GRENOBLE, LENORE and N. LOUANNA FURBEE (eds.) 2010. *Language documentation: Practice and values*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. xviii + 340 pp. ISBN: 978-90-272-1175-0

Reviewed by JORGE EMILIO ROSÉS LABRADA, *The University of Western Ontario*

Most estimates regarding the number of languages in the world at present agree that it exceeds 6,000 languages. Our knowledge of these some 6,000 languages is unfortunately extremely limited. According to Lehmann (1999:5), there is no reliable way of knowing how many language descriptions there are, but his educated guess is that around half of the world's languages are only known by name and that, out of the other half, only a thousand are represented by descriptions that comprise a grammar.

The documentation and description of all these languages would not be a pressing matter, were it not for the endangerment situation that most of these languages are in nowadays. The dire situation of the world's languages has gained a lot of attention since the grim prediction of extinction for half of them by the end of this [twenty-first] century (Krauss, in Hale et al. 1992:6) came to light; and numerous authors, e.g. Crystal (2000), Evans (2010), Hagège (2000), Harrison (2007), *inter alia*, have examined the factors that lead to—as well as the processes that result in—the disappearance of a language. It is this increased awareness of the possibility of losing forever the world's linguistic diversity, coupled with many technological advances such as portable computers, digital recorders, etc., that has led to the (re)blossoming of language description (from now on LDesc) and language documentation (from now on LDoc) as subfields of linguistics in the last two decades.

LDoc and LDesc are, however, not new (Woodbury 2003:35)[1]; they have been around in the field of linguistics since (at least) the times of Franz Boas, when it was expected that linguists working on 'exotic' languages would produce a grammar, a dictionary, and a collection of texts at the end of long periods of fieldwork.[2] What constitutes a recent development is the theorizing of both subfields in the last 14 or so years, most notably with the seminal work of Lehmann (1999, 2001) and that of Himmelmann (1998, 2006), but see also the work of Woodbury (2003, 2011), Austin & Grenoble (2007), and Austin (2010). One of the tell-tale signs of the 'maturity' these two subfields have reached in the recent past is the appearance of the journal *Language Documentation & Conservation* (University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu) and the serial publication *Language Documentation and Description* (The School of Oriental and African Studies, London) both completely devoted to research in these areas, and of a number of thematic volumes, e.g. Gippert, Himmelmann & Mosel (2006) and Haig, Nau, Schnell & Wegener (2011). It is precisely one of these volumes that is under review here: *Language documentation: Practice and values*, edited by Lenore A. Grenoble and N. Louanna Furbee and published by John Benjamins

---

[1] For an in-depth discussion of the history of LDoc, see Woodbury (2011).

[2] This has come to be known as the Boasian trilogy.

Publishing Co. in 2010. The volume is organized in six parts and includes both position papers and case studies. Additionally, the book has a preface and a useful selection of on-line resources (311–315), in addition to the usual indexes and a list of contributors. I will discuss each part of the book in turn and then close this review by offering an evaluation of the volume as a whole. However, before I do that, I would like to offer the reader a little background on this volume.

The chapters included in *Language documentation: Practice and values* stem from a collaboration—initiated by Louanna Furbee at the request of the Linguistic Society of America and funded by the National Science Foundation—that brought together several scholars working in and with endangered language communities to discuss the issues that arise in the field of language documentation. According to the preface of the volume, initial conversations among 21 people led to the organizing of a workshop during the 2005 Linguistic Society of America Institute at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology/Harvard that was organized along six topics: "(1) the requirements of field linguistic training; (2) the concerns and involvement of the heritage language communities; (3) the question of what is adequate documentation; (4) the uses of documentation in speaker communities; (5) training and careers in field linguistics; and (6) ethics and archiving best practices" (xvi).

Part One of the volume, "Praxis and values," only includes position papers and sets the scene for what is to come in the rest of the volume. The first chapter is N. Louanna Furbee's own "Language documentation: Theory and practice." In it, the author offers a survey of the subfield to date and explores the importance of having a theory of LDoc and how the lack of such a theory poses a problem for the practice of LDoc. Two case studies are briefly discussed: the first one is a project that focused on the study of evidentials in Tojolabal and the second one, a project to study Chiwere adoptive kinship. The message that stems from both is that collaboration and negotiated consensus among all of the project's stakeholders will yield the most satisfactory results in a language documentation project. The second chapter is a discussion of community-based research by Keren Rice. Rice focuses on the linguist's responsibilities to the community of speakers through her discussion of several funded programs in Canada, her geographic area of expertise. The third chapter is also concerned with ethics in LDoc. Martha Macri addresses the important question of "whose ethics?" by touching on three key issues: 1) the rights and obligations of the different stakeholders in a given project, 2) the relevance of the language documentation to the community whose language is being recorded, and 3) ownership, copyright, and access restrictions. The main contribution of Macri's chapter, however, lies on its focus on how these issues play out in a unique way in "documenting languages that are seriously endangered or that are expected to become endangered in the immediate future" (47).

