Consequences of Contact

Language Ideologies and Sociocultural
Transformations in Pacific Societies

Edited by
Miki Makihara
Bambi B. Schieffelin

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CONTENTS

THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

© 2006. CPIS, University of Hawai'i. All Rights Reserved.
Modified with permission.

Map of the Pacific Islands. © 2006. Center for Pacific Islands Studies, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. All Rights Reserved. Cartography by Manoa Mapworks, Inc. Modified and reproduced with permission.

MIKI MAKIHARA AND BAMBI B. SCHIEFFELIN

Cultural Processes and Linguistic Mediations

Pacific Explorations

T he contemporary Pacific is culturally and linguistically diverse, a complex, inter-related socioecological zone composed of islands with a variety of polities, including nation states (Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Tonga), and overseas collectivities (French Polynesia) and provinces (Rapa Nui or Easter Island, Papua) of nations.[1] These political designations have shifted over at least three centuries as these islands were taken, traded, and governed by various colonial and then postcolonial states. Though some achieved independence, issues of self-governance continue to be raised by others, as is the case of the West Papua independence movement.

No one can ignore the profound historical changes that contact with colonial and postcolonial governments and religious institutions have spurred throughout indigenous language communities of the Pacific. In recent years, large-scale socioeconomic transformations linked to globalization, urbanization, militarization, and environmental changes have reshaped communities through the movement of people, ideas, and commodities. However, the effects of contact on languages and their speakers, though no less pervasive, have proved easier to overlook—especially given characterizations of language still prevalent in the West as a transparent, culturally indifferent referential medium. Contemporary cross-cultural contact brought about by activities ranging from missionization, education, and tourism to conservation efforts, sustainable agriculture, the extraction of resources (timber, minerals, petroleum and fish), and nuclear testing continue to influence local language communities in both predictable and unpredictable ways.

The essays collected in this volume examine situations of intertwined linguistic and cultural change unfolding in specific Pacific locations in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. They have in common a basic concern with the multiple

ways that processes of historical change have shaped and been shaped by linguistic ideologies: reflexive sensibilities about languages and language use, held by Pacific peoples themselves. In this introduction, we outline some relevant broader contexts within which these chapters can be read. These contexts include: the complex history of cultural crossings and recrossings characteristic of Pacific societies; the varied history and political conditions of linguistic research in Pacific settings across different colonial and postcolonial phases of interaction between Europeans and Pacific Islanders; and the linguistic diversity of Pacific Island societies, and the social centrality of talk in them. We particularly seek to outline some of the main ways in which situations of linguistic and cultural change in the Pacific *vary*, and we suggest some strategies for understanding the dynamics of linguistic change by identifying its key agents, institutional sites, and linguistic forms within a wider historical conjuncture.

The Pacific has always been a place of intercultural contact, and these recent patterns must be understood in terms of the long and pervasive history of contact into which they figure. Melanesia had already been inhabited for at least forty thousand years by ancestors of Papuan- (non-Austronesian-) speaking peoples who had built extensive trading networks and complex interisland and broad interregional interactions extending possibly to Southeast Asia (Summerhayes 2007). Austronesian-speaking people migrated from Taiwan or sites nearby and started moving through Island Southeast Asia into Melanesia about four thousand years ago. Over the next three thousand years, they and their descendants, using sophisticated navigational skills, traveled vast distances from their origins. They settled as far east as Rapa Nui, as far west as Madagascar, to the north in Hawai'i and to the south in New Zealand. They had substantial cultural and ecological influence, including long-term fusions of traditions with Papuan peoples and among one another.[2] In the sixteenth century, European explorers began to chart the waters and bring news of exotic places and people (and sometimes the people themselves) back to Europe. During this time, Europeans conceptualized the Pacific region as "empty." They were ignorant about this area, vast expanses of ocean separated its small islands, and they believed that many of these islands (and those islands' resources) had no legitimate owners (Ward 1989). Later, this final sense of "emptiness" would enable various colonial powers to legitimize their own claims over Pacific territories, frequently accomplished through the use of written deeds transferring indigenous sovereignty to their own colonial nations. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, European Catholic and Protestant missionaries of various denominations, backed by their colonial governments, intensified contact first with Polynesia and then with other parts of the Pacific. Newly missionized Pacific Islanders often served as pastors and teachers alongside or independent of their European counterparts. Simultaneously, merchants, planters, and "blackbirders" (slavers) voyaged to these islands, initiating large-scale social, demographic, and ecological changes that would reverberate throughout the region.

This contact history remains relevant today, as evidenced in postcolonial debates about modernity, tradition, indigeneity, sovereignty, indigenous agency, and other political and social topics. Competing local, national, and transnational interests and perspectives have given rise to cultural activism concerned with indigenous rights, customs and cultural revival, political autonomy, and local resource management. These concerns have been articulated by elites and other members of local communities, and in political, religious, and academic contexts as well.[3] Whereas some have argued that changes initiated by earlier contact have been desirable and beneficial, leading to economic development and social improvement, others have seen them as essentially negative, causing people to lose their land, cultural and linguistic practices, and identity. Others view change as simply an inevitable consequence of globalization and other world-reshaping processes. Emerging from the arena of local politics, these divergent perspectives have informed scholarly attempts to theorize, model, or describe the dynamics of change in terms of continuity/discontinuity, assimilation, adaptation, and hybridity.[4]

Even the terms usually used to label the major Pacific Island regions—Melanesia, Micronesia, and Polynesia—show the instability that comes with being forged in the heat of historical processes of contact and colonialism. Though these three divisions have some correspondence to language groups, they were Western categories that originated in the 1830s and did not initially correspond to local perceptions or categories of identity and place. These three labels circulate in a variety of ways, both complicating and complementing indigenous perspectives, which emphasize a holistic view of the Pacific as "a sea of islands" (Hau'ofa 1993; Levinson, Ward, and Webb 1973) and of peoples as connected, rather than isolated, by the ocean. At the same time, localist discourses give importance to specific places, ethnicities, customs, languages, and histories. Most important, there are no singular or simple views of the Pacific to speak of.[5] Thousands of indigenous communities with diverse histories have had greater or lesser contact. Many are linked locally, and also have extensive and extending ties to diasporic communities both in and outside of the Pacific. Hence indigenous views are multiple and always changing.

Describing language(s) in culture

In the Pacific, language is intricately linked to the sociocultural and political transformations that we have briefly outlined above. As we will see, language is transformed by and transforms changing social realities. The multilingualism in vernaculars, lingua francas, and colonial and national languages that characterize many Pacific communities is a clear product of contact. What happens to linguistic structures, practices, and values mirrors, reinforces, and sometimes changes presuppositions about social relations and social relations themselves (Silverstein 1998). The role of language and the forms it takes, though central to cross-cultural contact situations, is rarely written about and remains undertheorized. Historical accounts, for example, often are vague about verbal interactions, failing to indicate languages used in contact moments, much less what might have been said or heard when partially shared languages were used to establish rudimentary forms of communication. For example, passionate debates within Pacific historiography about Captain Cook's 1779 death in Hawai'i have long engaged native and nonnative anthropologists, historians, linguists, and others.[6] There are multiple speculations regarding how Hawaiians addressed and referred to Cook at the time of his death and afterward. If we had more or less reliable, ethnographically annotated transcripts of what participants were saying, we would be able to begin to understand the multiple interpretations and viewpoints based on different interests

regarding Cook's identity. Without such clues, we are faced with trying to make sense against the grain of multiplying uncertainties as to what has been said, done, or meant, which is often misremembered or revised.[7]

The inherent complexity of communication in cross-cultural encounters must be kept in mind as we investigate the different interpretive strategies, translation conventions, and encoding procedures, as well as the broader language ideologies, which may converge in moments of contact. All of these have long-term consequences for indigenous people regarding resources and power. One clear example is the case of Maori and the British signing of the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi, which transferred sovereignty from the Maori to the British Crown. Translating culture-bound concepts such as *mana* and sovereignty has proved to be quite difficult and complicated (Biggs 1989). In addition, the parties involved had different understandings of the acts of signing and textual authority (McKenzie 1987). Both issues continue to be in play to this day, as evidenced by debates and legal contestations which now include discussions about contemporary multiethnic civil society in Aotearoa/New Zealand (Kawharu 1989).

Though Captain Cook and his crew collected word lists in the 1770s, noting similarities and possible historical connections among Polynesian languages, there was little systematic linguistic research on Pacific languages until the later part of the nineteenth century. Vernaculars were unwritten, structurally different from European languages, and there were an overwhelming number of them, often with dialectal differences. Though speakers were often multilingual, there were few trade languages or lingua francas as bridges. For those wanting to missionize, colonize, or carry out anthropological research in the Pacific, language learning and analysis presented a number of challenges, many of which remain today.

The first systematic and sustained linguistic work in the Pacific was carried out by missionary linguists, who focused on language analysis for translating the Bible.[8] Many faced the task of devising orthographies to write down previously unwritten languages, often producing the first word lists, dictionaries, and grammatical sketches. In many communities, these texts still influence local perceptions, use of the vernacular, and the shape of the language itself. It is ironic that through a process often referred to as phonological "reduction" (Pike 1947), these words on paper came to exert such power. Languages were often simplified through selective processes, and decisions about orthography and other issues of graphic representation and grammatical analysis were often based on ideological and ethnocentric grounds rather than sociolinguistic research.

