Language in Society **31**, 721–742. Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404502315033

Growing up monolingual in a bilingual community: The Quichua revitalization paradox

CAMILLA RINDSTEDT

Department of Education
Uppsala University
SE-750 02 Uppsala, Sweden
camilla.rindstedt@ped.uu.se

KARIN ARONSSON

Department of Child Studies
Linköping University
SE-581 83 Linköping, Sweden
Karar@tema.liu.se

ABSTRACT

The present investigation concerns language ideology and language practices in relation to a language shift – from Quichua-Spanish bilingualism to Spanish monolingualism – that seems to be under way. The analyses are based on fieldwork in an Ecuadorian sierra community characterized by ethnic revitalization. Among adult *comuneros*, the vernacular is seen as an essential part of their Indian cultural heritage. In the children's daily lives, the adults, particularly women and the elderly, speak Quichua among themselves, yet children are not addressed in the vernacular by either parents or elder siblings, and those under 10 years of age are generally more or less monolingual in Spanish. The paradoxical mismatch between ideology and daily practices – the ethnic revitalization paradox – is analyzed in light of Quichua speaking practices in intergenerational encounters, and in children's play dialogues. Ultimately, being Quichua means something different to members of each generation. (Quichua, language shift, ethnic revitalization, language socialization)*

ENDANGERED LANGUAGES

During the twenty-first century, at least half of the world's approximately 3,000 languages will become extinct, according to Krauss (1992:6). Linguistic diversity has progressively decreased all over the world for the past two generations. Indigenous languages, including Quechua in the South American Andes and languages in many other parts of the world, are threatened because they are not being transmitted to the next generation (Fishman 1991, Grenoble & Whaley 1998, Krauss 1992, Nettle & Romaine 2000). During the second half of the twentieth

© 2002 Cambridge University Press 0047-4045/02 $9.50

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502315033 Published online by Cambridge University Press

century, English and Spanish gained ground in relation to smaller peripheral languages like Quechua, spoken by Indians who are in many ways marginalized. In contrast, both English and Spanish are so-called metropolitan languages, spoken by the urban elite and economically dominant groups. Several factors can endanger a language, but two primary root causes are related to poverty and majority-culture oppression. In situations of language shift, it is almost always the dispossessed group that is forced or led to trade its mother tongue for another language. Other factors are related to urban migration, commuting, and other modernization processes involving majority-language literacy and attitudes (Fishman 1991). Majority-language education is, of course, an important factor. However, one of the ultimate decisive factors on the individual level is parents' choice of the language they use when addressing their children: when parents no longer speak their own first language in the home, that language is seriously endangered (Dorian 1980, Fishman 1991, Hornberger 1998). "Languages no longer being learned as mother-tongue by children are beyond mere endangerment, for, unless the course is somewhat dramatically reversed, they are already doomed to extinction" (Krauss 1992:4).

In Mexico, Hill & Hill 1986 have shown how Mexicano (Nahuatl) became seriously threatened by Spanish when Indian parents were encouraged by school authorities to speak Spanish to their children. In school contexts, language shift phenomena have been documented in Peru. A large number of Peruvians over age five speak Quechua, yet oppression and exclusion of Quechua speakers has been a constant feature of post-Conquest Peruvian society (Hornberger 1997). Quechua has been losing ground from an intergenerational perspective, while Spanish has spread to ever greater numbers in the younger generations (Hornberger & King 1996, Hornberger 1997). King 2001 has studied attempts by community and schools among the Saraguru in southern Ecuador to promote Quichua (the Ecuadorian variety of Quechua), at a time when the members of the particular communities studied have already shifted away from being primarily monolingual Quichua speakers to being mostly Spanish speakers. Several researchers have thus shown that indigenous languages are endangered in Latin America, and that this is an intergenerational pattern that involves gradual language shift; none of these studies, however, has involved detailed microanalysis of bilingual speaking practices in the home.

Drawing on detailed ethnographic observations of language practices in Gapun, New Guinea, Kulick 1992 demonstrated how a local language, Taiap, gave way to Tok Pisin, an English pidgin, while villagers gradually embraced an ideology of modernity, ceasing to speak Taiap to their children. Kulick 1992, 1998 primarily discusses how language practices associated with an endangered language were, in fact, also gendered. In the local ideology of people in Gapun, speaking the vernacular was intimately linked to female and depreciated old ways, whereas Tok Pisin was linked to modernity and maleness. Kulick primarily documents

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502315033 Published online by Cambridge University Press

adult–child conversations and conversations between adults, validating the strong link between Tok Pisin and modernity/maleness. As a less central part of his argument, he also notes that children spent much of their time in the company not of parents but of older siblings who actively spoke only Tok Pisin. On the basis of participant observation, Dorian (1981:107) and Hill & Hill (1986:112–113) similarly discuss the school's and siblings' role in language shift.

During the past decade or two, language extinction processes have been somewhat moderated by a growing awareness of the threat and by contingent LANGUAGE REVITALIZATION schemes (Fishman 1991, Hornberger 1997). Drawing on Fishman 1991 and others, Crystal 2000 identifies six factors that promote a language-shift reversal in favor of the subordinate language: relative visibility, wealth, power, presence in the educational system, writing practices, and access to electronic media.

In their consideration of the role of schools in reversing Quechua language shift in the Andes, Hornberger & King 1996 report that census records and sociolinguistic studies document a cross-generational shift during the latter half of the twentieth century from Quechua monolingualism to Spanish monolingualism. Today, there are rather ambitious schemes for Quechua revitalization in the Andes, and Quechua literacy training has been instrumental in reversing or at least arresting language shift. Nonetheless, the authors point out that there is a limit to the impact schools can have, and that language shift is an extremely common phenomenon.

The key to successful reversal of language shift is located primarily in the natural intergenerational transmission of the language in the home, not in government laws, policies, or formal schooling (Fishman 1991, Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer 1998). Detailed studies of language socialization practices and local ideologies are therefore important for understanding language-shift phenomena. However, out of 229 entries in a review of the linguistic anthropology of native South America, there are apparently no in-depth studies of language socialization in the home (Urban & Sherzer 1988); and as far as we know, documented microanalyses of language socialization in Quichua-Spanish speaking families have not been published in international forums. When we study natural language data from home settings, children's play dialogs provide rich material for analyzing ethnic identification as a local interactional phenomenon. In spontaneous play, children reveal their notions about power, control, and adult society – for instance, preschool children consistently choose to play the powerful party (Andersen 1990, Aronsson & Thorell 1999).

The present investigation concerns intergenerational Quichua–Spanish speaking practices (grandparents, parents, and children) and children's play dialogues in San Antonio,[1] a highland community in Ecuador. We will try to map how children's and their parents' and grandparents' language choices can be linked to distinct ideologies or notions of ethnicity.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502315033 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ETHNOGRAPHIC SETTING AND THE ETHNIC REVITALIZATION PARADOX

San Antonio, a small indigenous *comunidad* (community), is situated at an altitude of 2,500 meters in the central Ecuadorian Andes, in a region where (as in many other parts of the country) Quichua Indian ethnic consciousness has risen during the past 10 years. It comprises 127 households, but only a small percentage boast enough land to support themselves by subsistence agriculture and animal husbandry. In the past, many comuneros therefore worked on adjacent haciendas (private estates), and recently many male comuneros have temporarily migrated to work in the coastal city of Guayaquil or in Quito, the capital.