Part Two of the volume starts with Anna Berge's position paper: "Adequacy in documentation," which is also the title for this part. The author's aim is to provide some answers to the question "what does it mean to document a language *adequately*?" (51). She starts with a discussion of what LDoc is and moves on to explore the role of LDesc vs. LDoc, what and who gets documented and who does the documenting and for whom the documentation is, and the implications of adequacy for the work of linguists. The author closes each of the different sections with a short statement of what adequacy means with respect to the topic discussed in that particular section; for example when discussing who gets documented, she says:

> Adequacy in documentation should not be limited to what is considered the purest
> or most traditional form of the language, nor to a particular speaker population.
> Speakers of all ages, socioeconomic statuses, etc., should be included. (60)

It is these short but powerful statements that I highly recommend reading to anyone who is embarking on—or currently involved in—a language documentation project as they will most certainly make you think about the priorities and goals of your project.

The three case studies included in this part of the book are also concerned with the issue of adequacy: the first two with respect to representativeness of the record, the third one with respect to shared methods of data creation and data documentation. The case study by Laura Buszard-Welcher discusses the short-comings of the existing Potawatomi legacy documentation, which has a narrow focus on (almost exclusively) narrative texts. Through the analysis of Potawatomi conjuncts, Buszard-Welcher shows how a more representative corpus—especially one that includes conversation—could enhance our understanding of the grammar of a given language. It is this same message, i.e., the importance of a representative corpus, that Verónica Vázquez Soto's chapter "Documenting different genres of oral narrative in Cora (Uto-Aztecan)" stresses by illustrating the genre specific characteristics of two Cora texts: "The Rabbit" which is targeted for children, and "The Birth of Corn" which is an example of genre of creation myths.

The third case study is unusual in that it stems from work by a language acquisition lab—more specifically, the Virtual Center for Language Acquisition at Cornell University—rather than from the work of a language documentation team, but its relevance to LDoc is undeniable. Barbara Lust, Suzanne Flynn, María Blume, Elaine Westbrooks and Theresa Tobin discuss the construction and implementation of "an infrastructure that involves merging research labs with academic libraries […] and developing the technology, systems, and human resources to support this merger in the area of the language sciences" (95). Accessibility and recoverability of primary data and the metadata that accompanies said data have been at the heart of LDoc theorizing since its inception (See for example Bird & Simons (2003), *inter alia*) and the model discussed in this chapter is an important contribution to this literature. Of special interest to language documenters will be the Web-Based Data Transcription and Analysis tool developed at Cornell and discussed in the paper and the data-creation steps in Appendix 1 (100–102), which could serve as a starting point for any workflow of language documentation data creation and analysis. This chapter serves as an excellent link to the next part of the volume, which focuses on technology.

Part Three, "Documentation technology," starts with a position paper and includes three case studies, just as Part Two. In his position paper, Jeff Good adopts "the perspective of an idealized 'technician'" in hopes of giving "so-called ordinary working linguists a sense of how the technician understands and reacts to the needs of linguists" (112). The two main contributions of the paper are his discussion of the "value-desiderata recommendations model (VDR)," upon which much of the discussion on language documentation technology has been built, and how it could be implemented; and his overview of what LDoc is. This latter section of the paper (Section Three) offers an excellent eagle's eye view of how the field has developed and also of what the main concerns of practicing documentary linguists are. Unlike other LDoc 'technology' papers that have been published, you will not find a lot of technical terminology here, but you will find a useful way of conceptualizing

not only technology-related issues in your language documentation project, but also more general design issues on where the priorities of a project should lie and how to implement them.

