

# Toward a Non-binary Semiotics of Intersectionality: Linguistic Anthropology in the Wake of Coloniality

Jay Ke-Schutte<sup>1</sup>  | Joshua Babcock<sup>2</sup> 

<sup>1</sup>Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China

<sup>2</sup>Department of Race, Diaspora, and Indigeneity, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, USA

## Correspondence

Joshua Babcock  
Email: [jdbabcock@uchicago.edu](mailto:jdbabcock@uchicago.edu)

Jay Ke-Schutte  
Email: [jay.schutte@colostate.edu](mailto:jay.schutte@colostate.edu)

## Abstract

This special issue proposes a non-binary semiotics of intersectionality to both draw attention to and unsettle binary participation frameworks of “the-West-and-its-others.” Contributors demonstrate how intersectionality can reconfigure scholarly approaches to the semiotic analysis of social life, expanding the bounds of the ethnographic as both genre and site of ideological work while also suggesting new stakes for conceptualizations of the personal beyond static, neoliberal presuppositions of the identity-bearing individual. This proposed reorientation has stakes for the study of race–language co-naturalizations in locations reflexively cast as beyond white settler-colonial contexts. We place the study of intersectionality within the historical socius of the colonial and its prefixes (de-, post-, and anti-) by engaging with the historical and material conditions of human capital and land enclosure out of which Kimberlé Crenshaw’s micro-interactional observations emerged as originary reflections on the concept of intersectionality. Together, we consider linguistic and co(n)textual phenomena that are left out of most contemporary intersectional and critical race analyses. The authors demonstrate an array of modalities through which we can analytically separate intersectionality-as-method, while not assuming American monolingual racial experiences as universal.

## KEYWORDS

coloniality, intersectionality, non-binary semiotics, raciolinguistics

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.

© 2023 The Authors. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* published by Wiley Periodicals LLC on behalf of American Anthropological Association.

As for the idea of equal division of power between men and women, most people seem to believe that since there are power holders among men, there should be among women as well. But did such powerful female sovereigns as Queen Victoria of the British Empire or Empresses Lü Zhi and Empress Wu Zetian in the dynastic history of China ever bring the slightest benefits to the majority of women? He-Yin Zhen (1907)<sup>1</sup>

Thus in adopting the line of a nonracial approach, the [white] liberals are playing their old game. They are claiming a “monopoly on intelligence and moral judgement” and setting the pattern and pace for the realisation of the black man’s aspirations...They want to shy away from all forms of “extremisms,” condemning “white supremacy” as being just as bad as “Black Power!”. They vacillate between the two worlds, verbalising all the complaints of the blacks beautifully while skillfully extracting what suits them from the exclusive pool of white privileges. Steve Biko (1970)<sup>2</sup>

Intersectionality has become a watchword both in and beyond the academy, efflorescing across domains of activism and action as well as scholarly research and writing. As the term’s originator Kimberlé Crenshaw has noted, the efflorescence of the concept, though largely generative (Cho, Crenshaw, and McCall, 2013), far exceeds its origins as an intervention into the flattening, exclusionary machinations of legal tests in American antidiscrimination doctrine (e.g., Crenshaw, 1989, 1991). As Crenshaw illustrated in these early works, analyses of discrimination in American jurisprudence relied on legal tests that de facto treated “injury” as a function of discrete categories that operate in mutually exclusive isolation. That is, juridically, Crenshaw illuminated how one can experience injury because one is a woman, or because one is Black/a person of color, or because one is not a citizen, but not simultaneously due to all of these in a uniform, systemically relative sense; nor can injury be recognized as an emergent political effect that is distinct from any one vector of oppression. In the settings of legal reform that Crenshaw was concerned with, she demonstrated how the juridical individuation of these (and more) vectors of oppression prevented the U.S. legal system from seeing/addressing the political reality of often shifty, mutually inflecting, and non-discrete configurations of personhood (Crenshaw, 1989, 1991). Crucial as it was for the growth of Critical Race Theory both in law and disciplines across the social sciences and humanities, especially disciplines taking inspiration from various poststructuralisms (Puar, 2012), this insight seems more or less obvious on the face of it, especially among linguistic anthropologists and critical scholars of language; and to be sure, it can be argued that linguists, anthropologists, sociolinguists, and other critical scholars of language have cared about intersectional dynamics from the start, albeit often through somewhat grid-like configurations of age, gender, race, sexuality, nationality, and class.

The growth of intersectionality as a watchword, however, should not be equated to the actual growth of intersectional analyses as a—or *the*—dominant paradigm in linguistics, anthropology, feminist scholarship, gender and sexuality studies, etc., notwithstanding claims to the contrary (cf. Lazar, 2019; Liu et al., 2013; Nash, 2008; Puar, 2007). Its use has proliferated, but as sociocultural linguist deandre miles-hercules has argued, the term “intersectionality” has undergone indexical and semantic bleaching through both the erasure of the blackwomen&femme scholars who developed the analytic (and who did so even before the term as such existed); and, concomitantly, through the warping of its meaning and application (miles-hercules, 2022, 4–5). In the academy, this has manifested less in critiques that take intersectionality as nothing more than “identity politics on steroids” or just a way to “turn white men into the new pariahs,” as Crenshaw noted in a recent interview when speaking on right-wing alarmism aimed at intersectionality in the U.S. (in Steinmetz, 2020). Instead of

bald-faced dismissal, the term more often gets stripped of its dual commitments to “(a) addressing the ways single-axis analyses of systemic inequality make invisible the experiences of multiply-bound subjects and (b) disrupting the hegemonic order that conditions this erasure” (miles-hercules, 2022, 4). The result has been a conflation of intersectionality with marginalization or complexity in general, resulting in defanged, discursively encompassing claims like “culture itself is intersectional” (Boellstorff, 2005, 18, cited in miles-hercules, 2022, 5). Across both scholarly and lay domains, the bleaching of intersectionality reproduces the structures of white supremacy, anti-Blackness, and misogynoir—the nexus of anti-Black racism and misogynistic representation that targets Black women (Bailey, 2021)—even in work that claims to do the opposite.

Through this special issue, we build on our previous call for a “both-and” semiotics of intersectionality, one that refuses to take an “either-or” approach to the question of what *can* count as a structuring influence on semiosis (Babcock and Ke-Schutte, 2023; see also Henry, 2023; Pak and Hiramoto, 2023; Yoo, 2023). Though often assumed to be a universally accepted baseline among linguistic anthropologists and other critical scholars of language, analysts routinely find themselves subjected to professional pressures to choose: is this about race *or* class? Race *or* culture? Race *or* caste? Race *or* religion? Race *or* language? As an extension of the “both-and” semiotics of intersectionality, we call here for a *non-binary semiotics of intersectionality*, an approach that recognizes the potentials of intersectionality-as-method. By proposing a non-binary semiotics of intersectionality, we seek to both draw attention to as well as move beyond participation frameworks that set up false dichotomies of “the-West-and-its-others” as a ground for various entailed binaries: “domination *or* resistance,” “structure *or* agency,” “bottom-up *or* top-down,” “open-ended semiosis *or* historical overdetermination.” Like the papers in this collection, our introduction suggests openings into these problem-spaces (Scott, 2004) that are by no means prescriptive, but rather can prismatically reconfigure the ways that scholars approach the semiotic analysis of social life. This proposed reorientation has stakes especially for the study of race–language co-naturalizations in locations reflexively cast as lying beyond white settler-colonial contexts that are not structured by ideologies of presumptive (especially Anglophone) monolingualisms, which are frequently set against assumptions of “deviant” or marginal bilingualisms (Agha, 2008; Flores, 2013). As such, we place the study of intersectionality within the historical socius (Fanon, [1952] 2008) of the colonial and its prefixes (de-, post-, and anti-), by engaging with the fundamental historical and material conditions of human capital and land enclosure out of which many of Crenshaw’s micro-interactional observations emerged as originary reflections on the concept of intersectionality.

