The thesis of this essay is that linguistic anthropology is not the study of language. Rather, "language" functions as a permanently problematic, if indispensable, object for linguistic anthropological analysis and thought. This is because, as I suggest, the critical intervention of linguistic anthropology over the last 40 years has been its ethnographic focus on indexicality, in particular, the ways that indexical processes undermine language as an autonomous object, entangling it with other semiotic modalities and thereby displacing it beyond its putative borders. Reviewing linguistic anthropological scholarship from 2015, I argue that it is the study of this displacement and its more general semiotic implications—and the entangled and mutually informing analytics that have been developed to theorize them, for example, language ideology, entextualization, interdiscursivity, chronotope—that centers the field. Focusing on a set of such analytics, I illustrate how recent linguistic anthropological scholarship has elaborated the reflexive, dialectical nature of social life, theorizing what I call total semiotic facts. I explore these dialectics by discussing three thematic clusters that occupied the attention of the field in 2015: diversity and authenticity, political economy, and mass mediation.

La tesis de este ensayo es que la antropología lingüística no es el estudio del lenguaje. Más bien, el "lenguaje" funciona como un objeto para el análisis y la conceptualización antropológica lingüística, permanentemente problemático, si bien indispensable. Esto es debido, como lo sugiero, a que la intervención crítica de la antropología lingüística durante los últimos cuarenta años ha sido su foco etnográfico en la indexicalidad, en particular, los modos que los procesos indícesos socavan el lenguaje como un objeto autónomo, entrelazándolo con otras modalidades semióticas y por lo tanto desplazándolo más allá de sus bordes putativos. Revisando la investigación antropológica lingüística de 2015, argumento que es el estudio de este desplazamiento y sus implicaciones semióticas más generales—y la analítica entrelazada y mutuamente informativa que ha sido desarrollada para teorizarlos, por ejemplo, ideología del lenguaje, entextualización, interdiscursividad, cronotopo—lo que centra el campo. Enfocándome en una serie de tal analítica, ilustro cómo la investigación antropológica lingüística reciente ha elaborado la naturaleza reflexiva, dialéctica de la vida social, teorizando lo que llamo hechos totales semióticos. Exploro estas dialécticas discutiendo tres grupos temáticos que ocuparon la atención en el campo en 2015: diversidad y autenticidad, economía política, y meditación masiva.
“SHAKE WELL BEFORE USING”
Linguistic anthropology is not the study of language. This proposition may strike the reader as equally self-evident and oxymoronic. Self-evident, for linguistic anthropology has always studied much more than language (hence linguistic anthropology), but also oxymoronic, for what putatively defines the field is close attention to and analytical focus on language (hence linguistic anthropology). The contention of this essay, evinced in the diverse objects and modes of analysis taken up by linguistic anthropological inquiry in 2015, is that the critical intervention—and methodological, analytical, and theoretical bedrock—of contemporary linguistic anthropology is that “language” is not a coherent, autonomous object of analysis such that linguistic anthropology could be the study of it. This is despite, or rather because of, the fact that language—as an analytic and ethnographic and ideological object—cannot be done away with in linguistic anthropological thought, pedagogy, or practice (Cody 2010).

This isn’t to say that “language”—even in its formal, structural modalities—is not an object of analysis for linguistic anthropology (in the year in review, e.g., see Dixon 2015; Enfield and Sidnell 2015; Fleming 2014a, 2014b, 2015; Haviland 2015; Romero 2015). Rather, it’s that language, however construed, always presents a productively problematic object to linguistic anthropological analysis, its autonomy continually undermined and deconstructed by such analysis. As I argue below, this is because language—as shot through by indexical processes—splits and perforates itself, continually displacing itself beyond its putative borders. It is the study of this dialectical displacement, I suggest, that centers the field. This makes language paradoxically central to linguistic anthropology, even as it necessarily opens up horizons for linguistic anthropological study beyond “language.”

THE LONG SHADOW OF STRUCTURALISM AND THE OBJECT CALLED LANGUAGE
“Language” can, of course, serve as a basic foundational object of scholarly inquiry. It does, for example, for modern linguistics, a discipline that shares common origins and ongoing conversations with linguistic anthropology. Yet, if language is a coherent, self-contained object of analysis, this is only under certain conditions, with certain assumptions and methodologies and with certain erasures and disavowals. To recount one origin myth whose centenary is coming to pass this year, linguistics as a discipline emerged out of Ferdinand de Saussure’s purification of what he and his students called langue—that autonomous “system” of denotational function—from the composite language (of which only langue was amenable to scientific study) by externalizing parole or “speech” (i.e., the pragmatic, indexical features of linguistic semiosis).2 Yet, as was clear to Saussure himself (1986:15), inaugurating a “scientific” study of language required a disavowal, an acting as if this surfeit of speech was external to language as such.

Central to linguistic anthropology’s identity has been the refutation of this disavowal. Over the last 40 years, this has taken form as the ethnographic analysis of indexicality—the relationship, or semiotic ground, between some material sign token and its putative object based on an existential relation (e.g., of causality, co-presence, or contiguity). The result of such inquiry has been to show, on the one hand, the ways in which langue is unique to language (and thus why a structuralist anthropology is misleading) and, on the other, the ways that “language” (and langue) is, in principle and practice, inextricable from other modalities of social action. Note that every major analytic the field utilized in 2015 not only is not unique to language but, as we see below, shows how language is caught up in, and ultimately constituted by, indexical processes and modalities beyond itself.

In what follows I show this by first highlighting the diversity of objects of analysis taken up by linguistic anthropologists in 2015. I then turn to some of the analytics that have been used to theorize such objects and the (meta)indexical processes that constitute them. I underscore how these analytics mutually imply and build on each other, comprising accounts of what we might call, following Michael Silverstein (1985) following Marcel Mauss (following Émile Durkheim), total semiotic facts. Finally, I focus on three thematic clusters that occupied the attention of the field in 2015—diversity and authenticity, political economy, and mass mediation—drawing attention to how linguistic anthropologists have extended previous analytic advances through focus on these areas of study.

But first, some disclaimers.

STANDARD DISCLAIMERS APPLY
This review suffers certain limits: of scope—it cannot capture all the field’s publications; of temporality—the “year” is an arbitrary time unit with respect to scholarly activity; and of bias. Note, for example, that this essay is Anglocentric—it covers publications and conferences in English, largely produced by scholars who were trained and whose academic positions are in North America (Grossi and Ferreira 2015). Linguistic anthropology, of course, has historically been a North American field, largely known and taught only in its institutions. This is changing, happily, as evidenced in this review by the importance of international conversations regarding topics such as “superdiversity” and as reflected by the fact that, excepting Antarctica, the authors covered by this review are institutionally located on every continent.

