RESEARCH ARTICLE

Linguistic Anthropology in 2015: Not the Study of Language

Constantine V. Nakassis

ABSTRACT 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. [*linguistic anthropology, indexicality, language ideology, chronotope, superdiversity, authenticity, political economy, mass mediation, year in review*]

RESUMEN 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 antropológico 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 indéxicos 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. [*antropología lingüística, indexicalidad, ideología del lenguaje, cronotopo, superdiversidad, autenticidad, economía política, meditación masiva, año en revisión*]

AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST, Vol. 00, No. 0, pp. 1–16, ISSN 0002-7294, online ISSN 1548-1433. DOI: 10.1111/aman.12528

"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.[1] 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 *langage* (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 hand, 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

studies (Gershon 2015; Nakassis 2015). It also includes, just as importantly, nonacademic audiences. These latter communiqués have made important public interventions into issues such as the so-called language gap (Blum et al. 2015; Blum and Riley 2014; also see Avineri, Johnson et al. 2015 and the 2015 AAA session "Strangely Familiar: The 'Language Gap,' Blaming the Victim, and Child-Rearing in Poverty" [5-1075]), racist mascot names (Avineri and Perley 2014; McGoldrick 2015), and the potentials and importance of online activism in the wake of ongoing state violence against African Americans (Avineri, Barchas-Lichtenstein et al. 2015; Durrani 2015).

OBJECTS OF ANALYSIS

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 underdetermined. 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).[3]

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 dicentization, 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; Karrebæk and Ghandchi 2015; Kroskrity 2015; Stæhr and Madsen 2015) or, relatedly, a valuation or hierarchization of particular languages (Angermeyer 2015; Cooper and Nguyễn 2015; Costa 2015; Hiramoto and Park 2014; LaDousa 2014; McIntosh 2014;

Park 2015; Price 2014; Proctor 2014; Sherouse 2015; Zentz 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.[4] 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 intuits a 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

(Chrisomalis 2015), of race (Hodges 2015), of register (Jones 2014), of sexuality (Manning 2015a), of translation (Gal 2015), and of voice (Weidman 2014).

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 Nguyễn 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 analytics—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 transcendentally 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 (Graan 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 sociality.

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).[5]

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.[6] 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.[7] 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 (*sensu* 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 refigured

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 (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 liminally placed between such regimes of indexicality, be they migrant workers (Bae 2014; Hiramoto 2014; Park 2014), youth (LaDousa 2014), marginalized groups, or some combination thereof (Proctor 2014; Said-Sirhan 2014). While often anxiety-inducing (Hall 2014; Park 2015) and indicative of exclusionary practices and forms of inequality, such ambivalent framings are also potentially productive—not simply for those flexible workers who can successfully manage 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 commodity 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 Holborow, this makes the commodity formulation of language different from other commodities; it makes the commodification 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 commodify 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 intervention in the study of political economy has done what Holborow suggests, namely, interrogate the processes, social relations, and outcomes of practices and projects of commodification with an eye to critically teasing out and decentering the ideologies that underwrite them.

A recent supplemental issue of *Signs and Society* devoted to the "semiotic corporation" (Urban and Koh 2015) provides such an example, presenting a number of studies that demonstrate the necessity of viewing the corporation—that capitalist organizational form par excellence—as the ongoing 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; Sclafani 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 commodity, 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 accumulation. This is *not* the not-quite commodification of language (following Holborow) but something else besides, something that cannot be reduced to neoliberal logics of management 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 inefficiencies. As Cohen points out, in these contexts "communication" is enregistered vis-à-vis chronotopically distinguished imaginaries of Western and Russian modernity. "Communication," 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 defease 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 historicize 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 retrench them (as a more orthodox analysis might suggest). Doing this requires tracing out how the empirical phenomena that such analytics 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).[8] 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 coorient 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 antiracist 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 (Faudree 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," "illiberal"—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*

NOTES

Acknowledgments. Many thanks to Kathryn Woolard for inviting me to write this essay and for her incredibly helpful critical and stylistic interventions. The essay also benefited from an engaged anonymous reviewer as well as from readings by Paul Manning, Keith Murphy, Nicholas Harkness, and Eitan Wilf. Thanks to colleagues who made available prepublication versions of their articles and books. Finally, Rachel Howard provided invaluable (though remunerated) research assistance, without which this review would not have been as thorough.