The two quotes in the epigraph both exemplify and situate our intended intervention. First, Chinese feminist He-Yin Zhen draws attention to the limitations of “equality of the (two) sexes” as the model for critiquing oppressive gender hierarchies. Asking whether equal numbers of men and women hold power ultimately ignores history and bypasses the far more pressing questions of *what power does*, what it gets used *to do*, and *for whom*, all while presuming a settled binary that encompasses the terms of the debate. In the latter quote, Steve Biko—South African anti-apartheid activist, student leader, founder of the Black Consciousness movement, and co-founder of South African Students’ Organization—draws attention to white liberalism’s shifty logics of false equivalence that get used to bypass questions of history, power, and multiply stratified oppressive structures. While situated in distinct geographies, both spatially and temporally, these two thinkers similarly critique analogous political orders that treat binary operations as necessary and given: man/woman, western/nonwestern, Black/white.

The scholarship into which we critically intervene reproduces such binaries in two distinct ways: on the one hand, by leaving unquestioned binary formulae to essentialize the identities, geographic sites, and empirical-ethnographic loci associated with intersectionality—to

claim, for instance, that it is a “western theory” applicable only to “the west” seemingly because Kimberlé Crenshaw and others hold American passports and focus on the U.S. (e.g., Liu et al., 2013). On the other hand, we engage with scholars who recognize the flexibility of intersectionality as an antiracist, anti-oppressive methodological orientation, yet who still equate race with phenotype and naturalize whiteness as something that some people intrinsically *are* as grounds for subsequent calls to look beyond “the west” and the supposedly settled question of how “white people raciali[ze] others” (Ang et al., 2022, 585).

In the next three sections, we outline each of our substantive concerns. We start by outlining our approach to *raciolinguistic intersectionalities*, which attends to the pragmatics and ethnography of race-language co-naturalizations as they multiplicatively co-occur with other oppressive systems. We seek to show how raciolinguistic and intersectional perspectives are neither mutually exclusive, nor are they in any way reductive or epiphenomenal to the real-time semiotic processes toward which we and contributors to this collection turn our analytic attention. In our second section, we explicate what we mean by intersectionality-as-method, focusing on the ways that intersectionality both reconfigures and amplifies methodologies and epistemologies for the study of semiosis broadly, and socially situated language use specifically. Next, we outline the implications that this approach has for locating the personal in the ethnographic, refusing the (neo)liberal presumption that identities are discreet, perduring, and given, and that persons preexist their thinking, interpreting, and doing in the world (miles-hercules, 2022, 6; see also Bucholtz and Hall, 2005). In this section, we engage with the multimodality of ethnographic situations as both an empirical fact and methodological warrant and trace out both the implications of a non-binary intersectional method and the ways that contributors to this issue elaborate on these stakes and affordances. Finally, we engage the question: what do we mean by binary semiotic formulae, and who is still going on about binaries? We situate our contributors' papers across this section and the one preceding. Ultimately, this introduction is preaching to the choir, a move that is neither myopic nor gratuitous, but one that seeks to build solidarity with like-minded sojourners. Few would go so far as to publish against raciolinguistic intersectionalities, nonbinary semiotic approaches, or the effort to de-center Anglo-monolingual presumptions in the academy, but that doesn't mean that resistance doesn't continually rear its head. Our goal is less to convince the haters, and more to tell our comrades: we see you, and we're happy you're also along for the journey.

## THE PRAGMATICS AND ETHNOGRAPHY OF RACIOLINGUISTIC INTERSECTIONALITIES

In this section, we argue for the importance of the pragmatic and ethnographic in any approach to the analysis of intersectional dynamics. We also outline what we see as the relationship between a raciolinguistic perspective and the intervention of intersectionality. As we seek to show, the relationship is not one of “either-or,” but of “both-and” (Babcock and Ke-Schutte, 2023), not in the sense of multiplying discrete categories in isolation, but in the sense of multiplying oppressive structures. This multiplication is not an a priori conceptual presupposition, but one that takes place in the real-time, situated unfolding of social life. Contributors retain Crenshaw's early framing of intersectionality not as a “new, totalizing theory of identity” (1991, 1244), but as a “telling”: as Crenshaw put it in an incisive early formulation, “[a]lthough racism and sexism readily intersect in the lives of real people, they seldom do in feminist and antiracist practices. And so, when the practices expound identity as woman or person of color as an either/or proposition, they relegate the identity of women of color to a location that resists telling” (ibid, 1242). Of course—as the papers in this issue demonstrate—“woman” and “person of color” are not the only categorical vectors whose

intersections hegemonically overdetermine the conditions of possibility for compromised global subjects to act, even if the emergent configurations cannot be totally accounted for in advance, notwithstanding power-laden institutionalizing pressures that demand the contrary.

Drawing inspiration from Crenshaw's analysis, much contemporary feminist-, critical race-, and queer-theoretical scholarship has productively focused on the ideological stratification of gender, sexuality, racialization, citizenship, belonging, and other vectors. And yet, notwithstanding its incisive methodological admonitions, a great deal of extant work has still tended to treat language, mobility, passing, and racialization as discreet "intersectional" domains—an aporia that intersectional disability justice and education scholars, in particular, have highlighted (Annamma et al., 2013; Boda, 2022; Haynes et al., 2020). Bridging these domains continues to remain elusive for approaches that presume the ontological necessity of a divide or gap between categories of gender, sexuality, race, gender, citizenship, dis/ability, belonging, etc., thus (re)producing the very divides or gaps seen as in need of bridging (cf. MacKinnon, 2013), whether implicitly or explicitly. We and our contributors thus draw on and reconfigure longstanding linguistic anthropological approaches to the study of "discursively mediated interaction" (Silverstein, 2004, 621) as involving not only communication in a narrow sense— sending and receiving messages about "states of affairs concerning all manner of experienceable and imaginable things"—but also as the vehicle through which persons "experienc[e] culture by communicating through [language-in-use as] exemplar, medium, and site" (ibid).

As our approach aims to be transformative rather than additive, we thus aim to advance the telling of a "location that resists telling" (Crenshaw, 1991, 1242) without also succumbing to forms of disciplinary white-saviorism that would weaponize "our" methods to save "them." We here take up the pragmatics and ethnography of raciolinguistic intersectionalities (Babcock and Ke-Schutte, 2023), which we have elsewhere defined as the co-naturalization of language and race in and through other stratifying structures operative in situated, real-time contexts of semiosis. Race and language have acted as powerful ideological centers that overdetermine semiosis. However, as remains the case, they are one among many co-occurring oppressive structures whose co-occurrence requires historical and semiotic analysis. To say that race and language ideologically *overdetermine* semiosis in the wake of coloniality is not to say that they *determine* semiosis, that they foreclose its open-endedness, or that race-language co-naturalization is an *inevitable* outcome, claims that were never present in Jonathan Rosa and Nelson Flores's attention to overdetermination in their call for a "raciolinguistic perspective" on "racial and linguistic intersections and assemblages" (2017, 634–7). In other words, to speak of overdetermination is to say that history matters—a proposition that is neither trivial nor reductive, neither a senseless truism nor a prescriptive methodological stance—and that history is neither linear, fixed, nor shaped by sole causes, an approach to overdetermination linked to a psychoanalytic rather than materialist genealogy (Rada, 2022, 4–5). As we have argued elsewhere, in approaching even the conventionally race-gender-stratified dimensions of intersectionality:

the pragmatics of raciolinguistic intersectionalities are always ethnographically situated. This does not mean that such dynamics are inevitably and inescapably "small-scale," "local," or "micro" (Carr and Lempert 2016, 8). Rather, to attend to the ethnographic situatedness of raciolinguistic intersectionalities is to track the dynamic processes via which categories come to be materialized, felt, and critically reflected on in the social worlds in which we engage as professional analysts. That is, we insist that professional analysts must track the ways that raciolinguistic intersectionalities get made in and as historical, institutional, and interactional (Rosa and Flores 2017, 641) processes and projects. (Babcock and Ke-Schutte, 2023, 8)



Yet if intersectionality-as-method requires the ethnographic in order to track the pragmatics of interaction, this raises yet another cross-cutting question: what is *(the) ethnographic*?

