

Alía Warsco

Literature Review

Introduction to Latin American and Caribbean Studies II

May 7, 2023

Language as an Everyday Form of Resistance: The Case of Southern Quechua

The Southern variety of Quechua spoken primarily in Peru and Bolivia has a rich and complex history that spans centuries of state formations and resistance across the Andean region. Recently, there has been increasing scholarship on the importance of recognizing Quechua as an official language sub-nationally, nationally, and internationally. Scholars have taken from a variety of disciplines and undertaken research into many aspects of Quechua language history from the colonial era to modernity. Additionally, a plethora of work has been done in documenting state formation and the various political and social movements surrounding Indigenous peoples' rights and resistance within and to that state. Engaging with both the rhetoric of state formation and traditional ethno- and sociolinguistic study, this literature review aims to connect these two disciplines in new ways – providing an overview of the key themes and debates that have emerged in this growing body of scholarship and providing new perspectives and questions with which one can view Quechua language use as an active form of state resistance.

PART 1: State Formation

The grounding theoretical basis for this work is around state formation and resistance. James Scott, in *Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*, suggests that people can engage in small,

subtle forms of everyday resistance to state formation to resist domination. Scott argues that these forms of resistance take many forms and can often be unrecognized by those in power, because the state tends to focus on overt acts of resistance through protest and organization. In chapter 8, Scott concludes his examination of class struggle and the social experience of class in the small village Sedaka. His work summarizes the quieter acts of resistance that the poor use to combat the hegemonic forces at play in their lives: including boycotts, quiet strikes, theft, and malicious gossip. Of the study, he notes, “The objective is a deeper appreciation of everyday forms of *symbolic* resistance and the way in which they articulate with everyday acts of material resistance. Just as peasants... do not simply vacillate between blind submission and homicidal rage, neither do they move directly from ideological complicity to strident class-consciousness” (304, emphasis added). What I believe is missing from Scott’s conclusion, and perhaps what was not possible in the study of a potentially monolingual village, is the act of using language itself as a form of resistance. I am interested by the frameworks of the socialization and social use of language, as Scott refers to the socialization of wealth and social use of property (308). These are both tied to methods of exclusion through social activity based on class differences. What my work wishes to answer is how do speakers of Spanish and Quechua in history and modernity express difference through their language use? What are the consequences (class, gendered, or otherwise) that exist because of these social uses of language?

Also influential to these questions is Scott’s rethinking of the concept of hegemony. Pulling away from its Gramscian roots, Scott argues for hegemony as more than the process of material, ideological, and social domination. As we will see in the next section, hegemonic imaginings of a monolingual state have been historically powerful and have not been questioned in Peru and Bolivia until quite recently. However, Quechua exists as a break of this hegemony –

echoing what Scott asserts that “The concrete action of workers who defend their material interests may, for example, suggest a radical consciousness but, at the level of ideas – the level at which hegemony operates...” (316) Scott argues for a more nuanced understanding of the will and knowledge of hegemonic powers in the lower classes – and argues that these subversive and everyday forms of protest are argument for a “critical consciousness” that cannot be overlooked in lower classes.

Essential to this work is the further conversation of everyday forms of state formation (Joseph and Nugent) that builds off of Scott’s work. This work offers a nuanced understanding of state formation in Mexico, and highlights the everyday forms of negotiation in shaping the country’s political and social landscape. These included peasant rebellions, labor strikes, through to political campaigns and larger social movements. This work will inform the historical context that Quechua exists in as a polycephalic form of both state formation and state resistance. The intrinsically linked relationship between revolution and resistance, popular culture, and the state take center stage in this chapter. James and Nugent examine how these three, sometimes hard-to-materialize, concepts both influence and define each other and gain power through their obscurity.

The assertion that revolution and resistance is a *process* rather than an *event* (5) is compelling to this work, because the historical processes that Quechua has undergone in community making and state acceptance, dismissal, and banishment are processes themselves. Hegemony is described by James and Nugent on the same terms, and I am inclined to believe that Scott would agree with this assessment of hegemony as a process. This is an important context for the argument that the state contextualizes revolution within its own formations and boundaries – ones that I would argue include the language in which they are created. Joseph and

Nugent go on to explore how the state co-opts and seems to appropriate “revolutionary” or “resistance” language, including phrases such as *popular* and *the mass of people*, even *revolution* itself when naming parties. Here, I see a direct correlation with how the state historically and modernly uses the Spanish language as one of domination and social power, while sometimes in the same breath uplifting Indigenous causes and needs. This will further implicate Quechua language use as the language of revolution that the state hasn’t yet found ways to co-opt. The critical juncture to this work is the recognition of Quechua as a state-recognized language in 1975 in Peru and 2009 in Bolivia. The further implications of this state recognition are examined with Rousseau and Dargent’s chapter in the next section.