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 de- and 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 citationality (Goodman et al. 2014; Manning 2014a), fractal discursivity (Proctor 2014), genre (Jones 2015; Koven 2014; Noy 2015; Vigoroux 2015), heteroglossia (Jaffe et al. 2015), intertextuality (Graan 2015; Koven 2014; Prentice 2015), transculturality (Tetreault 2015), translation (Gal 2015), and voicing (Perrino 2015b; Weidman 2014).
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 ironical 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.

REFERENCES CITED

Agha, Asif
2015a Chronotopic Formulations and Kinship Behaviors in Social History. Anthropological Quarterly 88(2):401–415.
2015b Tropes of Branding in Forms of Life. Signs and Society 3(S1):S174–194.

Andrus, Jennifer
2015 Entextualizing Domestic Violence. New York: Oxford University Press.

Angermeyer, Phillip
2015 Speak English or What? New York: Oxford University Press.

Avineri, Netta, Jena Barchas-Lichtenstein, Robin Conley, Mariam Durrani, and Kathleen Riley
2015 Speech, Power, and Social Justice. Anthropology News, April 14. http://linguisticanthropology.org/blog/2015/04/14/an-news-silent-meditation-speech-power-and-social-justice-by-the-committee-on-language-social-justice/, accessed February 1, 2016.

Avineri, Netta, Eric Johnson, Shirley Brice-Heath, Teresa McCarty, Elinor Ochs, and Tamar Kremer-Sadlik
2015 Invited Forum: Bridging the "Language Gap." Journal of Linguistic Anthropology 25(1):66–86.

Avineri, Netta, and Bernard Perley
2014 This Holiday Season Let's Replace Disparaging Slurs. Huffington Post, December 4. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/american-anthropological-association/in-this-holiday-season-le_b_6262672.html, accessed February 1, 2016.

Bae, Sohee
2014 Anxiety, Insecurity and Complexity of Transnational Educational Migration among Korean Middle-Class Families. Journal of Asian Pacific Communication 24(2):152–172.

Bakhtin, Mikhail
1981 The Dialogic Imagination. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, trans. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Ball, Christopher
2015 Avoidance as Alterity Stance: An Upper Xinguan Affinity Chronotope. Anthropological Quarterly 88(2):337–372.

Blommaert, Jan
2015 Commentary: Superdiversity Old and New. Language and Communication 44:82–88.

Blum, Susan, Lizzie Fagan, and Kathleen Riley
2015 The Middle Class (Thinks It) Knows Best: Daring to Intervene in Disadvantaged Households. Huffington Post, February 11. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/american-anthropological-association/the-middle-class-thinks-i_b_6653932.html, accessed February 1, 2016.

Blum, Susan, and Kathleen Riley
2014 Selling the Language Gap. Anthropology News, September 9. http://linguisticanthropology.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/BlumRiley2014_SellingTheLanguageGap.pdf, accessed February 1, 2016.

Bonilla, Yarimar, and Jonathan Rosa
2015 #Ferguson: Digital Protest, Hashtag Ethnography, and the Racial Politics of Social Media in the United States. American Ethnologist 42(1):4–17.

Brightman, Robert
2015 The Return of the Windigo, Again. Semiotic Review. http://semioticreview.com, accessed February 1, 2016.

Brink-Danan, Marcy
2015a Faith in Conversation: Translation, Translanguaging, and the British God Debate. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology 25(2):173–194.
2015b Value and Meaning: Paradoxes of Religious Diversity Talk as Globalized Expertise. Language and Communication 44:44–58.

Carr, E. Summerson
2015 Occupation Bedbugs: Or, the Urgency and Agency of Professional Pragmatism. Cultural Anthropology 25(1): 257–285.