Quichua revitalization can be seen on many levels: the comuneros who reside permanently in the community have recently taken over two haciendas, one by occupation followed by purchase, and another by purchase; the area is said by other Ecuadorians to be a *zona roja* (radical zone) or *zona fuerte* (strong zone) where the *comuneros* are rebellious. Many of them are active in the national Indian political organization Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas del Ecuador (CONAIE, Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador), and the indigenous groups of the region were in the forefront of *el levantamiento indígena* (the Indian uprising) of 1990, the first in a series of recent mobilizations among indigenous groups in Ecuador. The community boasts several achievements in terms of land reform, schooling, free school lunches, the establishment of a small dairy, increased literacy, and greater rights. Without doubt, the Quichua group has increased its visibility, and it has also gained more wealth and power. On three counts, there is thus an ongoing reversal process in terms of Crystal's scheme. Yet San Antonio is still a poor community, and when talking about themselves, the comuneros often spontaneously speak of *nosotros los pobres* ('we, the poor'), *la raza india* ('the Indian race'), their 'Indian language' and 'we the Indians' in more or less synonymous senses.

Quichua has been the language of indigenous populations for several hundred years in Ecuador, and the ability to speak it has become a central means of enacting the indigenous ethnic identity (Muratorio 1981). In San Antonio, the comuneros are distinctly proud of their ethnic background as Puruhás and as Inca descendants, and they celebrate Quichua as a way of marking their powerful ancestry, as well as the fact that their language has survived despite oppression from the majority culture.[2] Today, speaking Quichua is a distinct political act, and it is seen as one of the most important markers of Indian ethnicity. Many of the comuneros express their view on language and ethnicity: *Sí, hablo Quichua, no quiero perder mí cultura indio* 'Yes, I speak Quichua, I don't want to lose my Indian culture', or *Nosotros somos indios, hablamos Quichua* 'We are Indians, we speak Quichua'. Being Indian and speaking Quichua are sometimes seen as almost synonymous. In any case, maintaining Quichua is a central part of their

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502315033 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Indian heritage. In San Antonio today, all adults except some of the most elderly speak both Quichua and Spanish fluently. When asked an open question about important customs to keep ("What traditions do you think are important to keep?"), one of their most common replies is *Respetar y no olvidar la lengua materna. La primera lengua que es quichua. Sin eso no somos nadie, pues* 'To respect and not to forget our maternal language. The first language, which is Quichua. So without that we are nothing'.

Many comuneros spontaneously refer to Quichua as their mother tongue, and they all see it as their children's mother tongue, claiming that their children do, in fact, speak Quichua. However, newcomers to the community soon discover that the children rarely speak to one another in Quichua. On a more or less regular basis, they may employ isolated Quichua insertions in their conversations, but by and large, children under age 10 are monolingual speakers of Spanish. At best, they master some Quichua passively and in a rudimentary way. Obviously, their parents' notion of "mother tongue" cannot be equated with language mastery. Moreover, the San Antonio parents do not address their children in their own mother tongue, Quichua. Yet there is a strong pro-Quichua ideology in the community, where the Quichua language is presently celebrated in many ways. On the level of actual local speaking practices, though, there seems to be a language shift under way in which Quichua–Spanish bilingualism is giving way to Spanish monolingualism. There thus exists what we will call an ETHNIC REVITALIZATION PARADOX.

The community school, built in the mid-1970s, is a monolingual Spanish school. The children do not speak Quichua in class or during breaks. All teachers are monolingual Spanish speakers (commuting from Riobamba), and no Quichua reading materials are employed, nor is Quichua celebrated in any other way, such as through singing Quichua songs.

Drawing on extensive survey data in Ecuador, Haboud 1991 has compared averred language preferences (Quichua/Spanish) with observed speaking practices. She found that even strongly pro-Quichua advocates employed much more Spanish than they themselves reported. In the area of language and ideology, however, there is well-known inconsistency between actual behavior and what people claim about their language practices (Boas 1966, Romaine 1995:317). Language is, in many ways, an opaque medium. This is another reason why it is important to study language practices, and not only what people say they do.

In line with our prior reasoning on the importance of sibling play and home language transmission, the present article is an attempt to map intergenerational bilingual speaking practices in San Antonio with a primary focus on language practices across generations – grandparent–child, parent–child, and child–child interactions – to inspect the paradoxical mismatch between Hispanic language practices and Quichua language ideology. The ultimate goal of this undertaking is to understand better the role of everyday practices in an emergent language shift.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502315033 Published online by Cambridge University Press

METHODOLOGY

In 1994, the first author (Rindstedt) set out on a 15-month-long field project to investigate language socialization and bilingual practices in the Andes. When looking for an Andean community with bilingual Quichua–Spanish speaking children, she was directed to San Antonio by foreign aid representatives in Riobamba, the provincial capital of Chimborazo. San Antonio was chosen as a field site because it was known to be highly bilingual, both by outsiders (including mestizos[3] working in the community) and by the comuneros themselves. As it turned out, the children were in fact not bilingual, and this unexpected state of affairs became, in turn, the subject matter of the present investigation.

The fieldwork involved audio-recording of play dialogs and following the everyday lives of four toddlers, who were chosen along dimensions such as age, gender, and number of children in the household: two girls, Kristina and Miriam, and two boys, Carlos and Vilmer Darío. They and their sibling caretakers were recorded on three consecutive days on a bimonthly basis (in all, at least seven recording periods for every focus child). Sibling caretaking and play were the primary focus of the recordings, which also covered a fair amount of adult–child interaction. Their ages at the outset ranged from one and one-half to three years, allowing study of the process of language learning as well as including one child with more developed speech. All the children had at least two older siblings, and prototypically, an older sibling, aged 4–6, would spend the greater part of the day taking care of the focus child. In addition to the recordings, the fieldwork also included participant observation and informal interviews with the comuneros.

LANGUAGE BACKGROUND: QUECHUA AND SPANISH IN THE ANDES

Today's dominant language in the Andes, Spanish, was introduced by the Spanish conquistadors and is now spoken by approximately 40 million people in the three Andean republics of Peru, Ecuador, and Bolivia. Quechua, one of a number of Andean Indian languages, is the largest indigenous language of the Americas, spoken by groups living from southern Colombia to northern Chile. Most speakers are found among the indigenous populations in Peru (4.4 million), Ecuador (2.2 million, a little more than 20% of a total population of 11 million), and Bolivia (1.6 million; von Gleich 1994). In total, Quechua has more than 10 million speakers, according to recent estimates (Hornberger 1997, King 2001). Statistics on language viability vary, though, and estimates of the number of Quechua speakers vary between 8 and 12 million speakers (Grinevald 1998:128). Ideologies and government policies often lead to more or less strategic estimates (Krauss 1992:5–6), and all figures must thus be used with great caution.

