

Language Diversity Endangered



Language Diversity Endangered

edited by

Matthias Brenzinger

Mouton de Gruyter
Berlin · New York

Mouton de Gruyter (formerly Mouton, The Hague)
is a Division of Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin.

⊗ Printed on acid-free paper which falls within the guidelines
of the ANSI to ensure permanence and durability.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Language diversity endangered / edited by Matthias Brenzinger.
p. cm. – (Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs ; 181)
Includes bibliographical references and indexes.
ISBN 978-3-11-017049-8 (hc. : alk. paper)
ISBN 978-3-11-017050-4 (pbk. : alk. paper)
1. Language attrition. I. Brenzinger, Matthias, 1957–
P40.5.L28L36 2007
306.44–dc22

2006035522

ISBN 978-3-11-017050-4

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

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

© Copyright 2007 by Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, D-10785 Berlin
All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this
book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechan-
ical, including photocopy, recording or any information storage and retrieval system, with-
out permission in writing from the publisher.
Cover design: Christopher Schneider, Berlin.
Printed in Germany.

Preface

The present volume aims to familiarize interested readers with the extent and variation of the accelerating phenomena of language endangerment. They will find global overviews on endangered languages in chapters dealing with all major geographic regions of the world. These contributions provide insights into the specific areal dynamics of language endangerment, past and present. In addition, the authors discuss numerous key issues concerning the documentation of endangered languages. This book is aimed not only at scholars and students from the various sub-disciplines of linguistics, but also addresses issues that are relevant to educators, language planners, policy makers, language activists, historians and other researchers in human science.

The volume comprises updated versions of presentations from the Colloquium *Language Endangerment, Research and Documentation – Setting Priorities for the 21st Century* held in Bad Godesberg from February 12th–17th, 2000 and sponsored by the *Volkswagen Foundation*. Besides the present publication, the colloquium had a substantial impact on the genesis of the UNESCO report *Language Vitality and Endangerment*, as well as the *Recommendations for Action Plans*. Between 2001 and 2003, a UNESCO ad-hoc expert group on endangered languages (co-chaired by Akira Yamamoto and Matthias Brenzinger) collaborated with the UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage Section in Paris to draft a preliminary version.

I wish to thank the *Volkswagen Foundation* for their financial support in organizing the colloquium. Thanks also to Monika Feinen, cartographer at the Institut für Afrikanistik, University of Cologne, for her professional contribution. I would like to thank Anke Beck (Mouton de Gruyter) for her sustained support in this enduring publishing project. Thanks are also due, of course, to the authors of the volume and to all colleagues who contributed by sharing their experience in the study of endangered languages. I am particularly grateful to the *Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa* at the *Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, Tokyo* for enabling me to finish the book manuscript during my stay there as a visiting professor in 2005–06.

Tokyo, April 2006

Matthias Brenzinger

Table of Contents

Preface	v
<i>Matthias Brenzinger</i>	
Language Endangerment Throughout the World	ix
<i>Matthias Brenzinger</i>	
Chapter 1	1
Classification and Terminology for Degrees of Language Endangerment	
<i>Michael Krauss</i>	
Chapter 2	9
Threatened Languages in Hispanic South America	
<i>Willem F. H. Adelaar</i>	
Chapter 3	29
Endangered Languages of Lowland Tropical South America	
<i>Denny Moore</i>	
Chapter 4	59
Endangered Languages of Mexico and Central America	
<i>Colette Grinevald</i>	
Chapter 5	87
Endangered Languages in USA and Canada	
<i>Akira Yamamoto</i>	
Chapter 6	123
Language Endangerment in Northern Africa	
<i>Matthias Brenzinger</i>	
Chapter 7	140
Endangered Languages in West Africa	
<i>Roger Blench</i>	
Chapter 8	163
Endangered Languages in Central Africa	
<i>Bruce Connell</i>	

Chapter 9	179
Language Endangerment in Southern and Eastern Africa <i>Matthias Brenzinger</i>	
Chapter 10	205
Endangered Languages in Europe <i>Tapani Salminen</i>	
Chapter 11	233
Language Endangerment in the CIS <i>Olga Kazakevich and Aleksandr Kibrik</i>	
Chapter 12	263
Endangered Languages of the Middle East <i>Jonathan Owens</i>	
Chapter 13	278
Language Endangerment in China and Mainland Southeast Asia <i>David Bradley</i>	
Chapter 14	303
Endangered Languages of South Asia <i>George van Driem</i>	
Chapter 15	342
Warramurrungunji Undone: Australian Languages in the 51st Millennium <i>Nicholas Evans</i>	
Chapter 16	374
Threatened Languages in the Western Pacific Area from Taiwan to, and Including, Papua New Guinea <i>Stephen A. Wurm</i>	
Chapter 17	391
The Languages of the Pacific Region: the Austronesian Languages of Oceania <i>Darrell Tryon</i>	
Indexes	411

Language Endangerment Throughout the World

Matthias Brenzinger

1. Introduction

Questions concerning the origin of human language have recently regained significant scholarly attention and it is expected that ongoing studies may produce important new insights into basic issues of language evolution. One of the most fundamental questions in this context is: Was there ever a *Homo sapiens* proto-language which existed some 100,000 or 200,000 years ago and then gave rise to large number of very distinct languages about 12,000 years ago, which for their part have been reduced to the approximately 6,000 of today? No matter what possible scenario for language genesis may be conjectured, it seems most likely that the large number of languages spoken on earth in some distant past dramatically dropped when hunter-gatherers changed to a pastoral lifestyle and even more so, when humans become sedentary farmers. The few thousand languages currently spoken are remaining relics of a once much richer pool of languages, and the shrinking of language diversity has accelerated during the last few thousand years.

The currently disappearing and endangered languages of the world, featured in the present volume, are essential sources for studying not only diachronic and synchronic aspects of human language. They are of eminent importance in attaining knowledge on human prehistory in general. Languages are formed by and reflect the most basic human experiences. Without proper scientific documentation, the decline of these languages will result in the irrecoverable loss of unique knowledge that is based on specific cultural and historical experience. Furthermore, the speech communities themselves will often suffer from the loss of their heritage language as a crucial setback of ethnic and cultural identity.

2. Indicators for assessing language vitality

The evaluation of the state of vitality of any language is a challenging task, as one has to consider different, intertwining factors. Speech communities are complex and patterns of language use within these commu-

nities vary and, in addition, are difficult to explore. Even the number of speakers is not always a clear indicator of language vitality. Languages spoken by thousands of people might be endangered, while others with a few hundred speakers may be vital and stable for the time being.

General indicators for the assessment of language vitality and also indicators for selecting languages for documentation were proposed and circulated prior to the colloquium *Language Endangerment, Research and Documentation – Setting Priorities for the 21st Century* by the organizer (Brenzinger 2000). These indicators were discussed at the colloquium, and are employed (some in a modified form) in the tables in the following contributions to this volume.

The indicators of Set A aim at capturing various levels of endangerment by considering a) the percentage of speakers within a population, b) the extent of language transmission, c) loss of functions in language use, and d) attitudes towards one's own language. Language endangerment is an ongoing process, and all indicators therefore serve to capture changes within the speech community.

The indicators of Set B relate to the question of ranking endangered languages most urgently in need for documentation. The scientific (linguistic) value is mainly assigned by considering the genetic status of an endangered language, and the second indicator is the current status of its documentation. The third indicator, namely research conditions, has been removed from the list as they are too varied and complex to be reduced to mere numbers. Furthermore, conditions for fieldwork are subject to constant changes.

Discussions of these indicators at the colloquium served as a starting point for the work of an UNESCO Ad-hoc expert group on endangered languages that collaborated with the UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage Section in Paris. Between 2001 and 2003 the team drafted a report entitled *Language Vitality and Endangerment*, as well as, *Recommendations for Action Plans*. A final version of the report and the recommendations were prepared by linguists, language planners, representatives of NGO's, as well as members of endangered language speech communities at a meeting at the UNESCO headquarters in Paris in March 2003. The final document identifies nine core factors that may help to assess and understand the language situation of specific endangered languages.

- Factor 1 Intergenerational language transmission
- Factor 2 Absolute numbers of speakers
- Factor 3 Proportion of speakers within the total population

- Factor 4 Loss of existing language domains
- Factor 5 Response to new domains and media
- Factor 6 Material for language education and literacy
- Factor 7 Governmental and institutional language attitudes and policies, including official language status and use
- Factor 8 Community members' attitudes towards their own language
- (Factor 9 Amount and quality of documentation)

By applying these factors to individual languages, a 5 to 0 grading system has been proposed in the UNESCO report. For instance, grade 5 with factor 1 shows that all members of the community are also speakers of the heritage language. Grade 0 states that all speakers of the language have passed away. All factors may be applied to a given language, and the table of numbers, which is obtained in this way, can help to characterize the kind and state of endangerment for a language. The tables may serve as instruments not only for the assessment of the current situation of a community's language, but also for the formulation of appropriate support measures for language documentation, maintenance, or revitalization.

Factors from (1) to (8) are applied to assess a language's vitality and its state of endangerment by capturing the dynamics of the processes of a given language shift situation. The single most crucial factor among them is *intergenerational language transmission* (1), which determines the extent of language acquisition among the children within a community. Languages without any young speakers are obviously seriously threatened by extinction. The *proportion of speakers within a community* (3) addresses among others, a rather important aspect of language vitality: is the language still an essential asset for being regarded a member of the community or not? If membership of the community is possible without speaking the heritage language, this language is highly endangered from within the community.

