10.17953/A3.6556

Documenting the Unexpected:
Repatriating Native American Linguistic Sovereignty in Northeastern Ancestral Lands

Bernard C. Perley

I was returning from the dentist's office one afternoon (April 2020, Vancouver, British Columbia) and the car radio was set on a classical music program. While sitting at a stop light, I heard a strong cello chord punctuating the airwaves, aggressively introducing the opening measures of the composition. As the cello proceeded into subsequent measures, the melody sounded familiar. The cello was joined by a quiet rhythmic rattle. Joining the rattle and the cello, a familiar voice sang in words familiar yet different. Soon it became clear the vocalist was a Native American male singing an honor song accompanied by an artist on the cello. I was mesmerized for nearly five minutes. As a Native American with an appreciation of classical music, I was delighted by the performance; I was even more delighted and surprised to hear the radio host announce the piece was titled *Honor Song* and performed by Yo-Yo Ma on the cello and sung by a Wolastoqey performer, Jeremy Dutcher.[1] Wow! A Maliseet singer performing with Yo-Yo Ma and broadcast on a classical music station! I would have never expected that. That wonderful experience was one of the latest of many unexpected events in my long, personal journey documenting emergent vitalities of the Maliseet language.[2] This essay is a critical reflection of the historical circumstances that contribute to the lingering linguistic colonialism that undermines Native American linguistic vitality in the Northeastern ancestral lands as well as the unexpected forms of linguistic sovereignty language activists and advocates explore in the service of language life.

The third decade of the twenty-first century is becoming a period of Native American language renewal in ways that challenge expectations from language experts and community members alike. Despite the continued pressures that suppress Native

Bernard C. Perley is Wolastokwiyik (Maliseet) from Neqotkuk (Tobique First Nation) and is currently the director of the Institute for Critical Indigenous Studies at the University of British Columbia. His research and advocacy empowers Indigenous communities in their efforts at language documentation and revitalization as modes of emergent vitalities.

American languages, a critical cohort of language activists are imagining new possibilities for Native American language life. These emergent vitalities, while drawing from earlier diagnoses and their attendant expectations, actualize new domains for Native American languages. These trajectories of language life resist the centuries-old linguistic colonialism that permeated ideological stances of discovery, superiority, and manifest destiny. Historical documents have served colonial projects for hundreds of years, but today those same documents are unexpected sources for linguistic renewal and reconceptualization of linguistic sovereignty for many Native American communities. Returning to Wolastoqey singer Jeremy Dutcher for a moment, he received Canada's 2018 Polaris Music Prize for Best Album as well as Canada's 2019 Juno Award for Album of the Year for his debut, *Wolastoqiyik Lintuwakonawa*. One song that has received much acclaim features a death chant inspired by a wax recording he found in the Canadian Museum of History. The result, as one writer noted, "was a work Canada needed, but could not expect."[3]

All historical documents regarding native North America are artifacts of centuries of colonial oppression of the Native peoples of the Americas. That oppression begins with Columbus' journal entry on the evening of October 12, 1492. Take, for an example, the following excerpt:

> They ought to make good slaves for they are quick of intelligence, since I noticed that they are quick to repeat what is said to them, and I believe they could very easily become Christians, for it seemed to me that they had no religion of their own. God willing, when I come to leave I will bring six of them to Your Highness so that they may learn to speak.[4]

That short excerpt reveals an imperial ideology that denies the Native peoples their personal sovereignty in order to subjugate them to serve imperial overlords, denies them their religious sovereignty in order to convert them to Christianity, and denies them their linguistic sovereignty, thereby laying the foundation for centuries of linguistic colonialism. In this third decade of the twenty-first century, the Native American languages of North America have reached the precipice of language extinction and its collateral extinctions.[5] Linguistic colonialism has been a primary catalyst for the eradication of most of the languages spoken by Native Americans, and, sadly, those same ideologies continue to undermine the remaining spoken languages. This is especially critical in the Northeastern United States and Maritime Canada. Linguists have catalogued the Native American languages of Northeastern ancestral lands as belonging to the Eastern Algonquian language family. A 1970 study provides an assessment of the status of the twenty-nine Eastern Algonquian languages and dialects. Twenty-two of the listed languages are declared extinct.[6] Since the release of that report, two languages have been declared to have no first-language speakers and the remaining five languages vary in their viability from "nearly extinct" to "vulnerable"—the healthiest category for the "endangered language" category.

One major reason for the "vulnerable" state of Native American languages is grounded in the latent imperial ideologies that perpetuate linguistic colonialism. If those ideologies and colonial practices continue unacknowledged or unchallenged, then

the remaining Native American languages will only exist in the various textual artifacts that document the colonial oppression of the Native Americans in the Northeast. However, increasing numbers of Native American activists and their allies offer alternatives to linguistic colonialism. Their efforts of linguistic repatriation may provide the catalyst to finally shake off the burden of colonial oppression and liberate Native American languages. Doing so will return personal and linguistic sovereignty to Native American communities. This essay explores that possibility from my perspective as a Native American who is also a linguistic anthropologist working on language revitalization issues in Indigenous communities. It is a personal and a professional perspective that appreciates the value of historical documents not only for the insights they provide about linguistic colonialism but also for the potential they have in the critical work of language and cultural revitalization in Native American communities.

Columbus' diary excerpt is an important indicator that European language ideologies have privileged imperial languages over others, following Aristotle's dictum differentiating between Greeks and barbarians and delineating who are worthy to be masters and who are condemned to be slaves. On October 12, 1492, Columbus was just the latest purveyor of European language discrimination and concomitant oppression. Significantly, the excerpt follows Columbus' lengthy description of the first peoples he meets in very positive terms. The tension between admiration and denigration would be repeated by colonial thinkers for the next 500 years. I argue this colonial tension created openings through which Native American scholars, activists, and community members repurposed colonial documentary artefacts toward Native American language life.

Ideologies of Empire and the Work of Erasure

The *Diario de Colón* is rightfully celebrated as "one of the most important texts ever written in Spanish."[7] Scholar and translator B. W. Ife notes the *Diario* benefits from the "techniques of literary textual analysis and criticism," but I would add the *Diario* could benefit from a reading from a critical ethnographic perspective as well.[8] I approach historical documents from what I describe as *critical ethnography*. The *critical* aspect is a perspective that acknowledges my experience as a Native American who lives with the consequences of colonization of the Americas on a daily basis. Harmful colonial imaginaries of Native Americans are imbedded in systems and structures that serve colonial interests at the expense of Native Americans. Personally, being on the receiving end of naturalized racism against Native Americans allows a different interpretation of popular discourses (such as sports mascots, place names, erasure of Native American presence) in addition to historical documents addressing Native Americans. The *ethnographic* aspect acknowledges my professional training in anthropology and its long history of ethnographic research and writing. Most critically, my attention to the colonial politics of Native representation necessitates the interrogation of historical texts and the influence those texts continue to have on the actions of Native peoples and settler colonial societies. My critical ethnographic reading of historical documents also acknowledges the contributions of critical scholars such as B. W. Ife and Stephen J. Greenblatt.