Far from being reductive, epiphenomenal, additive, or derivative, contributors to this special issue demonstrate how intersectionality-as-method affords different ways of thinking and doing that can better enable analysts to track the emergent poetics of raciolinguistic constructs beyond familiar lexicosemantic, category-structural, or text-artifactual approaches. This entails a refusal to stop at definitional concerns about what categories of perceived essential difference *are* and to instead explore social situations where difference comes to matter *for* subjects through the pragmatic recruitments of signs embedded in multiple oppressive structures. The essays in this issue illustrate such an unsettling of the ethnographic by considering history, institutional structures, multimodal data, genre effects, and interactional dynamics not as discrete types of material to be analyzed, some of them ethnographic, others transparently non-ethnographic, but as co-constituting the ethnographic object. This includes refusing to bracket the positionalities of professional researchers or the naturalized categories that variously undergird reflexively linguistic-anthropological approaches.

As such, the articles in this collection do not simply seek to delineate the stakes of interactional politics beyond the monolingual presuppositions of liberal speech genres that still owe a significant debt to the language of John Stuart Mill—notwithstanding excellent work in linguistic anthropology and allied disciplines that has offered rich empirical and conceptual contributions to the study of fractionally convergent histories of linguistic contestation and their entailed speech strategies across media, sites, and scales: for instance, in multiscrptal practices, graphic politics, and performances of indigeneity in eastern India (Choksi, 2015, 2021); in the constructed rivalries and incommensurabilities within and across Tamil and Québécois diasporas (Das, 2008, 2016); in trilingual state policy in postwar Sri Lanka (Davis, 2019); and in classic studies of media practices in the west and south-central African continent (Spitulnik, 1998a, 1998b; Newell, 2012), as well as in Bakhtinian analyses of bi- and multilingual practices (Woolard, 2008). Together, the contributors seek to build on, but certainly also to extend, this work by demonstrating what raciolinguistic intersectionalities analytically afford beyond the settler-colonial encounter, as well as by demonstrating how an understanding of their affordances compels a reconsideration in turn of what we take the ethnographic to be. In these ways, contributors to this collection further aim “to advance the telling of [the] location[s]” (Crenshaw, 1991, 1242) at which research participants’ (and professional researchers’) relationships are materialized through practical activity at the nexus of vectors of stratification. This includes but is not limited to “traditional” categories of race, class, sexuality, and gender; the emergent dialectic of identity and value distinctions within political economies of mobility; as well as the ever-changing semiotic and linguistic practices through which these vectors get materialized.

## INTERSECTIONALITY-AS-METHOD AND THE SIGN'S-EYE VIEW

In this section, we elaborate on what we mean by intersectionality-as-method, situating “method” alongside “methodology” and “epistemology” to disambiguate this perspective’s entailments against presumptive academic defaults that habitually position “novelty” and methodological “distinctiveness” over genealogical situatedness (Mkhize, 2022). This section also revisits what has been called the “signs-eye view” of interactional ritual (Silverstein, 2004, 631) to reconceptualize it in overtly intersectional terms. Following this, we turn to issues of category aesthetics, multimodality, and “the ethnographic.” Here, we trace out the entailments of intersectionality-as-method as a more productive, emergent

vantage point from which to delineate “the ethnographic” as an ethico-political stance, not as a quality, property, feature, or genre of text.

Drawing on Crenshaw's use of intersectionality, Patricia Hill Collins and Sirma Bilge (2016) have elaborated a succinct definition of the concept of intersectionality, emphasizing its applications in a diverse range of settings:

Intersectionality is a way of understanding and analyzing the complexity in the world, in people, and in human experiences. The events and conditions of social and political life and the self can seldom be understood as shaped by one factor. They are generally shaped by many factors in diverse and mutually influencing ways. When it comes to social inequality, people's lives and the organization of power in a given society are better understood as being shaped not by a single axis of social division, be it race or gender or class, but by many axes that work together and influence each other. Intersectionality as an analytic tool gives people better access to the complexity of the world and of themselves. (Collins and Bilge, 2016 1–3)

Such articulations are part of a tireless, ongoing demonstration that the theoretical stakes of intersectionality are not about singularities: of race, of white feminism, of America, or even of the settler colonial world and its West-to-Other hegemonies. Instead, intersectionality concerns the ways in which universalist propositions of equality come to stratify those who are most vulnerable in their particularity. The proposition of the universal thus marginalizes the particular precisely through its capacity to selectively define the right kinds of particularities that maintain an equilibrium with the universal, as opposed to identifying or “witnessing” particularities emerging within social and institutional aporias, lest they problematize a situated universalism's epistemological monopoly.

In the sense outlined by Collins and Bilge, intersectionality's conceptual innovation lies not only in its identification and demonstration of a key contradiction at the heart of (aspirationally) liberal societies and their institutions—that propositions of universal equality seem to engender the very inequalities they are attempting to elide—but also that intersectionality should explicate the very bottom-up, micro-interactions between subjects that supply the maintaining, sustaining, and emergent force for what appear to be top-down ideological and historical effects. Thus, from a methodological standpoint, the stakes of intersectionality lie significantly beyond the parochial politics of race and gender in America. An intersectional perspective imbricates an argument about the discursive processes through which general social stratification is enabled through a disequilibrium and misrecognition of assumed-to-be-discreet vectors of inequality and privilege in micro-interactional contexts.

Just as we do not propose intersectionality as a new, totalizing theory of identity, neither do we present intersectionality as a radically new, distinctive paradigm of research and analysis that either hubristically aspires toward or actually achieves the goal of throwing out all extant conceptual, theoretical, and methodological babies and bathwater. But what, then, is at stake in articulating an intersectional *method*? Around the time that Crenshaw first introduced intersectionality as a juridico-legal intervention, the American philosopher and feminist theorist Sandra G. Harding wrote on a similar problem of “feminist method.” In order to engage a recurrent demand to account for the feminist method's “distinctiveness,” often from self-positioned outsiders, Harding productively disentangles method, methodology, and epistemology in a way that inspires our own way out of what otherwise remains a conceptual morass. The problem with “distinctiveness,” she argues, is that:

discussions of method (techniques for gathering evidence) and methodology (a theory and analysis of how research should proceed) have been intertwined

with each other and with epistemological issues (issues about an adequate theory or justificatory strategy)...[M]ethod” is often used to refer to all three aspects of research. Consequently, it is not at all clear what one is supposed to be looking for when trying to identify a distinctive “feminist method of research” (Harding, 1987, 2).

Once we get clear about what it is that might constitute an answer to the question, once we make clear to ourselves and to interlocutors what it is that we are inquiring after, we can also let go of the expectation of “distinctiveness”—at the level of either method, methodology, or epistemology, let alone all three at once. In Harding's case, the result is that we find that there is both “less and more” to feminist method. *Less*, in that attempts to define what is “new” serve to “introduce a false sense of unity to all the different ‘little things’ feminist researchers do with familiar methods” (ibid). *More*, in that the “new methodologies and new epistemologies that are requiring these...uses of familiar research techniques” (ibid) are themselves non-trivial transformations. Because method, methodology, and epistemology are continuous, in other words, a change in the one fundamentally shifts the others.

As a theoretical disposition concerned with elided particularities that unsettle universals—through its empirical focus on the selective recruitment and isolation of particularities that underpin settled universals—intersectionality also entails both “less and more” than many within its genealogy habitually acknowledge. In most of its applications, intersectionality entails a transformation in methodology and epistemology—in the “theory and analysis of how research should proceed” and “issues about an adequate theory or justificatory strategy” (ibid)—rather than in the “techniques for gathering evidence” (ibid) as such. We do not mean this dismissively. Instead, we aim to sharpen our understanding of where extant approaches to intersectionality have focused, and how. Indeed, myriad articulations of intersectionality over the past three decades—whether as a field of study, a conceptual apparatus, an arena of social action, or a topic of debate—can be seen to define its intervention methodologically and epistemologically. Reflecting nearly 25 years after the term first appeared, Cho et al reviewed the emergence of what they termed “intersectionality studies.” For these scholars, for instance, intersectionality is about *framing*:

what makes an analysis intersectional—whatever terms it deploys, whatever its iteration, whatever its field or discipline—is its adoption of an intersectional way of thinking about the problem of sameness and difference and its relation to power. This framing—*conceiving of categories not as distinct but as always permeated by other categories, fluid and changing, always in the process of creating and being created by dynamics of power—emphasizes what intersectionality does rather than what intersectionality is* (Cho, Crenshaw, and McCall, 2013, 795, emphasis added).