External threats may derive from the introduction of formal education or new job opportunities for the members of a minority group. These changes may result in the *loss of domains* (4) in which the heritage language has still been used. A shift in religious affiliation of a community might also result in the shift to another mother tongue, a language that is associated with the new religion (5). Not only *Arabic*, but also *Hausa* and *Dyula*, for example, spread as first languages in West Africa along with Islam. Factor (6) relates to the stage of development of a given language ("Ausbau"). Does the community have an orthography? Have the community members agreed on a common standard form for writing the language? Are *teaching and learning materials* for the language available? Is

there literature, such as newsletters, stories, religious texts, etc. published in that language? Factor (7) deals with the *government's policies towards that language* and factor (8) assess the *speakers' attitudes* towards their ethnic language.

Finally, factor (9) aims at helping to determine the urgency for documentation by focusing on the quantity and quality of already existing and analyzed language data. This last factor is the remaining attempt to provide an indicator for the ranking of languages in urgent need for documentation, previously addressed in Set B above. Serious problems with the endeavor of prioritizing languages for documentation have been pointed out by Tryon (p. 438, this volume). He claims that the results gained from factors 1–8 might be overruled by criteria which arise in factor 9: The utmost importance of documenting language isolates, and the attempt to reach coherent language descriptions by choosing languages which are still spoken, not only remembered. While for the question of language documentation, factor 9 is the most crucial, it might be prove to be rather irrelevant for language revitalization efforts, as discussed by Grenoble and Whaley (2006: 4–5).

3. A global overview of endangered languages

Michael Krauss (University of Fairbanks, Alaska) opens the volume by proposing a refined terminology for categorizing degrees of language endangerment by considering the single factor language transmission. His scale comprises three basic categories, namely *safe*, *extinct*, and *endangered*, with the latter category being further refined by 5 subcategories.

The other chapters are assigned to regions and together capture the global extent of language endangerment. In addition, they analyze a wide range of different threats to individual languages and most importantly, draw attention to specific issues relevant for the research on and documentation of endangered languages.

Willem F. H. Adelaar (Leiden University, The Netherlands) reviews the complex history of language replacement in Hispanic South America from pre-colonial times to the present. *Quechua*, as the language of the Inca Empire, played a significant role in diminishing language diversity before *Spanish* and the European conquerors became a threat to South American languages and even to the people themselves.

Denny Moore (Museu Goeldi, Brasilia) presents a thorough overview of the enormous number of endangered languages of Lowland Tropical

South America. In discussing linguistic research and documentation carried out on these languages, he points out fundamental differences between non-missionary and missionary linguists in the important issues of training national and native linguists.

Colette Grinevald (University Lyon 2, France) shares her comprehension of the situation of endangered languages of Mexico and Central America with an activist approach. She approves achievements in language work on endangered languages that are reached by local, national and regional research institutions and calls for giving support to them. One concrete need in this respect is the training of Amerindian linguists.

Akira Yamamoto (University of Kansas, USA) presents an overview of endangered languages in the USA and Canada. He contrasts the language situation in three communities in some detail and discusses the language work going on in these communities. His main emphasis, however, is on issues that relate to the ethics and pragmatics of fieldwork.

Matthias Brenzinger (University of Cologne, Germany) focuses on endangered languages in Northern Africa. The spread of various "world" religions has had a major impact on the language map in this part of the world, the spread of *Arabic* along with Islam being the most significant.

In a second contribution, *Brenzinger* starts off with the endangered *Khoisan* languages of Southern Africa and moves on to deal with the Eastern African situation. The role of migration waves for language replacement is examined, followed by a typology of the various present settings of language replacement in this part of the world.

Roger Blench (Cambridge, UK) analyses the situation of endangered languages in West Africa by employing statistical methods. He captures national and regional differences, and stresses the importance of the still great number of languages for which no information exists at all.

Bruce Connell (York University, Canada) summarizes information on endangered languages of Central Africa. A brief account on the language history of the region is followed by an overview of endangered languages. This list is incomplete, as he states, due to the fact that even the most basic information for classifying languages does not exist for several countries in that region.

Tapani Salminen (University of Helsinki, Finland) provides an overview of the endangered language of Europe. The postscript added to his contribution just before the publication underlines a point he previously raises, that not all European languages are well studied and documented, and that even where they are, judgments on whether a language is endangered or not are not easily possible.

Olga Kazakevich (Lomonosov University of Moscow, CIS) and *Alexandr Kibrik* (Moscow State University, CIS) survey the endangered language in the CIS. In their contribution to this volume, they describe the importance of formal education in *Russian* as a major force in endangering all other languages that are and were spoken in the Russian Empire and the USSR.

Jonathan Owens (University of Bayreuth, Germany) centers his survey of endangered Middle East languages on Afghanistan, the country with the highest linguistic diversity in the region. He reviews linguistic research and provides diachronic information on languages and speech communities.

David Bradley (LaTrobe, Australia) examines the endangered languages of China and mainland Southeast Asia. For many languages, he adds details that are important for their endangerment to the basic statistical information.

George van Driem (Leiden University, The Netherlands) records the large number of endangered language in South Asia. Among other issues, he raises the question of whether it is in fact feasible to set up a universal code of conducting research is feasible.

Nicholas Evans (University of Melbourne, Australia) assesses the situation of Australian languages. He allows for an understanding not only of the linguistic characteristics of these languages, but also mentions aspects of the mythology and culture of the people.

Stephen Wurm † (Australian National University Canberra, Australia), one of the great scholars in the study of endangered languages, summarizes threatened languages in the Western Pacific area from Taiwan to, and including, Papua New Guinea.

Darrell Tryon (Australian National University Canberra, Australia) closes the volume by evaluating the endangerment of the Austronesian languages of the Pacific Region. Among other issues, he discusses practical questions concerning the setting up of local language archives.

4. The scope of the volume and further related topics

Linguists with regional expertise have contributed to the present volume, their investigations outlining the extent of language endangerment and analyzing threats to language and linguistic diversity. While the importance of language diversity in many other respects is acknowledged, the present studies choose to concentrate mainly on issues that relate to languages as resources for scientific research.

Yamamoto deals with fieldwork ethics, but for the actual linguistic fieldwork, we want to further refer to practical manuals, several of which explicitly consider the documentation of endangered languages (e. g. Newman and Ratcliff eds. 2001).

Language revitalization is an important related issue. Linguists such as, for example, Kenneth Hale and Thomas Kaufman, have been instrumental in setting up community programs that aim at countering language shift processes. For sustained success in language maintenance, however, language revitalization must be “a community-driven, a bottom-up kind of movement”, as pointed out by Grenoble and Whaley (2006: 20). We refer the reader to their book, *Saving languages*, the key publication on academic and practical aspects of language revitalization.

Skutnabb-Kangas might be consulted on important questions concerning endangered languages and language (human) rights. She examines not only the language policy environment of her own marginalized Saami language, but also of many endangered languages from various countries and continents (Skutnabb-Kangas 2000, 2002).

Even though the volume outlines threats to language and linguistic diversity with a global framework, dimensions of other linguistic variability remain widely ignored. There is no doubt about the fact that the diversity of linguistic variability will continue to evolve as long as humans exist and communicate. Special vocabularies are generated, for example, with the progressing professional specialization and new terminologies develop with achievements reached in technologies. Also peer group-specific speech forms follow rapidly changing fashions and linguistic variability is employed to express affiliations to specific scenes. Even new languages may arise in the formation of young nations.

Regional varieties as well as secret codes and other special languages, i. e. linguistic variability that encapsulates linguistic heritage, seem to be disappearing throughout the world. The formation of nation states with one unifying language, as well as a global coverage – first by mass media and now by the WWW – has fostered the assimilation of regional “dialects” to national standard “languages”.

In these processes, not only regional variants, but also distinct languages are often downgraded to mere “dialects” by national ideologies and as a result disappear, widely unnoticed. They may not be considered in the academic discourse on endangered languages and for that reason also not feature in the present volume. On the Okinawan Islands of Japan, for example, the entire language group of the *Ryukyuan* languages is about to disappear. The *Ryukyuan* languages are the only linguistic relatives of the otherwise

isolated *Japanese* language; however, their distance to *Standard Japanese* is much greater than, for example, the one between *German* and *English* (Heinrich 2005). The *Okinawan* languages are being replaced by *Standard Japanese* as a result of the Japanization of Okinawa, which started with the annexation of the Ryukyu Kingdom in 1879. In public schools, Okinawan children were educated to become Japanese and they were no longer allowed to speak their own language. Mashide Ishihara describes the policy of “One nation, one people, and one language” (Ishihara 2004) by the government in Tokyo, which made strong efforts to turn the Okinawans into loyal Japanese-speaking citizens. The U.S. occupation of Okinawa after WWII, which – at least formally – ended in 1972, marks the final stage of the fade of the *Ryukyuan* languages. The Americans tried to separate Okinawa from Japan and for that reason emphasized the distinctiveness of the *Ryukyuan* language and culture. This US policy, however, fostered the Japanization movement and today, even the remaining – mainly elderly *Ryukyu*-speakers – themselves refer to their languages as *Japanese* “dialects”.

Several contributions to the volume mention regions for which even the most fundamental information on minority languages does not exist, such as in Amazonia and parts of the African continent. During the past few years, financial support from various institutions and foundations allowed for quite a number of studies on endangered languages, for example, in *The Endangered Languages of the Pacific Rim* program of the Japanese government and the *DOBES (Dokumentation bedrohter Sprachen)* program of the *Volkswagen Foundation*, Germany. Other important programs for language documentation were set up by the *Rausing Foundation*, UK and the *Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NOW)*. Even though the *Endangered Language Fund*, USA and the *Foundation of Endangered Languages* provide relatively small grants, they have nevertheless had a significant impact on the discussions and the actual research of endangered languages. Research on language endangerment and the documentation of endangered languages will progress further, and we hope that the present volume will be a useful reference in these endeavours and encourage further discussions and studies on endangered languages.