Christopher Columbus, Protoethnographer and Colonial Ideologue

I was struck by how Columbus' journal anticipated by 400 years many early ethnographic representations of Native peoples of the Americas. The unquestioned assumptions of the character, physical bearing, cultural peculiarity, and presumed inferiority of colonized peoples have echoed and reverberated across the centuries since that momentous October 12 day in 1492. There have been countless studies on Columbus over the centuries, and each generation of scholars offer their contemporaneous perspectives regarding Columbus' life, his milieu, and the import of his "discovery." Leading up to and during the Columbus quincentennial, a surge of publications, public demonstrations, and media events emerged, dedicated to discussing, debating, and celebrating Columbus and his place in history. On the one hand, Indigenous activists made public statements, published critical texts, and engaged in public demonstrations during this period. On the other hand, there were non-Native scholars and advocates who felt it was their moral duty to be critical of colonization on behalf of Native peoples. During that intense period of critical engagement, it became clear that what was purported to be a historical event experientially distanced by 500 years was very much alive in 1992. The historical documents were not just curiosities of the past; they became contested voices in contemporary debates regarding the legacy of colonization.

Of the many possible threads of critical debate, I focus on the linkage between Columbus and linguistic colonialism. Two texts in particular are intriguing for their ethnographic reading of Columbus' journal. Ife addresses the translation as well as the linguistic problems associated with reading the journal. Greenblatt makes an argument that links Columbus to the broader issues of linguistic colonialism in the sixteenth century. Their critical perspectives and the attention to linguistic colonialism is a welcome critique of colonization, but Ife and Greenblatt do not speak from the experience of colonial subjugation.

Ife's 1990 text claims to offer a new translation that "gives an unrivalled insight into the events of the voyage, Columbus' first impressions of a people and culture which failed in so many ways to live up to his expectations, and the creation of many myths surrounding the New World which have coloured its view of itself down to the present day."[9] Ife adds, "Columbus' Spanish is not that of a native speaker. Even after several transcriptions at the hands of Spanish-speaking copyists, it retains many features which have an important bearing on our understanding of Columbus' cultural and linguistic formation, and on such issues as the reliability of the Journal in the form in which we have it."[10] Ife contextualizes the *Diario* as part of the "far-reaching network of controls administered with varying degrees of success by the Crown and the Church."[11] In contrast to the popular image of a heroic visionary on a perilous voyage, Columbus had in his presence on the beach that October day the Crown's representatives, the secretary and the accountant, "to see that all the proper formalities were carried out. And when the first landing was made, it was they who officially witnessed the documents which formally constituted the act of possession."[12] Ife concludes his analysis by arguing that Columbus chose to consider the inhabitants of the Caribbean as "nothing,

a tabula rasa on which the Catholic faith and European civilization had still to be inscribed. His chosen stylus was language, and the book in which the inscriptions would take place is the Journal."[13] There is, however, an irony underlying Columbus' attempt at linguistic and cultural colonization through language. "We know he made his first landfall on an island called Guanahaní, an island that he then renamed San Salvador. But to this day no one knows for certain which island Guanahaní was. In suppressing the Indian name, Columbus has erased the site of his greatest triumph."[14] Ife's critical reading of Columbus' journal should be placed in the period leading up to the global celebrations of the Columbus quincentennial. What was anticipated to be a global acknowledgement of Columbus' historic accomplishment became the flashpoint for critical reflection, Indigenous activism, and reconsideration of North American colonialism. Ife's reading highlights the linguistic and cultural colonization ideologies in Columbus' journal and appropriately notes that the "impressions" and "myths" continue to "colour" the view the New World has of itself. While Ife's statement is insightful, it lacks specificity. It is difficult to discern who "the New World" represents. Does it capture the experiences of the settler colonists, the Indigenous peoples, or both together? Furthermore, although Ife takes Columbus to task, it should not be forgotten that Columbus' first observations and impressions were only the first of many.

Complexities of Linguistic Colonialism

Stephen Greenblatt provides a broadly critical perspective for the complexity of imperial ideologies that circulated during the "early modern" period.[15] The same excerpt from Columbus' journal is quoted by Greenblatt to argue that the reader can discern the idiom of the time. Greenblatt comments, "We are dealing, of course, with an idiom: Columbus must have known, even in that first encounter, that the Indians could speak, and he argued from the beginning that they were rational human beings. But the idiom has a life of its own; it implies that the Indians had no language."[16] Greenblatt uses the Columbus quote to link the ideology behind Columbus' quote to the same ideology that allowed the Bishop of Avila to defend the presentation of Antonio de Nebrija's grammar: "When the queen asked flatly, 'What is it for?' the bishop replied, 'Your Majesty, language is the perfect instrument of empire.'"[17] The conceptually potent phrase "the language of empire" will become the ideological foundation for Spanish linguistic colonization. But, according to Greenblatt, that is not the only imperial ideology circulating in the sixteenth century. Greenblatt argues that "English is neither partner nor instrument; its expansion is virtually the goal of the whole enterprise."[18] Greenblatt draws from Samuel Daniel's *Musophilus* to argue that "to speak is to speak one's own language, or at least a language with which one is familiar."[19] Why draw this distinction? Greenblatt recalls that Daniel articulated the most important conversion of the Native peoples of the new world is "not the treasure of our faith," but the "treasure of our tongue."[20] Though Greenblatt highlights English linguistic colonialism as a greater "treasure" than religious conversion, it is clear that the Christianizing mission was still an important aspect of colonial thinking. That is made clear by the documentary evidence provided by the Eliot Bible and the published confessions of the Indians

in the northeast. Such translation and confessional efforts underscore the "irresistible" force of cultural presuppositions for Europeans. Greenblatt notes that European elites perpetuated the deficiency model of Native languages; he also acknowledges that the sailors, explorers, and others who bartered and conducted other forms of communication were aware that the Native peoples had their own languages.[21] This observation prompts Greenblatt to explain that there were Europeans who tried to "treat Indian speech as something men could come to understand."[22] Those individuals had recognized that the Native American languages could be "written with our Latine letters," that "their language is a kind of pleasant speech, and hath a pleasing sound and had some affinity with Greek terminations" and with "more sweetness or greatness than most European tongues."[23] Despite such assertions of linguistic sophistication from various commentators, the early modern humanists had to ignore the evidence and conclude "that the savages of America were without eloquence or even without language."[24] In the early modern period of the sixteenth century, to be without language was to be less than human. Greenblatt uses Shakespeare's character Caliban from *The Tempest* to provide a graphic example of the tensions created by the literary motif of the Wild Man imaginary of Renaissance Europe. Did Caliban have speech? Prospero states,[25]

> Abhorred slave,
> Which any print of goodness wilt not take,
> Being capable of all ill! I pitied thee,
> Took pains to make thee speak, taught thee each hour
> One thing or other: when thou didst not, savage,
> Know thine own meaning, but wouldst gabble like
> A thing most brutish, I endow'd thy purposes
> With words that made them known. But thy vile race,
> Though thou didst learn, had that in't which good natures
> Could not abide to be with; therefore wast thou
> Deservedly confin'd into this rock,
> Who hadst deserv'd more than a prison.[26]

Clearly, for Shakespeare, Caliban had to be taught language, but much more as well: Caliban had to be put in his place—"confin'd into this rock." This passage echoes Columbus' first impression. The Indians were destined to become slaves; fortunately, as Columbus suggested, they were capable of learning, so they needed to be taught language—and in turn they would be condemned to serve their European overlords. Tragically, the phrase "when thou didst not, savage, know thine own meaning" will be echoed by the American folklorist Charles Godfrey Leland in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.