Finally, this review focuses on scholarship oriented to other linguistic anthropologists. However, linguistic anthropologists have been addressing many other audiences. This includes disciplines beyond linguistic anthropology’s usual interlocutors (cultural anthropology, linguistics, conversation analysis)—to mention a few, cognitive psychology (Keane 2015a, 2015b; Ochs 2015), ethnic studies (Shankar 2015), legal studies (Urciuoli 2015), and media
The linguistic anthropological publications of 2015 show an incredible diversity in their objects of analysis. While the structural, pragmatic, and ideological aspects of language remain central focuses in much linguistic anthropology, many more objects of analysis beyond and besides language have been taken up: from Swedish design (Murphy 2015) and U.S. jazz pedagogy (Wilf 2014a) to human–insect and human–animal relations (Carr 2015; Lemon 2015; see also the 2015 AAA session “Animals as Social Actors” [3-0470]) and monsters (Brightman 2015; Manning 2014b, 2015b); from typography and script (Choksi 2015; Faudree 2015c; Jarlehed and Jaworski 2015) to visitor books at Israeli commemorative sites (Noy 2015); and from media spectacles of “mass psychogenic disease” in upstate New York (Goldstein and Hall 2015) to VCDs of Shi’ite recitations in Mumbai (Eisenlohr 2015). My point here is simply to underline the heterogeneity of empirical focuses, the ways in which linguistic anthropology has stretched its object of inquiry beyond language as such. What links all such studies together, as I discuss below, is a common orientation to and use of a core set of analytics and theoretical concepts that center around the implications of indexicality, as developed out of the systematic critique of structuralist approaches to language and culture.

INDEXICALITY, IDEOLOGY, AND OTHER ENTANGLED ANALYTICS

To take some simple examples, indexicality denotes the capacity of signs like a gesturing hand (‘Come here!’), a sociophonetic variable such as /r/ dropping (‘Noo Yawk’), or a demonstrative pronoun like “this” to “point to” something of their particular context of occurrence, say, the location to which the addressee is to come (Haviland 2015), the regional or class background of the speaker (Silverstein 2014), or the “boring” design of a table (Murphy 2015: 166). A critical feature of indexical signs is that, out of context (and thus at the level of structuralist analysis), they are inherently undetermined. To become determinately construable, indexical signs are dependent upon the singular event within which, as material forms, they are contextualized. This makes indexical signs necessarily permeable by that which they are not, open to taking on a range of values and meanings across the contexts and semiotic configurations—interactional, institutional, and historical—that frame them. Every indexical sign is entangled with its material contexts (present and past) and thus is never fully extricable from them, if also never fully determined by them (Derrida 1988).

Put more technically: to be efficacious and meaningful, indexical signs always presuppose some reflexive, or metasemiotic, framework (i.e., signs that take or frame other signs—including themselves, potentially—as their objects). Such frameworks are also indexical in nature, of necessity embodied and entangled with their own contexts of appearance and with what they frame. Thus, they are in turn metasemiotically framed, et cetera.

This sign–metasign relation at the heart of indexicality takes many forms. For example, it may take the form of emergently forged co-occurrence relationships between signs—be it within events (what linguistic anthropologists have theorized under the rubrics of poetic structure and entextualization; Debenport 2015; Manning 2014b, 2015b; Wilf 2014a:139–162; cf. Noy 2015:87) or across discursive events, whereby otherwise nonpresent signs are made to stand as a virtual context to ongoing activity (what linguistic anthropologists have theorized as interdiscursivity, among other analytics; Gal 2015; Wilf 2014a:115–138; Wortham and Reyes 2014).1

Indexical signs are also fixed by semiotic activity that, implicitly or explicitly, formulates and typifies them as signs of such-and-such a type (be it by overt discourse or by default assumptions about the signs in question). This type of metasemiotic framework—not unrelated to processes of entextualization and interdiscursivity (see n. 3)—has been most productively theorized under the rubric of language ideology, as discussed in the next section.

In short, the study of indexicality has led linguistic anthropologists to focus on the dialectical processes and relations that hold between social activity and the semiotic forms that reflexively (or metasemiotically) construe, mediate, and constitute such activity. This focus has resulted in the elaboration of a series of analytics (entextualization, interdiscursivity, and ideology but also voicing, enregisterment, iconization, and decentification, among many others) that mutually imply and inform each other. Together these entangled analytics form a core set of conceptual reference points that orient the field across its variegated objects of analysis. In what follows I focus on the ideology construct, with an eye toward these mutually implying relations.

LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY

Many of the publications of 2015 use the term language ideology to denote (politically situated or interested) ideas or beliefs about language (Cohen 2015; Karrebaek and Ghandchi 2015; Kroskryt 2015; Stehr and Madsen 2015) or, relatedly, a valuation or hierarchization of particular languages (Angermeyer 2015; Cooper and Nguyen 2015; Costa 2015; Hiramoto and Park 2014; LaDousa 2014; McIntosh 2014; Nakassis 2015; Poignant 2015; Schefold and Thomas 2015; Wilf 2014a: 115–138; Wortham and Reyes 2014).
These related conceptions of language ideology have recently come under two different critiques. In a 2015 essay, Paul Kockelman offers a sweeping extension of Peircean semiotics through reflection on how Aristotle, Marx, Heidegger, and Peirce variously formulate what a thing is. Each philosopher, Kockelman argues, does so by appealing to "recursively reticulated" semiotic processes (2015:154)—that is, processes iteratively embedded in other semiotic processes. At the core of his account, then, are the ways in which semiosis turns on reflexive, or metasemiotic, relations and processes. While such relations may take the form of "beliefs" about language, Kockelman points out that they are just as often embedded in and materialized by processes and infrastructures of various (nonmental) sorts. From this point of view, ideology—as, following Kockelman, false or arbitrary "beliefs"—is only one metasemiotic framework for social activity and perhaps not the most important. Of course, foundational works on language ideology (see Woolard 1998 and references therein) never restricted the notion of language ideology to questions of belief, even if classic definitions often appealed to "beliefs about language" (Silverstein 1979:193). Either Kockelman's critique is selective in its focus or it intuit the change in how linguistic anthropologists have conceptualized language ideology; more likely, both.