References

- Brenzinger, Matthias
2000 Selection and ranking of endangered languages most urgently in need for documentation. Discussion paper prepared for the colloquium *Language Endangerment, Research and Documentation – Setting Priorities for the 21st Century*, February 12th–17th 2000.
- Dwyer, Arienne; Brenzinger, Matthias and Akira Y. Yamamoto
2003 Safeguarding of endangered languages, *The endangered language fund newsletter* 7,1: 1–4.
- Grenoble, Lenore A. and Lindsay J. Whaley
2006 *Saving languages. An introduction to language revitalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heinrich, Patrick
2005 Reversing language shift in Okinawa Island, in Crawhall, Nigel and Nicholas Ostler (eds.) *Creating outsiders: Endangered languages, migration and marginalization*. (Proceedings FEL IX, Stellenbosch, South Africa, 18–20 November 2005), Bath: FEL. 137–144.
- Ishihara, Mashide
2004 One nation, one people, and one language: Becoming Japanese in Okinawa, 平成 13, 14, 15 年度科学研究費補助金 (基盤 A) 「日米における同化政策と 20 世紀沖縄」研究成果報告書 (琉球大学法学部 2004 年 3 月発行) 237–244. (Research report to the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research, “Nichibei ni okeru Doka-Seisaku to 20-seiki Okinawa”, 2001–03: 237–244).
- Newman, Paul and Martha Ratcliff (eds.)
2001 *Linguistic fieldwork*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove
2000 *Linguistic genocide in education – or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Mahwah, New Jersey, London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
2002 Irelands, Scotland, education and linguistic human rights: some international comparisons, in Kirk, John M. and Dónall P. Ó Baoill (eds.) 2002 *Language planning and education: Linguistic rights in Northern Ireland, the Republic of Ireland, and Scotland*. (*Belfast Studies in Language, Culture and Politics*, 6), Belfast: Cló Ollscoil na Banríona, 221–266.

Chapter 1

Classification and Terminology for Degrees of Language Endangerment

Michael Krauss

1. The following is a suggested framework or schema for classifying languages according to degree of viability, from ‘safe’ to *extinct*, with terminology and designators.

	'safe'		a+	
e n d a n g e r e d	stable		a-	all speak, children & up
	i n d e c l i n e	<i>instable; eroded</i>	a	some children speak; all children speak in some places
		<i>definitively endangered</i>	b	spoken only by parental generation and up
		<i>severely endangered</i>	c	spoken only by grandparental generation and up
		<i>critically endangered</i>	d	spoken only by very few, of great-grandparental generation
<i>extinct</i>		e	no speakers	

The schema and discussion do not address definition of “language” vs. “dialect” for example, or the type of rapid linguistic evolution or “decay” (such as loss of inflection, incorporation of loan words) which is considered by some also as “endangerment”.

The three basic categories are ‘safe’ and *extinct*, with everything in between *endangered*, by far the largest category, to be taken up last.

2. The term ‘safe’, designated a+, I have adopted as a technical term, so keep that in single quotes, to be used with caution, though perhaps that is inconsistent with the rest, also proposed as technical terms. ‘Safe’ are those languages which are not only being learned as mother-tongue by children as the norm, but which we predict will still be being so learned

for the foreseeable future, i. e. throughout this new century, still having at least a viable community, critical mass, of children speakers in the year 2100. Such would be a very large proportion of languages which are now spoken by a million or more, including children, and/or are firmly supported by the power of a state or regional government, this including also, though the population may be well below a million, e. g. *Icelandic* or *Faroese*, 250,000 and 40,000 respectively. The total number of 'safe' languages may thus currently be about 300 out of 6,000 or 5%, the majority of those being both spoken by over a million and supported by state power, used in educational and media domains. Sometimes, however, state support does not suffice, as in the notorious case of *Irish*, already severely endangered before it gained that support, or, more often, a million does not suffice without that support, as in the case of *Breton*, or *Quechua*. Even so, other factors may prevail, as in the case of *Yiddish* in conservative or Hasidic communities, which might classify *Yiddish*, perhaps the most famously "dying" language, in the elite class of 'safe' — to put the enormity of the *endangered* class in perspective — where *Yiddish* may well be at the 95th percentile for 'safety.' Probably no language with fewer than 10,000 speakers could anywhere be classified as 'safe', and 10,000 is probably at least at the 65th percentile for language speakership size, the median size being closer to 5,000. (It remains a major study, not addressed here, to consider factors detracting from language 'safety,' such as genocidal violence, industrial development, environmental degradation, demographic intrusion or upheaval, urbanization, indifference, television exclusively in the dominant language, along with the whole spectrum of attitudes, both of the minority and dominant language speakers).

3. *Extinct*, designated *e*, are languages no longer spoken or even potentially spoken (remembered) by anyone, so for which no new documentation can be obtained. Questionable cases of recent extinction of course are common, perhaps more common than cases where it is certain that not a single speaker anywhere survives. Borderline cases exist too, where a few words or phrases are remembered, which could be quite valuable in determining at least the genetic position of an otherwise undocumented language, though there is no one able to generate sentences in it. Such cases might be designated *e+*. Perhaps still more difficult to classify, but probably *e+*, are languages for which there are no fluent speakers or persons able to generate new sentences, but for which there are persons who may remember extensive rote ritual or epic text, such as *Ainu yukar*. (Similarly, however, there are or have been languages with extensive writ-

ten literature but with no native speakers, such as *Hebrew* until the late 19th century, *Coptic*, or clerical *Latin*, regularly used in ritual. Commonly these may have new text generated in writing may even be the only written language for the community, and may have persons potentially capable of conversation in them under special conditions. Along with other types, such as *Esperanto* or pidgins, these may perhaps be designated by the proposed scale, or something parallel to that, some perhaps even so high as 'safe,' however restricted their domain may remain. These, or any language sufficiently documented, have also the potential to be revived and will be considered at the end of this discussion.).

4. Between 'safe' and *extinct* is the entire spectrum of *endangered* languages, probably 95 % of the 6,000. The term *endangered* is clearly adopted from its use in the field of biology, where "endangered species" are defined as "in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of their range", as distinct from "threatened species", defined as "likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of their range". For language we have agreed to use the term *endangered* much more broadly, to include a large category, perhaps already a third of "endangered" languages, which are no longer spoken by children; those would correspond in biology to species which have lost the capacity to reproduce. Rather than use terms like "dying", "doomed", "terminal", or even "moribund" or "non-viable", which might well have a discouraging or negative effect, we extend the term *endangered* to include those too, however euphemistic that use may seem, trusting that the term *endangered* may itself be sufficiently alarming. For our purposes, I do not see either that a distinction between *threatened* and *endangered* for language would be very useful; since we are using "endangered" already as a euphemism for a status much graver than what "endangered" means in biology, it seems wrong to compound the obfuscation by calling merely "threatened" (not yet endangered) what does in most cases correspond to "endangered" in biology. Perhaps in further elaboration of a separate study of factors endangering a language, "threatened" might be defined to designate an upper minority of the category of stable but unsafe languages, to double or triple the number of non-endangered languages ('safe' 5 % + *threatened* 5–10 % more).

4.1. At the top of the scale in the *endangered* category is the class designated *a, stable*. So long as a language is being learned as mother-tongue by the children, it remains classified as *stable*. This would generally require that virtually all children are so learning the language, in the family,

and actually speaking it not only to their elders but to each other. Home is the essential domain, and so long as home use remains stable, though another language may be used increasingly in school, work, religion, etc., the language remains *stable*, however threatened it may be by factors external to the home. Failure of a language to expand into new technological domains may indeed increase the threat to it, but need not necessarily reclassify it as less than *stable*. A language might remain *stable* if it is merely the “norm” that children learn and speak it in the home, so long as cases where that is not so are truly exceptional, or are common only in a diaspora, e. g. permanently urbanized families, at some remove from the core area. The term *stable* seems detachedly realistic and not leading to complacency, so long as one remembers that that is merely the top category, still the majority worldwide, though probably for not much longer, of endangered languages. The use of the term *stable* is partly inspired by the phrase “Stabilizing Indigenous Languages” in the title for a series of North American conferences.

4.2. For the next subclass of *endangered* languages, incipiently in decline, I see no qualifier better than *instable* or *partly stable*, designated *a-*. (The designators, it is time to explain, are partly derived from the American public school grading system, where *a* is ‘excellent’, *b* ‘good’, *c* ‘fair, average’, *d* ‘poor’, and *f* ‘failing’, and *a-* is less than *a* but closer to *a* than to *b*, *b+* better than *b* but closer to *b* than to *a*, etc. They have the advantage of being more iconic than a numeral system, where it is not immediately clear whether the lower number 1 or I as opposed to the higher number 4 or IV is better.) There are clearly two different types of *a-* situations, both defined as where some of the children speak the language. The first type, *instable*, is where “some” of the children speak the language, e. g. some of the children in a single village, or scattered through a wider area, perhaps still a majority, but not constituting a stable or critical mass. *Instable* includes also a situation where the children speak the language some of the time, i. e. to elders, but amongst each other speak the replacing language, so seem destined to speak that to their spouses and children. The other subtype of *a-* might be *partly stable* or *eroding*, where for a more complex situation of several communities where the children all speak the language in one or more parts of it but there also is part or parts where only some children speak the language, especially where a clear geographical distinction is not easy to make. If it is easy to make such a distinction, then a further dimension of the designator system should be used, more than one designator separated by a comma, here namely *a, a-*, meaning that in a part of the language area all children are learning the

language, but in another part only some children are learning it. The language in that case as a whole would be *a-*, *partly stable* or *eroding*, but could be further designated as *stable* plus *instable*. The term *instable* (c.f. instability) is used as a technical term instead of “unstable”, in order to avoid the connotation of “mentally unstable”.