The first part of Greenblatt's essay argues that there is a difference between the linguistic colonialism projects of the Spanish and the English; namely, Spanish religious conversion and English linguistic conversion. Greenblatt also focuses on the European Wild Man imaginary to suggest a common image by which Europeans can come to understand the Native peoples of the Americas. In that imaginary, the

savages do not possess language and are therefore subhuman and, in the eyes of the Spanish, natural slaves. The second part of the essay argues for an equally troubling aspect of linguistic colonialism. What if the Indians *did* have language and what if we could understand them? Greenblatt suggests that as "arrogant, blindly obstinate, and destructive as was the belief that the Indians had no language at all, the opposite conviction—that there was no significant language barrier between Europeans and savages—may have had consequences as bad or worse."[27] Among those results would be the translation of Native American language in such a way that the "diction and syntax" would be cast as recognizably European. Greenblatt recounts Spanish clergyman Bartolomé de las Casas' commentary that "narratives are intentionally falsified, to make the conquistadores' actions appear fairer and more deliberative than they actually were."[28] Greenblatt adds,

> There may have been such willful falsification, but there also seems to have been a great deal of what we may call "filling in the blanks." The Europeans and the interpreters themselves translated such fragments as they understood or thought they understood into a coherent story, and they came to believe quite easily that the story was what they actually hear. There could be, and apparently were, murderous results.[29]

Greenblatt's commentary suggests that the translators and interpreters were seduced by their own ideologies of language and were not necessarily aware of the "murderous results." Greenblatt continues with a brief but significant discussion of the *Requerimiento* to reinforce his argument regarding the ideology of language transparency—"That all human beings are descended from 'one man and one woman' proves that there is a single human essence, a single reality. As such, all problems of communication are merely accidental," thereby complicating the European understanding of Native Americans and their languages.[30] On the one hand, the Indians do not have language and must be taught. On the other hand, the Indians *do* have language and they can be translated without problem. Greenblatt evaluates the early modern dilemma as the tension between difference and likeness. Difference contributed to silence and likeness contributed to collapsing unique identities.[31] Greenblatt argues that dilemma was beginning to change with Giambattista Vico's *The New Science* (1725). Greenblatt asserts that there was "a genuine theoretical breakthrough, a radical shift from the philosophical assumptions that helped to determine European response to alien languages and cultures."[32] In particular, Greenblatt states, "For Vico, the key to the diversity of languages is not the arbitrary character of signs but the variety of human natures. Each language reflects and substantiates the specific character of the culture out of which it springs."[33] In his closing thoughts, Greenblatt argues for acknowledging the opacity of Indian languages. He laments, "But as we are now beginning fully to understand, reality for each society is constructed to a significant degree out of the specific qualities of its language and symbols. Discard the particular words and you have discarded particular men. And so most of the people of the New World will never speak to us. That communication, with all that we might have learned, is lost to us forever."[34] Despite Greenblatt's celebration of Vico's influential, paradigm-shifting ruminations

on language, the work of erasure continued unabated. The ongoing colonization of North America precipitated the rapid decline of Native American communities in the Northeast, and their languages and cultures were increasingly becoming part of the historical record.

The Legacy of Linguistic Colonialism and the Rhetoric of Crisis

Greenblatt's closing comment has been a sentiment shared by linguists and language scholars who are grappling with the linguistic crisis dramatized as *language death*. World-renowned linguist K. David Harrison makes a very similar argument in an effort to bring attention to the severity of the global crisis of language endangerment.[35] Not only does Harrison attempt to publicize the gravity of the problem, he also wants to entice more scholars and concerned audiences to support efforts to revitalize endangered languages. Harrison argues, "When ideas go extinct, we all grow poorer. . . . Most ideas live on only in memory, and with the extinction of languages vanish forever."[36] The rhetorical strategy to link extinction to language is a common theme among language researchers working in endangered language communities.[37] Such descriptors—extinction, disappearance, death and dying, endangerment—also evoke comparison to species extinction. The operative metaphor conceptualizes languages as biological organisms, and like biological organisms, many languages are in danger of becoming extinct. David Harrison as well as biologist Daniel Nettle and linguist Suzanne Romaine recognize the value of the metaphor in making their concern and advocacy for endangered languages relatable to general audiences. Equally important, the goal for using the species-extinction metaphor is to create the impression that the general public can participate in supporting intervention programs to save dying languages. The metaphor draws attention to the linguistic crisis in a comprehensible way while simultaneously promoting concrete ways to help avert the crisis. In order to solicit public intervention, the crisis must be presented as a crisis for everyone. Harrison argues that the knowledge expressed in the world's languages remains undocumented, and that areas of knowledge from "human thinking about time, seasons, sea creatures, reindeer, flowers, mathematics, landscapes, myths, music, infinity, cyclicity, the unknown, and the everyday" will be lost. Harrison states the reason for his book: "By demonstrating the beauty, complexity, and underlying logic of these knowledge systems, I hope to motivate more people—speakers, language-lovers, and scientists alike—to work harder to ensure their survival."[38]

What form does language survival take? Harrison shares his strategy: "Linguists like me, too few in number, rush to record these tongues, while a few Native communities struggle to revive them. Some of these last voices will be preserved in archives, in print, or as digital recordings. Those last speakers who have generously shared their knowledge with others may see their ideas persist a while longer, perhaps published in books like this one."[39] Similarly, linguist Nicholas Evans identifies the difficulty of documenting oral languages and finding and using adequate linguistic tools to document endangered languages into "at least a trilogy of grammar, texts, and a

dictionary."[40] Evans notes that the trilogy is inadequate in capturing all the subtleties of spoken language, thereby requiring additional forms of documentation. Yet, he laments, "Though documentary linguists now go beyond what most investigators aspired to do a hundred years ago, we can still capture just a fraction of the knowledge that any one speaker holds in their heads, and which—once the speaker population dwindles—is at risk of never coming to light because no one thinks to ask about it."[41] As both Harrison and Evans indicate, the strategy to save dying languages is documenting them. Evans notes that the documentary practices of today differ from the practices of a hundred years ago. What are the differences in terms of documentation and are there different ideologies that inform those practices?