By reframing the analytic task away from terms, field, discipline, and static or discrete approaches to categories, these scholars land squarely in the domain of pragmatics: toward an insistence on practical activity rather than definitional or denotational fidelity. Crucially, the (re)framing that intersectionality offers in this account is one that intervenes at the level of epistemology.

Similarly, scholars in the fields of disability justice, queer studies, and their intersections (Toft and Franklin, 2020) have insisted on the importance of attending to *process* rather than *product*:

With this *articulation* of ‘political and ideological connections that require generative conditions to exist’ [Hall 2017], the *product of difference*—as an entity to be faced—is less intriguing for...scholarly and activist pursuits to dismantle



oppression for all. Rather, the *process of creating marginalized identities as inferior* serves as an important inquiry to move beyond the flattening of identity categories to generalized constructions of assumption, especially given the robust designs of colonization as a project of assimilation to construct acceptable visions of Self in our modern institutions documented throughout the world (Boda, 2022, 2–3).

While it matters that individuals variably and malleably get positioned in and through sites of encounter, histories and institutions still act as ideological encompassments that constrain the possibilities for action by ideologically simplifying the field of available resources through which persons project and construe their positionalities. This happens not linearly, through sole causes, but through the confluence of systems that are existentially intertwined, if analytically separable, with the result that “what might appear as racial and semiotic flexibility at the level of individual bodies and practices, can in fact involve the reproduction and rearticulation of broader racial and linguistic structures within emergent contexts” (Rosa and Flores, 2017, 636). Here, another important methodological and epistemic issue comes to the fore: the importance of centering processes of differentiation and marginalization beyond the putatively “micro” by acknowledging the entanglements of the here-and-now of interactional semiosis with both coloniality and gendered racial-capitalist designs (Alatas, 1977; Sweeney, 2021).

In his work, decolonial anthropologist Michel-Rolph Trouillot (1995, 2003) once warned against the anachronistic tendency of cultural anthropology’s methodological conservatism embodied in the hegemony of single site, single ethnographer, single space–time research (2003). Undertaking a historical survey of anthropology’s ethnographic archive, Trouillot meticulously explored a discursive tendency of participation-based ethnographic method: the ultimate, relativistic reduction of all sites, and indeed all “differences” situated within them, to a singular “ethnographic” mythic time. From Trouillot’s work, we note that *Writing Culture* did not “save” ethnography-as-method, but rather entrenched singularizing tendencies through the introduction of a new character in the ethnography: the reflexive sotto voice of the situated ethnographer meant to lend a self-critical gaze to the very endeavor of ethnography. Trouillot identified the ahistorical tendency of this highly curated literary archetype—a writing character that even the most culturally- and linguistically-distant traveler into the discipline of anthropology had to learn to adopt. The “experiencing” ethnographer could now stand outside of histories even while talking about them, for “culture” was dynamic, able to rescue historical agency from even the most compromised of “local” circumstances. Trouillot demonstrated how generations of anthropologists mystified the historical anthropological category of race by foregrounding “culture” as an anachronistic unit of commensuration, an act of semiotic violence through which anthropology could resuscitate its savage slot (1991).

And yet, against such warnings to avoid analyzing in terms of synchronic, calculable “intersectional coordinates” (Puar, 2007, 175), many accounts across contemporary feminist-, critical race-, and queer-theoretical scholarship still end up focusing on products—on lexical semantics, static categories, or text-artifacts—as evidence of processes of ideological stratifications along lines of gender, sexuality, racialization, citizenship, mobility, passing, ability, these domains nevertheless remain discrete. By positing the methodological and epistemological necessity of an a priori gap between such domains, the domains get made as simultaneously in need of bridging and unbridgeable, much like the constructed irreconcilability of the Enlightenment problem of words and “other minds” (Bauman and Briggs, 2003; Peters, 1999).

Our point is not to imply an inventory of scholars who “get it” and those who “do not.” We seek instead to highlight a productive opportunity to follow through on the entailment of intersectional methodology and epistemology *in and as method*—that is, in and as techniques

for gathering evidence. We stand alongside myriad interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary scholars of intersectionality in emphasizing the importance of process—a commitment that is both familiar and consonant with linguistic anthropological approaches. For the linguistic anthropologist, intersectionality as an analytical disposition prompts the researcher to be attentive to the micro-interactions through which subjectivity is articulated and where even the most radical claims of open-ended agency are elided. In the linguistic anthropological study of face-to-face interactions, intersectionality's micro-interactional sites are as crucial as, if not more easily identified than, they are in history, sociology, legal research, literature, and media studies. At stake is nothing less than the semiotic method as such, not just as a theoretical heuristic but as an ethico-political stance: as the linguistic anthropologist Krystal A. Smalls and others have productively articulated, the pragmatics and ethnography of sign processes have always been intersectional in precisely the non-reductive modes called for by Crenshaw, collaborators, colleagues, and co-conspirators, even if this fact has not always been explicitly recognized in the intellectual labors of the sub-discipline. By “intersectional,” we do not mean “complex” or “multifaceted.” Rather, as Smalls has argued, semiosis unfolds both in, from, and about racialized, gendered, and linguistically stratified situations whose present semiotic possibilities are constrained by colonial and imperial histories. This echoes calls made by advocates for North American Indigenous feminist theories like Maile Arvin, Eve Tuck, and Angie Morrill, who insist that we reckon with the ways that colonial encounters and ongoing settler-colonialism have created a present in which interactants find themselves multiply and simultaneously embedded in cisheteropatriarchal hierarchies of race, gender, and sexuality (2013, 9–11). That is, in the wake of coloniality—which is not an event or moment in the past but a set of structures that continue as both colonial category structures and settler-colonial domination—individuals find themselves racialized, gendered, and sexualized, positioned as speakers with gradiently marked embodiments speaking gradiently marked linguistic varieties.

Such an insight was present, if latent in now-classic conceptualizations of textuality in linguistic anthropology, and the dialectical intertwinement of what is signified (*denotational textuality*), what is accomplished (*interactional textuality*; Silverstein and Urban, 1996; Silverstein 1993), as well as in recent elaborations of *aesthetic textuality*—what gets felt, noticed, and rendered aesthetically experienceable in and as events of sign-use (Nakassis, 2019). As these longstanding interventions remind us, within any “large-scale, macrosocial orders, in-effect ritual centers of semiosis come to exert a structuring, value-conferring influence on any particular event of discursive interaction with respect to the meanings and significance of the verbal and other semiotic forms used in it” (Silverstein, 2004, 623). This is true, notwithstanding the fact that the multiply-scaled ordering of interaction ritual runs up against the focus on “surface-segmentable forms” (Silverstein, 1979, 197), or “lexically explicit -onomic structures,” in ways that privilege the lexical as a site of focus at the expense of cultural concepts beyond lexicalization (Silverstein, 2004, 634). In other words, accounting for the flexible, emergent, ritualized ordering of interaction has always required that we employ a reflexive attunement to the construction of personhood as a multi-vocal and always stratified process in which we must account for both our own and others' tendency to focus on words and other readily-decontextualized forms in reckoning the effects that we encounter in the world.