In another critique, Luke Fleming (2014a, 2014b, 2015) has argued that, whereas much current writing assumes that language ideologies synchronically mediate linguistic practices by acting on them as top-down superstructures, in order to understand the diachronic development of avoidance registers (his topic of study) we must see how ideologies emerge as second-order rationalizations (cf. Silverstein 1979) or, sensu Kockelman (2015:163–166), fetishes. In the cases Fleming reviews, ideologies about affinal avoidance speech (e.g., that it is semantically abstract because it is pragmatically deferential; cf. Dixon 2015:86) emerge from users' reflections on the denotational vagueness and lexical paucity of avoidance registers, as compared to everyday speech. As Fleming shows, however, this vagueness and paucity follow not from an ideology of deference but vice versa—more precisely, from the fact that taboos of various sorts (as informed by kinship ideologies) make certain speech forms in certain contexts unavoidably performative. From this "rigid performativity," avoidance practices emerge; from such practices, ideologies about them; and from such ideologies, further effects on linguistic practice and structure (Fleming 2015:57–59).

Fleming reminds us, then, that a language ideology is as much mediated by semiotic practices as it mediates them, a dialectical relationship at multiply laminated and embedded (or "reticulated") levels. Through this dialectic, language is perforated and mediated by its exteriorities—for example, by kinship ideologies and practices and thus by the material and marital organization of bodies and space, as Christopher Ball shows in his discussion of affinal avoidance practices in a Wauja village (2015:342, 354–359). As this suggests, what an ideology is "about"—here, "language"—is always ontologically located at and materialized by the shifting relations between (infra)structures of various sorts (e.g., of kinship, language, and social space), the semiotic practices that presuppose and instantiate them, and the ideologies that reflexively reanalyze and mediate both. It is the mutually constitutive relations between each of these tangled parts (its total semiotic facticity)—and not any of them on its own—that serves as the object of analysis.

This discussion further suggests that if a language ideology is "about" language, it is never only about language (and perhaps not most importantly about language), a fact that has been axiomatic of the language ideology construct (Woolard 1998:3). As Jennifer Andrus's study (2015) of hearsay law in American domestic abuse cases shows, for example, legal ideologies of language cannot be extricated from ideologies of gender (and the semiotic modalities they regiment). In these legal contexts, the speech and subjectivity of abused women are assumed to be inherently untrustworthy—except, notably, in cases of "excited utterances," speech acts that are "spontaneously" made following a trauma and thus presumed to be immune to confabulation or prevarication. Andrus shows how an empiricist ideology of knowledge and gender ideologies will work hand in glove to (re)frame, or "entextualize," certain co-occurring and contiguous signs and interdiscursive relations as "evidence" (e.g., violence that leads to embodied speech acts made by abuse "victims" in the presence of third parties such as police officers, who then cite them in court, wherein they become "excited utterances") while dismissing others (e.g., testimony made by those same women in court about their own experiences) (cf. Guzmán 2014; Slotta 2015b). Here, the complex institutionality of the law, by ideologically mediating and interdiscursively transmitting the performativity of iterated entextualized events (from "trauma" to "excited utterances" to "hearsay testimony" to "evidence" to court judgment), acts to mediate how cases themselves unfold to various effect.

Every indexical sign is entangled and rendered meaningful and efficacious by some ideological framework, and every ideology is entangled with other ideologies and, thus, other semiotic modalities. The reflexive recognition of this fact—in particular, that ideologies (e.g., of language) are never limited to what they are putatively "about" (viz. language)—has, as an example of the very process it has theorized, generated its own lexical register within linguistic anthropology: namely, "____ ideologies" or "ideologies of _____." In 2015, authors have elaborated the dialectics of graphic ideologies (Spitzmuller 2015), media ideologies (Eisenlohr 2015; Jones 2014), semiotic ideologies (Keane 2014), textual ideologies (Faudree 2015b), and ideologies of authenticity (Wilce and Fenigsen 2015), of brand (Koh 2015b), of communication (Nozawa 2015; Slotta 2015a), of creativity (Wilf 2014b), of mathematics pedagogy
of more general form has been teased out in a 2015 theme issue of ideologies, neither is it particular to the ideology of language. If the dialectical relationship between indexical and metasemiotic practices is not particular to language ideologies, interdiscursivity, ideology, chronotope, etc.) and the dialectics of semiosis and metasemiosis that they comprise, individually and together.

It is important to see that there are as many kinds of ideologies as there are phenomena or media to which social actors’ practices are reflexively oriented. Further, this proliferation of ideologies beyond the linguistic is implied by the language ideology construct. Yet, because what kinds of ideologies we attend to are ethnographically motivated, “language” and language ideologies of necessity remain an ongoing focus of linguistic anthropological inquiry. Indeed, while the analytic language ideology implies that languages—and even language—are never in principle autonomous or coherent, language is cross culturally an ethnographic object of cultural conceptualization, conjured and mediated by those ideologies that, ironically, always imbricate the linguistic with the nonlinguistic.

From this point of view, language ideology is not an analytic that supplements the study of language; it is an ethnographic datum central to the processes by which languages come to be purified, named, standardized, and thereby abstracted from and studied as “language.” The relationship of Enlightenment ideologies of language in, for example, missionary and colonial practices of studying indigenous languages, translating them, and standardizing and thereby transforming them (Graber and Murray 2015; Handman 2014; Romero 2015; Schieffelin 2014) is a testament to this fact. This is all the more important to underscore because this history forms, on the one hand, a central genealogy of modern linguistics and linguistic anthropology and, on the other hand, the contemporary scene of language revitalization projects (Debenport 2015; Henne-Ochoa and Bauman 2015; Kroskrity 2015; Quijada et al. 2015; Webster 2015; cf. Cooper and Nguyen 2015 on “language recognition projects”). This history is an instance of the dialectics of the total semiotic fact of language.

**CHRONOTOPES, ASSEMBLAGES, DIAGRAMS, AND OTHER TOTAL SEMIOTIC FACTS**

If the dialectical relationship between indexical and ideological (or metasemiotic) practices is not particular to language ideologies, neither is it particular to the ideology construct. This dialectic of semiosis and metasemiosis in its more general form has been teased out in a 2015 theme issue of *Anthropological Quarterly* on kinship chronotopes, edited by Christopher Ball and Nicholas Harkness. It also forms the infrastructure of the argument of Webb Keane’s recent book *Ethical Life* (2015a). Finally, a number of authors this year have developed integrative analyses—namely, genre (Manning 2015a), assemblage (Shankar 2015), and diagram (Murphy 2015)—that synthetically theorize the relations between these entangled analytics (indexicality, entextualization, interdiscursivity, ideology, chronotope, etc.) and the dialectics of semiosis and metasemiosis that they comprise, individually and together.