Ironically, the rhetoric of the twenty-first century sounds similar to the rhetoric of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century in the northeast United States. The number of Eastern Algonquian languages and dialects to become extinct from the seventeenth century to the early twentieth century is twenty out of twenty-nine.[42] The perception of vanishing Indians and their customs and languages was not an illusion. Just as linguists rush out to document the dying languages of the twenty-first century, one hundred years earlier scholars of that period were rushing out to document what was left of the Indians before they completely vanished. The salvage projects of these two periods share an uncanny similarity, both in practice and in ideology. The work of erasure has not been forgotten: it had become naturalized.

By the end of the nineteenth century, many observers believed the extinction of Native Americans was inevitable. The end of the Indian wars in the west, the seeming acculturation of the eastern tribes, and the science of progress recast American sentiment toward Native Americans from impediments to and casualties of American manifest destiny to helpless victims of social Darwinism. The scientific writings of Albert Gallatin, Samuel Morton, Ephraim Squier, and Lewis Henry Morgan helped naturalize the ideologies of conquest as scientific fact. Colonial linguistics maintained a program of conquest and conversion to facilitate the colonizing process.[43] This process was tied to Euro-American prevailing linguistic chauvinism that privileged Latin as the exemplar of civilized language. The linguistic analyses by colonial linguists using Latin grammar as the basis to describe Native American languages "led to treatments of Amerindian languages almost as barbarous as the treatment of their speakers."[44] Linguistic chauvinism can be traced back to Columbus' suggestion that for the natives to speak, they would have to learn Spanish. It is echoed in Shakespeare's *The Tempest* in the figure of Caliban and Prospero's assertion that he "endow'd" Caliban's "purposes with words that made them known" when Caliban himself did not know the meaning of his own thoughts. In 1884, Charles Godfrey Leland published his collection *Algonquin Legends*. In his introduction, Leland makes a case for the importance of his work and concludes with a Prospero-like sentiment:

> When it is borne in mind that the most ancient and mythic of these legends have been taken down from the trembling memories of old squaws who never understood their meaning, or from ordinary *senaps* who had not thought of them since

> boyhood, it will be seen that the preservation of a mass of prose poems, equal in bulk to *The Kalevala* or *Heldenbuch*, is indeed almost miraculous.[45]

Leland's commentary is striking for the chauvinism that he brings to the transcription of Algonquin stories. It is not enough to claim that the "trembling squaws" never understood the meaning of their own stories. In his preface, Leland confirms the prevailing perception of the inevitable vanishing of the Native Americans: "I believe that when the Indian shall have passed away, there will be far better ethnologists than I am who will be much more obliged to me for collecting raw material than for cooking it."[46] Leland's chauvinism does not stop there. He collaborated with John Dynley Prince on a second collection of Algonquin texts, *Kulóscap the Master* (1902), and rendered them in "English metre" to capture the authentic poetic or song-like structure of the original verses.[47]

Both authors, Leland and Prince, shared the belief that the Algonquians were destined for extinction. Leland writes, "I venture to say from the deepest conviction that it will be no small occasion of astonishment and chagrin, a hundred years hence, when the last Algonkin Indian of the *Wabano* shall have passed away, that so few among our literary or cultured folk cared enough to collect this connected aboriginal literature."[48] Prince added, "Let then our labor in this work suffice merely to present to the English-speaking public a few interesting and characteristic specimens of the traditions of a rapidly perishing race—a race which fifty years from now will have hardly a single living representative."[49] Leland and Prince not only share the vanishing Indian conviction but they also represent the linguistic colonial perspective that Native American languages are perfectly transparent. Not only do Leland and Prince proclaim to understand the meaning of Algonquian stories—they also had the audacity to produce a more authentic poetic form. Three hundred years after Shakespeare's *The Tempest* was written and performed, Leland and Prince become real-life Prosperos endowing the "trembling squaws" of the Algonkin *Wabano* with proper poetic language to make their thoughts comprehensible to an English reading audience. The nineteenth century rhetoric of crisis not only called attention to the extinction of Native Americans and their languages and cultures; it also motivated advocates to engage in documentary interventions that continued to perpetuate linguistic colonialism. How has that rhetoric changed in the twenty-first century? What kinds of interventions are practiced? Do those practices perpetuate linguistic colonialism?

Turning the Page? Repatriating Linguistic Sovereignty in the Ancestral Northeast

I remember the kitchen table was littered with photocopied pages of a nineteenth-century Maliseet language dictionary. My mother and I were immersed in the material as we went from page to page seeking old Maliseet words that were no longer used, words that were once used but no longer a part of daily life, confirming or contesting entries that were still in use. My mother is a fluent speaker of Maliseet and I am a language-learner. To be honest, my situation is more complex than that. Maliseet was my first language. When I started first grade, I did not speak a word of English. I

remember my first day of school as a traumatic one because I did not understand what anyone was saying. I could not communicate with anyone because I did not speak English and nobody at the school understood Maliseet. The trauma and alienation I experienced on that first day of school prompted my mother to switch to speaking English at home so that I could learn English. That decision would begin the gradual process of English replacing my first language. By the time I graduated from high school, English had become my first language and the Maliseet language had receded into silence. Many years later, it would take a course in Native American languages at the University of Texas at Austin to begin my long journey back to Maliseet. Part of that journey was the collection of all materials on the Maliseet language and culture in Maliseet, English, and German. These nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century documents were produced by concerned scholars who wanted to "save" what was left of the Maliseet language and culture before the last speakers died. The work of Leland and Prince were among the photocopies scattered across the dining table. Today, those documents are poised to take on new lives as sources for language revitalization. Key to making such language revitalization work is the repatriation of the Maliseet language and culture into the everyday lives of Maliseet community members.