R. H. Codrington was among the first and best known missionary linguists. At the British Melanesian Mission on Norfolk Island, he trained Pacific Islanders coming from a range of islands in the region. He also interviewed these teachers-in-training about their vernacular languages and native cultures, and over twenty-four years produced grammatical descriptions of more than two dozen languages of (present-day) Vanuatu and the Solomon Islands (Codrington 1885). Later work (Codrington 1891) focused on indigenous religious beliefs, and it introduced to Europe the concept of *mana*, which became influential in early debates about the nature of religion in native societies. His writing showed an appreciation of the complexity and systematicity of these languages, and of the importance of native knowledge,

albeit from interview data, for understanding local concepts. Although Codrington's writing is recognized as one of the earliest to contextualize language in cultural concepts, it was Bronislaw Malinowski's work that established the importance of systematic ethnographic fieldwork and redefined the place of language within it.

In *Coral Gardens and Their Magic* ([1935] 1978), Malinowski's focus on Trobriand Island agricultural practices enmeshed him in the study of magic and religious beliefs. One clear message from this work was that knowledge and use of the local language is essential for ethnographic understanding. Though Malinowski's emphasis was on the role of language for the ethnographer in generating a "native outlook," we can reframe this idea and see language as articulating natives' points of view, thus acknowledging that perspectives are multiple, knowledge is socially distributed, and language expresses social variation.

Conceptualizing language "as a mode of action," Malinowski propounded an ethnographic theory of language in Trobriand society that suggests his attempts to define context and pragmatics. His emphasis on utterances as effective achievements and speech as a component of concerted activity foregrounds a pragmatic and action-focused view of speech. Linking descriptions of Trobriand language practices to cultural activities, he argues that "the speech of a pre-literate community brings home to us in an unavoidably cogent manner that language exists only in actual use within the context of real utterance" ([1935] 1978, 2:v). His work demonstrates the importance to ethnographers of thinking about translation, inference, and cultural meaning, and his focus on chants and spells displays sensitivity to the interpenetration of linguistic and cultural processes. Though Malinowski paid close attention to language as a cultural practice, he also struggled to achieve a synthetic analysis of cultural and linguistic processes. In the end, he settled on two separate volumes, published under a single title. Today, many linguistic anthropologists realize the challenge of integrating the narrative of ethnographic description and the details of linguistic and sociolinguistic transcripts, which are themselves theoretically constructed.

Language(s) in the Pacific

From our perspective, two things stand out about language and speech practices in Pacific societies: their centrality in the construction of self and sociality, and social life more broadly, and their extraordinary diversity. In communities that are overwhelmingly organized through face-to-face encounters, language is an expressive resource that individuals must manage carefully and artfully. A variety of verbal resources and performative genres—oratory, narrative, song, lament, conversation, arguments, gossip, teasing in activities from the everyday to the ritual—have been linked not only to a rich tradition of expressive culture, but also to politics and memory. Social relationships are established and maintained through talk and acts of reciprocity and exchange, which are accomplished through talk. Signaled throughout the lexicon, morphology, syntax, and pragmatics are ideas about social relationships and personhood, identity, and affect, for example, in naming practices, honorifics, and pronoun systems. Language is key to socialization and in establishing

and understanding ethnopsychological dimensions. These and other features central to language and speech communities have been documented in the last fifty or so years by strong lineages of linguistic and cultural anthropologists in the Pacific.[9]

Anthropologists have theorized talk as a form of action in Pacific politics and political discourse, connecting it to different social systems. We do not wish to reify cultural models that oppose Melanesian, Big Man egalitarian societies in which power is achieved with Polynesian hierarchical chiefdoms in which power is ascribed. We recognize that there is variation across different regions and societies and the arenas within them, and that although talk and code selection often reflect different types of social organization and status relations, these are not static features. To the extent that communities or interactional contexts might be shown to be organized on more or less egalitarian grounds, talk is still crucial in creating and re-creating egalitarian relations. Open disagreement, which may be expected in more egalitarian communities, is often expressed indirectly in public and private domains, as settling conflict is carefully managed. In more hierarchical language communities, where power is more likely to be ascribed on the basis of kinship and other preexisting arrangements, those with power are often at risk and must verbally justify their positions and persuade others to maintain hierarchies in political arenas. Thus, general cultural preferences toward ascription and achievement must still be constituted verbally. For both kinds of polities, talk is also what challenges and sometimes transforms the status quo, and those who are eloquent with words are highly regarded (Duranti 1994; Myers and Brenneis 1984).

Talk is central not only in acting politically but in managing interpersonal conflict, where it plays an informative and persuasive role in Pacific communities. Taking as a starting point the embeddedness of personhood in complex matrices of social relations, it is clear that talk functions to negotiate and reestablish moral, social, and emotional boundaries, especially when they have become strained (White and Watson-Gegeo 1990). It is in these affectively charged contexts that new ideas and feelings about identity are articulated and tried out, thus providing opportunities for change or revision.

The impression of the centrality of language in Pacific communities might be an academic artifact, the result of intense attention that anthropologists (mostly American) have paid to language, starting with early work in folk classification, ethnoscience, and ethnography of speaking. However, a variety of co-occurring factors suggest that many Pacific societies do indeed place a high value on talk, regardless of scale or social organization. Language and speech practices are tied to issues of truthfulness, practices of revealing and concealing specific forms of knowledge, and the efficacy of many forms of social or ritual action. Not only are speech genres varied and elaborated, but metalinguistic vocabulary is often extensive. People talk about, and think about, talk a lot. They judge and circulate talk, and they remember certain forms of talk—in verbal activities ranging from stories to land claims—for generations.

Further evidence of the centrality of talk to Pacific societies comes from the way indigenous scholars and local activists have always recognized its importance in native communities, especially its rootedness in their histories and places. The centrality of native language and indigenous discourse has been described in several ways: "as markers of deep difference" (Diaz and Kauanui 2001b: 320), as resources for decolonization projects, and as ways to reclaim cultural knowledge and political autonomy. This has become even more salient with the implicit and explicit language policies of missionization and colonization, which have changed patterns of language transmission, disrupting local speech ecologies.[10] These disruptions have led to language shift and loss in many communities, often increasing consciousness about language itself. In particular, Maori and Hawaiian language activists have been leaders in language revitalization efforts, which include establishing language immersion schools (language nests),[11] promoting the connectedness of linguistic and cultural practices in pursuing broader social and political projects.[12]

The centrality of a shared vernacular in identity-making is also linguistically marked and made salient in other kinds of contact situations. In Papua New Guinea and the Solomon Islands, the importance of a shared local language is expressed in the creole languages (Tok Pisin and Pijin) spoken there. The word wantok, which derives from English 'one talk,' originated on plantation settings in the early part of the twentieth century, which brought together laborers from diverse parts of Melanesia. This was one of the first Pacific contexts in which large numbers of language community boundaries converged. Across social groups, regardless of any other markers of social similarity, calling someone wantok can evoke shared family or clan membership or ethnolinguistic affiliation. It is a major category of social solidarity that can legitimize one's participation in a social network in a larger system of exchange; using this term recognizes a social connection and signals distinction as well. The term continues to be socially and economically useful and symbolically charged as people increasingly move to new places and interact in wider social networks.

In addition to the centrality of language and talk in Pacific societies, the enormous diversity of languages also requires our attention. Linguistic diversity has in fact long characterized the Pacific. Linguists estimate that as many as thirteen hundred of the world's six thousand or so languages can be found in the Pacific (Foley 1986; Lynch 1998). The northern third of New Guinea alone (from the Bird's Head to the Sepik-Ramu Basin, an area no larger than Great Britain) is the most linguistically diverse part of the planet, with at least sixteen unrelated language families (Pawley 2007; Ross 2005). Diversity characterizes various dimensions of language. For example, within these thousand or so languages, there are differences in the size and density of language communities and their networks. This has social consequences for the distribution and meaning of communicative resources. There are also significant structural and genetic differences among Pacific languages, a topic that has been taken up from various cross-disciplinary perspectives—archaeological, biological, and linguistic—collaboratively seeking to unravel origins and contact using comparative methodologies, as with research on the ultimate origins of the Polynesians and their historical relations and contacts with peoples of Melanesia, Southeast Asia, and even South America.[13] These include investigating the life cycles of the few precolonial indigenous pidgin and creole languages that arose in the context of intergroup trading and social relationships (Foley 1988). More important than these indigenous contact languages per se was the multilingualism that evolved as speakers learned the languages of neighboring communities enabling kinship and trading relationships. Thus, various types of linguistic diversity were deeply connected to precolonial contacts between people across villages, islands, and continents.

The development of contact languages—pidgins and creoles—is itself a major linguistic consequence of colonial contact. Four major Pacific creole languages—Tok Pisin and Pijin (mentioned above), Bislama (Vanuatu), and Hawai'i Creole English—emerged out of plantation settings involving intense and sustained contact among laborers from multiple, mutually unintelligible language communities who had no previous relationships and were suddenly put in contact with each other. Because of the particular nature of the sociolinguistic and power dynamic in these plantation settings, these languages carry traces of their contact histories: they mix colonial languages with selected local vernaculars (e.g., Tok Pisin is primarily a mix of English and Tolai) but exhibit certain common structural properties. These four have become structurally complex and multifunctional, rooted in the social life of speech communities, while others may have been short lived.[14]

There have been different hypotheses about why there is such linguistic diversity and so many small language communities, particularly in parts of Melanesia. One explanation suggested is geographical isolation, but this idea is not widely supported because groups have maintained various (and in many cases extensive) forms of contact despite rugged mountainous terrain.[15] A second explanation is long-term human habitation (forty thousand years), which usually results in language change and diversification (Foley 1986: 8). The third proposal, based on social attitudes and linguistic ideologies, claims that linguistic diversity is a matter of choice, something which has been cultivated in order to highlight difference and maintain boundaries among groups that are otherwise culturally similar.[16] In the Pacific, as elsewhere, though multilingualism is valued, one's own language is a foremost marker of identity, whether it indexes one's local village or a larger social group.