Put differently, “the sign” has never been dis-embodied, pre-racialized, pre-gendered, pre-sexual, or ahistorical by default—a “neutral” vehicle only later layered with embodiment, race, gender, sexuality, and history (Rosa and Flores, 2017, 2020; Smalls, 2020). And yet, the capaciousness of a semiotic method has repeatedly been curtailed by disciplinary and sub-disciplinary limits imposed by methodologies and epistemologies that circumscribe what can count as a valid axis of differentiation or analytic category. In alignment with Krystal Smalls' recent exploration of the semiotics of racialization across locations in

the Black Diaspora, the intersectional approach we are advocating for might ask: how does “meaning-making about and through race” (Smalls, 2020, 233) happen in locations where histories, institutions, and interactions (Rosa and Flores, 2017, 622) afford the conditions of possibility for the embodiment of listening subjects who aspire toward whiteness but do not themselves aspire *to be* white in non-Western encounters? In this way, we build on work that takes an intersectional approach to analyze the performance of racism among postcolonial co-ethnics without naturalizing the category of white people, or people with white identities, either as self-evident or as isomorphic with positional whiteness (Babcock, 2023) or whiteness as apex-category (Ke-Schutte, 2023).

Toward the aim of addressing intersectionality-as-method's sign's-eye view, contributors to this collection have formulated wide-ranging and innovative methodological entry points in situating intersectionality within still-decolonizing non-Western interactions. The race-class-language intersectionalities at stake in this collection are deftly rendered in Katy Highet's analysis of the metapragmatic and metasemantic enregisterments of English's class-stratified raciolinguistic propensities within a participation framework of YouTube video-mediated English language connoisseurship among Indian men. The interactional setting she explores both draws on and elides the intersections of race, class, gender, and hierarchies of language use anchored by both whiteness and anti-Blackness. In Velda Khoo's paper, we see the indexical hybridity of Singlish, or Singaporean Colloquial English, as it gets operationalized intersectionally within a context that differs sharply from the siloed monolingualism of Anglo-settler-colonial speaking situations. In her analysis, Singlish emerges as a genuinely multi-lingual nexus among speakers from language worlds that are already discreetly multilingual.

## MULTIMODALITY AND SITUATING THE PERSONAL IN THE ETHNOGRAPHIC

Given the significant challenges in semantically defining and distilling institutional authority in the regulation, constraint, and maintenance of identity, indexicality—as a “signs-eye view” in linguistic anthropology—prompts an approach that favors pragmatist and formalist genealogies to approaching questions of identity and their translation. This entails a shift from what identities and translations *are*, in the definitional and semantic sense, to what identities and translations *do* as signs that emerge out of the imbricated social labors of semiotic reception and production (Ke-Schutte, 2023). It is through this more pragmatist-inspired approach that semiosis is placed at the heart of the production of institutional authority, regimes of value, forms of power, and their ideological infrastructures. As we emphasize here, personhood is not something that can simply be dispensed with, nor is it something that can be taken unproblematically at face value. Rather, we insist that emergent personae in the ethnographic interaction are always already multimodally configured, re-imagined, entextualized, and variously mutilated through its presumed-upon predication.

Compromise has a long history in non-Western revolutionary thought. Here, our papers analytically understand the politics of compromise as affording a participatory presence at the cost of truncated citation or distorted translation, like signing an unequal contract, or making an unfair deal, whether the signing subject is aware of the structural mechanism that engenders the compromise or not. Audre Lorde's (2007 [1984]) master's tools and Lauren Berlant's (2011) cruel optimism are two profound examples of compromise in this abstract sense. It is no coincidence that both thinkers were fundamentally intersectional in their thinking. Of course, “person” inflects a variety of potential social histories as well as personal associations (pun intended). Our associations with person, persona, and personhood vary

widely depending on whether these associated signs are accessed via their contiguity to or distance from other icons of personhood (Carr, 2011).

In addition, our inferences as to someone's personhood are as much informed by their speaking as their physical appearance or resemblance to what one might refer to in English as a "human." Here, "human" as a sign has had a somewhat different destiny both in its scientific and humanistic afterlives (all puns intended; Wynter, 2003). The "human" does not require its own speech for its definition in either the species-register of more-or-less inanimate anatomical attributes and artifactual affordances; or as an a priori rights-bearing subject in the humanistic sense (Stocking, 1988). By contrast, the "person"—variously construed—can be seen as a person-defining and language-defining, thus as both a consenting and violable subject, in the sense that a person can be stolen from, disenfranchised, or legalistically injured in ways that are harder to equivocate in human-animal binarisms (though animals, corporations, collectives, and abstract entities can function as persons within a wide range of social institutions).

However, for personhood to be construed as such, the person as entity entails a recognized communicative reflexivity either for itself or by proxy: thus, an observable capacity to communicate about communication. This is a capacity that Michael Silverstein identified as the metapragmatic and metasemantic features of human communication in defining the discipline's methodological approach for generations of his students (Silverstein, 1993, 38–42 ff). One example that Silverstein enjoyed teaching about was that of the bee dance, where the bee dance can be seen as an astoundingly elaborate non-human communicative system. However, seeing the bee dance as a dance, as such, requires a translation of the hive-as-organism into inter-personal communicators as well as a translation of their activities into sentences about communication, which begs two important meta-communicative questions: for whom does the bee dance? And can the bee dance about dancing? While there is no doubt that we can (and do) talk about talking, linguistic reflexivity goes significantly beyond meta-talk as evidence for our disciplinary object. For linguistic anthropologists, signs like diplomas, qualifications, as well as the expanded professional registers through which trained and authorized subjects attempt to manage the social and political effects of their expertise (to lesser or greater degrees of efficacy) all depend on a reflexive interplay between signs for their signification—that is, a co-textual relationship.

In fact, what many adjacent disciplines might call "context" is explored as itself a meta-communicative principle in linguistic anthropology, hence the linguistic anthropologist's particular entextualization of "co(n)text"—a formulation that imbricates both contextual and co-textual interpretations of social interaction. Here, a co(n)textual understanding of social situations from inter-personal to trans-temporal and historical interactional scales allows insight into why some signs appear contextually fragile—for instance, deictics like *I*, *you*, *they*, and *we* (Hanks, 2005)—whereas other signs appear as significantly more durable, portable even, across contexts. Historical artifacts, human tools, "ancient" words, money, brands, and more all have an indisputably dialogical propensity as signs, as do formations of race, ethnicity, gender, nationality, class, normative sexuality, and monolingualism. And yet, despite their potential deconstructability as so-called "floating signifiers," because of the reality of history—in other words, because of the overdetermination of multiple, shifting, and chronotopically layered co-occurrent structures—they get (re)constructed in ways that, for their sign-users, *must* cathect an institutional durability across contexts and *must* do so for those who depend on their semiotic integrity.

In this way, Andrew Carruthers' analysis of "passing" as Malay in Indonesian-Malaysian borderlands situates the (meta)semiotic labor that generates orderings of siloed, racialized, national formations as the arbiters of personal and personified identity. Working from this context to turn a critical gaze onto the hemispheric parochialism of contemporary American anthropological explorations of stratified identity, the possibility of passing at once articulates

a virulent anxiety and the impossibility of its resolution: the intersectional indistinguishability of the passing subject becomes the engine for ever-increasingly extravagant efforts aimed at differentiation along multiple axes at multiple scales. More generally, Carruthers's paper demonstrates how differentiations are a matter of degree and not necessarily of kind. In her work on educational equity and language-class-caste intersectional stratifications in rural India, Jessica Chandras draws attention to the political limits of multilingual education policies that are predicated on siloed language ideologies of multilingualism, a kind of linguistic apartheid that recruits agential personas to persons without agency by ostending assimilation as the solution to linguistic, classed, and caste oppressions. In her evocative meditation on Sinification and intersectional personhood in Sino-Tibetan interactions, Schu-Ke profoundly demonstrates the tension between the precarity and alienations of ethnic- and linguistically-enregistered personas in contemporary China. Exploring the emergence of "intersectional personae," Schu-Ke's paper productively problematizes how studies of raciolinguistically-stratified "bilingualism" in linguistic anthropology have frequently presumed West-to-Other or Anglocentric contexts as the default participation frameworks within which subjects become enregistered. All these papers are stellar examples of the analytical possibilities of multimodal ethnographic approaches to linguistic anthropological work that must articulate (in the sense of literally being joined or formed of jointed connections) the person-al as both within and fundamental to institutional and interpersonal formations that emerge contrapuntally at multiple spatial and temporal scales.