Emergent Vitality and the Ideologies of the Future

The Maliseet community of Tobique First Nation in New Brunswick, Canada, is grappling with the prospect that they may witness the loss of their heritage language as the everyday mode of communication. One summer, a community meeting was called to solicit support for a Maliseet language immersion program. The organizer distributed photocopies of articles discussing Native American language endangerment in Canada. One article predicted that only three Native American languages would be spoken at the end of the century. Maliseet was not one of them. A second article had an appendix in which a table listed all the Native American languages spoken in Canada, the numbers of speakers, and their relative state of vitality. Everyone in the meeting turned to the page that listed Maliseet and the room grew silent as everyone assessed what "on the verge of extinction" meant. The organizer allowed the tension to build before she "reiterated her reasons why an immersion program in Maliseet was desperately needed on the reservation."[50] Since that meeting in 1993, many developments on the reservation have addressed the language-extinction issue. Among them are the voice-over "versioning" program by Jeffrey Bear, evening language courses for adults and children, and ongoing Maliseet language instruction at the elementary school. Each domain of language use creates new documents as well as catalysts for language use. The rhetoric of crisis is important for motivating community members into active participation in language-related activities and programs. However, the rhetoric also creates its own constraints. The use of biological organism metaphors to describe languages offers a partial perspective. It is partial because all metaphors can never completely stand for the target object or entity. In addition, the metaphor also biases interpretation and the kinds of actions that can be taken.[51] For example, when a biological organism is declared extinct, that organism is understood as being gone forever. When a language

is declared extinct, does it follow that it, too, is gone forever? Is it possible to think of contingent ontologies for language?[52] As a Native American linguistic anthropologist working to revitalize Indigenous languages, I argue that we move away from the language death and extinction discourses and work from the stance of language life. By focusing on language life, we can also see the emergent aspect of everyday life and attend to how language contributes to that emergent vitality.[53] This is a critical aspect of repatriating Native American linguistic sovereignty because it allows the incorporation of historical documents that can be repurposed for language life.

The Maliseet communities have had to endure, resist, and challenge the various iterations of the cant of conquest, from Leland and Prince's pronouncements of the inevitable extinction of the *Wabano* to language experts' dire predictions of the extinction of the Maliseet language. These pronouncements continue to exert colonial chauvinism through documents of professional authority. Can Maliseet people challenge that authority? Can they repatriate their stories and assert emergent vitalities for Maliseet futures? Not only is the answer to those questions "yes" but the shift toward repatriation is already taking place. For example, the repatriation of collected Algonquin-Passamaquoddy-Maliseet stories is already under way.[54] I have critiqued the "poetics of extinction" that Leland and Prince represent and described how the violence of translation rendered Maliseet stories as nothing more than "just so stories" suitable for children.[55] By the 1960s, Kay Hill, a non-Indian "storyteller," continued the legacy of erasure-by-translation in her retelling of Wabanaki stories. Her goal was not to faithfully translate the Wabanaki stories but to *re-present* them in a form suitable for non-Native children—as forms of entertainment. To accomplish her goal, Hill took out "savage and erotic elements" as well as moments in which "characters changed disconcertingly from good to evil" and "from human to animal."[56] Her excuse for such drastic revision to the original forms was to follow "the example of Indian storytellers themselves who, in passing the songs and poems of the Old Time, departed in a large degree from the original poetry, omitting some incidents and adding others as memory served."[57] Hill's editorial violence to the original stories makes it clear that she took possession of the stories and decided that the qualities that made them "Indian" had to be removed so that Aristotelian-minded children would understand and be entertained by them. Her suggestion that she "merely followed the example of Indian storytellers themselves" is a clear indication of colonial chauvinism justifying the violence her retelling inflicts on the stories. It would seem the colonial appropriation project is complete. Maliseet stories are no longer for the Maliseet people. What can be done? Maliseet storytellers must repatriate the stories.

Repatriation and the Semiotics of Survival

My critical assessment of non-Maliseet folklorists, scholars, and media personalities in the essay "Silence before the Void" was intended not merely to describe the violence done to the Maliseet stories; it was also an argument to engage in the "semiotics of survival."[58] The essay follows the translation of a Maliseet story over the course of 100 years. The stories were first entextualized, turning them from oral performance into

text artefacts. As an example, Leland had to document what was initially a speech event in which the story was being told by an Indian storyteller. That act of entextualization removed the story from the social domain in which it was shared; the decontextualization made it possible for Leland to recontextualize the story as part of his collection, assembled with his goals, his prejudices, and his audiences. The subsequent iterations of the story moved the stories farther away from the experiences of the Maliseet, culminating in Kay Hill's collections half a century later. But that is no longer the case. The essay describes how I reentextualized one of the stories about Tobique Rock, returning to it all the elements that make the story meaningful to the Tobique First Nation community. For example, the story has a specific location that links the story with the experience of community members, describing how the local landscape was transformed in an epic battle between our culture hero, Kloskap, and his nemesis, Kwapit. I also retold the story to link the past to the present and to the future. This is important in asserting that the stories are reminders of our responsibilities to our environment, to one another, and to future generations. To reinforce the relationship to our heritage landscape, I told the story in graphic novel form. All the illustrations are drawn from specific places in and around the reservation. The story is in Maliseet and English. The final product will not be a typical graphic novel, turning from one page to another. All the pages will be linked in one continuous piece of paper, folded accordion-like. This arrangement is to allow the reader to read from page 1 to page 20, where the last frame depicts the storyteller telling the young listener, "Now you need to hear the story in Maliseet." Turn the page and the story starts on the obverse side of the paper in Maliseet. Another important reason for the accordion arrangement is that, behind the graphic novel panels, I drew a 360-degree landscape from the perspective of the Tobique Rock. When the reader connects page 1 to 20, the reader will be standing on the Tobique Rock in Maliseet mythic time. Not only does the reader read the story but the reader also experiences the story. My repatriation of one Maliseet story is my way of imagining the repatriation of Maliseet linguistic sovereignty. The story is not finished. The reason for creating this immersive and experiential document is to provide members of the Maliseet community with a catalyst to learn to tell the story in Maliseet. The goal is not to produce one more document that sits on a shelf. The graphic novel is intended to promote face-to-face storytelling in Maliseet words, in Maliseet worlds, for Maliseet futures.

Documenting Language Reclamation and Awakening

Maliseet is one of few remaining Eastern Algonquian languages spoken today. Leland's and Prince's 1902 prediction that the Algonquian peoples would vanish within fifty years turned out to be erroneous. However, the Maliseet communities are grappling with the real possibility that the relative vitality of the Maliseet language is in danger of shifting toward endangerment and eventual silence. The Maliseet case is not an isolated one. Today, the global linguistic crisis known as "language endangerment" has prompted many language-focused fields such as linguistics, sociolinguistics, and linguistic anthropology to "save" endangered languages. The rhetoric is similar to the

crisis rhetoric at the end of the nineteenth century, and some of the documentary methods are similar. But there are significant differences, too. Among the most important is the collaborative work in documentation projects in which the members of the endangered language community are active partners in the design and implementation of the documentation projects. Linguist K. David Harrison describes how he worked closely with community members in their efforts to revitalize and document their languages.[59] In his chapter "Saving Languages," Harrison describes how linguists had declared the Eastern Algonquian language Lenape to be extinct. Harrison notes the work of Shelley DePaul in her efforts at teaching the Lenape language at Swarthmore College. Harrison writes,

> Though the official count of Lenape speakers is only about three, that number is now growing, thanks to a bold experiment being carried out at Swarthmore College by Shelley DePaul. As a former schoolteacher, Shelley has devoted years to compiling and studying all available archival records of Lenape, often written in illegible (except to specialists) phonetic symbols. She traveled many miles to collect knowledge from the elders, organizing it into textbooks, committing it to memory.[60]

