vedrine1.php.

9. One anonymous reviewer mentions the case of the Euskara Batua variety of Basque, which was promoted by the Academy of the Basque Language, with some degree of success, as the written “standard” variety of the language.

References

- Aboh, Enoch. 2009. Competition and selection: That's all! In *Complex process in new languages*, ed. Enoch Aboh and Norval Smith, 317–344. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Aboh, Enoch, and Michel DeGraff. Forthcoming-a. A null theory of Creole formation. In *The Oxford handbook of universal grammar*, ed. Ian Roberts. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . Forthcoming-b. Some notes on nominal phrases in Haitian Creole and in Gùngbè: A trans-Atlantic Sprachbund perspective. In *Language contact and language change: Grammatical structure encounters the fluidity of language*, ed. Tor Afarli and Brit Mæhlum. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Austin, Peter, and Andrew Simpson, eds. 2007. *Endangered languages*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.
- Beauvoir, Max. 2009. De la littérature orale vodou haïtienne. Paper read at the Institut d'études et de recherches africaines, October 22, and at the Faculté de linguistique appliquée, October 29, Port-au-Prince, Haiti.
- Beauvoir, Rachel, and Didier Dominique. 2003. *Savalou e*. Montreal: Les Editions du CIDIHCA.
- Beauvoir-Dominique, Rachel. 2011. Significance of the Bois Caiman ceremony, Saint-Domingue, 1791. Paper read at the Black in Latin America Conference, W. E. B. Du Bois Institute for African and African American Research, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, January 29.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1925. Why a linguistics society? *Language* 1:1–5.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1982. *Ce que parler veut dire: L'économie des échanges linguistiques*. Paris: Fayard. English edition: *Language and symbolic power*, ed. and trans. Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991).
- Bunsen, Christian Charles Josias. 1854. *Outlines of the philosophy of universal history applied to language and religion*. Vol. 2. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans.
- Casimir, Jean. 2011. Haiti's need for a Great South. *The global south and world disorder*, special issue of *Global South* 5, no. 1: 14–36.
- Chacón, Jaime Aráoz, Martín Castillo Collado, and Susan E. Kalt. 2011. *Proyecto yachay q'ipikuna*. Available at www.rcc.mass.edu/language/faculty/Sue_Kalt/sue_project.asp.
- Coon, Jessica, Pedro Mateo Pedro, and Omer Preminger. 2011. The role of case in a-bar extraction asymmetries: Evidence from Mayan. Ms. available at <http://ling.auf.net/lingBuzz/001401>.
- Curry, Renee, Charissa Eichman, Amanda Staudt, Garrit Voggesser, and Myra Wilensky. 2011. *Facing the storm: Indian tribes, climate-induced weather extremes, and the future for Indian country*. Boulder, CO: National Wildlife Federation. Available at http://www.nwf.org/~media/PDFs/Global-Warming/Reports/NWF_Tribal_LandsExtremeWeather_FINAL.ashx.
- Daut, Marlene. 2009. Un-silencing the past: Boisrond-Tonnerre, Vastey, and the re-writing of the Haitian Revolution, 1805–1817. *South Atlantic Review* 74, no. 1: 35–64.
- Dayan, Joan. 1995. *Haiti, history, and the gods*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Debien, Gabriel. 1971. *Les esclaves aux Antilles Françaises (XVII–XVIII siècles)*. Basse-Terre, Guadeloupe: Société d'Histoire de la Guadeloupe.
- DeGraff, Michel. 2001a. Morphology in Creole genesis: Linguistics and ideology. In *Ken Hale: A life in language*, ed. Michael Kenstowicz, 53–121. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- . 2001b. On the origins of Creole: A Cartesian critique of Neo-Darwinian linguistics. *Linguistic Typology* 5, nos. 2–3: 213–310.
- . 2002. Relexification: A re-evaluation. *Anthropological Linguistics* 44, no. 4: 321–414.
- . 2005a. Linguists' most dangerous myth: The fallacy of Creole Exceptionalism. *Language in Society* 34, no. 4: 533–591.