Chávez, Alex
2015 So ¿Te Fuiste a Dallas? (So You Went to Dallas?/So You Got Screwed?): Language, Migration, and the Poetics of Transgression. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology 25(2): 150–172.

Choksi, Nishaant
2015 Surface Politics: Scaling Multiscriptality in an Indian Village Market. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology 25(1):1–24.

Chrisomalis, Stephen
2015 What's So Improper about Fractions? Prescriptivism and Language Socialization at Math Corps. Language in Society 44(1):63–85.

Cody, Francis
2010 Linguistic Anthropology at the End of the Naughts: A Review of 2009. American Anthropologist 112(2):200–207.
2015 Print Capitalism and Crowd Violence beyond Liberal Frameworks. Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa, and the Middle East 35(1):50–65.

Cohen, Susanne
2015 The New Communication Order: Management, Language, and Morality in a Multinational Corporation. American Ethnologist 42(2):324–339.

Cooper, Audrey, and Trần Nguyễn
2015 Signed Language: Community–Researcher Collaboration in Việt Nam: Challenging Language Ideologies, Creating Social Change. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology 25(2):105–127.

Costa, James
2015 Can Schools Dispense with Standard Language? Some Unintended Consequences. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology 25(1):25–42.

Da Silva, Emanuel
2015 Humor (Re)Positioning Ethnolinguistic Ideologies: "You Tink Is Funny?" Language in Society 44(2):187–212.

Debenport, Erin
2015 Fixing the Books. Santa Fe: SAR Press.

Derrida, Jacques
1988 Limited, Inc. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Dixon, R. M. W.
2015 Edible Gender, Mother-in-Law Style, and Other Grammatical Wonders. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Durrani, Mariam
2015 Digital Counterpublics: Twitter in the Aftermath of Ferguson. Anthropology News, March 26. http://linguisticanthropology.org/blog/2015/03/26/an-news-digital-counterpublics-black-twitter-in-the-aftermath-of-ferguson-by-marian-durrani-university-of-pennsylvania/, accessed February 1, 2016.

Eckert, Penelope
2014 The Trouble with Authenticity. *In* Indexing Authenticity. Veronique Lacoste, Jakob Leimgruber, and Thiemo Breyer, eds. Pp. 43–54. Boston: Walter de Gruyter.

Eisenlohr, Patrick
2015 Mediating Disjunctures of Times: Ancestral Chronotopes in Ritual and Media Practices. Anthropological Quarterly 88(2):281–304.

Enfield, Nick, and Jack Sidnell
2015 Language Structure and Social Agency: Confirming Polar Questions in Conversation. Linguistics Vanguard 1(1):131–143.

Faudree, Paja
2015a Singing for the Dead, On and Off Line: Diversity, Migration, and Scale in Mexican Muertos Music. Language and Communication 44:31–43.

2015b Tales from the Land of Magic Plants: Textual Ideologies and Fetishes of Indigeneity in Mexico's Sierra Mazateca. Comparative Studies in Society and History 57(3):838–869.
2015c Why X Doesn't Always Mark the Spot: Contested Authenticity in Mexican Indigenous Language Politics. Semiotica 203:179–201.

Faudree, Paja, and Becky Schulthies
2015 Introduction: "Diversity Talk" and Its Others. Language and Communication 44:1–6.

Fleming, Luke
2014a Australian Exceptionalism in the Typology of Affinal Avoidance Registers. Anthropological Linguistics 56(2):115–158.
2014b Whorfian Pragmatics Revisited: Language Anti-Structures and Performativist Ideologies of Language. Texas Linguistics Forum 57:55–66.
2015 Taxonomy and Taboo: The (Meta)Pragmatic Sources of Semantic Abstraction in Avoidance Registers. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology 25(1):43–65.

Gal, Susan
1989 Language and Political Economy. Annual Review of Anthropology 18:345–367.
2015 Politics of Translation. Annual Review of Anthropology 44:225–240.

Gershon, Ilana
2014 Selling Your Self in the United States. PoLAR 37(2):281–295.
2015 What Do We Talk about When We Talk about Animation. Social Media and Society (April–June):1–2.