## WHAT BINARIES? WHOSE BINARIES? OR... INTERSECTIONALITY'S OTHERS?

Through their explicit integration of historical and multimodal data in counterpoint with interactionist and ethnographic analyses, the papers in this collection unsettle the spurious methodological binary of "ethnographic and non-ethnographic" linguistic anthropology: Katy Hight by analyzing the cinematographic framing of YouTube videos together with transcribed denotational text, face-to-face talk, and online comments; Velda Khoo by considering language-policy documents, political oratory, and mediatized metapragmatic discourses; Andrew Carruthers by linking historical-cartographic imaginaries, state classificatory technologies, and uses of linguistic shibboleths in raciolinguistic metacommentaries on passing and policing; Schu-Ke by analyzing grammatical alternants, literary genres, and material environments; and Chandras by considering classroom interactions, racialized histories of caste (and vice versa), shifting linguistic ecologies, modes of production, and educational policy, among others.

Beyond this, they identify a significant difference between the multilingual encounters of our informants and the bilingual indexicalities of so many critical theoretical, postcolonial, and raciolinguistic investments in West-to-Other interactions. In this regard, multilingualism is a key overlapping theme across the contributions to this collection, not only as an explicit alternative to the pervasiveness of bilingualism's Anglocentric bias but also as a critique of the disciplinary a priori in area studies that presume bounded translations of others' worlds into the political and cultural terms of the West. This is evidenced in the difficulties faced by scholars working on relationships between and among non-Western subjects as opposed to "more legible" projects between the West and its others. Working in Sino-Tibetan, inter-Singaporean, inter-caste, Sino-South, or Indonesian-Malay contexts immediately engenders disciplinary counterintuitions that seem to destabilize standard regionalist arguments and political common sense—to say nothing of funding structures.

Area studies stand as an important intervention for us and the contributors to this special issue. By area studies, we do not mean working narrowly within the legacies of Cold War



social sciences of “areas” definable a priori in terms of their regional contiguities as both relativizing method and explanatory ground (Heller and McElhinny, 2017; see also Price, 2016). Instead, we seek to initiate three moves. First, to unsettle the hierarchy between a semiotic conceptual apparatus centered on North American linguistic anthropology—that is, linguistic anthropology whose prestige, hegemonic centers of (re)production are located primarily in North American, especially U.S. institutions—and the interdisciplinary historical and contextual labor often relegated as background. Second, to engage substantively with debates taking place in interdisciplinary spaces that serve as a key site of conceptual and theoretical encounter at which scholars outside prestige intellectual and academic networks. And finally, to refuse a binaristic divide between “area studies” and “linguistic anthropology” proper altogether.

Toward these ends, the papers in this issue collectively situate semiotic concerns in contexts. The binary at issue is one that is all too prevalent in the social sciences, one that frequently appears nested in the pedagogical opposition between nomothetic (universally law-like) and ideographic (particular, event-based) observation, including their respective methodological imperatives. This opposition more commonly emerges in research claims based on scientific or qualitative universalism versus case-based, context-bound investments in observing differences rendered more or less “incommensurable.” In American anthropology, this binaristic tension can and has emerged in various permutations of semiotically-universal versus culturally-relativistic habits of speaking about difference or sameness across ethnographic scales, thus ensuring that the tension remains constitutive even in its (often successful) navigation. Contesting the Anglo-colonial and decidedly monolingual conceptual monopoly at the heart of both positions, our contributors each cut this Gordian knot by situating their arguments in contexts beyond the settler-colonial encounter. Resisting both the hyper- or meta-semiotic “real” that commensurates all, as well as the translationally-nihilistic transcendental alterities of ethnographic non-commensuration, we situate our arguments in places, not “areas,” where the monolingual pedal points that limit the “bi” in bilingualism and “multi” in multilingualism fail to resonate.

Yet again, the suggestion is not that area studies offer transparent methodologies, methods, or epistemological apparatuses that do not require critical reformulation. Apart from reducing both matrix and target to monolingually-bounded settings, the presupposition of bilingualism in area studies’ translations operationalizes the idea that regions being studied have languages that are ordered more or less like the Western modernist, standardized-language states—a situation which, at best, engenders siloed monolingual understandings of multilingualism that obscure both an understanding of what languages are as well as the contexts in which they are being stratified. Here, bilingualism remains an as-yet-unprovincialized language ideology within a variety of fields that are less concerned with the study of languages and people in contexts of dynamic, interlingually-dense interactions and exchanges than in constituting people and language as objects through which culturally-situated notions of difference can be reinscribed.

Of course, not all uptake of intersectionality in non-western contexts falls into this narrowly bilingual mode, and recent works in domains often parochialized as “area studies” or cited only as ethnographic and historical background sources have done admirable work in making use of intersectionality in non-U.S., non-white-settler contexts to show the workings of the “new” (read: “cultural”) racism among groups taken to be the same, phenotypically and ethno-racially. This is exemplified, for instance, in the work by editors and contributors to a recent issue of *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, “Migration and the New Racism: Beyond Colour and the ‘West,’” where contributors trace out the multiplying effects of oppressive structures that resignify migrant status as a hierarchizing vector that intersects with race, ethnicity, class, gender, and (post)colonial legacies in the Asian region (Ang et al., 2022; Ranghram, 2022). Contributors to the collection offer nuanced analyses across regional

locations: in constructed hierarchies among Nikkeijin ethnic return migrants in Japan, where national differences get rearticulated among co-ethnics as racial differences (Tsuda, 2022); in the ethnolinguistic racialization of North Koreans in South Korea (Hough, 2022); in transnational hierarchies anchored by claims to possessive whiteness among Malaysian academic expatriates (Koh and Sin, 2022); in stratifications of class and employment patterns that contend with Muslim co-religious affinities and restrictions on local/foreign marriage in Malaysia (Chee et al., 2022); in selective affiliations and intersectional boundary-making projects that emerge aboard transnational ships (McKay, 2022); in racist hierarchies constructed among mixed-race Eurasians in Singapore (Rocha and Yeoh, 2022); and in varieties of Sinophobia and anti-Chinese sentiment by both co-ethnics and members of other Asian ethnoracial and -linguistic groups (Ang, 2022; Ang and Colic-Peisker, 2022; Ho and Kathiravelu, 2022). While these analyses incisively detail the ways that stratifying effects multiply across distinct yet interconnected oppressive structures, they do so while essentializing “whiteness” and “white societies” as their foil. In exploring intersectionality beyond “the west,” that is, the papers end up accepting that “white” is something that some people and societies *are* or *have*, and that the fact of “shared” race and/or ethnicity is self-evident and attributable by the analyst.

## CONCLUSION

Recent work in linguistic anthropology has outlined the contours of raciolinguistics as an analytic approach—attending to the racialization of language and languaging of race (Alim, 2016)—and has traced out elite formations in the postcolony as a site of value-production crucial to postcolonial semiotics (Reyes, 2021). This work has motivated the proliferation of scholarship and debate among linguistic anthropologists, sociolinguists, and other critical scholars of language. Like any leading edge of inquiry, the emergent scholarship and surrounding debates have given rise to as many, if not more questions than answers.

While raciolinguistic perspectives have more often met with skepticism for its purported determinacy and universalization, intersectionality is much more often dismissed out of hand through assertions that intersectionality “isn’t really new”; that nothing about it is “novel or surprising”; that it is a “political stance, not an *actual* intervention”; and/or that explicitly engaging intersectionality-as-method means one has necessarily left something else out (something that, by implication, is “more important” or “more real”). Elsewhere, we have argued that a “both/and” semiotics of intersectionality can refuse such a priori categorial impasses, manifested in implicit-to-explicit insistences that one cannot account for both race *and* “other deeply naturalized categorial constructs like gender, class, ethnicity, nationality, educational attainment, dis/ability, technological appurtenances, and so on” (Babcock and Ke-Schutte, 2023, 4)—and moreover, that these choices are not merely incompatible, but unequal, with race as un-rigorous, even dangerous terrain whose very mention amounts to its reproduction (for a critique, see Lo, 2020). A key initial entailment of intersectionality-as-method involves critical attention to the shifting indeterminacy of sign processes, together with the efforts that professional analysts and participants alike make to control, purify, or stabilize raciolinguistic enregisterment processes (Agha, 2005), and to recognize that these two dynamics stand in a constitutive, dialectical relationship to one another.

