



Imperialism's Effects on Language Loss and Endangerment: Two North American Cases of Resilience, the Maliseet-Passamaquoddy and Wôpanâak Language Communities

Citation

Eames, Abigayle J. 2019. Imperialism's Effects on Language Loss and Endangerment: Two North American Cases of Resilience, the Maliseet-Passamaquoddy and Wôpanâak Language Communities. Master's thesis, Harvard Extension School.

Permanent link

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:42004079>

Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA>

Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

Imperialism's Effects on Language Loss and Endangerment: Two North American Cases
of Resilience, the Maliseet-Passamaquoddy and Wôpanâak Language Communities

Abigayle Eames

A Thesis in the Field of International Relations
for the Degree of Liberal Arts in Extension Studies

Harvard University

March 2019

Abstract

This project aimed to look at the causes of linguistic diversity loss, the factors for language resiliency, and potential setbacks in the field behind saving languages. Of the world's estimated 7,500 languages, over half will be extinct by the year 2050. There are obvious yet mostly unquantifiable negative impacts of languages dying, specifically the loss of specific human knowledge intrinsic to every language. Linguists are working frantically to preserve as much of this linguistic knowledge as possible, but there are differences within the field that could also be poorly affecting these efforts. By looking at cases of success, the potential for success for other endangered languages can be improved and increased. The study then turns to look specifically at two endangered language cases in the northeast region of the United States. The Wabanaki and Wampanoag linguistic communities both experienced similar, yet distinct, effects from colonial, national and, more recently, global forms of imperialism. Their languages have passed through different levels of linguistic vitality through these imperialist periods, and have encountered language maintenance, documentation and language death quite distinctly. Yet the methods by which Wabanaki and Wampanoag languages have survived are in alignment with the same methods seen in other language endangerment success cases. As well, the specific language information across linguistic databases, though differing, all points to similar outcomes for each language reviewed, suggesting that differences in methodology perhaps do not have an effect on conservation improvements for linguistic diversity loss.

Biographical Sketch

The author, Abigayle Eames, is a 2011 graduate of McGill University in Montréal, Québec, Canada, where she studied modern languages. She is of Franco-American decent and a native of Maine, now residing in Boston, Massachusetts. Though her grandparents spoke Canadian French, and she and her mother both had standard French classes up until high school, she does not speak the language with any sort of fluency. Abigayle worked briefly in the foreign language services industry following her undergraduate degree at McGill. This Harvard University thesis was completed in tandem with her joining the Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School. While there, she has assisted on executive education courses on negotiation, mediation and conflict resolution in Cambridge, MA and across Europe, the Middle East, Asia and Latin America. She has completed personal courses on negotiation and mediation and participated as the mock Foreign Relations Minister from China in a 75-role Harvard Kennedy School negotiation of a global resolution to the Afghan conflict. Also, while working at the Program on Negotiation she has assisted with coordinating PON's Great Negotiator Award for both George Mitchell for his involvement in facilitating the peaceful resolution of the Troubles of Ireland, and for Juan Manuel Santos, at the time the sitting President of Colombia, for his role in negotiating Colombia's guerilla conflict with the FARC. Eames hopes to someday personally assist with facilitating dialogue between communities, much like her mentors and heroes.

Dedication

This work is dedicated to future generations who will never experience or know the diversity that we are just still experiencing in diversity's final hour. With linguistic diversity loss there is an unquantifiable loss of knowledge that exists only within each language lost. And it is more than this: when languages die, the communities left behind often feel the void of their cultural losses, as language and culture go hand-in-hand.

This dedication is made in the name of more than just linguistic diversity loss though. As upsetting as it is to only consider this piece of diversity loss, our world is literally dying around us; we also lose plant and animal species every week. In light of this, it seems trivial to take up just linguistic diversity loss.

With the outcome of this study, we leave hope for these future generations that we might still be able to combat these losses. Moreover, there are examples of successes within other forms of diversity loss. These successes must be reviewed across the board so that we might hopefully maintain as much natural diversity within our world as possible. There is only hope for future generations if we are able to work together towards those common goals that hold across all of humanity. The time for this important work is now. These efforts will be applauded by younger generations who will not only prosper the most from these efforts, but carry on with, work hardest for, and improve the most upon. Without our work now, the outlook for future generations is far bleaker, and in a much less beautiful world. So this work now is dedicated to all future generations of humanity, that they may have the same chances at life that we have.

Acknowledgements

The results of this endeavor would not have been possible without the guidance and mentorship of Professors Theodore MacDonald as Thesis Director and Doug Bond as Research Advisor. They each not only lent direction to this study but also supplied significant words of encouragement when the workload seemed daunting and conceptualization unattainable.

Moments of support and comfort also came from my family: parents Ted and Susan Eames and siblings Emily Perkins, Isabelle Eames and Charlie Eames, as well as my loving partner, Patrick Loftus. Without their patience, support, and quiet space, this long process would have been significantly more difficult. To Patrick, thank you especially for assuming household maintenance and at times primary care for our dog so that I could focus on research and writing both before and after already long workdays.

Acknowledgment must also be made to the unsung heroes of every course and academic program, the administrators, and specifically here, those behind the ALM degree at the Harvard Extension School. Chuck Houston landed as my confidante of fears and ambitions, as I had initially begun my studies in Anthropology and Archaeology. He deserves particular thanks for continuing to advise me even after I switched to International Relations and for always showing an interest in my academic interests and aspirations. Sarah Powell helped me to track deadlines and requirements as my International Relations academic advisor.

Thanks to you all, and a humble apology to anyone I've forgotten.

Preface

While working in the foreign language services industry, after completing a BA focusing on modern languages at McGill University, I came across requests for linguistic services that were not met with success. Requests might not be filled for a number of reasons: interpreters unavailable, impossible deadlines, cost, etc. Two specific instances really struck me though, because their barriers were to a near complete lack of access to linguists. The first was a request for a Ma'am interpreter at the court appearance of a Guatemalan migrant worker. In the United States the accused should have a right to understanding the system and charges being brought against them, but when there is a linguistic barrier, this is complicated. Legal court interpretation can be made available in real-time via in-person interpretation, phone or video interpretation methods. However, with the Ma'am request above, we were unable to locate a Ma'am interpreter logistically close enough, or even available. Ma'am was not considered an endangered language at the time in 2013, but there were only three Ma'am linguists in all of the United States, all in California and stretched thin by the need of their services.

The second request we were not able to meet was from the EPA for Yup'ik translation of elder statements into English to support their case against the Bristol Bay Pebble Mine in Alaska. They believed that the statements demonstrating how much the ancestral lands and salmon habitats had changed during the lives of the Yup'ik elders would assist in ending the mining companies' activities. However, because their legal timeline was so short, we were not able to fulfill the request. We were only able to locate

two Yup'ik linguists, both too busy teaching at the University of Fairbanks.

Environmentalists have shown that indigenous peoples are the best wardens of their ancestral lands. They retain the most comprehensive knowledge of the weather, climate, flora and fauna. When their languages are lost, they typically erode alongside this cultural knowledge of their surroundings.

One of the first things I recall being told in that industry was that virtually any language need could be filled, but I quickly learned that was not true. For the larger languages, the inability to find a linguist was rare and typically because of timelines or costs. With endangered languages the inability to fill requests was far more common, and due to a limited number of skilled linguists, as well as timelines and costs. These cases seemed direr, their circumstances being much more compelling than average education or court interpretation needs. It was also the case that these requests were canvased to language agencies across the country, so the requests themselves were even far more desperate than average. This led me to the topic of endangered languages: the work that is being done, the differences within the field of linguistics, and the easily defeatist view of linguistic diversity loss. But, as I choose to believe that the anthropogenic causes of climate change can still be turned around, I also believe that linguistic diversity loss can be slowed and possibly even halted. I believe that humanity can, and really does have the capacity, to turn things around before it is too late, and before the erosion of diversity and knowledge becomes our undoing.

Table of Contents

Biographical Sketch	iv
Dedication.....	v
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Preface.....	vii
Chapter I. Introduction: Linguistic Diversity Loss and Hope for the Future.....	1
Chapter II. Issues with the Study of Linguistic Diversity.....	6
Chapter III. Imperial Forces of Colonialism, Nationalism and Globalism and their Effects on Linguistic Diversity.....	22
Colonialism.....	23
Nationalism.....	31
Globalism.....	36
Chapter IV. Gaelic, Catalan and Hebrew Successes of Language Maintenance.....	42
Gaelic.....	44
Catalan.....	49
Hebrew.....	54
Language Rights as Special Group Rights.....	57
Chapter V. Wabanaki and Wampanoag Languages.....	66
Maliseet-Passamaquoddy Language in the Wabanaki Confederacy.....	70

Wôpanâak Language in the Wampanoag Federation.....	75
Colonial Causes of Loss of Indigenous Life.....	80
Colonial Proselytization and Language Documentation.....	87
Imperialist Civic and Ethnic Nationalisms.....	95
In Globalism: Documentation, Maintenance, RLS, and Revival.....	103
Current Linguistic Vitalities and Future Prognoses.....	106
Chapter VI. Conclusion: What to Learn from Success Cases and the Future Outlook of Linguistic Diversity.....	110
References.....	113

Chapter I.

Introduction: Linguistic Diversity Loss and Hope for the Future

Language, within all of its forms, is an incredible phenomenon of the human experience. It is a human system of communication, which includes classifications for thinking of and quantifying the natural world, unique and specific to each and every linguistic culture. Linguists disagree on the actual amount of languages currently in existence, but it is generally agreed to be around 7,500 (Lewis, Simons, & Fennig, 2016). Throughout human history, this number has varied greatly with the natural, and sometimes forced, ebb and flow of human cultures. Human languages form a portion of the world's biodiversity and are a marker of humanity's diversity and also all of human knowledge. Linguistic diversity is the naturally occurring diversity amongst human languages, linguistic cultures, and ways of conceptualizing and categorizing the world that has developed across geography and history (UNESCO, 2016). Like the vast majority of other forms of biodiversity, languages are also dying off at an alarming rate. Though sometimes considered a naturally occurring process, this downward cycle of diminishment began only recently within human history. The endangerment and death of linguistic diversity has been sped up drastically through eras of colonization, nationalism and the globalism that have occurred over the last 600 years. With half of the world's languages in danger of extinction, a conservative estimate, humanity is at risk of losing nearly half of all accumulated human knowledge (Crystal, 2000, p. ix).

As defined by the Summer Institute of Linguistics, language vitality "is demonstrated by the extent that the language is used as a means of communication in

various social contexts for specific purposes” (SIL, 2017, “Language Vitality,” para. 1). In order to create an accurate picture of the immediacy of endangered languages, language vitality should be measured precisely and similarly across databases. The point of this study is to look at the causes of language endangerment and death and the methods used to counteract language endangerment. Language data is starkly different between the major, publicly accessible databases, and this is a detriment to the immediacy of the field. Language death occurs when the speakers of a language cease to exist, either suddenly or gradually. Despite proper documentation in written or recorded forms, a language cannot exist without people to speak it, and technically speaking, this requires at least two speakers, “for a language is only really alive as long as there is someone to speak it to” (Crystal, 2000, p. 2). Thus, with so many of the world’s languages critically endangered, accurate information within databases, available to anyone interested, should be given.

There are many factors of societal organization that influence language endangerment and death, which can be divided into categories of physical danger or language shift. Physical danger includes natural disasters, famine, disease, and acts of violence like war and genocide. When a speaker population is diminished, so is its language. Language shift, the second category, occurs when intergenerational language transmission is disrupted, by discouragement and preventative efforts, or voluntarily when speakers choose to assimilate to another group (Nettle & Romaine, 2000, pp. 4-7). Intergenerational language shift can be interrupted either from the top-down, when a language is no longer used in official situations, like courts, church, and politics, or bottom-up when a language has retreated from informal settings, like in the home (Nettle

& Romaine, 2000, p. 91). Language shift can be further subdivided into language shift by force, and language shift by choice. Forceful shift occurs when more powerful societies, such as European colonizers, “force minorities into shift by... forcing them into a subordinate role, or by seizing the land and resources on which their communities are based” (Nettle & Romaine, 2000, p. 90). Forceful shift is often also accompanied by physical endangerment. The less violent form of language shift, voluntary shift, occurs when “a community of people come to perceive that they would be better off speaking a language other than their original one” (Nettle & Romaine, 2000, p. 91). The defining difference between forced shift and voluntary shift is that the option of remaining where they are and who they are is still available within voluntary shift (Nettle & Romaine, 2000, p. 91).

Akin to other forms of flora and fauna classifications, languages are interrelated, and their origin stories can be drawn to other related languages and societies. A language family is defined as a group of languages that are related to each other through the descent from one common mother tongue, the proto-language of that family. In the study of endangered languages, some linguists prefer to focus on language families rather than individual languages because they believe that it eliminates some of the difficulties stemming from differing opinions on what constitutes a language versus a dialect (Whalen & Simons, 2012, p. 156). There are certainly benefits to approaching language studies through this lens. It is easily understood how approaching the documentation and maintenance of related, endangered languages as language families may have benefits. It eliminates the need to start from scratch when a language, belonging to a family with much documentation already accomplished, is identified. As well, there may be cases

where protections and revival efforts for related groups of languages are strengthened because those communities would have more bargaining power together than solitarily. In approaching languages broadly though, rather than specifically, linguists may be sacrificing the opportunity to study individual linguistic traits that make languages unique within their families and communities.

This investigation is going to begin by first looking at the issues within the study of endangered languages. There are differences among linguists and linguistic societies that affect the documentation and sharing of language data. This has consequences for those studying endangered languages, chiefly because the data is presented differently across the three major, public databases, and very different synopses are available across these databases as well. The majority of severely endangered languages survive through aging populations, as intergenerational language transmission has been updated. To push for the immediacy of a language's state of vitality, having accurate data available on the language is crucial. The study will then move to looking at the chief causes that have sped up language endangerment through both categories of physical danger to speech communities and language shift. The effects of colonialism, nationalism and globalism on language endangerment and death have all been thoroughly wrung out. It is interesting to learn how they have been classified into distinct forms, each with further differentiations in their effects on language endangerment and death. The three forms of imperial expansion will be looked at broadly, before moving on to specific language cases.

This will be followed by a brief look at the legacies of Irish Gaelic, Spanish Catalan and Hebrew, three cases of successful language resiliency despite being

geographically located in areas that have long had another dominant, official language. The effects of imperialism seen in colonialism, nationalism and globalism, as well as the issues of available data, will be contrasted with their successes in maintaining and reviving these heritage languages. Moving from these well-known cases of language success, this investigation will develop further by analyzing two smaller, and lesser-known cases of success in North America. The languages of the Wabanaki Confederacy and Wampanoag Federation are related Algonquian languages that have similarly experienced the imperialist effects of colonialism, nationalism and globalism. The outcomes and reactions of these groups have been, likewise, similar, though the three Wabanaki languages are in varying states of endangerment, and the Wampanoag are currently working to resuscitate their indigenous Wôpanâak language over a hundred years after the death of its last native speaker. Hebrew and Wompanoag offer particularly interesting cases, because both languages were classified as extinct and have been brought back to life by their speech communities. The successful efforts to document, maintain, and reclaim these languages is the thrust of this study, as this will show how it might be possible to save other endangered languages as well.

Chapter II.

Issues with the Study of Linguistic Diversity

Linguists involved with the study of endangered languages are split between documenting languages and Reversing Language Shift (RLS). Language documentation is widely viewed as the most effective means of saving a language, given the current rate at which languages are dying. Even then though, there are not nearly enough linguists to document all endangered languages, with a language dying approximately every two weeks (Wiecha, 2013, “New Estimates on the Rate of Global Language Loss,” para. 5; Crystal, 2002, p. 25). RLS explains the process by which a community might combat language loss, thereby reversing or delaying death. RLS is thus the ultimate goal for linguists studying endangered languages; however, RLS is not feasible in most cases. There are stories of success with RLS efforts but very few in comparison to how many languages there are, or were, in existence. Any success stories are supported by speech communities of these endangered languages being directly involved with conservation efforts. With so many languages endangered, and speakers of the most endangered languages aging rapidly, documentation may well be the last resort for preserving any of the value intrinsic to every language. Documentation, however, does not ensure the survival of a language, nor does it preserve even a majority of its value, be that value cultural, taxonomic, geographic, creationist, biologic, etc. Furthermore, there are many differing opinions surrounding the methods for documenting language vitality that have proved to add unnecessary layers of difficulty within combatting these issues.

One of these impediments is the void of a standardized system to measure

language vitality. This has resulted in linguistic databases cataloguing data according to different systems of measurement. Linguists have always worked to create a collaborative field, making their research publicly available, and promoting the study of, and awareness for, language endangerment. Though because they employ different schema to measure language vitality, and identify different categories of language vitality, it is difficult, if not impossible, to compare across databases. Attempts to create a measurement system for language vitality began in the early 1990's, alongside linguistic biodiversity loss gaining wider acknowledgement, and this, both within and outside of the linguistics community. The first of these systems was the Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS), introduced by Joshua Fishman in 1991, in his book *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical, and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Fishman is a prominent figure in studies of language endangerment and has written widely on various topics within the subject.

Intergenerational language transmission is the most common schema accounted for in language vitality frameworks. It considers at what rate and how effectively the language is being transmitted from one generation to the next and was coined by Joshua Fishman as part of his work on the GIDS model. Intergenerational language transmission is a naturally occurring process, which normally happens during child rearing. Once language transmission has been interrupted, a language is considered to have fallen into decline. Following this seminal work, many organizations and databases built their own systems, heavily influenced by GIDS, but also with almost all of them incorporating intergenerational language transmission, the sole schema considered within GIDS. GIDS itself was not improved upon until 2010 with Paul Lewis and Gary Simons' Expanded

Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (EGIDS), presented in their paper, “Assessing Endangerment: Expanding Fishman’s GIDS.” Yet despite the generally accepted traits of these systems, GIDS and EGIDS, neither has been adopted universally as seems practical. Taking this further, most frameworks even consider additional, distinct schemas and categories of language vitality.

The GIDS system considers just a single schema, intergenerational language transmission, and has eight categories of vitality, not including a level for extinct (Fishman, 1991, pp. 87-109). This is important to note because some vitality frameworks include a category for extinct, counted or not. EGIDS is far more complex, considering many schemas, and expanding GIDS to thirteen categories of vitality, including four separate categories within the same category level (Lewis & Simons, 2010, p. 2). The four sub-levels are differentiated by how language vitalities are affected by specific pressures of language shift within diaspora speech communities. EGIDS is still based around intergenerational language transmission, though it expands the GIDS design to look at additional schemas, such as levels of use in other countries/regions, use in education, and use in writing (Lewis & Simons, 2010, pp. 11-15). Distinct from frameworks below, these are built into the scale as factors of intergenerational language transmission, unlike other GIDS based frameworks, which actually consider multiple schemas.

Ethnologue, considered one of the best databases for information on languages (Crystal, 2000, p. 4), first appeared in 1951 (SIL, 2017, “Ethnologue: Languages of the World,” para. 1) and predates any language vitality framework. Though its data was originally intended for missionary translations of Bible scripture (Harrison, 2010, p. 23),

its mission has changed dramatically, and many linguists have rallied behind the reliable data that it provides. The linguistic vitality framework it came to adopt has six levels of vitality. *Ethnologue* also transparently lists the equivalent EGIDS levels compared to the vitality framework it catalogues languages within. Like GIDS, *Ethnologue* considers only intergenerational language transmission as a schema within its framework; however, *Ethnologue* is ultimately categorized by absolute number of language speakers, and not intergenerational language transmission (Lewis, Simons & Fennig, 2016).

Ethnologue's parent organization, the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL), adopted a framework more similar to EGIDS. SIL was originally founded in 1934 to train missionaries as field linguists. Like *Ethnologue* after it, the objective has moved further towards language preservation than missionizing and translating scripture. "As a faith-based nonprofit organization, SIL works alongside language communities as they discover how to harness the power of their language to address challenges and reach their goals" (Lewis, Simons & Fennig, 2016). SIL published the first issue of *Ethnologue* in 1951 and is now on the Twenty-First Edition. Again, it has its own unique framework though, the Language Vitality Assessment. It fully incorporates EGIDS' thirteen levels and expands them with sub-levels that include abnormal causes of language endangerment within specific levels of vitality (Lewis, Simons & Fennig, 2016). SIL again considers six schemas within its framework: language variation, language contact, multilingualism, language vitality, language attitudes, and language use (SIL, 2017, "Language Assessment," para. 3).

Other linguistic organizations have also implemented their own six-level language vitality frameworks; however, the organizations listed below include extinct within their

six-levels, rather than listing it as an additional state. Furthermore, some of these scales have again also taken intergenerational language shift as a stand-alone schema considered, like GIDS. The frameworks of both the Endangered Language Catalogue (ELCat) and the Endangered Languages Project (ELP) have six levels of vitality, but their levels are distinct from GIDS and each other (Lee & Van Way, 2016, p. 278; Endangered Languages Project, 2017). ELCat's vitality framework, the Language Endangerment Index (LEI), is based off of four schemas: intergenerational language transmission, absolute number of speakers, speaker number trends, and domains of use of the language (Lee & Van Way, 2016, p. 278). The LEI is "different from other methods of assessment in several ways, especially as it can be used even if limited information is available" (Lee & Van Way, 2016, p. 271), though this may be an overgeneralization. ELP categorizes its vitality scale on total number of speakers alone. Both ELCat and ELP include only endangered languages within their databases, yet their different language vitality frameworks present similar data very differently.

These two organizations are greatly dependent on each other. ELP is funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF) as a joint endeavor by Google and twenty-nine linguistics organizations involved with the preservation and documentation of endangered languages. The ELCat database is headed by the Linguistics Department at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, and the University of Eastern Michigan. ELP has drawn language data from ELCat since its launch in 2012 (Endangered Languages Project, 2017, "About," para. 4). ELCat is not publicly accessible, despite contributing to the Google-supported ELP. ELP reciprocally lends support to ELCat, as well as partner organizations also contributing to ELCat's database (Lee & Van Way, 2016, p. 272). ELP

is the most interconnected of the databases that will be reviewed and promotes awareness for endangered languages, as well as providing a place for linguists to work collaboratively.

