

Gabriela Pérez Báez, Chris Rogers, Jorge Emilio Rosés Labrada (Eds.)

Language Documentation and Revitalization in Latin American Contexts

Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs

Editor

Volker Gast

Editorial Board

Walter Bisang

Jan Terje Faarlund

Hans Henrich Hock

Natalia Levshina

Heiko Narrog

Matthias Schlesewsky

Amir Zeldes

Niina Ning Zhang

Editor responsible for this volume

Volker Gast

Volume 295

Language Documentation and Revitalization in Latin American Contexts

Edited by

Gabriela Pérez Báez

Chris Rogers

Jorge Emilio Rosés Labrada

DE GRUYTER
MOUTON

ISBN 978-3-11-043807-9

e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-042890-2

e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-042894-0

ISSN 1861-4302

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2016 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston

Typesetting: fidus Publikations-Service GmbH, Nördlingen

Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck

☺ Printed on acid-free paper

Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Table of contents

- Gabriela Pérez Báez, Chris Rogers and Jorge Emilio Rosés Labrada
- 1 Introduction — 1**
- Denny Moore and Ana Vilacy Galucio
- 2 Perspectives for the documentation of indigenous languages in Brazil — 29**
- Carolyn O'Meara and Octavio Alonso González Guadarrama
- 3 Accessibility to results and primary data of research on indigenous languages of Mexico — 59**
- Saul Santos García, Tutupika Carillo de la Cruz and Karina Ivett Verdín Amaro
- 4 The revitalization of Wixárika: A community project in the midwest region of Mexico — 81**
- Rosa Yáñez Rosales, Dana Kristine Nelson, Melissa Niño Santana, Rodrigo Parra Gutiérrez, Paulina Lamas Oliva, Agustín Vega Torres and Rocío Rojas Arias
- 5 Reclamation initiatives in non-speaker communities: The case of two Nahuatl communities in the south of Jalisco State, Mexico — 109**
- Rosa Vallejos
- 6 Structural outcomes of obsolescence and revitalization: Documenting variation among the Kukama-Kukamirias — 143**
- Gabriela Pérez Báez
- 7 Addressing the gap between community beliefs and priorities and researchers' language maintenance interests — 165**
- Liliana Sánchez
- 8 The linguist gaining access to the indigenous populations: Sharing cultural and linguistic knowledge in South America — 195**
- Magnus Pharao Hansen, Néstor Hernández-Green, Rory Turnbull, Ditte Boeg Thomsen
- 9 Life histories, language attitudes and linguistic variation: Navigating the micro-politics of language revitalization in an Otomí community in Mexico — 215**

Chris Rogers

- 10 Indigenous authenticity as a goal of language documentation and revitalization: Addressing the motivations in the Xinkan community — 247**

Stéphanie Villard and J. Ryan Sullivant

- 11 Language documentation in two communities with high migration rates — 273**

Elena Benedicto, Amelia Chantal Shettle and
Mayangna Yulbarangyang Balna

- 12 Linguistic ideologies as a crucial factor in language revitalization: A look at the Mayangna languages of Nicaragua — 305**

Index — 345

Gabriela Pérez Báez, Chris Rogers and
Jorge Emilio Rosés Labrada

1 Introduction

1 Overview

There has been a significant increase in the concern for and awareness about endangered languages within the field of linguistics. The responses to this social and linguistic issue fall into one of three categories: (1) language documentation in order to preserve these languages for scientific study and linguistic analysis; (2) language revitalization in order to expand the domains of use of a language through language planning programs, projects, and activities; and (3) the investigation of the causes and consequences of endangerment and the typological classification of endangered languages. An overarching theme common to these responses has been the development and use of ethical and methodological best practices for collaborating with language communities. All of these responses are significant and meaningful to language communities and scholars. However, the discussion and outcomes, including recommendations for best practices, are focused on widely-known language communities and sociolinguistic contexts in North America, Australia, Europe, or New Zealand (see Austin and Salabank 2011; Brenzinger 2007; Crippen and Robinson 2013; Crystal 2000; Errington 2003; Fishman 1991; Gippert, Himmelmann, and Mosel 2006; Grenoble and Furbee 2010; Grenoble and Whaley 1998, 2006; Harrison, Rood, and Dwyer 2008; Hinton and Hale 2001; Krauss 1992; Moseley 2010; Nettle and Romaine 2000; Penfield et al. 2008; Rice 2006, 2012; and Whaley 2011; *inter alia*). Literature that focuses on Latin American issues is scant. In particular, before the publication of this volume, there have been no book-length works examining – through case studies – the practicalities and methodologies of language documentation and language maintenance/revitalization with an exclusive focus on Latin American contexts. Other case-study book-length volumes on language documentation and language maintenance/revitalization examine the topics dealt with in this volume but the number of chapters that focus on projects carried out in Latin America is limited or non-existent. For instance, only two out of 21 contributions in Greno-

Gabriela Pérez Báez, Smithsonian Institution

Chris Rogers, Brigham Young University

Jorge Emilio Rosés Labrada, University of British Columbia

ble and Furbee (2010) are devoted to Latin American languages. In comparison, there are five contributions on US Native American languages, and the bulk of the contributions is from researchers whose research is based in the US, Canada or Australia. There are no Latin American case studies in early publications such as Hinton and Hale (2001) nor are there any in more recent publications such as Haig et al. (2011). Thus, there is a need to make broadly available a wider set of case studies on language documentation and revitalization experiences in other parts of the world as do, for example, Franchetto and Rice (2014), Cruz and Woodbury (2014) and Stenzel (2014), among others. It is to this end that the 11 case studies presented in this volume describe, compare, and contrast language documentation and/or revitalization experiences throughout Latin America in light of the previously published information.

Language documentation and revitalization in communities in Latin America is characterized by a number of unique factors (see below) that must be considered in order for the responses to language endangerment in the region to be appropriate, meaningful, or effective. These characteristics are the result of a high level of linguistic diversity, varying levels of social and political development, and a diverse set of cultural practices. For example, Latin America is home to over 100 distinct language families whose languages are spoken in communities of all sizes (ranging from millions of speakers on the one hand to a single speaker on the other). Some of these languages are official languages in the countries where they are spoken (e.g., Guaraní, Quechua, Aymara) while most others are scarcely recognized by their national governments. In conjunction with this, many language communities, despite desiring to document and revitalize their languages, do not have the social, political, or economic infrastructure in place to support language planning projects. In other cases, communities may not perceive their languages as endangered because social and cultural practices mask the signs of ongoing language shift. When considered altogether, this means that expectations and best practices for language documentation and revitalization in Latin America are different from the ones outlined in sources such as those cited above. It is consequently clear that addressing these differences can help in developing better responses to the global concern for language endangerment.

In order to show how these differences affect the practice of language documentation and revitalization, each chapter in this volume presents a case study highlighting one or more of the factors representative of the situation. These case studies were originally presented and discussed in a special panel at the 2013 Annual Meeting of the *Society for the Study of the Languages of the Americas* in conjunction with the *Linguistic Society of America*. This special panel highlighted a number of issues and challenges for community members, scholars, and researchers working with communities in Latin America, which present a

unique context for responding to language endangerment. These can be summarized into the following list of factors:

- High levels of linguistic and dialectal diversity
- Lack of social, political, and/or economic resources
- Lack of infrastructure to support language planning projects, programs, and activities
- Community perception of documentation and/or revitalization projects and engagement in them
- Community expectations as to the outcomes for language documentation and revitalization
- Response to and acceptance of ethical behavior prescribed by the field of linguistics
- Geographic distance and terrain, and geopolitical borders

Each of these factors was present in two or more situations discussed in the special panel and are thus discussed here in the different chapters. However, we certainly do not claim that this list is exhaustive, as we expect further research and discussions to refine this list both for Latin America and elsewhere. This is especially true because we acknowledge that this list represents macro-factors that, upon close examination, encompass a number of smaller issues that need to be evaluated and understood in light of a broader discussion on language endangerment, documentation, and revitalization. For example, infrastructure encompasses local and national support as well as a correlation to individual motivation. Nevertheless, as a whole, the set of case studies presented here support our claim that the response to language endangerment in communities throughout Latin America is different from that suggested or expected in more widely known discussions and publications. It is hoped that the broad geographic, linguistic and cultural representation of the cases discussed in this volume make it as relevant as possible to a broad audience of those interested in language documentation and revitalization in Latin American contexts and to those interested in improving language documentation and revitalization approaches at a global level.

To achieve our purpose this book is organized as follows. The remainder of this chapter is devoted to characterizing the factors mentioned above and to showing how they represent a unique context for Latin American language communities. First, the linguistic background and geographical delimitations of Latin America are discussed in Section 2; the purpose being to provide the necessary background for evaluating the information presented throughout this volume. Then, in Section 3, a detailed comparison of the relevant factors in and outside of Latin America is presented, with cross-references to each individual

chapter providing specific evidence. The remaining eleven chapters of this book represent case studies that discuss specific language scenarios in many individual political and geographical settings. Collectively these case studies represent the complexity of the issues for language endangerment in Latin America and the implications for methodologies and best practices for responding to this global issue in the region.