**Kinship Chronotopes**

For Mikhail Bakhtin (1981), *chronotope* denotes the semiotic configurations of time, space, and personhood in representational forms such as novels and poetry. As Asif Agha (2015a) notes in a commentary essay, Bakhtin (1981:85 n. 2) used the term to critique Kant’s arguments that time and space are transcendental intuitions that enable phenomenal experience. While Bakhtin takes up Kant’s notion that time and space are a necessary metasemiotic framework within which experience is possible, he radicalizes this thesis; on the one hand, he insists on the immanence of chronotopic formulations in representational forms while, on the other hand, pointing out the variety of such formulations. Time and space (and kinship, as this issue shows), and thus experience and meaning, cannot be accessed (or transcendently intuited) independently of the generic and cultural specificities of the semiotic practices in question—be they philosophical reanalyses of classical mechanics or, in this theme issue, rituals in Hindu Mauritius or Muslim Bombay (Eisenlohr 2015); narratives of national belonging in postcolonial Kenya (McIntosh 2015); kinship address practices in indigenous Amazonia (Ball 2015); or letters delivered to kinless, “solitary” seniors in Japan (Nozawa 2015). Chronotopes such as the world-breaking rupture of certain strains of South Korean Christianity that Nicholas Harkness (2015) writes about, for example, are not simply conditions of experience and semiosis—in Harkness’s case, of proper, egalitarian Christian social relations and “modern” subjectivity. They also consist of and are constructed out of signs located in social time and space, such as fictive, age- and generation-neutralizing kinterms and associated modalities of in-group greeting, and the (aspirational) discourses that reflect on and typify them.

Chronotopic formulations, as Harkness’s example suggests, are metasemiotic frameworks that actively construe and shape the temporal and spatial unfolding of social life, making certain kinds of experiences of time, space, and (kinship-based) sociality and personhood possible. At the same time, they emerge in historical and interactional space and time through social actors’ own reflections on time, space, and social practice (also see Chávez 2015; Koven and Marques 2015)—for Harkness’s informants, through their rationalizations of Korean address terms as mediated by their interpretations of Christian doctrine as well as through their imaginations of the relation between “modern” national development and Christian enlightenment.

There is, then, a dialectical quality to chronotopes of precisely the same kind as language ideologies (Green 2015:65). On the one hand, chronotopes metasemiotically project configurations of time–space–personhood (and kinship) in and onto time and space, mediating the unfolding of semiosis. On the other hand, chronotopes themselves emerge in social time and space through semiotic practices of various kinds—in particular, through practices by social actors as they reflexively orient to, and chronotopically act on, time, space, and personhood or, as Harkness’s
examples suggest, as they dialogically reflect on and contest other chronotopes and their associated semiotic forms, such as “traditional” (read: Confucian) address terms associated with perceived-to-be un-Christian modes of hierarchical sociability.

**Ethics, Sex, Advertising, Design**

Synthesizing literatures on cognitive and developmental psychology, conversation analysis, philosophy, linguistic anthropology, and social history, Webb Keane’s magisterial analysis (2015a) of what he calls ethical life argues that questions of ethics and morality must be located at the dialectical nexus among psychological process, social interaction, and ethical projects. This move is necessary, Keane argues, to stave off reductive arguments that would collapse questions of ethics and morality into universal psychological faculties. It is also necessary, however, in order to recognize that ethics and morality cannot simply be reduced to historically contingent and culturally particular systems (or ideologies) of morality. The mediating term, Keane suggests, is interaction, those processes wherein psychological faculties such as theory of mind—fundamentally underdetermined vis-à-vis ethical life—provide affordances for (but do not determine) ethical acts and judgments. At the same time, social interaction—itself ethically underdetermined (Lempert 2013, 2015)—provides an infrastructure (e.g., conversational turn taking) that affords particular events of reflexive reanalysis (e.g., ethical judgments), upon which particular perduring morality systems and social movements are themselves elaborated, institutionalized, and disseminated (such as 19th-century abolitionism or 20th-century feminist consciousness raising).

But even as psychology and interaction provide a semiotic infrastructure of affordances that are taken up in ethical life and its ideologies of morality and ethics, those very reflexive reanalyses themselves mediate, in historically and culturally specific ways, that which gives rise to them: interaction emerges from but also helps develop psychological faculties; ethical judgments emerge from and metasemiotically shape the flow of the interactions they saturate; and social movements are elaborations of ethical judgments and the reflexive models of ethical life they afford (i.e., that are entextualized by them), even as they in turn shape how ethical judgments are made (or not) in particular contexts. While each of these levels of analysis is a recognizable disciplinary zone for the study of ethics, what is novel is Keane’s articulation of each to the others as dialectically entangled parts of a larger whole: ethical life. Here, then, is the classic Durkheimian social fact, now reformulated through the analytic interventions forged by the linguistic anthropological study of the limits of language.

If total semiotic facts like those studied by Keane are semiotic totalities, they are totalities of a particular kind, born as the open-ended, nonessentialist center of gravity of multiply intersecting processes. Each of the analytics that linguistic anthropology has developed (ideology, entextualization, interdiscursivity, chronotope, etc.) carves a slice of such emergent, contingent totalities. A number of linguistic anthropological works in 2015 have attempted to theorize the relations among these various slices through synthetic analytics.

Paul Manning’s historical ethnography (2015a) of “sexual” relations among Khevsurs in the Georgian mountains, for example, uses the integrative analytic genre to theorize the linkages between the romantic, sexual (but nonpenetrative) practices particular to this social group and the literary practices that have represented and disseminated them. While “genre” is not a new analytic, Manning’s usage of the term is, treating the physical act and the literary act of sexuality together. This is because, as Manning shows, each act is interdiscursively, or citationally (Manning 2014a), entangled with the other and thus materializes it—sex acts presuppose and entail their literary representations and vice versa. Sexuality, as genre, is located at the intersection of these dialectically, and interdiscursively, linked semiotic modalities and entextualized events.