James and Nugent go on to critique methods of studying history “from below” and “from above” in isolation, and seek to provide both views in the essays in the book, and in my observations, I seek to do the same. Though these formulations can be contested and the importance of both scrutinized, my further research will aim to show the importance of studying the relationship between the “below” (through the lens of Bolivia) and “above” (through the lens of Peru) and how their actions and linguistic policies affect each other. Though many of the works in the following section focus in on Peru’s context specifically, in the final iteration of this work, care will be taken to examine the different histories that exist within the two nations.

James and Nugent go on to suggest that consciousness of and in revolution is “predicated upon selective (and always contested) traditions of historical memory that reside and are nourished in popular ‘subcultures of resistance.’ (11). This action of selective memory will be essential with the work of Isaias Rojas-Perez and his findings on the post-internal conflict “nonmemory” of the state in regard to the lives lost and disappeared during the conflict. This restates the importance that the “state” holds in revolution, and explain how both the state and popular culture define the

boundaries of revolution. Popular culture, here, is in reference to the “music, art, handicrafts, narratives, rituals, and theater” of the *campesinado* and urban underclass (15). The question that remains in this narrative is if popular culture and state formation are inherently reliant on each other, what if a subsection of popular culture is created in a different language than the state? How does the state build itself working within two contrasting languages? What motivations might the state have to standardize language, reject language, or, co-opt the language? This is what I will examine through my research of Quechua.

To round out theoretical imaginings on state, I turn to Krupa and Nugent’s *Off-Centered States: Rethinking State Theory Through an Andean Lens*. This work seeks to understand how people work within and against the state simultaneously, and examine what it means to participate in political life. By doing this, they are off-centering the state. They explain how invoking or not invoking the state, acting for the state or not, and even addressing the state or not off-centers it. From this off-center location, they “denaturalize it as the transcendental core of political life and the master symbol of political practice. In doing so, they are perhaps doing exactly what the state they suggest asks them not to. By understanding the state through the material consequences of it, the mask and concealment is no longer important. In fact, they further this approach by not taking the state as a given (9), therefore not reifying its existence. The authors additionally argue that the state must be imagined based on evidence from everyday life, and those imaginations are inherently personal based on their experience with what they perceive as the state. Therefore, there are many affective responses to the state, and the authors seek to understand the relationship between these attachments. In the context of Quechua speakers, what the state may look like and what the state may “say” could differ tremendously from Spanish monolinguals.

Of the four routes of inquiry that Krupa and Nugent suggest as routes of off-centering the state, my line of questioning directly speaks to two. One of these routes of inquiry what Krupa and Nugent call a “critical phenomenology of rule” (6). It is a method of questioning that examines the social space of lived governmental and nongovernmental encounters to understand the conditions that make the state present in everyday social relations. Language, in this view, fits very well. It is the process with which states fundamentally “speak” to their people, and how those people choose to “speak” back. The method of inquiry also hinges on understanding the way the state is apprehended and experienced (in everyday, or not so everyday ways) and how people make choices and navigate the distinctions between legitimate and illegitimate rule to form conclusions and an image about the state.

Further, Krupa and Nugent suggest focusing on cross-border processes of statecraft in transnational and subnational powers. I will address this in two ways. Though the places Quechua and its varieties are spoken are across nation boundaries, and the experiences they have are often similar at the national level, in subnational regions this experience may differ. For example, the Cuzco and Ayacucho region in Peru, where Quechua is the first language of most of its residents, have specific language rights built into their law and policy that often come before nation-level change. This will be discussed in further detail in the next section, looking into the plural history of Quechua language in policy in Peru specifically in the 20th century.

In examining the many ways the state is formed over time, and the many ways that resistance to that state can take place, I aim to show the ways that language is a tool co-opted by the state and used in practice by communities that are left fundamentally off-center of the state.