2 The linguistic background of Latin America

The scarcity of case studies on language documentation and revitalization in Latin America is in stark contrast with the large number of languages and language families of the region. It is important to understand this diversity, as it is a motivating force behind the trend of increasing linguistic field research. It is also often an important factor to consider as part of a language revitalization strategy. Revitalization, in turn, is an important concern in Latin America given the high degree of endangerment found in the area. We focus on these two points, diversity and endangerment, in this section, prior to discussing linguistic diversity in Section 3.1 as a factor worthy of consideration.

Linguistic diversity is high in Latin America with concentrations of numerous dialectal varieties or even mutually unintelligible and/or genetically unrelated languages in small geographic areas. South America in particular is the geographic region with the greatest genetic diversity in languages – defined as the number of language families – in the world (see Campbell and Grondona 2012). Overall, given the 420 language families (including isolates) in the world (Campbell 2012; Hammarström 2010), Mexico, Central and South America combined are home to about a third of the world's language families. Similarly, many (if not most) of the languages spoken in Latin American countries are endangered to various degrees and despite best efforts there is no consistent, or accepted, language vitality typology which represents the many social and political factors involved. Both of these issues are discussed in the present section, in turn.

2.1 Number of languages

Quantification of the number of languages spoken in Mexico alone has challenged language documenters for centuries and debate continues over the status of linguistic systems throughout Latin America as languages or dialects. Various attempts at this have been undertaken throughout the post-colonial history of

the country (cf. Longacre 1967; Kaufman 1974; Suárez 1983; and INALI 2008; *inter alia*). Garza Cuarón and Lastra (1991) summarize some of these efforts and provide an inventory of 65 languages from ten different language families in addition to languages known to have disappeared since colonial times. The *Instituto Nacional de Lenguas Indígenas* (INALI, ‘National Institute of Indigenous Languages’) produced an extensive Catalog of Indigenous National Languages (INALI 2008) listing 364 language varieties belonging to 68 language groups from the following 11 language families with at least one language spoken in Mexico: Algic, Uto-Aztecan, Cochimí-Yuman, Seri, Otomanguean, Mayan, Totonac-Tepehua, Tarascan, Mixe-Zoquean, Tequistlatec-Jicaque and Huave. The Ethnologue (Lewis, Simons, and Fennig 2014)¹ lists 282 living languages for Mexico.

More broadly, Campbell (1998) lists ten language families (groupings of two or more) and seven isolates for Middle America (i.e., Central America and the Caribbean). In addition to these, Campbell indicates that there are over 100 unclassified extinct “languages” (1998: 169) documented in historical sources. Some of the latter may be alternate names for extant languages but it is likely that indeed a large number of languages have disappeared since 1492. As in Mexico, the actual number of individual languages in this region is hard to estimate because of the unclear status of some speech varieties as either separate languages or dialects of a common language and because of the number of languages that have lost their speakers in the last five centuries. For example, McQuown (1955) lists 351 languages for Mexico and Central America. The Ethnologue (Lewis, Simons, and Fennig 2014)² lists 43 extant languages in Belize, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Guatemala and Panama combined; an additional 23 are listed for the Caribbean. Glottolog (Hammarström et al. 2015)³ lists 723 languages for Middle America, the US and Canada without distinguishing between them.

Linguistic diversity in South America is the greatest in the world given the large number of distinct language families (not the absolute number of distinct languages). Crevels (2012: 167) offers summarized estimates on indigenous populations and number of indigenous languages for South America by country, amounting to a total of 420 languages. Campbell (2012) mentions 108 language families of which 53 have at least two member languages and 55 are isolates. Of the 53 families, 43 are small and comprised of six or less languages. The number of individual languages is again hard to determine but Campbell (2012) coincides

1 Accessed online at <http://www.ethnologue.com/country/MX> on November 6, 2014.

2 Accessed online at <http://www.ethnologue.com/region/CAM> and <http://www.ethnologue.com/region/CAR> on November 6, 2014.

3 Accessed online at <http://glottolog.org/glottolog/language> on September 3, 2015.

with Crevels and gives 420 as his estimate of currently-spoken languages. The Ethnologue lists 458 languages for South America (Lewis, Simons, and Fennig 2014).⁴ Glottolog lists 645 for South America (Hammarström et al. 2015).⁵ The country with the highest number of languages in the region is by far Brazil; *Moore and Galucio* (Chapter 2, this volume)⁶ expand on this matter through firsthand experience in the challenge of developing an inventory of linguistic diversity in Brazil.

Undoubtedly the figures for the entire region of Latin America will continue to change as language shift continues and as new language groups are defined and accepted. However, it is clear that in the context of language endangerment, linguistic diversity must be considered as a factor for the reasons explained below in Section 3.1.

2.2 Language endangerment in Latin America

Many of the languages spoken in Latin American countries are endangered to various degrees. Although it is difficult to obtain language vitality data for the entire region, there are online resources that provide some meaningful statistics. The Catalog of Endangered Languages (ELCat) provides endangerment levels for 731 endangered languages in Central and South America, including Mexico, based on four criteria: Intergenerational Transmission, Absolute Number of Speakers, Speaker Number Trends, and Domains of Use of the Language.⁷ Table 1 provides the counts of languages in each category. There are 34 languages that do not have an endangerment status assigned.⁸

⁴ Accessed online at <http://www.ethnologue.com/region/SAM> on November 6, 2014.

⁵ Accessed online at <http://glottolog.org/glottolog/language> on September 3, 2015.

⁶ References to specific chapters in this volume are made by placing the authors' last names in italics. The chapter number accompanies the first mention but not subsequent ones.

⁷ Report generated from <http://www.endangeredlanguages.com> on November 12, 2014.

⁸ We are most grateful to Dr. Lyle Campbell and the staff of The Endangered Languages Project for providing us with this report generated from the ELCat EMU system.

Tab. 1: Vitality counts and characterizations according to ELCat

Vitality		No. of languages
Dormant	No known L1 speakers	30
Critically Endangered	Under 10 elder speakers, rapid shift in few domains	70
Severely Endangered	10–99 adult speakers, rapid shift in limited domains	58
Endangered	100–999 adult speakers, few child speakers, rapid shift in expanded domains	146
Threatened	1,000–9,999 adult speakers, few child speakers in local domains	216
Vulnerable	10,000–99,999 adult and child speakers, limited shift in many domains	132
At Risk	Large numbers of speakers but domains of use are unknown	45
Safe	Large numbers of speakers in a wide range of domains	0
Unknown		34

In comparison, the Ethnologue (Lewis, Simons, and Fennig 2014)⁹ classifies languages along the Expanded Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (EGIDS), which includes classifications of languages on 13 different levels. This information can be summarized using the classifications listed in Table 2. These classifications include national languages like English, Spanish, and Portuguese. Three subregions of Latin America are distinguished according to these labels: Central America (including Mexico), the Caribbean and South America.

⁹ Accessed online at <http://www.ethnologue.com/region/SAM> on November 6, 2014.

Tab. 2: Vitality counts and characterizations according to Ethnologue

Vitality		No. of languages		
		Central America	Caribbean	South America
Institutional	Large speaker base in many domains	14	3	18
Developing	Large speaker base in many domains with growing literacy	106	4	109
Vigorous	Large speaker base of adults and children, but in restricted domains	77	10	57
In Trouble	Average speaker base with rapid shift	87	3	135
Dying	Limited speaker base with extremely rapid shift, including complete shift	41	3	139

The linguistic diversity and the various classifications of endangerment in Latin America have motivated many attempts to clarify the situation and to document the individual languages. In the last 10 years, the three major funding agencies for language documentation have awarded a number of projects. The Dokumentation bedrohter Sprachen (DOBES) program has funded two projects in Mexico (Chontal, Lacandón) and 14 projects in South America that included 24 languages. Among these projects are the People of the Center project, which documented five languages, the Aikanã/Kwaza project which documented two languages, and the Chaco project which documented four languages. The Endangered Language Documentation Programme (ELDP) funded 31 projects in Central America and 33 projects in South America between 2006 and 2013. The Endangered Languages Archive (ELAR) website lists 23 documentation projects in Mexico alone.¹⁰ In Brazil, *Moore and Galucio* report that DOBES funded nine documentation projects while ELDP supported 22 projects. According to Franchetto and Rice (2014: 253), the National Science Foundation Documenting Endangered Languages Program (NSF-DEL) has funded projects on some 23 Central American languages and 21 South American languages. Franchetto and Rice (2014: 254) also report that the Endangered Language Fund (ELF) funded around 30 projects in Latin America between 1996 and 2012. The need for linguistic research and attention to the language endangerment problem in Latin America requires an improved understanding of the factors affecting documentation and revitalization, especially given that these endeavors are often funded by entities based outside the

¹⁰ Endangered Languages Archive website accessed at <http://elar.soas.ac.uk/deposit-list-by-country> on November 7, 2014.

region. We thus turn to the factors that have been identified by the contributors to this volume.