UNESCO has been undeniably influential in promoting indigenous rights, including language rights. Language Vitality and Endangerment, an article submitted in 2003 at the International Expert Meeting on the UNESCO Programme Safeguarding of Endangered Languages, set the foundation for UNESCO's methods of analyzing levels of language endangerment. It was written before their *Red Book of Languages in Danger of Disappearing*, and its current published database, *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger*. The latest edition of *Atlas* is now available online even. Despite the framework from Language Vitality and Endangerment being the first framework used by UNESCO, it is the more complex of the two frameworks used within their databases. This system is also the most robust of all language vitality frameworks, but regardless, UNESCO replaced it with the simplified vitality framework used in the *Atlas* (UNESCO, 2017, pp. 7-12).

UNESCO's *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger* also bases its language vitality framework off of the GIDS framework, with six categories for linguistic vitality, and including a category for extinct within these six. The *Atlas* has intergenerational language transmission as the only schema within its framework, but the levels, correspondingly, do not match with any of these other frameworks. The *Atlas* publication only includes endangered languages though, and so only five of its categories of vitality are actually included within the database.

The *Red Book* was launched in 1993, and also used a vitality framework

comprised of six levels, again including extinct (UNESCO AdHoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages, 2003, p. 5). As stated, it is a far more complex framework, and its primary vitality levels also have sub-levels within all but one of the schemas it considers: absolute number of speakers. The nine schemas considered in its framework are: intergenerational language transmission, absolute number of speakers, proportion of speakers within the total population, trends in existing language domains, response to new domains and media, materials for language education, government and institutional language attitudes and policies, community members' attitudes towards their own language, and amount and quality of documentation (UNESCO, 2003, pp. 7-16).

These eight language vitality frameworks show how linguists have created many robust, communally accessible databases. Albeit, they continue to measure language vitality by distinct schemas and across different levels unique to each framework. With the advent of the internet, linguistic databases, where linguists are able to contribute their work, make suggestions for improvement on current and past research, and freely and publicly review each others' work, have become globally accessible. The three most prominent of all publicly and electronically accessible, global language databases are *Ethnologue*, *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger*, and the Endangered Languages Project (Grenoble, 2013, p. 295; Lee & Van Way, 2016, pp. 271-273). Each of these has a corresponding sociolinguistic school of thought behind it, and governing or associate organizations, respectively: the Summer Institute of Linguistics, UNESCO, and the ELP's partnership of twenty-nine contributing endangered language organizations, including the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Eastern Michigan University, and supported by the NSF and Google. It is important to remember that the ELP collects data

from another database, ELCat, produced in collaboration by the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, and Eastern Michigan University, and not publicly accessible (Endangered Languages Project, 2017, "About," para. 4). Although these do make a huge difference in how linguists are able to work together against linguistic diversity loss, as illustrated earlier, these organizations and databases use different language vitality frameworks with different schemas and vitality scales. This makes sharing data unnecessarily problematic.

Each database is intended for different users, evidenced by its purpose and associate organization(s). To understand any of the currently used language vitality frameworks, one must be familiar with GIDS, EGIDS and intergenerational language transmission. To review, the GIDS and EGIDS systems were built around a core schema of intergenerational language transmission. GIDS was crafted to measure language vitality before language databases had been made widely accessible. It is based off of eight categories of vitality, not including a category for extinct (Fishman, 1991, pp. 87-109). EGIDS was introduced as an expansion to GIDS (Lewis & Simons, 2010, p. 2). Intergenerational language transmission is the natural process of language being passed down from generation to generation, by parents and older family and community members to children. This duty falls predominantly during child rearing, and once this transmission is no longer occurring fully, a language is seen as having fallen into decline (Fishman, 1991, p. 12). Intergenerational language transmission is interrupted due to language shift, when a community is either forced into using another language, or voluntarily chooses to begin using another language (Nettle & Romaine, 2000, p. 7). Most subsequent language vitality frameworks are influenced by GIDS and/or EGIDS and have intergenerational language transmission as a schema.

In addition to how language vitality is classified, organizations choose whether or not to include languages within their databases for varying reasons. The primary reason for including a language is whether or not it is extinct. *Ethnologue* lists 7,097 safe and endangered, living languages (Lewis, Simons & Fennig, 2016, “Welcome to the 19th Edition,” para. 3). The ELP includes 3,398 endangered, living languages (Endangered Languages Project, 2017). The *Atlas* states that there are about 3,000 endangered languages, but only lists around 2,500 endangered or extinct languages, 230 of these being extinct (Mosely, 2010, “UNESCO *Atlas of the World’s Languages...*,” para. 2). Adding to the stark variation in numbers among databases is contention throughout the linguistics community over where to draw the line between what constitutes a language versus what constitutes a dialect. A variation or style of a language generally falls into the category of dialect, but significantly, much of this contention has social and political roots. Differentiation between languages and dialects often involves outside factors, such as local politics, or differences in naming conventions (what groups call themselves, and how they are referred to by other groups), making it difficult for linguists to accurately differentiate whether or not some languages are actually dialects or vice versa (Nettle & Romaine, 2000, p. 28). This is really the main reason for differing opinions on how many languages are in existence.

Two communities may speak mutually intelligible languages, or dialects, but choose to differentiate themselves linguistically, largely to illustrate their views of ethnic differentiation. “A well- recognized example is the status of Swedish, Danish, and Norwegian, which are counted as separate languages despite the fact that the members of these communities can understand each other to an appreciable extent” (Crystal, 2000, p.

11). Communities may not view their speech as the same and view each group's language as a distinct language. Sweden, Denmark and Norway have chosen to differentiate themselves through their linguistic cultures. Another scenario occurs when a more powerful society that smaller groups belong to does not recognize their differences, and their languages are labeled as dialects despite actually being distinct languages. Alternatively, different groups may speak mutually un-intelligible languages, but the more powerful group chooses not to differentiate between the groups linguistically, culturally or politically, labeling and subordinating languages as dialects.

As well, differentiations around whether or not a community speaks a dialect or a language and should be included in a database can be attributed to the linguists' comprehension of the speech communities' linguistic status. There have been instances where a language may have been listed multiple times within a database, entered by different ways of calling it. The International Standards Organization (ISO) provides standardized three-digit language and dialect codes that have been universally taken up by linguists to catalogue language data (ISO, 2017, "Language Codes – ISO 639," para. 4). Proposed changes and additions are reviewed annually by SIL, as a separate endeavor to their oversight of *Ethnologue* (Lewis, Simons & Fennig, 2016, "Welcome to the 19th Edition," para. 3). This allows for language and dialect identification across databases but does not come without challenges. It is likely codes may still be provided for languages and dialects that are misreported by linguists, unawares that there is already some documentation on a language, or, again, renaming a language by another name distinct from its previous documentation.

Databases pull their data from the linguists that work with them directly, but are

also affected by other organizations, such as those associated with ELP, SIL's oversight of the codes used to represent languages within databases (Lewis, Simons & Fennig, 2016, "Welcome to the 19th Edition," para. 3), and/or funding organizations, such as the UN, NSF or Google. The number of known languages and dialects is overseen by the International Standards Organization, but significantly, the SIL oversees all suggestions for changes and additions to the current ISO lists, separately from its work with *Ethnologue*. ISO 639-3 currently lists 7,469 language codes, diverging from *Ethnologue*, and 46,836 names used for those languages (Lewis, Simons, & Fennig, 2016, "Using the Code Tables," para. 6). Smaller organizations tend to have more localized efforts and may be less affected by larger organizations. Their funding still most often comes from organizations with influence though, again like the UN, NSF or Google.

In 2010, D.H. Whalen and Gary F. Simons highlighted in their publication of *Endangered Language Families*, how an approach to the study based on language families rather than individual languages, could eliminate contention over having to differentiate between languages and dialects, a very minimalist view on which languages to include. It is noteworthy that Simons is also an editor of the most recent release of *Ethnologue*. This does bring to the forefront the differences between scholarly camps, as this approach would neglect the study of thousands of languages closest to extinction. Linguists do agree that there are traits in common within language families that can be studied more universally, possibly quickening the documentation of some linguistic traits in the face of not being able to document all endangered languages. Regardless, as all languages are unique, most linguists would also agree that this tact would sacrifice more than it would save.

Along the same vein, in her review of “Assessing levels of endangerment in the Catalogue of Endangered Languages (ELCat) using the Language Endangerment Index (LEI),” (Lee & Van Way, 2016), Lenore A. Grenoble notes that they have presupposed a need to, “quantify language vitality” (2016, p. 293). She confirms that this is a presupposition by linguists before them, and seen in other language catalogues, such as *Ethnologue*, UNESCO’s *Atlas*, and other vitality metrics, as well (Grenoble, 2016, p. 295). What is interesting, and again distressing, is that Grenoble is suggesting that language vitality frameworks are not as necessary as most sociolinguists feel they are. Lee and Van Way’s paper details ELCat’s language vitality framework and the four schemas within its framework. They argue that LEI is superior to GIDS, “UNESCO’s nine factors assessing language vitality” (not including its sub-levels), and EGIDS, because “it can be used even if limited information is available.” Even if only the total population of speakers is known, the language can still be placed within the LEI, but this is not always an accurate indicator of a language’s vitality.

Linguists are at opposite poles on this issue, and some scholarly camps choose to include even languages that may be dialects, while others believe that we should be approaching the study of endangered languages by families, not bothering to differentiate between languages and dialects at all (Whalen & Simons, 2010, p. 7). Still others feel that because this issue has caused such a stalwart it may not even be necessary to measure language vitality precisely (Grenoble, 2013, p. 296). This is related to databases having incongruences in data and exacerbated by these databases also not accounting for the same languages, e.g. only including endangered languages, or also including languages that have already become extinct. Correspondingly, funding has a large impact on which

organizations linguists work with and are trained by. This affects linguists leaning towards delineating between languages and dialects, which vitality frameworks they use within their research, which database(s) they contribute to, and in turn, how comprehensive and accurate a database may be.

It seems evident that the reasons for choosing which languages to include or disclude within databases and which schemas to consider within language vitality frameworks are often largely based on the databases' contributing organizations and linguists, intended users, and funding. Yet all linguists working on the study of endangered languages are part of an intentionally collaborative field. There are many disagreements within the linguistics community concerning endangered languages, but all agree that dying languages need to be, at the very least, documented. In order to do so on a global scale, it is necessary to be able to measure language vitality in a uniform manner and across databases to fully benefit from the information now electronically available, and to prioritize those languages most in danger. Through comparisons of *Ethnologue*, *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger* and the Endangered Languages Project's databases, it is quickly apparent that although they have similar uses, their categorization of language vitalities and language vitality frameworks are different.

These differences are ultimately doing more harm than good to the preservation of linguistic biodiversity and combatting language endangerment. It can be very difficult to navigate through these systems if not encamped within, but that would also be to prescribe to a specific framework. By streamlining these methods, linguists could achieve a more effectively collaborative and efficient platform. They would be better able to accurately share and access data, regardless of the database used, and this would further

eliminate some of the existing barriers to the preservation of linguistic diversity.

Additionally, further streamlining methodology could make the field more approachable for those with language knowledge, but without formal linguistics training, for example, speech community members.

Since the inception of the study of endangered languages, the field has enjoyed a couple of pivotal moments in the spotlight. The first of these moments began with the 1991 Linguistic Society of America (LSA) Symposium, the same year Fishman published *Reversing Language Shift*. This led to a 1992 issue of the academic journal, *Language*, being focused entirely on endangered languages (Hale et al., 1992, p. 2). The resulting research brought a rush of interest to the field, from which there was an early surge in meaningful work. The second of these moments came out of the 2008 documentary, *The Linguists* (Kramer & Miller), albeit this yielded a very distinct outcome. Surrounding the success of this film, there was an incredible push to alert the general public of the issue, and many news sources, small and large, published or broadcast a segment on *The Linguists*, endangered languages, and the Indiana-Jones-type nature of ethnolinguistic documentation (Boyle, MSNBC, 2009; Garreau, Washington Post, 2008; Vidal, The Guardian, 2008; Walker, Christian Science Monitor, 2009; and others), regardless of how far from this image the scholarship actually is. Whereas the LSA Symposium led to new findings and professionals joining the field, *The Linguists* generally helped to spread the message and raise awareness outside of the linguistics community.

Over a decade after the 1991 LSA Symposium, Lindsay Whaley outlined a scarcity of consistent publications in the second half of her “Work on Endangered Languages,” presented at the 90th birthday symposia for the LSA. Whaley reported that

even in 2014, there was “no consensus on a technical definition of what constitutes an ‘endangered language.’” She went on to acknowledge the lack of “awareness of decreasing language vitality in many language communities and the scholarly attention paid to such languages [had] remained consistent over the past nine decades of linguistics in the United States.” Whaley was warning that despite the rise in awareness for the plight of endangered languages generally, the amount of scholarship coming out of the field had not increased, and there had been little progress in aligning methodologies across the field.

SIL and its database *Ethnologue*, UNESCO’s *Red Book* and *Atlas*, the Endangered Languages Project, and ELCat all use their own, distinct, language vitality frameworks, and provide data according to these frameworks, and despite their associations. How often and how accurately data is being shared can have a serious impact on accuracy. The ELP bases its language vitality levels off the total number of speakers, a single schema considered in other frameworks. With many languages having only a handful of elderly speakers, a single passing could mean extinction (Harrison, 2010, p. 11). The greatest issue with the study of endangered languages is that even though linguists have made concerted efforts to work together by making their research publicly available, they are still using different frameworks to measure language vitality. The use of different databases and which languages are being included would be fine, but the use of different frameworks of measurement is counterproductive to a unified stance on the subject and achieving a comprehensive view of linguistic diversity.

It is with this lack of a clear roadmap among databases, their associated organizations, and their accompanying language vitality frameworks, and accompanying

schemas, that most scholars of endangered languages, their vitality, and their documentation, begin their work. Thus, it is very difficult to navigate these systems if not already encamped within a linguistic school. By deciphering between these differences, it may be possible to lend acute improvements to the field, that could in turn lead to additional linguistic diversity protections, more effective efforts, and improved collaboration between linguistic camps and across language databases. This study will move to analyze three successful examples of language maintenance and two examples of severely endangered languages within these contexts. These cases, in particular the two last examples, will illustrate how these differences in methodology between linguistic camps matter less than believed at the start of this research. All five examples, however, show that there is still significant hope regardless of how efforts are being performed, just as long as there is cooperation within the field.

A benefit of vying language vitality frameworks is the relationship of other schemas included to intergenerational language transmission and language shift. All of the languages that will be explored later have been endangered because of disrupted intergenerational language transmission and language shift. Chapter III will look at three major causes of disrupted intergenerational language transmission and language shift: colonialism, nationalism and globalism. Chapter IV will then explore language cases with successful language maintenance, language reclamation, and reversing language shift, despite these three causes of shift: Irish, Catalan and Hebrew. Chapter V focuses on two case studies of endangered indigenous languages, Wabanaki and Wampanoag, exploring the causes of their endangerment, and their efforts to maintain and reclaim their linguistic cultures.

Chapter III.

Imperial Forces of Colonialism, Nationalism and Globalism and their Effects on Linguistic Diversity

Colonialism, nationalism and globalism have greatly contributed to the rise in linguistic diversity loss. As could be expected, the vast majority of endangered languages are also indigenous languages. Colonialism began a massive shift towards colonizing such groups and their languages, which has sped up the rate of indigenous language loss. Over the past few hundred years, continued colonialism, nationalism, and now globalism, have continued to support this downward trend. European disease alone caused the dramatic loss of indigenous life, with some areas in the Americas experiencing depopulation of up to 90%. As previously described, languages definitely become endangered when their speech communities are physically threatened. The other category of language endangerment causes is when speakers gradually shift to speaking other languages in place of their heritage languages. In this way, their heritage languages are no longer transmitted to children, ultimately, leading to language death. Language shift has been a devastating effect of imperialism throughout colonialism, nationalism and globalism. The focus of this section is now on some of the social and political elements of colonialism, nationalism and globalism that have contributed to linguistic biodiversity loss, and rather not on the accompanying epidemiological causes. The patterns, and similarities that can be drawn between these three trends, despite distances between unrelated, endangered and extinct languages, directly illustrate that these imperial designs have greatly affected and intensified language endangerment.

Colonization is still ongoing today and has continued through waves of nationalism and globalism. Nationalism was, in many cases, tied to colonialism, but in many instances came to serve the same purposes of colonialism. Both worked to invalidate the legitimacy of other cultural groups within newly acquired and newly identified territories. Globalism, though still expanding, has even further promoted the homogeneity of the world today. In order to fully understand how the indigenous Wabanaki and Wampanoag languages of the North American northeast have survived, it is necessary to also look at the positive contributions of these three imperial drivers. Colonialism lent the first occurrences of documentation to indigenous languages, codifying their legacies for future use. Subsequent civic nationalism provided the plans for indigenous ethnic nationalism as well. Globalism has lent technology, which has greatly enhanced language documentation, maintenance, and Reversing Language Shift, as well as the ability to access and share language data. Somehow though, despite rapidly decreasing linguistic diversity, the language communities that will be visited after this section have persisted. Ironically, the survival of these languages is, in part, likely due to colonialism, nationalism and globalism's positive contributions.

Colonialism

Colonial Europeans exploited the populations they encountered for many reasons, chief among them, land, resources and freedom. Even for those groups escaping oppressive regimes in the Old World, they poignantly still drew justification from these experiences for their colonial transgressions in the New World. Indigenous peoples encountered by colonial Europeans were viewed by them as nomadic inhabitants without

land ownership. This view allowed them to settle, claim the land and resources, and massacre, enslave or subjugate the indigenous (Anaya, 2004, pp. 26-29). Colonizers brought with them European languages, religions, governments, and economies that were forcefully imposed upon their new wards. For the indigenous, this too often meant assimilating to avoid violent retaliation for non-conformity.

Colonialism can be characterized by the societal structures through which it was implemented. As differentiated by Salikoko Mufwene, the three main forms of colonialism are settler colonization, extraction colonization (also referred to as trade colonization), and exploitation colonization (2008, pp. 2-4). All three forms have had distinct and profound effects on linguistic biodiversity loss. Settler colonization occurs when travelers explore an area with the intent to found a new community. This necessitates claiming new land and resources as their own or for the empire behind their expansion settlement. The new diaspora community is typically founded on similar principles as the society left behind, and these colonies were typically expectant that indigenous societies should convert to their worldviews legally, religiously, culturally, and linguistically.

Extraction colonization has the initial intent of extracting and trading resources, and not permanent relocation. Extraction colonies can be structurally temporary, or structurally permanent and inhabited by transients, such as in the case of military or trading posts. Regardless though, it is often the case anyways that some structurally temporary extraction colonies would become more permanent as their missions succeeded, as was the case of many trade colonies in the Americas. Although extraction colonizers do not intend to set down permanent roots, there is still a need to claim the

land and resources where they set up camp (Mufwene, 2008, p. 3). Despite this, these colonies were less likely than settlement colonies to rely on indigenous communities to survive, as resources were brought with them to survive and trade again. In most instances of transient inhabitants, these supplies would even be renewed with changeovers.

Exploitation colonization is extraction colonialization through forced indigenous labor. As just shown with extraction and settlement colonizations, exploitation often grew out of extraction colonialization. As a well-known example, European colonies in Africa were initially conceptualized as extraction colonies. Africans were advantageously found to be physically stronger than most Europeans though, and Europeans established that Africans could be a source of labor to assist in extracting resources. Thus, African extraction colonies quickly converted to exploitation colonies, a trend soon followed in the Americas. The effects of settlement colonialization on linguistic diversity, versus the effects of extraction and exploitation colonializations must necessarily be explored. “We can claim that, unlike the settlement colonialization of the Americas and Australia, the exploitation colonialization of Africa has hardly contributed directly to the endangerment or extinction of indigenous African languages” (Mufwene, 2008, p. 3). Settlement colonialization in the Americas specifically included indigenous subjugation and, with it, linguistic homogenization.

Mufwene goes on to observe that Africa’s unique linguistic landscape, pock-marked by pigeons and creoles, developed because extraction colonialization ensured the heavy influence of indigenous languages by colonizing languages. The Europeans had less need to communicate with the Africans, than the Africans needed to communicate

with the Europeans (Mufwene, 2008, p. 4). Too well known, European abuses carried out against indigenous Africans did not end there. Though the colonizers still infrequently set up settlement colonies in Africa, the goal of traders grew to be the capture of Africans to be sold into slavery, and other Africans were even employed by Europeans to do so for them. They were sold throughout the European world, and particularly in the Americas, where indigenous, unexposed to European disease, were dying at alarming rates after first contact.

As above, the Europeans required justification for these actions taken against the encountered indigenous peoples, and the first of these justifications was by directly invalidating the humanity of the indigenous. “For international law purposes, indigenous lands prior to any colonial presence were considered legally unoccupied or terra nullius (vacant lands),” (Anaya, 2004, p. 29) Linguistic and cultural barriers made it so that the indigenous were not wholly aware of European intentions. Commonly, because there were an abundance of resources under indigenous governance, these communities were happy to teach and share what they had and knew of their environments and how to subsist.

By deeming indigenous peoples incapable of enjoying sovereign status or rights in international law, international law was thus able to govern the patterns of colonization and ultimately to legitimate the colonial order, with diminished or no consequences arising from the presence of aboriginal peoples. (Anaya, 2004, p. 29)

These early misunderstandings between the indigenous and the Europeans fortified this European justification for colonial, national and global imperialism.