4.3. The next subclass is *b*, *definitively endangered* (and definitively in decline) for lack of a better term, meaning that the language has passed the crucial basic threshold of viability, is no longer being learned as mother-tongue by children in the home, that the youngest speakers are of the parental generation, or more precisely that the youngest generation of which all are speakers is the parental generation. (That age could of course vary widely in different parts of the world, minimum probably from 15 to 20.). This might include also situations where the parents not only can but do speak the language to their children, yet permit the children regularly to respond in the replacing language, so that the children hardly become active speakers of the endangered language. Designated with variants of *b*, such as *b-*, might be cases where some of the parents speak the language, or where more uniformly the youngest speaker age is 25 or 30, again meaning in a different way that some parents speak the language. Another type of finer designation might be *b+*, for where the youngest speakers may be 5 or 15, but the intergenerational transmission is definitively interrupted. If the youngest speakers are already even five, the language has probably been definitively abandoned. Though numerically more children may still be able to speak it than cannot, the language should probably be designated *b+* rather than *a-*, because of the dynamic, which is always more important than sheer numbers. The system allows also for two more types of complexity. The first is as shown above, two designators divided by comma, e. g. here *a,b* for two communities or distinct geographical areas, in one of which all speak the language, in the other only parents and up. The second type, which I have very often used, is joining two designators with a hyphen, ambiguous in American notation as the same symbol as a minus sign, e. g. *a-b*, for a complex or continuum which ranges from all children speaking the language to only parents and older speaking it. Perhaps the joining symbol should not be used so ambiguously, so that a situation ranging from where some of the children speak the language in one part to where only parents and up speak it would be *a-b*, thus allowing very finely also, e. g. for *a-b+*, *a-b-*.

4.4. The next subclass is *severely endangered*, *c*, where the youngest speakers are of grandparental generation, middle aged (*mutatis mutandis* age span of 35–60 or even wider) where parents cannot teach the language

to their children. I have picked “severely” over “seriously endangered”, which implies that it is not “serious”, or “gravely endangered”, too funereal. This is by far the most common basic category for indigenous North American languages, for example, both because of historical timing and the breadth of the age-span. More complex distinctions such as *a-c*, *c-*, can of course be used. For example, the long *Inuit* continuum I have designated *a-c*, for *a* in Greenland and Eastern Canada, but not Labrador, *b* in Central Canada and a few parts of Alaska, *c* in Western Canada and most of Alaska. Another type of fine designation that I occasionally used in my circumpolar report was *-c*, for where the youngest speakers were in the range 35–40, i. e. youngish for grandparent but closer to *c* than to *b*; this should, according to the above, be better symbolized *c+*.

4.5. The last subclass before *extinct* is *critically endangered*, *d*, for languages of which the youngest speakers are in the great-grandparental generation, and are also very few, often fewer than 10 for most American languages, and constituting the second largest class, after *c*, for the U.S. Languages very close to extinction, with all speakers at the very end of life expectancy, and fewer than 10, could be designated *d-*. In this class too the numbers could be problematical. e. g. in the case of *Hawaiian* (not counting *Ni'ihau*, the one isolated island which is *a*), where the youngest speakers throughout are over 70, but with a large enough population that there may be still a thousand such elders, some of whom also could become centenarians; such a language might well resist extinction longer than small languages designated *c* where the number of speakers is 10, some aged only 55, but of whom none might reach 80. Sheer numbers should only secondarily be a factor in the classification however, the *Hawaiian* case being far less frequent than the smaller language populations. For languages in class *d* it should also be noted that the further toward extinction a language moves, the more the actual language ability of the last speakers may become an issue. Often neither academic linguistics nor community language interest can afford to discount speakers with less than eloquent or complete command of a language in this category; a designation of *d-* might well include or consist only of a very few speakers with less than complete competence, or very rusty speakers or semi-speakers. Some languages, e. g. *Sayan Samoyed*, resisted extinction for a generation or more on that basis, possibly also *Ubykh* now.

5. Finally, the designations so far have dealt only with unidirectional movement from *stable* downward to *extinct*. One type of exception would be languages traditionally learned in adulthood, e. g. as I have heard

about *Tarascan* in Mexico, where children learn only *Spanish*, but are expected to learn in young adulthood *Tarascan* and henceforth to speak that with other adults. It would be important to note other such cases. Possibly, *Esperanto* and pidgins could have similar special designations, or secret or ritual languages, such as *Demün*, *Coptic* or clerical *Latin*. Before considering and designating those, however, we need to consider another type more frequent and important for our purposes, increasingly the result of community programs for reversal of language loss. One example is *Hawaiian*, which might be designated *a, d-a*; the *a* is for *Ni'ihau*, the small isolated island where the children all still speak the language, and *d-a* is for the rest of the islands, where until recently the only speakers were the generation of those now past 70 or 75, but where some younger adults began learning the language about 20 years ago, instituted the Punana Leo (Language Nest) movement now spanning kindergarten through high school (all basically taught through the medium of *Hawaiian*, graduates of which are now raising native *Hawaiian*-speaking children). *Maori* in New Zealand had probably reached a designation of *b-c* (maybe *a-c*), but the Kohanga Reo movement (parent to its *Hawaiian* counterpart) has now produced many child speakers; *Maori* thus might be designated *b-c-a* (or *a-c-a*). *Cornish* was indeed extinct for about a century, and insofar as revivalist claims are correct, that there are now some native-speaking *Cornish* children, could be designated *e-a*, or if not, then *b-a*. *Irish* is still *a* in some of the Gaeltachtaí (*Irish*-speaking districts), but has many more speakers who actually do speak it to each other as a second language and whose children are native speakers of it e. g. in Dublin, so *Irish* generally might be designated *a, b-a*. A pidgin in the process of becoming a creole might also be designated *b-a*.

Possibly, using *x+* instead of the *-y* device used occasionally in my circumpolar paper, the designation *-b* might be reserved for languages learned only in adulthood or school, such as *Tarascan*, *Esperanto*, pidgins, or clerical *Latin*, where the state of decline is not relevant. *Sanskrit* however, reportedly has children speakers, so should accordingly be designated *-a*. Also, until the late 19th century, *Hebrew*, which is now of course, *a+*, and still may have more second-language than native speakers, might be designated as *-a+*! Finally, cases like *Ainu* or successful results of the California-type master-apprentice program, insofar as one or very few adults have successfully learned the language from a last aged speaker, might be designated *d-b*, noting that the hyphen in those loss-reversal cases does not signify a range of speakers throughout the intermediate generations. Presumably terms could be assigned to various types of loss

reversal, e. g. *revived* (from extinction) for *Cornish*, *e-a*, or even *e-b*; *re-vitalized* or *restabilized* or *restored*, variously, for cases like *c-a*, *d-a*, *d-b*; *renativized* for *Sanskrit* or *Hebrew*, *-b-a*, *nativized* or *creolized* for pidgins, also *-b-a*.

Chapter 2

Threatened Languages in Hispanic South America

Willem F. H. Adelaar

1. Introduction

In the western part of South America language endangerment is not a recent phenomenon. The process of linguistic reduction may have started during the 15th century with the conquest wars conducted by the Incas of Cuzco. At the height of their power the Incas dominated the Andean region from southern Colombia to the centre of Chile with the inclusion of all the coastal areas. The Incas introduced the habit of relocating entire populations from newly conquered areas to places in the centre of the empire, where they could be controlled more easily. Conversely, loyal populations from the centre were taken to the borders for reasons of defense. This practice, known as *mitma*, may have favored the use of the imperial language (*Quechua*) to the detriment of the original languages of some of the affected populations.

2. The linguistic consequences of conquest and colonization

The spread of epidemic diseases during the 16th century, as well as the actions of the Spanish conquerors, who had introduced them, had a devastating effect upon the ethnic and linguistic diversity existing in the area under discussion. Several coastal populations disappeared during the 16th and 17th centuries. If they had languages of their own, these fell into oblivion before they could be described or documented. An example is the *Quingnam* language, which was spoken along the Peruvian coast near Trujillo and further south. The survivors assimilated with the newcomers and turned to *Spanish*. Coastal cities such as Lima and Trujillo became predominantly European in culture and in language, as well as in the physiognomy of their inhabitants.

In the highlands of what are today Bolivia, Ecuador and Peru, the presence of the indigenous population remained strong. A language of communication and administration, known as 'the general language of the Inca', was widely used in the Inca Empire. If not as a mother tongue, it was used as a second language by most of the Inca's subjects, who often main-

tained local languages as well. This 'general language of the Inca' was a variety of the linguistic family later to become known as *Quechua*. In the former Inca Empire the Spanish authorities initially favored the use of three languages, in order of importance, *Quechua*, *Aymara* and *Puquina*. It shows the great interest of the Spanish rulers for the southern half of the former Inca Empire with its rich mineral resources. The languages spoken in the northern half of the former empire were seriously neglected and remained largely unstudied and undocumented (cf. Adelaar 1999). Standardized varieties of *Quechua* and *Aymara* were introduced in the aftermath of the 3rd Church Council of Lima (*Tercer Concilio Limense* 1582–83). They became instruments of Christianization and, in the case of *Quechua*, interregional contact. All other languages fell victim to neglect and were gradually replaced either by *Quechua*, or by *Spanish*. The relatively unimportant *Puquina* language also suffered that fate. *Aymara* survived in a much reduced part of its original territory, i. e. the area surrounding Lake Titicaca. The only language that benefited from the colonial policy was *Quechua*. It became more and more important. The introduction and stabilization of *Quechua* in the highlands of Bolivia and Ecuador, where it had hardly been present before, was remarkably successful.