The consequences of contact history for linguistic diversity in the Pacific have sparked considerable academic debate. Using the notion of "linguistic imperialism" to describe missionization and colonization, Mühlhäusler (1996) envisions a contemporary Pacific in which there is rapid, irreversible, and extensive disruption of precolonial linguistic ecologies. He claims that many vernacular languages have already become obsolescent or at least seriously damaged as English and associated literacy practices have spread. The result of these processes of language shift, decay, and death, he concludes, is linguistic homogeneity in terms of structure, meaning, and patterns of use. Certainly, as Mühlhäusler and others before him have argued, colonization and missionization, often linked, led the shift from precolonial or traditional egalitarian multilingualism or linguistic diversity in the Pacific to increased hierarchization of languages and linguistic hegemony (Sankoff 1980a). Consequential transformations of such hierarchical arrangements are detailed in this volume by Jourdan for urban Solomon Islanders (chap. 2), by Makihara for Rapa Nui (chap. 3), and by Riley for Marquesans (chap. 4).

Singling out literacy as a particularly potent technology, Mühlhäusler claims this introduced communicative technology and its associated practices have often led to "an almost total transformation of most Pacific societies and most languages spoken in the area" (1996: 212). While numerous scholars working in the Pacific view this assessment as exaggerated and overly pessimistic, all agree that the introduction of literacy and the institutions in which it was embedded has had significant cultural, sociopolitical, and epistemological impacts in previously nonliterate Pacific societies.[17]

Points of encounters

In the Pacific, literacy in vernacular or colonial languages was commonly introduced as part of a sustained program of missionization. Regimentation, surveillance, and the imposition of new institutional forms (churches, schools, and clinics) and worldviews characterized these colonial projects. As a number of ethnographic and sociolinguistic studies of literacy practices have shown, however, literacy is not an autonomous technology that, when imposed on a community, is taken up "as is."[18] When there are "discrepant intentions" between the introducers and the recipients of literacy, its control is up for grabs (Besnier 1995: 17). Like other new forms of knowledge, local people take up literacy, at least partially, according to their own ideologically and culturally informed purposes. These in turn shape local processes of indigenizing this technology, which is crucial to its integration in the community's communicative repertoire. These are both sites and signs of local agency and meaning-making, the consequences of which may or may not endure. Understanding them as contexts of dynamism offers insights into the linguistic and cultural processes involved.

Even when agents of colonization and missionization held a shared interest in changing local communities or appropriating indigenous souls or lands, encounters themselves were highly variable in terms of duration, intention, and scale. It was in such encounters, ranging in scope from a single instance to sustained contact, that different modes of communication, appearance, and assumptions about the world produced not only the possibilities for transformation, innovation, and reorganization, but new communicative practices and ideologies as well. Three short examples of different types of encounters and the short- and long-term consequences for particular literacy practices illustrate just a few of the possible scenarios that have been documented. Each exhibits different temporal organization regarding points or phases of contact, as well as manner, duration, and intensity.[19] They illustrate ways in which the incorporation of new modes (literacy) expand local communicative repertoires and give rise to new genres and registers along with new ideas about language itself. These examples also highlight the different types of evidence—historical, ethnographic, sociolinguistic, and linguistic—that are resources for understanding the nature of contact and issues of agency and interpretation.

Rapa Nui, like other Pacific societies, had no indigenous literacy prior to European contact. In 1770, a Spanish expedition made a six-day visit to the island which included signing an official deed annexing the island to Spain, or so the Spanish thought. It may have been this event that inspired the creation of an indigenous script, *rongorongo* incised on wood tablets, twenty-five of which survive today. One interpretation of the origin of *rongorongo* is that the inhabitants of Rapa Nui associated the act of making signs at this deed-making event with power and prestige and sought to emulate it in devising their own scripts based on indigenous motifs, rather than use the Roman alphabet. Though relatively little is known about the exact use or content of these tablets, they fostered social and political change, the emergence of literate ritual specialists, and the teaching of this script (Fischer 1997, 2005). The *rongorongo* embodies one kind of local response following exposure to a new technology, literacy. Local transformations unfolded on multiple levels. Rapa Nui seemed to have taken the *idea* of writing, invented their

own script, and devised locally relevant uses for it. Less than a hundred years later, more enduring and intensive forms of European contact started to have a major influence on Rapa Nui language and social life (see Makihara 2004 and chap. 3 of this volume). The arrival of slavers led to a major population decline, and missionaries led the community to convert to Christianity. *Rongorongo* was abandoned, and its meanings obscured.

Analyses of contemporary literacy practices among the Nukulaelae islanders in Tuvalu, a Polynesian nation, provide our second example, an account of continuing indigenization and dynamism (Besnier 1993, 1995). Samoan pastors sent in the 1860s by the London Missionary Society introduced Christianity on this small atoll, and in the process restructured local social and political life. The islanders quickly learned how to read and write in Samoan, which remained the language of school, church, law, and government until the 1930s, when Tuvaluan began to replace it. While pastors encouraged Bible reading, at the same time local people quickly became letter writers, first in Samoan but later in Tuvaluan, adapting literacy for their own social purposes. The extensive letters written by both men and women are used to maintain contacts outside of Nukulaelae, including its diasporic communities, and perform affective, informational, moral, and economic functions. This early emergence and continuous use of letter writing may be viewed as a mild form of resistance as the local uses of literacy significantly went beyond those intended by the religious authorities who introduced it (Besnier 1995: 178). This locally important emphasis on personal writing stands in stark contrast to the commonly held view that "literacy has become a source of confusion and doubt in the oral societies of the Pacific, and...is contributing to cultural erosion" (Topping 1992: 30).[20]

Our final case focusing on the introduction of literacy and new language varieties comes from Erromango (southern Vanuatu), where, in the mid-nineteenth century, Presbyterian mission policy promoted one local language among many as a lingua franca, now known as Erromangan (Crowley 2001). Lacking ethnographic or linguistic documentation regarding precontact language and social life on Erromango or Erromangans' original response to missionization, Crowley compares mid-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century missionary texts (a catechism and hymnal) with extensive samples of contemporary written and spoken Erromangan. His linguistic analysis demonstrates local peoples' sensitivity to the missionaries' written version of their spoken language. More specifically, Erromangans continue to use the early missionary hymns, which are structurally simplified and diverge radically from their spoken language. Moreover, they are also highly selective in which grammatical features they use, rejecting certain features when modeling contemporary hymns after these missionary versions. Crowley hypothesizes that the local community initially viewed this nineteenth-century missionary variety as "bad" Erromangan but later reevaluated it as "good" Erromangan, and it now functions as a written and sung register for religious purposes. Thus local people are constructing this "good" Erromangan, underlining their active and selective adaptation of literacy and its features as a register while resisting its influence into spoken registers (255). Outsiders such as missionaries can also shape the process of indigenization in local communities, for example, by selecting or "shaping" vernaculars (or trade or colonial languages) according to their own ideologies and purposes to make them more effective for proselytizing and literacy as well.[21] Handman (chap. 8, this volume) provides a detailed account of these processes currently in progress in Bible translation training at SIL International (formerly known as the Summer Institute of Linguistics) in Papua New Guinea. Philips (chap. 9, this volume) offers historical analyses of how missionaries collaborated with local Tongan elites in shaping secular nation-state formation through scholarly representations of chiefly language.

It is difficult to historically reconstruct the language ideologies of Pacific Islanders as both agents and recipients of change because written accounts of these contact encounters were relatively rare, and those that survived were biased in one direction. We often do not have the methods or means to trace the linguistic and cultural practices—the origins of which are easily lost—that create new vernacular forms and meanings. We have to search for linguistic and cultural traces of participants' voices. Fortunately, as part of the Western preference for writing letters and leaving records, we have documentation of what European and other missionaries thought they were doing, as well as reminders of what they were "planting" with their imperial languages and ideologies. In addition to records and letters, their translations of liturgical materials, often published, provide evidence for tracking contact-induced change in vernacular languages and their practices. Though language change over time can go unnoticed and undocumented, one (handy) consequence of the introduction of literacy and these publication practices is the creation of material artifacts—texts that can provide clues to language contact histories. Sources and types of evidence may already be the product of multiple contact and mediation, requiring analysts to be attentive to such heteroglossic voices in these texts. We see additional types of evidence for tracing linguistic and cultural change in transcripts as well as in missionary and scholarly documents and other materials in Schieffelin for Bosavi, Papua New Guinea (chap. 7 of this volume), and in Philips for Tonga (chap. 9).