Similarly, Shalini Shankar’s study (2015) of “diversity” in Asian American advertisement firms develops the analytic assemblage in order to theorize how multiform interdiscursive linkages cohere across phases, sites, and media of the advertising process as an image and ideology of “diversity,” from the uptake of recent census categories to market research practices to meetings with clients to the fine-tuning of ad design and production and to the multimodal ads themselves. Shankar’s analysis illustrates how the study of complex ethnographic objects such as advertising and diversity (like ethics and sexuality) requires tracing the linkages among multiple modalities and events of semiosis as they intersect in, and entextualize and materialize as, advertising practices, texts, and institutions. As Shankar further demonstrates, this assemblage is dialectically mediated by a particular “postracial” imaginary—that is, this assemblage is constituted within an ideological chronotope of race, even as that chronotope and its ideologies come to be contested and transformed through the events and linkages that this assemblage comprises.

In a final example, Keith Murphy’s innovative study (2015) unpacks a complex and distributed (if, to Swedes at least, self-evident) object of analysis: Swedish design. Doing so, Murphy shows, necessitates theorizing diverse interdiscursive connections over both interactional and historical timescales: among modernist manifestos on the politics of aesthetics, the early 20th-century exhibitions that popularized such aesthetics, the design schools that institutionalized them, the design practices they cultivate, the objects thereby materialized, and the art shows and commodity markets through which these objects circulate. Murphy’s use of the term diagram, like Manning’s genre and Shankar’s assemblage, enables analytical purchase on these dialectic relations across sites and scales, illustrating how aesthetic and political ideologies come to be materialized in and as artifacts with particular indexicalities (e.g., as egalitarian, modern) and...
material qualities (e.g., clean lines, solid colors). Through analysis of verbal and nonverbal modalities (such as gesture), Murphy demonstrates in fine detail how events of designing artifacts are mediated by the aforementioned interdiscursive relations and the multiple voices and ideologies they carry along with them. Such relations transduce those voices and ideologies into material form, creating what Murphy calls heteroglossic artifacts (2015:92–93). Swedish design, in its dynamical totality (or diagrammaticity), is the contingently achieved outcome of these dialectic relations among ideology, interdiscursivity, entextualization, and material form over sociohistorical and political time and space.

**THREE THEMATIC HORIZONS**

**Diversity and Authenticity**

A number of recent special issues and edited volumes have been published by linguistic anthropologists and sociolinguists in ongoing conversation regarding the intertwined issues of authenticity, “superdiversity,” and globalization (Faudree and Schulthies 2015; Hiramoto and Park 2014; Lacoste et al. 2014; Wilce and Fenigsen 2015). These discussions, by their own accounts, constitute no less than an overturning of the sociolinguistics canon. Critiquing the ideological biases of previous generations (e.g., investments in the “authenticity” of particular speakers, contexts, and speech forms within bounded, monoglot communities), these studies have suggested a number of new rubrics—superdiversity, metrolingualism, translanguaging, and the sociolinguistics of globalization. Jan Blommaert (2015), for example, has suggested that studies of “superdiversity” take what would have been typified as exceptional and aberrant in an earlier sociolinguistics—for example, code-mixed speech across language communities—and recognizes it as the norm. This paradigm project, Blommaert suggests, offers both new exemplary objects of analysis (those emergent in an increasingly “superdiverse” world) as well as new “tactics” to reanalyze old topics (e.g., codeswitching, multilingualism, and community).

Linguistic anthropologists have remained skeptical of these epochal claims and “new” theoretical moves (Faudree 2015a; Moore 2015; Reyes 2014), pointing out that previous generations of scholars had already focused on, and theorized, precisely these issues and, more critically, that such epochal claims misconstrue shifts in ideological and institutional regimes particular to contemporary Europe (how European nation-states, in particular, “see” diversity) for shifts in demographic or sociolinguistic diversity per se. As Michael Silverstein (2015) points out in reviewing English’s long history of language contact and in revisiting his now 40-plus-year-old work on 18th- and 19th-century Chinookan jargon, there is nothing particularly new about “superdiversity” as sociolinguistic condition (cf. Pennycook and Otsuji 2015) nor have we lacked the conceptual tools to theorize it in its ethnographic particulars (Hall and Nilep 2015). Rather, what is new is that the hegemony of monoglot ideologies of standard within, and propped up by, European nation-states qua language communities (see Silverstein 2015) has increasingly come to be seen, by those very states, as perforated by the recalcitrantly “diverse” practices of their nonstandard speech communities.

Spurred by such critical engagements, recent conversations among linguistic anthropologists and sociolinguists have shifted and extended the focus of such new paradigms to worrying projects of diversity and authenticity as ethnographic data. Linguistic anthropologists, for example, have interrogated the pragmatics of “diversity talk”—metasemiotic practices that take diversity as their object of focus (Faudree and Schulthies 2015)—in multiple contexts, from indigenous cultural and linguistic revitalization projects in Mexico (Faudree 2015a) to pan-Arab media spectacles (Schulthies 2015), as well as exploring the metasemiotic frames (Wilce and Fenigsen 2015:137) that orient projects of authenticity, analyzing ethnographic objects as diverse as the psychotherapeutic self (Smith 2015), coffee shops (Perrino 2015a), cheese and rugs (Heller 2014), anime characters’ vocal quality (Starr 2015), and regional (Johnstone 2014; Silverstein 2014) and age-linked speech registers (Eckert 2014).

Individually and together, these studies outline the total semiotic facts of diversity and authenticity, which is to say, the dialectical relations between forms of difference and sameness and the projects and practices that come to ideologically construe, and thereby entextualize, typify, and constitute, those forms as (in)authentic or diverse. Let me consider two examples, one a project of diversity, the other of authenticity.

Becky Schulthies’s study (2015) of diversity talk in pan-Arab corporate television demonstrates how forms of regional and national linguistic diversity have, of late, been apprehended by media professionals as resources for accessing new markets (Goebel 2015; Shankar 2015). While in the past, pan-Arab media favored modern standard Arabic (MSA) from particular regions of the Middle East, increasingly different voices are being heard and linguistically accommodated on air. In this case, seeing diversity like a market has not only resulted in new reflexive models of television production and marketing. It has also entextualized difference in new ways (as ambivalently valorized rather than straightforwardly devalued or silenced) through novel textual features (on the talent shows Schulthies discusses, e.g., subtitles for non-MSA speech or, in recent shows, the lack thereof; use of nonstandard registers in edited back stories and in interactions with hosts; and new musical genres) and modes of language use (e.g., accommodated registers and multicode and -style repertoires). This, Schulthies argues, has in turn contributed to shifting notions of “Arabness” and the enlarged boundaries of the language community.