Part 2: Quechua as Resistance

Critical to understanding the historical context of this work are three key moments: the use of Quechua as a means of conversion to Christianity during the colonial period, the wavering legality and tolerance of Quechua within the state spanning until the 19th century, and the final recognition of Quechua as an official language in Peru in 1975 and Bolivia in 2009. Quechua, a historically oral language, was the lingua franca of the Inca Empire, which dominated most of the pre-Columbian Andean region. With the imposition of Spanish on Quechua speakers in colonial and key state formative moments in history, Quechua (and subsequently its speakers) was seen as a lesser form of language, and those with power used Quechua exclusively as a tool of subjugation and as a means of conversion to Christianity. However, Quechua language varieties persisted as an active form of state resistance. Scott argues that forms of resistance can be invisible, and this section will explore Quechua language use specifically for both infiltrating and countering state narratives.

The earliest look into Quechua language use will pull from the chronicle of Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala. In his work, Guaman Poma documents pre-colonial life in the Andes, recanting traditions of idols, burials, festivals, and other traditions common under the Incan empire. Using this text I will argue that his plead to the king and use of traditional, well-established Spanish literary modes also serve as intervention and resistance to colonial power. Writing in both Spanish and Quechua, this work represented an attempt at social construction in an environment where other models were not available. Poma also identifies himself as the personification of fear in colonial imaginings. He was identified as *Indio ladino* by colonial forces of his time because of his literacy in the Spanish language. In his own parlance:

Que los dichos corregidores y padres y comenderos quieren muy mal a los yndios ladinos que sauen leer y escriuir, y más ci sauen hazer peticiones, porque no le pida en la rrecidencia de todo los agrauios y males y daños. Y ci puede, le destierra del dicho pueblo en este rreyno. (497)

The corregidores, padres, and encomenderos despise the ladino Indians who know how to read and write especially if they know how to draw up petitions, because they fear these Indians will demand audits of all the injuries harms, and damages they have caused. If they can, they banish these Indians from their pueblos in this kingdom. [translation by Frye 2006, 169]

Here, Poma recognizes himself and how he exists within the state: as a colonial fear because of his language abilities. He recognized how he existed outside of state hegemonic practice and used his knowledge of Spanish language and Spanish literary modes to critique and provide commentary on the state. The bilingual nature of the work exemplifies the space that Guaman Poma was writing in – one where Quechua and its speakers were feared for their abilities to contrast the state. Importantly, though, Poma makes clear that he does not disagree entirely with the colonial rule, in fact, he uses his pleas as a valuable community member (and importantly, as a Christian) to proclaim his duty in righting the wrongs of the colonial powers.

Two works are important to understanding the journey of Quechua language use to the present. First, Rousseau and Dargent explore the complex history of Indigenous language rights in Peru through the lens of the country’s language regime – particularly its state policies – from the colonial period to modernity. The article explores how language politics may sit in Latin American Indigenous politics. They question why Peru decided to develop language policy that granted Indigenous language speakers the “right to interact in their mother tongue with the state” (163), in a time where this was largely unheard of. This framework puts considerable trust in the state to acknowledge the policies and rights that are imparted in their institutional and legislative literature for Indigenous people in a state that is not particularly known for doing so, and in fact

has had ongoing internal conflicts over this issue, among many others. Rousseau and Dargent explore the two broad kinds of language rights: tolerance-oriented and promotion-oriented. The first is in reference to a strict tolerance of citizens' use of the language in the private sphere and in civil society, while the second refers to allowing citizens' use of that language over the dominant one in their interactions with public institutions. The authors argue that Peru's history of Quechua recognition have swayed from one to the other, usually towards tolerance and more modernly towards promotion, but never to full extent of promotion (165). The authors recognize four critical junctures in Quechua's state recognition history:

- (a) Post-independence nineteenth century – 1960s: De facto monolingualism
 - (b) Reformist military regime – 1970s: Legal recognition of Quechua as national language alongside Spanish; compulsory Quechua education in the school system
 - (c) Neoliberal Constitution – 1990s: Constitutional recognition of pluricultural character of society; right to ethnic/cultural identity; right to use Indigenous language to interact with public administration; right to bilingual education
 - (d) Decentralization and new electoral system – 2000s: Subnational governments; adoption of Indigenous languages as official; new national laws on Indigenous languages that creates linguistic rights and asserts an official-languages regimes at the subnational level
- (Adopted from Table 1, 166)