Traditionally, Quechua has been one of the lingua francas in the Andes, together with Puquina and Aru (Heath & Laprade 1982:123). When discussing southern Peru, Mannheim 1984 refers to Quechua as an oppressed language in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502315033 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that, for over four centuries, individuals and institutions alien to the Quechua community have been making crucial decisions about the language (see also Albó 1979). The terminology varies, but, argues Mannheim, there is continuity between how the vernacular has been treated by the Spanish conquistadors and by today's institutions. Historically, a Hispanist position was promoted as a way of guarding the language unity of the Spanish empire; today it is advocated as a way of building the Peruvian nation-state. In the past, the Jesuits employed Quechua as a medium of proselytizing indigenous groups; today, liberal school officials promote bilingual programs not primarily as a way of protecting language rights, but as a transitional model that facilitates Hispanic enculturation (Mannheim 1984). Mannheim writes about Peru, but obviously his reasoning is relevant for neighboring Ecuador and Bolivia, since the history of the Andean republics has been partly a shared colonial history. In his critical reasoning on colonial processes, Mannheim draws on Heath & Laprade 1982, who made related points about Castilian colonialization of vernacular languages in the Spanish colonies. During most of the colonial period, the Spanish crown espoused a policy of Castilianization, a program to spread Spanish to the Indians in an effort to Christianize them (Heath & Laprade 1982:119). Castilianization ideology supported the replacement of the Indian languages with Spanish. This, however, was not very effectively or consistently imposed, and there were few incentives for the Indians to acquire Spanish (Heath & Laprade 1982:119).

Mannheim summarizes the Andean situation succinctly: "For four and a half centuries the 'Andean language debate,' the issues and terms of language policy, have continued to have at their center the question of whether or not the Quechua have a right to exist as a separate community" (1984:291). Quechua is highly diversified, covering about 17 different "emergent" languages; it can be compared in language complexity with, for instance, the Romance languages (Grinevald 1998:129). Today, Quechua linguists generally recognize two branches of the language: Quechua I, the languages of Peru; and Quechua II, the varieties spoken in northern Ecuador, Bolivia, Chile, and Argentina (Torero 1964). The varieties spoken in Ecuador, Argentina, and parts of Peru are called "Quichua." In Ecuador, many Quichua speakers are bilingual in the vernacular and Spanish. Spanish is the official language, whereas Quichua is merely recognized as a national language.

Quichua and Spanish in San Antonio

In Ecuador today, Spanish is the language of the white and mestizo majority, which is largely urban and coastal, whereas most Quichua groups live in the Andean sierra (mountain range). Quichua is by and large a viable language, spoken by a substantial part of the population, yet it may be threatened on a local level. Here we will analyze one such case, as well as the relative roles of sibling caretaking and children's play practices in ongoing language shift.

In San Antonio today, almost all adults (and all of the studied children's parents) are bilingual speakers in that they speak both Quichua and Spanish on a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502315033 Published online by Cambridge University Press

regular basis; they see themselves as fluent speakers of both languages, proudly commenting about their language skills, *Nosotros hablamos ambos de los dos* 'We speak both'. When Quichua is used in family life, however, it is generally only employed between husband and wife (as in ex. 2, below), not between parents and children. In prototypical family conversations, the parents address each other in Quichua and/or Spanish, but their children in Spanish.

The Spanish spoken in San Antonio is a regional variety. Many comuneros see themselves as poor speakers of Quichua, lamenting that their language is a variety that is not *legítimo* 'legitimate'; instead, it is *mete mete* 'half and half', *mezclado* 'mixed' or *chaupi-chaupi* 'half-half'. (In this discussion, Quichua words and morphemes are given in underlined italic, and Spanish in italic.) In contrast, the comuneros are nostalgic about the pure language usage of the past. Don Pedro the president of the community asks rhetorically: *Llegando a la realidad qué Quichua sabemos?* 'When we get to the truth, which Quichua do we know?'

Language mixing is clearly seen as undesirable and is deprecated (cf. Kroskrity 1998:108) – something that the comuneros themselves are ashamed of. The contact language has been called *media lengua* 'half, or mixed, language' and is quite common among Quichua groups in the Central Ecuadorian Andes (e.g., Muysken 1989). On the level of everyday speaking, however, there is high tolerance for Quichua insertions as well as bilingual word formation (e.g., nouns built on Quichua roots but with Spanish suffixes, or vice versa).

Spanish marks gender at several different loci. Gender is less marked in Quichua, and this has influenced the regional variety of Spanish. The definite article (*el* for masculine, *la* for feminine gender) is not generally employed, although it is required in standard Spanish. The comuneros do not differentiate systematically between the pronouns *el* 'he' and *ella* 'she', employing the two interchangeably in an apparently random way, or between 1st and 3rd person verb forms (e.g., between *he* and *ha* of the verb *haber* 'to have'). Similarly, the regional variety of Spanish does not differentiate between the noun endings *-o* and *-a*, used in Spanish for indicating gender. The Quichua morpheme *-ca*, a kind of topicalization marker, is often added to the ends of words in Spanish in order to emphasize nouns, pronouns, and numerals (roughly equivalent to the definite article 'the', or 'the very'). Sometimes, inflectional Quichua endings are added to Spanish verbs, as in *vamochic* 'let's go'. Conversely, Spanish suffixes are added to Quichua words. For instance, *ñaño-s* 'brothers' is built up with a plural ending in Spanish. Similarly, *huahu-ito* (child) often gets a diminutive suffix in Spanish (*-ito*/*-ita*). It should be noted, though, that there is a diminutive suffix in Quichua, *-cha* that may be used in much the same way. In brief, various contact phenomena testify to the mutual influences between Quichua and Spanish. In the present study, Quichua excerpts are not transcribed into standard Ecuadorian Quichua, known as Quichua Unificado (Unified Quichua; see King 2001:41), but into the local variety of Quichua.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502315033 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Quichua language domains

VISIBILITY is an important aspect of the viability of a language (Fishman 1991). In Ecuador, Quichua is not an official language, and there are no daily Quichua newspapers or Quichua channels on national television; however, a few radio channels broadcast in Quichua. One of the major channels in the Riobamba area is las Escuelas Radiofónicas Populares del Ecuador, widely listened to in San Antonio. Generally, however, Quichua is not visible in the national media. The Bible and some other religious texts have been translated into Quichua, but there is very little secular literature. Quichua remains primarily a spoken language, not a written one. The Protestant Evangelical Church employs both Quichua and Spanish.

In contrast, Spanish is the only language of communication in the Catholic Church. Spanish is also the official language of schooling, and the teachers are monolinguals from the urban environment of Riobamba, and are referred to as "mestizos" by the comuneros (but addressed as *señorita* or *señoritas*). In Fishman's 1964 terminology of LANGUAGE DOMAINS, schooling takes place within a Spanish domain. Spanish also tends to be the dominant language in the market-place in Riobamba. In sum, the Spanish language has a dominant role in public life, and consequently, Quichua is marginalized. Language-shift reversal has been discussed with respect to increasing visibility in novel language domains (Fishman 1991). At present, there are no such novel domains appropriated by the Quichua language, in that there are no settings perceived by the comuneros as exclusively Quichua-speaking. Yet in terms of everyday speaking practices among adults, San Antonio is a bilingual community in that both Quichua and Spanish are spoken on a daily basis. Most community settings are, in fact, more or less bilingual with respect to language-choice OPTIONS. In their homes, adults freely use Spanish and Quichua interchangeably. As will be seen, though, neither parents nor elder siblings choose to employ both languages in their interaction with toddlers.