Goebel, Zane
2015 Language and Superdiversity. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goldstein, Donna, and Kira Hall
2015 Mass Hysteria in Le Roy, New York: How Brain Experts Materialized Truth and Outscienced Environmental Inquiry. American Ethnologist 42(4):640–657.

Goodman, Jane, Matt Tomlinson, and Justin Richland
2014 Citational Practices: Knowledge, Personhood, Subjectivity. Annual Review of Anthropology 43:449–463.

Graan, Andrew
2015 Chronotopes of the Political: Public Discourse, News Media, and Mass Action in Post-Conflict Macedonia. *In* Culture, Catastrophe, and Rhetoric. Robert Hariman and Ralph Cintron, eds. Pp. 47–67. New York: Berghahn Books.

Graber, Kathryn
2015 On the Disassembly Line: Linguistic Anthropology in 2014. American Anthropologist 117(2):350–363.

Graber, Kathryn, and Jesse Murray
2015 The Local History of an Imperial Category: Language and Religion in Russia's Eastern Borderlands, 1860s–1930s. Slavic Review 74(1):127–152.

Grossi, Miriam, and Vinicius Ferreira
2015 Toward Linguistic Diversity in Anthropology. American Anthropologist 117(1):152–153.

Guzmán, Jennifer R.
2014 The Epistemics of Symptom Experience and Symptom Accounts in Mapuche Healing and Pediatric Primary Care in Southern Chile. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology 24(3):249–276.

Hall, Kira
2014 Hypersubjectivity: Language, Anxiety, and Indexical Dissonance in Globalization. Journal of Asian Pacific Communication 24(2):261–273.

Hall, Kira, and Chad Nilep
2015 Code-Switching, Identity, and Globalization. *In* The Handbook of Discourse Analysis. 2nd edition. Deborah Tannen, Heidi Hamilton, and Deborah Schiffrin, eds. Pp. 597–619. New York: Wiley.

Handman, Courtney
2014 Becoming the Body of Christ: Sacrificing the Speaking Subject in the Making of the Colonial Lutheran Church in New Guinea. Current Anthropology 55(10):205–215.

Harkness, Nicholas
2015 Basic Kinship Terms: Christian Relations, Chronotopic Formulations, and a Korean Confrontation of Language. Anthropological Quarterly 88(2):305–336.

Haviland, John
2015 Hey! Topics in Cognitive Science 7(1):124–149.

Heller, Monica
2014 The Commodification of Authenticity. *In* Indexing Authenticity. Veronique, Lacoste, Jakob Leimgruber, and Thiemo Breyer, eds. Pp. 136–158. Boston: Walter de Gruyter.

Henne-Ochoa, Richard, and Richard Bauman
2015 Who Is Responsible for Saving the Language? Performing Generation in the Face of Language Shift. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology 25(2):128–149.

Hill, Jane
2014 Looking Back, Looking Ahead. Annual Review of Anthropology 43:1–14.

Hillewaert, Sarah
2015 Writing with an Accent: Orthographic Practice, Emblems, and Traces on Facebook. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology 25(2):195–214.

Hiramoto, Mie
2014 "Island Girl from the Island": Tattooed Symbols and Personal Identities in Contemporary Hawai'i. Journal of Asian Pacific Communication 24(2):173–195.

Hiramoto, Mie, and Joseph Sung-Yul Park
2014 Anxiety, Insecurity, and Border Crossing: Language Crossing in a Globalizing World. Journal of Asian Pacific Communication 24(2):141–151.

Hodges, Adam
2015 Ideologies of Language and Race in US Media Discourse about the Trayvon Martin Shooting. Language in Society 44(3):401–423.

Holborow, Marnie
2015 Language and Neoliberalism. New York: Routledge.