We have selected examples of what happens to oral varieties of language when they are in contact with, or are translated or transformed into, literate varieties to illustrate a number of points about the sites and consequences of contact. For one, in mission and colonial contexts, writing is thought of as being more authoritative than speaking, and written documents (especially deeds and treaties) are among the first written texts that many groups new to literacy experience. These texts carry an authority of print, with the power of words enduring over time and space. But the power and meaning of such texts have been and continue to be challenged by, for example, Maori. Missionaries thought of the Bible and its translations as another type of verbal contract, one that promised salvation to those who abided by it. The notions of language, oral and written, that accompanied missionary and colonial regimes were embedded in particular language ideologies, ideas about language and their users that traveled with the very codes and projects that were the concerns of these agents of contact and change.

We turn next to the concept of language ideology as a theoretical framework as it provides a way to understand how participants on all sides of the cross-cultural interchange think about and use language. This provides a link between the sociocultural and linguistic processes emergent in contact situations. Though some expect language to be transparent—a list of vocabulary items containing meanings with largely functional equivalencies across code boundaries—this is not the case. It is

often not only difference in codes and problems in translating between them that make understanding difficult, but ideas about the nature of language itself or its functions which, when taken for granted on one side and unimagined or even unimaginable on the other, lead to the misrecognition of meaning and even intentions. These issues are elaborated in this volume by Stasch for Korowai, West Papua (chap. 5), and by Robbins for Urapmin, Papua New Guinea (chap. 6).

Language ideologies and sites of contact and change

Though shaped by asymmetrical power relations, colonial encounters are dynamic and complex. There is rarely a clear "zero point" separating the times before and after contact. Language and the speech activities that give shape to both subjective and intersubjective social lives are themselves shaped by language ideologies and by conceptions about persons, worlds, and knowledge. Ways of feeling, thinking, and speaking about language (metalanguage), a property of human communication, are never neutral or ahistorical, but are closely tied to specific sociocultural and episte-mological frameworks and processes. The chapters in this volume explore the nature and mechanisms of such cultural processes that not only transform languages but also social realities and relationships as they are linguistically constituted, encoded, and enacted. In this way, language ideologies and practices mediate consequences of cultural contact over time. The chapters exemplify various cultural conceptions of language, its uses, and users, which are made particularly salient and observable in contact across interactional and institutional settings.

Here, we offer a definition of language ideology that is broad enough to encom-pass the theoretical and methodological perspective dominant in linguistic anthro-pology.[22] We take language ideologies to be cultural representations, whether explicit or implicit, of the intersection of language and human beings in a social world. Mediating between social structures and forms of talk, such ideologies do not just concern language. Rather, they link language to identity, power, aesthetics, morality, and epistemology in terms of cultural and historical specificities. Through such link-ages, language ideologies underpin not only linguistic form and use, but also signifi-cant social institutions and fundamental notions of persons and community.

In framing our discussion of language ideology, we draw inspiration from Raymond Williams's perceptive assertion that "a definition of language is always, implicitly or explicitly, a definition of human beings in the world" (1977: 21). This characterization, itself already ideological and interestingly ambiguous, captures a broad range of widely shared cultural ideas that have resonance not only in academic discussions but in local language communities.[23] In fact, Williams's observation becomes particularly germane in situations of contact between language commu-nities within a broader multilingual speech community.[24] This conceptualization allows room for choice and change, which are always intertwined, both in terms of code(s) themselves and the indexical associations between language elements and social meanings. As history demonstrates, these associations may be recruited for

various political, religious and other identity projects. When cultural and linguistic elements come into contact, systems that are already conventionalized and enshrined in institutions may be renewed as dominant or may persist as residual. At the same time, actors might innovate or at least experiment with these elements, formulating new articulations out of the mixture of both sets of resources.[25] As Williams reminds us, we are not talking about personal experience but rather "social experience which is still *in process*, often indeed not yet recognized as social, but taken to be private, idiosyncratic, and even isolating, but which in analysis...has its emergent, connect-ing, and dominant characteristics, indeed its specific hierarchies" (132).

Williams's emphasis on the processual nature of cultural formations is equally applicable to linguistic elements. Studies of linguistic and cultural contact often focus on norms and outcomes, relegating agency as manifested in attempts at establishing innovative forms and meanings to the back burner. Close attention to process, on the other hand, reminds us that both new social and linguistic elements must be collectively recognized as meaningful in order to join the category of potentially legitimate alter-nate forms of expression. Where contact is relatively recent or benign, there may be stances of apprehension best characterized as curiosity or disinterest. For innovated or introduced elements to enter a system, however, they must generate sufficient consen-sus among speakers in a given language community if choice among alternates is to be socially meaningful. If this does not occur, such innovated forms could be rejected or reinterpreted. The gradual emergence and recognition of new linguistic forms consti-tutes the mortar for language change more generally. The accumulation of many small choices may lead to unintended outcomes—for example, an increased linguistic diver-sity in Melanesia. Here we would add that the language ideology perspective demands nuancing the assertion that linguistic diversity in Melanesia is a matter of choice. Given the variety of contact histories and trajectories, individual linguistic choices may be more or less socially established and more or less conscious, synchronically (across speakers, genres, situations, and communities) and diachronically.

There are, thus, variable degrees of consciousness in contact settings regarding different elements of language and language change. Recognizing, and then incorpo-rating elements from a new language as a form of embodiment connects this practice to Bourdieu's notion of habitus (1977). Contact often is the context that disrupts and possibly transforms one's habitual practices, or at least makes one aware that what was taken for granted is now subject to scrutiny. Voicing new forms, based either on mimesis or as a novel form to avoid such association, allows one to engage with the other, the previously unknown, and provides the potential for transforming one's self, language, and language ideologies.

Language ideologies materialize—but also naturalize—the linguistic status quo. When language users accept particular practices as the usual or dominant, there is no further need for explicit articulation of operative ideologies. The emergence of alternative possibilities in mission or colonial contact, however, often foregrounds the interaction between previously naturalized and newly available linguistic forms, creating a context for discussions of difference as well as for affective responses, such as desire. Contexts in which language ideologies are in conflict often give rise to a higher degree of explicitness about underlying views and beliefs. These are also the sites in which language ideologies are recalled or

produced, made visible and audible, and their naturalness questioned, bringing us to what Giddens (1984) would call "discursive consciousness." This is where processes of reconfiguration are often initiated. Missionizers and colonizers sharing the goal of creating different types of persons often challenge the integrity and value of local cultural and linguistic practices by prohibiting certain words, genres, and languages and insisting on the use of others. Their rationalizations for such actions are usually expressed as "civilizing," "modernizing," and Christianizing native people. All parties, regardless of power dynamics, are motivated by affective and subjective dimensions of their actions and must have had a range of emotions affecting how interactions unfolded and concluded. The degrees of surprise, wonder, curiosity, fear, and uncertainty and of consequent transformation in European contact encounters vary greatly across communities and over time. Each of the numerous meetings and engagements between indigenous and European individuals and groups involves ambiguity and mismatch between what was intended and unintended. This conditions the points of articulation between the old/indigenous and the new/nonindigenous.

Often unnoticed and undocumented are moments of choice, compromise, adjustment, and outright opposition on the part of local community members facing introduced ideas and actions. In such encounters, not only are the imposed ideas taken under consideration, but traditional ones may be reevaluated and lead to syncretic cultural or linguistic forms. In some cases, even if communities subscribe to mission or colonial evaluation of their tradition, their reworking of what they desire to incorporate or change requires substantial cognitive, social, and linguistic reorganization.[26] This is often difficult to achieve and may exacerbate existing lines of social conflict and generate new ones. Homogeneity is rare in the way such moments are perceived, understood, talked about, and remembered.

From a methodological perspective, we need to be able to scrutinize such early and emergent formulations and their interactions with what are dominant and residual, and to seriously consider the role of agency in these processes. We value the notions of voicing and dialogism (Bakhtin 1981), paying careful attention to the actual linguistic forms that speakers use when in dialogue with various interlocutors in order to establish stance, as expressed through modality, pronoun choice, code selection, and the many pragmatic resources that language affords. It is in this sensitive and often ambiguous area between the privately felt and the socially recognized that speakers' voicings are especially relevant. Whether speakers are carrying out mundane routines or performing public political speech that stands for a group's location in the world, agency and utterance matter. We must attend to the details—such as who is able to or chooses to speak, the particular form of utterance, and its effect on the listeners—as part of any methodology that is concerned with language ideology and its place in analyses of linguistic and social change. By closely examining both the contexts of language use and the ideologies that give them meaning, we can see how particular social and cultural formations and linguistic forms arise, continue to be effective, or come to be associated in new ways (such as inversion) as consequences of contact, which themselves are available for further transformation.

Chapter overviews

In this introductory essay, we have sought to promote a perspective that highlights the importance of language ideologies in understanding the interconnectedness of linguistic and cultural processes in contact situations. In discussing contact and its consequences in the Pacific, we underscore the complexity of contact histories in the region, the centrality of language in its social life, and the diversity of languages and linguistic forms in its societies. We briefly introduce each chapter and then describe the salience of these issues in the individual chapters in this collection as a way of drawing connections across Pacific experiences. The map of the Pacific Islands indicates the location of each chapter.

In chapter 2, Christine Jourdan analyzes the changing urban modalities of language use by residents of Honiara, the multilingual capital city of the postcolonial Solomon Islands. The sociolinguistic order inherited from the colonial period—when English was at the top of the hierarchy, and local vernaculars and Pijin at the bottom—is undergoing reorganization. Jourdan argues that language selection is central to constantly redefining sociality, revealing speakers' agency and the situatedness of the urban self, and expressing ethnic, generational, social, and gender identities.