In the following, we present examples of adult–child and peer dialogues, beginning with the four children's interactions with conversational partners who speak Quichua most of the time (their grandmothers), then presenting the children's dialogues with their parents, and last, with their siblings.

LANGUAGE CHOICES IN THE CONVERSATION OF THREE GENERATIONS

Quichua puro puro – grandmother's Quichua

Today, there are only a few monolingual Quichua speakers left in San Antonio. They are all old women, and they are considered to be the best Quichua speakers in the community, speaking *Quichua puro puro* 'very pure Quichua' without mixing the two languages as the other comuneros do. The oldest men, however, are

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502315033 Published online by Cambridge University Press

all bilinguals who routinely employ both Spanish and Quichua in their daily interactions with other adults (using, e.g., lexical borrowings and morphological features from the alternative language). In San Antonio, people typically live in nuclear households, and none of the four focus children lives in an extended household including grandparents. Most people live in small one-story adobe dwellings surrounded by high mud or stone walls. Privacy is highly valued, and the comuneros often talk about avoiding people seeing so much that they start to *murmurar* 'gossip'.

Although the grandmothers consider their Spanish very poor, they generally speak Spanish rather than Quichua to their grandchildren, claiming that the children would not understand them otherwise. Normally, the *abuela* 'grandma' code-switches between Quichua and Spanish; language alternation is thus a routine feature of adult–child talk between an *abuela* and her grandchild (ex. 1).

(1) Vilmer Darío (VD) (1:10) and Vilie (3:6) are seated on the ground playing with a few earth-covered *toctes* (walnuts) they have collected. Their mother and *abuela* are busy milking cows in the corral outside the grandmother's house, a short distance away. The boys call out for their grandma to come over, and as she walks over to where they are seated outside the corral, she grabs a big stone with which to crush the nuts. She sits down on her heels next to the boys. As she strikes one of the nuts she cries out loud:[4] (Tape V0595)

1	Abuela:	*Ayau mamitalla.*	Ouch little sweet Virgin.
2	Vilie:	*Dame golpeando.*	Hit (it) for me.
3	Abuela:	*Mana alli rumi cashcaca.* *Mana alli rumi cashcaca.* *¡Quita! ¡Quita! ¡Quita!*	This stone was no good. This stone was no good. Get out of here! Get out of here! Get out of here!
4	Vilie:	*A mí tan dame golpeando.* *¡Aquí está mío!*	Hit (it) for me as well. Here is mine!
5	Abuela:	*E::.*	Uh::.
6	Vilie:	*¡DE MÍO YA DE MÍO MÍO!*	MINE NOW MINE MINE! (Stretches out his hand)
7	VD:	*¡MÍO!*	MINE!
8	Abuela:	*¡Coma! ¡Coma! ¡Coma!*[5]	Eat! Eat! Eat! (the nuts)

Grandma jokingly blames the rock for being worthless, code-switching back to Spanish when asking Vilie to move (turn 3). Her code-switching takes place when she changes her speaking style from a private commentary mode, to a command mode as it were ('get out of here!'), when addressing Vilie, who – in vain – asks her to shell his nut. The toddler Vilmer Darío is quiet during most of this sequence, looking on at what is happening. The only word he utters, toward the end of this sequence, is *'MÍO'* 'MINE', which he parrots from Vilie in order to get attention as well as help from his grandma (turn 7).

In peer talk among children, FORMAT TYING is quite common; that is, children imitate entire phrases or parts of sentences from their peers' prior turns (Goodwin 1990). Such alignments can be seen between Vilmer Darío and Vilie (turn 7), but not between the children and their grandmother. Neither boy in the present context spontaneously speaks Quichua, nor do they, through format tying, recycle any Quichua from their grandmother's contributions. This example is quite typ-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502315033 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ical of *abuela*–child interactions in that the children normally do not "tie on" to Quichua phrases. Similar findings have been reported from Kulick's (1992) detailed analyses of adult–child interaction in Gapun, New Guinea; the children would hear the vernacular, Taiap, but they would make format tyings only in Tok Pisin. In Gapun, however, there was not an ongoing ethnic revitalization process, which means that it would perhaps be more natural to expect vernacular format tyings in San Antonio. From participant observation, however, we can add that the children treated their grandparents quite politely, and from a very early age they were taught to greet them with affection and engage in conversations. There is no reason to believe that the elderly were not seen as important persons for the children.

Asymmetrical language choice in mother–father interactions

When the women in San Antonio talk to one another, they communicate in Quichua, except in specific settings, such as the Catholic Church, the marketplace, or the school. At times, they employ Spanish insertions (e.g., technical vocabulary), but most of what is said is in Quichua. In contrast, the focus children's mothers and other mothers normally address their children in Spanish with some Quichua insertions. Many of the fathers are employed as temporary migrant workers in places where Spanish is their language of work. Outside the community, the men communicate primarily in Spanish, but at home they normally use Quichua and Spanish interchangeably when talking to their spouses. In contrast, the wife generally speaks Quichua to her husband. There is thus often an ASYMMETRICAL PATTERN OF LANGUAGE CHOICE among married couples, in that the wife speaks Quichua more or less consistently, whereas the husband responds in Spanish or in Spanish and Quichua, as we see in (2):

(2) Miriam (3:2), Geovani (8:11), uncle Alberto, mama Dolores, and CR are standing on the patio when don Lucho (papa) suddenly enters the gate and walks across the patio to greet us all. He has returned from a political meeting, held in another community. Mama Dolores is irritated by the fact that he spends so little time in the house. He has been gone all morning and has not returned until late in the afternoon (past lunchtime). Geovani is the first to catch sight of him, announcing his arrival out loud: (Tape M0295)

1	Geovani:	*¡YA VIENE PAPÁ!*	DADDY'S COMING NOW!
2	Don Lucho:	*Señorita Camilla. Buenas tardes.*	Good afternoon, señorita Camilla. (shakes hands)
3	CR:	*Buenas tardes.*	Good afternoon. (shakes hands)
4	Alberto:	*Papa Lucho.*	Daddy Lucho. (shakes hands)
5	Mama Dolores:	*Ñachu shamunquichic*?	Are you coming now?
6	Don Lucho:	*Ña*.	Yes.
7	Mama Dolores:	*Huanpra ricurinchu urapi maipi*?	Did you see (the) teenager down there?
8	Don Lucho:	*¿Cuál huanpra?=*	Which teenager?=
9	Mama Dolores:	*=Fanni urapi caracungachu*.	=Is Fanni down there feeding fodder?
10	Don Lucho:	*No sé*.	I don't know.
11	Mama Dolores:	*Uratami rirca*.	She went down there.
12	Don Lucho:	*¿En Tunshi?*	To Tunshi?