- . 2005b. Word order and morphology in “creolization” and beyond. In *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Syntax*, ed. Guglielmo Cinque and Richard Kayne, 293–372. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2009. Language acquisition in creolization and, thus, language change: Some Cartesian-Uniformitarian boundary conditions. *Language and Linguistic Compass* 3–4:888–971.
- . 2010. Language barrier: Creole is the language of Haiti, and the education system needs to reflect that. *Boston Globe*, Opinion section, July 16.
- . 2013a. Men anpil, chay pa lou: An nou sèvi ak lang kreyòl la pou bon jan edikasyon ak rechèch ann Ayiti. In *Akademi kreyòl ayisyen: Ki pwoblèm? Ki avantaj? Ki defi? Ak kolèk entènasyonal sou Akademi Kreyòl Ayisyen an*, ed. Renault Govain and Komite pou tabli Akademi Kreyòl Ayisyen, 133–166. Port-au-Prince, Haiti: Editions de l’Université d’Etat d’Haïti.
- . 2013b. MIT-Haiti Initiative uses Haitian Creole to make learning truly active, constructive, and interactive. In *Educational Technology Debate*. Online article at <https://edutechdebate.org/cultural-heritage-and-role-of-education/mit-haiti-initiative-uses-haitian-creole-to-make-learning-truly-active-constructive-and-interactive/>.
- DeGraff, Michel, Robert Berwick, and Trevor Bass. 2013. Language acquisition and computational phylogenetics: Creole languages and family values. Ms., available at MIT Linguistics & Philosophy.
- DeGraff, Michel, and Megan Driscoll. 2011. MIT’s Michel DeGraff on expanding access to education in Haiti. *Education Portal*, online interview, at http://education-portal.com/articles/Expanding_Access_to_Education_Professor_Michel_DeGraff_Talks_About_His_Work_for_Haiti_at_MIT.html.
- DeGraff, Michel, and Katia Ulysse. 2011. Our word is our bond. *Voices of Haiti*, online interview at www.voicesfromhaiti.com/inner-views/michel-degraff-mit-linguistics-professor-our-word-is-our-bond/.
- DeGraff, Michel, and Don Walicek. 2005. Creole Exceptionalism and accidents of history. *Sargasso*, 1–34.
- Dejean, Yves. 2006. *Yon lekòl tèt anba nan yon peyi tèt anba [An upside-down school in an upside-down country]*. Port-au-Prince, Haiti: FOKAL.
- Dejean, Yves, and Michel DeGraff. 2013. Language mismanagement in Haiti. Ms., available at MIT Linguistics.
- Descourtilz, Michel Etienne. 1809. *Voyages d’un naturaliste, et ses observations faites sur les trois règnes de la nature, dans plusieurs ports de mer français, en Espagne, au continent de l’Amérique septentrionale*. . . . 3 vols. Paris: Dufart, Père.
- Deutscher, Guy. 2009. Overall complexity: A wild goose chase? In *Language complexity as an evolving variable*, ed. Geoffrey Sampson, David Gil, and Peter Trudgill, 243–251. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Devonish, Hubert. 2007. *Language and liberation: Creole language politics in the Caribbean*. 2nd ed. Kingston, Jamaica: Arawak.
- Dorian, Nancy. 1998. Western language ideologies and small-language prospects. In *Grenoble and Whaley 1998*, 3–21.
- Dubois, Laurent. 2011. *Haiti: The aftershocks of history*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- England, Nora. 2007. The influence of Mayan-speaking linguists on the state of Mayan linguistics. In *Austin and Simpson 2007*, 93–112.

- Fattier, Dominique. 1998. Contribution à l'étude de la genèse d'un créole: L'atlas linguistique d'Haïti, cartes et commentaires. 6 vols. PhD diss., Université de Provence, France.
- Fermino, Jessie Little Doe. 2000. An introduction to Wampanoag grammar. Master's thesis, MIT.
- Fick, Carolyn. 1990. *The making of Haiti: The Saint Domingue revolution from below*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Foster, Charles, and Albert Valdman, eds. 1984. *Haiti—today and tomorrow: An interdisciplinary study*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Fouchard, Jean. 1953. *Les marrons du syllabaire: Quelques aspects du problème de l'instruction et de l'éducation des esclaves et affranchis de Saint-Domingue*. Port-au-Prince, Haiti: Imprimerie Henri Deschamps.