Taken together, these papers advocate for intersectionality-as-method in linguistic anthropology. Each paper in this collection directly identifies a semiotics of intersectionality beyond a “West-and-its-Others” perspective—even at the most literal level of region, participation framework, and non-Western interactants—to explicitly consider linguistic and co(n)

textual phenomena that are left out of most contemporary intersectional and critical race analyses, even while these phenomena are the fundamental categories through which the persons and their variously inhabited vectors of social capital are stratified.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We extend our gratitude first to the authors whose analyses brilliantly and incisively demonstrate the kinds of interventions for which we advocate in this introduction: Andrew Carruthers, Jessica Chandras, Katy Highet, Schu-Ke, and Velda Khoo. We are also grateful for the generosity of the editor, anonymous reviewers, and contributors to a related collection that appeared in *Signs and Society*, which we've thought of as the unofficial first pair-part to the present special issue: Asif Agha, Jacob Henry, Mie Hiramoto, Vincent Pak, and Joyhanna Yoo. We express our further thanks to our many co-thinkers and co-conspirators along the way, the comrades who have refused to cave to the pressure to take the path of least resistance when advocating for raciolinguistic and intersectional approaches to the study of language and social life, and who have made our own paths clearer and more navigable as a result. Last but not least, we extend our gratitude to Sonia Das, the associate editors, and anonymous reviewers at the *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, not only for hosting this special issue in the first place, but also for the critical feedback and support that made it possible to bring this collection into the world.

## ORCID

ke-Schutte  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8183-1409>

Joshua Babcock  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9264-2873>

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> In Liu et al. (2013, 66)

<sup>2</sup> In Biko (1987, 22)

## WORKS CITED

- Agha, Asif. 1998. "Stereotypes and Registers of Honorific Language." *Language in Society* 27: 151–93.
- Agha, Asif. 2005. "Voice, Footing, Enregisterment." *Journal for Linguistic Anthropology* 15 (1): 38–59.
- Agha, Asif. 2008. "What Do Bilinguals Do? A Commentary." In *Beyond Yellow English: Toward a Linguistic Anthropology of Asian Pacific America*, edited by Angela Reyes and Adrienne Lo, 253–58. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Arvin, Maile, Eve Tuck, and Angie Morrill. 2013. "Decolonizing Feminism: Challenging Connections between Settler Colonialism and Heteropatriarchy." *Feminist Formations* 25 (1): 8–34.
- Alatas, Syed Hussein. 1977. *The Myth of the Lazy Native: A Study of the Image of the Malays, Filipinos and Javanese from the 16th to the 20th Century and Its Function in the Ideology of Colonial Capitalism*. London: Frank Cass and Company Limited.
- Alim, H. Samy. 2016. "Introducing Raciolinguistics: Racing Language and Linguaging Race in Hyperracial Times." In *Raciolinguistics: How Language Shapes Our Ideas About Race*, edited by H. Samy Alim, John R. Rickford, and Arneetha F. Ball, 1–30. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ang, Ien. 2022. "On the Perils of Racialized Chineseness: Race, Nation and Entangled Racisms in China and Southeast Asia." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 45 (4): 757–77.
- Ang, Sylvia, and Val Colic-Peisker. 2022. "Sinophobia in the Asian Century: Race, Nation and Othering in Australia and Singapore." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 45 (4): 718–37.
- Ang, Sylvia, Elaine Lynn-Ee Ho, and Brenda S. A. Yeoh. 2022. "Migration and New Racism Beyond Colour and the 'West': Co-Ethnicity, Intersectionality, and Postcoloniality." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 45 (4): 585–94.
- Annamma, Subini Ancy, David Connor, and Beth Ferri. 2013. "Dis/Ability Critical Race Studies (DisCrit): Theorizing at the Intersections of Race and Dis/Ability." *Race Ethnicity and Education* 16 (1): 1–31.
- Babcock, Joshua. 2023. "(De)Coupling Positional Whiteness and White Identities through 'Good English' in Singapore." *Signs and Society* 11 (1): 23–44.
- Babcock, Joshua, and Jay Ke-Schutte. 2023. "Toward a 'Both-And' Semiotics of Intersectionality: Raciolinguistics Beyond White Settler-Colonial Situations." *Signs and Society* 11 (1): 1–22.

- Bailey, Moya. 2021. *Misogynoir Transformed: Black Women's Digital Resistance*. New York: New York University Press.
- Bauman, Richard, and Charles L. Briggs. 2003. *Voices of Modernity: Language Ideologies and the Politics of Inequality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Berlant, Lauren. 2011. *Cruel Optimism*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Biko, Steve. 1987. *I Write What I Like: A Selection of His Writings*. London: Heinemann Publishers.
- Boda, Phillip Andrew. 2022. "Identity Making as a Colonization Process, and the Power of Disability Justice to Cultivate Intersectional Disobedience." *Education Sciences* 12 (7): 462.
- Boellstorff, Tom. 2005. *The Gay Archipelago: Sexuality and Nation in Indonesia*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bucholtz, Mary, and Kira Hall. 2005. "Identity and Interaction: A Sociocultural Linguistic Approach." *Discourse Studies* 7 (4–5): 585–614.
- Carr, E. Summerson. 2011. *Scripting Addiction: The Politics of Therapeutic Talk and American Sobriety*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Carr, E. Summerson, and Michael Lempert. 2016. "Introduction: Pragmatics of Scale." In *Scale: Discourse and Dimensions of Social Life*, edited by E. Summerson Carr and Michael Lempert, 1–21. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Chee, Heng Leng, Brenda S. A. Yeoh, and Wan Teng Lai. 2022. "Ties That Bind, Lines That Divide: Bangladeshi Labour Migrants, Malaysian Spouses, and the New Contours of Racialization." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 45 (4): 677–96.
- Cho, Sumi, Kimberlé Crenshaw, and Leslie McCall. 2013. "Toward a Field of Intersectionality Studies: Theory, Applications, and Praxis." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 38 (4): 785–810.
- Choksi, Nishaant. 2015. "Surface Politics: Scaling Multiscriptality in an Indian Village Market." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 25 (1): 1–24.
- Choksi, Nishaant. 2021. *Graphic Politics in Eastern India: Script and the Quest for Autonomy*. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Collins, Patricia Hill, and Sirma Bilge. 2016. *Intersectionality*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 1989. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics." *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 1989 (1): 8.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 1991. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review* 43 (6): 1241–99.
- Das, Sonia Neela. 2008. "Between Convergence and Divergence: Reformatting Language Purism in the Montreal Tamil Diasporas." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 18 (1): 1–23.
- Das, Sonia N. 2016. *Linguistic Rivalries: Tamil Migrants and Anglo-Franco Conflicts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Davis, Christina P. 2019. *The Struggle for a Multilingual Future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fanon, Frantz. [1952] 2008. *Black Skin, White Masks*. New York: Grove.
- Flores, Nelson. 2013. "Silencing the Subaltern: Nation-State/Colonial Governmentality and Bilingual Education in the United States." *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* 10 (4): 263–87.
- Gal, Susan, and Judith T. Irvine. 2019. *Signs of Difference: Language and Ideology in Social Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hanks, William F. 2005. "Explorations in the Deictic Field." *Current Anthropology* 46 (2): 191–220.
- Harding, Sandra. 1987. "Introduction: Is There a Feminist Method?" In *Feminism and Methodology: Social Science Issues*, edited by Sandra Harding, 1–14. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Haynes, Chayla, Nicole M. Joseph, Lori D. Patton, Saran Stewart, and Evette L. Allen. 2020. "Toward an Understanding of Intersectionality Methodology: A 30-Year Literature Synthesis of Black Women's Experiences in Higher Education." *Review of Educational Research* 90 (6): 751–87.
- Heller, Monica, and Bonnie McElhinny. 2017. *Language, Capitalism, Colonialism: Toward a Critical History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Henry, Jacob. 2023. "'Say a Sentence': Drawing an Interactional Link between Organizations, Language Ideologies, and Coloniality." *Signs and Society* 11 (1): 93–114.
- Ho, Elaine Lynn-Ee, and Laavanya Kathiravelu. 2022. "More than Race: A Comparative Analysis of 'New' Indian and Chinese Migration in Singapore." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 45 (4): 636–55.
- Hough, Jennifer. 2022. "The Racialization of North Koreans in South Korea: Diasporic Co-Ethnics in the South Korean Ethnolinguistic Nation." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 45 (2): 616–35.
- Ke-Schutte, Jay. 2023. *Angloscene: Compromised Personhood in Afro-Chinese Translations*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Koh, Sin Yee, and I Lin Sin. 2022. "Race, Whiteness and Internationality in Transnational Education: Academic and Teacher Expatriates in Malaysia." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 45 (4): 656–76.
- Liu, Lydia, Rebecca Karl, and Dorothy Ko, eds. 2013. *The Birth of Chinese Feminism: Essential Texts in Translational Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.