Irvine, Judith
1989 When Talk Isn't Cheap: Language and Political Economy. American Ethnologist 16(2):248–267.
Jaffe, Alexandra, Michele Koven, Sabina Perrino, and Cecile Vigouroux
2015 Introduction: Heteroglossia, Performance, Power, and Participation. Language in Society 44(2):135–139.
Jarlehed, Johan, and Adam Jaworski
2015 Typographic Landscaping: Creativity, Ideology, Movement. Social Semiotics 25(2):117–125.
Johnstone, Barbara
2014 "100% Authentic Pittsburgh": Sociolinguistic Authenticity and the Linguistics of Particularity. *In* Indexing Authenticity. Veronique Lacoste, Jakob Leimgruber, and Thiemo Breyer, eds. Pp. 97–112. Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
Jones, Graham
2014 Reported Speech as an Authentication Tactic in Computer-Mediated Communication. *In* Indexing Authenticity. Veronique Lacoste, Jakob Leimgruber, and Thiemo Breyer, eds. Pp. 188–208. Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
Jones, Rodney
2015 Generic Intertextuality in Online Social Activism: The Case of the *It Gets Better* Project. Language in Society 44(3):317–339.
Karrebæk, Martha, and Narges Ghandchi
2015 "Pure" Farsi and Political Sensitivities: Language and Ideologies in Farsi Complementary Language Classrooms in Denmark. Journal of Sociolinguistics 19(1):62–90.
Keane, Webb
2014 Rotting Bodies: The Clash of Stances toward Materiality and Its Ethical Affordances. Current Anthropology 55(10):312–321.
2015a Ethical Life. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
2015b Why Cognitive Anthropology Needs to Understand Social Interaction and Its Mediation. Social Anthropology 23(2):192–193.
Kockelman, Paul
2015 Four Theories of Things: Aristotle, Marx, Heidegger, and Peirce. Signs and Society 3(1):153–192.
Koh, Kyung-Nan
2015a How Brands (Don't) Do Things: Corporate Branding as Practices of Imagining "Commens." Semiotica 207:451–473.
2015b Representing Corporate Social Responsibility, Branding the Commodity as Gift, and Reconfiguring the Corporation as 'Super'-Person. Signs and Society 3(S1):S151–173.
2015c Translating "Sustainability" in Hawai'i: The Utility of Semiotic Transformation in the Transmission of Culture. Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology 16(1):55–73.
Koven, Michele
2014 Interviewing: Practice, Ideology, Genre, and Intertextuality. Annual Review of Anthropology 43:499–520.
Koven, Michele, and Isabelle Marques
2015 Performing and Evaluating (Non)Modernities of Portuguese Migrant Figures on YouTube: The Case of Antonio de Carglouch. Language in Society 44(2):213–242.
Kroskrity, Paul
2015 Designing a Dictionary for an Endangered Language Community: Lexicographical Deliberations, Language Ideological Clarifications. Language Documentation and Conservation 9:140–157.
Kulkarni-Joshi, Sonal
2015 Religion and Language Variation in a Convergence Area: The View from the Border Town of Kupwar Post-Linguistic Reorganisation of Indian States. Language and Communication 42:75–85.
Lacoste, Veronique, Jakob Leimgruber, and Thiemo Breyer, eds.
2014 Indexing Authenticity. Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
LaDousa, Chaise
2014 Hindi Is Our Ground, English Is Our Sky. New York: Berghahn Books.
Lemon, Alaina
2015 MetroDogs: The Heart in the Machine. Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute 21(3):660–679.
Lempert, Michael
2013 No Ordinary Ethics. Anthropological Theory 13(4):370–393.
2015 Ethics without Immanence: A Reply to Michael Lambek. Anthropological Theory 15(2):133–140.
Manning, Paul
2014a Once upon a Time, There Was Sex in Georgia. Slavic Review 73(2):265–286.
2014b When Goblins Come to Town: The Ethnography of Urban Hauntings in Georgia. *In* Monster Anthropology in Australasia and Beyond. Yasmine Musharbash and Geir Henning Presterudstuen, eds. Pp. 161–178. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
2015a Love Stories. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
2015b Pixies' Progress: How the Pixie Became Part of the Nineteenth-Century Fairy Mythology. *In* The Folkloresque. Michael Dylan Foster and Jeffrey A. Tolbert, eds. Pp. 81–103. Logan: Utah State University Press.
McGoldrick, Gillian
2015 My High School Mascot Is Offensive. Education Week, February 17. http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2015/02/18/my-high-school-mascot-is-offensive.html, accessed February 1, 2016.
McIntosh, Janet
2014 Linguistic Atonement: Penitence and Privilege in White Kenyan Language Ideologies. Anthropological Quarterly 87(4):1165–1199.
2015 Autochthony and "Family": The Politics of Kinship in White Kenyan Bids to Belong. Anthropological Quarterly 88(2):251–280.
Moore, Robert
2015 From Revolutionary Monolingualism to Reactionary