In those parts of the Andes that did not originally belong to the Inca Empire (Colombia) or where its influence had been superficial (Chile) similar policies were followed. *Muisca* (*Chibcha*) and *Quechua* obtained an official status in the kingdom of Nueva Granada, present-day Colombia (Triana y Antorveza 1987: 163–70); *Araucanian* maintained a dominant position in Chile. The policy followed with regard to *Muisca* was not successful. The language died out during the 18th century. In Paraguay and adjacent areas, *Guaraní* became the leading language, its use being stimulated by the Jesuit missions. Today, *Paraguayan Guaraní* is the only native American language whose position can be considered unthreatened. The number of its speakers is growing constantly and comprises more than 90% of the population of Paraguay. Large areas of what are today Argentina and Chile, as well as the Gran Chaco region, remained untouched by colonization until the 19th century. In those areas the native languages were not immediately threatened.

The influence of colonial rule in the Amazonian lowlands bordering on the Andes was of an intermittent character. In central Peru, an initially successful mission among the Asháninca and other Amazonian tribes was interrupted in 1742 by the rebellion of Juan Santos Atahualpa. On the other hand, several numerous tribes, such as the Panatahua of the Huallaga river valley, disappeared as a result of epidemic disease introduced by

the mission (Santos 1992). The plains of what is now eastern Bolivia were the scene of severe warfare during the first 150 years of colonization. In 1692 the Jesuits succeeded in establishing a successful mission among the Chiquito Indians (Marzal 1992, I: 421–55). They favored the use of the *Chiquitano* language at the cost of the languages of many other ethnic groups sharing the Chiquito culture and way of life, who were incorporated into the missionary domain. Another missionary experiment took place further west in the Moxos region, an old cultural area with an extraordinary linguistic diversity. In Moxos many of the local languages were preserved, although most of them are moribund today.

The policy of the Spanish colonial authorities with regard to the native languages changed radically in 1770. Three years before, the Jesuits, who were active protectors of the natives and their languages, had been expelled from the empire. Henceforth, forced ‘Castilianization’ (Hispanicization) became the rule, following the model of the Romans, who also had succeeded in imposing their language upon the populations they had conquered. The failed indigenous rebellion of 1780–81, headed by Tupac Amaru II, a descendant of the Inca elite, entailed a further repression of the use of the indigenous languages (cf. Triana y Antorveza 1987: 514–15).

Unfortunately, the independence of the Andean nations initially did not bring any improvement in the status of the native languages. All new states sustained the ideal of homogeneous European-style nations with a single national language, *Spanish*. The indigenous legacy was to be disposed of as soon as possible. It is in this period that we have to look for the roots of the profound feeling of inferiority that the Andean populations continue to nourish with respect to their native languages and which has been the cause of the major language shift that takes place in the Andes today. In the meantime previous shifts in language loyalty continued to be operational, as *Aymara* gained terrain on the *Uru* languages, and *Quechua* on *Aymara* and on the *Zaparoan* languages of the Ecuadorian Amazon. However, varieties of *Quechua* now became threatened throughout the Andes. The Chilean Araucanians conquered new territories in central and southern Argentina and imposed their language on the vanquished *Tehu-elche*, *Teushen* and *Günina Küne* (cf. Censabella 1999: 89–96).

3. Language loss through genocide

The new nation-states turned their attention towards areas to whose possession they considered themselves entitled and which had never been

brought under Spanish control. The fierce resistance of the local Indians led to downright genocide in Argentina and in Uruguay. The last nomadic Indians of Uruguay were surrounded and slaughtered in 1831. The survivors were enslaved (Pi Hugarte 1993). The power of the free Indians of central and southern Argentina was broken in two successive campaigns, in 1833 under general Juan Manuel de Rosas, and above all in 1879, when general Julio Argentino Roca launched his infamous *Conquista del Desierto* 'Conquest of the Desert', preceded and accompanied by heated nationalist rhetoric. The campaign of 1879, which continued with a somewhat lower intensity until 1885, destroyed all hopes of a peaceful solution. Thousands of Indians were killed, native settlements destroyed, the survivors, including several famous chiefs, taken prisoner. Due to the harsh conditions of the campaign, many of them died in custody. The extermination war in the Pampas and Patagonia was followed by similar, but less effective actions in the Gran Chaco region (Martínez Sarasola 1992).

Tierra del Fuego became the scene of a particularly nasty case of genocide. The inhabitants of its main island, the nomadic *Ona* or *Selk'nam* Indians, were wiped out by headhunters hired by cattle-raising landowners, with the passive support of the Argentinian and Chilean authorities, mainly between 1890 and 1910 (Martínez Sarasola 1992: 311–15). At one time 500 died after eating whale meat that had been poisoned on purpose. Many *Onas* sought the protection of the Salesian mission, where starvation and disease caught up with them. In 1899 nine *Onas* were exhibited as 'cannibalistic Indians' in a cage at the World Fair in Paris. The *Onas* never gave up their language. Their language died in the 1970s with the death of the last full-blooded tribe members. Another tragic case is that of the *Yahgan* or *Yamana*, who inhabited the archipelago south of the main island of Tierra del Fuego. This once numerous southernmost nation on earth fell victim to diseases imported by missionaries. Most of them died between 1880 and 1910. Among the survivors only a few aged people remember the language. The *Alacaluf* or *Kawesqar*, who once inhabited the immense area of channels and fjords between Tierra del Fuego and the Chonos archipelago, are still present, but their number is now reduced to 28 (Viegas Barros, ms.). Their chances of survival are limited.

Another episode of postcolonial violence, which had consequences for the survival and distribution of peoples and languages, were the atrocities that accompanied the exploitation of wild rubber in the upper Amazon basin between 1880 and 1914. In 1894 the notorious rubber-baron Fitzcarraldo machine-gunned the *Toyeris*, a subgroup of the *Harakmbut* in the southern Peruvian jungle because of their refusal to work for him (Gray

1996). Survivors escaped to areas near the Andean slopes, where they had to fight an internecine war with their relatives over diminished resources. Rubber extraction companies, such as the Peruvian Casa Arana, persecuted and enslaved thousands of Amazonian Indians with utmost cruelty, causing tremendous mortality among them. Most severely hit was the area of the Putumayo river at the border between Colombia and Peru. *Huitoto* Indians were incited to hunt down members of other tribes, such as the *Andoque* and *Bora*. The atrocities are described in the Casement report (Casement 1988). The production of this report, presented to the British Parliament in 1911, was motivated by the fact that a British company held a considerable economic interest in Arana's activity in the area. As a consequence of deportations and forced labor, fragments of Indian tribes ended up a thousand miles away from their original habitat. The effects of the rubber-boom can still be felt today. Many until then thriving native groups were split up or fell down to critical numbers. The number of speakers of their languages was of course affected accordingly.

4. Language shift in the Andes

The second half of the 20th century brought a great deal of interest in the Andean languages and their situation. Several languages were documented and described. The distribution and the dialectal variety of *Aymara* and *Quechua* were thoroughly studied. The native languages became a political issue in 1975, when the military government in Peru issued a decree declaring *Quechua* to be the second national language along with *Spanish*. This measure had little immediate effect and was never seriously implemented, but the change in attitude of the dominant groups is significant. One issue that was raised was the question whether a unique standard variety had to be selected for *Quechua*, or several standards corresponding to the local dialectal variety, which is considerable in Peru. As a result six different dialects of *Quechua* were selected to be standard varieties. Grammars and dictionaries of these varieties were published by the Peruvian Ministry of Education and the Instituto de Estudios Peruanos (Escobar 1976).

At present, the multicultural and plurilingual character of Bolivia and Ecuador is duly recognized at different official levels. Ecuador furthermore has powerful Indian organizations, who give a high priority to the use of the native languages. The Colombian constitution of 1991 recognizes the cultural rights of all the native groups in the country. In Chile the

Mapuche Indians are also revindicating cultural and linguistic rights. The first experiments with bilingual education gradually developed into large-scale programs which now carry the epithet 'intercultural', thus showing the intention to preserve the native languages and cultures alongside knowledge of the national language and society. Best known are the experimental programs of bilingual education, run with German state development aid (GTZ – Deutsche Gesellschaft für technische Zusammenarbeit), that were operational in Puno (Peru) and in Quito (Ecuador) during the 1980s and 1990s, as well as the current intercultural bilingual education program PROEIB Andes in Cochabamba (Bolivia).