The indigenous had generations of cultural knowledge about their environments that was needed by the Europeans to survive long-term, particularly where the climates

were considered harsh in comparison to Europe's more temperate environments. Consequentially, the need for interpreters to bridge communication was also needed for the transfer of indigenous knowledge. The ability of one indigenous person to already communicate, not just in their own native language, but in the language of other nearby indigenous speech communities, held value to the colonizers. "Indigenous languages have vanished the most in settlement colonies than elsewhere" (Mufwene, 2008, p. 21). This is clearly because of the need to impose colonial languages for the success of settlement colonies, which again, was quite different from extraction and exploitation colonies. "Trade colonies and exploitation colonies have actually introduced new language varieties... that have triggered new dynamics of competition among the indigenous languages themselves" (Mufwene, 2008, p. 21). Thus, despite any positive contributions to languages through colonialism, be it documentation in order to proselytize or the creation of new languages, European expansion ultimately commenced the turn from robust linguistic diversity to tremendous language endangerment.

Policies were regularly put into place that discriminated against traditional systems of governance because they were not ordered according to Old World procedures. Most policies that have affected language loss did not directly target minority languages, unless implicitly forbidding the use of specific languages. More often they were written to control resources or public services, like land, education, or public participation. Rather than disallow the use of languages, policies created a power imbalance that required the use of colonial languages over indigenous languages.

Languages are endangered because of colonization, stealing of children, genocide, and the need to use another language for access to health care, legal services, education and jobs. Simply put, what causes the loss of languages is dominance of one group of people over another. (Eira, 2007, p.82)

These more common policies to govern the commons produced grave effects on linguistic diversity. Other indigenous structures could not be shifted effectively until language had been dealt with, thus the necessity of policy that affected indigenous language use. Revisiting Mufwene, “Generally [colonizers] ignored, marginalized, and/or eradicated any indigenous structures from which the Natives had to shift gradually once the colonists had reached a critical mass and were powerful enough to rule them” (2008, p. 7). Language was, and still is, often one of the first of these indigenous structures to be broken down by colonization.

It is interesting that policies affecting language could be used to subjugate through inclusion, because by learning the colonial language, indigenous also gained an understanding of the colonizing society’s culture. Hence, language can also be used in the opposite manner, and could “be employed as a means to restrict or exclude public understanding and participation” (Gonzalez Nieto, 2007, p. 234). Considering these opposing outcomes of language use policies, colonial linguistic policy was cunningly employed to create divides in indigenous communities across lines of those with linguistic inclusion within the colonizing societies, opening up social and economic privilege, and those without inclusion. “The usage of language within law may represent a barrier that does not only reflect unequal distributions or asymmetrical relations of power, but also a gate that works to perpetuate unequal access to economic, social, and cultural resources,” (Gonzalez Nieto, 2007, p. 234). Most indigenous communities colonized by Europeans understood this, and also recognized that this access required them to give up their heritage languages and cultures. As will be shown, the Wompanoag

recognized the importance of having a record of Wôpanâak, and despite the death of their language over a century ago, these records assisted in the recent revival of their language.

Proselytization was a severe driver of language shift as well, and missionaries were commonplace early on in European expansion. Proselytization is really a subset of policies, and important to discuss because of the justification that could be drawn for an entire colonizing mission. In order to convert, missionaries, like settlement colonies, required interpreters. This necessarily meant employing natives. Missions brought with them new technology and social benefits, such as reading and writing or elevated status among the newcomers, that the indigenous could only gain access to by learning colonizing languages. As with colonial policies more broadly, though there were consequences to not converting to European religions, access to benefits meant replacing their indigenous cultures and languages. Conversion often was not embraced, but non-conformity often led to the types of violence that will be described in Chapters IV and V.

Distinct from other sub-divisions of colonial policy, proselytization also spurred the translation of religious doctrines into indigenous languages to make them accessible for converts. As a sign of this, the *King James Bible* is the most translated document ever in history. This translation required specialized linguistic groundwork though. If one does not already exist, the first step was to establish a writing system for the indigenous language. This had the positive effect of creating an early written record for many indigenous languages. The indigenous then had to be taught to read, and as seen within language vitality frameworks, this would enforce further language shift. Again, contemporary linguists have been able to support the revival of the Wôpanâak language in part due to the existence of an early Bible translation. However, despite this

unintended positive effect, proselytization ultimately supported the erosion of indigenous linguistic diversity, and the negative impacts far outweigh any positive contributions.

Though disease is an epidemiological cause for language loss, this effect of colonialism decimated American indigenous populations and their oral traditions following first contact. These losses occurred long before settlement colonization, subsequent colonial policy and proselytization, and before wars between the Europeans and the indigenous had occurred, though all of which further supported linguistic diversity loss. European colonizers brought illnesses to the Americas where the indigenous were previously unexposed to superbugs, and without immunities (O'Brien & Jennings, 1999, p. 6). Diseases were capable of wiping out entire indigenous communities, and these experiences were also crippling for survivors. Loss of life is the most obvious cause of American language endangerment and death, and these early instances of disease were nearly ruinous.

Perpetuating the loss of indigenous life, violent skirmishes and wars were common between indigenous and European colonizers. Each group saw the other as a threat, either directly to their community, or to developing land and resource allocations. The indigenous had the advantage of knowing the land, but European colonizers had more sophisticated weaponry, were better organized, and had more experience with large-scale warfare. Further, the indigenous were left incredibly vulnerable following their initial encounters with Europeans because of the diseases that had already swept through their communities. Both the Wabanaki and Wompanoag, taken up in Chapter V, had already suffered greatly from European diseases before engaging in the French and Indian, and King Philips Wars. Though not even necessary to re-state, the added loss of

life within indigenous communities during these wars had further grave effects for their linguistic vitality.

Nationalism

The basic concept of nationalism is based on commonalities among people, around which a community is built up. In exchange for joining a like group, the individual gains protection and security from other, different groups. Like colonialism, nationalist ideas have permeated civilization since the dawn of history. Nationalism itself, however, evolved into a movement only very recently in human history, moving away from the concept of human similarities, and towards specific concepts of nation building. Nationalism, based on actual commonalities, is distinct from the type of nationalism that has had profoundly devastating effects on linguistic diversity. Surprisingly, “Colonial states were typically anti-nationalism, and often violently so” (Anderson, 2006, p. 163), because this earlier nationalism was based on actual commonalities between peoples they hoped to colonize and absorb. As the colonists required subjugation of the indigenous, they had to reject local ideas of nationalism to move their goals forward.

The successful outcomes of the American and French revolutions provided the blueprints for the newer form of nationalism, and after these successes, the world’s political stage was drastically changed. “In effect, by the second decade of the nineteenth century, if not earlier, a ‘model’ of ‘the’ independent national state was available for pirating” (Anderson, 2006, p. 81). Nationalism moved from a base of commonality, to a broadly geographical base.

For many commentators the modern state, and nationalist movements who help create them, are the result of modernization and industrialization, with the loss of

the old order, the rise of capitalism, the introduction of vernacular languages and the regionalization of elites. (Mar-Molinero, 2000, p. 4)

These new ideals of nationalism aligned people across visions of equality that could deconstruct previous social hierarchies. There was also a strong political undercurrent that carried these visions. “It is in the level of importance attached to political aspirations where the more modern concept of nationalism is relevant. This political aspiration may often (but not always) involve the creation of a ‘state’” (Mar-Molinero, 2000, p. 4). The early form of nationalism, based on actual commonalities within the group, is known as ethnic nationalism, and the newer form of nationalism, with idealist commonalities and political aspirations, is known as civic nationalism. It will be shown how this newer form of nationalism would be taken up by indigenous to protect their communities from the states that were formed around them.

Benedict Anderson differentiates between these two types of nationalism in *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (2006). *Imagined Communities* refers to the idea that civic nationalism assumes commonalities within groups that are often too large for all members to even know each other. Thus, they may not actually have many ideals or points of view in common, despite assuming they do; meaning these assumed commonalities are really imaginary. Varying in name, Alter, Fishman, and Mar-Molinero all also refer to nationalism as having two forms. However, they refer to ethnic nationalism as cultural nationalism, and civic nationalism as political nationalism (Alter, 1991; Fishman, 1972; Mar-Molinero, 2000). Alter even interchanges the use of subjective and cultural for ethnic nationalism, and objective and political for civic nationalism (Alter, 1991). Regardless of the terminology, nationalism’s

different forms have also had very different effects on language endangerment and loss, much like colonialism's forms.

Ethnic nationalism is based on defined and noticeable similarities among people, "which may include language, territory, race or common history and heritage" (Mar-Molinero, 2000, p. 6). These bounds have the effect of protecting and promoting perceived similarities, and at the direct expense of outsiders, even when there is no political intention included within ethnic nationalism. "Membership of communities who perceive their sense of nation from this viewpoint can be highly exclusive, sometimes racist, but not necessarily politically aggressive" (Mar-Molinero, 2000, p. 6). As will be shown with all of the language cases further on, ethnic nationalism has had profound positive effects for the promotion of indigenous languages and can often be found in reaction to civic nationalism. "Often cultural nationalism involves a movement keen to promote cultural awareness and to protect its cultural differences" (Mar-Molinero, 2000, p. 6). Ethnic nationalism has not been a catalyst to language endangerment, but rather the opposite.

Civic nationalism is more intentionally created and has at its core a state-building purpose, often across ethnic lines. Thus, to create Anderson's imagined commonalities, it is often at the expense of the actual commonalities drawn in ethnic nationalism. Civic nationalism is usually associated with the writing of Rousseau and in the aftermath of the French Revolution. The ideals enshrined are considered liberal-democratic, and essentially political. Nationalism here consciously sets out to create a nation based on democratic principles of full participation and consent of the people. The defining characteristics promoted as part of the national identity are consciously (and subjectively)

chosen and cherished (Mar-Molinero, 2000, p. 6). Mar-Molinero provides a strong definition for nationalism's forms, drawing from and further building on Benedict Anderson's conceptualization of civic nationalism, both illustrating the detriment of civic nationalism. Because civic nationalism is not built on actual similarities, and rather espoused values, for this to succeed, the concrete binds of ethnic nationalism are ignored or expatriated. Anderson believes that these communities are "imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion" (Anderson, 2006, p. 6). In order to achieve this, the imagined civic nation needs to be built up, unifying different groups, while simultaneously othering groups that choose not to assimilate to the new doctrine. Sometimes, the groups being othered have more in common with factions of groups joining the new nation, however the ideologies driving this have proven very powerful.

Along with civic nationalism came a new rise in language standardization. A nationalizing language needed to be ordered well enough that it could be taught to the masses, furthering colonialism's effects on linguistic biodiversity. "Vernacular language-of-state assumed ever greater power and status in a process which, at least at the start, was largely unplanned" (Anderson, 2006, p. 78). The message of the nation needed to reach the people, and like with colonialism, there is no better way to assimilate than by forcing language shift to better disseminate other governing principles. These principles were empowered by new technology of print and press. In this way, the vernacular gained strength and momentum, not only among the proliferators, but among all who shared their language.

Civic nationalism had very specific, detrimental effects on language loss and endangerment. “The modern European nation-states that emerged in the nineteenth century were based on the principle of one national language” (Nettle & Romaine, 2000, p. 174). This necessarily required the systematizing of language beyond what began in earlier colonialism. The ideas behind state building needed to reach broader groups, and the language used needed to be understood by everyone assumed within the civic state. “...As in many other aspects, nationalism’s utilization of the vernacular is not so much a clear break or departure relative to earlier periods as much as in the intensity with which it pursued this utilization” (Fishman, 1975, p. 41). During this early period of civic nationalism, the improved means to go about these practices enabled the urgency for language standardization and dissemination. The efforts of colonization had set the stage for this. “The general growth in literacy, commerce, industry, communications and state machineries that marked the nineteenth century created powerful new impulses for vernacular linguistic unification within each dynastic realm” (Anderson, 2006, p. 78). Showing again that linguistic unification must be at the expense of linguistic diversity.

The patterns being drawn through colonialist, nationalist, and soon to be shown, globalist methods of imperial expansion should now start to seem obvious and apparent. These are trends that cannot only be drawn across evolving timelines, but also across the globe. “Thus English elbowed Gaelic out of most of Ireland, French pushed Breton to the wall, and Castilian reduced Catalan to marginality” (Anderson, 2006, p. 78). A large part of the incredible success of language standardization under imperialist policies is due to the effects on language attitudes that they create. Colonialism and nationalism are both justified through ideas of a superior culture being responsible for inferior cultures. This

has had grave effects on attitudes of indigenous peoples on their cultures and languages. In order to gain access to the benefits of social status associated with more powerful language communities, indigenous are required to shift their language use to colonial, national and global languages. Keeping with their indigenous languages came without these new societal benefits, and so, both naturally and coercively, negative feelings about indigenous languages were created.

Globalism

Globalization will now be looked at as the third and final period of imperialist drivers, though it is going to be treated as less intentional than colonialism or nationalism. Globalism is the increasing interaction of people, states, or countries through the growth of the international flow of money, ideas, and culture. It is primarily an economic process of integration that has also had social and cultural affects in line with the two other imperial forces shown. Accordingly, it has had continued, adverse effects on linguistic diversity. Like colonial documentation and indigenous movements of ethnic nationalism to counter civic nationalism, globalism will also be shown to have had some positive impacts against language endangerment and loss. Globalism's greatest tool has been technology, and the Internet has been perhaps the most incredible development to come out of this. Technology has made language documentation easier than ever, raised awareness for the plight of endangered languages, and empowered indigenous communities to save their languages. However ultimately, globalism's negative impacts on linguistic diversity, once again far outweigh any positive improvements to the field of linguistics as the downward spiral of linguistic diversity continues.

The most obvious impact of globalism has been the shrinking of time and space for the transfer of ideas and communication. It is easier and faster than ever to access places and communities that were previously remote and cut off from colonial and national economies. In fact, there is now truly a global economy, and it can be accessed over the phone or Internet, and in real time, without delay. “Many scholars cite recent developments in travel and technology as accelerating the flows of information and cultural products, making contact between and among communities easier and faster than ever before” (Back, 2015, p. 16). This access though is still only available through the use of specific, standardized, global languages. Again, drawing a parallel through colonialism and nationalism, gaining access to the social and economic benefits that have accompanied globalism have caused further language shift. The difference of language shift is now that it is no longer forced as it was under colonialism and nationalism. Indigenous language speakers are now, more so than ever, consciously choosing to shift from use of their heritage languages, to use of global languages.

Another point of interest as regards globalism’s proliferation of language shift is the accompaniment of positive language attitudes. Where under colonialism and civic nationalism, language shift was forced and accompanied by negative views towards indigenous language use, language shift under globalism is voluntary, and often accompanied by positive views of indigenous language use. A byproduct of this has been bilingualism. Language shift necessarily begins with some bilingualism, but the previously accompanying negative views ensured that bilingualism was not a goal of learning the more powerful language. Within globalism, and following reactions of

renewed ethnic nationalism, indigenous language pride has made bilingualism a goal of language access.

With the universal spread of education and media in national and world languages, including their extension to formerly marginal and marginalized communities, and with increasing mobility and economic and social integration within and across nation states, the individual experience of most indigenous people in the world has irrevocably changed. This means that remaining monolingual is not an option for members of minority groups, unlike some majority communities. It does not necessarily mean that more and more languages will disappear, if minority communities choose to remain bilingual or multilingual. (Bradley, 2010, p. 145)

Thus, unlike under colonialism and civic nationalism, and despite the continuing trend of linguistic biodiversity loss, because globalism has not forced language shift, indigenous communities are more likely than ever to continue speaking their heritage languages while gaining access to the social and economic benefits of globalism.

Globalism is also considered to take divergent forms, mondialism and glocalization. Mondialism is the concept of globalization on a world scale, for example, literally encompassing the entire globe within the same economic system. This is the form of globalization that is most typically associated with its assumed definition.

Mondialisation was conceptualized by Francophone linguists

in reference to the interconnectedness of different parts of the world thanks to better networks of communication and transportation, which have facilitated world exchanges of goods manufactured in different parts of the world and more movements of people who now can remain connected to their places of origins while residing (permanently) in the host country. (Mufwene, 2008, p. 23)

In other words, people are now able to move away from their indigenous communities, without losing their sense of self and community because they are able to still so easily access it when wanted or needed. Taking this further, mondialism lacks the forced

assimilation that would require them to completely leave behind their communities, cultures and languages when choosing to join a new community.

The second form of globalism is glocalization. This is the concept of gentrifying within a geographic region, for example, requiring the entire United States to only conduct business in English. “Locally, people learn a language because of the benefits, usually socioeconomic... that they hope to derive from them rather than because of whether or not they feel connected to the outside world... [There is a] utilitarian dimension of languages, as assets that one accumulates only if they have local market values that are significant to them” (Mufwene, 2008, p. 11). What is immediately apparent in this second form is that assimilation is still not forced in order to gain inclusion, but there is a coercive element. Despite needing to learn a new language, there are benefits that accompany being able to speak a global language, even if it is not used within the local context.

These two ideas of globalism are related to the typically accepted, “dichotomy of global scale versus local setting” (Collins, Slembrouck, & Baynham, 2009, p. 1). However, this is not actually the case with glocalization. In fact, “if we lived in a globalized world, we live it through local circumstances, and the terms globalized/local are necessarily linked” (Collins, Slembrouck, & Baynham, 2009, p. 1). In his work on the effects of globalization on linguistic biodiversity, Mufwene also negates this dichotomy regarding globalism. Where mondialism looks at globalism on a global scale, glocalization looks at the effects of globalism on a local scale and relates back to the idea of forced assimilation. “Settings such as secondary urban centers where populations maintain regular ties with their relatives in the rural areas continue to provide ecologies in

which even minor ethnic languages are not endangered” (Mufwene, 2008, p. 10). Neither mondialism, nor glocalization forces language shift, but all of globalization does still coerce shift and create environments that encourage the use of global languages in place of indigenous languages. The benefits that can be gained from learning and using a global language are typically seen to outweigh the benefits of retaining indigenous cultures and languages. Besides, communities that choose to shift towards using global languages should not be faulted for wanting access to the global benefits that accompany this. Language use should remain optional.

The Internet has been the most powerful tool of globalism. It was first available in English, and then soon after made available in other global languages. The availability of Internet access is predicated on the availability of other technologies though, specifically computers. Making computer and Internet access available in a new language is no small feat, and akin to the translation projects undertaken during colonialism. For this reason, these technologies have been slow to be made available in minority and indigenous languages, further supporting linguistic biodiversity loss. “A little over a decade ago, it was generally feared that English (above any other Western European language) would prevail as the language of the Internet and this situation would precipitate the extinction of minority or marginalized languages” (Mufwene, 2008, p. 15). In actuality, what the Internet (and other forms of technology as well) has been able to accomplish is a growing awareness of endangered and dying languages. “On the contrary, this electronic medium has availed another sphere where the putatively endangered languages can be used, as long as some graphic system has been developed for them and their users can access the new technology” (Mufwene, 2008, p. 15). Where once it was believed that new

technology, including the Internet, would be the tipping point for linguistic diversity loss, the opposite has occurred. If they so choose, indigenous communities now have technology available to assist them in creating programs to document, maintain, and revive their languages, and with improved access to linguists who can support them in this.

To end this section, there are drivers advancing language loss and endangerment coming from both outside of and within indigenous language communities. Imperialist ideas throughout colonialism, nationalism, and globalism have all served as outside forces promoting language shift. “There are two main factors which are driving this increase [in the rate of language loss]: one is external, the forces of globalization and increasing external contact for every minority society” (Bradley, 2010, p. 145). But simply looking at these causes is to ignore the fact that language use should be a choice, and to gain access to the benefits of colonial, national and global communities, learning an imperial language is necessary. Thus, the second factor “is the internal response to these pressures, leading individuals to make choices not to use or transmit their languages, but to shift to using dominant languages” (Bradley, 2010, p. 145). In light of the desperate global state of linguistic biodiversity, it is hard to remember that language loss is a naturally occurring process, and a conscious choice made by speakers. Given the proliferation of endangered languages by imperial drives though, it seems logical to lend support to maintenance, RLS and revival efforts wherever possible.

Chapter IV.

Gaelic, Catalan and Hebrew Successes of Language Maintenance

While looking at the issue of language endangerment and loss from the outside, it seems easy to take a defeatist stance. Loss is inevitable. There are not enough linguists to document all dying languages, and even if there were, it would still be impossible to document all of these languages completely. As already shown, these basic detriments are much further compounded by the differences that exist between linguists on how best to approach the classification of endangered languages, be it degrees of endangerment with differing language vitality frameworks, or classification of languages and dialects. Albeit, these differences have not been entirely detrimental to the field and advances being made. If the lens into language loss is viewed from the inside, efforts towards language revitalization and management appear more optimistic as they transcend these issues through rights more recently granted. There are a handful of striking, well-known examples that will now be analyzed to find the common drivers of their successes. As well, cases of success can be found around the world among smaller, lesser-known language communities. Parallels can be drawn between the communities behind these efforts, both well-known and lesser-known, which should be considered to aid in other cases where maintenance, RLS and revival are being considered. Political motivations are at the forefront of these parallels and have been exercised directly by these communities as tools to aid in reviving their languages and cultures, and in gaining the necessary rights to do so successfully.

To review, colonial policies disallowed indigenous groups from using their heritage languages, forcing language shift and disrupting intergenerational language transmission. In order to succeed though, colonialism necessarily created a record of the indigenous languages they assimilated. Nationalism created new waves of language standardization in order to disseminate novel ideas of self-determination, and indoctrinate the masses, despite few actual similarities existing within sovereign boundaries. Nevertheless, nationalism has also been used to invigorate language revitalization efforts, throwing off colonial forces that initially threatened linguistic heritages. It provided a plan for subsequent civic nationalisms, which in turn promoted ethnic nationalisms that have successfully assisted many communities since. More recently, globalism has had particular economic leanings towards language shift. It has made the world feel smaller than ever previously, making it easier to access and interact with other cultures and peoples. The need for English (and other global languages) to ascend economically has never been so obvious, and this new access has triggered further language shift away from traditional linguistic heritages. Furthermore, globalism has also served to promote bilingualism and multilingualism, and brought huge improvements in methods for how languages are documented and how linguistic research is shared. The advent of the Internet alone has meant that some communities have shifted their language use to communicate with outside communities. However, it has also made language maintenance and revival methods available to these same communities and supported their use of multiple languages. So though language shift has continued into modernity, and loss has increased at a rapid rate, language documentation, maintenance, Reversing Language Shift and revival have all also become more attainable.