3 Language documentation and revitalization in Latin America

The purpose of this section is to provide a detailed comparison of the relevant factors for language documentation and revitalization in and out of Latin America. This comparison is supported by cross-references to individual chapters in this volume, which exemplify the differences between widely known responses to language endangerment and those required in Latin American communities. Each of the factors that have emerged from the ongoing discussions among all of the authors and the editors (and introduced in Section 1 above) is discussed in turn.

3.1 Linguistic diversity and language endangerment in Latin America

Linguistic diversity in the context of documentation and revitalization presents special challenges. It has already been mentioned that the mere distinction between dialects and languages is a matter of debate. *Moore and Galucio* present a specific discussion about the difficulty of ascertaining the number of languages spoken in Brazil. The authors explain how this problem plays out in the Brazilian context and they question the liberal use of a figure of 180 languages spoken in Brazil despite there being no tangible evidence to back this figure. The authors cite Moore, Galucio, and Gabas (2008) as an attempt at arriving at a more reliable count of 150 indigenous Brazilian languages. They go further to explain that the assignment of language terms is problematic because the practice of language documentation is relatively recent in Brazil and the classification practices are still being developed. These complications are common in regions of high linguistic diversity.

Beyond quantification, linguistic diversity presents challenges in revitalization practices that can be quite specific. *O'Meara and González Guadarrama* (Chapter 3, this volume) describe the case of the community of San Mateo Almoloo in Central Mexico, where two attempts at teaching Nahuatl failed because the teachers were not speakers of the local varieties of Nahuatl. In one case, the strategies implemented by a teacher who was a speaker of a variety spoken in the state of Guerrero in western Mexico were seen with suspicion. In a second

attempt, classes were not well attended because the teacher was not a speaker of the local Nahuatl variety.

Yáñez Rosales et al. (Chapter 5, this volume) explain that the participation in language reclamation activities by speakers of varieties of Nahuatl that are different from those historically spoken in the communities with which they work has enabled advances towards meeting the goals of their language reclamation project; this participation, however, initially faced rejection and criticism. In their case study, the authors describe the process through which the communities of Tuxpan and Ayotitlán in the western Mexican state of Jalisco have attempted to reclaim Nahuatl varieties of the Western Periphery. These two communities no longer have fluent speakers and the documentation of their respective varieties is limited, as in the case of Tuxpan, or non-existent, as in the case of Ayotitlán. Both communities have created bilingual school programs aimed at language reclamation. In both cases, the Nahuatl-speaking teachers were from the La Huasteca region in the states of Hidalgo and Veracruz, rather than speakers of the local Nahuatl variety. In both cases, there was initial criticism about the involvement of teachers who were speakers of varieties other than the local ones. The lack of an alternative made the criticism subside over time and the teachers continue to be part of the reclamation process. Their involvement then lends special characteristics to the reclamation process. In the case of Tuxpan, for instance, the drafting of a dictionary involves the documentation of a lexicon from the different varieties of Nahuatl spoken by the teachers.

Linguistic diversity is discussed in other papers in this volume in different ways; yet all convey the importance of it for understanding the uniqueness of language communities. Both the Otomí case in *Pharao Hansen et al.* (Chapter 9, this volume) and the San Lucas Quiaviní Zapotec case in *Pérez Báez* (Chapter 7, this volume) are unique cases within the large and diverse families of Otomí languages and Zapotec languages, respectively. What applies to each of these two communities cannot necessarily be taken as representative of the larger set of Otomí and Zapotec speaking communities since sociocultural contexts, language vitality and other characteristics will vary from one community to the next as much as the languages may be distinct. Even in shallow and less diverse families such as the Chatino family, language communities can vary significantly. *Villard and Sullivant* (Chapter 11, this volume) place the Tataltepec and Zacatepec Chatino case studies within the context of three recognized Chatino languages with significant structural differences and vitality situations, Tataltepec and Zacatepec being two of the most highly endangered Chatino languages. The Kukama-Kukamiria case in *Vallejos* (Chapter 6, this volume) addresses diversity within a language community and shows that the level of fluency in a language may change the structural characteristics of it, but not the value of revitalization

and documentation projects. Given this diversity, much is required in the way of resources and infrastructure in order to adequately document the myriad languages of Latin America and in order to carry out the work in a manner that is appropriate for each language community.

3.2 Resources, infrastructure and language endangerment in Latin America

Community-internal resources generally range from limited to non-existent in Latin American societies, most of which are dependent on subsistence agriculture, hunter-gathering, or small-scale trade and services. State and federal¹¹ resources, if available, are generally very limited and not efficiently administered. The chapters in this volume provide numerous case studies where the quest for resources has been pivotal for documentation and revitalization endeavors.

Specifically, in contexts of high linguistic diversity as in the case of Mexico, Guatemala, or Brazil, language documentation is paramount as part of the process of quantifying the diversity of a country. As such, the funding required to conduct adequate language documentation can be overwhelmingly high. In cases where such funding is missing domestically, researchers may be required to seek funding from foreign sources. This strategy is not without impact and can be beneficial and at the same time be the cause of complications as described in *Moore and Galucio*. In their chapter, the authors explain that the international sources of funding for the extensive documentation needed for the languages in Brazil has been a cause of tension among Brazilian researchers. At the same time, however, the efforts to document Brazilian languages including the search for funding outside the country has increased the visibility of the country's indigenous languages and prompted national initiatives that gave way to the locally developed and funded *Projeto de Documentação de Línguas Indígenas* (PRODOC-LIN, 'Indigenous Languages Documentation Project') which began in 2006 under the direction of Brazilian linguist Bruna Franchetto.

Resources needed for documentation and revitalization may include telecommunications technology and infrastructure, the availability of which cannot be taken for granted in a substantial number of Latin American communities. *O'Meara and González Guadarrama* illustrate the complications related to the

¹¹ The words "federal" and "state" are used here as cover terms for "nation/country" and for "largest political division inside a country", respectively. Therefore, these words can refer to different entities in different countries.

implementation of the directive that primary data must be returned to the source community, as advocated for in Austin (2006), Bowden and Hajek (2006), and Dwyer (2006), among others. *O'Meara and González Guadarrama* contrast the large established language archives with incipient archiving efforts in Mexican indigenous communities. The authors first describe the planning and infrastructure behind the creation of the Northeastern North American Languages Archive (NNAILA), the Ahtna Regional Linguistic and Ethnographic Archive (Berez, Finnesand, and Linnell 2012), and archives of South American languages supported by the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics (see Seifart et al. 2008). Subsequently, they describe the situation in their field sites: the Nahuatl community of San Mateo Almomoloa in central Mexico and the Seri community of El Desemboque in northwest Mexico. In both cases, Internet connectivity is not available in a manner that would enable community members to freely and easily consult online archives of the type mentioned above. As such, the researchers sought to develop jukebox-type archives so that the data physically resides in the community. In San Mateo Almomoloa, the lack of a physical space to house an archive, compounded with a lack of social trust and complex interactions with the local government, made for a difficult delivery of research data to the community. A compromise was reached to allow for a language archive to reside in a school, but the arrangement was not optimal. In the Seri community of El Desemboque, the school setting was deemed inadequate given that the school system is government-run and that the teachers are not Seri speakers. As such, the only arrangement to date is to make the data available one-on-one to community members who express an interest in accessing it. Both of these cases highlight the frequent situation encountered in Latin American contexts where infrastructure as basic as a space to house a computer or adequate Internet connectivity is lacking, making it very difficult, if not impossible, for the data to be returned effectively to a community. *Benedicto, Shettle and Mayangna Yulbarangyang Balna* (Chapter 12, this volume) also indicate that certain resources such as Internet access are available only in urban centers. As such, access to these resources by residents of rural communities is dependent on their community's proximity to those urban centers.

An important issue to consider in Latin American contexts is that while resources may exist, both domestically and internationally; access to them might be contingent upon a working knowledge of a dominant language such as Spanish, Brazilian Portuguese or English. This is especially the case for online language archives whose interface might be in a dominant language, and sometimes in a dominant language that is not the national language that a specific Latin American community might speak. Consider the institutional archives described in *O'Meara and González Guadarrama*, which are online and require language

proficiency in Spanish and Internet connectivity as a condition for accessing any materials of interest. Similarly, access to conferences, training and other educational opportunities might require knowledge of a dominant national or international language. This is obviously quite problematic for monolingual speakers of indigenous Latin American languages but even bilingual speakers do not have access to resources and exchange opportunities such as most US-based conferences and training opportunities delivered in other languages (such as English).