- . 1972. *Langue et littérature des aborigènes d'Ayiti*. Paris: Editions de l'Ecole.
- . 1981. *The Haitian maroons: Liberty or death*. New York: E. W. Blyden Press.
- García, María Elena. 2004. Rethinking bilingual education in Peru: Intercultural politics, state policy, and Indigenous rights. *Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 7, no. 5: 348–367.
- Geggus, David. 1989. Sex ratio, age, and ethnicity in the Atlantic slave trade: Data from French shipping and plantation records. *Journal of African History* 30, no. 1: 23–44.
- . 1991. Haitian Voodoo in the eighteenth century: Language, culture, resistance. *Jahrbuch für Geschichte von Staat, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft Lateinamerikas* 28:21–51.
- . 2002. *Haitian revolutionary studies*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Godenzzi, Juan Carlos. 2008. Language policy and education in the Andes. In *Encyclopedia of language and education*. Vol. 1, *Language policy and political issues in education*, ed. Nancy H. Hornberger and Stephen May, 315–329. New York: Springer.
- Grenoble, Lenore A., and Lindsay J. Whaley, eds. 1998. *Endangered languages: Language loss and community response*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Groupe de Travail sur l'Education et la Formation. 2010. *Pour un pacte national pour l'éducation en Haïti*. Port-au-Prince, Haiti: Bibliothèque Nationale.
- Haboud, Marleen, and Nicholas Ostler. 2011. *Endangered languages: Voices and images*. Bath, UK: Foundation for Endangered Languages.
- Hale, Kenneth. 1965. On the use of informants in field-work. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 10:108–119.
- . 1972. A new perspective on American Indian linguistics. In *New perspectives on the pueblos*, ed. Alfonso Ortiz, 87–110. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- . 1998. On endangered languages and the importance of linguistic diversity. In Grenoble and Whaley 1998, 192–216.
- Harrison, Regina. 1989. *Signs, songs, and memory in the Andes: Translating Quechua language and culture*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Hebblethwaite, Benjamin. 2012. French and underdevelopment, Haitian Creole and development: Educational language policy problems and solutions in Haiti. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 27, no. 2: 255–302.
- Heywood, Linda. 2002. *Central Africans and cultural transformations in the American diaspora*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heywood, Linda, and John Thornton. 2007. *Central Africans, Atlantic Creoles, and the foundation of the Americas, 1585–1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hinton, Leanne, and Kenneth Hale. 2001. *The green book of language revitalization in practice*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Hoffmann, Léon François. 1984. Francophilia and cultural nationalism in Haiti. In Foster and Valdman 1984, 57–76.
- Hornberger, Nancy, and Serafin Coronel-Molina. 2004. Quechua language shift, maintenance, and revitalization in the Andes: The case for language planning. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 167:9–67.
- Hurbon, Laënnec. 1988. *Le barbare imaginaire*. Paris: Cerf.
- Indian Health Services 2011. *IHS Fact Sheets: Disparities*. Rockville, MD: Federal Health Program for American Indians and Alaska Natives. Available at www.ihs.gov/newsroom/factsheets/disparities.
- Jenson, Deborah. 2011. *Beyond the slave narrative: Politics, sex, and manuscripts in the Haitian revolution*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- King, Kendall. 2004. Language policy and local planning in South America: New directions for enrichment bilingual education in the Andes. *Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 7, no. 5: 334–347.
- King, Kendall, and Nancy Hornberger, eds. 2004. Quechua sociolinguistics. *International Journal of Sociology of Language* 167 (special issue).
- . 2006. Quechua as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 26:177–194.
- Klein, Thomas. 2006. Consciousness and linguistic agency in Creole: Evidence from Gullah and Geechee. *Internet Journal for Cultural Sciences* 16.
- Labat, R. P. 1722. *Nouveau voyage aux isles de l'Amérique contenant l'histoire naturelle de ces pays, l'origine, les moeurs, la religion & le gouvernement des habitans anciens & modernes*. . . . 8 vols. 1742 edition: Paris: Guillaume Cavelier père, libraire. Page references are to the 1742 edition.