Gaelic

The first well-known example of language success that will be explored in this paper is the Gaelic language of Ireland, referred to here as Irish. Irish was once a widely spoken, thriving and growing language. Unbeknownst to most, up until about 1,000 AD Irish was aggressively expanding, but this was before the Isle's British colonization (Nettle & Romaine, 2000, p. 4). Interestingly, Ireland was the first colony of the British Empire, though far predating the later periods of vast colonial European expansion reviewed in Chapter III. Irish was once such a robust language that its literature comprises some of the oldest in Europe, after only Latin and Greek (Nettle & Romaine, 2000, p. 4). Despite this rich early history, the language experienced a severe decline under later years of British colonization, and the accompanying colonial language policies. Under British rule, the use of indigenous languages was often explicitly not permitted, particularly under missionaries and within boarding schools (Crystal, 2014, p. 112).

Much like in North America, there were arcane and cruel practices implemented by the colonizers, which forced even children to police each other for fear of corporeal punishment (Crystal, 2014, p. 112). English boarding schools alone were enough to interrupt language transmission, and this intentional tactic to erase language and culture will be shown again when the Wabanaki and Wompanoag indigenous communities are explored. These practices, in addition to directly forcing language shift, also had the effects of shaming these communities, and creating negative language attitudes towards their indigenous heritage languages and cultures. Negative attitudes have the effect of

causing people to choose not to transmit their languages intentionally, out of not only shame, but also fear that their children will face similar treatment.

The Irish Potato Famine had a particularly devastating impact on the use of the Irish language. "...Caused by the potato blights of 1845-6," the famine "resulted in 1 million deaths between 1845 and 1851 and the beginning of a long period of emigration" (Crystal, 2014, p. 93). As already seen, dying and endangered speaker populations are an immediate and obvious cause of endangered languages and language death. During this period, the Irish

population of 8 million in 1841 had shrunk to 6.5 million a decade later. The impact was greatest in rural communities, and as this was where Irish was chiefly spoken, the famine must have hastened the decline of Irish at the time. (Crystal, 2014, p. 94)

Language shift typically occurs first and most rapidly within and around urban centers. Rural areas, due to less exposure, are typically able to maintain heritage languages better as these micro economies are less dependent on the greater society, out of necessity (Mufwene, 2008, pp. 10-11). During the Potato Famine though, this limited dependence made the impacts of food shortage deadlier in rural areas, quickening the decline of Irish use (Crystal, 2014, pp. 93-94). It is also likely that due to Irish-British relations at this time, British aid was virtually non-existent, where as they did provide aid to other regions of their empire affected by the same blight.

The Irish language has survived in large part due to long-seeded anti-British colonialism sentiments and subsequent Irish ethnic nationalism. Irish ethnic nationalism gained speed as a movement during the nineteenth century, as the region now known as the Republic of Ireland began gaining ground against the British towards autonomous statehood. A large tenet of this movement was increasing pride for and use of the Irish

language. “Irish nationalists paraded the purity of Irish as further evidence of the wickedness of English” (Fishman, 1975, p. 67). The fastest and most effective way to achieve this was through implementation of the language within education, reversing centuries of work by the British to Anglicize the island. As a direct correlation, Irish regained a position within education early at the beginning of the movement, and this assisted in reviving the use of the Irish language by younger segments of the population. “The main focus of the state-sponsored language revival at that time was, firstly, increasing knowledge of the language through the education system (Irish was made a compulsory subject), and secondly, using the language, along with English, in the state system” (Mac Póilin, 2013, p. 145). Though this forceful push for use of the language through education was not alone enough to increase intergenerational language transmission, it did result in new generations of second language Irish speakers. This is not to say that there are no cases of intergenerational transmission, though necessitating communal changes, examples of which will be shown further on.

In spite of British colonialism and the skewed results of Irish nationalist policy, Irish today is still viewed as a success in so much as it is still being widely learned and spoken. The early twentieth century push for Irish education was a huge proponent of Irish revival and had the causal outcome of increasing the number of Irish speakers. But it lends a peculiar case.

Despite the fact that virtually every child studies Irish extensively in school, it is little used at home. ...According to one estimate, in 1990 there were just under 9,000 speakers with sufficient attachment to Irish to transmit it to their children. (Nettle & Romaine, 2000, p. 4)

The phenomenon of Irish language revival has created generations of bilingual Irish second language speakers. Ultimately, without a growing community of Irish speakers

working to pass Irish onto their children as a first language, the language should still be considered as in decline. As the movement has been unable to bring Irish back into the home domain, and without children learning a language from their parents, the language is still in a state of decline. The death of the Irish language has been at least delayed for the meantime though.

The need for communal change to create intergenerational language transmission was recognized by a group in Belfast, Northern Ireland in the 1960s. The group built a brand new community comprised of native Irish speakers and Irish as a second language speakers, but all of whom hoped to pass the language onto their children. They named their community the Shaw's Road Gaeltacht, borrowing the word Gaeltacht and giving it new meaning.

The word Gaeltacht... has now become what could be described as a geo-linguistic term. It usually refers to those scattered areas – mainly in the west of Ireland – where the thread of linguistic continuity has never been broken, where the language has been passed on from one generation to the next for thousands of years. (Mac Póilin, 2013, p. 143)

Their new use of the term, however, came to encompass a neo-Gaeltacht, and its hope of reclaiming of the groups' heritage language. Through the creation of this Irish only community, they were able to achieve what previous generations of pro-Irish Gaelic speakers were not. "Over four generations, every generation in my family had either a native or revivalist speaker who did not pass the language on, through the family, to the next generation. ...We wanted to break this pattern; in fact, to reverse it" (Mac Póilin, 2013, p. 141). It is well known that language immersion is the best way to learn a language, but once learners leave that closed environment, they typically switch back to using their mother tongues. In this sense, previous generations had not succeeded in

bringing Irish back into their homes. “Language immersion education is the most efficient way of passing knowledge of the language to the next generation. On its own, however, it does not guarantee a new generation of active speakers” (Mac Póilin, 2013, pp. 160-161). By bringing Irish back into the homes and the community first, in addition to education solely in Irish, the Shaw’s Road Gaeltacht was able to create a place that fostered Irish language transmission, and nurtured Irish first language speakers.

According to *Ethnologue*, there are 141,000 native speakers in Ireland, and 1,030,000 total speakers listed as having Irish as their second language. Though it is taught “as an official language in schools and encouraged by the government,” its language status is listed as just a 3 (Wider communication) within the more accurate, EGIDS language vitality framework (Simons & Fennig (eds.), 2018, “Irish”). This level 3 does not connote a severely endangered language, but neither does it support that a language is expected to grow. This is clearly because Irish is a language without a base of first language speakers passing on the language. UNESCO’s *Atlas of the World’s Languages in Danger* lists Irish as definitely endangered. The online database references the 2011 Irish Census, and counts, “77,185 daily speakers outside of [the] educational system,” noting that it is widely studied as a second language (Moseley (ed.), 2010, “Irish”). It is interesting that the Atlas records the language as extinct as a first language in Northern Ireland, however as shown above, this is actually not true within the Shaw’s Road Gaeltacht at the very least. In line with the *Atlas*, the Endangered Languages Project (ELP) also lists Irish as a definitely endangered language, citing around 40,000 native speakers, with 64,265 total speakers including those who count Irish as their second language (Endangered Languages Project, 2018, “Irish”). This data,

disappointingly, is taken from a 2006 census, however, making it the least accurate of the three major databases. Of note, though *Ethnologue* does not place a priority on the vitality of Irish, both the *Atlas* and ELP do place Irish firmly within categories of endangerment.

Catalan

The second well-known case of success for language maintenance and revival is the Catalan language in Spain. Catalan is entwined in Spain's strong linguistic history and has thrived alongside its related Castilian since long before standardization of the "Spanish" language. Today, and since the Industrial Revolution, the northern regions of Spain have had strong economies that feed into and assist in supporting Spain's more southern regions. In part because of these economies, many of Spain's northern languages have managed to survive the wide linguistic homogenization the rest of Spain has experienced. This process of standardization began in the fifteenth century, swelled around the Industrial Revolution, gained violent fervor throughout the reign of Franco in the twentieth century, and has continued as a lasting tradition of the Castilian Spanish language. Following Franco's terror, Catalan has finally been recognized as an unofficial language; yet it is still not officially included within Spanish public education. Regardless, and unlike the case of Irish Gaelic, it has retained its importance within many public and domestic domains and benefitted from uninterrupted language transmission. Like Irish, Catalan's history has strengthened language sentiments, adding to deep political drivers that have been advanced as ethnic nationalism in direct reaction to centuries of encroaching Castilian policies.

With the advent of Spain's colonial expansion, Spain took a particularly self-important stance on the matter of language. Their colonial aspirations necessitated the need to standardize the Castilian language so that it could be disseminated and taught within the New World. Within Spain, there were other aspirations to standardizing the Castilian language, to unite the territory of Spain under one rule, and one language. Nebrija published the first official grammar of Castilian Spanish the very same year that Christopher Columbus discovered the New World (Gonzalez Nieto, 2007, p. 232). Upon completion of this compendium, "the Bishop of Avila famously remarked when presenting Queen Isabella with the first Spanish grammar book in 1492, 'Language is the perfect instrument of Empire'" (Hulme in Lepore, 1998, p. xiv). The first stage of Spanish empire building began immediately in the New World with Columbus' arrival. Once Spain had established authority, "Nebrija's recommendations were implemented and the policy of language was inflexible, and all those native inhabitants were to learn it if they wanted to be considered civilized citizens" (Gonzalez Nieto, 2007, p. 233). As well known, this led to the current vibrant state of Spanish in the Americas, and the subsequent erasure of Latin America's indigenous languages.

Though language standardization within Spain began at the same time, Catalan was not yet directly threatened, but attentions had begun within Spain, and moved rapidly towards the north as they saw success with the Industrial Revolution.

Catalan was the target of repression throughout the eighteenth century in all domains of public life. With the unification of Spain, and the abolition of the laws and institutions of self-government in the Catalan-speaking territories, Spanish became the sole official language, as in all regions of the Spanish state. (Ferrer, Sankoff, & Turell, 2006, p. 199)

This would mark the beginning of the Catalan regions' want for self-determination. Both sides of this struggle were strengthened by the Industrial Revolution. The crown had a need for language standardization at this time to control the gains being made in the northern regions. At the same time, these regions were feeling particular pride in their advancements, which certainly served to invigorate later movements of ethnic nationalism and self-determination. Concurrently, civic nationalism was being seen throughout Europe and the New World, which as just seen with Irish, would serve to fuel Catalan nationalism.

Another wave of Spanish language standardization occurred again under Franco's rule during the twentieth century. Franco's justifications followed Nebrija's earlier motivations for writing his initial grammar publication.

Spain is organized through the imposition of a totalitarian concept, by means of national institutions which ensure its totality, its unity and its continuity. The character of each area will be respected, but without prejudice to national unity, which must be absolute, with only one language, Castilian, and only one identity, Spanish. (Francisco Franco, 1939, cited in Cucó, 1989, in Ferrer, Sankoff, & Turell, 2006, p. 201)

This "totalitarian concept" was matched with brute force, and direct physical threat to speakers of Catalan, beyond just language policies. As has been shown numerous times before now, when there is a direct threat to speaker populations, their language is inevitably threatened. This was a brutal period for speakers of Catalan, as the fascist government mowed down those who stood in its opposition. Nevertheless, Catalans were able to maintain significant intergenerational language transmission, despite the political and physical threats, likely due to the language's wide use and the regions industrial successes.

Not unsurprisingly, the centuries of threat that Catalan experienced created waves of support for maintaining and reviving their heritage language. This counter-nationalism was fueled by centuries of mistreatment under policies of Spanish language standardization, and a deep want for self-determination. “The strengthened economy of Catalonia, for example, has been a major factor in encouraging the use of Catalan there, and this has enhanced the prestige of the language in other Catalan-speaking areas” (Crystal, 2014, p. 176). Catalan nationalism was felt at all levels of industry too, and not just within the particularly disenfranchised segments of society. “Service industries and... manufacturing industries tend to be the domains in which endangered languages can most benefit from economic growth” (Crystal, 2014, p. 176). Catalan successes of industry created a viable economic environment for self-determination, and this was felt by all strata of Catalan society, aiding in presenting a united front against language standardization across Spain.

Catalonian nationalism began very early in Spain’s campaigns to place Castilian as the sole language of the country. Albeit, had Spain implemented the same homogenizing force within its borders as it did within the New World at the time of Nebrija’s publication, this might not have been the case. “The industrial and economic strength of Catalonia and the divergence of its interests from those of the Spanish state were such that, especially after 1898 when Spanish hegemony was weakening, the emergence of a middle-class Catalan nationalism became very evident” (Ferrer, Sankoff & Turell, 2006, p. 200). Moreover, ethnic nationalism likely would not have been enough alone. The shows of civic nationalism already taking place in other parts of Europe empowered Catalonian nationalism to go further. “This extended to political action,

especially in the urban areas, and provided ideological support which was particularly intense from 1906-23 for the project of restoring, modernizing and codifying the Catalan language” (Ferrer, Sankoff & Turell, 2006, p. 200). It is because of these earlier, fervent attitudes towards preservation of the language that kept intergenerational language transmission intact and allowed the language to survive through Franco’s campaigns of language standardization.

Ethnologue reports that there are 3,710,000 native speakers of Catalan, and 5,100,000 speakers listed as having Catalan as their second language. Catalan is the statutory provincial language in the Catalanian Autonomous Community, Valencian Autonomous Community (where it is called Valencian in local laws), Aragon Autonomous Community (where it is called Eastern Aragonese in local laws), and the Balearic Islands. Catalan’s language status is listed as a 2 (Provincial) within the EGIDS language vitality framework, and it is actively used within all language domains (Simons & Fennig (eds.), 2018, “Catalan”). The *Atlas* does not even list Catalan. It does, however, list Aragonese, having roughly 10,000 speakers (Moseley (ed.), 2010, “Aragonese”). Again, in line with the *Atlas*, the ELP also does not list Catalan. Because both databases choose to only list endangered languages, this at least, aligns with expectations. Adding to this, the ELP lists Aragonese as endangered with less than 10,000 speakers, many of whom study Aragonese as a second language (Endangered Languages Project, 2018, “Aragonese”). Thus, despite the many threats experienced by the language, Catalan speakers have successfully managed to exercise civic nationalism to a level of sufficient protection against outside language threats. Catalanian nationalism continues to imbue the speaking communities with language pride today, intergenerational language shift has

remained uninterrupted, and the language remains healthy within Spain, regardless of continued Castilian language standardization practices.

Hebrew

Like most ancient languages, Hebrew died as a spoken language a very long time ago. Unlike most extinct languages though, Hebrew actually survived through religious texts and ceremony. Religious doctrine has been a huge driver of keeping written languages alive, and just in this way, Hebrew has lived on as a liturgical language for centuries beyond its lifespan as an ancient spoken language. What is most striking about this situation is that language is a naturally evolving organism that morphs alongside the evolution of human cultures. Typically, liturgy does not change though, and is intended to remain static despite the changing world around it. “Hebrew was passed from one generation of Jews to another for over 2,000 years as the language of sacred texts, rabbinic writings, and formal prayer. In the nineteenth century it was hardly used in contexts beyond these” (Nettle & Romaine, 2000, p. 92). These texts served as a record though, making it possible to bring the language back.

The atrocities of World War II committed against the Jews resulted in the largest scale genocide ever carried out in human history. The Allies response to attempt amends for these crimes was to grant the Jewish survivors and diaspora a nation of their own, centered on their historical homeland. According to Crystal, “a powerful combination of political and religious factors explain the rebirth and ongoing maintenance of Hebrew in modern Israel” (2014, pp. 169-170). Prior to World War II a Zionist movement had begun among Jewish intellectuals. This movement was akin to the ethnic nationalist

movements seen above with the Catalan and Irish speaking communities above. Zionism was also based on a shared ethnicity though and strengthened by Judaism. Whereas Irish and Catalan speakers were threatened to assimilate, the Jews were threatened by genocide. There was less so an issue of language standardization, and the Zionist nationalist movement was a reaction to widespread anti-Semitism and Nazism. This movement had a profound effect on the reclamation of the Hebrew language.

With the advent of Zionism and the creation of the state of Israel in 1948, Hebrew was, unprecedentedly, reinvented in the contexts from which it had disappeared. It is now the national language, and almost all Israelis speak it, perhaps over three million of them as their first language. (Nettle & Romaine, 2000, p. 92)

Hebrew is the most successful example of language reclamation for this accomplishment.

However, it can, and should, also be argued that the birth of Israeli society itself created the perfect environment for complete language reclamation. “A number of factors, however, conspired to make the revival of Hebrew successful – such as its connection with a world religion, nationalist ideology, and widespread emigration to Israel” (Nettle & Romaine, 2000, p. 188). More emphasis should be placed on the re-rooting of thousands of Jews, coming from different places around the world, and speaking different languages. As seen on a small scale in Northern Ireland in the Shaw’s Road Gaeltacht, families were able to raise their children with Irish as their first language, and they were able to maintain Irish as the language in their homes and small community. With Hebrew, “this made it possible for adults to make a break from their previous language backgrounds and start again in a new country in settlements where they used Hebrew as a second language” (Nettle & Romaine, 2000, pp. 188-189). The

importance of place and breaking entirely from the use of other languages within both informal and formal language use domains is implicitly obvious with the case of Hebrew.

Thus, Hebrew quickly became the most common language in Israel, because Israeli's shared the same faith, and their faith had kept the written language alive. Jewish texts were used to teach the language within the religion and used to reclaim Hebrew as the national language of Israel. "It was this conjunction of factors which enabled Hebrew to emerge from its status as an ancient literary language of male elites to become a common language for all Jews in the modern state of Israel" (Nettle & Romaine, 2000, p. 189). It is also worth noting that due to the late formation of the Israeli state, Israel is the only country to have never experienced some form of colonialism in any way.

Land made the language, in other words, and language made the land. Hebrew of course had a historical territorial link to the land of the Jews, and its establishment as the language of the modern nation-state of Israel was viewed as the homecoming to its ancestral land of the Bible. (Nettle & Romaine, 2000, p. 189)

This link, since the revival of Hebrew had been uninterrupted, and relatively unthreatened by any outside forces which may have affected their language revival.

Hebrew is a particularly interesting language case worldwide. The ancient scriptural language died out as a spoken language, and hundreds of years later was brought back as a national language with the birth of the Israeli nation. This was possible because despite the language dying as a language spoken in most domains of life, it lived on through Hebrew scripture and ritual (Nettle & Romaine, 2000, p. 92). These domains were relegated only to educated men, but nevertheless they were able to maintain its record. Typically, women are thought to be mostly responsible for language transmission, because they are often responsible for most, if not all, of child rearing. Thus, when language transmission is interrupted, it is typically because the women have stopped

speaking it to their children in the home domains (Fishman, 1991, p. 162). With Hebrew, it survived because it was used among men in the temple and education, however women were left out of these activities. In this way, Jewish diaspora communities ceased to use Hebrew within the home, but the men kept the language alive within formal domains of religion and education. When Israel was founded as a nation, Jews were able to bring their language home, having only Hebrew as a language in common in their homeland (Fishman, 1991, pp. 289-291).

Hebrew is listed in *Ethnologue* as having 8,330,000 speakers in Israel, with 4,380,000 first language speakers. Its vitality is listed as a level 1, signaling that it is a robust language being passed onto children, and with a growing speaker population (Simons & Fennig (eds.), 2018, “Hebrew”). The *Atlas* does not list Hebrew. Not unsurprisingly, ELP also does not list Hebrew. Israelis have successfully pulled the Hebrew language out of extinction and created an environment for it to thrive within all domains of their society. It is no longer a static language either and has taken on the qualities of a thriving language, evolving alongside the new society created for its speakers.

Language Rights as Special Group Rights

As will be shown even further below with the Wabanaki and Wampanoag, certain groups require special rights in order to exercise and maintain their cultural heritages and languages. As the topic of international rights came onto the world’s stage following the atrocities and gross loss of human life during World War II, the rights of the individual were placed as higher priority above group rights. Though these conversations paved the

way for the discussion of group rights, they also failed to protect minority groups from mis-treatment by the state. The same atrocities that led to and occurred during WWII occurred again, and the seed for group rights that was planted during discussions of individual rights finally sprouted. These group rights necessarily included language rights, as languages are often targeted as a marker of ethnicity. Civic nationalism, as specifically shown, purposely requires the homogenization of groups in order to disperse and promulgate ideas of commonality.

In reviewing studies of the larger, well-known success stories above, Irish, Catalan and Hebrew, it is “obvious that the vitality of languages depends largely on an adequate socioeconomic, infrastructure... that can support them” (Back, 2015, p. 22). However, these circumstances alone are not enough to fully revive a language, and there are other examples where these circumstances were not even enough to save languages. The communities behind these efforts need to be thoroughly committed to revival of the use of their heritage language, because there will always be an economic incentive to continue the shift towards the encroaching language which has caused language shift to occur in the first place. “Efforts to revitalize Gaelic/Irish were doomed to fail in Ireland, while the recreation of Hebrew in Israel ...benefited from a number of circumstantial factors, other than the support of the economic system, which favored their success” (Back, 2015, p. 22). Catalan, Irish and Hebrew were mostly successful in their efforts to create the necessary political and economic environments required for the success of their language revivals, but Irish presents a different outcome. Catalan, despite the political tyrannies it experienced over centuries of Castilian standardization, and Hebrew, despite centuries of use only within specific, formal religious domains, both have thriving first

language speaker populations today. Irish, however, in spite of similar economic and political circumstances, has predominantly seen a rise in the use of Irish among second language speakers.