In chapter 3, Miki Makihara examines ideologies of code choice and language revalorization embedded in the political discourse of the bilingual, indigenous Polynesian community of Easter Island, Chile, where the local Rapa Nui language has in the past been marginalized and endangered by Spanish. Rapa Nui speakers have challenged this situation first by expanding syncretic Rapa Nui–Spanish speech styles into public and political domains and, more recently, by constructing purist Rapa Nui speech styles. She argues that Rapa Nui speakers deploy these speech styles as linguistic registers for political ends, voicing different but complementary sets of values—democratic participation, on the one hand, and primordialism and ethnic boundary construction, on the other. Makihara illustrates the ways that Rapa Nui have revalorized and maintained their language by establishing new linguistic registers, thereby adding extra sociolinguistic meanings to speech styles and increasing linguistic heterogeneity.

Chapter 4 focuses on the Marquesas (French Polynesia), where most adults use both Marquesan and a local variety of the colonial language, French, switching between them—sometimes intrasententially—in a number of contexts. Kathleen Riley explores the contradictions and effects of official discourses and everyday socializing practices in this multilingual community. Language socialization data from two time periods a decade apart evidence the ways in which Marquesans are rejecting in practice the diglossic separation of their two languages, producing and reproducing instead the officially lamented but covertly prestigious code-switched variety charabia/sarapia to index their identities as both French and Polynesian.

In chapter 5, Rupert Stasch charts an ideology of linguistic difference that shapes how Korowai of West Papua have evaluated and spoken an intrusive lingua franca over the first quarter-century of their contact with it. Calling Indonesian "demon language" (where "demon" contrasts paradigmatically with "human"), Korowai emphasize that the new language is simultaneously strange and parallel to their own. Stasch examines speech practices and evaluations of this new language as a perspective

on the world that is alien to the community's geographic and cultural position, but that exists as a kind of displaced, deformed counterpart to that position. Bilingual Korowai increasingly make passing use of Indonesian in conversation with other Korowai, precisely because of the artful potential of the language for signifying strangeness and parallelism at the same time.

In chapter 6, Joel Robbins puts forth the idea that language ideologies stand in complex relationship to ideologies of material exchange, especially in Melanesia, where contemporary changes in language ideology have been in important respects shaped by transformations in traditional ideologies of exchange. Among the Urapmin of Papua New Guinea, the relationship between the two changing ideologies and wider ideologies of change that have developed in the wake of conversion to Christianity has been apparent in local debates over the practice of charismatic Christian rituals of Holy Spirit possession. Robbins discusses these rituals and the debates that surround them in detail to show how new ideologies of change have transformed how the Urapmin think about both material and linguistic exchange.

Bambi Schieffelin, in chapter 7, analyzes Tok Pisin Bible reading and vernacular translation practices introduced during missionization in Bosavi, Papua New Guinea. These are critical sites for studying linguistic and cultural processes that reshape the vernacular. Focusing on the metapragmatic domain of reflexive language, specifically reported speech and thought and the speech act of blasphemy, Schieffelin illustrates what happens when language ideologies and languages associated with fundamentalist missionaries, biblical scripture and Bosavi pastors come into contact over a twenty-year period (1975–1995). Reflexive language and the ideas that underlie its use are found to be culturally and sociohistorically specific and, as such, do not travel easily across texts and time in either Tok Pisin or Bosavi.

In chapter 8, Courtney Handman examines the role of linguistic versus cultural knowledge as it is theorized for Bible translation at the Summer Institute of Linguistics in Papua New Guinea. As part of a process of revising its training procedures, SIL has shifted from using its own expatriate member-translators to using Papua New Guineans, who are members of the Bible Translation Association and 'native speakers' of the languages into which the Bible is translated. Handman argues that their training regimes are based on a linguistically oriented notion of group identity, rather than native culture, that establishes 'heart' or native language as more central to authenticity and Christian commitment.

In chapter 9, Susan Philips proposes that Christian missionaries and the Tongan chiefly class collaborated over time in changing language ideology about Tongan lexical honorifics (*lea faka-'eiki* 'chiefly language') as one way of highlighting their concept of the political shift from a Tongan traditional hierarchy to a Tongan secular modern nation-state hierarchy. Based on careful examination of scholarly representations of these honorifics in descriptions of Tongan language over the past two hundred years, she shows the considerable stability over time in the number of levels of honorification described, and even in some of the specific lexical items associated with each level. In contrast, the conceptualization of the targets of the honorifics—that is, who is indexed by the particular honorifics (e.g., God or the King)—has changed significantly. In this way, the language ideologies of Christian missionaries and Tongan chiefly class have stressed continuity over rupture while repressing the sacred in Tongan nation-state formation.

In chapter 10, Joseph Errington provides a thoroughgoing commentary on these contributions. Here, we offer a few provisional, synthetic remarks to help orient the reader. The chapters in this volume share a perspective that highlights the dynamics of linguistic and cultural processes in contact situations brought about by historical and ongoing missionization and (de)colonization. Working with ethnohistorical, ethnographic and sociolinguistic data, they offer analyses of a range of sites in which multiple social and linguistic transformations have occurred and continue to unfold as a result of the types of contact we have discussed above. These sites enable the creation of new types of local actors, such as pastors, Bible translators, teachers, political activists, spirit mediums, and tour guides, some of whom introduce, innovate, legitimate, or resist new ideas and ways to express them through language. Local actors take their roles as agents in these societies creating new genres and registers to accommodate and participate in their changing social contexts, transforming local language communities. In the process, they have cultivated new cultural conceptions of language, for example, as a medium for communicating religious knowledge and truth (chapters by Robbins, Schieffelin, and Handman) and for (re)constructing social boundaries and transforming relationships of domination (chapters by Jourdan, Makihara, Riley, Stasch, and Philips).

In times of cultural contact, communities often experience language change at an accelerated rate. This is particularly so in small-scale communities where innovations and continuity routinely depend on the imagination, creativity, and charisma of fewer individuals. The essays in this volume provide evidence of this potential and a record of their voices. We can thus gain insight into the social history of a language because it is marked by the history of its users and by the contexts in which they transform and construct their ethnolinguistic landscape.

The chapters also provide examples of communities and their different contact histories of varying depth, highlighting different consequences for the multiple codes, styles, and modes of communication which are developing, competing, or coexisting simultaneously. Several focus on small-scale, relatively egalitarian communities that are in the earlier phases of sustained contact and newly experiencing the emergence of multiple linguistic ideologies and language varieties (e.g., chapters by Stasch, Robbins, and Schieffelin). Others underscore the effect of longer contact histories, emphasizing the subsequent and continuing transformation of heterogeneous linguistic ideologies and practices (e.g., chapters by Jourdan, Makihara, Riley, Handman, and Philips).

Contact settings constitute sites for producing new linguistic forms and practices drawing on different colonial, lingua franca, and local language varieties and ideologies. Speakers use linguistic processes such as addition, deletion, and modification, including reordering or reversal of elements for transforming codes (denotational and indexical). For example, Korowai incorporate Indonesian into their linguistic repertoire through loans, calques, and neologisms (Stasch, chap. 5) and Honiarans import their village vernaculars' phonologies and lexicons into their Pijin speech (Jourdan, chap. 2). Marquesans (Riley, chap. 4) and Rapa Nui (Makihara, chap. 3) alternate between colonial and vernacular codes, each creating a new style of speech. In addition, some Marquesan and Rapa Nui speakers consciously avoid previously borrowed elements from colonial languages. These linguistic processes and their resulting codes provide a lens for understanding yet another set of relationships

between linguistic ideologies and practices and their role in the transformation of social relations over time.

Language ideologies are intricately attached to conceptions of person, community, and power. This becomes particularly apparent and consequential in cross-cultural contact settings—be they religious, governmental, colonial, or economic—that are inherently asymmetrical in terms of power relations. In such contact settings, these fundamental notions about person, community, and power cannot be assumed, and must be negotiated or at least articulated. These same notions inform speakers' and writers' linguistic choices and discursive strategies. Here we foreground the simultaneity and multiplicity of linguistic phenomena, addressing how and why new language varieties are created and how selection among multiple codes and forms transform languages and language communities. For example, urban Honiarans are expanding the social meanings of Pijin through the creation of dialects that signify social differentiation, ethnicity, gender, and generation, thus valorizing this creole language not only as a national language, but as their own. In the context of missionization, a new register, Christian talk, is emerging as Bosavi pastors read and translate the Tok Pisin Bible in church services. This new variety is not yet formally recognized and named. Similarly, Rapa Nui activists are developing registers of political discourse in which a purist style of speech is strategically deployed in particular, public interethnic contexts. Marquesans have created new genres for socializing children by combining French-style reprimands within Marquesan teasing frameworks. Innovated language varieties and practices reorganize semiotic associations and evaluations of languages and functions. These new articulations of cultural and social formations provide evidence of how speakers mobilize linguistic resources and how they are accommodated into the linguistic ecology, revising and enriching it.