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502315033 Published online by Cambridge University Press

13	Mama Dolores:	*Fanni ura escuela ladu pimi canga.*	Fanni is probably at the side of (the) school.
14	Don Lucho:	*Yo no se. ¿Sí hay algo no?*	I don't know. There is something isn't there?
15	Mama Dolores:	*Sacsacta tichari micumurcanguiari.*	You've been eating well. (ironic voice)
16	Geovani: (to Miriam)	*¡Ya, ya, así, así, atatati!*	Yes of course, like this, like this, it's dirty!
17	Miriam:	*¡Arroz cocinó CON PAPAS TITAS!*	She cooked rice WITH FRENCH FIES! (baby talk register)
18	Don Lucho & Mama Dolores:	(Laughing)	

During the entire sequence, Mama Dolores interacts with her husband in Quichua. There are only two exceptions to this. The first one is *escuela* 'school', which she says in Spanish, instead of using the Quichua word, *yachana-huasi*. The Spanish word *escuela* is a common borrowing in regional Quichua, which means that her "language mixing" can quite easily be understood as a local variety of Quichua. The second example of Spanish is her postposition *ladu*, from the Spanish *lado* (side); in standard Spanish one would say *al lado de la escuela*. This borrowing has been thoroughly Quichua-ized.

Throughout most of this sequence, Don Lucho talks to his wife in Spanish (turns 8, 10, 12, and 14). The only time he code-switches to Quichua is when he replies *ña* (yes) to her question about whether he is coming now (turn 6). Also, he employs the Quichua insertion of *huanpra* 'young person', which is often used instead of Spanish *joven*.

After his initial announcement (turn 1), Geovani does not take part in his parents' conversation, though he continues to speak in Spanish to Miriam as they play beside their parents. As is quite typical in multiparty family conversations, both children interact in Spanish during the entire sequence. Miriam, however, has apparently understood what her parents talked about in Quichua and Spanish, because she enters the conversation in the last turn, shouting that her mama prepared rice and French fries. Her parents look at her and laugh at what she just said. Their amusement may indicate that it cannot be taken for granted that a three-year-old child will understand conversations taking place partly in the vernacular, or alternatively that they are laughing at her baby-talk register.

The present dialogue, then, is asymmetrical in two ways. First, the mother speaks more Quichua than the father; and second, both parents employ more Quichua than the children.

Spanish in parent–child dialogues

In prototypical family conversations, the parents address each other in Quichua and/or Spanish, but when addressing their children, they generally speak in one language only; Spanish. They say explicitly that if they were to employ both

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502315033 Published online by Cambridge University Press

languages, their children would get confused and eventually enter the Hispanic school speaking *mete mete*.

(3) Miriam (3:2) is sad because her mother has left her alone on the patio. When Mama Dolores returns, Miriam is still standing on the dirt road outside the house crying incessantly. Mama Dolores reprimands her: (Tape M0295)

Mama Dolores: (angrily)	*¿Ya está aquí quieren que murmurar? ¿Qué está haciendo papito? Vamos adentro, vamos. ¡Ve! Chachi adentro. ¡Venga!*	Are you still here, do you want them to gossip? What are you doing daddy? Let's go inside, let's go. Look! Sit down inside. Come!

Mama Dolores warns Miriam that people may start to *murmurar*. Her first concern is that Miriam move back inside the house behind the protective mud wall. Yet she mitigates her scolding by addressing Miriam in a diminutive form (*papito*, literally 'little daddy'), and by formulating her directive as a joint activity ('let's go inside'). She addresses Miriam in Spanish except for a single command, *chachi* 'sit down', expressed in Quichua. Another common directive in the vernacular is *elace* 'catch'. Common Quichua exclamations are *tatai* 'dirty', *achachai* 'it's cold', and *arrarai* 'it's hot'. The interjection *mamitalla* 'little sweet Virgin' is used frequently as well.

In a bilingual community, language preference practices can also be seen in repair work, not only in language choice and code-switching patterns. San Antonio parents do not normally encourage their children to speak Quichua, but it is unusual for parents to correct their children if they employ Quichua words or expressions in Spanish utterances. During more than a year of fieldwork, we very rarely observed such repairs (or, indeed, any repairs of children's language use). There were only two instances in which adults (a parent and an uncle) corrected the children's Quichua, replacing it with Spanish words (4 and 5). In both documented cases of language-choice repair, the adult corrected a Quichua language choice. The reverse never occurred – parents never replaced Spanish words with Quichua terms.

(4) Mama Luzeo and Carlos (2:7) are on a field outside their house. On the way back home, Mama Luzeo and Carlos pass by don Manuel who is working in the field. Carlos calls out for their dog Rocky to follow them: (Tape C0895)

1	Don Manuel:	*Yo tan voy a ir más luegito, ya sigue.*	I'm going a little later as well, you go ahead.
2	Carlos:	*¡Allcu!*	Dog!
3	Don Manuel:	*Vaya no más a la casa. A la casa.*	Just go to the house. To the house.
4	Carlos	***¡Allcu!***	**Dog!**
5	Don Manuel:	*A la casa sí, sí.* [Con allcu también, lleva no más al perro, lleva no más.	To the house yes, yes. [With (the) dog as well, just bring the dog, just bring (it).
6	Carlos:	*[¡Allcu!*	[Dog!
7	Mama Luzeo:	*¡Perro se dice, no allcu!*	One says dog, not dog! (in an irritated voice)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502315033 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Carlos calls out allcu several times (turns 2, 4, and 6) before his mother finally corrects him. In San Antonio, allcu is frequently used as an alternative to Spanish *perro* 'dog', and Don Manuel, in fact, also employs this form (turn 5). Mama Luzeo speaks *campesino* (peasant) Spanish (in standard Spanish, she would have said *no se dice* allcu). It is not clear why Mama Luzeo decided to correct Carlos's language choice in this specific instance. Neither teachers nor parents normally correct children's Spanish grammar; at school, however, the kindergarten teacher reports that she sometimes (but rarely) corrects the children's vocabulary or their pronunciation.

As an aside, it can be pointed out that this example illustrates a discrepancy between ideology and behavior, in that Mama Luzeo spontaneously claimed that she did not correct her children's choice of Quichua. Yet, as discussed above, it is well known that there is inconsistency between actual behavior and what people claim about their language practices.

On another occasion, one of the focus children's uncles, a teenager, corrected the child's Quichua word choice:

(5) Vilmer Darío (2:2), and Tío Manuel (uncle) are interacting inside the house. (Tape V0995)

1	Vilmer Darío:	*Chuchitaca.*	The little breast.
2	Tío Manuel:	*¡Tetita no chuchitaca tetita!*	Little breast, not the little breast, little breast! (in an irritated voice)

When Vilmer Darío demands his mother's breast as *chuchitaca* in Quichua, instead of making an equivalent construction in Spanish, Tío Manuel immediately corrects him (*tetita*). It can be seen that Tío Manuel's repair is produced in a regional variety of Spanish, where the definite article (in this case *la*) is dropped. It is not known, though, whether Tío Manuel primarily repaired the toddler's Quichua word choice or his *mete mete* construction, which involves a Quichua root (chuchu) and a Quichua suffix (-cha) combined with a Spanish diminutive suffix (-*ita*).

Spanish between siblings

In San Antonio, as in many other non-Western contexts, sibling caretaking is the norm (cf. Weisner & Gallimore 1977). The toddlers studied spend the greater part of their day outdoors in the company of their 4- to 6-year-old caretakers, while their mothers work in the house or in a nearby field. In the afternoon, older school-age siblings (6- to 12-year-olds who do not yet have other duties) may join them, playing along or keeping an eye on the others, yet primary responsibility for sibling caretaking usually rests with a child who does not yet attend school.