The right to use one's heritage language was necessarily approached as each individual's right to choose his or her language of use. Overall, the creation of group rights has been a huge boon to the study. Though Irish revitalization is still considered a success, the factors that caused it to evolve differently from Catalan or Hebrew, are in part because of the speakers' right to choose their language. There are other examples like Irish as well.

While the [Quebec] state has set up the right economic ecology for the maintenance of French as a useful language, ...bilingual policy of the federal government provides its citizens the alternative of favoring the language that is likely to offer more advantages to their children in the larger region where English is the dominant language. (Back, 2015, p. 22)

This is much the situation with Irish too, especially so because intergenerational language transmission had long been interrupted in favor of English as the dominant language.

Despite re-writing the socioeconomic and political situation within Ireland, most households within Ireland continued to speak English within the majority of their speaker domains.

The need for language rights presupposes group rights, but there is a clear need specifically for language rights, as now evidenced. Despite traction in gaining group rights, the governing state still holds the majority of power on issues of language use.

Accurate information on many languages is difficult to come by, however, because governments often ignore and even ban certain languages – in some cases because they do not recognize them as languages, in other cases because they deny the right of a group who speaks that language to exist. (Nettle & Romaine, 2000, p. 30)

When the issue of choice is brought into play, this still does not solve the issue of linguistic biodiversity loss. As Michelle Back aptly points out, “citizens of non-French origin can evoke their human rights to reject the imposition of French on them” (Back, 2015, p. 22). This then leaves the question of how to craft language rights that will not only respect the choice of speakers, but also prevent the death of languages. Too often, “the ‘language rights’ advocated by linguists often clash with the human rights of speakers, and it appears that the latter will usually prevail” (Back, 2015, p. 22). Unfortunately, to truly respect speakers’ rights to choose, it may be by sacrificing the languages they are choosing not to continue speaking and passing on.

There is also the issue of balancing group rights in contrast with sovereign rights of the state. James Anaya points out that although progress has been made in the international arena of rights granting, relatively new individual and group rights are still, “balanced against the sovereignty of the total social collective on the other” (Anaya, 2004, p. 20). Individual and group rights have been crafted by the governing states behind them, having the ability to choose whether or not it is within their sovereign interest to ratify and acknowledge. As shown through colonialism and nationalism,

these premises meant that Indian tribes and other indigenous peoples, not qualifying as states, could not participate in the shaping of international law, nor could they look to it to affirm the rights that had once been deemed to inhere in them by natural or divine law. (Anaya, 2004, p. 27)

The way that this process unfurled has really granted additional liberties to the states, and not the individuals and groups that this process initially set out to protect. “State sovereignty, originally conceived of to advance human interests, would be a conceptual means by which international law could enter into complicity with inhumane forces” (Anaya, 2004, p. 27). In this way, it has evolved that not only were additional group

rights necessary, but also more specific group rights, such indigenous rights and language rights.

This is not to say, however, that there have not been further advancements working to improve the state of international law. There have been significant improvements with the initial approach to thought around governance of indigenous communities, which has in turn facilitated improvements to the rights that have been granted to them since. Indigenous are no longer considered as forming inferior societies, nor wards that must be taken care of.

These changes have engendered a reformed system of international law, and the reformed system, in turn, has provided fertile ground for social forces to further alter, and eventually reverse in many ways, the direction of international law where it concerns the indigenous peoples of today. (Anaya, 2004, p. 49)

Thoughts surrounding indigenous languages have also shifted in this way. Through the work done on indigenous languages, partly during colonialism and nationalism, it has been proven that indigenous languages are just as robust and complex as European languages. This should help to pave the way for specific language rights as well.

These changes in attitudes towards indigenous peoples, alongside contemporary indigenous ethnic nationalism have fueled their direct involvement in the rights they have come to be granted. “The international system’s contemporary treatment of indigenous peoples is the result of activity over the last few decades. This activity has involved, and substantially been driven by, indigenous peoples themselves,” (Anaya, 2004, p. 56). By having a part in the formation of these advancements, sovereign rights have taken a back seat to the actual needs of the communities that these rights should be working for.

Indigenous peoples have ceased to be mere objects of the discussion of their rights and have become real participants in an extensive multilateral dialogue that also has engaged states, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and independent

experts, a dialogue facilitated by human rights organs of international institutions. (Anaya, 2004, p. 56)

In finding middle ground on which indigenous peoples and their sovereign states are able to work together, there has been actual progress made for their protections.

Article 13 of the UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, adopted in just 2007, states that “indigenous peoples have the right to revitalize, use, develop, and transmit to future generations their histories, languages, oral traditions, philosophies, writing systems, and literatures, and to designate their own names for their communities, places, and persons,” (United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Article 13). This does not necessarily grant them all of the “three forms of group-specific rights,” that Will Kymlicka identifies below, but it has been a huge step in the right direction. However, in line with Anaya’s recognition that this state designed system has faults in favor of sovereignty, the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand all voted against this UN Resolution, but did later reverse their stance for the Declaration’s adoption in 2007. To take this further and lend a better understanding of how the current situation can still be improved, specifically for the protection of indigenous languages, it is necessary to further explore the work done by Kymlicka.

In *Multicultural Citizenship* (2005), Will Kymlicka dissects the distinction of different types of cultural diversity and the different forms group rights can take. He approaches this topic with the assumption that it is human nature to want uniformity within society. This is a goal that necessitates justification for actions to push this agenda. In colonialism this justification came through religious proselytization and the divine mission. Under civic nationalism this justification came from policies and laws, but indigenous empowerment has been shown to also manifest as ethnic nationalism in

response to civic nationalism. Through globalism it has been the furthering of a world economy only accessible through certain languages that has increased language shift and endangerment. It would be morally defunct to disallow indigenous communities access to the global economy for the sake of saving their languages. That it has taken so long to get to this space, speaks to the colonizing societies unwillingness to extend the same protections and rights that they themselves enjoyed, access within one's language of choice.

As Kymlicka points out, there are two forms of cultural diversity within societies. "In the first case, cultural diversity arises from the incorporation of previously self-governing, territorially concentrated cultures into a larger state" (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 10). This is the form that cultural diversity has taken within the Americas, and will be visited when the cases of Wabanaki and Wampanoag are reviewed in Chapter V. "These incorporated cultures, which I call 'national minorities', typically wish to maintain themselves as distinct societies alongside the majority culture, and demand various forms of autonomy or self-government to ensure their survival as distinct societies" (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 10). Unfortunately, because of imperialism's want to homogenize expanding societies, autonomy was completely left out of early European expansion. "In the second case, cultural diversity arises from individual and familial immigration. Such immigrants often coalesce into loose associations which I call 'ethnic groups. They typically wish to integrate into the larger society, and to be accepted as full members" (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 11). In this instance, bilingualism and multilingualism are often able to thrive. This has been the case for diaspora communities throughout globalism, as evidenced by the growing numbers of bilingual and multilingual peoples around the world today.

As already shown in Chapter III, “the history of ignoring national minorities in the New World is inextricably tied up with European beliefs about the inferiority of the indigenous peoples who occupied the land before European settlement” (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 22). These beliefs were necessary to justify colonization though, and without them, it is unlikely that European expansion would have occurred as it did. Borrowing from the Colonial example, this is even a sentiment that continued through waves of civic nationalism around the globe.

These racist attitudes are slowly fading, but they have often been replaced, not with the recognition that indigenous peoples are distinct nations, but with the assumption that they are a disadvantaged ‘racial minority’ or ‘ethnic group’ for whom progress requires integration into the main-stream society. (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 22)

The promotion of group rights has assisted in changing mindsets around these issues, however indigenous still often lack the support of their assumed national governments to fully break these patterns.

Moving beyond this, Kymlicka asserts that “there are at least three forms of group-specific rights: (1) self-government rights; (2) polyethnic rights; and (3) special representation rights” (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 27). Self-government rights are quite obvious, but given the history of indigenous treatment, the right to autonomy and self-government does not provide a clear solution. Polyethnic rights are rights awarded to groups living among other cultures. They provide protections to these groups from other groups around them, such as the right to use their languages of choice within a greater society. Often, in order to actuate these rights though, there needs to be positive reinforcement provided by the greater society. Special representation rights can be just that support. They require special supports from the greater society in order that the minority group may actualize

its polyethnic rights. For example, a minority group may choose to speak their indigenous language of choice, but without greater government support to do so, this choice is limited to domains within their linguistic community. Without language services available to them in their careers, local law, medicine and education, regardless of their chosen language, they are forced to interact in these domains using the language of their greater society. Thus, if governments enacted wider special representation rights, there could potentially be fewer choices made towards language shift.

Chapter V.

Wabanaki and Wampanoag Languages

The decline of linguistic diversity due to European expansion has been no different than declines in other forms of natural diversity. Expansion within the Americas is perhaps the greatest example, given the vast biodiversity that once existed across the continents' distinct geographic and climatic landscapes. "A survey of the North American continent done some time ago in 1962 revealed that there were 79 American languages, most of whose speakers were over 50." Considering this survey was completed nearly 400 hundred years after first contact, it is incredible to think of how many languages there may have once been. Within this same survey, "there were 51 languages with fewer than 10 speakers, such as the Penobscot language of Maine..." (Nettle & Romaine, 2000, p. 5). Since that study, this number has most definitely shrunken significantly, and Penobscot, a language of the Wabanaki Confederacy, died with its last speaker in 1993 (Simons & Fennig (eds.), 2018, "Abenaki, Eastern"). The cycle of linguistic diversity has been far from static, and with the varying effects of nationalism and globalism, on top of trends already set into motion by colonialism, these losses have only continued to gain momentum.

This study now moves towards targeting the effects of colonialism, nationalism and globalism on language loss specifically within New England, through two chosen cases of indigenous linguistic communities, Maliseet-Passamaquoddy of the Wabanaki Confederacy, and Wôpanâak of the Wompanoag Federation. Just in New England, the effects have been different between these two indigenous nations. Discouragingly, most

indigenous languages in this region are already, or are on the near verge of, extinction, as “Eastern Algonquian languages are commonly believed to be the language group most permanently destroyed through European contact” (Rivett, 2014, p. 554). Thus, what remains for indigenous languages in the region are but a fraction of what once comprised a robust, linguistically diverse region. As seen above, the vast majority of those that are still alive are in varying states of decline. Because of the distinct effects of the three forms of imperialist policy reviewed in Chapter III, the indigenous languages that are still alive are engaging in documentation, maintenance and Reversing Language Shift in different ways. Some of the same parallels seen with Irish, Catalan and Hebrew can also be correlated to indigenous languages within New England. However, the indigenous languages of New England are in much further states of decline than the languages above ever were. This is due to the continued proliferation of colonialism for American indigenous, regardless of their already desperately diminished populations; and notwithstanding any positive impacts from nationalism and globalism, as will be shown.

This analysis now turns to looking at the Maliseet-Passamaquoddy language of the Maliseet and Passamaquoddy tribes in the Wabanaki Confederacy and the Wôpanâak language of the Wampanoag Federation. Both groups are included within the Abenaki ethnic group, as they are called in Canada, or the New England Algonquian Nation, as the British called them; and both languages belong to the Algonquian family of languages. Given the ability for success that will be illustrated with these two specific languages, the hope for saving other dying languages becomes more evident. Even if a language is already moribund, these communities have created their own blueprints for how to support other communities in reviving their heritage languages in the future, should they

so choose. As believed by some linguists in the field, and partially illustrated with the success of reviving Wôpanâak, there are advantages to approaching the study and documentation of languages as families rather than as completely distinct, individual languages. This is particularly relevant when there is any contention at all, politically fueled or not, around whether or not a community's language constitutes a dialect or a proper language in and of itself. This will be shown with both languages chosen, and with the Wabanaki, how bargaining power can be gained by collaborating and affiliating with related tribes as allies.

The Maliseet-Passamaquoddy and Wôpanâak languages are two examples that, regardless of their relation, have had different histories and different encounters with colonialism, nationalism and globalism. Today, they are experiencing different states of linguistic vitality, but both languages are still severely endangered. Northeastern Native Americans were among the first indigenous populations of North America to come into contact with European explorers and settlers. The early colonizers in this region quickly came to rely on the natives to survive the harsh climate they encountered. The Pilgrims, one of the better-known groups of European settler colonizers, came into immediate contact with the Wompanoag when Massasoit, a Wampanoag native sachem, was the first to meet them in Plymouth in 1620 (Travers, 1975, p. 9). The Wabanaki came into even earlier contact with French colonizers in what is now Northern Maine and New Brunswick. The Maliseet and Passamaquoddy Tribes of the Wabanaki Confederacy were the first indigenous to meet Samuel de Champlain in 1604 at the mouth of the St. Croix River (Francis, Leavitt, & Apt, 2008). Yet despite these very early encounters, Maliseet-Passamaquoddy and Wôpanâak are both still alive some 400 years later, and when other

neighboring indigenous languages are not. Thus, perhaps of most importance in this study is a view into how Wabanaki and Wampanoag have been able to survive.

These languages were chosen for this study because of their remarkable histories, and interactions with colonialism, nationalism and globalism. The Wabanaki are interesting because Maliseet-Passamaquoddy is still alive despite their dealings with the French *and* the British and because of the recent Truth and Reconciliation Committee set up to acknowledge the horrors of colonialism and nationalism experienced by the Confederacy. Because Wôpanâak was brought back from the dead (somewhat like Hebrew), the Wampanoag present a particularly motivating case for revival. As well, both of these cases show the importance of community involvement in language maintenance and Reversing Language Shift. “The urgency of community ownership in the process of reclamation is far more important than the need to ensure conformity with a linguist’s notions of analytical process and verification” (Eira, 2007, p. 82). To maintain a language against shift, the language must be brought back into informal domains, have the tools and technology to do so, and have the community support to enact these desires. Wabanaki and Wampanoag ethnic nationalisms and engagement with globalism have driven their communities’ efforts for language maintenance and revival. It is through these views from the inside, digging into Maliseet-Passamaquoddy and Wôpanâak as cases of success, that hope for saving, or reclaiming, other dying languages will be found.

There are many terms used to refer to indigenous peoples globally. Indigenous in the Americas were first called Indians by European explorers, as the explorers believed that they had circumvented the globe to arrive in the Indies for trade. Although incredibly

incorrect, the use of this term is still sometimes used today even, and will be seen regularly in the sources used. Worldwide, there have been many other terms used to refer to the peoples encountered. Most typically, “as empire building and colonial settlement proceeded from the sixteenth century onward, those who already inhabited the encroached-upon lands and who were subjugated to oppressive forces became known as indigenous, native, or aboriginal” (Anaya, 2004, p. 3). These terms are more broadly accepted as correct and are considerably less offensive. Going forward though, the groups that will be reviewed, and are still so often referred to as Indians or Native Americans, will be referred to as indigenous. The reason for this is that “the term indigenous... has long been used to refer to a particular subset of humanity that represents a certain common set of experiences rooted in historical subjugation by colonialism, or something like colonialism” (Anaya, 2004, p. 5). The specific Wabanaki and Wampanoag communities that are going to be examined are still living under this colonial subjugation. The result of these subjugations is that they have interacted with nationalism and globalism in ways that are parallel to the communities explored above, as well as unique to their indigenous situations.

Maliseet-Passamaquoddy Language in the Wabanaki Confederacy

The Wabanaki Confederacy is comprised of five tribal nations that stretch from Newfoundland in Canada to central Maine in the United States, and from the eastern coasts to eastern Quebec. Wabanaki, as they refer to themselves, means “People of the Dawnland” (Four Directions Development Corporation, 2018). The five Wabanaki nations are the Maliseet, Micmac, Penobscott, Passamaquoddy and Abenaki. Though all

five nations still exist, their territory has shrunk drastically. In the state of Maine, what was once an expansive empire has since been relegated to just 5 reservations today (Four Directions Development Corporation, 2018). This current description is not far from a description of the Confederacy from over a century ago in 1915. According then to Frank G. Speck's account,

Algonkian tribes from Maine eastward to the Atlantic and northward to the St Lawrence comprise what is called the northeastern Algonkian or Wabanaki group. This includes the Penobscot of Penobscot bay and river, the Passamaquoddy of Passamaquoddy bay, the Malecite of St John's river, the Micmac of the coast of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward island, Cape Breton, and Newfoundland, and also the Abenaki of St Francis, Province of Quebec, originally from Maine. (Speck, 1915, pp. 492-493)

The Wabanaki are a particularly interesting case because their territory was divided and quarreled over by the French and the British, and then later, Canada and the United States also. Their earliest interactions with both French and British colonizers were not with settlement colonizers but with explorers and then traders from extraction colonies. They warred repeatedly with the British, but not the French, despite efforts towards proselytization by French Jesuits, Franciscans, and later, Catholics. During the French and Indian War (1688-1763), tribes of the Confederacy spanned different sides of the conflict due to their territory's span across Canada and the United States. The Confederacy has also faced multiple changing treaties between colonial powers, especially so when the territory of Maine was finally ceded to the United States.

Recently, the State of Maine completed an investigation into the treatment of Wabanaki children, from which it learned that the State had not been living up to its obligations to indigenous children as laid out in the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) (Maine Indian Tribal-State Commission, 2012). In the documentary *Dawnland*, Maine's

Truth and Reconciliation Committee is commended as the first of its kind in the United States, and modeled after the Canadian TRC formed to review first nations and indigenous peoples (Mazo & Duthu, 2018). The film details how the Committee found evidence to support abuses prior to the 1978 ICWA Act, and abuses still ongoing decades after the Act.

There were three languages spoken among the Wabanaki Confederacy, Abenaki-Penobscott, Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, and Mi'kmaq, each language being spoken widely by its namesake tribes within the Confederacy. All three are Abenaki languages within the Algonquian family. These are related Algonquian languages, but they are different enough that speakers cannot easily understand each other (Native-languages.org, 2015, "Algonquian Languages"). It is important that these languages are distinct enough from each other to be properly classified as languages without ambiguity, because this study will look specifically at the survival of just Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, though drawing from the effects on the Confederacy as a whole. As the Confederacy acted as a unit to increase their bargaining power, their tribal histories are intricately entwined, and must be considered together. Despite this though, Abenaki-Penobscott is no longer a living language, as above, yet Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, and Mi'kmaq are both still alive and spoken.

The Wabanaki Confederates were diverse peoples with different cultures, languages, governing bodies and forms of religion. The Wabanaki territory, was claimed early on as part of "the former French territory of Acadia, now including Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, a small portion of Quebec, and the portion of Maine east of the Kennebec River" (Harper & Ranco, 2009, p. 22). The

Maliseet and the Passamaquoddy are two distinct tribal groups within the Wabanaki Confederacy. These two tribes came to share the same language, most commonly and aptly named Maliseet-Passamaquoddy.

Maliseet and Passamaquoddy are descriptive terms for their respective territories within eastern Maine and western New Brunswick. “The Passamaquoddy are peskotomuhkatiyik, ‘people who spear Pollock,’ ...; the Maliseet are wolastoqewiyik, ‘people of the St. John River,’” (Francis, Leavitt and Apt, 2008, p. 3). American indigenous have been called by so many names it is often confusing. An example of this is the use of Abenaki versus the New England Algonquian Nation. Today, there are Maliseet and Passamaquoddy living on both sides of the St. John River, though the river once stood as the boundary to the historically Maliseet territory heading towards Quebec, and the historically Passamaquoddy territory including the Eastern most border between Canada and the United States (Francis, Leavitt & Apt, 2008, p. 3). Maliseet-Passamaquoddy is very much still extant with speakers in both historical territories.

There have been both preservation and revival efforts for the Maliseet-Passamaquoddy language over the past couple decades. The *Passamaquoddy-Maliseet Dictionary*, written by David A. Francis and Robert M. Leavitt, is a testament to these efforts and was released in 2008. Maliseet-Passamaquoddy is the Wabanaki language that is going to be looked at most in-depth, because there is the most documentation of the language still available from early interactions with both the English and French extraction and settlement colonies. As well, these communities are being chosen for their strong community programs supporting the maintenance and RLS efforts of their language today. However again, Maliseet-Passamaquoddy must be looked at in the

greater context of the Wabanaki Confederacy. The tribes, though individually recognized, have banded together since first contact; and they have enjoyed greater negotiating power as the resulting coalition, than as individual entities.

Maliseet-Passamaquoddy has an active community behind it promoting maintenance and RLS efforts. “There is some very promising and important work going on to help preserve and keep the Passamaquoddy language alive” (Passamaquoddy Tribe at Pleasant Point, 2014, “Passamaquoddy,” para. 1). Although fluent speakers are still most commonly found among older members of the tribes, intergenerational language shift is still present, but fluency is less common among younger speakers of the language. This has increased concern that the language will die out, as Abenaki-Penobscott has already. Globalism has brought new hope though, through the technologies that have already been mentioned. “The digital age has brought a new way of preserving, learning and teaching the language. Multimedia computers now offer text, pictures, audio, video and interactivity. This new media has become a valuable tool with language preservation and revitalization” (Passamaquoddy Tribe at Pleasant Point, 2014, “Passamaquoddy,” para. 2). In addition to these efforts made by adult speakers and learners, the Wabanaki community is making an effort to re-introduce the language through education, in hopes of bringing it back to their children.

The tribes have also been working alongside linguists, to create a system for Maliseet-Passamaquoddy revival. “Language Keepers is an innovative approach combining descriptive linguistics, documentary video, and community outreach to revive speaker groups to use heritage language in traditional and contemporary activities while recording it for language learning, dictionary development, research, cultural

transmission, and revival,” (Language Keepers, 2018, para. 3). This is a project that has gained significant support, and is funded by the NSF and National Endowment for the Humanities Documenting Endangered Languages Program. Given the tribes’ historical territory spanning across Maine and eastern Canada, community involvement in this project has also come to span this contemporary boundary. “The documentation has taken place at the Passamaquoddy communities of Pleasant Point and Indian Township (Maine), and Tobique First Nation Reserve (New Brunswick, Canada)” (Language Keepers, 2018, para. 4). The survival of the language has likely been prolonged because of the collaborative nature of the Wabanaki Confederacy to ensure their cultural and linguistic survivals.