In cases of high endangerment levels where few speakers are left, or in cases where only reclamation rather than revitalization is an option, a critical resource is basic documentation of the language in question. This basic documentation is oftentimes also lacking. *Yáñez Rosales et al.* describe the reclamation efforts of Nahua communities in Jalisco where a lack of documentation has required that those interested in language reclamation resort to resources on related languages rather than the local Nahuatl varieties which no longer have speakers. As mentioned earlier, this has required community members to work with speakers of other Nahuatl varieties as language contributors in language documentation efforts aimed at creating language resources for the community engaged in the reclamation process.

Another critical resource identified in various chapters in this volume relates to the community-based social and intellectual resources needed to foster a sustainable collaboration. These types of resources allow the community to benefit from a research project and might enable the researcher to be involved in a collaborative language revitalization effort in a meaningful way. *Villard and Sullivan* describe the impact of short cycles in the local administration which hamper the sustainability of their work and explain that the involvement of community members in the local sweat equity practices prevented the development of any mid- to long-term collaborative endeavors. This included the sustained participation of individuals in research projects. *Pérez Báez* reports a similar problem with the three-year rotating cycles of the teachers' tenures in the San Lucas Quiavini preschool, which makes long-term project goals difficult to sustain. *O'Meara and González Guadarrama* also report complications in sustaining, over time, the arrangements made for a local language archive intended to make linguistic research data available to the wide community; these complications are the result of the cyclical change of local government officials. These authors also explain how a lack of generalized trust in language documentation endeavors prevent these from evolving and growing to the point where they can have a positive impact towards language revitalization. *Yáñez Rosales et al.* report similar issues faced by a revitalization initiative in a Jalisco Nahua community as a result of school administration turnover. The San Jerónimo Acapulco Otomí case described in *Pharao Hansen et al.* shows the social tensions that can ensue when there is no

one linguistic authority in the community that can validate the documentation efforts led by the researchers as well as the revitalization efforts led by community members themselves. In all cases, a critical element of social infrastructure is lacking and hampers best efforts to carry out long term documentation and revitalization as prescribed in best practices in linguistics.

Various chapters describe scenarios where community members interested in language teaching lack the necessary training to do so effectively. *Santos García, Carillo de la Cruz, and Verdín Amaro* (Chapter 4, this volume) report that the Wixárika community of El Colorín in the state of Nayarit, Mexico does not have teachers in its school system who are speakers of the local language despite the fact that federal law guarantees mother-tongue education. On the flip side, cases are found where those who have the necessary teacher training are not the most proficient speakers of the target language or are not speakers of it at all. *Vallejos* presents an evidence-based discussion showing how the language of speakers of Kukama-Kukamiria with different levels of fluency is substantially different from the language of fluent L1 speakers. The author documents the structural differences between fluent speakers and latent-speakers and discusses the language change patterns that might emerge through the participation of latent-speakers as role models in language classrooms. This points to the impact that the participation of speakers other than fluent L1 speakers can have in a process of language revitalization. This is an issue relevant to the case presented in *Pharao Hansen et al.* where, of the three community members who were interested in revitalization, only one had teacher training but only passive knowledge of the target Otomí language. It is common in Mexico to see trained teachers who are speakers of an indigenous language placed as teachers in a community where a different language variety or even an altogether different language is spoken. *O'Meara and González Guadarrama* describe the negative attitudes by members of the San Mateo Almomoloa community towards teachers in the local schools who were from outside the community and were speakers of a variety of Nahuatl that is different from the one spoken locally. *Pérez Báez* describes that most work towards sustaining the use of San Lucas Quiaviní Zapotec was made possible by the interest and dedication of two teachers in the local pre-school. These highly competent, trained teachers were Zapotec speakers. However, they were not speakers of the local Zapotec variety. So while they were interested and personally engaged in revitalization, their ability to engage in literacy efforts was hampered.

These scenarios contrast significantly with the situation described in *Benedicto, Shettle and Mayangna Yulbarangyang Balna* for Nicaragua where constitutional recognition of local languages has enabled the creation of a robust system of bilingual intercultural education. While the authors do not overtly make this observation, one can infer that the role of the documentary linguist across these

cases is substantially different: in all the examples in the previous paragraph, the linguist must extend his or her work into the fields of applied linguistics and pedagogy in an effort to respond to the moral directive of contributing to the sustainability of the languages of interest to linguists. In the Nicaraguan case, the educational system is supported by a robust cohort of trained teachers at various levels and equipped with educational materials in the relevant languages that, among other things, allow for the use of local languages (to varying degrees) as media of instruction. The relationship between community members involved in language instruction and the external documentary linguist is then able to follow a Participatory (Action) Research approach in which a substantial part of the documentary and applied work is carried out by community researchers (Benedicto et al. 2004, 2002; Benedicto et al. 2007).

Reclamation scenarios pose a special situation and one in which the only recourse is to reach out to teachers who are speakers of related languages. The Nahua case described in *Yáñez Rosales et al.* for the state of Jalisco, Mexico also shows the challenge that reclamation presents when those trained as language teachers are speakers of varieties that are not those to be reclaimed. While reclamation efforts have the inherent difficulty of developing trained teachers from within their reduced or non-existent group of speakers, the situation is exacerbated by the dysfunctional bilingual education policies in Mexico. In her discussion about the differences in language structure across speakers of Kukama-Kukamiria with different fluency levels, *Vallejos* actually shows that there is value in the language knowledge that latent-speakers of a highly endangered language may have.

3.3 Community engagement, motivation and language endangerment in Latin America

Concern over language endangerment has created renewed interest and efforts in language documentation, language revitalization, and language planning in general. These efforts are often backed by the motivation to preserve linguistic diversity, to scientifically explore language similarities and differences, or to preserve linguistic information related to human history and/or social development. However, it is also understood that each language community is unique and that specific issues must be met on a community-by-community basis (Dobrin 2008). In Latin American language communities, these differences require particular attention to the motivation of communities to engage in language planning activities, programs and projects.

The main point of this section is that motivation for engagement with and involvement in language documentation and revitalization is not a categorical concept but rather a continuum representing various social circumstances. In Latin America some communities are engaged in a way which seems consistent with widely known views on language endangerment (see the chapters by Santos García, Carrillo de la Cruz, and Verdín Amaro and Benedicto, Shettle and Mayangna Yulbarangyang Balna), others show little or no interest in these types of activities and efforts (see the individual chapters by Pérez Báez, Villard and Sullivan, and Rogers [Chapter 10, this volume]), and some clearly fall somewhere in between (see the chapter by Yáñez Rosales *et al.*). This continuum of engagement and motivation affects the expected outcomes of language documentation and revitalization projects (as is discussed below in Section 3.4) as well as the linguists themselves, who are faced with pressure to show how their own work fits into the published best practices in the field of linguistics.

In the case of the Wixárika community in Nayarit, Mexico as described by Santos García, Carrillo de la Cruz, and Verdín Amaro, there is an almost ideal amount of engagement and motivation. External linguists and researchers collaborate with community members to create and sustain revitalization efforts. This type of collaboration has developed after years of social and political influence on and in the community as well as sustained interest by the external researchers. However, even in this ideal situation it is clear that lauded revitalization programs such as language nests and immersion classrooms are impractical. Success for this language community came only after what the authors call a “more locally oriented approach” (Santos García, Carrillo de la Cruz, and Verdín Amaro, this volume: 103) to community engagement. This involved avoiding pre-conceived ideas and plans for the community and developing initiatives (even temporary ones) based on the actual needs and issues in the community, such as the ongoing revitalization of cultural practices.

For two Nahua speaking communities in Mexico, Yáñez Rosales *et al.* show that motivation is affected by the sociolinguistic situation in a community. Throughout Latin America, communities show interest in responding to the loss of their languages, but after years of social and political inequality there are often no speakers of their ancestral languages left. As the Nahua cases illustrate, communities in this situation are not motivated to revitalize a language that is no longer their first language. They are interested in what the authors refer to as language reclamation. This starts as the recognition of the symbolic value of a language for a community and requires a unique set of resources and goals. This sociolinguistic atmosphere calls for a delicate balance of external support and internal community involvement and is expected to take much longer than other revitalization scenarios.

On the opposite side of the spectrum, it is common for language communities throughout Latin America to not even have an interest in or expectation for language revitalization or documentation. For example, the Chatino communities of Zacatepec and Tataltepec in Oaxaca, Mexico as described by *Villard and Sullivant* have little interest in these activities because large-scale community migration has altered the social value of the communities' languages. Members of these communities have a greater interest in learning English as a tool of social and economic advancement than in developing their own languages toward this same goal. The addition of English to the already existing social diglossia in these communities has severely hampered any interest in the revitalization of Chatino and has affected the way external linguists interact with the community. The authors clearly illustrate that they are not able to be agents of language shift reversal and focus instead on the few pockets of interest in preserving the language through recorded materials.