- Lo, Adrienne. 2020. "Systems, Features, Figures: Approaches to Language and Class vs. Language and Race." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 24 (3): 293–307.
- Lorde, Audre. [1984] 2007. *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches by Audre Lorde*. Berkeley: Crossing Press.
- MacKinnon, Catharine A. 2013. "Intersectionality as Method: A Note." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 38 (4): 1019–30.
- McKay, Steven C. 2022. "Navigating Race: Intersectional Boundary-Making Onboard Transnational Ships." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 45 (4): 697–717.
- Mkhize, Khwezi. 2022. "Is It New? Genealogy, Self and the Question of Novelty." Lecture presented at the HUMA Doctoral Seminar Series, HUMA Institute for Humanities in Africa, University of Cape Town, June 1. <http://www.huma.uct.ac.za/event/khwezi-mkhize-is-it-new-genealogy-self-and-question-novelty>.
- hercules, deandre miles-. 2022. "The Real Tea: Language at the Intersections." In *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Sexuality*, edited by Kira Hall and Rusty Barrett, 1–18. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lazar, Michelle M. 2019. "Semiotics of Homonationalism." In *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Sexuality*, edited by Kira Hall and Rusty Barrett, 1–14. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nakassis, Constantine V. 2016. "Linguistic Anthropology in 2015: Not the Study of Language." *American Anthropologist* 118 (2): 330–45.
- Nakassis, Constantine V. 2019. "Poetics of Praise and Image-Texts of Cinematic Encompassment." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 29 (1): 69–94.
- Nash, Jennifer C. 2008. "Re-Thinking Intersectionality." *Feminist Review* 89 (1): 1–15.
- Newell, Sasha. 2012. *The Modernity Bluff: Crime, Consumption, and Citizenship in Côte d'Ivoire*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pak, Vincent, and Mie Hiramoto. 2023. "Sticky Raciolinguistics." *Signs and Society* 11 (1): 45–67.
- Peters, John Durham. 1999. *Speaking Into the Air: A History of the Idea of Communication*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Price, David H. 2016. *Cold War Anthropology: The CIA, the Pentagon, and the Growth of Dual Use Anthropology*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Puar, Jasbir. 2007. *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Puar, Jasbir. 2012. "'I Would Rather Be a Cyborg Than a Goddess': Becoming-Intersectional in Assemblage Theory." *philoSOPHIA* 2(1): 49–66.
- Rada, Michelle. 2022. "Overdetermined: Psychoanalysis and Solidarity." *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 33 (2–3): 1–32.
- Raghuram, Parvati. 2022. "New Racism or New Asia: What Exactly Is New and How Does Race Matter?" *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 45 (4): 778–88.
- Reyes, Angela. 2021. "Postcolonial Semiotics." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 50: 18.1-18.7.
- Rocha, Zariné L., and Brenda S. A. Yeoh. 2022. "Hierarchies of Mixedness: Hybridity, Mixed-Race Racisms and Belonging for Eurasians in Singapore." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 45 (4): 738–56.
- Rosa, Jonathan, and Nelson Flores. 2017. "Unsettling Race and Language: Toward a Raciolinguistic Perspective." *Language in Society* 46 (5): 621–47.
- Rosa, Jonathan, and Nelson Flores. 2020. "Reimagining Race and Language: From Raciolinguistic Ideologies to a Raciolinguistic Perspective." In *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Race*, edited by H.Samy Alim, Angela Reyes, and Paul V. Kroskrity, 90–107. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Scott, David. 2004. *Conscripts of Modernity: The Tragedy of Colonial Enlightenment*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1979. "Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology." In *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels*, edited by Paul R. Clyne, William F. Hanks, and Carol L. Hofbauer, 193–247. Papers from the Conference on Non-Slavic Languages of the USSR. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1993. "Metapragmatic Discourse and Metapragmatic Function." In *Reflexive Language*, edited by John Lucy, 33–58. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Silverstein, Michael. 2004. "'Cultural' Concepts and the Language-Culture Nexus." *Current Anthropology* 45 (5): 621–52.
- Silverstein, Michael, and Greg Urban. 1996. "The Natural History of Discourse." In *Natural Histories of Discourse*, edited by Michael Silverstein and Greg Urban, 1–17. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Smalls, Krystal A. 2020. "Race, SIGNS, and the Body: Towards a Theory of Racial Semiotics." In *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Race*, edited by H.Samy Alim, Angela Reyes, and Paul V. Kroskrity, 233–60. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Spitulnik, Debra. 1998a. "Mediating Unity and Diversity: The Production of Language Ideologies in Zambian Broadcasting." In *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*, edited by Bambi B. Schieffelin, Kathryn A. Woolard, and Paul V. Kroskrity, 163–88. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Spitulnik, Debra. 1998b. "The Language of the City: Town Bemba as Urban Hybridity." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 8 (1): 30–59.



- Steinmetz, Katy. 2020. "She Coined the Term 'Intersectionality' Over 30 Years Ago. Here's What It Means to Her Today. An Interview with Kimberlé Crenshaw." *Time*, February 20, 2020. <https://time.com/5786710/kimberle-crenshaw-intersectionality/>.
- Stocking, George. 1988. *Bones, Bodies, Behavior: Essays on Biological Anthropology*, 3–18. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Sweeney, Shauna J. 2021. "Gendering Racial Capitalism and the Black Heretical Tradition." In *Histories of Racial Capitalism*, edited by Justin Leroy and Destin Jenkins, 53–84. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Toft, Alex, and Anita Franklin, eds. 2020. *Young, Disabled and LGBT+: Voices, Identities and Intersections*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. 1991. "Anthropology and the Savage Slot: The Poetics and Politics of Otherness." In *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*, edited by Richard G. Fox, 17–44. Santa Fe, New Mexico: School of American Research Press.
- Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. 1995. *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. 2003. *Global Transformations: Anthropology and the Modern World*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tsuda, Takeyuki (Gaku). 2022. "Racism Without Racial Difference? Co-Ethnic Racism and National Hierarchies among Nikkeijin Ethnic Return Migrants in Japan." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 45 (4): 595–615.
- Woolard, Kathryn A. 2008. "Simultaneity and Bivalency as Strategies in Bilingualism." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 8 (1): 3–29.
- Wynter, Sylvia. 2003. "Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom: Towards the Human, After Man, Its Overrepresentation—An Argument." *CR: The New Centennial Review* 3 (3): 257–337.
- Yoo, Joyhanna. 2023. "A Raciosemiotics of Appropriation: Transnational Performance of Raciogender among Mexican K-Pop Fans." *Signs and Society* 11 (1): 68–92.

**How to cite this article:** Ke-Schutte, Jay and Joshua Babcock. 2023. "Toward a Non-binary Semiotics of Intersectionality: Linguistic Anthropology in the Wake of Coloniality." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 00 (0): 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jola.12397>.