Wôpanâak Language in the Wampanoag Federation

Like the Wabanaki, the Wampanoag are also part of the New England Algonquian Nation. The southern subset of these indigenous peoples was comprised of the Pequots, Narrangansetts, Massachusetts, Pawtucketts, and Wampanoags confederated tribes (Travers, 1957, p. 13). It was the Wompanoags who first greeted the Pilgrims, and then quickly became these settlers’ greatest asset in the New World.

The Wampanoag Federation played a great part in the early life of the colonies, for it was they, under the friendly leadership of the great Sachem Massasoit, who guided and helped the Pilgrims through the perils and hardships of their first forty years on the soil of the New World. (Travers, 1957, p. 13)

Without the Wampanoag, the Pilgrims would have fared worse with their limited knowledge of how to survive the harsh New England climate. There was a close relationship between these communities early on, and the natives even acted as interpreters for the settlers to communicate with other nearby tribes. The more commonly

known story leaves out the brutality that the Wompanoag Federation was later subjected to, not long after by the same Pilgrim settlers. It is this exact relationship that was appropriated to tell the story of the first American Thanksgiving, still celebrated widely and recognized as a national holiday in the United States (Smithsonian, 2019).

Historically inhabiting areas of mainland Massachusetts, Cape Cod and Martha's Vineyard, the Wampanoag Nation is now comprised of just the federally recognized state- and tribally-recognized Herring Pond, and Assonet Wampanoag communities, and smaller family bands (Weston and Sorenson, 2011, p. 75). Before the arrival of the Pilgrims, the Wampanoag had already encountered other Europeans, which resulted in epidemics that wiped out entire populations of indigenous in the region. Massasoit, known as King Philip among the British, had returned home from a years-long trip serving as an interpreter for the British, to find that entire communities from his sachem had succumbed to sickness. "In a span of less than 60 years, up to 98% of the proud and fiercely independent Wampanoag Indians were destroyed by the Europeans who came to this land in search of God and gold and glory" (O'Brien & Jennings, 1999, p. 6). Later, after the arrival of the Pilgrims, early efforts by missionaries resulted in the first translation of the Bible into an American indigenous language in the Wampanoag language (Rivett, 2014, p. 563). The ensuing struggle to proselytize the indigenous would lead to the further devastating King Philip's War (1675-1676) (Lepore, 1998, p. xx). The War killed almost all of those who had survived the earlier epidemics. Their communities were decimated by these encounters, severely endangering their Wôpanâak language and culture with them (O'Brien & Jennings, 1999, p. 6). Many survivors moved away and joined other tribes, such as the Wabanaki (Kushinka, 2015, "The Wampanoag Language:

A Tale of Revival”). The Federation’s diaspora communities, and those who remained, were in this way forced to learn other languages for survival.

The Wampanoag left an imprint on the English language though, which shows that at least early in the relationship, English may not have been the dominant language. This was directly because the English colonizers were forced to rely on the indigenous communities early on. “The language brought to the English lexicon words like pumpkin (spelled pohpukun in Wopanaotooaok), moccasin (mahkus), skunk (sukok), powwow (pawaw), and Massachusetts (masachoosut)” (Marcelo, 2017). The Wampanoag previously recognized the importance of language because of their need to communicate with other tribes. So, early in their encounters with Europeans this linguistic power struggle was already known to them. Almost immediately in their dealings with the indigenous, the Europeans needed to employ Americans as interpreters. Their knowledge of multiple indigenous languages made them naturally better equipped and valuable as interpreters. The Europeans had likely only had prior familiarity with other European languages and needed to communicate with many different indigenous groups. This awareness of the importance of language, by both sides, supported the creation of early written records in Wôpanâak. In addition to the first American indigenous language translation of the Bible, an *Indian Primer* was designed to teach the written language (Rivett, 2014, pp. 563-564), and even some legal documents were produced in Wôpanâak.

When these indigenous groups first came into contact with explorers, fishermen and traders, initial contact was peaceful for the most part, but European diseases ravaged the communities, regardless of the explorers intents (Harper & Ranco, 2009, p. 28;

O'Brien & Jennings, 1999, p. 6). When European settlers arrived in New England, they quickly realized they needed to rely on the already beleaguered tribes to survive the harsh new climate (Travers, 1957, p. 13). The natives were accustomed to trading with other tribes, and these initial encounters with Europeans were most frequently peaceful, and for familiar purposes of trade. The Europeans did not treat the indigenous well long term though. As settlement colonization began, disputes with the indigenous increased in frequency and severity (O'Brien & Jennings, 1999, p. 6; Belmessous, 2011, pp. 2-3).

To justify their later treatment of the natives, the groups of indigenous they encountered were conceptualized as Noble Savages (Lutri, 1975, pp. 210-211); yet despite the aid given, the indigenous still had to be viewed as savage to justify colonial actions. Thus, the British conceptualized and also justified a large part of their colonizing missions as needing to proselytize the indigenous they were cohabitating alongside.

The charter of the Massachusetts Bay Company said that the principal aim of the English colony was to 'incite' the Native peoples to accept and practice the Christian religion. Certain laws were even passed later to ensure that the Indians would accept Christianity and not practice their own religion. (O'Brien & Jennings, 1999, p. 116)

The Europeans were not only on missions to settle and trade new lands, but also to proselytize and convert new followers to their monotheistic, European religions.

Though there were some allies between the inhabitants, negative European sentiments towards indigenous identities were endemic. "Even the best friends of the native peoples (like Roger Williams) uses words like 'barbarians' and 'savages' when referring to them" (*Records of the Colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, in New England*, Vol. I, 1636-1663; In O'Brien & Jennings, 1999, p. 12). Another great ally of New England indigenous, Daniel Gookin, was the Superintendent of the Indians for

Massachusetts Colony. This post was akin to a modern-day Bureau of Indian Affairs Head, making him a powerful friend. Yet, his official government account of the traditional Wampanoag and other indigenous in the region recounted

The customs and manners of these Indians were, and yet are, in many places brutish and barbarous in several respects, like unto other savage people of America... They are very revengeful, and will not be unmindful to take vengeance upon such as have injured them or their kindred... They are naturally much addicted to lying and speaking untruth; and unto stealing, especially from the English. (Gookin, 1674, p. 9; In O'Brien & Jennings, 1999, p. 12)

Thus, even colonial allies of the indigenous were severely biased, a trend already shown to be out of necessity for European expansions, be it for religion or state.

The Wampanoag language declined rapidly as a spoken language under colonial policies, but mostly due to the great loss of life. Colonialism had a devastating effect on loss of human life within the Wampanoag nation, and, “like hundreds of other native tongues, [Wôpanâak] fell victim to the erosion of indigenous culture through centuries of colonialism” (Marcelo, 2017). It is believed that the language passed quietly towards the end of the nineteenth century. Today, Wôpanâak is an incredibly special language though, because there has been a modern revival of the language by Wampanoag descendants, effectively having brought their language back from the dead. It had not been spoken formally or colloquially for nearly a century when its community decided to revive it (Marcelo, 2017). Unlike Hebrew, the language was no longer spoken in any formal or informal domains outside the use of words that were adopted by English, like pumpkin and moccasin, and place names, like Massachusetts and Chappaquiddick. It is because of the existence of the early Bible translation and other teaching and legal documents, that tribe members and linguists were able to piece together their Wôpanâak language. Words that were missing from these documents could be approximated based

on the language's close relation to neighboring Algonquian languages, either still alive, or with recent documentation (*We Still Live Here: Âs Nutayuneân*, Makepeace, 2011). Wôpanâak is the first known case of successfully bringing a language so moribund back from the dead.

Colonial Causes of Loss of Indigenous Life

The Wabanaki Confederacy was removed from the early colonial settlements in New England, probably in part because their environments were harsher than those of the Massachusetts colonies. Their early contact though, with explorers, fishermen and traders, did not spare them from the epidemics that also laid waste to more southern indigenous neighbors. Epidemics began to severely affect the Wabanaki communities in 1616 when, “as much as 75% of the Wabanaki population in Maine [succumbed to illness], and many coastal villages were entirely abandoned” (Harper & Ranco, 2009, p. 28). There may have been as many as 40,000 Wabanaki before the epidemics began. Deeply diminished after these events, “the primary impacts of these were in the ability of Wabanaki groups to resist European incursion into their territory (Bourque 1989; Prins 1995; Harper & Ranco, 2009, p. 28). The Wabanaki were able to overcome these devastating losses, but not without sacrificing some of their territories to French and British settlers. They regrouped following their losses and created new communities for the survivors. “The overall subsistence lifestyle, especially east of the Kennebec River, was not greatly impacted, as Wabanaki leaders routinely regrouped families in familiar territory after such dramatic events,” (Harper & Ranco, 2009, p. 28). These epidemics

would continue through into the eighteenth century, until the indigenous had finally built up enough immunity for European diseases to be inconsequential.

Much like the Wabanaki, “several devastating epidemics between 1612-1619 brought by European explorers reduced the [Wampanoag] Indian populations along the coast by up to 90% of the original population” (O’Brien & Jennings, 1999, p. 6). Squanto, a future Wampanoag interpreter for the British, greeted the Pilgrims upon their arrival at Plymouth Rock, and bridged communities with the Pilgrims, but he also personally experienced these horrors. “When the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth (Patuxet) in 1620, fewer than 2,000 mainland Wampanoag had survived out of the original population of up to 12,000-15,000. The island Wampanoag were protected somewhat by their relative isolation and still had 3,000” (O’Brien & Jennings, 1999, p. 6). Decades before, Squanto had been kidnapped by explorers and brought to Europe where he was educated. Squanto eventually earned his freedom and accompanied a group of Europeans back to New England. “Upon returning to the new colony, Squanto discovered that his fellow Patuxet and most of the individuals from two neighboring coastal tribes had died as a result of a plague” (Kushinka, 2015, “The Wampanoag Language: A Tale of Revival”). Despite the devastation to his community, Squanto had served as a pseudo interpreter between what remained of his community and the Plymouth Pilgrims. “After the English Puritan settlement of modern-day Massachusetts in 1630, epidemics continued to reduce mainland Wampanoag until there were only 1,000 by 1675,” (O’Brien & Jennings, 1999, p. 6). One can imagine how the devastating psychological effects on survivors of these communities, and their desperate need for assistance, could have further lasting impacts.

The Wampanoag fought directly against the English during the brief and brutal King Philip's War (1675-1676). The war was so named by the British victors for Metacom, the youngest son of Massasoit who was there to first greet the Pilgrims, and who had come to be known as King Philip among the English (Lepore, 1998, p. xx). The Wampanoag fought to protect their territories and to push back the English colonizers threatening their resources and forcing their submission. The winners were to obtain the land, and rule over the other side. This was a violent dispute specifically between the Wampanoag and their colonizers, but it came to involve other tribes as well, even including the Wabanaki. The War was still particularly devastating to the Wampanoag populations though. "It is believed that only 400 Wampanoags survived King Philip's War in 1676 and remained in this region" (O'Brien & Jennings, 1999, p. 6). There were after effects following the war that were further detrimental to linguistic vitality. Those who remained were already in severe danger of losing their language entirely. After epidemics and then wars, and, "with the male population decimated, many Wampanoag women ended up marrying outside of the community, which contributed greatly to the decline in the use of the language" (Kushinka, 2015, "The Wampanoag Language: A Tale of Revival"). Out of necessity for survival, what remained of the indigenous were forced to integrate into other communities, further forcing language shift.

The initial cause of the conflict was due to the death of John Sassamon, a Wampanoag Protestant convert, who had an important role in assisting John Eliot in his Bible translation of Wôpanâak. Sassamon had not only shared their heritage language with the English, but he also warned them of Metacom's plans to attack the British for their continued claims to Wampanoag lands. "The fighting... began in June 1675, when

three men were hanged by the neck not far from Plymouth Rock. They had been convicted of murdering... John Sassamon,” (Lepore, 1998, p. xi). Sassamon will come up again when proselytization and *Eliot’s Bible* are discussed. The ensuing war was disastrous for both sides, and had the Wompanoag not suffered from disease prior, they likely could have beaten the English.

In spite of British efforts to teach the Wampanoag to read in order to proselytize their communities, the written language remained an English domain. In spite of the brutal reactions to this power struggle,

King Philip’s War is almost as remarkable for how much the colonists wrote about it: more than four hundred letters written during the war survive in New England archives alone, along with more than thirty editions of twenty different printed accounts. (Lepore, 1998, p. xiii)

The English victors had the historical advantage to write about the atrocities they experienced and were able to literarily justify the retaliatory atrocities they themselves committed against the Wampanoag. Despite the fact that Wôpanâak had been given voice through proselytization, this was truly for English means, and not actually for Wampanoag use. Though much existed in the way of Wampanoag documents, these were surrounding just teaching and proselytizing.

And, in the end, their writings proved to be pivotal to their victory, a victory that drew new, firmer boundaries between English and Indian people, between English and Indian land, and between what it meant to be ‘English’ and what it meant to be ‘Indian’. (Lepore, 1998, p. xiii)

These British records were used to justify British encroachment onto Wampanoag territories, and the result was the near destruction of the Wampanoag Federation, and complete British control of what remained of Wampanoag lands. This was the ironic culmination of the Wampanoag’s early recognition of the importance of language.

This English documentation follows the strong trend of language documentation begun before this war, by proselytization. The cause of King Philip's War is likely a combination of factors, and not just British colonial incursions or proselytization alone. Colonialism not only created a power struggle between the colonizers and would be colonized, but it proliferated any struggles that already existed between indigenous inhabitants. There were not only land and resource disputes between the British and the Wampanoag, but also between the Wampanoag and other indigenous tribes.

Very few records exist documenting the [spoken and written] words of native peoples in historic times. Thus, for example, if one desires to know about the causes and events of the King Philip's War (1675-1676), all that is available are the words of the conquering Europeans whose words sometimes seem like... stories not meant to be taken seriously. (O'Brien & Jennings, 1999, pp. 10-11)

Despite *Eliot's Bible*, *Indian Primer*, or any other early records of the Wôpanâak language, again, the written documentation and translation of Wôpanâak was for English means and never really meant for Wompanoag use alone.

Wars during this period were not always the colonizers directly against the indigenous. A primary reason for forming the Wabanaki Confederacy was that "when any of the Wabanaki allies were menaced with war it was, of course, their right to call upon the other three for support" (Speck, 1915, p. 502). In many instances the indigenous were coerced, or forced even, to fight alongside the lesser evil of opposing colonizing factions. The French and Indian War spanned over 75 years from 1688-1763 and is a good example of indigenous Americans choosing sides with the French or British in their border and trade war. Tribes of the Wabanaki Confederacy were forced to choose between supporting different sides due to the expanse of their collective territories. The French and Indian War was unusual, because nations of the Confederacy were physically

on separate sides of the battles between New France and New England. The causes of Wabanaki tribes choosing different sides to fight with during the conflict “focus on the dispute over territory between the Wabanaki, otherwise known as the Dawn Land people, the French of Canada, and the English of New England at the turn of the eighteenth century” (Belmessous, 2011, p. 1). The Penobscot Tribes of the Confederacy from northern Maine and southeastern Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia were well documented as actively involved in the war, fighting alongside the French. The French benefited tremendously from their local knowledge and heritage of faring through the harsh climate of the region.

Ultimately, the British did win though, and the French were forced to cede all of their territory East of the Mississippi and French Louisiana to Spain.

By the Treaty of Utrecht, France ceded to Great Britain her claims on Newfoundland, the Hudson Bay territories, and Acadia. This cession would generate endless disputes between France and Great Britain as the borders of Hudson Bay were not delimited and those of Acadia were also contested. (Belmessous, 2011, p. 3)

These transfers of territory consolidated North America for Britain and would ensure English and Spanish as the dominant languages in the Americas. In choosing sides, the Wabanaki tribes were making a calculated estimation of how to best retain their territories. They had very different relationships with the French and British, often dependent on each tribe’s proximity to the European colonizers.

Wabanaki claims reveal that indigenous peoples could position themselves in the contests between other nations as much through legal as military means. They also illustrate the extraordinary degree to which European legal claims could be, in fact, a response to indigenous claims. (Belmessous, 2011, p. 2)

French colonizers had settled on Wabanaki lands only with their permission and agreeing to remain in unoccupied areas. They had come to form these relationships with the

French initially through trade relations, then followed by relatively successful (peaceful) proselytization.

The Confederacy's relationship with the British was in stark contrast though. The Wabanaki had also allowed the English to settle their lands and build posts where they could trade pelts for European goods at favorable rates. ... The Wabanaki resented English violations of these reservations and constantly reminded the English that they had no title to settlements that remained Wabanaki property. (Belmessous, 2011, p. 2)

This tension was soon accompanied by a series of confrontations with tribes of the Confederacy, and retaliatory attacks by the British settlers. During this period of attacking each other, there were many treaties put into place to attempt peace between the two societies, however the English consistently failed to follow these deals. "Constant British encroachments on Wabanaki territory created much tension between the two peoples, which fed a continuing cycle of diplomatic negotiations and violent clashes" (Belmessous, 2011, p. 3). Though these attacks remained consistently as the Wabanaki against the British, the violence within an already stressed community naturally caused issues within the Confederation as well.

The Wabanaki tribes disagreed on how to deal with the British, and this led to the Confederacy's division during the French and Indian War when "some Wabanaki supported the French alliance whereas others favored the English and a third faction promoted neutrality" (Belmessous, 2011, p. 3). Though the French did offer more support for the Wabanaki than the English, their intentions were still self-interested. "The French also supported Wabanaki land claims, as those lands would constitute a buffer zone between French and English settlements" (Belmessous, 2011, p. 6). This shows that even if European intentions may have seemed altruistic, such as with the translation of *Eliot's Bible*, European imperial expansion was still at the crux of their backings. These factors

made for a long and brutal period of incursions spanning the entirety of the 75 years long French and Indian War, and one without clear or fair resolution for the ancestral inhabitants of the territories in dispute.

Colonial Proselytization and Language Documentation

As just also shown through indigenous loss of life, motivated justification for settling in the New World was the proselytization of indigenous peoples. When missionaries arrived in the New World they were met with languages unlike any previously encountered in Europe, the Middle East, Africa or Asia. In order to truly convert someone, they must be able to understand religious doctrine, and American indigenous languages lacked systems of writing and recording akin to European writing. Therefore, in order to make European religions accessible to the indigenous languages, they needed to be able to express European concepts of God, faith and spirit in the indigenous languages; these were ideas that rarely translated well. In order to best communicate then, the indigenous had to necessarily be recruited into the process. “The Mi’kmaq and Wampanoag language texts... exist today due to indigenous contributions to missionary linguistics” (Rivett, 2014, pp. 553-554). Without the involvement of the indigenous in these processes, they likely would have been impossible for the European proselytizers.

The unintended consequence of this was that writing these languages down held value for future maintenance, RLS and revival efforts. For both Wabanaki and Wampanoag languages, colonial proselytization had the positive outcome of documentation.

As a partial consequence of these surviving texts, Mi'kmaq is one of the few remaining eastern Algonquian languages still spoken, with an estimated three thousand native speakers. Wampanoag, though one of the first eastern Algonquian languages declared dead, is currently undergoing a massive project of revitalization. (Rivett, 2014, p. 553)

This documentation would be later used for saving these languages through maintenance, RLS and revival efforts. “The indigenous influence on these texts helps to explain the irony that the very agent of cultural effacement also preserved the raw material for future revitalization projects,” (Rivett, 2014, p. 554). This will be taken up further below and was very important to the successes of the Wabanaki and Wampanoag languages.

Europeans were very adept at justifying their actions against indigenous peoples. The name of religion was their greatest tool of empire building, justifying their need to expand and convert and justifying their gross actions while expanding and converting. Their second greatest tool of empire building, shown throughout periods of colonization, nationalism and globalism, was language. European missionaries harnessed the power of language and used it to justify their actions in the name of religion. “Remedying the effects of Babel required both studying the ancient scriptural languages of Hebrew and Greek and sanctifying vernacular languages so that they could be put on the same footing as the traditionally understood sacred languages” (Rivett, 2014, pp. 553-554). In this way, language takes on an ephemeral quality, as being God-created, and not a natural device of man. By harnessing indigenous languages in order to convert their speakers to European Christian monotheism, indigenous languages are raised in God’s esteem. “Eliot places Wampanoag directly within this mystical language scheme” in his own justifications for writing down Wôpanâak, creating a Bible translation in the indigenous language, and writing a teaching manual, the *Indian Primer*, so that the Wampanoag

could absorb Protestant gospel (Rivett, 2014, p. 556). In this way, he justified his use of the indigenous language to proselytize, as well as justifying the necessity of proselytization.

John Eliot and John Sassamon have already been mentioned for their importance to the Wampanoag history with Puritanical proselytizing. Their efforts created a written record of Wôpanâak that survived long past the spoken language itself. The opportunity to justify British colonization of Wampanoag territories through conversion of the Wampanoag indigenous, held great value to the British colonizers. For his work, Eliot was not only supported monetarily, but the Puritans were even gifted a printing press by Great Britain very early in American history. “Eliot attempted to understand an entirely foreign syntax, to transform an oral language into a written one, and then to translate Christian sermons, primers, Bibles, and conversion tracts into Wampanoag” (Rivett, 2014, p. 550). Eliot took his mission even further, too. He sought to improve the Wôpanâak language, and he had at his disposal the power of the press and an empire behind him fully backing this work.

It was important to the British colonizers, and even more specifically, to the Puritans, that there be justification for the uncivilized acts committed against the indigenous New England populations whose lands they had come to inhabit.

[Eliot's] aim was not simply to make these Christian texts intelligible to his native proselytes but also to transform the language itself from what Eliot perceived as its fallen and savage status into a redeemed Algonquian language capable of conveying Christian truths in a new form. (Rivett, 2014, pp. 550-551)

He believed that by raising the language in God's esteem, he was also raising the indigenous speakers out of their savageness. Despite religious justification though, it was

directly against colonial Puritan faith, and all other European faiths, to act with such brutality against other human beings.