The Xinkan community offers another perspective on motivation and engagement in language documentation and revitalization. *Rogers* describes how in this community, as in many other communities throughout Latin America, individuals have suffered years of prolonged prejudice and discrimination. This social and political inequality has in turn affected the way these local communities are perceived by both national governments and other local communities. In the Xinkan case, the result of this inequality is that community interest is less about documenting or revitalizing a language for the sake of preservation or ethnic identity, and more about the need to establish authenticity as an indigenous community. Efforts toward language documentation and revitalization in this community are merely a means by which to show their authenticity and support their claims for equality. Since there are no speakers of the ancestral languages, community members organize their claims for equality and social and political reform based on scientific language documentation and revitalization. *Rogers* concludes that following from this type of situation for some communities the focus should not be language documentation and revitalization, but "language documentation and community creation" (*Rogers*, this volume: 268).

For some language communities the reality of language endangerment is obscured by unique social factors, and this in turn affects their willingness to engage in language documentation and revitalization efforts. The Zapotec community in San Lucas Quiaviní, Oaxaca, Mexico is split between two connected communities across an international border: the community in Oaxaca and a sister community in Los Angeles, California, in the United States. *Pérez Báez* describes that in the Los Angeles community, children rarely acquire the ancestral variety of Zapotec, while in the community in Oaxaca they do so regularly. With expectation of migration from Oaxaca to California (and often back again),

the community language is endangered as migrant children only learn Spanish or English. However, this shift is not recognized by the community because the practice of migration and beliefs about the integral relationship between the language and the place of birth mask its effects. This has an obvious impact on the interest in language maintenance in the community, and has resulted in the author having to create awareness of the issue in the first place.

Finally, in many cases languages are spoken across political boundaries. *Sánchez* (Chapter 8, this volume) addresses situations where language communities span multiple countries creating difficulties in the way a community can be involved with language documentation and/or revitalization. In these situations a portion of the community is subject to one set of country-specific regulations and state-level policies while another portion is guided by a distinct set of regulations and policies. *Sánchez* shows that this “transnational”-ity can make coordinated efforts difficult (although some efforts have had success), especially when the majority language shared by the countries is not the same, for example as in the case of the Kukama-Kukamiria language which is spoken both in Peru and Brazil (Vallejos 2014).

These various scenarios raise ethical questions. How much can external researchers “massage” the language ideologies of individual communities? Should external researchers intervene in the community to establish a level of motivation that meets the expectations set forth in the literature on language documentation and revitalization; and if yes, to what extent? Or should external researchers passively follow whatever community members deem appropriate in their specific situation? Each of the authors mentioned above have created a solution to these questions that is most appropriate for the communities with which they collaborate. These contributions add to the general understanding of what research in the areas of endangered languages and language documentation and revitalization entails, and may provide some solutions that may be helpful as other field researchers work to understand what may be the best way to move forward in their relationship with an endangered language community.

3.4 Expected outcomes and language endangerment in Latin America

Language documentation and revitalization are flexible and fluid because of the uniqueness of the sociolinguistic, economic and political characteristics of each and every language community. This fluidity, in turn, makes it hard to measure and even define success for activities focused on language endangerment. One community might define success by its efforts to collect a recording of 100 words,

while another might define success by its implementation of an established revitalization program (such as a language nest program). However, discussions about language endangerment, documentation, and revitalization often detail specific milestones, goals, or achievements as being highly significant (as introduced in Section 1). These provide evidence that the programs, activities, or research are headed in the “correct” direction and that something significant has been accomplished. These expectations often include collaboration with and not work on, or in, a language community; the careful archiving of materials in ways which ensure the future access to a language; and the responsibility to return all materials created, recorded, or developed to the language community for their unique purposes. However, because of the differences in motivation and engagement in language documentation and revitalization efforts in communities throughout Latin America (see Section 3.3 above), these expected outcomes are often difficult to achieve, are unwanted by the individual communities, or are simply meaningless given the particular context. Many of the contributions to this volume show how attempts at meeting the expectations dictated by funding organizations or universities are difficult to achieve.¹²

For example, the description of the Chatino communities by *Villard and Sullivant* shows that a community does not always see the need to produce these standardized results. This chapter shows that these language communities want external linguists to be engaged in teaching English as well as in creating materials or activities related to Chatino. This would definitely seem to aid language shift rather than reverse it. The authors suggest that in these communities success is best defined through efforts in “empowering individual speakers, which may lead, in the long run, to grassroots revitalization efforts” (Villard and Sullivant, this volume: 300), but that this is only feasible after prolonged contact between the language community and the external linguists.

Similarly, *Pérez Báez* explains that the San Lucas Quiavini Zapotec community shows that community members have no expectations about how the efforts and work of an external linguist might benefit them. The author described her efforts in disseminating information and the results of her research to the communities, but found the community to have little interest in them. She had envisioned a long-term language maintenance effort in the community as a direct outcome of her years of work there. However, the beliefs and social practices of community members make this type of outcome to be of limited impact (at least for the time being).

12 A fact that we do not believe is unique to the individual case studies included here.

The case study of the Kukama-Kukamiria communities by *Vallejos* shows that expected language documentation and revitalization outcomes can be affected by the types of speakers present in a language community. Following Grinevald and Bert (2011), this chapter classifies speakers on a scale from fluent speakers to last speaker and shows that the level of benefit for documentation and revitalization stemming from the involvement of speakers does not decrease as fluency decreases. The Kukama-Kukamiria communities, despite having limited access to fluent speakers of their heritage language, value the outcomes of documentation and revitalization projects as a means of cultural revalorization. Furthermore, *Vallejos* shows that we have much to learn from all types of speakers and that language documentation projects should not focus on fluent speakers alone.

As a final example of the differences in expected outcomes between external linguists and community members, in some communities the expectation is simply to provide support for the non-linguistic (i.e., ethnic) identity. For the Xinkan community of Guatemala this is precisely the case (see the chapter by *Rogers*). This community has no interest in revitalization programs, language planning initiatives, or language learning materials; they simply want evidence and support for their claims to the unique space within the sociopolitical and historical atmosphere of Guatemala. This goal is a direct outcome of both the lack of a community of language users in the Xinkan community and the existence of legislation that suggests social, political and economic support for indigenous communities – as long as they can prove they are authentically indigenous.

Latin American language communities often do not expect, or even see the need for, the outcomes many field linguists feel the need to produce. To improve discussions about language endangerment, the expectations and measures of success will necessarily need to be more open and flexible than previously stated in the literature.

3.5 Ethics and language endangerment in Latin America

In general, the discussion about ethics and best practices is relatively new to the field of linguistics (see Austin 2010; Czaykowska-Higgins 2009; Dorian 2010; Dwyer 2006; Grinevald 1993, 2007; Newman 2009; Rice 2006; Tsunoda 2005; and Yamada 2007). As with other topics in language endangerment, discussions about ethics have primarily drawn from experiences in North America, Europe, and Australia. Notable exceptions dealing with Latin American languages are Grinevald (1993, 2007) and Yamada (2007). As seen in previous sections of this chapter, Latin America requires a unique set of perspectives when responding to language endangerment; this applies as well to ethics in linguistics research. The

contributors to this volume highlight certain ethical issues that have presented a particular challenge in their research. These can be grouped into issues related to defining roles in the relation between a researcher and community members, the particulars of establishing a collaboration, and considerations related to obtaining informed consent.

Czaykowska-Higgins (2009) classifies three types of ethical models: linguist-focused, community-based, and Community-Based Language Research (CBLR). The main difference between the first two models and CBLR is that in the former the linguist retains the role of expert while in the latter all the research participants are considered to be experts, linguists and speakers alike. Similarly, Rice (2006) and Czaykowska-Higgins (2009) agree that there has been a shift in North America in the last few years towards a more community-based approach to linguistic fieldwork, be it CBLR or one of the other two research models. The advantages of this approach to language research are evident; however, this does not imply that this approach can be applied to all research situations (see Dobrin 2008, Crippen and Robinson 2013).

In some Latin American contexts, as explained in this volume, collaboration may follow the path of what is considered to be a successful collaboration in language documentation and revitalization in the current literature. Examples include *Vallejos'* collaborative work with Kukama-Kukamiria speakers with various levels of fluency, which in turn greatly benefitted the research; and the long standing collaboration with the Mayangna Yulbarangyang Balna described in *Benedicto, Shettle and Mayangna Yulbarangyang Balna* with a myriad outputs of benefit both to the language community and to the researcher's work. *Santos García, Carillo de la Cruz* and *Verdín Amaro* also describe a case where a productive collaboration emerged between researchers and a Wixárika community in Nayarit, Mexico. However, in many other cases, communities are not interested in collaborating, or at least not in a manner that follows the canons advocated for in the literature; nor have the communities an interest in taking control of a project. The case studies presented by *Villard and Sullivant* and by *Pérez Báez* are two cases where a collaboration around revitalization was not of interest to the larger community. In both cases the authors explain how they approach this particular challenge. *Rogers* explains that while collaboration emerged with Xinka community members, the community interests did not revolve around revitalization of the local language either; rather the interest was in using the language as a means to validate an identity. In other cases, the available resources or social support may impede the progress of an established collaboration. Consider the situations described in *O'Meara and González Guadarrama*, where a lack of support from authorities, but not other community members closer to the research, and a lack

of infrastructure hampered the researchers' efforts to return their research results via a community-based language archive.