In short, Schulthies’s study elucidates the dialectics of diversity, detailing how particular projects of diversity and the ideological frameworks they presuppose construe and reanalyze a particular indexical field of sameness and difference, whereby linguistic and regional diversity is refiured
as an economic asset. Further, she shows how in doing so such projects enable a range of pragmatic activities (of television producers, hosts, contestants, and viewers) that thereby come to reconfigure and “shift” (Faudree 2015a:33) both the speech forms that circulate on and off the air (viz., linguistic diversity) and the ways in which such forms are indexically meaningful, in this case, what “Arabness” may comprise.

Similarly, consider Eitan Wilf’s study (2014a) of jazz education, which masterfully brings the conceptual tools of linguistic anthropology to analyze the workings of U.S. music colleges. As Wilf shows, embedded in such institutions is a foundational ideological (and racializing) tension between creativity—as emblematized by improvisational jazz practice—and rationality—as emblematized by academic jazz pedagogy. At stake in this tension are questions of (in)authenticity, as when such colleges’ pedagogic routinizations of creativity threaten to mark such institutions and their students as inauthentic. To take an example of the ironies entailed in such a project of authenticity: one way that jazz students are taught to improvise solos is through the use of digital music technologies (Wilf 2014a:115–138), with which students can slow down the original recording of past jazz greats without distorting pitch or timbre. This feature allows students to learn to accurately replicate the masters’ “authentic” solos and then to laminate their replications on top of the original recordings. As Wilf shows, such an act of copying another’s authentic creativity is a transformative ritual, allowing the student to inhabit a jazz master’s singularity and creativity in the real time of the song fragment, re-entextualizing his solo as mine, and through that interdiscursive chronotopic collapse (me-now-here substituting for him-then-there) to experience pure creativity as such. As teachers and students explain, through this routinizing technology one can inhabit the subjectivity of, and thus (learn how to) become, a more authentic player. Yet, the gaps between original and copy reemerge in their effacement. Most interestingly, this is because every act of substituting for a jazz master changes the very “affordances” of the student’s body (to use Keane’s term), his or her ability to hear the specificities of the solo, specificities that can, in turn, be zeroed in on by the technological capacities of the digital technology. This dialectic between students’ skills and ears and the technology that trains them to hear and play more like the authentic original continually necessitates new acts of copying that temporarily overcome the very tension of (in)authenticity that drives this educational project.

One implication of these studies is that “authenticity” and “diversity” are not simply ideologies that guide various practices but are themselves the outcomes of social projects that are always liable to success or failure (as judged from within those projects). Seeing and hearing diversity on air are achievements of pan-Arab television institutions, just as experiencing authenticity and being seen as authentic are achievements (and, in certain cases, failures) by jazz players and colleges.

But more than success or failure, the analyses of projects of authenticity and diversity in the publications of 2015 also demonstrate the importance of highlighting outcomes that exceed such projects’ normative horizons, of studying the surfeit of those projects, be they parodies of authenticity projects that open up or foreclose new spaces of identity and belonging (Da Silva 2015; Heller 2014:150–153; Koven and Marques 2015; Vigouroux 2015; Wang 2015), forms of interethnic conviviality (Goebel 2015) or expanded inclusiveness (Schulthies 2015) that diversity projects may unexpectedly engender, or kinds of creativity enabled beside and beyond ideologies of (in)authenticity (Wilf 2014a).

Political Economy

More than 25 years have now passed since the 1989 publication of Susan Gal’s and Judith Irvine’s classic articles on language and political economy—a landmark revisited by a symposium held on March 6, 2015, at the University of Chicago, “Neoliberal Frontiers: Language and Political Economy Revisited.” And nearly 40 years have passed since Pierre Bourdieu’s reflections on language and economics—as marked by the 2015 AAA panel “Engaging with/Debating Bourdieu’s ‘Economics of Linguistic Exchanges’ 40 Years Later” (4-1385). As evident from the symposium, the AAA panel, and 2015’s publications, linguistic anthropology continues to have much to say about political economy, both as it relates to language and more generally.

We can parse this vibrant area of research into, on the one hand, the study of (meta)semiotic practices that constitute capitalist organizational forms such as corporations (Cohen 2015; Urban and Koh 2015) and the bearers of value to which they orient, such as commodities (Faudree 2015b; Kockelman 2015; Wilf 2014b) and brands (Agha 2015b; Gershon 2014; Koh 2015a, 2015b, 2015c; Shankar 2015; Urban 2015; Wang 2015), and, on the other hand, literatures on the commodification of language and other emblems of identity (Faudree 2015a, 2015b; Heller 2014; Henne-Ochoa and Bauman 2015:144–145; Johnstone 2014) and neoliberal ideologies of subjectivity and language and other emblems of identity (Cohen 2015; Hall 2014; Holborow 2015; Park 2015; Urciuoli 2015). Much of the latter discussion has focused on the ways in which global English has increasingly been linked to expanding neoliberal market logics under conditions of globalization (Hiramoto and Park 2014; LaDousa 2014; Price 2014; Proctor 2014; Zentz 2014).

As scholars have observed, with neoliberalization new indexicalities have emerged; in many contexts, linguistic forms and other shibboleths of identity—such as tattoos (Hiramoto 2014) and “heritage” goods (Heller 2014)—have become unmoored from framings of ethnonational and ethnolinguistic identity, authenticity, and “pride” and instead have come under commodity formulations. Such “zombie categories,” as Kira Hall (2014:264) has put it, have not replaced earlier indexicalities. Rather, they stand in palpable contradiction to and tension with them. This felt tension is
most pronounced, unsurprisingly, among those who are lim-
inally placed between such regimes of indexicality, be they
migrant workers (Bae 2014; Hiramoto 2014; Park 2014),
youth (LaDousa 2014), marginalized groups, or some com-
bination thereof (Proctor 2014; Said-Sirhan 2014). While
often anxiety-inducing (Hall 2014; Park 2015) and indica-
tive of exclusionary practices and forms of inequality, such
ambivalent framings are also potentially productive—not
simply for those flexible workers who can successfully man-
age this terrain but also for capital itself, as when identities
of various kinds come to be linked to projects of profit
(Faudree 2015a, 2015b; Heller 2014; Johnstone 2014;
Wang 2015).