Jesus Christ did not teach his followers to steal land from God's other children. He did not tell anyone it was his father's will to trick people into giving over their land when they were first made drunk, and then lied to about what making marks on paper meant. Or threatened with death if they did not do what the English wanted them to do in the name of Jesus Christ. (O'Brien & Jennings, 1999, p. 8)

This Christian guilt was palpable, and Eliot provided a release from the guilt through his work on the Wôpanâak language. "Through Eliot's translation, the sacred essence of Algonquian words had been unlocked," (Rivett, 2014, p. 568). In doing so, he not only justified their actions, but also lessened the severity of their actions because they could then be viewed as means to an end.

Eliot's work was monumental and so comprehensive that it was used to assist in justifying and proliferating European colonization elsewhere in the world after. "In 1663 Eliot printed the first edition of *Mamusse wunneetupanatamwe up biblum God*, which has become known as the *Eliot Bible* and is one of the first complete Bibles published in a non-Western language" (Rivett, 2014, p. 563). Eliot's methods were brought back to Europe with his Bible and adopted by other missionizing efforts. His work was so "in line with the interests of his patrons in London as Royal Society members worked to produce Gaelic, Lithuanian, and Turkish Bibles as well" (Rivett, 2014, p. 563). It was not just that he had translated the Bible, he had found a way to do so that stayed close to original doctrine, and simplified the teaching process, essentially harnessing the power of language. This trend in documenting and translating languages eventually manifested in the field of linguistics, and the formation of the Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Eliot's insights into how best to teach the doctrine in the new written language quickly followed his Bible. He immediately began working on how to teach literacy, as literacy was the next required step for the Wampanoag to be able to read and learn from his Bible translation.

Speaking to the significance of literacy as a prerequisite for implementing Protestantism in the indigenous community, the *Indian Primer* partook of a long tradition of Protestant primers and catechisms, which paradoxically sought both to inculcate a personalized faith by teaching Protestants how to read the Bible and to instill uniformity by uniting creed and alphabet. (Rivett, 2014, pp. 563-564)

Again, Eliot set a new precedence for proselytization with this codification for teaching literacy, and he had a printing press at his disposal to help achieve this goal. His ideas would continue to spread throughout the colonized world over the next 400 years, into the contemporary. It can and should even be considered that Eliot's contributions are still today supporting language documentation and learning.

Proselytization within the Wabanaki was quite different from that of the Wampanoag, beyond the obvious differences of French colonies versus British colonies, Franciscan conversion versus Puritan conversion, *and* spanning two separate colonial territories. It is interesting what the two proselytizing religions had in common, their need for justification to settle through proselytizing. Yet, proselytization manifested quite differently between the two European colonizers. "Whereas the Puritans made literacy almost a prerequisite for conversion... Chrestien Le Clercq and his successor, Pierre Maillard, actively discouraged it" (Rivett, 2014, p. 559). This left the methods and degree of creating ways to transfer the Franciscan gospel more flexible, and the interaction between the two speech communities played out rather differently.

Le Clercq acknowledged the difficulty of transferring these ideas into the Mi'kmaq language.

How could the cosmology of a Franciscan Recollect be successfully translated into a language that was exceedingly difficult to learn, that bore no resemblance to European tongues, and, perhaps most important, that espoused a very different understanding of the relationship between matter and spirit? (Rivett, 2014, p. 550)

Le Clercq's solution to this impasse was not to translate the gospel into Mi'kmaq as Eliot had, but to re-write the gospel through already understood Mi'kmaq concepts of the cosmos. As an example of this,

the Sun God created a man and woman who bore numerous children. Soon the children started to kill one another, and the sun wept with grief. The tears created a flood over earth that destroyed all but the good relatives, who then received from the Sun God basic survival skills for living on earth. (Rivett, 2014, p. 577)

This perhaps required a deeper understanding of the indigenous culture by Le Clercq than Eliot, but made the task of understanding easier for the Wabanaki than for the Wampanoag.

In addition to needing a creative means to interpret the gospel to the Wabanaki indigenous, Le Clercq still needed a way to translate the gospel through written record. This was a necessary tool for proselytizing, as already shown with Puritanism's required literacy and *Eliot's Bible* and *Indian Primer*. So, Le Clercq "came up with a creative solution, devising a system of 'characters,' which he claimed were based on Mi'kmaq hieroglyphs; these characters were refashioned to accord with Catholic prayers and written on birch bark in charcoal" (Rivett, 2014, p. 550). Mi'kmaq, in this way was not actually recorded in a European writing system, and there were unique benefits to this. For one, Franciscan gospel was made even more accessible for the Wabanaki than by

Eliot's methods. At the same time, it helped to preserve the Mi'kmaq language and their indigenous form of writing.

In the absence of a printing press, he made the new Franciscan gospel familiar to the Wabanaki from the outset by producing his teachings on a common medium for them. "Le Clercq recorded his ideograms on sheets of birch bark, which were distributed to Mi'kmaq families" (Rivett, 2014, p. 578). Though intimately distinct, the distribution was, "in much the same manner that the *Indian Primer* was distributed to Wampanoag families" (Rivett, 2014, p. 578). The Micmac coveted their own birch bark records, and by using these, he placed the Franciscan gospel at the same level of recorded language importance as their own records of Mi'kmaq language. Of course, though this was at the time a further detriment to the survival of the language, causing language shift, it added to anthropological records of the language.

An interesting coincidence that aided Le Clercq's efforts was the use of the cross in Wabanaki hieroglyphs, prior to the French's arrival. "Beginning in the sixteenth century, cross-bearing Europeans started traveling to the banks of Maritime Canada for fishing and trade" (Rivett, 2014, p. 582). There were already many transient colonists at this time, and they may have traded these idols for supplies from the tribes. It is possible that the same groups, who brought the Christian cross to indigenous people, brought with it their European diseases, which unleashed so much pain. Given the transient nature of these colonizers, there were fewer proselytization pressures put on the indigenous, such as would have been felt from settlement or exploitation colonizers.

During these years, the Mi'kmaq did not convert to Christianity, so the cross took on an entirely different meaning within their culture. By the time Le Clercq settled in Gaspé, the cross had been fully incorporated into Mi'kmaq shamanistic and diplomatic rituals. (Rivett, 2014, p. 582)

This Wabanaki knowledge of the cross came without the negative connotations that the image of a cross might have had for other indigenous who came into immediate contact with settlement colonizers, like the Wompanoag and their early contact with the Pilgrims and Puritanism.

Much like Puritan Christianity, Le Clercq's Franciscan faith required him to attempt justifying French actions and intentions. "...Le Clercq used his own discovery of the symbol of the cross among the Gaspesian Indians as evidence that France's New World conquest was providentially designed," (Rivett, 2014, p. 583). This divine approval empowered France's conquest to colonize and proselytize. The existence of the cross already in Wabanaki visual culture is similar to how Eliot saw his work releasing, "the sacred essence of Algonquian words" (Rivett, 2014, p. 568). The aspect of the divinity lends a stronger mission to colonization, and not only justifies the right to colonize, but also any immoral actions that coincide to promote the mission of colonization. Language, being such a great tool of empire building, was used to assist with colonizing and proselytizing in all five mentioned cases of successful language maintenance. Language shift because of empire building was the root cause of endangerment to Catalan, Irish, Hebrew, Maliseet-Passamaquoddy and Wôpanâak.

Despite the atrocities that followed proselytization, and the erosion of linguistic biodiversity that it has caused worldwide, the documentation of indigenous languages was an extremely powerful benefit. Documentation has been one of the most important forces that kept languages around longer than if there had been no written record of them through colonialism, nationalism and globalism. "American Indian language texts contain a contested history of modernity's own legacies of loss as well as a record of the counter

availing promise of language survival and revitalization that is being practiced among Mi'kmaq and Wampanoag descendants today” (Rivett, 2014, p. 588). These two cases were chosen in part due to the volume of documentation created for Europeans’ broad efforts to proselytize and colonize these indigenous communities, as their documentation is the key to their current existence and states of linguistic vitality.

Imperialist Civic and Ethnic Nationalisms

The American indigenous had different conceptions of land ownership. In contrast to European understandings of ownership, the indigenous viewed land and natural resources as not to be really owned, but rather more so, as leased (Anaya, 2004, pp. 26-29). So they were treated as squatters, and indigenous territories were claimed and purchased by the European colonizers (Nettle & Romaine, 2000, p. 90). The vast territories that they had once inhabited were divided into states, and sold as private and public properties. The indigenous were granted limited space on reservations, with limited resources, in exchange for what they gave up. New, foreign, federal regulations surrounding land rights then governed the indigenous and their homelands. As a further impact, they were made to give up their traditional ways of life under this new governance, losing much of their culture along with the land (*Dawnland*, (Mazo & Duthu, 2018). In all scenarios of indigenous contact with European colonizers, new territory was seen as valuable, and in most instances, involuntarily ceded to Europeans.

The collective bargaining power of the Wabanaki Confederacy is best shown through its successful negotiations. In addition to calling on other tribes for military support, the Wabanaki were able to call on each other to form negotiation coalitions. This

perk of membership has also successfully withstood imperial changes through nationalism and globalism even until today.

The Passamaquoddy-Penobscott settlement, which came after a complex process of negotiation that engaged the White House, involved a congressionally approved transfer of \$54.5 million to purchase land for the tribes and an additional \$27 million to be divided evenly between the Passamaquoddies and Penobscots. (Anaya, 2004, p. 203)

Even though today the Wabanaki occupy just a sliver of the lands they once inhabited, the Confederacy's collective bargaining power has done a great deal for the tribes.

Following the Colonial Period, despite better fitting within European spaces, the New England indigenous still did not physically fit the new mold of American. Social and political campaigns which sought to Americanize these uprooted communities were common practice. Policies of taking indigenous children from their families and tribes and sending them to English language boarding schools, carried through from seventeenth and eighteenth century colonialism into eighteenth and nineteenth century nationalism. Once at these schools, the children were forced to forget their heritage cultures and languages, and forced to replace them with U.S. ideals of Americanism. Though the children may have entered these schools fluent in their indigenous languages and with little to no knowledge of English, they would often be punished for using their mother tongues (*Dawnland*, Mazo & Duthu, 2018), just as under British colonial rule in Ireland.

The recent documentary, *Dawnland* (Mazo & Duthu, 2018), about the Truth and Reconciliation Committee formed by the State of Maine to address the history of colonization and gross atrocities exercised against the Wabanaki indigenous of Maine, looks mainly at indigenous child welfare. The film shows interviews and stories from

Wabanaki members of childhoods ripped from their communities and forced to live in boarding schools and with foster families. In these places they experienced the horrors of having their languages and cultures torn away from them. They were punished for their indigenous-ness and shamed for their heritages. One woman tells the story of having her mouth washed out with soap, and another tells of being bathed in bleach. These stories all occurred after the 1978 Indian Child Welfare Act, with the transfer of indigenous children moving from boarding schools to private families of European descent (Mazo & Duthu, 2018). These children suffered in solitude through cultural genocide, away from their communities. They were ripped from their families, on the basis of their indigenous-ness, without due justification, and intentionally placed outside of their families and communities, not even considering other relatives as options.

This caused not only their shift from using indigenous languages to using English, but also very negative trends in attitudes towards their cultures and languages. They were taught to be ashamed of the rich cultural histories that they came from and were made fearful of holding onto those traditions (*Dawnland*, Mazo & Duthu, 2018). This had further effects as well. Upon leaving these schools and returning to their indigenous communities, these sentiments followed them, disrupting intergenerational language transmission further, and erasing entire cultures along with it. These practices were a direct cause of the dire state of indigenous language diversity in New England today, with many languages already gone, and those that remain composed of very few aging speakers.

Despite colonial boarding school practices of forcefully taking indigenous children ending, indigenous child welfare has remained a problematic subject as colonial

policies merely morphed through re-writing. With the end of state-imposed boarding schools for indigenous children, came the rise of placing indigenous children within the welfare system. Instead indigenous children were taken from their families and tribes, and sent to live with foster families, instead of available family members. These foster families were often white and saw part of their duty to these children to rid them of their native-ness (*Dawnland*, Mazo & Duthu, 2018). The intent was exactly as it had been with boarding schools, to Americanize them, and to erase their indigenous cultural traits. The children were subjected to similar treatments and abuses as they had been within the boarding schools, not only degrading their knowledge of their heritage cultures and languages, but again adding to negative sentiments and shame for their native-ness (*Dawnland*, Mazo & Duthu, 2018). One could argue that this new welfare system may have even been worse than the boarding schools, as they were even more alone in these circumstances, away from their families, their communities, and any other indigenous peoples who might have lent comfort in their torture. The effects of these mal-treatments clearly resulted in ethnic nationalism within the United States, like that now seen with the Wabanaki and Wampanoag.

The Wabanaki and Wampanoag communities were profoundly affected by waves of both civic and ethnic nationalism. Ironically, and similarly to Irish, Catalan and Hebrew, the drivers of civic nationalism (and causes of language endangerment and death) likewise provided the master plans to rallying indigenous ethnic nationalisms. The initial blueprints for civic nationalism are considered to have been born out of the French and American Revolutions (Mar-Molinero, 2000, p. 6). North American indigenous peoples would have felt the effects of this civic nationalism from the onset of

colonialism, and especially so during the American Revolution. Over a hundred years before the American Revolution, similar concepts were already being used to justify colonization, despite colonizers adversity to ethnic nationalism (Anderson, 2006, p. 163). The birth of the United States failed to include the indigenous inhabitants within the newly formed nation long before its independence. The subjugation and abuse that followed necessarily required a reaction from the indigenous.

The Wabanaki understood the power of affiliation before even first contact. They recognized the power that came from working alongside other indigenous groups, forming a coalition, to better actualize their collective goals. Frank G. Speck, in his 1915 description of the Wabanaki, even describes them by their civic nationalism. What he leaves out is their ethnic traits in common, or ethnic nationalism. “As I have indicated, the Penobscot, Passamaquoddy, Malecite, and Micmac, forming the Wabanaki group, has a certain national identity based, of course, upon their common interest” (Speck, 1915, p. 498). The Wabanaki are often referred to as the Abenaki, and when referred to as the Abenaki, the group was likely also considered to include other Algonquian peoples that had migrated north due to encroaching colonialism. The Wabanaki nations are, “culturally close related, and the Europeans found it hard to distinguish one tribe from another. For this reason, the French called them ‘Abénaquis’ while the English generally referred to them as,” the New England Algonquian Nation (Belmessous, 2011, p. 2). Thus there is a lot of inconsistency over how to name the groups within the different sources. What the Europeans did recognize though was their understanding of nationalism and their ability to organize as such.

To protect the banded relationships within the Wabanaki Confederacy, there were checks put into place to protect their group's democracy. "One of the side provisions of the Wabanaki alliance, which united the tribes by bonds in which each tribe had a share in the making, was the policy of electing each other's head chiefs" (Speck, 1915, p. 503). By all tribes having a say over who is best placed to lead their nation, keeping with the best interests of all Wabanaki nations, all groups had a say over the fairness of any single nomination for leadership. There was more than this that came out of their alliance though. In addition to the tribes electing, "each other's chiefs, [they] called upon each other for aid against outside enemies, and held meetings to treat upon matters which affected their common interests" (Speck, 1915, p. 498). The trust that was placed in each other through these agreements created a powerful, bonded relationship.

This relationship showed a familial relationship, lending further strength to the ethnic ties between the Wabanaki nations within the Confederacy.

The four tribes, whose native names have been previously given, were graded in the following order. The Penobscot came first and were referred to as... 'our elder brothers,' the Passamaquoddy, Malecite, and Micmac came next, in the order given, under the appellation of... our younger brothers.' (Speck, 1915, p. 499)

The Penobscot were probably listed as the elder brothers in this scenario as they were the largest of the tribes. Recall that Speck listed the Penobscot as occupying two regions, "Penobscot bay and river," (1915, p. 493). Looking at Maine today, there are five autonomous regions inhabited by the Wabanaki, and two of these are Penobscot dedicated reservations (Four Directions Development Corporation, 2018). The Wabanaki Confederacy has recently experienced a revival of ethnic nationalism, resulting in a surge of community involvement for preserving and strengthening their cultural heritage (Passamaquoddy Tribe at Pleasant Point, 2014, "Passamaquoddy," para. 1). This neo-

ethnic nationalism was shown previously when documentation, maintenance, revival and RLS efforts for Maliseet-Passamaquoddy were emphasized.

Today the Wampanoag are renewed with their own national pride as well, reclaiming their linguistic heritage through Wampanoag language immersion classes and Wampanoag schools. This has not always been the case though, as the tribe was left so decimated after the colonial period. An indigenous nationalism movement put into motion first by other American indigenous inspired the Wampanoag. “During the first few decades of the 20th century, the Pan-Indian movement was sweeping across the continent. This movement, a counteraction to the dominant culture of the United States, was a means for Indians to reinforce their ‘Indianness,’” (Weinstein-Farson, 1988, p. 75). This ethnic nationalism had much in common with the ethnic nationalisms seen in Ireland, Spain, Israel, and among the Wabanaki. The Wabanaki Confederacy was quite unique in the region though.

Before the arrival of Europeans, most Indian tribes had kept to themselves, interacting on occasion with similar neighboring tribes to form loose alliances against hostile tribes. Following the contact period, the few confederated activities that occurred, such as their participation in the French and Indian Wars and King Philip’s War, had ended in failure. (Weinstein-Farson, 1988, p. 75)

As already seen with the Wabanaki, their alliance was threatened by European expansion, despite their acknowledgement of its importance for their victory.

Yet the Wabanaki ideas of building coalitions were somehow also present within the Pan-Indian movement that inspired the Wampanoag.

By the early 20th century, several Indian leaders and tribes had come to see the value in working together to press for their rights against the government bureaucracy – and to assert their unique Indian identity, which they realized they were losing. (Weinstein-Farson, 1988, p. 75)

It is interesting that despite the early Wabanaki understanding of the importance of collective bargaining power, that it would take so long for these ideas to spread to other indigenous groups so nearby.

Eben Queppish and Nelson Simons, members of the Wampanoag Federation, delivered these ideas to their tribe directly, after living away from the Federation. “Queppish had spent much of his childhood dressing up as an ‘Indian’ to participate in ‘Wild West’ shows in Montana. ... Simons had been educated at the Carlisle Indian School in Pennsylvania” (Weinstein-Farson, 1988, p. 75). During their time away, they had both experienced first hand the racism that had led to the erosion of their indigenous community. “Backed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the [Carlisle] school’s purpose was to educate young Indians from across the country to be good U.S. citizens” (Weinstein-Farson, 1988, pp. 75-76). The abuses that they experienced long after colonization surely fueled their affections for the Pan-Indian movement and inspired them to return home. “During the 1920s, Queppish and Simons... were instrumental in organizing the Wampanoag Nation, a confederacy of communities that would function as a political entity and strengthen its members’ Indian identity” (Weinstein-Farson, 1988, p. 76). Prior to this movement, the Wampanoag had all but lost their traditional culture. Yet after, “one sees today marriages, burials, council meetings, powwows, social gatherings, sacred tobacco ceremonies, sweats, and the like, which, although modified and adapted over the years, nonetheless embrace *nukkône mayash* – the ways of the ancient ones” (O’Brien & Jennings, 1999, p. 10). Queppish and Simons actions indirectly led to today’s miraculous revival of the Wôpanâak language. Despite this not even being a goal of their efforts, the seed had been planted. “The Wampanoag are reconstructing their language spoken in

these woods, fields, lakes and mountains for over 10,000 years. We are now able to say prayers and sing songs in the ancient language” (O’Brien & Jennings, 1999, p. 10). In the next section of this chapter, it will be shown how modern access to improvements in the studies of endangered languages, alongside this renewed ethnic nationalism, have made this revival possible.

In Globalism: Documentation, Maintenance, RLS, and Revival

Globalism has made it easier to access and interact with communities that were once incubated from other parts of the world which may have been changing and homogenizing more rapidly. This access has been multi-lateral as well. These same remote communities are now more able to leave, and globalism has added to the world’s linguistic biodiversity loss as language shift and bilingualism have never occurred at higher rates. Depending on how communities have been affected by colonialism and nationalism, globalism has either sped up language loss, or created an environment that fosters bilingualism. Bilingualism necessarily accompanies language shift. In some positive circumstances, it can incubate an indigenous language and even prolong its existence.

Though technology has been the catalyst for globalism itself, and language endangerment and death during globalism, it has also generated new methods for recording and sharing through both audio and visual sources that have deeply impacted language shift and learning. This has enhanced language learning and documentation, making them quicker, easier, and more accessible. The Internet has had the same affects, but to exponential degrees. It is now possible to have a real-time conversation with

someone on the other side of the world, and to practice a learned language with a native speaker. As already shown, it has also made possible the existence of language databases, like *Ethnologue*, *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger*, and the Endangered Languages Project. So despite globalism speeding up language shift and die-off, it has also made documentation, maintenance and reversing language shift research and methods accessible to communities where it was previously much more difficult to share. These improvements to the preservation of linguistic diversity have aided in success cases of maintenance and shift.

In the case of the Wabanaki, Language Keepers has served as an invaluable localized database for Maliseet-Passamaquoddy documentation, maintenance, RLS and revival efforts (Language Keepers, 2018, para. 3). The online portal has made methods of language learning and documentation widely available and accessible in ways that it never could have been prior to globalism's technology. Likewise, despite the death of Wôpanâak, the accessibility of improvements to the field of endangered languages has aided the tribe in bringing back their language. The community's colonial interactions with their colonizers left a written legacy of their language, which alongside the aid of linguists could be used to bring the language back (*We Still Live Here: Âs Nutayuneân*, Makepeace, 2011). It is now being taught to children in immersion schools, and adults within the community. But without the global spread of ideas and use of new technology, this incredible revival effort of Wôpanâak probably would never have happened.