In their playing and sibling caretaking, the older children consistently spoke Spanish to their younger siblings even though they employed some Quichua insertions, as for specific common nouns or routine commands (cf. 'sit down!', in 3). Thus, in San Antonio, the children spoke Spanish not only to adults but also to one another. Because the toddlers spent the great part of their day in the care of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502315033 Published online by Cambridge University Press

older siblings, they were exposed almost exclusively to Spanish, except for some Quichua insertions. Below we present a few sibling dialogues that illustrate the monolingual quality of sibling play:

(6) Kristina (2:7), nicknamed Kristian, Cecilia (5:3), and Blanca (7:4) are seated on top of a pile of sand (building material) on the patio. Blanca pretends to insert blackberry cuttings and a "tomato tree" in a pile of sand, digging a hole in the sand into which to plant them. Cecilia and Kristina assist her in her playing. (Tape K0695)

1	Blanca:	*Éste hoja de tomate ésteca– de ese– hierba mora.*	This leaf of this very tomato of this– blackberry herb.
2	Kristina:	*Mola ñuca cogí.*	I picked blackberry (baby talk register).
3	Blanca:	*¡Ve! Yo te da cabando aquí.*	Look! I'm digging for you here.
4	Kristina:	*A mí [mío.*	For me [mine.
5	Blanca:	*[¡Traiga! Para yo seguir poniendo. Unito no más yo tengo, yo tengo.*	[Bring (it)! So that I can continue putting (them down). Only one little one. I've got I've got only one.
6	Kristina:	*Ñuca yo shal–*	I I sha–
7	Blanca:	*¡Venga poner! Trae uno más. Éste voy a ir a sembrar.*	Come put (it)! Bring one more. I'm gonna sow this one.
8	Cecilia:	*Ñuca este dos.*	I these two.
9	Blanca:	*Ñuca acá. Voy a sembrar éste– éste acá a otro. A otro cuarto sentado otrosca. Quita Kristian acá–. Allá anda sembrando dónde lo que estaba mío.*	I there. I'll sow this one– this one over there to other. In the other room seated the others. Take (it) away Kristian (nickname) there– Go sow there where mine was.
10	Kristina:	*Yo arbolito cogiendo tomate ñuca.*	I'm picking a tomato from the little tree I.
11	Blanca:	*A mí chiquito.*	For me (the) little tiny one.
12	Kristina:	*A mí otro [chiquito.*	For me another [little tiny one.
13	Blanca:	*[Ese piedra. ¡Ay!*	[That rock. Ouch!
14	Cecilia:	*¡Ay! Ve. Ésteca.*	Ouch! Look. This very one.

As in American children's language use (Goodwin 1990), there is extensive format tying in the children's play dialogues. In San Antonio, most of the format tying takes place in Spanish, not in Quichua, the children's main language of interaction, as when Kristina repeats Blanca's *a mí chiquito* with just a minor variation, *a mí otro chiquito* (turn 12).

Most of the children's and their conversational partners' spoken Quichua occurs as insertions in Spanish utterances. For instance, the 1st person pronoun, *ñuca* 'I', is employed fairly consistently by most comuneros. It is often routinely used in Spanish utterances, and it is never corrected by the speakers themselves or by their coparticipants. As can be seen above, all three girls, regardless of age, employ the Quichua pronoun form (turns 2, 6, 8, 9 and 10). It is apparently not just a child-language insertion but part of the local grammar (that is, parts of the Quichua pronoun system penetrate spoken Spanish in that 1st person *ñuca* is used together with or instead of its Spanish equivalent, *yo*). Such an emphatic use of the first person could at times be heard in the community. Quichua code-switching is thus employed as a local resource in the children's expressive repertoire, changing the affective tone of the inter-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502315033 Published online by Cambridge University Press

action and serving as what Gumperz 1982 refers to as a CONTEXTUALIZING CUE.

Another area that often contains Quichua insertions is the semantic field of animals. Many such words are used interchangeably in Quichua or Spanish, and language choice is quite free. It is, for instance, common that the comuneros alternate freely between the Quichua and Spanish terms misi or *gato* 'cat', bizi or *ternero* 'calf', cuchi or *cochino* 'pig', usa or *pulga* 'flea', and allcu or *perro* 'dog', as in (4). In contrast, there is a local preference for Quichua for a few terms referring to persons, in particular huahua 'child', which is one of the few Quichua words used by monolingual Spanish speakers in Ecuador.

In (7), it can be seen how Quichua words enter the children's conversation:

(7) Miriam (3:6) and Geovani (9:3) are playing together on the patio. As on many other occasions, Geovani is teaching Miriam to sing various songs he has learned in school, but Miriam is busy swaddling her huahua 'child', a doll, and she asks Geovani to help her to put it on her back, the common Quichua way to carry a child. He checks that it is placed correctly on her back. (Tape M0695)

1	Geovani:	*A ver. ¡Canta, canta!=*	Let's see. Sing, sing!=
2	Miriam:	*=¡Espera! ¡Espera! ¡Espera! Quiere dormir mí* huahua*. Cada rato duerme. Cada rato está lavanta. ¡Calla! ¿Sí está en culo? Qué no caiga.*	=Wait! Wait! Wait! My child wanna sleep. She sleeps all the time. She gets up all the time. Quiet! Is it around her bottom? So that she doesn't fall.
3	Geovani:	*¡Así! A ver en culo.*	Like this! OK, around her bottom.

In this brief episode, Miriam employs only one Quichua word, huahua. This word was employed in all households among the four focus families, but it is also used among Spanish speakers in Ecuador. In the fieldwork recordings, a number of social reference terms often rendered with Quichua instead of Spanish equivalents were found: huanpra 'female, young person', taiticu 'father', chuch/u 'breast', and ñaño 'brother'. The last is a nonstandard Quichua term; the standard Quichua term for 'brother', when said by another brother, is huauqui, and when said by a sister, turi.

Although the children consistently play in Spanish, this finding is not completely self-evident. After all, they do hear Quichua on a regular basis, even though the parents address them almost exclusively in Spanish. In many ways, the children are quite respectful when speaking to adults, and adults are definitely treated as authorities, yet the adult's language, Quichua, is not adopted as children's play language.

CONCLUSION: EXPLAINING THE ETHNIC REVITALIZATION PARADOX

Yo no soy runa *de* anacu

Many young comuneros work outside the community. Don Lucho, Miriam's father and one of the most militant Quichua leaders in the community, laments that

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502315033 Published online by Cambridge University Press

local youth seem to entertain an illusion that they face a successful future because they speak Spanish, and that they are already on the road to social and economic progress. Don Pedro, the president of the community, worries about related issues, claiming that the children have begun to feel embarrassed about their illiterate parents, and that they at times want to silence them or do the talking for them – for instance, when they go to the market together, or when mestizos come to visit the community. When interacting with mestizos in these places, the children seem to be ashamed of their Quichua-speaking mothers.