What is most telling about each of these is exemplified through the examination of the military government of General Juan Velasco Alvarado (1968-1975) and neoliberal regime of Alberto Fujimori (1990-2000). The authors suggest that these junctures were not prompted by political dynamics related to Indigenous politics or languages. They were dynamics implicating economic, class, and land reform. In so doing, though these regimes enacted many plural-linguistic rights and policies in legislation and jurisdiction, these policies in practice gained little momentum after their adoption and quickly were left underfunded and undone.

Looking into the 2000s, Rousseau and Dargent explore Paulina Arpasi's, an Aymara woman and elected congressperson's, proposition that it is not linguistic rights, but recognition in the zones where the Indigenous languages predominate, as well as the state's obligation to protect and promote these languages that Indigenous people are fighting for (171). This can be seen clearly in Indigenous-majority subnational governments' (and as Krupa and Nugent may refer to them as, Off-Centered States) adoption of language rights policies far before the adoption of national law on Indigenous languages that created full-fledged linguistic rights. It is this that makes me question the motivations of the 2011 Peruvian national law on Indigenous languages. What does it mean for a state to officially tolerate a language, and what does it mean for a state to promote that language? Understanding that the 1975 recognition of Quechua means very little in practice, what does the state serve to gain in recognizing an official language within legislative operations? Why, if it is an officially tolerated language, do we still see Quechua community resistance to state messaging?

One clear example of Quechua community resistance to state messaging more modernly is seen through Isaias Rojas-Perez's *Mourning Remains: State Atrocity, Exhumations, and Governing the Disappeared in Peru's Postwar Andes*. In a critical examination of the nonmemory of the state in post-internal war (1980-2000) Peru, Rojas-Perez examines the Quechua communities who instead honor and remember the disappeared in direct contrast to the state's utter silencing of the violence and atrocity that was committed during the internal war. As Rojas-Perez remarks:

“These [Quechua] words unravel the political temporality that the Peruvian elites attempt to fabricate. They bring back into the public sphere the presence of those about whom the nation does not want to speak and whose atrocious deaths at the hands of the state it wants to forget. Like a nightmarish apparition that comes out of nowhere to haunt the nation's celebration of its well-being...” (5)

The act of non-memory for those largely Indigenous lives who were lost or who disappeared during this stage of the internal conflict is materialized for the state as the Cristo del Pacífico. For Quechua speakers and community members, their rebellious yet simple act of memory is materialized through a much humbler form, La Cruz de la Hoyada. This physical advertisement of the community's memory in the name of the dead and disappeared is an act of active resistance to state messaging. Materially, this happens in a language the state understands, through monuments and gestures. Yet symbolically, this happens in a language the state had just recognized – Quechua. Rojas-Perez discusses the language of numbers, evidence, and rights, as opposed to the language of ritual as “intelligible in the always already constituted public sphere... De facto vehicles for eliciting a response to questions concerning the protection of the life and personal integrity of individuals as well as the viability of the body politic” (10). Rojas-Perez speaks of language here in a strictly non-linguistic way. Here, he means the different functions that a single language can serve as different “languages.” I would go further, and imply that in fact, in Peru, Spanish exists as this language of numbers, evidence and rights, while in many cases Quechua exists as the language of ritual, memory, and atrocity of the state.

Finally, I will end with sociolinguistic perspectives on state language development programs with an examination of Kazakh in Kazakhstan by Ainur Baimyrza. We can loosely contrast the linguistic situation of Kazakh and Russian in Kazakhstan with that of Quechua and Spanish in Peru and Bolivia. In Kazakhstan, Kazakh is recognized as the official “state” language, while Russian is recognized as the “language of interethnic communication” and is used predominantly in everyday life (252). Russian became the predominant language through the rise of the USSR, and Kazakh was only recognized during the late Soviet period, when the state was in crisis. Here, the contrast can be seen with Quechua – when Spanish arrived and

language contacted, Spanish became the de facto language in state operation because of discriminatory and racialized sociolinguistic attitudes that this literature review does not have the scope to detail. However, with the adoption of state language development programs (in 1989, revised in 1997) that promote improving and standardizing the methodology of teaching the language, developing the infrastructure for teaching Kazakh, increased demand for the language, and improving pluralistic language culture, Baimyrza reports that “although many issues were resolved on paper, they were not resolved in life” (251). The comparison here to Quechua is made clear through the aforementioned recognitions of Quechua in Peru during the reformist military regime and neoliberal constitution as explained by Rousseau and Dargent. If one is to imagine the comparison, Spanish would be the language of “interethnic communication,” as Russian is in former Soviet states.