Although these developments give ground to optimism as to the preservation of the native languages, the reality is less cheerful. The Andean languages, *Quechua* in particular, are subject to a phenomenon that can be described as 'massive language shift'. The *Quechua* language is split up into a multitude of dialects, some of which differ considerably from each other. Therefore, some prefer to speak of '*Quechuan* languages', which is indeed more correct than the term 'dialects'. In particular, the varieties of Central Peru (*Quechua I*) are known for their great diversity and their historical interest. Precisely these Central Peruvian dialects are rapidly disappearing. Whereas in 1940 the percentage of *Quechua* speakers in the provinces of Junín, Pasco, Tarma and Yauli was still calculated at 75 % of the total population (Rowe 1947), it had fallen to less than 10 % in 1993 (Pozzi-Escot 1997: 258). In the countryside there are still children who learn the language but their number amounts to only a few percent. If *Quechua* will survive, its speakers will probably be users of four of five of the more successful dialects, most of which belong to the *Quechua IIB* and *IIC* subgroups (following Torero 1964). However, even the so far highly successful *Ayacucho dialect (Quechua IIC)* is under heavy pressure. During the period of violence of 1980–93 the population of the Peruvian department of *Ayacucho* dropped by 25 %, mainly through migration. The refugees filled the shanty towns of Lima and other coastal towns, where there is hardly any future for *Quechua* speakers. In the meantime *Quechua* is rapidly losing ground to *Spanish* in the Ayacuchan countryside (Chirinos 1999).

As we have seen, the great Andean language shift is probably due to historical causes which continue to have an effect, even though the social conditions are changing. As Cerrón-Palomino (1989: 27) puts it, "*Quechua* and *Aymara* speakers seem to have taken the project of assimilation begun by the dominating classes and made it their own." What the shift amounts to is an increase in the amount of bilingualism, coupled with a

sort of collective decision not to hand on the language to the next generation. Sometimes the shift appears to be quite abrupt. Whereas the parents' generation still has a poor command of *Spanish*, the children deny active knowledge of their parents' language and address them in *Spanish*. So, a traumatic communication gap appears to exist within the families. Since the same phenomenon of language shift affects large unorganized populations, spread out over hundreds of isolated villages and hamlets, there is very little an outsider can do about it, even with the best of intentions. In this respect, the situation of small language communities, such as those found in the Amazon region, is more favorable, because there are better possibilities to reach the community as a whole.

In the Andean countries the percentage of *Quechua* and *Aymara* speakers has decreased in relation to the total population, probably ever since the independence. At the same time, the absolute numbers of speakers of these languages have increased, but much less drastically than the national population in its totality. The Peruvian census of 1993 indicates a number of 3,199,474 of *Quechua* speakers and 420,215 *Aymara* speakers of five years and older (Godenzzi 1998) on a total population (all ages) of $\pm 23,000,000$. In 1940 the total number of *Quechua* speakers older than five was 2,444,523 and that of *Aymara* speakers 231,935 on a total population (all ages) of 6,673,111 (Rowe 1947). In spite of the increase in absolute numbers, we have seen that the situation of *Quechua* at the local or regional level can be much more dramatic, than at the national level. In the near future we may begin to observe a decrease in the absolute number of *Quechua* speakers, especially in Peru, where the situation is particularly precarious. The situation in Bolivia, with 2,400,000 *Quechua* speakers and 1,600,000 *Aymara* speakers (Albó 1995) on an estimated total population of $\pm 7,500,000$, is less dramatic. There is a considerable overlap between the figures of *Aymara* and *Quechua* speakers due to cases of bilingualism and trilingualism. The Ecuadorian situation remains unclear as a result of considerable fluctuations in the number of *Quechua* speakers (1,400,000 to 2,000,000) provided by the statistics.

5. Tables of endangered languages in each country

The languages of Venezuela and those of the Amazonian parts of Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru are not included here. For these languages I refer to Denny Moore's contribution chapter 3, this volume.

Table 1. Indigenous languages of Argentina. Data mainly based on Censabella 1999. For Tehuelche the source is Ana Fernández Garay (personal communication). Many languages have further speakers outside Argentina. The Tupi-Guaraní languages are all very closely related.

<i>Family, Languages</i>	<i>Speakers</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Trans- mission</i>	<i>Status</i>
<i>Araucanian</i>				
Mapuche	less than 60,000	40,000 to 60,000 (preservation of pre-Araucanian substratum)	locally	a, b, c
<i>Chon</i>				
Gününa	extinct since the 1960s			e
Yajich	extinct since the 1970s			e
Ona	extinct since the 1970s			e
Tehuelche, Aonek'enk	4	200	no	d
<i>Guaicuruan</i>				
Mocoví	most	3,000 ~ 5,000	yes	a—
Pilagá	most	2,000 ~ 5,000	yes	a—
Toba	most	36,000 ~ 60,000	yes	a, a—
<i>Lule-Vilela</i>				
Vilela	possibly a few speakers	11 (1974) (merged with Tobas)	no	d, e
<i>Matacoan</i>				
Chorote	most	1,200 ~ 2,100	yes	a
Chulupí, Ashluslay, Nivaclé	all	200 ~ 1,200 (more in Paraguay)	yes	a
Mataco, Wichi	all	35,000 ~ 60,000	yes	a
<i>Quechuan</i>				
Collas	10,000 ~ 20,000 (more in Bolivia)	group not well defined	yes	a—, b
Santiago del Estero	60,000 ~ 120,000	no ethnic group	yes	a

Table 1. cont.

<i>Family, Languages</i>	<i>Speakers</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Transmission</i>	<i>Status</i>
<i>Tupí-Guaraní</i>				
Chiriguano, Ava	most	15,000 ~ 21,000 (more in Bolivia)	yes	a, a-
Mbyá	all	2,500 ~ 3,500 (more in Brazil)	yes	a
Tapieté	no data	384 (more in Paraguay)		c
Guaraní correntino	100,000 or more	no ethnic group	yes	a-

Table 2. Indigenous languages of Chile. Data from various sources: Álvarez-Santullano Busch 1992; Gundermann 1994; Martinic 1989; Poblete and Salas 1997, 1999

<i>Family, Languages</i>	<i>Speakers</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Transmission</i>	<i>Status</i>
<i>Alacalufan</i>				
Kawesqar, Alacaluf	28	28	possibly	c
<i>Araucanian</i>				
Huilliche	a few 1,000		probably not	c
Mapuche	200,000 ~ 500,000	928,500 (census 1992)	yes	a-
<i>Atacameño</i>				
Atacameño, Kunza	only words and expressions are remembered	2,000		e
<i>Aymaran</i>				
Aymara	16,000	33,000 (more in Bolivia and Peru)	locally	b
<i>Chon</i>				
Ona, Selk'nam	extinct since the 1970s			e
<i>Quechuan</i>				
Quechua	no data	many outside Chile		
<i>Yahgan</i>				
Yahgan, Yamana	2 (1994)	100 (mixed)	no	d

Table 3. Indigenous languages of Paraguay. The figures for the Gran Chaco area are based on the DGEEC census of 1992 and alternative counts discussed in Melià (1997). Many groups of the Lengua-Mascoi family (all closely related) now live in mixed communities. The Tupi-Guaraní languages are all very closely related. Lyle Campbell (personal communication) observes that the number of Chorotí speakers must be substantially higher

<i>Family, Languages</i>	<i>Speakers</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Transmission</i>	<i>Status</i>
<i>Guaicuruan</i>				
Emok-Toba, Toba Qom	755	781 ~ 1,030	yes	b
<i>Lengua-Mascoi</i>				
Angaité	971	1,647	most	c
Guaná	24	84 (probably more)	mixed with other groups	d
Lengua, Enxet	9,387	9,501 ~ 13,050	most	a-
Sanapaná	789	1,063 ~ 1,358	most	b
Toba Mascoi	1,312	2,057	most	a-
<i>Matacoan</i>				
Chorotí, Manjui, Yofuajá	208	229 ~ 274 (more in Nivaclé communities)	yes	a
Chulupí, Nivaclé	7,780	7,934 ~ 12,504	yes	a
Mak'á	990	1,061	yes	a
<i>Tupi-Guaraní</i>				
Aché, Guayakí	538	639 ~ 883	yes	a
Guarayo, Guarani-eté	24	1,254 ~ 2,111	yes	c
Mbyá	2,435	4,744 ~ 10,990	yes	a
Chiripá, Nhandeva	1,930	6,918 ~ 8,602	assimilating to Paraguayan Guaraní	a-
Paí Taviterã, Kaiwá	500	8,026 ~ 8,750	assimilating to Paraguayan Guaraní	a
Tapieté	123	1,351 ~ 1,789	assimilating to Paraguayan Guaraní	d
<i>Zamucoan</i>				
Ayoreo	815	814 ~ 1,708	yes	a
Chamacoco	908	908 ~ 1,281	yes	a

Table 4. Indigenous languages of Bolivia: Highlands, Gran Chaco and Eastern plains. Data based on Albó 1995:19 and the Censo Rural Indígena de Tierras Bajas [Rural indigenous census of the Lowlands], cf. Rodríguez Bazán 2000; for Paunaca: de Haan personal communication; for Iru-Itu (Uru): Muysken personal communication

<i>Family, Languages</i>	<i>Speakers</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Transmission</i>	<i>Status</i>
<i>Aymaran</i>				
Aymara	1,600,000		yes	a, a-
<i>mixed language</i>				
Callahuaya	a few		probably not	c
<i>Uru-Chipayan</i>				
Chipaya	1,000	1,000	yes	a-
Iru-Itu, Uchumataco, Uru	1	142	no	d
<i>Quechuan</i>				
Quechua	2,400,000		yes	a
<i>Arawakan</i>				
Chané	possibly extinct (more in Argentina)			e?
Paunaca	a few		no	c
<i>Chiquitoan</i>				
Chiquitano, Besiro	5,855	47,086	locally	a-
<i>Matacoan</i>				
Mataco, Weenhayek	1,811	2,081	yes	a
<i>Tupi-Guaraní</i>				
Chiriguano, Guaraní boliviano	33,670	36,917	yes	a
Tapieté	70	74	yes?	c
<i>Zamucoan</i>				
Ayoreo	771	856	yes	a