In line with these fears, Marco, a very outspoken preschool child, had the following to say to his father about Quichua: *Yo no soy runa de anacu. No soy runa de pobre anacu. Solo quiero hablar en castellano. ¿Y a mi qué?* 'I'm not an anacu skirt Indian. I'm not a poor anacu skirt Indian. I just want to speak in Spanish. What is it to me?' In his view, Quichua is apparently associated with Indianness, rural life, poverty, and femininity (the *anacu*, the women's traditional square, ankle-length wrapped skirt), and this is why he does not want to speak it. He does not want to be associated with the Quichua language or with the culture. Instead, he wants to speak Spanish, which has the reverse connotations – mestizo, maleness, urban life, paid work, progress. In his brief statement, he in fact enumerates most of the factors that have been suggested as explanations for a language shift to Spanish in the Andes. Like Marco, many other boys and girls in the community report that they are ashamed to speak the Quichua language, or just that they do not like to communicate in Quichua. Even preschoolers have distinct opinions as to why they do not want to speak the vernacular. Related positionings of the vernacular are found in Don Gabriel's competing cultural voices, where business is related to Spanish and Mexicano to women who are considered to be particularly Mexicano (Hill 1995).

Marco's comments clearly indicate that language shift is linked to local notions of gender. His analysis of gender can also be compared with that of de la Cadena 1995, who makes somewhat similar points when writing about gendered patterns of Quechua ethnicity in Chitapampino, a community near Cuzco, Peru. When discussing the equation of female gender, low status, and Quechua in Peru, she does not propose any simple affirmative or negative answer to her rhetorical question of whether women are more Indian. However, she displays many ways in which women are both more oppressed and "more Indian" with respect to speaking habits, clothing and diet. In fact, she proposes a hierarchy, starting at the bottom: indigenous women, indigenous men, mestizo groups, and the dominant elite. In his work on southern Andean Peru, Chirinos distinguishes four sociocultural types: *indígena*, acculturated Indian, *cholo*, and *mestizo* (1997:252–56). His hierarchy does not differentiate between indigenous men and women, because *indígena* in fact refers to both men and women, even though the end-morpheme is a feminine one. In San Antonio one generation ago, many women were beaten; symptomatically, several of the focus children's parents reported that their fathers would beat their mothers, but the focus fathers themselves do not engage in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502315033 Published online by Cambridge University Press

beating their wives. Violence directed toward women has thus diminished across three generations.

In San Antonio, Indian ethnicity is also gendered in that women observe traditional habits, such as dress codes, more closely than men do. Similarly, girls wear the traditional *anacu* at school, whereas boys do not wear traditional clothing at school or in their leisure time (although neither group speaks Quichua). In fact, the girls and their parents argue with the teachers about also letting the girls wear their traditional colorful *shalinas* (shawls) at school. These shawls are used for many purposes – for warmth, for beauty, for hiding the face when talking to mestizo adults, or for playing with dolls (folding the shawl into a doll, or for carrying pretend dolls on the back); and neither the parents nor the girls themselves accept that the *shalinas* are not allowed at school. In addition, women speak Quichua in more contexts than do men, and it is the old women who are the harborers of *puro puro* Quichua. Moreover, it is the women, and not the men, who speak Quichua in the asymmetrical couple-talk pattern discussed earlier. By contrast, it is the men who are more active politically and who struggle through different national and local organizations for ethnic revitalization. Thus, no simple claims can be made about men being "less Indian."

Quichua and position in the age hierarchy

Generally speaking, the pattern of usage of endangered languages tends to show generational variation. Drawing on Canadian Indian data, Krauss 1992 demonstrates that many languages that are spoken today will not be spoken in 50 years because the youngest speakers are now in their midlife period, and the language is not being transmitted to the youngest generation. Some aboriginal languages in Canada, for instance, are spoken by 20% of children above 5 years of age, 30% of people between 40 and 44, and 60% of people above 85. Consequently, a rise in average speaker age is a strong predictor of language shift (Crystal 2000:17).

As can be seen in San Antonio, bilingual practices are clearly linked not only to gender hierarchies but, above all, to position in the age hierarchy. On the level of daily speaking practices, bilingualism in San Antonio is highly structured along a generational hierarchy. Very old people, particularly old women, are monolingual Quichua speakers; most adults in middle age, including the children's parents, are truly bilingual in that they habitually switch between Quichua and Spanish, employing Quichua with their elders and Spanish in the marketplace or when talking with the children's teachers, the nurse's aide, or other mestizos. In contrast, young people (children below age 10), just like very old people, act as monolingual speakers. Obviously, some of the children have varying degrees of passive knowledge of Quichua, but they do not reveal much of this in their daily play or sibling caretaking. When we take into account the toddlers' marginal experience of Quichua, it is not surprising that they grow up as monolingual rather than bilingual speakers. Active bilingual-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502315033 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ism is primarily a utility for the middle generation, not for young children or senior citizens.

Ultimately, language shift or language reversal is a question for the future. When asked if Quichua may disappear one day, the comuneros look perplexed, calmly shrugging their shoulders and saying this is impossible. They are all convinced that their children will eventually pick up Quichua at a later stage in life, after finishing school or when they get married; all adults today in fact speak Quichua, and so speaking the vernacular is part of being an adult Indian, as is being married. Quichua will thus continue to be spoken in the community by the next generation, and for generations to come. To put it simply, the comuneros do not worry about language shift because they do not see the Quichua language as endangered. The language is so much a part of their Quichua identity that they cannot even conceive of a future without it (see Hornberger 1985 for a similar discussion about indigenous peoples in Puno, Peru). They cannot imagine what it would be like to be an adult Indian and unable to speak the Quichua language, "their Indian mother tongue, the language of their ancestors and forefathers." On the one hand, the ethnic revitalization paradox can somewhat speculatively be explained using a model of biological preprogramming, or what Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer (1998:84) call the GENETIC FALLACY: the belief that, at the end of schooling or after marrying, the children will somehow be able to speak Quichua as all adults presently do in the community, and much as other adult capacities develop. Speaking Quichua is an innate feature of Quichua ethnicity that may just take time to manifest.

On the other hand, ethnicity involves much more than speaking the indigenous language. As can be seen in our present analyses, the comuneros define their children as Quichua even though they do not speak the language. For instance, the comuneros define themselves as hard-working Indians, using the land under conditions much harder than any mestizo would be able to handle. Both children and adults know that the comuneros of San Antonio have fought gallantly for their rights – managing, for instance, to take over the two haciendas. Revolutionary pride is also part of their Quichua identity. Moreover, the children are taught Quichua norms of behavior in everyday life, such as avoiding giving people the opportunity to gossip. Being Quichua is much more than speaking the language.

Last, and perhaps most important, ethnicity is a fluid concept (Eriksen 1992, 1993) that cannot be pinpointed to singular groups or languages. Rather, it has to do with social practices, and more specifically with patterns of practices. Thus, for old women in San Antonio, being a Quichua Indian might entail being a monolingual Quichua speaker. For their children, being Quichua involves mastering two languages. In contrast, for their grandchildren, Quichua identity is linked to Hispanic speaking practices. For all three generational groups, living a Quichua life is ultimately tied to actual interactions with other Quichua comuneros and with mestizos at school, at home, and in the marketplace.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502315033 Published online by Cambridge University Press

APPENDIX

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

-	interruption of sound
=	one turn follows immediately upon another
CAPS	high amplitude
Bold	**marked emphasis** (changes in pitch and/or amplitude)
:	sound stretch
( )	encloses nonverbal communication, contextual information
[	overlapping utterances
Italic	*Spanish words and sentences are set in italics*
<u>*italic*</u>	Quichua words and sentences are underlined and in italics

NOTES

* The authors would like to thank Nancy H. Hornberger, Jane H. Hill, and an anonymous reviewer for detailed and helpful comments on this article. We would also like to thank Ann-Carita Evaldsson for helpful comments on an earlier version of this article.