The importance of status, therefore, is not only a legal status of language in a society, but a category that reflects the sociolinguistic and social status of that language. Multilingual states are composed of specific complexities, associating one language or another with a specific function, and most of them outside of the dominant language, according to Baimyrza, do not have stability – on the contrary, they have objective variability, which is tested in the reality of life (259). Plurality of language in Kazakhstan implies a plurality of identity within its people, a case that I would argue similarly for Quechua and other Indigenous language speakers in the Andes. To conclude, Baimyrza proposes that for linguistic policy to succeed in democratic, pluralistic states, it must follow the path of harmonious equality of languages in the conditions of linguistic sovereignty (259). This implies greater resources, including modern requirements for higher education, science, and the implementation of a formal educational process. It also requires a “new paradigm of thinking... a new approach to the problem that does not deny the

past, but rather, conducts analysis from the point of view of today, based on fidelity, enriches its content, makes new judgements” (259). I’m inclined to agree with this assessment. In many contexts regarding linguistic plurality within the state, the policy that affects it should not deny the past. In fact, it should recognize, explore, understand, and make a stance on that past to successfully and fully commit to linguistic development and equality. More than that, it should let the speakers of those languages speak for themselves. Drawing from Indigenous calls to action and needs for state intervention (or state recession) in linguistic policy making, messaging, and community building are central to building a just and equitable linguistic policy.

It is here that I aim to make my intentions clear with my critique of state recognition of Quechua. I think if implemented correctly with the appropriate infrastructural, financial, and community resources, Quechua state language programs would be a remarkable step in ensuring the future use and vitality of the language. As it stands, however, we see historical examples in the Andes of Spanish as the state language of nonmemory, while Quechua is the language of not only memory, but mourning. It is in its memory where Quechua holds its revolutionary power. If implemented with care, language vitality and appreciation can be ensured.

Conclusion

The very fabric of language is one explicitly of difference. What makes a language different from another may be the grammar, syntax, and phonology, surely, but the cultural identity and social implications that come with each language and its community of speakers is not to be forgotten. Language is an active process of inclusion and exclusion, identity making and boundary drawing. Quechua, like any language with a history of contact with colonial languages, has forged a space in its speakers as a powerful community forming tool. These

communities have existed strictly outside of the historic hegemonic realities, plural as they may be, of the state. Thorough examination of Scott, James and Nugent, and Krupa and Nugent reveals everyday formations, resistances, and off-centerings of the state. Critical to understanding the theoretical context this work exists in are notions of state-making, through policy and through hegemonic ideologies, popular culture, and how Quechua can exist as a polycephalic form of both off-center state formation and state resistance. Both of these are powerful in the historical contexts of Peru and Bolivia, which present different ways of studying language recognition, tolerance, and promotion as “from below” and “from above.”

Historically, Indigenous Quechua speakers like Guaman Poma have used language to forge their own place in colonial history, using the literary modes familiar to them by colonization, while maintaining a strict and critical view of the state as it existed. 19th century moves to recognize language had less to do with its speakers and more to do with gaining material or social power. These policies historically did more on paper than in practice to support and maintain Quechua and other Indigenous languages, like we see in the case of Kazakh. Modernly, we see Quechua language speakers and community members counteracting the selective memory of the state in Peru through material and linguistic means. Quechua exists as the language of ritual, memory, and atrocity of the state. It is a form of everyday resistance through its continued use in remembering state actions against the state’s wishes in many historical contexts. Through this historical context I propose that the motivations to recognize Quechua as an official language in the Peruvian and Bolivian state are influenced by recognizing that Quechua is a tool of memory. This directly contrasts with hegemonic imaginings of state and popular culture.