Contact settings provoke opportunities for language users to consciously reflect on language at different levels. Even the nature of language itself may come to pose certain dilemmas. Urapmin in Papua New Guinea are struggling to enact a Christian conception of language as a vehicle of sincerity and social truth, which traditionally are demonstrated primarily through nonlinguistic acts and exchange. Bilingual in their vernacular and Tok Pisin, they do not seem preoccupied about code selection or code boundaries in their religious and secular communication as it is language itself that they find untrustworthy (Robbins, chap. 6). Bible translators at SIL, on the other hand, consider similar properties of language, sincerity and authenticity, as exclusive to the "heart" language of its native speakers. They advocate the sole use of vernaculars for translation and proselytizing, rejecting other languages, including Tok Pisin, a national language, which they claim is inadequate, not a real or true language (Handman, chap. 8). At SIL, language is conceptualized generally as a referentially and semantically transparent vehicle for the transmission of cultural knowledge, but one language, the heart language, is privileged for the purpose of Bible translation because it is thought to be inalienable, intimately linked to the notion of personhood. Furthermore SIL language ideology constructs cultural knowledge as alienable, substitutable with Christian knowledge. Australian missionaries in Bosavi subscribed to similar ideas about the separability of language and culture, but they were comfortable using Tok Pisin in

Bible translation. Though translation activities often lead to misunderstanding and misrecognition, they also provide opportunities for introducing ideas that previously had no linguistic expression. They also induce heightened awareness of code boundaries and differences between codes.

In other communities, it is the boundaries between different languages that draw explicit attention as markers of social difference to be recruited in the expression of new social identities (Jourdan, Stasch). In communities experiencing language shift or loss, such awareness of code boundaries may give rise to the ideas of language surveillance and techniques of language policing expressed as purist ideologies, which has consequences for power relationships (Makihara, Riley). We note an interesting set of contrasts organized around notions of the detachability of parts of language and alienation of language from its speakers. In different language communities, some parts of language are thought of as more detachable than others. These language elements may be more available as resources for playing, innovating, and experimenting with ways for marking affective and social stances and identities. Deploying accents and loanwords provide evidence of these flows among urban Honiarans and Korowai speakers. In circumstances of language shift in process, however, language community members may come to lament their detachment and alienation from their ancestral language, remembering its past with nostalgia. At the same time, they are also being pragmatic, and they work to recover what they can of their language, often disattending to the formal code boundaries of past varieties they no longer speak. The syncretic linguistic ideologies in Rapa Nui and Marquesan, though perhaps viewed as compromises, give life to their languages and underscore the inalienability and centrality of language in local language communities and add diversity to local speech economies.

One fundamental theme uniting these chapters is that in all communities, language is conceptualized, objectified, and manipulated to constitute new social realities. Drawing on and transforming linguistic ideologies, speakers actively reshape language. They add new language practices and are willing to give up or revise old ones. As the chapters that follow illustrate, all levels of language may be deployed, from lexical and grammatical through a range of metalinguistic and discursive strategies, by speakers who are mobilizing new social and political formations, as well as enacting new visions of themselves.

Notes

We dedicate this volume to the people of the Pacific, who have assisted all of us in so many different ways in our years of fieldwork. We hope that these essays will contribute to the growing documentation and understanding of processes of change that are taking place in Pacific communities and their language(s).

1. For this discussion, we use "Pacific" to refer to Melanesia, Micronesia, and Polynesia in a broad geographic sense. The chapters in this volume, however, focus on communities generally categorized as Melanesian and Polynesian.

2. Bellwood and Renfrew 2003; Blust 1999; Kirch 2000.

3. Clifford 2001; Douglas 1998; Feinberg and Zimmer-Tamakoshi 1995; Gegeo 2001; Hanson 1989; Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983; Jolly and Thomas 1992; Kame'eleihiwa 1992; Keesing and Tonkinson 1982; Lindstrom and White 1994; Linnekin 1983, 1991; Linnekin and Poyer 1990; Trask 1991, [1993] 1999; Wagner 1975.

4. Clifford 2001; Robbins 2004; Robbins and Wardlow 2005; Rumsey 2006; Sahlins 1981, 1985.

5. See, for example, essays in Diaz and Kauanui 2001a; and in Teaiwa 2001.

6. Borofsky 1997; Obeyesekere 1992; Sahlins 1981, 1996; Tcherkézoff 2003.

7. This is illustrated in another academic debate in Pacific ethnography regarding the substance as well as the truthfulness of what was said to Margaret Mead in Samoa and how she interpreted it (see Acciaioli 1983; Brady 1983; Freeman 1984; Mead 1928). This suggests that there are always multiple views and layers of interpretation that complicate any event or encounter.

8. See Errington 2001 for a historical, comparative review of colonial linguistics and the role played by missionary and nonmissionary linguists.

9. See Besnier 2004; Brenneis and Myers 1984; Brison 1992; Duranti 1994; Goldman 1983; Keating 1998; Kulick 1992; Lutz 1988; Merlan and Rumsey 1991; Ochs 1988; Sankoff 1980b; Siegel 1987; Watson-Gegeo 1986; Watson-Gegeo and White 1990. This work was preceded by foundational anthropological scholarship on language in the Pacific, including the work of Bronislaw Malinowski, Ward Goodenough, Harold Conklin, Charles Frake, John L. Fischer, Michelle Rosaldo, and Anne Salmond.

10. See Mühlhäusler 1996: chap. 6, for an overview of mission language policies in the Pacific.

11. See Benton 2001; Harrison and Papa 2005; Hohepa 2000; Kapono 1995; Karetu 2002; King 2001; Mutu 2005; Pihama et al. 2004; Schütz 1994; Warner 2001; Wilson and Kamanā 2001.

12. For example, Maori, Hawaiian and other Polynesian languages share distinctive phonological systems that were not recognized by the Europeans. The early orthographies devised by Christian missionaries did not include symbols for a glottal stop or vowel length (in Hawaiian 'okina and kahakō respectively) which are part of the phonological inventories of these languages. In the case of Hawaiian, according to Kualono (n.d. cited in Romaine 2002: 198) "to omit 'okina and kahakō in print... is to do the language a great injustice... (and) in words where they do exist to be a misspelling of those words." Because of the variation in the use of these symbols, we follow the usage in the original publications in the references.

13. For example, see Friedlaender 2007; Kirch 2000; Pawley and Ross 1993. Thor Heyerdahl 1952 made it into more popular discourses.

14. It is beyond the scope of this discussion to detail the linguistic and social histories of Pacific pidgin and creole languages. The following studies provide a comprehensive overview. See Carr 1972; Crowley 1990; Jourdan 1991; Jourdan and Keesing 1997; Keesing 1988; Meyerhoff 2003; Reinecke 1969; Romaine 1995; Sakoda and Siegel 2003; Sankoff 1980b; Siegel 2000; Smith 2002; Tryon and Charpentier 2004.

15. Kulick 1992 provides a compelling argument and additional sources.

16. Foley 1986; Kulick 1992; Laycock 1982; Sankoff 1980a; Sumbuk 2006.

17. Mühlhäusler's arguments were based on secondary sources. A number of linguists who had done extensive empirical research on vernacular Pacific languages criticized his examples as highly selective and not generalizable to warrant his alarmist position. Additionally, Mühlhäusler was highly critical of linguists working in the Pacific, whom he claimed maintained an ideological neutrality and were not adequately concerned about language loss. A principal goal of his book was to expose what he believed was wrong about linguistics. Many found this critique both misdirected and unfounded (see Crowley 1999; Kulick 1999; Lynch 1996; Siegel 1997).

18. Kulick and Stroud 1993; Schieffelin 2000; Street 1984.

19. Silverstein 1996 outlines several dimensions of contact that are relevant to studying change in local language communities, including "periodicity."

20. Talking about literacy practices in Gapun, Papua New Guinea, Kulick and Stroud perceptively observe that they take place "with a characteristic Melanesian eye for the novel and the useful [as the villagers] have been active and creative in their encounter with literacy" (1993: 55).

21. See, for example, McElhanon 1979 and Rutherford 2005.

22. Several edited volumes and articles on language ideology review and explore this multidisciplinary area of inquiry. See Blommaert 1999; Gal and Woolard 2001; Joseph et al. 2003; Joseph and Taylor 1990; Kroskrity 2000; Schieffelin, Woolard, and Kroskrity, 1998; and Silverstein 1979.

23. We find it interesting that Williams's characterization of language can be read from a Chomskian, universalist notion of language as well as from a culturally relativistic one in which language is understood to be grounded in its sociohistorical context, thus subject to variation and change at all levels.

24. Here we are using Silverstein's (1996) distinction between "language community" (which is based on a single, shared denotational code [i.e., language X] and its norms of usage including grammar) and "speech community" (which is a more general term referring to a social group in regular interaction sharing norms of language usage). Many speech communities are composed of multilingual individuals belonging to multiple language communities, some of which are in contact with each other. Even if a speech community is isomorphic with a language community, thus having the label monolingual, this distinction allows us to examine the interaction of referential or denotational levels with social functions of language—for example, those that index social identities. As Silverstein 1998 reminds us, both membership in and allegiance to a language community and a speech community are matters of degree, thus allowing variation.

25. This notion of elements in contact reconfigured in novel formations resonates with discussions in creole studies (e.g., superstrate, substrate, and cognitive influences) and anthropological theories about continuity and discontinuity in cultural change. We emphasize the processual and transformative nature of these categories in producing new forms and practices through interaction.

26. See Sahlins 1985.

References

Acciaioli, Gregory, ed. 1983. *Fact and Context in Ethnography: The Samoa Controversy.* Special issue of *Canberra Anthropology* 6 (1, 2).

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. 1981. Discourse in the Novel. In *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*, pp. 259–422. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bellwood, Peter, and Colin Renfrew, eds. 2003. *Examining the Farming/Language Dispersal Hypothesis.* Cambridge, UK: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, University of Cambridge.