As Marnie Holborow (2015) notes, however, taking at
face value projects that attempt to render language a com-
modity runs the risk of reinscribing neoliberal ideologies
that fetishize language as some “thing” to be bought or sold.
As she argues, in contexts such as call centers or tourism,
insofar as linguistic skills are always embedded within labor
power—that which is bought and sold—there is a certain
inalienability or nondetachability of linguistic labor. For Hol-
borow, this makes the commodity formulation of language
different from other commodities; it makes the commodi-
fication of language never guaranteed but, rather, a tenuous
gambit within a particular project liable to success or failure.
Just because a call center or a tourist locale attempts to com-
modify language or linguistic identity doesn’t mean that it
succeeds in doing so, either in extracting value or conferring
profit or in commanding the recognition of language as a
commodity from the market or labor force.

Arguably, however, linguistic anthropology’s interven-
tion in the study of political economy has done what Hol-
borow suggests, namely, interrogate the processes, social
relations, and outcomes of practices and projects of com-
modification with an eye to critically teasing out and decen-
tering the ideologies that underwrite them.

A recent supplemental issue of Signs and Society devoted
to the “semiotic corporation” (Urban and Koh 2015) pro-
vides such an example, presenting a number of studies that
demonstrate the necessity of viewing the corporation—that
capitalist organizational form par excellence—as the ongo-
ing and emergent—and, thus, tenuous and defeasible (Agha
2015b)—effect and medium of semiotic practices (Prentice
2015; Urban 2015; Wilf 2015). In addition to interrogating
capitalist forms (commodities, brands, and corporations) as
the ongoing achievement of semiotic practices of various
kinds, a number of authors have also asked what novel forms
emerge when such formulations are extended in new ways
and in new domains. What happens to the brand form when
nations, universities, ethnicities (Wang 2015), residential
communities (Koh 2015b), politicians (Reyes 2015; Sclfani
2015), and everyday persons (Gershon 2014) are formulated
as brands (or vice versa; Koh 2015b)? As these ethnographic
studies evince, such tropes of capital—be they on the com-
modity, the corporation, or the brand—are productive of
much more than the ideological teloses of what they cite.

Consider, for example, the interfaith groups in the
United Kingdom discussed by Marcy Brink-Danan (2015b).
Such groups have taken on Taylorist techniques and expert
discourses for “managing” religious diversity but put to ends
that run orthogonally to capitalist market logics of accumu-
lation. This is not the not-quite commodification of language
(following Holborow) but something else besides, some-
thing that cannot be reduced to neoliberal logics of manage-
ment or the market (or the terms of Marxist analysis) even
as it does not stand apart from them. Similarly, consider
Susanne Cohen’s study (2015) of management discourses
within multinational corporations in postsocialist Russia that
posit “communication” as the salve for economic ineffici-
cencies. As Cohen points out, in these contexts “communica-
tion” is enregistered vis-à-vis chronotopically distinguished
imaginaries of Western and Russian modernity. “Communi-
cation,” as Cohen shows, is thereby tightly bundled with
questions of morality that run alongside, but are distinct
from, the instrumentalization of communicative practices
that drive how such management discourses have been taken
up within these very corporations.

Echoing my concluding suggestion in the discussion of
diversity and authenticity above, these studies afford insight
into how citational peregrinations of capital dialectically
act back on, decenter, and partially defeat the capitalist
form(ulation)s that we might otherwise see as seamlessly
circulating through social time and space. The productive
recalcitrance inherent in this dialectic forces us to historize
and relativize, and thus rethink, the very analytics of our
political economic and linguistic anthropological studies—
commodity, corporation, and brand but also language,
personhood, and community—rather than reframe them (as
a more orthodox analysis might suggest). Doing this requires
tracing out how the empirical phenomena that such analy-
ics denote are continually undergoing reformulation and
transformation through these tropic extensions in ways we
haven’t yet fully theorized; that is, it requires teasing out
the total semiotic fact of political economy in its dialectical
dynamism.

Mass Mediation

Media technologies of various sorts continue to be a growing
area of focus for linguistic anthropologists. In addition to
drawing on various media such as print, television, and the
Internet as ready-at-hand data sources to address non-media-
specific theoretical questions, linguistic anthropologists in
2015 also reflected on the methodological (Bonilla and Rosa
2015; Ochs 2015; Wortham and Reyes 2014:143–170),
political (Avineri, Barchas-Lichtenstein et al. 2015; Bonilla
and Rosa 2015; Durrani 2015), and theoretical problematics
specific to particular media. In what follows I focus on some
theoretical issues raised by such publications.

A number of studies explored the capacities of media
to transform the participation frameworks of the semiotic
forms they remediate, both in their internal configurations
and in their scale. As these studies show, users’ reflexive
orientation to the fact of mediation is central to these transformative capacities.

Media reconfigure users’ footings, a proposition explored by a number of scholars of social media (Bonilla and Rosa 2015; Hillewaert 2015; Jones 2014; Jones 2015). As Ilana Gershon (2015) has suggested, for example, rather than performances of offline identities, online selves on websites such as Facebook are productively seen as animations enlivened by the network of individuals who come to co-orient to each other through the profile in question. This includes not only one’s “friends” (and friends of friends), who co-author and thereby entextualize that profile through serial and parallel commentary, but also the computer programmers and others (e.g., advertisers) who are integral to the media platform’s infrastructure and interface.

This participation framework and the concept of self it entails present interesting problems in cases of self-branding (Gershon 2014). In such contexts, the self—largely marketed in these online forums—is ideologically presumed to be coherent and consistent across interdiscursively connected digital platforms (such as Facebook and LinkedIn), even as it is ultimately animated by those unruly, surfeit voices that exceed the control of the biographical individual linked to the profile. As Gershon shows, it is the reflexive awareness of this fact that guides how young people today come to orient to their own online (and offline) selves, anxiously policing their web profiles so as to successfully package and market their “brand.” Gershon’s analysis demonstrates how this reflexivity mediates the textual form of such social media as it dynamically comes into being over interdiscursively chained events of animation.

In addition to reconfiguring participation frameworks, media afford capacities to rescale those frameworks and the semiotic forms around which they’re organized. One abiding interest of linguistic anthropologists studying media is how one-to-many (i.e., “mass”) and many-to-many participation frameworks transform social collectivities and their reflexive senses of themselves, as with recent studies of anticommunist networks forged through hashtag activism on Twitter (Bonilla and Rosa 2015) or the shifting senses of Mazatec identity as circulated online by Day of the Dead songs and commentaries on them (Faudrè 2015a). The rescaling of social collectivities through media also leads to shifting indexical values of the semiotic forms that anchor such collectivities: as with stigmatized speech forms in insular Kenya, whose indexical values online have changed given their use in Facebook’s ambiguous participant frameworks (Hillewaert 2015), or “be+like” quotatives among U.S. youth in online chat platforms, whose meanings and uses have changed in/by being remediated on- and off-line (Jones 2014).