Not only are historical documents accessed for lexical terms, models of usage, and resources for language-learning and teaching, they are being coordinated with contemporary documentation efforts to create a language curriculum to "reclaim and propagate" the Lenape language. The strategies included borrowing words and/or constructing new ones to modernize the language. Harrison notes the significance of the Lenape class: "In 2009, a select group of Swarthmore College students enrolled in Shelley's newly formed Lenape class. For the first time ever, Lenape was being taught at an institution of higher learning in the Lenape homeland, the Delaware Valley. It was a historic occasion."[61] The story of the "reclamation" of Lenape is inspiring, but, as Harrison notes, it was not without controversy. "Scholars who insist that Lenape is extinct have criticized the effort, saying that the Pennsylvania Lenape are not the 'real' Lenape, pointing out that the Pennsylvania branch of the tribe is not federally recognized, or suggesting that it is a mixed or impure form of the language."[62] Those critics are contemporary linguistic colonialists that have naturalized the chauvinism of their forebears and continue to perpetuate the oppression of the Native peoples of North America. Meanwhile, the Lenape ignore those relics of past colonialism and continue their repatriation efforts as they reclaim all forms of Lenape, create new forms of Lenape vocabulary and usage, and initiate new discursive exchanges in Lenape. Shelley DePaul and her Lenape language advocates are asserting their linguistic sovereignty as Lenape in the twenty-first century. As Harrison states, "These critiques aside, I believe this bold effort is exactly what is needed to bring languages back from the brink of extinction. What better place than a room full of young, bright, enthusiastic minds to extend the life span of the Lenape language? The fact that college students want to learn it will also have a positive effect on the tribe itself, as tribe members struggle to gain federal recognition and to reconcile their everyday lives in modern America with their ancestral traditions."[63]

The reclamation of a language that experts have declared extinct does require boldness and determination. One celebrated case that has made headlines is the work of Wampanoag linguist-activist Jessie Little Doe Baird. Baird's work on the reclamation of the Wômpanâak language was recognized by the MacArthur Foundation, awarding her a MacArthur Fellowship in 2010. The foundation's site provides a short biography of Baird, noting that she is "reviving a long-silent language and restoring to her Native American community a vital sense of its cultural heritage."[64] The site mentions the critical factor that makes Baird's work possible: "Wampanoag (or Wômpanâak), the Algonquian language of her ancestors, was spoken by tens of thousands of people in southeastern New England when seventeenth-century Puritan Missionaries learned the language, rendered it phonetically in the Roman alphabet, and used it to translate the King James Bible and other religious texts for the purposes of conversion and literacy promotion. As a result of the subsequent fragmentation of Wampanoag communities in a land dominated by English speakers, Wampanoag ceased to be spoken by the middle of the nineteenth century and was preserved only in written records."[65] Like Shelley DePaul of the Lenape, Jessie Little Doe Baird had relied heavily on historical documents to find vocabulary and grammatical usage as well as cultural perceptions to develop her language-reclamation program. The reclamation of a supposedly "extinct" language creates some intriguing difficulties as well as possibilities. Baird worked closely with the late Kenneth Hale in discerning grammatical patterns, compiling lexicons, and developing a Wômpanâak phonology. The critical work of using historical documents continued after Hale passed away. A segment in the video *We Still Live Here: Âs Nutayuneân* shows MIT linguist Norvin Richards explaining how he and Baird perused a copy of the Eliot Bible looking for vocabulary terms to include in the ever-growing Wômpanâak-English dictionary.[66,67] This is an important acknowledgement that Baird is working closely with linguists to develop new materials from historical documents in the collaborative project of Wômpanâak reclamation. In the immediately succeeding segment of that video, Baird is shown discussing how she developed a Wômpanâak word for *dog*. She states that she could not find the Wômpanâak word for *dog*, so she had to produce one. Baird borrows from the Maliseet-Passamaquoddy their word for *dog—olomus*. Baird then consults a chart of corresponding sound changes across Eastern Algonquian languages and replaces Maliseet-Passamaquoddy consonants and vowels, producing a linguistics-informed new Wômpanâak word for *dog—anum*.[68] The MacArthur Foundation site sums up their appraisal of Baird's work as follows: "Through painstaking research, dedicated teaching, and contributions to other groups struggling with language preservation, Baird is reclaiming the rich linguistic traditions of Indigenous peoples and preserving precious links to our nation's complex past."[69] Baird's example illustrates the kinds of new lives that historical documents can have when Native American communities repatriate them to serve the needs of the community in the present as well as the future.

The Lenape and the Wômpanâak examples highlight a couple of key tensions between the language advocates of "extinct" languages and some experts in the scholarly community. As Harrison noted, DePaul has to work in the contentious

political and academic environment that challenges the Pennsylvania Lenape identity as well as the belief that an "extinct" language cannot be brought back to life. Native American language activists must be prepared to endure criticism and have the courage to continue to challenge those linguistic colonial assumptions. Miami language activist Daryl Baldwin did exactly that. Baldwin was informed that linguists had declared the Miami language to be extinct. Baldwin recalls thinking *extinct* means "gone forever." He responded, "Maybe these academics are wrong. Maybe we can reconnect. Maybe Miami can be the language of emotion, the language of thought, not just the language of speech."[70] Those thoughts led to the Myaamia language awakening program. Baldwin had the courage to question academic authority and the perseverance to initiate and establish a language- and cultural-awakening program in collaboration with Miami University of Ohio. Baldwin recognized that the possibilities he posed were just the beginning. He works closely with linguist David Costa in developing a sound system for everyday speech, creating texts for language learning, and translating historical texts to further the language awakening. In his recently published collection of Miami-Illinois texts, Costa provides a brief explanation of the significance of the volume as well as the provenience of the texts. He describes his method of translation and transcription: "The translations and transcriptions of these stories have been redone and corrected based on the knowledge of the Miami-Illinois language I have attained over the last twenty-two years."[71] Costa, as the linguist, speaks to the process of repurposing historical documents, making them accessible to contemporary readers. However, it is Baldwin who explains why repatriating these texts is important:

> Our language provides the mental framework for Myaamia thought. Our stories link us to the events, ideas, and beliefs spanning generations and thus merges with our current place and time, giving us a "deeper" meaning to our lives. This complex, intergenerational experience is our reality as Myaamiaki. It is through our language and from our stories that we preserve that unique experience. It is through the culturally embedded knowledge, produced by past generations, and the experiences of our children and our grandchildren yet to come that we envision a future as Myaamiaki. To tell stories as our people have always done is to remember. To create new stories is to grow and continue remembering. It is not a static experience but one that embraces change and new realities, no matter what place we call home or generation we live among.[72]

These three cases—the Lenape, the Wômpanâak, and the Myaamia language projects—have a number of critical similarities. Language experts had declared each language extinct. Each language advocate ignored the expert opinion and had the courage and perseverance to initiate language programming. Each case is an example of changing the metaphors used by experts from *dead* and *extinct* to *reclamation* and *awakening*. These similarities underscore the importance of repatriating Native American linguistic sovereignty. Rather than accept the unquestioned chauvinism of linguistic colonialism, these activists redefined the terms by which they repatriated historic documents and repurposed them for new life for their languages. Baldwin

recognizes that language is a multigenerational experience and that, as such, it is subject to "change and new realities." The Lenape, Wômpanâak, and Myaamia language communities have embraced change in order to explore those new realities.