Multilingualism: Top-Down Discourses of Linguistic Diversity in Europe, 1794–Present. Language and Communication 44:19–30.

Murphy, Keith
2015 Swedish Design. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Nakassis, Constantine V.
2015 A Tamil-Speaking Heroine. Bioscope 6(2):165–186.

Noy, Chaim
2015 Thank You for Dying for Our Country. New York: Oxford University Press.

Nozawa, Shunsuke
2015 Phatic Traces: Sociality in Contemporary Japan. Anthropological Quarterly 88(2):373–400.

Ochs, Elinor
2015 Corporeal Reflexivity and Autism. Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science 49(2):275–287.

Park, Joseph Sung-Yul
2014 "You Say Ouch and I Say Aya": Linguistic Insecurity in a Narrative of Transnational Work. Journal of Asian Pacific Communication 24(2):241–260.
2015 Structures of Feeling in Unequal Englishes. *In* Unequal Englishes. Ruanni Tupas, ed. Pp. 59–73. Basingstroke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pennycook, Alistair, and Emi Otsuji
2015 Metrolingualism. New York: Routledge.

Perrino, Sabina
2015a Narrating Authenticity in Northern Italian Historical Cafés. Language and Communication 40:82–91.
2015b Performing Extracomunitari: Mocking Migrants in Veneto Barzellette. Language in Society 44(2):141–160.

Prentice, Michael
2015 Managing Intertextuality: Display and Discipline across Documents at a Korean Firm. Signs and Society 3(S1):S70–94.

Price, Gareth
2014 English for All? Neoliberalism, Globalization, and Language Policy in Taiwan. Language in Society 43(5):567–589.

Proctor, Lavanya Murali
2014 English and Globalization in India: The Fractal Nature of Discourse. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology 24(3):294–314.

Quijada, Justine, Kathryn Graeber, and Eric Stephen
2015 Finding "Their Own": Revitalizing Buryat Culture through Shamanic Practices in Ulan-Ude. Problems of Post-Communism 62(5):258–272.

Reyes, Angela
2014 Linguistic Anthropology in 2013: Super-New-Big. American Anthropologist 116(2):366–378.

Reyes, Antonio
2015 Building Intimacy through Linguistic Choices, Text Structures, and Voices in Political Discourse. Language and Communication 43:58–71.

Romero, Sergio
2015 Language and Ethnicity among the K'ichee' Maya. Provo: University of Utah Press.

Said-Sirhan, Yurni
2014 Linguistic Insecurity and Reproduction of the Malay Community's Peripherality in Singapore. Journal of Asian Pacific Communication 24(2):221–240.

Saussure, Ferdinand de
1986[1916] Course in General Linguistics. R. Harris, trans. New York: Open Court.

Sclafani, Jennifer
2015 Family as a Framing Resource for Political Identity Construction: Introduction Sequences in Presidential Primary Debates. Language in Society 44(3):369–399.

Schieffelin, Bambi
2014 Christianizing Language and the Dis-placement of Culture in Bosavi, Papua New Guinea. Current Anthropology 55(10):226–237.

Schulthies, Becky
2015 Do You Speak Arabic? Managing Axes of Adequation and Difference in Pan-Arab Talent Programs. Language and Communication 44:59–71.

Shankar, Shalini
2015 Advertising Diversity. Durham: Duke University Press.

Sherouse, Perry
2015 Russian Presence in Georgian Film Dubbing: Scales of Inferiority. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology 25(2): 215–229.