Table 5. Indigenous languages of Peru: Highlands and coast. Data based on the 1993 census of INEI (Chirinos 2001). The figures for Aymara and Quechua have been corrected for the original exclusion of children aged between 0 to 4. The figure of Quechua II includes Amazonian Quechua speakers (c. 27,000)

<i>Family, Languages</i>	<i>Speakers</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Transmission</i>	<i>Status</i>
<i>Aymaran</i>				
Aymara	466,000		yes	a, a-
Jaqaru	725	2,000	yes	a-, b
Kawki	11		no	d
<i>Yungan</i>				
Mochica	extinct in the 1950s			e
<i>Quechuan</i>				
Quechua I	750,000		yes (locally not)	a, a-, b, c, d
Quechua II	2,675,000		yes (locally not)	a, a-, b, c, d

Table 6. Endangered Quechua varieties in Peru. Contains some examples of endangered Quechuan varieties in Peru (data from Pozzi-Escot 1998; Godenzzi 1998)

<i>Variety</i>	<i>Speakers</i>	<i>Transmission</i>
Alto Pativilca (QI)	no data	in decay
Cajamarca (QII)	10,000	locally
Chachapoyas (QII)	a few elder speakers	no
Huanca (QI)	35,000	only in a few districts
Lamas (QII)	15,000	locally
Pacaraos (separate)	a few elder speakers in group of 900	no
Yaru (QI)	38,000 (less than 10% of population)	very little transmission
Yauyos (QI)(QII): several dialects	no data	locally

Table 7. Indigenous languages of Ecuador: Highlands and Coast.
Data based on Juncosa (ed.) 1997; Haboud 1999

<i>Family, Languages</i>	<i>Speakers</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Trans- mission</i>	<i>Status</i>
<i>Barbacoan</i>				
Coaiquer, Awá, Awapit	all	2,000 ~ 3,000 (more in Colombia)	yes	a
Cayapa, Chachi, Cha'palaachi	all	7,600	yes	a
Colorado, Tsachila, Tsafiki	all	2,000	yes	a
<i>Chocoan</i>				
Emberá	all	60 (more in Colombia)	yes	a
<i>Quechuan</i>				
Quechua (Highlands)	1,405,000 ~ 2,000,000		yes	a, a-, b
Quechua (Amazonia)	14,000 ~ 30,000		yes	a

Table 8. Indigenous languages of Colombia: Highland, Coast and Llanos. Data provided by J. Landaburu and based on Arango and Sánchez 1998. Additionally, González and Rodríguez 2000

<i>Family, Languages</i>	<i>Speakers</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Trans- mission</i>	<i>Status</i>
<i>Arawakan</i>				
Achagua	most	280	yes	a-
Piapoco	all	4,470 (more in Venezuela)	yes	a
Goajiro, Wayuunaiki	all	140,000 (more in Venezuela)	yes	a
<i>Barbacoan</i>				
Coaiquer, Awapit	most	12,940		a-
Guambiano	most	18,000 ~ 20,780	yes	a-
Totoró	4	3,650	no	d
<i>Cariban</i>				
Opon-Carare	probably extinct			e?
Yucpa, Yuco	all	1,500 ~ 3,530	yes	a

Table 8. cont.

<i>Family, Languages</i>	<i>Speakers</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Trans- mission</i>	<i>Status</i>
<i>Chibchan</i>				
Barí, Dobocubí	all	3,530	yes	a
Chimila	most	900	yes	a-
Cuna, Tule	all	1,160 (more in Panamá)	yes	a
Ika, Arhuaco, Bántucua	all	8,600 ~ 14,300	yes	a
Kankuamo, Atánquez		extinct in 1970s		e
Kogui, Kaggaba	all	7,000 ~ 9,770	yes	a
Tunebo, U'wa	all	3,000 ~ 7,010	yes	a-
Wiwa, Damana, Arsario, Malayo, Guamaca, Marocasero, Sanká	all	1,850 ~ 2,800	yes	a
<i>Chocoan</i>				
Emberá	most	71,000 (more in Panamá)	yes	a
Wounaan, Waunana	all	7,970	yes	a
<i>Guahiboan</i>				
Cuiba	all	2,270 (more in Venezuela)	yes	a
Guahibo, Sikuaní	all	21,425 (more in Venezuela)	yes	a
Guayabero	all	1,060	yes	a-
Macaguane, Hitnu	all	184 ~ 542	yes	a
<i>Makú-Puinave</i>				
Puinave	all?	2,000 ~ 5,380	yes	a
<i>Paezan</i>				
Páez, Nasa Yuwe	40,000 or more	80,000 ~ 119,000	yes, locally	a, a-
<i>Quechuan</i>				
Inga(no)	all	17,860 ~ 26,000	yes	a

Table 8. cont.

<i>Family, Languages</i>	<i>Speakers</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Trans- mission</i>	<i>Status</i>
<i>Salivan</i>				
Piaroa, Dearuwa, Wo'tiheh	most	797 (more in Venezuela)	yes	a
Sáliba	in decay	1,304	no	c
<i>Sebundoy</i>				
Camsá, Sebundoy	most	4,020 ~ 4,736	yes	a
<i>Tinigua</i>				
Tinigua	2		no	d



Map 1. Hispanic South America

Added letters refer to specific dialects of Quechua I and Quechua II.

1	Mapuche	36	Chipaya
2	Gününa Yajich (Gününa Küne)	37	Iru-Itu (Uchumataco)
3	Ona (Selk'nam)	38	Chané
4	Tehuelche (Aonek'enk)	39	Paunaca
5	Mocoví	40	Chiquitano (Besiro)
6	Pilagá	41	Jaqaru
7	Toba	42	Kawki
8	Vilela	43	Mochica
9	Chorote (Chorotí)	44	Quechua I
10	Chulupí (Ashluslay, Nivaclé)	44a	Alto Pativilca
11	Mataco (Wichi, Weenhayek)	44b	Huanca
12	Quechua II (Collas)	44c	Yaru
12a	Santiago del Estero	45	Pacaraos Quechua
12b	Cajamarca	46	Coaiquer (Awá, Awapit)
12c	Chachapoyas	47	Cayapa (Chachi, Cha'palaachi)
12d	Lamas	48	Colorado (Tsachila, Tsafiki)
12e	Yauyos	49	Emberá (Catío, Chamí, Sambú)
12f	Ecuadorian Highlands Quichua	50	Achagua
12g	Ecuadorian Lowlands Quichua	51	Piapoco
12h	Inga (Ingano)	52	Goajiro (Wayuunaiki)
13	Chiriguano (Ava, Guaraní boliviano)	53	Guambiano
14	Mbyá	54	Totoró
15	Tapieté	55	Opon-Carare
16	Guaraní correntino	56	Yucpa (Yuco)
17	Kawesqar (Alacaluf)	57	Barí (Dobocubi)
18	Huilliche	58	Chimila (Ete Taara)
19	Atacameño (Kunza)	59	Cuna (Tule)
20	Aymara	60	Ika (Arhuaco, Bintucua)
21	Yahgan (Yamana)	61	Kankuamo (Atánquez)
22	Emok-Toba	62	Kogui (Kaggaba)
23	Angaité	63	Tunebo (U'wa)
24	Guaná	64	Damana (Wiwa, Arsario, Malayo Guamaca, Marocasero, Sanká)
25	Lengua	65	Wounaan (Waunana)
26	Sanapaná	66	Cuiba
27	Toba Mascoi	67	Guahibo (Sikuani)
28	Mak'á	68	Guayabero
29	Aché (Guayakí)	69	Macaguane (Hitnú)
30	Guarayo (Guarani-eté)	70	Puinave
31	Chiripa (Nhandeva)	71	Páez (Nasa Yuwe)
32	Paí Taviterã (Kaiwá)	72	Piaroa (De'aruwa, Wotiheh)
33	Ayoreo	73	Sáliba
34	Chamacoco	74	Kamsá (Sebundoy)
35	Callahuaya	75	Tinigua

References

Adelaar, Willem F. H.

- 1999 Unprotected languages: The silent death of the languages of northern Peru. In Herzfeld and Lastra (eds.) *Las Causas Sociales de la Desaparición y del Mantenimiento de las Lenguas en las Naciones de América* [Trabajos presentados en el 49º. Congreso Internacional de Americanistas, Quito, Ecuador, julio 7–11, 1997] Hermosillo, Sonora: Editorial Unison. 205–222.

Adelaar, Willem F. H., with the collaboration of Pieter C. Muysken

- 2004 *The languages of the Andes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Albó, Xavier

- 1995 *Bolivia plurilingüe: una guía para planificadores y educadores*, vol. 1–3. La Paz: CIPCA and UNICEF.

Álvarez-Santullano Busch, María Pilar

- 1992 Variedad interna y deterioro del dialecto Huilliche. *Revista de lingüística teórica y aplicada (RLA)* (Concepción–Chile) 30: 61–74.

Arango Ochoa, Raúl and Enrique Sánchez Gutiérrez

- 1998 *Los pueblos indígenas de Colombia 1997*. Bogotá: Tercer Mundo and Departamento Nacional de Planeación.

Casement, Roger

- 1988 *Putumayo: Caucho y Sangre* [Relación al Parlamento Inglés (1911)]. Quito: Ediciones Abya-Yala.

Censabella, Marisa

- 1999 *Las lenguas indígenas de la Argentina. Una mirada actual*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Universitaria de Buenos Aires.