The first case study in this part of the volume is Jessica Boyton, Steven Moran, Helen Aristar-Dry, and Anthony Aristar's discussion of the School of Best Practices that is part of the—now widely known—Electronic Metastructure for Endangered Languages Data (E-MELD) project. The authors start by offering some background information on the E-MELD project and move on to discussing the School of Best Practices itself and its possible uses. They do an excellent job at convincing the reader of the usefulness of consulting this unique resource as their documentation project moves through the different stages: background research on the language and on LDoc best practices, data collection, and data storage and presentation. They also encourage the reader to help others by sharing their LDoc experience on the School's website. The next case study focuses on the work of two archives, namely the Pacific and Regional Archive for Digital Sources in Endangered Cultures (PARADISEC) and the "Archiving Project" of **Laboratoire de Langues et Civilisations à Tradition Orale (LACITO) of the French Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique** (CNRS). Nicholas Thieberger and Michel Jacobson focus on archiving issues such as metadata, formats, and encoding from the perspective of these two archives and discuss the importance of making LDoc data accessible and preserving it for posterity. Although perhaps not the main goal of the authors while writing this chapter, a set of archiving best practices can be extracted from this chapter. The third and final case study in the technology section of this 2010 volume is David Golumbia's "Representing minority languages and cultures on the World Wide Web". The author makes an important distinction between 'object-of-study' websites, i.e., the kind of website that represents a language and/or a people as an object of study and therefore "reinforces the sense that the Web is for the use of majority culture members" (162), and subject-oriented websites, which "presume that the basic 'owners' and users of the Web are the culture members themselves" and thus "present indigenous groups in a realistic light, critically describing them as members of the present world rather than parts of an 'extinct' past" (164). This is an important distinction that could be framed in terms of the community-based research approach described in Czaykowska-Higgins (2009): the first kind of website is most likely the result of research *on* a language or language group, the second kind of website will most likely result from more ethical research carried out *for*—and hopefully *with* and *by*—the members of the community being represented. Many language documenters would do well to bear in mind this important point when working on mobilizing the products of their research. Golumbia ends his chapter with a series of useful recommendations for the creation of subject-oriented websites such as follows:

> - If possible, integrate [the] project with other community information technology projects.
> - If appropriate, develop the site to be an outward-looking site that also addresses itself to others and presents a positive view of the language group as living people in today's world. (169)

Collaboration occupies a central position in the theorizing of language documentation as demonstrated by the number of articles and book chapters devoted to this topic.[3] It also has been featured in many professional discussions among language documenters. To cite just one example, it was the topic of the special session "Methodology and practice in collaborative language research" at the 2013 Linguistic Society of America annual meeting. Therefore, it is no surprise that one of the parts of this volume would also be devoted to this topic. Part Four, "Models of successful collaboration," features two position papers and four case studies. In the first position paper, Donna B. Gerdts examines the role of the linguist in language revitalization programs. The main point this author wants to get across is that "linguistic expertise is not sufficient for successful participation in a language program;" instead—she contends—"a linguist must develop social and political skills to be an effective member of a language revitalization team" (174). This honest discussion of the ins and outs of working with endangered languages based on the author's own experience contributes greatly to bridge the gap between academia (in this case, represented by practicing linguists) and community (in this case, the speakers of the languages on which said linguists work). It is a must-read for members of both communities of practice; linguists will benefit from a better understanding of what communities want (Section Four) and endangered languages communities members of ways to get the most out of their linguist (Section Five). Arienne Dwyer's position paper builds on the author's 2006 work on collaborative research (See Dwyer 2006) and constitutes "an attempt both to cite specific examples of collaboration and to derive general principles of collaboration from them" (193). Through a discussion of three collaborative projects—one with the Kickapoo language of the U.S., one with the Ega language of Ivory Coast, and one with the Monguor and Wuntun languages of China—Dwyer shows the benefits of collaborative LDoc vis-à-vis 'lone-ranger' language research. She derives from this discussion four principles of collaboration:

1) Assess the needs of the different stakeholders in a project;
2) Make expectations with respect to goals, methodologies, payment, etc. as clear as possible from day one;
3) Be flexible and make sure you implement changes as needed; and
4) Make sure the work being done serves to empower the community.

Another asset of the chapter by Dwyer is the section on ethics and responsibility (208–211), which gives an overview of possible ethical conflicts in collaborations of academics with other academics, of academic linguists with language communities, and of collaboration via technology.