In the Latin American context, a frequent concern relates to the need to obtain informed consent prior to working with a consultant. Complications may arise simply because of the format and manner in which consent is to be obtained as per the regulations of ethics review boards. There are three recognized types of informed consent: written, verbal, and third-party consent. Most ethics review boards require written consent but written consent may not be appropriate in some Latin American contexts, for two primary reasons. First, it is still frequent that fieldworkers will work with non-literate consultants. Therefore, there is no value in presenting a written document that a person may not be able to read. In fact, it can be argued that doing so may be not only offensive but also rather abusive and illegal. The practice of presenting a written document can be problematic even when working with literate consultants. Even if written in "simple language", informed consent documents are unusual and can be dense and not easily understood even by literate consultants. A one-page, single-spaced document may take several minutes for someone to read, and reading in the presence of the researcher and under pressure to respond may put undue stress on consultants and coerce them to sign independently of whether the document was understood. Ironically, this is precisely the type of pressure that the procedures of ethics review boards attempt to prevent. *Sánchez* warns that a standardized approach to permission and consent is not always best since the relationships between a language community and their own "self-perception" are complex and must be considered a local issue.

Certainly, it is possible to obtain a waiver of signed consent and verbal consent can be accepted with prior approval from an ethics review board. However, verbal consent still requires that an information sheet be presented to the consultant with the same effects as above: the consultant is put in a position to read a dense document in the presence of the researcher and acquiesce to the request to participate in the research. Further, while IRB/REB documents are intended to reassure participants, in many Latin American contexts the presentation of a written document may evoke scenarios in which written documents have been used to validate abusive practices that strip individuals in vulnerable situations of their rights. While this is not discussed overtly in *Pérez Báez*, her research required participant observation over a period of three summers in San Lucas Quiavini prior to beginning formal research. As such, her research was heavily grounded on trust she developed with community members over time. *Pérez Báez* reports that the information sheets were at odds with the trust-based relationships that she had established with the community and made for uneasy starts to the interviews she conducted. *Pharao Hansen et al.* include a quote showing that com-

munity members remember the times when a lack of literacy skills enabled abuse towards indigenous peoples.

Situations such as the one that *Pérez Báez* describes emerge when the socio-cultural context surrounding a research project is not of the type that makes the presentation of a written document or the notion of informed consent coherent. This in turn raises questions about the meaning of consent and understanding about the use of data in communities without access to electricity, the Internet or international archives (see Dorian 2010: 181 and Thieberger and Musgrave 2007).

4 Conclusion and goals for this volume

The 11 case studies presented in this volume raise a number of questions about the principles that should drive language documentation and revitalization in Latin America. These questions revolve around the role that a researcher is expected to play, the obligations that a researcher is asked to take on, and the boundaries that a researcher is told to observe, as per current best practices in the field. We have few answers to these questions, but as suggested by the cross-references made to the chapters in this volume, the contributors have found different solutions to them.

The chapters in this volume should make it clear to the reader that the context for language documentation and revitalization as a response to language endangerment presents challenges in Latin American communities that may not generally emerge in other contexts such as those in the United States, Canada, Australia or New Zealand. The foregoing discussion, in fact, only discusses the biggest issues mentioned in the chapters of this book. The contributors to this volume have firsthand experience with a variety of other issues beyond those mentioned in detail here, including: access to education and education levels, the presence and importance of literacy, the geography and physical environment of language communities, and attitudes and perspectives on the value of language and its use. These, and many others, may not be explicitly mentioned in the chapters that follow but ideas about them can be found throughout. Further discussion about language endangerment in Latin America must show how these social variables affect the responses by both researchers and community members.

It is similarly clear that the global response to and concern for language endangerment must be informed by all of the variables and challenges discussed here and not just the variables found in more widely known scenarios. With this volume we hope to foster increased discussion of these issues in order to make current ethical frameworks appropriate to a broader number of community sce-

narios. To this end, the 11 chapters in this volume provide a detailed discussion of some of the most important factors affecting language documentation and revitalization in Latin America.