Like Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, Wôpanâak belongs to the Algonquian family of languages. "On Martha's Vineyard, the person believed to be the last fluent speaker of the Wampanoag language died in 1890" (Kushinka, 2015, "The Wampanoag Language:

A Tale of Revival,”). Though the Wampanoag language is currently classified as extinct, and for over a century did not have a mother-tongue speaker, the language has recently recouped a single mother-tongue speaker of their ancestral language. The Wôpanâak Language Reclamation Project began in 1993 through efforts initiated by tribes from the Wampanoag Nation (Wôpanâak Language Reclamation Project, 2017, “Wôpanâak Language Reclamation Project”). Wôpanâak is the spelling of Wampanoag using the modern orthography of the language. The Project saw particular traction when Jessie Littledoe Baird, a member of the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe who holds a Master’s of Linguistics from MIT (1996), joined the Project in 1993 (*We Still Live Here: Âs Nutayuneân*, Makepeace, 2011). At the onset, Baird was working alongside groundbreaking linguist, Ken Hale. Hale is celebrated for his contributions to the general study of Native American languages. The Project has seen success in large part because of Baird’s contributions, as well as others with MIT ties. Norvin Richards, an MIT faculty member, and Nitana Hicks, also a member of the Wampanoag Nation, a student of Baird’s in Wôpanâak, and herself having likewise received a Master’s in Linguistics from MIT, were also initially involved (*We Still Live Here: Âs Nutayuneân*, Makepeace, 2011).

The Project was able to reconstruct Wôpanâak grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary through comparison of other languages within the Algonquian family, and also because there is a large corpus of written documentation of the Wôpanâak language (*We Still Live Here: Âs Nutayuneân*, Makepeace, 2011). John Elliot’s 1663 translation of the Bible was the first complete Biblical translation in this hemisphere, and soon followed by his *Indian Primer*, designed to teach the Wampanoag to then read their

language (Rivett, 2014, pp. 563-564). As well, native speakers wrote a number of legal documents, such as wills and deeds. Hicks, Richards and Baird are currently contributing to Wôpanâak's reclamation through work on pedagogical materials, including a textbook and dictionary. Baird currently teaches the language in the Mashpee area, including a Wôpanâak immersion class that is only open to members of the Wampanoag Nation (Wôpanâak Language Reclamation Project, 2017, "Wôpanâak Language Reclamation Project"). Her daughter is the first native speaker of Wôpanâak in over a century.

Current Linguistic Vitalities and Future Prognoses

Ethnologue lists Maliseet-Passamaquoddy as currently having only 410 speakers, though with an ethnic population of 3,000 people. The language is listed as a 7, Shifting, within *Ethnologue*'s language vitality framework. Though this vitality level is concerning and shows the language to be in significant danger and decline, it is noted that language attitudes remain positive, and that there is a growing interest in the language (Simons & Fennig (eds.), 2018, "Malecite-Passamaquoddy"). This outlook from just *Ethnologue* aligns well with the findings above. UNESCO's *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger* reports that there are 500 total speakers of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, with 400 living in Canada and 100 living in the United States. Despite the slightly higher numbers of speakers listed in this second database, the *Atlas* does list the language as Severely endangered within its language vitality framework (Moseley (ed.), 2010, "Maliseet-Passamaquoddy"). The Endangered Languages Project also reports that there are approximately 500 speakers of the language, fanned out between Maine and New Brunswick. It identifies the language as only 20% likely to survive (Endangered

Languages Project, 2018, “Maliseet-Passamaquoddy”). Though encouraging finding that both the *Atlas* and the Endangered Languages Project list more speakers than *Ethnologue*, their prognoses for the vitality of the language are disheartening.

Turning to Wampanoag, *Ethnologue* does not list any speakers of the language, but does list that there is an ethnic population of 4,000 today. Regardless of having no listed speakers, its vitality is cited as awakening, and the listing makes note of the current revivalist efforts (Simons & Fennig (eds.), 2018, “Wampanoag”). The *Atlas* does not list Wôpanâak at all, in short, because this database does not include any dead languages. The Endangered Languages Project, though listing the language, makes no mention of speakers of the language, though it does bring up the recent revivalist efforts, and death of the language towards the end of the eighteenth century. Wôpanâak is recorded as Awakening, but its chance for survival is unlisted (Endangered Languages Project, 2018, “Wampanoag”).

All of these database listings leave us with grim outlooks for the future of these two languages. Yet their continued survival and continued positive upward attentions are also quite optimistic, and despite the violent histories of these peoples. There are many other New England indigenous languages that experienced less direct contacts with European colonizers and still did not manage to keep their languages alive, however Maliseet-Passamaquoddy and Wôpanâak have survived, for the most part. Their survival has been serendipitous though. Had it not been for their specific interactions with colonialism, nationalism and globalism, there may have never been the amount of documentation recorded during colonialism, counter ethnic movements to American civic nationalism, nor the positive community efforts towards further documentation,

maintenance, RLS and revival during present-day globalism that did occur. And without these lending to their survival, surely neither language would be alive.

Both the survival of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy and the revival of Wôpanâak are cases of success though. They lend hope to other dire cases, and in different ways. Maliseet-Passamaquoddy has been able to stay alive, whereas Wôpanâak has been brought back to life. In this way they each lend a distinct set of blueprints for other languages, dependent on their state of linguistic vitality. These blueprints are now also easily accessible to other linguistic communities, should they so choose to enact similar language planning within their own communities. More than this, those communities wanting to save or revive their indigenous languages are now also more likely than ever to be able to gain access to linguists, even if just over the Internet, who can support them in their own efforts, but to emphasize, only should they so choose.

So despite the continued proliferation of language endangerment and death, the imperialist age of globalism has arrived accompanied by new technology and the Internet. This came just in time to potentially make progress against linguistic diversity loss set into action by colonialism, nationalism, and pushed even further by recent trends of globalism. However, it must also be remembered that, when looking at the Wabanaki Confederacy and the Wampanoag Federation at least, if it had not also been for colonialism's strong tradition of documentation, nationalism's empowerment to preserve their languages and cultures, and globalism's improvements to documentation, these languages probably wouldn't have survived until today. This is the pattern that has been shown with the indigenous examples of Wabanaki and Wampanoag language communities. Despite the greater losses in speaker populations and added severities of

their distinct language vitality circumstances, in comparison to the Indo-European cases visited, the Wabanaki and Wampanoag have still been able to keep their languages alive today.

Chapter VI.

Conclusion:

What to Learn from Success Cases and the Future Outlook of Linguistic Diversity

Languages are dying all over the world at an alarming rate, unprecedented before. It is now clear that this increasing rate of decline, worldwide, is due to abuses carried out against these speech communities during colonialism, civic nationalism and globalism, which took both coercive and physical action to homogenise the world in the interest of imperialist powers. To reference the great Noam Chomsky,

It's because of the process of state formation and the formation of the dominant culture and so on. You hear people talk a lot about endangered languages. Languages are dying all over the world, which is a serious problem. They talk mostly about indigenous languages dying, which is true; they are dying off very fast. But the same is true for languages in Europe. They are dying off very quickly just because of the establishment of a more powerful central state. (Chomsky in Orelus, 2014, p. 50)

This is not to say that we should be without hope for the future of linguistic diversity. As we will never know the value of linguistic diversity until it is too late, yet we know that languages are definitely valuable for a variety of reasons, and we should lend assistance wherever and however possible to prevent as much degradation of linguistic diversity as possible. It is possible to save those languages whose communities wish to do so. We now have the knowledge and ability to do so, as shown with all five language cases from this study, Catalan, Irish and Hebrew, Maliseet-Passamaquoddy and Wôpanâak.

Linguists and indigenous language speakers involved in the field are not yet defeated either, and recent accomplishments have renewed their fervor to continue working to save dying languages. "Renowned linguist Noam Chomsky said the following

about the revival of the Womponoag language: ‘The idea that this could have been done after 100 years is... I don’t think anyone could have believed it,’ (Kushinka, 2015, “The Wampanoag Language: A Tale of Revival”). Wôpanâak is really a remarkable case study. Though it seems most obvious that we should be working to save those languages that are still alive, Wôpanâak provides a plan, and proof of success, to revive languages long after they are lost. “There is hope for the language: A young girl is being raised with Wampanoag as her mother tongue, making her the first native speaker of the language since the mid-1800’s,” (Kushinka, 2015, “The Wampanoag Language: A Tale of Revival”). At the beginning of this study, in the Literature Review, it was noted that many linguists, defeated by the sheer volume of languages endangered, have resigned themselves to documentation, assuming that these are the best efforts that can be made given the gigantic uphill climb to reverse linguistic biodiversity loss. Considering only Wôpanâak, this may be true.

By looking at other languages though, it is more apparent that maintenance and Reversing Language Shift efforts are not for nothing, and as worthy of efforts as documentation and revival. Saving languages is actually about more than just reclaiming a community’s traditional linguistic culture.

For indigenous communities, reviving language is part of a much bigger picture of reclaiming sovereignty or self-determination... Colonisation is in no way a thing of the past, and the need to reclaim authority over their own business is high on the Indigenous agenda. Reclaiming language, then, is an act of decolonization embedded in these larger goals. (Eira, 2007, p. 83)

It is this concept of self-sovereignty that is particularly highlighted through indigenous speakers of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy. Though their communities have made great strides in maintaining the language and RLS, there still needs to be more done to ensure the

language's survival. But they have gained other improvements for themselves, that are equally, if not even more, important to their communities. They have made gains in reclaiming their original territories, though still just a small fraction of what they once occupied, and the Maine Wabanaki-State Child Welfare Truth and Reconciliation Commission was the first Truth and Reconciliation Commission to ever be formed in the United States. It can and should be assumed that with these gains, there will be additional gains to the reclamation of their indigenous languages as well.

References

- Anaya, S. James (2004). *Indigenous Peoples in International Law*. New York: Oxford.
- Anderson, Benedict (2006). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso.
- Back, M. (2015). Globalized or glocalalized? Transnational or transcultural? Defining language practices in global space. In *Transcultural Performance: negotiating globalized indigenous identities* (15-29). Retrieved from https://link-springer-com.ezpprod1.hul.harvard.edu/chapter/10.1057/9781137412430_2.
- Belmessous, Saliha. (2011). "Wabanaki versus French and English Claims in Northeastern North America, c. 1715. In *Native Claims: Indigenous Law against Empire, 1500-1920*, (pp. 1-36), doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199794850.001.0001.
- Boyle, Alan. (2009). "The Race to Save Our Languages." MSNBC. Retrieved from http://cosmiclog.nbcnews.com/_news/2009/02/26/4350531-the-race-to-save-our-languages.
- Bradley, David (2010). Language Endangerment and Resilience Linguistics: Case Studies of Gong and Lisu. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 52:2, pp. 123-140.
- Collins, James, Slembrouck, Stef, & Baynham, Mike (2009). Introduction: scale, migration and communicative practice. In *Globalization and Language in Contact: Scale, Migration and Communicative Practices* (pp. 1-16). New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Crystal, David. (2014). *Language Death*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Crystal, David. (2000). *Language and the Internet*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- de Lutri, Joseph R. (1975). Montaigne on the Noble Savage: A Shift in Perspective. *The French Review*, 49(2), pp. 206-211.
- Dixon, David (2014). *Never Come to Peace Again: Pontiac's Uprising and the Fate of the British Empire in North America*. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Dorian, Nancy C. (Ed.). (1989). *Investigating Obsolescence: Studies in Language Contraction and Death*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Eira, Dr. Christina (2008). Addressing the Ground of Language Endangerment. In *Working together for Endangered Languages: Research Challenges and Social Impacts- Proceedings of Foundation for Endangered Languages Conference XI* (pp. 82-90). Kuala Lumpur, October 26-28, 2007.
- ELCat. (2017). The Catalogue of Endangered Languages. Retrieved from <http://linguistlist.org/projects/elcat.cfm>.
- Endangered Languages Project*. (2017). Retrieved from <http://www.endangeredlanguages.com/#/4/43.300/-2.104/0/100000/0/low/mid/high/unknown>.
- Ferrer, Raquel Casenoves, Sankoff, David, and Turell, Teresa M. (2006). Linguistic Shift and Community Language: The Effect of Demographic Factors in the Valencian Region, Balearic Islands and Catalonia. In *Globalization and Language in the Spanish Speaking World: Macro and Micro Perspectives*. Ed. Clare Mar-Moliner and Miranda Stewart. Palgrave MacMillan: New York.
- Fishman, Joshua A. (1975). *Language and Nationalism: Two Integrative Essays*. Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.

- Fishman, Joshua A. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Bristol, PA: Multilingual Matters.
- Four Directions Development Corporation (2018). Wabanaki Tribes. Retrieved from <http://www.fourdirectionsmaine.org/wabanaki-tribes/>
- Francis, David A., Leavitt, Robert M., and Apt, Margaret (2008). *A Passamaquoddy-Maliseet Dictionary: Peskotomuhkati Wolastoqewi Latuwewakon*. Goose Lane Editions: New Brunswick.
- Garreau, Joel. (2008). Babble On, Researchers in ‘Linguists’ Documentary. Washington Post. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/10/01/AR2008100103115.html>.
- Gonzalez Nieto, David (2007). The Emperor’s New Words: Language and Colonization [Special double-issue]. *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge*, 5, 231-238.
- Grenoble, Lenore A. (2016). A response to ‘Assessing levels of endangerment in the Catalogue of Endangered Languages (ELCat) using the Language Endangerment Index (LEI)’, by Nala Huiying Lee & John Van Way. In *Language and Society*, (pp. 1-8), doi: 10.1017/S0047404515000950.
- Grenoble, Lenore. (2013). Language Revitalization. In Robert Bailey, Richard Cameron, & Ceil Lucas (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Sociolinguistics* (pp. 293-300). doi:10.1017/S0047404515000950.
- Hale, Ken, Michael Krauss, Lucille J. Watahomigie, Akira Y. Yamamoto, Colette Craig, LaVerne Masayeva Jeanne, and Nora C. England. (1992). Endangered

- Languages. *Language*, 68(1), 1-42.
- Harper, Barbara, and Ranco, Darren. (2009). *Wabanaki Traditional Cultrtral Lifeways Exposure Scenario*. Prepared for EPA in collaboration with the Maine Tribes. Retrieved from: <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-08/documents/ditca.pdf>
- Harrison, K. David. (2010). *The Last Speakers: The Quest to Save the World's Most Endangered Languages*. Washington, D.C.: National Geographic Society.
- Harrison, K. David. (2007). *When Languages Die: The Extinction of the World's Languages and the Erosion of Human Knowledge*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- International Standards Institute. (2017). ISO 639-3:2007(en). Retrieved from <https://www.iso.org/obp/ui/#iso:std:39534:en>.
- Kramer, Seth, Miller, Daniel A., & Newberger, Jeremy (Producers and Directors). (2008). *The Linguists* [Motion Picture]. USA: Ironbound Films.
- Kushinka, Matthew (2015, November 22). The Wampanoag Language: A Tale of Revival [Weblog post]. Retrieved from <https://www.redlinels.com/wampanoag-language/#extinction>
- Language Keepers. (2018). Languages Keepers: Documenting Endangered Language for Education, Research and Revival. Retrieved from: <http://www.languagekeepers.org/>.
- Leavitt, Robert M., and Francis, David A., Eds. (1990). *Wapapi Akonutomakonol: The Wampum Records, Wabanaki Traditional Laws*. Fredericton, New Brunswick: Micmac-Maliseet Institute, University of New Brunswick.

- Lee, Nala Huiying, and John Van Way. (2016). Assessing Levels of Endangerment in the Catalogue of Endangered Languages (ELCat) using the Language Endangerment Index (LEI). *Language in Society*, 45(2), 271-292.
- Lepore, Jill (1998). *The Name of War: King Philips War and the Origins of American Identity*. Vintage Books, Random House: New York
- Lewis, Paul, & Simons, Gary. (2010). Assessing Endangerment: Expanding Fishman's GIDS. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique*. Retrieved from <http://www.01.sil.org/~simonsg/preprint/EGIDS.pdf>.
- Maine Indian Tribal-State Commission. (2012). *"Maine Wabanaki-State Child Welfare Truth and Reconciliation Commission Mandate*. Indian Tribal-State Commission Documents. Paper 19. Retrieved from https://digitalmaine.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1017&context=mitsc_docs
- Makepeace, Anne (Producer & Director). (2011). *We Still Live Here: Âs Nutayuneân* [Motion Picture]. USA: PBS, Independent Lens.
- Mar-Molinero, Clare (2000). *The Politics of Language in the Spanish Speaking World*. New York: Routledge.
- Marcelo, Philip (2017, November 27). Wampanoags teaching children their lost language. *Boston Globe*. Retrieved from <https://www.bostonglobe.com/metro/2017/11/26/wampanoags-teaching-their-lost-language/IPspUizNtrys5GvOaeZJKL/story.html>
- Mazo, Adam, & Duthu, N. Bruce (Producers), & Mazo, Adam, & Pender-Cudlip, Ben (Directors). (2018). *Dawnland* [Motion Picture]. USA: Upstander Project.

- Mosely, Christopher (Ed.). (2010). *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger* (3rd ed.) Paris: UNESCO Publishing. Online version.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S., & Vigouroux, Cécile B. (2008). Colonization, Globalization and Language Vitality in Africa: An Introduction. In Cécile B. Vigouroux, & Salikoko S. Mufwene (Eds.), *Globalization and Language Vitality: Perspectives from Africa* (pp. 1-31). London: Continuum Press.
- National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian. (2019). Everyone's History Matters: The Wampanoag Indian Thanksgiving story deserves to be known. Retrieved from <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/blogs/national-museum-american-indian/2017/11/23/everyones-history-matters-and-wampanoag-indian-thanksgiving-story-deserves-be-known/>.
- National Science Foundation. "Documenting Endangered Languages (DEL)." Accessed June 18, 2013. http://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm_summ.jsp?pims_id=12816.
- Native-Languages.org. (2015). Vocabulary in Native American Languages: Wabanaki Indian Words. Retrieved from http://www.native-languages.org/wabanaki_words.htm.
- Nettle, Daniel, & Romaine, Suzanne. (2000). *Vanishing Voices: The Extinction of the World's Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- O'Brien, Francis Joseph, Jr. (Moondancer), & Jennings, Julianne (Strong Woman) (1999). *Wampanoag Cultural History: Voices from Past and Present*. New Port, Rhode Island: Aquidneck Indian Council, Inc. & Massachusetts Language Revival Project.

- Orelus, Pierre W., with Noam Chomsky (2014). *On Language, Democracy, and Social Justice*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.
- Passamaquoddy Tribe at Pleasant Point. (2014, April). Language. Retrieved from <http://www.wabanaki.com/language.htm>.
- Rivett, Sarah. (2014) Learning to Write Algonquian Letters: The Indigenous Place of Language Philosophy in the Seventeenth-Century Atlantic World. In *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 71:4, (pp. 549-588). Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5309/willmaryquar.71.4.0549?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents
- SIL International. (2017). *Language Assessment*. Retrieved from <https://www.sil.org/language-assessment>.
- Simons, Gary F. and Charles D. Fennig (eds.). 2016. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World, Nineteenth edition*. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. Retrieved from <http://www.ethnologue.com>.
- Simons, Gary F. and Charles D. Fennig (eds.). 2018. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World, Twenty-first edition*. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. Retrieved from <http://www.ethnologue.com>.
- Speck, Frank G. (1915). The Eastern Algonkian Wabanaki Confederacy. *American Anthropological Association*, 17, 492-508. doi: 10.1525/aa.1915.17.3.02a00040
- Travers, Milton A. (1975). *One of the Keys, 1676-1776-1976: The Wampanoag Indian Contribution*. Published for the Nation by the Dartmouth Massachusetts Bicentennial Commission: Dartmouth.
- UN General Assembly, *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*:

resolution / adopted by the General Assembly, 2 October 2007, A/RES/61/295, available at: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/471355a82.html> [accessed 5 December 2018]

UNESCO. (2003). Promotion of Linguistic Diversity: UNESCO Endangered Languages Programme. Retrieved from http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL_ID=36847&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html.

UNESCO. (2016). Biodiversity and Linguistic Biodiversity: Maintaining Indigenous Languages, Conserving Biodiversity. Retrieved from <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/endangered-languages/biodiversity-and-linguistic-diversity>.

UNESCO. (2017). Frequently Asked Questions on Endangered Languages. Retrieved from <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/endangered-languages/faq-on-endangered-languages/>.

UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages. (2003). *Language Vitality and Endangerment*. Retrieved from <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/00120-EN.pdf>.

Vidal, John. (2008). "As Forests are Cleared and Species Vanish, There's One Other Loss: A World of Languages." *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2014/jun/08/why-we-are-losing-a-world-of-languages>.

Warren, Wendy A. (2012). More than Words: Language, Colonization, and History. *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 69(3), 517-520. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5309/willmaryquar.69.3.0517>

- Walker, Ruth. (2009). 'The Linguists': Raiders of the Lost Tongues. *The Christian Science Monitor*. Retrieved from <http://www.csmonitor.com/The-Culture/The-Home-Forum/2009/0227/p18s01-hfes.html>.
- Weinstein-Farson, Laurie (1988). *The Wampanoag*. New York: Chelsea House Publishers.
- Weston, Jennifer, and Sorenson, Barbara (2011, December). Awakening a Sleeping Language on Cape Cod: The Wampanoag Language Reclamation Project, 40(4). Retrieved from <https://www.culturalsurvival.org/publications/cultural-survival-quarterly/awakening-sleeping-language-cape-cod-wampanoag-language>
- Whalen, D.H., & Simons, Gary F. (2012). Endangered Language Families. *Language*. 88(1), 155-173.
- Whaley, Lindsay J. (2014). Work on Endangered Languages. *Linguistic Discovery*. 12(1), 31-37.
- Wiecha, Karin. (2013, March). New Estimate on the Rate of Global Language Loss. *The Rosetta Project*. Retrieved from <http://rosetta-project.org/blog/02013/mar/28/new-estimates-on-rate-of-language-loss/>.
- Wôpanâak Language Reclamation Project. Retrieved from <http://web.mit.edu/norvin/www/wopanaak.html>.