I again bring forward the intertwining lines of questioning which I seek to answer with my further research:

How do speakers of Spanish and Quechua in history and modernity express difference through their language use?

What are the consequences (class, gendered, or otherwise) that exist because of these social uses of language?

If popular culture and state formation are inherently reliant on each other, what if a subsection of popular culture is created in a different language than the state?

How does the state build itself working within two contrasting languages?

What motivations might the state have to standardize language, reject language, or, co-opt the language?

What does it mean for a state to officially tolerate a language, and what does it mean for a state to promote that language?

Understanding that the 1975 recognition of Quechua in Peru means very little in practice, what does the state serve to gain in recognizing an official language within legislative operations?

Why, if it is an officially tolerated language, do we still see Quechua community resistance to state messaging?

Works Cited

- Baimyrza, A. (2022). Influence of state language development programs on the formation of language identity. *Journal of Language & Linguistics Studies*, 18(1), 250–261.
<https://doi.org/10.52462/jlls.179>
- Guaman Poma de Ayala, F. (1615). *El primer nueva corónica y buen gobierno*. Royal Library of Denmark. <http://www5.kb.dk/permalink/2006/poma/info/en/frontpage.htm>
- Gilbert M. Joseph and Daniel Nugent (1994) “Popular Culture and State Formation” *In Everyday forms of State Formation: Revolution and the Negotiation of Rule in Modern Mexico*. G. M Joseph and Daniel Nugent Eds.
- Krupa, C. and Nugent, D. (2015) Chapter 1 “Off-Centered States: Rethinking State Theory through an Andean Lens”. In *State Theory and Andean Politics. New Approaches to the Study of Rule*. Eds. C. Krupa and D. Nugent. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Rojas-Perez, I. (2017). Introduction. In *Mourning Remains: State Atrocity, Exhumations, and Governing the Disappeared in Peru’s Postwar Andes*. Stanford University Press.
- Rousseau, S., & Dargent, E. (2019). *The Construction of Indigenous Language Rights in Peru: A Language Regime Approach*.
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1866802X19866527>
- Scott, J. C. (1985). Hegemony and Consciousness: Everyday Forms of Ideological Struggle. In *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* (pp. 304–350). Yale University Press. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1nq836.13>

Additional Bibliography

- Gonzales, O. (2022). *Nación anti: Ensayos de antropología lingüística andina : lenguaje y pensamiento quechua : traducción cultural y resistencia* (Primera edición.). Pakarina Ediciones.
- Howard, R. (2015). *Por los linderos de la lengua: Ideologías lingüísticas en los Andes*. Institut français d'études andines. <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.ifea.5275>
- Huras, A. (2019). Communicating faith: Language and extirpation in the seventeenth-century Archdiocese of Lima. *Colonial Latin American Review*, 28(2), 197–228.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10609164.2019.1627135>
- Jesus, M. G. G. D., & González, M. L. C. (2022). Language reclamation and ethnic revival in P'urhépecha territory. *AlterNative*, 18(4), 496–510.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/11771801221116149>
- Osorio, A. (2004). The King in Lima: Simulacra, Ritual, and Rule in Seventeenth-Century Peru. *Hispanic American Historical Review*, 84(3), 447–474.
- Pajdzińska, A. (2013). *The linguistic worldview and literature*. 41–59. In *The Linguistic Worldview: Ethnolinguistics, Cognition, and Culture*. Adam Glaz, Przemyslaw Lozowski, David S. Danaher Eds. <https://doi.org/10.2478/9788376560748.c2>
- Pratt, M. L. (1991). Arts of the Contact Zone. *Profession*, 33–40.
- Ramirez Wohlmuth, S. (2001). *Language and identity in contemporary Latin American thought* (pp. 2001–2001).
- Siordia, C., & Díaz, M. E. (2012). Language shift in the United States and foreign-born older Mexican heritage individuals: Co-ethnic context for language resistance. *HISPANIC JOURNAL OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES*, 34(4), 525–538.

Torres, M. D. (2011). Claiming Ancestry and Lordship: Heraldic Language and Indigenous Identity in Post-Conquest Mexico. *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, 30, 70–86.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1470-9856.2010.00484.x>

Wroblewski, M. (2019). Performing Pluralism: Language, Indigeneity, and Ritual Activism in Amazonia. *The Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology*, 24(1), 181–202.