References

- Austin, Peter K. 2006. Data and language documentation. In Jost Gippert, Nikolaus P. Himmelmann & Ulrike Mosel (eds.), *Essentials of language documentation*, 87–112. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Austin, Peter K. 2010. Communities, ethics and rights in language documentation. *Language Documentation and Description* 7. 34–54.
- Austin, Peter K. & Julia Sallabank (eds.). 2011. *The Cambridge handbook of endangered languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Benedicto, Elena, Amelia Chantal Shettle & Mayangna Yulbarangyang Balna. This volume. Linguistic ideologies as a crucial factor in language revitalization: A look at the Mayangna languages of Nicaragua. In Gabriela Pérez Báez, Chris Rogers & Jorge Emilio Rosés Labrada (eds.), *Language documentation and revitalization in Latin American contexts*, 305–344. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Benedicto, Elena, Demetrio Antolín, Modesta Dolores, M. Cristina Feliciano, Gloria Fendly, Tomasa Gómez, Baudillo Miguel, and Elizabeth Salomón. 2007. A Model of Participatory Action Research: the Mayangna Linguists' Team of Nicaragua. In Maya Khemlani David, Nicholas Ostler, Caesar Dealwis (eds.), *Proceedings of the XI FEL Conference on 'Working Together for Endangered Languages – Research Challenges and Social Impacts'*, 29–35. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: SKET, University of Malaya and Foundation for Endangered Languages.
- Benedicto, Elena, Modesta Dolores & Melba McLean. 2004. Formación de lingüistas indígenas: los mayangna de Nicaragua. In Zarina Estrada Fernández, Ana Fernández Garay & Albert Alvarez González (eds.), *Estudios en lenguas amerindias. Homenaje a Ken Hale*, 49–61. Hermosillo (Sonora), Mexico: Editorial UniSon.
- Benedicto, Elena, Modesta Dolores & Melba McLean. 2002. Fieldwork as a participatory research activity: The Mayangna linguistic teams. In Julie Larson & Mary Paster (eds.), *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: General session and parasession on field linguistics (2002)*, 375–386. Berkeley, CA: University of California at Berkeley.
- Berez, Andrea, Taña Finnesand & Karen Linnell. 2012. C'ek'aedi Hwnax, the Ahtna Regional Linguistic and Ethnographic Archive. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 6. 237–252.
- Bowden, John & Hajek, John. 2006. When best practice isn't necessarily the best thing to do: dealing with capacity limits in a developing country. In Linda Barwick & Nicholas Thieberger (eds.), *Sustainable data from digital fieldwork*, 45–56. Sydney: Sydney University Press.
- Brenzinger, Matthias (ed.). 2007. *Language diversity endangered*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Campbell, Lyle. 1979. Middle American languages. In Lyle Campbell & Marianne Mithun (eds.), *The languages of Native America*, 902–1000. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Campbell, Lyle. 1998. Linguistic contributions to Guatemalan prehistory. In Jane H. Hill, P. J. Mistry & Lyle Campbell (eds.), *The life of language: Papers in honor of William Bright*, 138–192. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Campbell, Lyle. 2012. Classification of the indigenous languages of South America. In Lyle Campbell & Verónica Grondona (eds.), *The indigenous languages of South America: A comprehensive guide*, 59–166. Berlin and Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Campbell, Lyle & Verónica Grondona (eds.). 2012. *The indigenous languages of South America: A comprehensive guide*. Berlin and Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Crevels, Mily. 2012. Language endangerment in South America: The clock is ticking. In Lyle Campbell & Verónica Grondona (eds.), *The indigenous languages of South America: A comprehensive guide*, 167–234. Berlin and Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Crippen, James A. & Laura C. Robinson. 2013. In defense of the Lone Wolf: Collaboration in language documentation. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 7. 123–135.
- Cruz, Emiliana & Anthony C. Woodbury. 2014. Collaboration in the context of teaching, scholarship, and language revitalization: Experience from the Chatino Language Documentation Project. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 8. 262–286.
- Crystal, David. 2000. *Language death*. Cambridge: 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.
- Dobrin, Lise. 2008. From linguistic elicitation to eliciting the linguist: Lessons in community empowerment from Melanesia. *Language* 84 (2). 300–324.
- Dorian, Nancy C. 2010. *Investigating variation: The effects of social organization and social setting*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dwyer, Arianne 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. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dwyer, Arianne M. 2010. Models of successful collaboration. In Lenore A. Grenoble & N. Louanna Furbie (eds.), *Language documentation: Practice and values*, 193–212. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Endangered Languages. 2012. The Linguist List at Eastern Michigan University and The University of Hawaii at Manoa. <http://www.endangeredlanguages.com> (accessed 11 November 2014).
- Errington, Joseph. 2003. Getting language rights: The rhetorics of language endangerment and loss. *American Anthropologist* 105 (4). 723–732.
- Fishman, Joshua. 1991. *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.
- Franchetto, Bruna & Keren Rice. 2014. Language documentation in the Americas. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 8. 251–261.
- Garza Cuarón, Beatriz & Yolanda Lastra. 1991. Endangered languages in Mexico. In Robert H. Robins & Eugenius M. Uhlenbeck (eds.), *Endangered languages*, 93–134. Oxford, New York: Berg.
- Gippert, Jost, Nikolaus P. Himmelmann & Ulrike Mosel (eds.). 2006. *Essentials of language documentation*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Grenoble, Leonore A. & N. Louanna Furbbee (eds.). 2010. *Language documentation: Practice and values*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Grenoble, Lenore A. & Lindsay J. Whaley. 2006. *Saving languages: An introduction to language revitalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grenoble, Lenore A. & Lindsay J. Whaley (eds.). 1998. *Endangered languages: Current issues and future prospects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grinevald [Craig], Colette. 1993. Commentary on: Ethics, advocacy and empowerment: Issues in methods in researching language. *Language and Communication* 13 (2). 97–100.
- Grinevald, Colette. 2007. Endangered languages of Mexico and Central America. In Matthias Brenzinger (ed.), *Language diversity endangered*, 59–86. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Grinevald, Colette & Michel Bert. 2011. Speakers and communities. In Peter K. Austin & Julia Sallabank (eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of endangered languages*, 45–65. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haig, Geoffrey, Nicole Nau, Stefan Schnell & Claudia Wegener (eds.). 2011. *Documenting endangered languages: Achievements and perspectives*. Berlin and Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hammarström, Harald. 2010. The status of the least documented language families in the world. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 4. 177–212.
- Harrison, K. David, David D. Rood & Arienne M. Dwyer (eds.). 2008. *Lessons from documented endangered languages*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Hinton, Leanne and Kenneth Hale (eds.). 2001. *The green book of language revitalization in practice*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Instituto Nacional de Lenguas Indígenas. 2008. *Catálogo de las lenguas indígenas nacionales: Variantes lingüísticas de México con sus autodenominaciones y referencias geoestadísticas*. http://www.cdi.gob.mx/lenguamaterna/catalogo_lenguas_indigenas_mexico_2008.pdf (accessed 11 November 2014).
- Kaufman, Terrence. 1974. *Idiomas de Mesoamérica*. Guatemala: José Pineda Ibarra.
- Krauss, Michael. 1992. The world's languages in crisis. *Language* 68 (1). 4–10.
- Lewis, M. Paul, Gary F. Simons & Charles D. Fennig (eds.). 2014. *Ethnologue: Languages of the world, Seventeenth edition* [Online version]. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. <http://www.ethnologue.com> (accessed 11 November 2014).
- Longacre, Robert. 1967. Systemic comparison and reconstruction. In Norman A. McQuown (ed.), *Handbook of Middle American Indians*, vol. 5, 117–160. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- McQuown, Norman A. 1955. The indigenous languages of Latin America. *American Anthropologist* 57. 501–570.
- Moore, Denny, Ana Vilacy Galucio & Nilson Gabas Jr. 2008. O Desafio de documentar e preservar as línguas Amazônicas [The challenge of documenting and preserving the Amazonian languages]. *Scientific American (Brasil) Amazônia (A Floresta e o Futuro)* 3. 36–43.
- Moore, Denny & Ana Vilacy Galucio. This volume. Perspectives for the documentation of indigenous languages in Brazil. In Gabriela Pérez Báez, Chris Rogers & Jorge Emilio Rosés Labrada (eds.), *Language documentation and revitalization in Latin American contexts*, 29–58. Berlin and Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Moseley, Christopher (ed.). 2010. *Atlas of the world's languages in danger*, 3rd edn. Paris, UNESCO Publishing. <http://www.unesco.org/culture/en/endangeredlanguages/atlas> (accessed 11 November 2014).

- Musgrave, Simon & Nicolas Thieberger. 2007. Who pays the piper. In David Maya Khemlani, Nicholas Ostler & Caesar Dealwis (eds.), *Working together for endangered languages: Research challenges and social impacts: Proceedings of the Xlth FEL Conference, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, 26–28 October 2007*, 47–55. Bath, England: Foundation for Endangered Languages.
- Nettle, Daniel & Suzanne Romaine. 2000. *Vanishing voices: The extinction of the world's languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Newman, Paul. 2009. Fieldwork and field methods in linguistics. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 3 (1). 113–125.
- O'Meara, Carolyn & Octavio Alonso González Guadarrama. This volume. Accessibility to results and primary data of research on indigenous languages of Mexico. In Gabriela Pérez Báez, Chris Rogers & Jorge Emilio Rosés Labrada (eds.), *Language documentation and revitalization in Latin American contexts*, 59–79. Berlin and Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Penfield, Susan D., Angelina Serratos, Benjamin V. Tucker, Amelia Flores, Gilford Harper, Johnny Hill Jr. & Nora Vasquez. 2008. Community collaborations: best practices for North American indigenous language documentation. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 2008 (191). 187–202.
- Pérez Báez, Gabriela. This volume. Addressing the gap between community beliefs and priorities and researchers' language maintenance interests. In Gabriela Pérez Báez, Chris Rogers & Jorge Emilio Rosés Labrada (eds.), *Language documentation and revitalization in Latin American contexts*, 165–194. Berlin and Boston: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Pharao Hansen, Magnus, Néstor Hernández-Green, Rory Turnbull & Ditte Boeg Thomsen. This volume. Life histories, language attitudes and linguistic variation: Navigating the micro-politics of language revitalization in an Otomí community in Mexico. In Gabriela Pérez Báez, Chris Rogers & Jorge Emilio Rosés Labrada (eds.), *Language documentation and revitalization in Latin American contexts*, 215–245. Berlin and Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rice, Keren. 2006. Ethical issues in linguistic fieldwork: An overview. *Journal of Academic Ethics* 4 (1–4). 123–155.
- Rice, Keren. 2012. Ethical issues in linguistic fieldwork. In Nicholas Thieberger (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of linguistic fieldwork*, 407–429. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Rogers, Chris. This volume. Indigenous authenticity as a goal of language documentation and revitalization: Addressing the motivations in the Xinkan community. In Gabriela Pérez Báez, Chris Rogers & Jorge Emilio Rosés Labrada (eds.), *Language documentation and revitalization in Latin American contexts*, 247–271. Berlin and Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sánchez, Liliana. This volume. The linguist gaining access to the indigenous populations: Sharing cultural and linguistic knowledge in South America. In Gabriela Pérez Báez, Chris Rogers & Jorge Emilio Rosés Labrada (eds.), *Language documentation and revitalization in Latin American contexts*, 195–213. Berlin and Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Santos García, Saul, Tutzpika Carillo de la Cruz & Karina Ivette Verdín Amaro (Universidad Autónoma de Nayarit). This volume. The revitalization of Wixárika: The account of a community project in the midwest region of Mexico. In Gabriela Pérez Báez, Chris Rogers & Jorge Emilio Rosés Labrada (eds.), *Language documentation and revitalization in Latin American contexts*, 81–108. Berlin and Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Seifart, Frank, Sebastian Drude, Bruna Franchetto, Jürg Gasché, Lucía Golluscio & Elizabeth Manrique. 2008. Language documentation and archives in South America. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 2 (1). 130–140.