- Laurie, Nira, and Alastair Bonnett. 2002. Adjusting to equity: The contradictions of neoliberalism and the search for racial equity in Peru. *Antipode* 34, no. 1: 28–53.
- Lewis, M. Paul, ed. 2009. *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*. 16th ed. Dallas, TX: SIL International. Online version: www.ethnologue.com/.
- Luykx, Aurolyn. 1999. *The citizen factory: Schooling and cultural production in Bolivia*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- . 2004. The future of Quechua and the Quechua of the future: Language ideologies and language planning in Bolivia. In King and Hornberger 2004, 147–158.
- Madiou, Thomas, fils. 1847. *Histoire d'Haiti*. 8 vols. Port-au-Prince, Haiti: Imprimerie Jh. Courtois.
- Makepeace, Anne, Jennifer Weston, Mary Lampson, and Jessie Little Doe. 2010. *Âs Nutayuneân: We still live here*. Oley, PA: Bullfrog Films.
- Martínez Cobo, José. 1987. *Study of the problem of discrimination against Indigenous populations*. Vol. 5, *Conclusions, proposals, and recommendations*. Submitted by the Special Rapporteur of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. New York: United Nations.
- Mathieu, Suze. 2005. *Depi nan Ginen nèg renmen nèg: Kreyòl ak demokrasi ann Ayiti* [Since Ginen, blacks love blacks: Creole and democracy in Haiti]. Pòtoprens, Haiti: Près nasyonal peyi d Ayiti.
- . 2008. Lang nou, kilti nou, idantite nou [Our language, our culture, our identity]. Interview by Nélío Joseph. *Le Nouvelliste*, July 25.
- . 2010. Yon lèt tou louvri pou Mesye Vernet Henry Rektè Inivèsite Leta Ayi-

- syen [An open letter for Mr. Vernet Henry, Rector of the State University of Haiti]. *Le Nouvelliste*, August 21–22.
- McCarty, Teresa L., Toe Skutnabb-Kangas, and Ole Henrik Magga. 2008. Education for speakers of endangered languages. In Spolsky and Hult 2008, 297–312.
- McManis, Charles. 2007. *Biodiversity and the law: Intellectual property, biotechnology, and traditional knowledge*. London: Earthscan.
- McWhorter, John. 2001. The world's simplest grammars are creole grammars. *Linguistic Typology* 5, nos. 2–3: 125–166.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1914. Le problème de la parenté des langues. *Scientia, Rivista di Scienza* 15, no. 35: 3. Reprinted in *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*, by Antoine Meillet, vol. 1 (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1958).
- Midy, Franklin. 2006. Les Congos à Saint-Domingue: De l'imaginaire au réel. *Ethnologies* 28, no. 1: 173–201.
- Migge, Bettina, Isabelle Léglise, and Angela Bartens. 2010. *Creoles in education: An appraisal of current programs and projects*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Montilus, Guérin. 2006. Vodun and social transformation in the African diasporic experience: The concept of personhood in Haitian Vodun Religion. In *Haitian Vodou: Spirit, myth, and reality*, ed. Patrick Bellegarde-Smith and Claudine Michel, 1–6. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Morales Ayma, Evo. 2010. Ley No 070 Ley de 20 de Diciembre de 2010: Ley de la educación “Avelino Siñani—Elizardo Pérez.” In *Gaceta Oficial del Estado Plurinacional de Bolivia*. Sucre, Bolivia: Ministerio de la Presidencia. Available at www.gobernabilidad.org.bo/images/stories/documentos/leyes/070.pdf.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. 2001. *The ecology of language evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2008. *Language evolution: Contact, competition, and change*. London: Continuum.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993. Elite closure as a powerful language strategy: The African case. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 103:149–163.
- Parackahua Arancibia, María Cristina. 2011. Resistencia de padres y docentes contra la Educación Intercultural Bilingüe (EIB) y cómo vencer. Presentation at the Harvard University Workshop “Indigenous Voices in the Andean Classroom,” Cambridge, MA, November 3.
- Political Database of the Americas. 2011. <http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Constitutions/Bolivia/bolivia09.html>.