Conclusion: Documenting the Unexpected

I began this essay with an account of my delighted surprise hearing Jeremy Dutcher, a Maliseet community member, sing an honor song on a classical music station. I wanted to contrast that recent experience with the centuries of colonial documentation of Native American languages as the expected places where Native American languages are found. Dutcher's performance is an example of repatriation of linguistic sovereignty that repurposes colonial artefacts of Native American languages. I argue all historical documents regarding native North America are artifacts of colonial oppression of the Native peoples of the Americas. I also argue that the work of erasure has become naturalized and the rhetoric of crisis in the language sciences has perpetuated linguistic colonialism in well-intended documentation interventions. Linguistic anthropologist Joseph Errington recognizes the discomfort such latent colonialism provokes:

> The colonial era ended two generations ago, but colonialism has not really gone away. Its afterlife has been all too clear in global north-south inequalities; in bloody politics from Timor to Iraq to Rwanda; in critical identity politics where former colonial powers now are homes to former colonial subjects and their children. Many conspicuous signs of the colonial past in the globalizing present make it easy to wonder whether some genuinely new era is here or in the offing, or whether there has ever been a definitive rupture to separate us from the colonial epoch.[73]

Among the "conspicuous signs of the colonial past" are the metaphors language experts use to describe languages as biological organisms. The use of a biological metaphor to describe language situations provides relatable comparisons, but it also introduces constraints for possible actions. The global crisis of language endangerment suggests we have moved beyond the colonial era, but the intellectual imperative to "save" dying languages seems to serve the interests of linguistic scientists more than the communities faced with the prospect that their heritage languages will become extinct.

Emergent Vitality Is Child's Play and Much More

I participated as an invited guest in a language maintenance and revitalization workshop in a reservation elementary school. Attending the workshop were the language and culture teachers, the academics, and myself. The conversation revolved around teaching strategies, language-instruction challenges, and the role of linguists in language maintenance and revitalization efforts. At one point during a discussion on language documentation, the language teacher spoke up and commented that they had a linguist working with them who was doing a terrific job. But the linguist wanted

the teachers and the community members to document every language event because the heritage language was considered endangered. The teacher explained that he was torn by the linguist's request because they have limited resources and they wanted to teach the children the language. If they spent all their time and money recording the elders, they wouldn't have time or money to teach the children. The other teachers and community members nodded in agreement. The conversation moved to strategies of language instruction. The same teacher recalled a day when he was teaching the children the heritage numbers, and that they were doing well in the classroom exercises. The teacher then became animated when he shared his surprise while monitoring the children during recess. He observed a group of boys huddled around a table. He was curious. As he approached, the boys paid him no attention and continued with their activity. The teacher leaned into the group and discovered the boys playing a Japanese card game that required quick challenges and responses using numbers. Much to the teacher's surprise, the boys were using their heritage language numbers: "They were using the heritage numbers and using them so quickly! *I* couldn't use the numbers that quickly!"[74] This example highlights a critical factor in the success of Native American linguistic repatriation. The future of all languages is in the creativity that speakers, learners, and instructors bring to everyday domains of usage. The Japanese card game is an example of the emergent vitality for the heritage language of the boys (and of their community), but it is also an aspect of all languages. Languages are constantly changing, providing language-reclamation and language-revitalization activists the opportunities for creativity, innovation, and vitality.

The documentation of these emergent forms of language use is a step toward reversing the work of erasure and silence. Rather than conforming to the colonial impulse to document the last words of the last speakers as a desperate measure to mitigate language death, Native American language activists are documenting creativity and innovation in their heritage languages as a celebration of language life. Native Americans are becoming experts in their own linguistic traditions, and they are doing so by challenging the privileged discourses of non-Indian experts. They take the artifacts of colonial oppression and repurpose them to repatriate their linguistic sovereignty. Shelley DePaul continues to reclaim Lenape against the protestations of critics. Jessie Little Doe Baird continues to draw from missionary sources to recontextualize vocabulary and grammatical usage for twenty-first-century Wampanoag needs, and Daryl Baldwin continues to defy expert pronouncements about language extinction and works toward the intergenerational transmission of the Myaamia language. These three Native American language activists represent a new generation of scholars who understand the legacy of colonialism but are not resigned to accept its naturalized chauvinism. They offer new metaphors with new possibilities that signal new perspectives about documentation. The work of language is not one of codification. The work of language is mediating social relationships. Daryl Baldwin encouraged embracing change and new realities for awakening sleeping languages. Documenting those "new realities" is a move away from linguistic colonialism and the centuries-long documentation of the New World toward a new era of documenting the emergence of new worlds in native North America.

Bringing It Home

This essay celebrates a potentially transformative period in the emergent vitality of the Maliseet language. My home community, Tobique First Nation in New Brunswick, Canada, held a "language summit" in June 2022 in an effort to coordinate support for Maliseet language revitalization. The organizer invited me to be a keynote speaker because I "wrote the book on the Maliseet language" (referring to my 2011 monograph). There was good attendance and excellent conversations. The attendees were across all generations and Maliseet language-speaking abilities. I witnessed energy and commitment from the younger generations of language advocates-activists. One of the speakers was Jeremy Dutcher, and he shared his own journey of language reclamation through music. Dutcher emphasized how his generation is approaching language reclamation from a more joyful place than the previous generations who endured the traumas of residential schools and reservation day schools. In 2011, I wrote, "The life of the Maliseet language depends upon its reintegration into the lives of the Maliseet people."[75] Today, not only is Maliseet heard in our everyday lives (on the radio, for example) but Maliseet has a global audience thanks to Jeremy Dutcher's international concert tour. This is all possible because Jeremy Dutcher repatriated Maliseet songs from wax cylinders stored in a national museum. Additional developments in this transformative moment include the start of a Wolastoqey immersion school in Fredericton, New Brunswick. I also acknowledge, with great appreciation, that Jeremy's generation is using *Wolasotoqey* instead of *Maliseet* as a preferred descriptor for our ancestral language. The youngsters are asserting their linguistic sovereignty—and it is joy to behold.

Let us give thanks for Maliseet language life.

Wolasweltomohtine ciw wolastoqey latewewakon pemawhsowakon.