Martha Macri's is the first case study in Part Four and it describes the work of the J. P. Harrington Database Project at the University of California, Davis. The project's aim has been to transcribe and annotate the field notes of the late J. P. Harrington and has proven to be a successful collaboration between academics and Californian Native peoples. Al-

---

[3] The interested reader can be referred to, for example, Dwyer (2006), Yamada (2007), and Czaykowska-Higgins (2009).

though the vastness of the Harrington collection makes the project discussed in this chapter unique in aspects such as duration, number of people involved, etc., it could, in my opinion, constitute a model for similar endeavors with a focus on legacy materials. One other such endeavor is the one discussed in Colleen Fitzgerald's chapter (also in Part Four), which is a collaborative project with the Tohono O'odham Nation to make accessible Tohono O'odham language documentation to the community. Although smaller in scale and narrower in focus (only one language as opposed to many Californian languages) than the project described by Macri, the message Fitzgerald leaves us is essentially the same as the one conveyed by Macri: "investigating whether archival materials (of both formal and informal natures) exist [and most importantly making them accessible] should be considered critical in working with endangered languages" (240). The other two case studies included in Part Four, however, are fairly different from the two just discussed. The first of those two is the one by Hermelindo Aguilar Méndez, Teresa López Méndez, Juan Méndez Vázquez, Maria Bertha Sántiz Pérez, Ramon Jiménez Jiménez, N. Louanna Furbee, Louanna del Socorro Guillén Rovelo, and Robert A. Benfer, which explains how a language documentation project emerged as an epiphenomenon of the larger endeavor of a NGO dedicated to improving health. The work of the Centro de Investigaciones en Salud de Comitán, A.C. (CISC), founded in 1990, focuses on the population on the Mexico-Guatemala border in the state of Chiapas, which is largely Tojolabal. This work led to a year-long ethnographic study of a Tojolabal community and this led to language revitalization efforts. Although possibly a rather unique coupling of interest or path to language revitalization, this project shows how NGOs could be particularly helpful in starting language documentation and revitalization/maintenance projects, especially in conflict areas, and could serve as a model for collaboration between linguists and local NGOs in other parts of the world. The last case study in Part Four argues for the importance of documenting pragmatics because of how susceptible to change this area of grammar is in language shift situations. Through her study of two different age groups of Hmong speakers (i.e., elders vs. college age) in a satellite community in the U.S., Susan Bert shows how contact with American English has influenced the use of particles such as *thov* and *soj* that are used to add politeness to requests. The author argues that gaining a better understanding of pragmatic change could lead to 1) better intergenerational communication, 2) less 'puristic' attitudes, and 3) higher success rates for heritage language learners; all of which could help language maintenance in the community.

Part Five of the volume under review is concerned with "Training and careers in field linguistics" and it includes one position paper and one case study. Judith M. Maxwell's position paper "Training graduate students and community members for native language documentation" runs along two main themes: the importance of language documentation and 'salvage' linguistics, and preparation for the field. It is the latter theme that will be of utmost interest to the novice linguist interested in starting a documentation project. Maxwell's "quick and dirty run-through of pre-field considerations, needs, intellectual tools and physical tools" (263) is both extremely ambitious and extremely informative. Exemplification by means of actual mini case studies or short anecdotes of the points raised in the chapter helps drive specific points home in a most effective manner. The case study included in this part of the volume focuses on the work carried out in the student-run Language Documentation Training Center at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. Frances

Ajo, Valérie Guérin, Ryoko Hattori and Laura C. Robinson explain how the workshops are organized and how and why this initiative targets native speakers of under-documented languages. This project, now on its tenth year, has proven to be a successful model for linguistic training of native speaker linguists in an academic environment—at the same time providing teaching experience to linguistics graduate students—and its application elsewhere would be beneficial to our field's collective language documentation and revitalization efforts. Given that two of the topics included in the conversations from which this volume stems were centered on the issue of LDoc training and education (namely, "(1) the requirements of field linguistic training; [and] (5) training and careers in field linguistics" (xvi)), I personally would have liked to see more contributions—especially case studies—to this part of the book.[4]

Lenore Grenoble, in the conclusions (Part Six), summarizes some of the main themes that run through the volume: technology, collaboration, stakeholders, and training. Her discussion of "the inherent tensions in the work in language documentation" (305) sets the agenda for future research and theorizing in this subfield of linguistics. Some of the questions we should be asking ourselves—she argues—are: What should be the scope of a language documentation project? Is collaborative work appropriate in all instances? What should be the goals and end products of a documentation project? What should we expect of linguists with respect to technology? Grenoble's critical assessment of the field and how it has evolved "calls for continuing development of better methods to ensure that both the process of documentation and the end products meet the evolving needs of speakers and linguists now and in the future" (289).