Publicity, and engagements with public sphere theory, continues to be a central framework in which this focus on media, collectivity, and the pragmatics of scale has been articulated if only because—as Francis Cody has most recently pointed out—ideologies of liberal publicity continue to hegemonically mediate the ways in which “collective self-abstractions” (Cody 2015:52) are articulated in much, but importantly not all, of the contemporary world. Cody’s essay and other recent works (Brink-Danan 2015a; Debenport 2015; Slotta 2015a, 2015b) have provided a number of critical evaluations of liberal notions of the public sphere and its continued influence on academic thought. Indeed, consider the range of prefixes that qualify the noun “public” in academic discussions—“counter,” “ad hoc,” “semi,” “illiberals”—all of which diagram their difference from some unmarked notion of “the (liberal) public.” What, Cody asks, “would critical theories of the embodied public sphere that need not assume the hegemony of liberalism look like” once we disabuse ourselves of this liberal hang-up (2015:51)? Cody’s study of Tamil politics as well as Erin Debenport’s fascinating monograph on “Keiwa” literacy projects in the U.S. Southwest (2015), Marcy Brink-Danan’s study of the “God debate” in Britain (2015a), and James Slotta’s discussion of Truth and Reconciliation commissions in Canada (2015b) all provide examples that begin to answer this question.

A critical contribution of these studies is that reflexivity to the fact of mass mediation is constitutive of processes of publicity. We see this in Cody’s discussion of crowds attacking media institutions like newspaper offices for running stories critical of political leaders. Subtending this violence is the reflexive orientation of such crowds to the performative effects of news reporting (e.g., to impugn the reputations of political leaders). But such crowds do not simply express their collective anger; they do so under the watchful eye of television cameras and other news organizations, knowingly performing their embodied illiberality in reaction to stories that are published by media outlets that well know the reactions they will provoke. Debenport similarly shows how it is reflexivity to the presumed promiscuous publicness of the written word—as it comes to be negatively construed by an ideology of language as proprietary good and secret—that anxiously guides the politics, and fates, of literacy and lexicographic projects (and entries) in the indigenous Southwest (also see Kroskrity 2015): in her case, the termination of the literacy project she studied.

In all these cases, forms of mediation and social agents’ reflexive stances toward the affordances and (potential) effects of such media are part of a total media fact. As with affinal avoidance registers, Swedish furniture, and U.S. jazz education, here we find a dialectical relationship among ideological formulations of media; the media practices that presuppose, instantiate, and act on such reflexive formulations; and the very artifacts, technologies, and institutions that enable those practices and serve as their sites of reflexive reanalysis and political intervention. Caught in this dialectic, media are not simply the means through which social processes unfold nor are they simply objects of reflexive awareness and activity. They are also thereby the material and textual outcome of these entangled semiotic processes, of these total semiotic facts.
CONCLUSIONS

One discourse among linguistic anthropologists ambivalently remarks that we have moved away from the specificities of language toward “ever more sophisticated cultural interpretation” (Hill 2014:2; cf. Reyes 2014:370) or that we have increasingly come nearer to sociocultural anthropology (Graber 2015:359), if (shaken well and up) with a twist (Silverstein 2005:119). In this review essay I have attempted to frame both these chronotopic propositions in a different light. What is this object “language” from which linguistic anthropology has presumably moved away? If “language” is not an object or an originary point for linguistic anthropology but rather a permanent site of problematization—one that has generated the rich analytic and theoretical developments that characterize the field’s dynamic center of gravity—then is the issue less of the recession or the erosion of our subdisciplinary identity than the dialectical unfolding of what linguistic anthropology has long, perhaps always, been doing?

Constantine V. Nakassis  Department of Anthropology, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637; cnakassi@uchicago.edu
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1. The year in review—“2015”—roughly spans September 2014 to September 2015 as well as the November 2015 AAA meetings.
2. Regarding this centenary, see recent conferences at the University of Chicago, University of Toronto, and Notre Dame University: https://teleologiesofstructuralism.wordpress.com, accessed February 1, 2016.
3. More technically, entextualization denotes the contingent process by which some unfolding flow of signs comes to be bounded off from its surrounding co(n)text as an iterable “text”—a coherent gelling, or event-internal iconisms, of discrete but indexically copresent signs—that can thereby be dead re-contextualized. Processes of entextualization thus imply processes of interdiscursivity—understood as the achievement of relations of iconism across distinct but indexically tangled events of discourse—because every “text” is the achievement of a (meta)semiotic type that links its tokens across contexts. Both processes are ultimately metasemiotically and thus ideologically mediated, as what counts as iconic or indexically copresent is not pregiven but always up for reanalysis and reinterpretation. In the publications of 2015, analytics related to questions of interdiscursivity also include citation.
4. I am sympathetic with Kockelman’s resistance (2015) to the common reduction of ideology to (false) beliefs. Yet, if one fully follows Kockelman here, what becomes of the critical interventions of the ideology construct? Indeed, his dismissal seems to put the political pragmatics of the ideology construct on uncertain ground. It also ignores the ironic and reflexive fallibilism that is central to the language ideology construct, namely, to point up the situatedness of our own work and to point out the dialectical entanglements between the worlds we study and our analyses of them.
5. The term superdiversity has emerged in sociological and sociolinguistic discussions primarily centered in and about Europe (Faudree and Schulthies 2015) to describe what is supposed to be a new epochal condition—a level of diversity and complexity surpassing previous periods—driven by the intensity of globalization, urbanization, and migration. Linguistically, it has been suggested, this can be seen in the incredible hybridity that one finds in certain urban European areas.
6. Such critiques mirror in certain measure, and with a certain lag, anthropology’s own decolonization of its ideological commitments, viz. “culture.”
7. One is reminded of the oldness of some of these issues by Sonal Kulkarni-Joshi’s revisiting (2015) of John Gumperz’s famous work on linguistic diversity in the Deccan.
8. Footing is a term coined by Erving Goffman to refer to the ways in which participants in interaction orient and take stances to their activity and thus to other participants.
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