- Stenzel, Kristine. 2014. The pleasures and pitfalls of a 'participatory' documentation project: An experience in Northwestern Amazonia. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 8. 287–306.
- Suárez, Jorge A. 1983. *The Mesoamerican Indian languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tsunoda, Tasaku. 2005. *Language endangerment and language revitalization*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Vallejos, Rosa. This volume. Structural outcomes of obsolescence and revitalization: documenting variation among the Kukama-Kukamirias. In Gabriela Pérez Báez, Chris Rogers & Jorge Emilio Rosés Labrada (eds.), *Language documentation and revitalization in Latin American contexts*, 143–164. Berlin and Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Villard, Stéphanie & J. Ryan Sullivant. Language documentation in two communities with high migration rates. In Gabriela Pérez Báez, Chris Rogers & Jorge Emilio Rosés Labrada (eds.), *Language documentation and revitalization in Latin American contexts*, 273–304. Berlin and Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Whaley, Lindsay. 2011. Some ways to endanger an endangered language project. *Language and Education* 25 (4). 339–348.
- Yamada, Racquel-María. 2011. Integrating documentation and formal teaching of Kari'nja: documentary materials as pedagogical materials. *Language Documentation & Conservation*, 5, 1–30.
- Yáñez Rosales, Rosa Herminia, Dana Kristine Nelson, Melissa Niño Santana, Rodrigo Parra Gutiérrez, Paulina Lamas Oliva, Agustín Vega Torres & Rocío Rojas Arias. This volume. Reclamation initiatives in non-speaker communities: The case of two Nahua communities in the south of Jalisco State, Mexico. In Gabriela Pérez Báez, Chris Rogers & Jorge Emilio Rosés Labrada (eds.), *Language documentation and revitalization in Latin American contexts*, 109–141. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Denny Moore and Ana Vilacy Galucio

2 Perspectives for the documentation of indigenous languages in Brazil

1 Introduction

In the last two decades language documentation has advanced greatly in Brazil, a nation with many minority languages within the predominantly Portuguese-speaking national context. This paper aims to provide an overview of the evolution of language documentation and relevant language policy in Brazil. There are identifiable country-specific macro factors and trends at work which strongly influence the prospects for language documentation and revitalization and which are different from those found in other world regions.

In Brazil the situation of the native peoples (some of which are still out of contact with the outside world) is different from that of the native peoples of the USA or Australia. Scientific linguistics is relatively recent in Brazil. The impact of international documentation programs has been stronger in Brazil, where documentation was less developed, than in Europe or the United States. Large government programs in Brazil have important effects but are notably precarious, with success by no means guaranteed. Like other aspects of Brazilian society, the development of language documentation and revitalization encounters resistance from those who are adapted to the underdeveloped system. Such an underdeveloped system is not a lack of something, but rather a positive system that actively seeks to reproduce itself and defends maintenance of the status quo by reacting against what is perceived as threats. So, as odd as it may seem, linguists whose prestige would diminish with the development of more effective responses to the issue of language endangerment in the country can be motivated to oppose them. At a more micro level the questions encountered in projects are similar to those encountered elsewhere, for example, taking into account local systems of cultural meaning (Dobrin 2008), dealing with local politics and rivalries (Benedicto et al. 2002; Pharaao Hansen et al., this volume), power sharing in collaborative projects (Benedicto et al. 2007) and realistically evaluating the chances of success in language revitalization (Dorian 1987).

Some historical information about linguistics in Brazil is presented in Section 2. Then the role and impact of the large international documentation programs are examined. Two individual documentation projects supported by international documentation programs are described briefly in Section 3. A noteworthy effort that merits attention, the indigenous language documentation program of Brazil's National Indian Foundation (FUNAI), is discussed in Section 4. Language documentation and maintenance, and language policy and planning in general, require knowledge of the situation of the languages of a country. This has been problematic in Brazil, given the large size of the country, the number of languages, and the often difficult access to speakers of the native languages, more than two-thirds of which are spoken in Amazonia. Academic politics among the community of linguists complicates the matter further. The nature of the difficulties in knowing the situation of the indigenous languages is described in Section 5. Two initiatives by the federal Brazilian government in principle aim at surveying the nation's languages: a national survey of the languages of Brazil (INDL) and the inclusion of a question about indigenous languages in the 2010 Brazilian national demographic census. The methodology of these potentially important programs and their results to date are discussed in Section 6, relating them to some of the relevant questions for language policy and management. In Section 7 a summary of the aspects presented in the paper is offered to help evaluate the perspectives for language documentation and revitalization in Brazil.

2 Language documentation in Brazil and the international documentation programs

Language documentation, in some sense, was carried out early in Brazilian colonial history, with descriptive efforts by Jesuit missionaries; for example, Anchieta (1595). That work was tied to practical aims and did not continue. The Jesuits were expelled in the mid eighteenth century. In the last half of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century, non-specialists, especially members of scientific expeditions, achieved a certain amount of linguistic description. Notable among these non-specialists were Karl von den Steinen, General Couto de Magalhães, Theodor Koch-Grünberg, Curt Nimuendajú, Emilie Snethlage, and João Capistrano de Abreu. Modern scientific studies began in the second half of the twentieth century. Mattoso Câmara Junior established the Linguistics Sector of the Museu Nacional in Rio de Janeiro in 1961 and wrote a monograph about indigenous languages (1965), in spite of not being a fieldworker himself. By the middle of the 1980s the study of indigenous languages had spread to a number

of universities and it has continued spreading to almost all regions of Brazil. Beginning in the late 1980s a number of Brazilian students went abroad to pursue graduate studies in linguistics. Upon their return they contributed to the national capacity in scientific linguistics by bringing recent theory and methods from the centers where they studied. The first comprehensive grammar of an indigenous language written by a Brazilian linguist in decades was published by Seki (2000).

For a period of time, ranging from the late 1950's to the early 1980's, the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) occupied a prominent position in the study of Brazilian indigenous languages. An accord of cooperation was established between the Museu Nacional and SIL in 1956, and it was terminated only in 1981. With the increase in the number and quality of Brazilian scientific linguists the importance of foreign missionaries in the study of native languages has decreased and no national academic institutions have formal cooperation agreements with SIL at the present time. Missionary linguists have not participated in the recent development of language documentation in Brazil. However, they continue to be active in the field and promote religious conversion which may threaten traditional verbal culture.

The greater Brazilian capacity in linguistics was important when the large international language documentation programs began. The DOKumentation BEDrohter Sprachen (DOBES) program of the Volkswagen Foundation supported projects in Brazil beginning in 2001. The Endangered Languages Documentation Programme (ELDP) administered by the School of Oriental and Asian Studies of the University of London, with resources from the Hans and Lisbet Rausing Charitable Fund, supported projects in Brazil starting in 2002. These programs were notably friendly to countries with great linguistic diversity where the national capacity in language documentation could be developed. In the first rounds of the competition for these projects the Brazilian linguists who had studied abroad and the foreign linguists residing in Brazil were more successful, owing in part to their familiarity with foreign languages and international norms for project proposals, as well as greater exposure to the international concern for endangered languages and for language documentation and revitalization. The languages in Brazil documented with support from the DOBES and ELDP projects are listed in Table 1 below.

Tab. 1: Languages documented with support from DOBES and ELDP projects in Brazil

Language (family)	Linguist	Institution(s) ¹
<i>DOBES:</i>		
Kuikuro (Carib)	Franchetto	Museu Nacional
Trumai (isolate)	Guirardello	MPI Nijmegen/Museu Goeldi
Aweti (Tupî)	Drude	Free University of Berlin/Museu Goeldi
Kaxuyana (Carib)	Meira	Leiden/Museu Goeldi
Bakairi (Carib)	Meira	Leiden/Museu Goeldi
Mawé (Tupî)	Meira	Leiden/Museu Goeldi
Kaxinawá	Camargo	CNRS
Aikanã (isolate)	van der Voort	MPI Nijmegen/Museu Goeldi
Kwazá (isolate)	van der Voort	MPI Nijmegen/Museu Goeldi
<i>ELDP:</i>		
Puruborá (Tupî)	Galucio	Museu Goeldi
Sakurabiat (Tupî)	Galucio	Museu Goeldi
Karo (Tupî)	Gabas	Museu Goeldi
Ayuru (Tupî)	Demolin	Free University of Brussels/Univ of São Paulo
Salamây (Tupî)	Moore	Museu Goeldi
Xipaya (Tupî)	Rodrigues	Federal University of Pará
Apurinã (Arawak)	Facundes	Federal University of Pará
Ofayé (Macro-Jê)	Ribeiro	University of Chicago/Federal Univ of Goiás
Kaduwéu (Guaykuru)	Sandalo	State University of Campinas
Enawenê Nawé (Arawak)	de Resende	Museu Nacional
Oro Win (Chapakura)	Birchall	Radboud University Nijmegen/Museu Goeldi
Waikhana (East Tukano)	Stenzel	Federal Univ of Rio de Janeiro
Wanano (East Tukano)	Stenzel	Federal Univ of Rio de Janeiro
Kanamari (Katukina)	Dienst	Goethe University
Akuntsu (Tupi)	Aragon	University of Utah
Kubeo (Tukano)	Chacon	University of Utah
Desana (Tukano)	Silva	University of Utah
Gavião (Tupi)	Meyer	Museu Goeldi
Suruí (Tupi)	Meyer	Museu Goeldi
Dâw (Nadahup)	Epps	University of Texas, Austin
Paressi-Haliti (Arawak)	da Silva	Federal University of Rio de Janeiro
Paressi-Haliti (Arawak)	Brandão	University of Texas, Austin

These programs, along with some support for projects from other international entities such as the National Science Foundation and the Endangered Language Fund, helped to introduce digital technology and documentation methods into

¹ Institutions to which the linguists were associated at the time of the project.