Having now discussed all six parts, I would like to offer a general appraisal of the volume. Some of the main contributions of LDoc to the field of linguistics include, but are not limited to: 1) fostering the discussion about what constitutes ethical language research; 2) developing best practices in data collection and audio/video recording; and 3) encouraging—and developing best practices in—archiving. All of these topics are discussed at length in *Language documentation: Practice and values*, a volume that strikes the appropriate balance between the number of ideas and the number of applications (in itself no small feat!). The collective wisdom of the 36 contributors to the volume, who range from experienced fieldworkers who have been working with endangered languages for many years to novice linguists and community members, is great; and the variety of themes covered and the goals and methodologies of the projects discussed give the volume both breadth and depth. I would thus like to conclude this review by saying that this edited volume constitutes a welcome addition to the library of any documentary linguist, and more generally to the library of those interested in language documentation and in preserving the world's linguistic diversity.

---

[4] I should point out, however, that there is a short discussion of training in Dwyer's chapter (199) and a whole section in Grenoble's chapter (300–305). The latter offers a good complement to the small number of contributions to Part Five of the volume and the discussion of the shortcomings of traditional field methods courses is particularly enlightening. I refer the reader interested in a more in-depth account of language documentation training to Jukes (2011).

REFERENCES

Austin, Peter K. 2010. Current issues in language documentation. *Language Documentation and Description* 7. 12–33.

Austin, Peter K. & Lenore A. Grenoble. 2007. Current trends in language documentation. *Language Documentation and Description* 4. 12–25.

Bird, Steven & Gary Simons. 2003. Seven dimensions of portability for language documentation and description. *Language* 79(3). 557–582.

Crystal, David. 2000. *Language death*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Czaykowska-Higgins, Ewa. 2009. Research models, community engagement, and linguistic fieldwork: Reflections on working within Canadian indigenous communities. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 3(1). 15–50.

Dwyer, Arienne M. 2006. Ethics and practicalities of cooperative fieldwork and analysis. In Jost Gippert, Nikolaus P. Himmelmann & Ulrike Mosel (eds.), *Essentials of language documentation*, 31–66. New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.

Evans, Nicholas. 2010. *Dying words: Endangered languages and what they have to tell us*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Gippert, Jost, Nikolaus P. Himmelmann & Ulrike Mosel (eds.). 2006. *Essentials of language documentation*. New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hagège, Claude. 2000. *Halte à la mort des langues*. Paris: Odile Jacob.

Haig, Geoffrey, Nicole Nau, Stefan Schnell & Claudia Wegener (eds.). 2011. *Documenting endangered languages: Achievements and perspectives*. Boston, MA: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hale, Kenneth, Michael E. Krauss, Lucille J. Watahomigie, Akira Y. Yamamoto, Colette Grinevald Craig, LaVerne Masayesva Jeanne & Nora C. England. 1992. Endangered languages. *Language* 68(1). 1–42.

Harrison, K. David. 2007. *When languages die: The extinction of the world's languages and the erosion of human knowledge*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 1998. Documentary and descriptive linguistics [extended version]. *Linguistics* 36(1). 161–195. http://www.hrelp.org/events/workshops/eldp2005/reading/himmelmann.pdf (11 April, 2010).

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 2006. Language documentation: What is it and what is it good for? In Jost Gippert, Nikolaus P. Himmelmann & Ulrike Mosel (eds.), *Essentials of language documentation*, 1–30. New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jukes, Anthony. 2011. Researcher training and capacity development in language documentation. In Peter K. Austin & Julia Sallabank (eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of endangered languages*, 423–445. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Lehmann, Christian. 1999. Documentation of endangered languages: A priority task for linguistics. Paper presented at ASSIDUE 1: Arbeitspapiere des Seminars für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Erfurt. Universität Erfurt, Erfurt, Germany. http://www2.uni-erfurt.de/sprachwissenschaft/ASSidUE/ASSidUE01.pdf (11 April, 2010).

Lehmann, Christian. 2001. Language documentation: A program. In Walter Bisang (ed.), *Aspects of typology and universals*, 83–97. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Woodbury, Anthony C. 2003. Defining documentary linguistics. *Language Documentation and Description* 1. 35–51.

Woodbury, Anthony C. 2011. Language documentation. In Peter K. Austin & Julia Salla-
bank (eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of endangered languages*, 159–186. New York,
NY: Cambridge University Press.

Yamada, Racquel-María. 2007. Collaborative linguistic fieldwork: Practical application of
the empowerment model. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 1(2). 257–282.