- Price-Mars, Jean. 1956. *Formation ethnique, folklore et culture du peuple haïtien*. 2nd ed. Port-au-Prince, Haiti: Imprimerie N.A. Théodore.
- Ramsey, Kate. 2011. *The spirits and the law: Vodou and power in Haiti*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rickford, John. 1997. Unequal partnership: Sociolinguistics and the African American speech community. *Language in Society* 26, no. 2: 161–197.
- Roberts, Peter. 2008. *Roots of Caribbean identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roberts, Sarah Julianne. 1998. The role of diffusion in the genesis of Hawaiian Creole. *Language* 74, no. 1: 1–39.
- Saint-Fort, Hugues. 2011. *Haïti: Questions de langues, langues en question*. Port-au-Prince, Haiti: Editions de l'Université d'Etat d'Haïti.
- Saint-Louis, Vertus. 2006. Le surgissement du terme “africain” pendant la révolution de Saint-Domingue. *Ethnologies* 28, no. 1: 147–171.

- Saint-Méry, Moreau de. 1797. *Description topographique, physique, civile, politique et historique de la partie française de l'isle de Saint Domingue*. 3 vols. Philadelphia: Published by the author.
- Samarin, William. 1986. Protestant missions and the history of Lingala. *Journal of Religion in Africa* 16, no. 2: 138–163.
- Sánchez, Liliana. 2004. Functional convergence in the tense, evidentiality, and aspectual systems of Quechua Spanish bilinguals. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 7, no. 2: 147–162.
- Schieffelin, Bambi, and Rachele Charlier Doucet. 1994. The “real” Haitian Creole: Ideology, metalinguistics, and orthographic choice. *American Ethnologist* 21, no. 1: 176–200.
- Seuren, Pieter. 1998. *Western linguistics: An historical introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Singler, John. 1996. Theories of creole genesis, socio-historical considerations, and the evaluation of the evidence: The case of Haitian Creole and the relexification hypothesis. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 11, no. 2: 185–230.
- Speas, Margareth. 2011. Language ownership and language ideologies. Manuscript available online at <http://people.umass.edu/pspeas/lgownership.pdf>.
- Spolsky, Bernard, and Francis Hult, eds. 2008. *Handbook of educational linguistics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Thornton, John. 1993. “I am the subject of the King of Congo”: African political ideology and the Haitian Revolution. *Journal of World History* 4, no. 2: 181–214.
- Trouillot, Hénock. 1962. *Les origines sociales de la littérature haïtienne*. Port-au-Prince, Haiti: Imprimerie N.A. Théodore.
- Trouillot, Michel Rolph. 1995. *Silencing the past: Power and the production of history*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- . 2002. Culture on the edges: Caribbean creolization in historical context. In *From the margins: Historical anthropology and its futures*, ed. Brian Keith Axel, 189–210. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- UNESCO 1953. *The use of vernacular languages in education*. Monographs on Fundamental Education, 8. Paris: UNESCO.
- United Nations. 2007. *United Nations declaration on the rights of Indigenous peoples*. Available at www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf.
- . 2009. *The UN declaration on the rights of Indigenous peoples, treaties and the right to free, prior, and informed consent: The framework for a new mechanism for reparations, restitution, and redress*. Available at www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/en/EGM_A42.html.
- Valdman, Albert. 1984. The linguistic situation of Haiti. In Foster and Valdman 1984, 77–99.
- Walter, Stephen. 2008. The language of instruction issue: Framing an empirical perspective. In Spolsky and Hult 2008, 129–146.
- Warner-Lewis, Maureen. 2003. *Central Africa in the Caribbean: Transcending time, transforming cultures*. Kingston, Jamaica: University of West Indies Press.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1958. On the compatibility of genetic relationship and convergent development. *Word* 14: 374–379.
- Zefi, Lemèt. 2011. Edikasyon ak lang nan divès pwopozisyon plan rekonstriksyon d Ayiti [Education and language in various proposals for the reconstruction of Haiti]. In *Entre refondation et reconstruction: Les problématiques de l'avenir post-sismique d'Haïti*, ed. Wilson Dorlus, 257–264. Port-au-Prince, Haiti: Editions de l'Université d'Etat d'Haïti.