[1] A pseudonym for the real name of the community is used to protect the comuneros' identity. Note that there are a few communities in the area with this very name. This study is not about any of those communities.

[2] The indigenous peoples of the province were originally called Puruhás and spoke a language of the same name. The Inca and succeeding Spanish conquests, however, caused the obliteration of this original ethnic group. The Indians in the area were transformed, during the Inca conquest, into "generic" Indians. The Puruhá language was lost, but it is reported to have been spoken until 1692 (Murra 1946:797).

[3] Literally, a mestizo is a person of mixed race. In the sierras, it normally refers to a person identifying with Hispanic rather than Indian culture. In the present text, the use of "mestizo" follows the comuneros' local way of speaking; that is, mestizos are all groups who have adapted their clothing, manner, and ways of speaking to that of the white (urban) population.

[4] All translations are approximate. Baby-talk expressions have been translated to baby-talk constructions. Ungrammatical constructions in Standard Spanish have not been translated to ungrammatical English constructions, though, as they are accepted in the regional Hispanic language. Words in parentheses in the translation have been added in order to achieve a more standard English translation.

[5] It can, for instance, be noted that the suffix *-a* in *coma*, in the *abuela*'s last turn in Spanish (ex. 1, turn 8), is not the expected one in standard Spanish, where *-e* would be the standard grammatical choice (i.e. *come*).

REFERENCES

Albó, Xavier (1979). The future of the oppressed languages in the Andes. In William C. McCormack & Stephen A. Wurm (eds.), *Language and society: Anthropological issues*, 309–30. The Hague: Mouton.

Andersen, Elaine (1990). *Speaking with style: The sociolinguistic skills of children*. London: Routledge.

Aronsson, Karin, & Thorell, Mia (1999). Family politics in children's play directives. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31:25–47.

Boas, Franz (1966). *Introduction to Handbook of American Indian languages*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. (Original, 1911)

Chirinos, Andres (1997). An experience of indigenous literacy in Peru. In Nancy H. Hornberger (ed.), *Indigenous literacies in the Andes: Language planning from the bottom up*, 251–65. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Crystal, David (2000). *Language death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dauenhauer, Nora Marks, & Dauenhauer, Richard (1998). Technical, emotional, and ideological issues in reversing language shift: Examples from Southeast Alaska. In Grenoble & Whaley 57–98.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502315033 Published online by Cambridge University Press

de la Cadena, Marisol (1995). "Women are more Indian": Ethnicity and gender in a community near Cuzco. In Brooke Larson & Olivia Harris (eds.), *Ethnicity, markets, and migration in the Andes: At the crossroads of history and anthropology*, 328–48. Durham: Duke University Press.
Dorian, Nancy (1980). Linguistic lag as an ethnic marker. *Language in Society* 9:33–41.
______ (1981). *Language death: The life cycle of Scottish Gaelic dialect*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Eriksen, Thomas Hylland (1992). Linguistic hegemony and minority resistance. *Journal of Peace Research* 29:313–32.
______ (1993). *Ethnicity and nationalism: Anthropological perspectives*. London: Pluto Press.
Fishman, Joshua A. (1964). Language maintenance and language shift as a field of inquiry. *Linguistics* 9:32–70.
______ (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Goodwin, Marjorie H. (1990). *He-said-she-said: Talk as a social organization among Black children*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
Grenoble, Lenore A., & Whaley, Lindsay J. (1998). *Endangered languages: Current issues and future prospects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Grinevald, Colette (1998). Language endangerment in South America: A programmatic approach. In Grenoble & Whaley, 124–159.
Gumperz, John J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Haboud, Marleen (1991). *Distribución del uso del quichua en Ecuador*. Quito: EBI.
Heath, Shirley Brice, & Laprade, Richard (1982). Castilian colonialization and indigenous languages: The cases of Quechua and Aymara. In Robert L. Cooper (ed.), *Language spread studies in diffusion and social change*, 119–134. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Hill, Jane H. (1995). The voices of Don Gabriel: Responsibility and self in a modern Mexicano narrative. In Dennis Tedlock & Bruce Mannheim (eds.), *The dialogic emergence of culture*, 97–147. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
______, & Hill, Kenneth (1986). *Speaking Mexicano: Dynamics of syncretic language in central Mexico*. Tucson: University Arizona Press.
Hornberger, Nancy H. (1985). *Bilingual education and Quechua language maintenance in highland Puno, Peru*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
______ (1997). Literacy, language maintenance, and linguistic human rights: Three telling cases. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 127:87–103.
______ (1998). Language policy, language education, language rights: Indigenous, immigrant, and international perspectives. *Language in Society* 27:439–58.
______, & King, Kendall A. (1996). Language revitalisation in the Andes: Can the schools reverse language shift? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 17:427–41.
King, Kendall A. (2001). *Language revitalization processes and prospects: Quichua in the Ecuadorian Andes*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Krauss, Michael (1992). The world's languages in crisis. *Language* 68:4–10.
Kroskrity, Paul V. (1998). Arizona Tewa Kiva speech as a manifestation of a dominant language ideology. In Bambi B. Schieffelin et al. (eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*, 103–22. New York: Oxford University Press.
Kulick, Don (1992). *Language, shift and cultural reproduction: Socialization, self, and syncretism in a Papua New Guinean village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
______ (1998). Anger, gender, language shift, and the politics of revelation in a Papua New Guinean village. In Bambi B. Schieffelin et al. (eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*, 87–102. New York: Oxford University Press.
Mannheim, Bruce (1984). Una nación acorralada: Southern Peruvian Quechua language planning and politics in historical perspective. *Language in Society* 13:291–309.
Muratorio, Blanca (1981). Protestantism, ethnicity, and class in Chimborazo. In Norman Whitten (ed.), *Cultural transformations and ethnicity in modern Ecuador*, 506–34. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
Murra, John, V. (1946). The historic tribes of Ecuador. In Julian H. Steward (ed.), *Handbook of South American Indians*, vol. 2, *The Andean civilizations*, 785–821. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502315033 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Muysken, Pieter (1989). Media lengua and linguistic theory. *Canadian Journal of the Sociology of Language* 33:409–22.
Nettle, Daniel, & Romaine, Suzanne (2000). *Vanishing voices: The extinction of the world's languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Romaine, Suzanne (1995). *Bilingualism*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
Torero, Alfredo (1964). Los dialectos Quechuas. *Anales Científicos de la Universidad Agraria* (Lima) 2:446–78.
Urban, Greg, & Sherzer, Joel (1988). The linguistic anthropology of native South America. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 17:283–307.
von Gleich, Utta (1994). Language spread policy: The case of Quechua in the Andean republics of Bolivia, Ecuador and Peru. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 107:77–113.
Weisner, Thomas S., & Gallimore, Ronald (1977). My brother's keeper: Child and sibling caretaking. *Current Anthropology* 18:169–190.

Final version received 2 January 2002

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404502315033 Published online by Cambridge University Press