Notes

1. Visit https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fL1BEvKnDvk.
2. Bernard C. Perley, *Defying Maliseet Language Death: Emergent Vitalities of Language, Culture, and Identity in Eastern Canada* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2011).
3. Jordan Darville, "Jeremy Dutcher Shares the Spotlight in the Majestic 'Mehcinut' Video, *Fader*, October 10, 2019, https://www.thefader.com/2019/10/10/jeremy-dutcher-mehcinut-video.
4. B. W. Ife, *Christopher Columbus: Journal of the First Voyage (Diario del primer viaje), 1492.* (Wiltshire: Aris & Phillips Ltd., 1990), 31.
5. Bernard C. Perley, "Last Words, Final Thought: Collateral Extinctions in Maliseet Language Death," in *The Anthropology of Extinction: Essays on Culture and Species Death*, ed. Genese Marie Sodikoff (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2012), 127–42.
6. Ives Goddard, "Eastern Algonquian Languages," in *Handbook of North American Indians, vol. 15: Northeast*, ed. Bruce Trigger (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1978), 70–77.
7. Ife, *Christopher Columbus*, iv.

8. Ibid.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid., xiii.
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid., xxv.
14. Ibid.
15. Steven J. Greenblatt, "Learning to Curse: Aspects of Linguistic Colonialism in the Sixteenth Century," in *Learning to Curse: Essays in Early Modern Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 16-39.
16. Greenblatt, *Learning to Curse*, 17.
17. Ibid.
18. Ibid.
19. Ibid., 17–18.
20. Ibid., 16.
21. Ibid. 19–20.
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid.,19.
24. Ibid., 21.
25. In the First Folio of Shakespeare's collected works, Miranda makes the statement presented here. Later editors felt such a harsh indictment was out of character for Miranda's gentle nature. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, in *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*, ed. S. J. Greenblatt, W. Cohen, J. E. Howard, and K. Eisaman Maus (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1997), 3047–107.
26. Ibid., 3066.
27. Greenblatt, *Learning to Curse*, 26.
28. Ibid., 27.
29. Ibid.
30. Ibid.
31. Ibid., 31.
32. Ibid.
33. Ibid., 32.
34. Ibid.
35. K. David Harrison, *When Languages Die: The Extinction of the World's Languages and the Erosion of Human Knowledge* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).
36. Ibid., vii.
37. Some of the popular texts include David Crystal, *Language Death* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Daniel Nettle and Suzanne Romaine, *Vanishing Voices: The Extinction of the World's Languages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); K. David Harrison, *When Languages Die: The Extinction of the World's Languages and the Erosion of Human Knowledge* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); K. David Harrison, *The Last Speakers: The Quest to Save the World's Most Endangered Languages* (Washington, DC: National Geographic, 2010); Nicholas Evans's *Dying Words: Endangered Languages and What They Have to Tell Us* (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010).
38. Harrison, *When Languages Die*, viii.
39. Ibid., vii.
40. Nicholas Evans, *Dying Words*, xvii.
41. Ibid.
42. Goddard, "Eastern Algonquian Languages," 71.
43. Randy Allen Harris, *The Linguistic Wars* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 20.

44. Ibid.

45. Charles Godfrey Leland, *Algonquin Legends* (Mineola: Dover Publications, 1992), 13. Originally published as *The Algonquin Legends of New England; or, Myths and Folk Lore of the Micmac, Passamaquoddy, and Penobscot Tribes* by Houghton, Mifflin and Company, Boston, in 1884.

46. Ibid., iv.

47. Charles Godfrey Leland and John Dyneley Prince, *Kulóskap the Master and Other Algonkin Poems* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1902), 13.

48. Ibid., 15.

49. Ibid., 40.

50. Perley, *Defying Maliseet Language Death*, 2.

51. Bernard C. Perley, "Zombie Linguistics: Experts, Endangered Languages, and the Curse of Undead Voices," in *Anthropological Forum* 22, no. 2 (2012): 133–49. See also Bernard C. Perley, "Remembering Ancestral Voices: Emergent Vitalities and the Future of Indigenous Languages," in *Responses to Language Endangerment: In Honor of Mickey Noonan. New Directions in Language Documentation and Revitalization*, ed. Elena Mihas, Bernard Perley, Gabriel Rei-Duval, and Kathleen M. Wheatley (Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2013), 243–70.

52. Perley, *Defying Maliseet Language Death*.

53. Perley, *Defying Maliseet Language Death* and "Remembering Ancestral Voices."

54. See Leland, *Algonquin Legends*; Leland and Prince, *Kulóskap the Master*; John Dyneley Prince, "Passamaquoddy Texts," in *Publications of the American Ethnological Society*, vol. X (New York: G. E. Stechert & Co., 1921); Edward D. Ives, ed., "Malecite and Passamaquoddy Tales," in *Northeast Folklore*, vol. VI: 1964 (Northeast Folklore Society); published under the auspices of the Department of English (Orono: University of Maine, 1965).

55. Bernard C. Perley, "Silence before the Void: Language Extinction, Maliseet Storytelling, and the Semiotics of Survival," in *Telling Stories in the Face of Danger: Language Renewal in Native American Communities*, ed. Paul V. Kroskrity (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2012): 184–204.

56. Kay Hill, *Canadian Favourites. Glooscap and His Magic: Legends of the Wabanaki Indians* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1963), 8–9.

57. Ibid.

58. Perley, "Silence before the Void."

59. K. David Harrison, *The Last Speakers: The Quest to Save the World's Most Endangered Languages* (Washington, DC: National Geographic Society, 2010).

60. Ibid., 258.

61. Ibid., 250–59.

62. Ibid., 259–60.

63. Ibid., 260.

64. MacArthur Foundation, www.macfound.org. Accessed June 27, 2014.

65. Ibid.

66. Anne Makepeace, *We Still Live Here: Âs Nutayuneân* (Oley: Bullfrog Films, 2010).

67. Ibid., 36.25-minute mark.

68. Ibid., 37-minute mark.

69. MacArthur Foundation, www.macfound.org.

70. Miami Nation of Oklahoma, *Myaamiaki Eemamwiciki: The Story of Our Awakening* (Upstream Productions, 2008).

71. David J. Costa, ed. and transl., *Myaamia neehi peewaalia aacimoona neehi aalhsoohkaana: Myaamia and Peoria Narratives and Winter Stories* (Oxford: Myaamia Project, Miami University, 2010), xi–xii.

72. Daryl Baldwin, "Introduction," in *Myaamia neehi peewaalia aacimoona neehi aalhsoohkaana: Myaamia and Peoria Narratives and Winter Stories*, ed. and transl. David J. Costa (Oxford: Myaamia Project, Miami University, 2010), xv.

73. Joseph Errington, *Linguistics in a Colonial World: A Story of Language, Meaning, and Power* (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2008), 1.

74. Perley, "Zombie Linguistics," 133–49.

75. Perley, *Defying Maliseet Language Death*, 199.