Silverstein, Michael
1979 Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology. *In* The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels. Paul R. Cline, William Hanks, and Carol Hofbauer, eds. Pp. 193–247. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
1985 Language and the Culture of Gender: At the Intersection of Structure, Usage, and Ideology. *In* Semiotic Mediation. Elizabeth Mertz and Richard Parmentier, eds. Pp. 219–260. Orlando: Academic Press.
2005 Languages/Cultures Are Dead! Long Live the Linguistic-Cultural! *In* Unwrapping the Sacred Bundle. Daniel Segal and Sylvia Yanigasko, eds. Pp. 99–125. Durham: Duke University Press.
2014 The Race from Place: Dialect Eradication vs. the Linguistic "Authenticity" of Terroir. *In* Indexing Authenticity. Veronique Lacoste, Jakob Leimgruber, and Thiemo Breyer, eds. Pp. 159–187. Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
2015 How Language Communities Intersect: Is "Superdiversity" an Incremental or Transformative Condition? Language and Communication 44:7–18.

Slotta, James
2015a The Perlocutionary Is Political: Listening as Self-Determination in a Papua New Guinean Polity. Language in Society 44(4):525–552.
2015b Phatic Rituals of the Liberal Democratic Polity: Hearing Voices in the Hearings of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. Comparative Studies in Society and History 57(1):130–160.

Smith, Benjamin
2015 The Semiotics and Politics of "Real Selfhood" in the American Therapeutic Discourse of the World War II Era. Semiotica 203:203–226.
Spitzmuller, Jergen
2015 Graphic Variation and Graphic Ideologies: A Metapragmatic Approach. Social Semiotics 25(2):126–141.
Stæhr, Andreas, and Lian Malai Madsen
2015 Standard Language in Urban Rap: Social Media, Linguistic Practice, and Ethnographic Context. Language and Communication 40:67–81.
Starr, Rebecca
2015 Sweet Voice: The Role of Voice Quality in a Japanese Feminine Style. Language in Society 44(1):1–34.
Tetreault, Chantal
2015 Transcultural Teens. New York: Wiley.
Urban, Greg
2015 Symbolic Force: A Corporate Revitalization Video and Its Effects. Signs and Society 3(S1):S95–124.
Urban, Greg, and Kyung-Nan Koh
2015 The Semiotic Corporation: An Introduction. Signs and Society 3(S1):S1–12.
Urciuoli, Bonnie
2015 The Metaculture of Law School Admissions: A Commentary on Lazarus-Black and Globokar. Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies 22(1):113–119.
Vigouroux, Cecile
2015 Genre, Heteroglossic Performances, and New Identity: Stand-Up Comedy in Modern French Society. Language in Society 44(2):243–272.
Wang, Xuan
2015 Inauthentic Authenticity: Semiotic Design and Globalization in the Margins of China. Semiotica 203:227–248.
Webster, Anthony
2015 Intimate Grammars. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
Weidman, Amanda
2014 Anthropology and Voice. Annual Review of Anthropology 43:37–51.
Wilce, James, and Janina Fenigsen
2015 De-Essentializing Authenticity: A Semiotic Approach. Semiotica 203:137–152.
Wilf, Eitan
2014a School for Cool. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
2014b Semiotic Dimensions of Creativity. Annual Review of Anthropology 43:397–412.
2015 Ritual Semiosis in the Business Corporation: Recruitment to Routinized Innovation. Signs and Society 3(S1):S13–40.
Woolard, Kathryn
1998 Introduction: Language Ideology as a Field of Inquiry. *In* Language Ideologies. Bambi Schieffelin, Kathryn Woolard, and Paul Kroskrity, eds. Pp. 3–50. New York: Oxford University Press.
Wortham, Stanton, and Angela Reyes
2014 Discourse Analysis beyond the Speech Event. New York: Routledge.
Zentz, Lauren
2014 "Love" the Local, "Use" the National, "Study" the Foreign: Shifting Javanese Language Ecologies in (Post-)Modernity, Postcoloniality, and Globalization. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology 24(3):339–359.