Benton, Richard A. 2001. **Balancing Tradition and Modernity:** A Natural Approach to Maori Language Revitalization in a New Zealand Secondary School. In *Bilingual Education,*

ed. Donna Christian and Fred Genesee, pp. 95–108. Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc.

Besnier, Niko. 1993. Literacy and Feelings: The Encoding of Affect in Nukulaelae Letters. In *Cross-Cultural Approaches to Literacy*, ed. Brian V. Street, pp. 62–86. New York: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1995. *Literacy, Emotion, and Authority: Reading and Writing on a Polynesian Atoll.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2004. Diversity, Hierarchy, and Modernity in Pacific Island Communities. In *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, ed. Alessandro Duranti, pp. 95–120. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Biggs, Bruce. 1989. Humpty-Dumpty and the Treaty of Waitangi. In *Maori and Pakeha Perspectives of the Treaty of Waitangi*, ed. I. Hugh Kawharu, pp. 300–312. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.

Blommaert, Jan, ed. 1999. *Language Ideological Debates*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Blust, Robert. 1999. Subgrouping, Circularity and Extinction: Some Issues in Austronesian Comparative Linguistics. In *Selected Papers from the Eighth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, ed. Elizabeth Zeitoun and Paul Jen-kuei Li, pp. 31–94. Taipei: Academia Sinica.

Borofsky, Robert. 1997. CA Forum on Theory in Anthropology: Cook, Lono, Obeyesekere, and Sahlins. *Current Anthropology* 38 (2): 255–282.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice* Translated by Richard Nice. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brady, Ivan, ed. 1983. Speaking in the Name of the Real: Freeman and Mead on Samoa. Special section of *American Anthropologist* 85 (4): 908–947.

Brenneis, Donald L., and Fred R. Myers, eds. 1984. *Dangerous Words: Language and Politics in the Pacific*. New York: New York University Press.

Brison, Karen. 1992. *Just Talk: Gossip, Meetings, and Power in a Papua New Guinea Village*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Carr, Elizabeth B. 1972. *Da Kine Talk: From Pidgin to Standard English in Hawaii*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

Clifford, James. 2001. Indigenous Articulations. *The Contemporary Pacific* 13 (2): 468–490.

Codrington, Robert H. 1885. *The Melanesian Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 1891. *The Melanesians, Their Anthropology and Their Folk-Lore*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crowley, Terry. 1990. *Beach-la-Mar to Bislama: The Emergence of a National Language in Vanuatu*. New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 1999. Linguistic Diversity in the Pacific. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3 (1): 81–103.

———. 2001. The Indigenous Linguistic Response to Missionary Authority in the Pacific. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 21 (2): 239–260.

Diaz, Vincente M., and J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, eds. 2001a. *Native Pacific Cultural Studies on the Edge*. Special issue of *The Contemporary Pacific* 13 (2).

———. 2001b. Native Pacific Cultural Studies on the Edge. *The Contemporary Pacific* 13 (2): 315–341.

Douglas, Bronwen. 1998. *Across the Great Divide: Journeys in History and Anthropology*. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic.

Duranti, Alessandro. 1994. *From Grammar to Politics: Linguistic Anthropology in a Western Samoan Village*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Errington, J. Joseph. 2001. Colonial Linguistics. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30: 19–39.

Feinberg, Richard, and Laura Zimmer-Tamakoshi, eds. 1995. *Politics of Culture in the Pacific Islands*. Special issue of *Ethnology* 34 (2).

Fischer, Steven R. 1997. *Rongorongo: The Easter Island Script: History, Traditions, Texts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2005. *Island at the End of the World: The Turbulent History of Easter Island*. London: Reaktion Books.

Foley, William A., ed. 1986. *The Papuan Languages of New Guinea*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1988. Language Birth: The Processes of Pidginization and Creolization. In *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey, IV Language: The Socio-Cultural Context*, ed. Frederick J. Newmeyer, pp. 162–183. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Freeman, Derek. 1984. *Margaret Mead and Samoa: The Making and Unmaking of an Anthropological Myth*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Friedlaender, Jonathan S., ed. 2007. *Genes, Language, and Culture History in the Southwest Pacific*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gal, Susan, and Kathryn Woolard, eds. 2001. *Languages and Publics: The Making of Authority*. Manchester, England: St. Jerome.

Gegeo, David W. 2001. Cultural Rupture and Indigeneity: The Challenge of (Re)visioning "Place" in the Pacific. *The Contemporary Pacific* 13 (2): 491–507.

Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The Constitution of Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Goldman, Laurence R. 1983. *Talk Never Dies: The Language of Huli Disputes*. London: Tavistock.

Hanson, Allan. 1989. The Making of the Maori: Culture Invention and Its Logic. *American Anthropologist* 91 (4): 890–902.

Harrison, Barbara, and Rahui Papa. 2005. The Development of an Indigenous Knowledge Program in a New Zealand Maori-Language Immersion School. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 36 (1): 57–72.

Hau'ofa, Epeli. 1993. Our Sea of Islands. In *A New Oceania: Rediscovering Our Sea of Islands*, ed. Epeli Hau'ofa, Eric Waddell, and Vijay Naidu, pp. 2–16. Suva, Fiji: School of Social and Economic Development, University of the South Pacific.

Heyerdahl, Thor. 1952. *American Indians in the Pacific: The Theory behind the Kon-Tiki Expedition*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Hobsbawm, Eric J., and Terence O. Ranger, eds. 1983. *The Invention of Tradition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hohepa, Pat. 2000. Towards 2030 AD (2) Maori Language Regeneration Strategies, Government, People. *He Pukenga Kōrero* 5 (2): 10–15.

Jolly, Margaret, and Nicholas Thomas, eds. 1992. *The Politics of Tradition in the Pacific*. Special issue of *Oceania* 62 (4).

Joseph, Brian D., Johanna Destefano, Neil G. Jacobs, and Ilse Lehiste, eds. 2003. *When Languages Collide: Perspectives on Language Conflict, Language Competition, and Language Coexistence*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Joseph, John E., and Talbot J. Taylor, eds. 1990. *Ideologies of Language*. New York: Routledge.

Jourdan, Christine. 1991. Pidgins and Creoles: The Blurring of Categories. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 20: 187–209.

Jourdan, Christine, and Roger Keesing. 1997. From Fisin to Pijin: Creolization in Process in the Solomon Islands. *Language in Society* 26: 401–418.

Kameʻeleihiwa, Lilikalā. 1992. *Native Land and Foreign Desires*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.

Kapono, Eric. 1995. Hawaiian Language Revitalization and Immersion Education. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 112: 121–135.

Karetu, Timoti S. 2002. Maori—New Zealand Latin? In *Indigenous Languages across the Community*, ed. Barbara Burnaby and Jon Reyhner, pp. 25–29. Flagstaff: North Arizona University Press.

Kawharu, I. Hugh, ed. 1989. *Maori and Pakeha Perspectives of the Treaty of Waitangi.* Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.

Keating, Elizabeth. 1998. *Power Sharing: Language, Rank, Gender, and Social Space in Pohnpei, Micronesia.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Keesing, Roger M. 1988. *Melanesian Pidgin and the Oceanic Substrate.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Keesing, Roger, and Robert Tonkinson, eds. 1982. Reinventing Traditional Culture: The Politics of Kastom in Island Melanesia. Special issue of *Mankind* 13 (4).

King, Jeanette. 2001. Te Kohanga Reo: Maori language revitalization. In *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice*, ed. Leanne Hinton and Ken Hale, pp. 119–128. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Kirch, Patrick V. 2000. *On the Road of the Winds: An Archaeological History of the Pacific Islands before European Conquest.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kroskrity, Paul V., ed. 2000. *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Polities, and Identities.* Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Kualono. n.d. Hale Kuamoʻo. University of Hawaiʻi at Hilo Hawaiian Language Webpages. Electronic document, http://www.olelo.hawaii.edu, accessed March 2007.

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

———. 1999. Review of *Linguistic Ecology: Language Change and Linguistic Imperialism in the Pacific*, by Peter Mühlhäusler. *Anthropological Linguistics* 41 (8): 404–406.

Kulick, Don, and Christopher Stroud. 1993. Conceptions and Uses of Literacy in a Papua New Guinean Village. In *Cross-Cultural Approaches to Literacy*, ed. Brian V. Street, pp. 30–61. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Laycock, Donald C. 1982. Melanesian Linguistic Diversity: A Melanesian Choice? In *Melanesia: Beyond Diversity*, ed. R. J. May and Hank Nelson, Vol. 1, pp. 33–38. Canberra: Australian National University Press.

Levinson, Michael, R. Gerard Ward, and John W. Webb. 1973. *The Settlement of Polynesia: A Computer Simulation.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lindstrom, Lamont, and Geoffrey M. White, eds. 1994. *Culture, Kastom, Tradition: Developing Cultural Policy in Melanesia.* Suva, Fiji: Institute of Pacific Studies.

Linnekin, Jocelyn S. 1983. Defining Tradition: Variations on the Hawaiian Identity. *American Ethnologist* 10 (2): 241–252.

———. 1991. Cultural Invention and the Dilemma of Authenticity. *American Anthropologist* 93 (2): 446–449.

Linnekin, Jocelyn S., and Lin Poyer, eds. 1990. *Cultural Identity and Ethnicity in the Pacific.* Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi Press.

Lutz, Catherine. 1988. *Unnatural Emotions: Everyday Sentiments on a Micronesian Atoll and Their Challenge to Western Theory.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lynch, John. 1996. Review of *Linguistic Ecology: Language Change and Linguistic Imperialism in the Pacific*, by P. Mühlhäusler. *Language in Society* 26 (3): 461–464.

———. 1998. *Pacific Languages: An Introduction.* Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi Press.

Makihara, Miki. 2004. Linguistic Syncretism and Language Ideologies: Transforming Sociolinguistic Hierarchy on Rapa Nui (Easter Island). *American Anthropologist* 106 (3): 529–540.

Malinowski, Bronislaw. [1935] 1978. *Coral Gardens and Their Magic.* 2 vols. New York: Dover Publications.

McElhanon, Kenneth A. 1979. Some Mission Lingue Franche and Their Sociolinguistic Role. In *New Guinea and Neighboring Areas: A Sociolinguistic Laboratory*, ed. Stephen A. Wurm, pp. 277–289. The Hague: Mouton.

McKenzie, Don F. 1987. The Sociology of a Text: Oral Culture, Literacy and Print in Early New Zealand. In *The Social History of Language*, ed. Peter Burke and Roy Porter, pp. 161–198. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mead, Margaret. 1928. *Coming of Age in Samoa: A Psychological Study of Primitive Youth for Western Civilization.* New York: William Morrow.

Merlan, Francesca, and Alan Rumsey. 1991. *Ku Waru: Language and Segmentary Politics in the Western Nebilyer Valley, Papua New Guinea.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Meyerhoff, Miriam. 2003. Formal and Cultural Constraints on Optional Objects in Bislama. *Language Variation and Change* 14 (3): 323–346.

Mühlhäusler, Peter. 1996. *Linguistic Ecology: Language Change and Linguistic Imperialism in the Pacific Region.* New York: Routledge.

Mutu, Margaret. 2005. In Search of the Missing Māori Links—Maintaining Both Ethnic Identity and Linguistic Integrity in the Revitalization of the Māori Language. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 172 (1): 117–132.

Myers, Fred, and Donald Brenneis. 1984. Introduction: Language and Politics in the Pacific. In *Dangerous Words: Language and Politics in the Pacific*, ed. Donald Brenneis and Fred Myers, pp. 1–30. New York: New York University Press.

Obeyesekere, Gananath. 1992. *The Apotheosis of Captain Cook: European Mythmaking in the Pacific.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ochs, Elinor. 1988. *Culture and Language Development: Language Acquisition and Language Socialization in a Samoan Village.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Pawley, Andrew. 2007. Recent Research on the Historical Relationships of the Papuan Languages: or, What Does Linguistics Say about the Prehistory of Melanesia? In *Genes, Language, and Culture History in the Southwest Pacific*, ed. Jonathan S. Friedlaender, pp. 36–60. New York: Oxford University Press.

Pawley, Andrew, and Malcolm Ross. 1993. Austronesian Historical Linguistics and Culture History. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 22: 425–459.

Pihama, Leonie, Kaapua Smith, Mereana Taki, and Jenny Lee. 2004. *A Literature Review on Kaupapa Māori and Māori Education Pedagogy.* The International Research Institute for Māori and Indigenous Education, University of Auckland.

Pike, Kenneth. 1947. *A Technique for Reducing Languages to Writing.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Reinecke, John E. 1969. *Language and Dialect in Hawaii: A Socio-linguistic History to 1935.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Robbins, Joel. 2004. *Becoming Sinners: Christianity and Moral Torment in a Papua New Guinea Society.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Robbins, Joel, and Holly Wardlow, eds. 2005. *The Making of Global and Local Modernities in Melanesia: Humiliation, Transformation and the Nature of Cultural Change.* Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Romaine, Suzanne. 1995. Birds of a Different Feather: Tok Pisin and Hawaiʻi Creole English as Literary Languages. *The Contemporary Pacific* 7 (1): 81–123.

———. 2002. Signs of Identity, Signs of Discord: Glottal Goofs and the Green Grocer's Glottal in Debates on Hawaiian Orthography. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 12(2): 189–224.

Ross, Malcolm D. 2005. Pronouns as a Preliminary Diagnostic for Grouping Papuan Languages. In *Papuan Pasts: Cultural, Linguistic, and Biological Histories of Papuan-Speaking Peoples*, ed. Andrew Pawley, Robert Attenborough, Jack Golson,

and Robin Hide, pp. 15–66. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics, Australian National University.

Rumsey, Alan. 2006. The Articulation of Indigenous and Exogenous Orders in Highland New Guinea and Beyond. *Australian Journal of Anthropology* 17 (1): 47–69.

Rutherford, Danilyn. 2005. Frontiers of the Lingua Franca: Ideologies of the Linguistic Contact Zone in Dutch New Guinea. *Ethnos* 70 (3): 387–412.

Sahlins, Marshall. 1981. *Historical Metaphors and Mythical Realities*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

———. 1985. *Islands of History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 1996. *How "Natives" Think: About Captain Cook, for Example*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sakoda, Kent, and Jeff Siegel. 2003. *Pidgin Grammar: An Introduction to the Creole English of Hawai'i*. Honolulu: Bess Press.

Sankoff, Gillian. 1980a. Political Power and Linguistic Inequality in Papua New Guinea. In *The Social Life of Language*, pp. 5–27. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

———. 1980b. *The Social Life of Language*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Schieffelin, Bambi B. 2000. Introducing Kaluli Literacy: A Chronology of Influences. In *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities*, ed. Paul V. Kroskrity, pp. 293–327. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Schieffelin, Bambi B., Kathryn A. Woolard, and Paul V. Kroskrity, eds. 1998. *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theor+ y*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Schütz, Albert J. 1994. *The Voices of Eden: A History of Hawaiian Language Studies*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Siegel, Jeff. 1987. *Language Contact in a Plantation Environment: A Sociolinguistic History of Fiji*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1997. Review of Linguistic Ecology: Language Change and Linguistic Imperialism in the Pacific Region. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 17: 219–244.

———, ed. 2000. *Processes of Language Contact: Studies from Australia and the South Pacific*. Montreal: Les Editions Fides.

Silverstein, Michael. 1979. Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology. In *The Elements: A Parasession of Linguistic Units and Levels*, ed. Paul R. Clyne, William F. Hanks, and Carol L. Hofbauer, pp. 193–247. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

———. 1996. Encountering Language and Languages of Encounter in North American Ethnohistory. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 6 (2): 126–144.

———. 1998. Contemporary Transformations of Local Linguistic Communities. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 27: 401–426.

Smith, Geoff P. 2002. *Growing up with Tok Pisin: Contact, Creolization, and Change in Papua New Guinea's National Language*. London: Battlebridge.

Street, Brian V. 1984. *Literacy in Theory and Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sumbuk, Kenneth. 2006. Papua New Guinea's Languages: Will They Survive? In *Language Diversity in the Pacific: Endangerment and Survival*, ed. Denis Cunningham, D. E. Ingram, and Kenneth Sumbuk, pp. 85–96. Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Summerhayes, Glenn. 2007. Island Melanesian Pasts—A View from Archaeology. In *Genes, Language, and Culture History in the Southwest Pacific*, ed. Jonathan S. Friedlaender, pp. 10–35. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tcherkézoff, Serge. 2003. The Unwarranted Encounter between the Etymology of Papalagi and the Apotheosis of Captain Cook. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 112 (1): 65–73.

Teaiwa, Teresia K. 2001. Militarism, Tourism and the Native: Articulations in Oceania. Ph.D. diss., University of California, Santa Cruz.

Topping, Donald M. 1992. Literacy and Cultural Erosion in the Pacific Islands. In *Cross-Cultural Literacy: Global Perspectives on Reading and Writing*, ed. Fraida Dubin and Natalie A. Kuhlman, pp. 19–33. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Regents/Prentice-Hall.

Trask, Haunani-Kay. 1991. Natives and Anthropologists: The Colonial Struggle. *The Contemporary Pacific* 3 (1): 159–177.

———. [1993] 1999. *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai'i*. Revised ed. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Tryon, Darrell T., and Jean-Michel Charpentier. 2004. *Pacific Pidgins and Creoles: Origins, Growth, and Development*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wagner, Roy. 1975. *The Invention of Culture*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Ward, R. Gerard. 1989. Earth's Empty Quarter? The Pacific Islands. *Geographical Journal* 155 (2): 235–246.

Warner, Sam L. No'eau. 2001. The Movement to Revitalize Hawaiian Language and Culture. In *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice*, ed. Leanne Hinton and Ken Hale, pp. 133–146. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Watson-Gegeo, Karen A. 1986. The Study of Language Use in Oceania. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15: 149–162.

Watson-Gegeo, Karen A., and Geoffrey M. White, eds. 1990. *Disentangling: Conflict Discourse in Pacific Societies*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

White, Geoffrey M., and Karen A. Watson-Gegeo. 1990. Disentangling Discourse. In *Disentangling: Conflict Discourse in Pacific Societies*, ed. Karen A. Watson-Gegeo and Geoffrey M. White, pp. 3–49. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

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

Wilson, William H., and Kauanoe Kamanā. 2001. "Mai loko mai o ka 'i'ni: Proceeding from a Dream." The 'Aha Pūnana Leo Connection in Hawaiian Language Revitalization. In *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice*, ed. Leanne Hinton and Ken Hale, pp. 147–176. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.