Chirinos Rivera, Andrés

- 1999 Lealtad o utilidad de las lenguas indígenas en el Perú y Bolivia. Mirando más allá del año 2000. Lecture presented at the symposium: *In-forme sobre las lenguas del Mundo. La situación latinoamericana*. Cochabamba: UNESCO and PROEIB Andes, March 1999.

- 2001 *Atlas lingüístico del Perú*. Cuzco–Lima: Ministerio de Educación and Centro Bartolomé de Las Casas.

Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo

- 1989 Language policy in Peru: a historical overview. In Hornberger (ed.) 11–33.

Crevels, Emily and Willem F. H. Adelaar

- 2001–04 South America (online reports on endangered languages of Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Ecuador, French Guyana, Guyana, Paraguay, Peru and Suriname). In K. Matsumura (ed.), *UNESCO Red Book of Endangered Languages*. Tokyo: The International Clearing House of Endangered Languages (ICHEL) (www.tooyoo.l.u-tokyo.ac.jp/ichel/archive/southamerica.html).

- Escobar, Alberto (ed.)
 1976 *Serie de seis Gramáticas referenciales y seis Diccionarios de consulta de la lengua quechua*. Lima: Ministerio de Educación and Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- Godenzzi, Juan Carlos
 1998 Transfondo: 'Cultura de paz, bilingüismo e interculturalidad.' *Coiné, Boletín informativo de temas lingüísticos del Departamento de Humanidades de la Universidad del Pacífico*. Año 1, No. 2. Lima: Universidad del Pacífico.
- González de Pérez, María Stella and María Luisa Rodríguez de Montes
 2000 *Lenguas indígenas de Colombia. Una visión descriptiva*. Santafé de Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.
- Gray, Andrew
 1996 *The Arakmbut: mythology, spirituality, and history in an Amazonian community*. (*Arakmbut Indians of Amazonian Peru*, 1). Providence: Berghahn.
- Gundermann Kröll, Hans
 1994 Cuántos hablan en Chile la lengua aymara? *Revista de lingüística teórica y aplicada (RLA)* (Concepción-Chile) 32: 125–139.
- Haboud, Marleen
 1999 La situación lingüística de las lenguas en Ecuador. Lecture presented at the symposium: *Informe sobre las lenguas del Mundo. La situación latinoamericana*. Cochabamba: UNESCO and PROEIB Andes, March 1999.
- Hornberger, N. H. (ed.)
 1989 *Bilingual education and language planning in Indigenous Latin America*. (*International journal of the sociology of language*, 77). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Juncosa, José E. (ed.)
 1997 *Monografías mínimas del Ecuador. Tsachila – Chachis – Cholo – Cofán – Awá-Coaiquer*. Serie Pueblos del Ecuador N° 14. Quito: Abya-Yala.
- Klein, Harriet E. Manelis and Louisa R. Stark
 1985 Indian languages of the Paraguayan Chaco. In Klein and Stark (eds.) *South American Indian languages. Retrospect and prospect*. Austin: University of Texas Press. 802–845.
- Martínez Sarasola, Carlos
 1992 *Nuestros paisanos los Indios. Vida, historia y destino de las comunidades indígenas en la Argentina*. Buenos Aires: Emecé.
- Martinic, M.
 1989 Los canoeros de la Patagonia occidental. Población histórica y distribución geográfica (siglos XIX y XX). El fin de una etnia. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* (Paris) 75: 35–61.

Marzal, Manuel M.

- 1992 *Utopía posible. Indios y jesuitas en la América colonial (1549–1767)*. 2 Vols. Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, Fondo Editorial.

Melià, Bartomeu

- 1997 *Pueblos indígenas en el Paraguay*. Fernando de la Mora, Paraguay: Dirección General de Estadística, Encuestas y Censos (DGEEC).

Pi Hugarte, Renzo

- 1993 *Los indios de Uruguay*. Colección Pueblos y Lenguas Indígenas 3. Quito: Ediciones Abya-Yala [Originally Madrid: Ediciones MAP-FRE].

Poblete M., María Teresa and Adalberto Salas

- 1997 El aymara de Chile (fonología, textos, léxico). *Filología y Lingüística* (San José: Universidad de Costa Rica.) 23,1: 121–203; 23,2: 95–138.
 1999 Fonemas yamana (yagan). Estructura fonológica de la palabra. *Revista de lingüística teórica y aplicada (RLA)* (Concepción-Chile) 37: 107–122.

Pozzi-Escot, Inés

- 1998 *El Multilingüismo en el Perú*. Cuzco: Centro de Estudios Regionales Andinos “Bartolomé de Las Casas” and PROEIB Andes.

Rodríguez Bazán, Luis Antonio

- 2000 Estado de las lenguas indígenas del Oriente, Chaco y Amazonía bolivianos. In Queixalós and Renault-Lescure (eds.) *As Línguas Amazônicas Hoje* [The Amazonian languages today] São Paulo: Instituto Socioambiental. 129–149.

Rowe, John Howland

- 1947 The Distribution of Indians and Indian languages in Peru. *The Geographical Review* (New York) 37: 202–215.

Santos, Fernando

- 1992 *Etnohistoria de la Alta Amazonía, Siglos XV–XVIII*. Colección 500. Años Nº 46. Quito: Abya-Yala, Movimientos Laicos para América Latina (MLAL).

Torero Fernández de Córdova, Alfredo

- 1964 Los dialectos quechuas. *Anales Científicos de la Universidad Agraria* (Lima: Universidad Agraria de La Molina.) 2: 446–478.

Triana y Antorveza, Humberto

- 1987 *Las lenguas indígenas en la historia social del Nuevo Reino de Granada*. Biblioteca “Ezequiel Uricoechea” Nº 2. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.

Viegas Barros, J. Pedro

- n. d. *La lengua de los Chonos del sur de Chile. Una comparación con el Qawasqar y el Yagan*. Buenos Aires. (unpublished manuscript)

Chapter 3

Endangered Languages of Lowland Tropical South America¹

Denny Moore

The languages discussed in this chapter are found in a vast region which roughly corresponds to lowland South America: the Amazonian regions of Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, and Colombia, as well as all of Brazil, Venezuela, Guyana, Suriname, and French Guiana. Present figures indicate the presence of about 300 indigenous and creole languages in this region, though the number would be less if mutually intelligible dialects were not listed as separate languages. The available figures (and those presented here) are unreliable, but give some idea of the situation of these languages which can be compared to the situation in other world areas.

South America is noted for linguistic diversity. Nichols (1990: 479) estimates the continent has about 90 linguistic stocks, conservatively defined, compared to 14 stocks in Africa. Kaufman and Golla (2001: 48) estimate 50 language families and 50 isolates in South America. Lizarralde (2001: 266) estimates that there were “possibly 1,200 indigenous groups” in native South America before European contact, and that 65 percent of the native languages became extinct. Kaufman and Golla (2001: 48) estimate 550 native languages in pre-Columbian South America, of which 300 survive. The Andean highlands are rather different from the lowlands culturally, linguistically, and even genetically (Simoni et. al. 2001). The earliest pottery in the New World (8,000 to 6,000 B.P.) is in Amazonia (Roosevelt 1994: 5). According to Roosevelt (1994), the floodplains of Amazonia supported dense populations organized in chiefdoms which were quite different from the surviving indigenous cultures in the present-day tropical forest. The arrival of the Europeans ultimately decimated the chiefdoms, though there was a long and eventful period of interaction between them and the Europeans.

The surviving native lowland societies are mainly in the hinterlands, where sustained contact has been relatively recent. In Eastern Brazil, for example, few native groups still speak their language. Rodrigues (1993) estimates that 75% of the native languages of Brazil have already disappeared. There are still indigenous groups in Amazonia who live with no

contact with national society. Even today these groups usually lose two-thirds of their population from diseases when they enter into sustained contact. This mass death is completely unnecessary since the diseases responsible for it are all preventable or treatable, but the necessary assistance measures are seldom carried out, and both the general public and specialists, such as anthropologists, often accept the deaths as routine and normal.

Scientific knowledge of the languages of lowland South America is still limited. In Brazil, for example, according to the estimates of Franchetto (2000: 171) there is good description for only 19% of the native languages, some description for 64%, and nothing for 13%. The national capacity for linguistic research varies greatly from country to country, with Brazil, Colombia, and Venezuela seemingly the most developed in scientific linguistics (leaving aside French Guiana, which is formally a part of France and undergoing recent development). In Brazil the scientific investigation of indigenous languages only began in the second half of the twentieth century but is developing at an accelerating pace. In the last 15 years 23 doctoral dissertations involving indigenous languages were defended in Brazilian graduate programs (including one by a foreign missionary linguist). Of these, 16 included analysis of language structure. Aside from these, 17 doctoral dissertations involving indigenous Brazilian languages were defended in graduate programs abroad (including three by foreign scientists). Of these, 15 included analysis of language structure. Characteristically for the region, the number of linguists with only an M.A. is disproportionately high: about one hundred M.A. theses involving indigenous languages have been defended in Brazil in the last 15 years.

Progress in the development of national centers for linguistics in the region increases the national capacity for dealing with the question of endangered languages and their documentation, though much more remains to be done. At least in Brazil there has been too little respect for linguistic description, which is often disparaged, more prestige being attributed to partial descriptions with theoretical pretensions. The first published complete description of an indigenous language by a Brazilian linguist in decades is the grammar of *Kamaiurá* by Seki (2000). Real dictionaries (not wordlists) and text collections are still rare in Brazil. Recent support by the *Volkswagen Foundation* for projects documenting the *Kuíkúro*, *Trumái*, and *Awetí* languages of the Xingu is having an excellent impact on the level of documentation being carried out.

In my experience, the nature of scientific underdevelopment is not generally understood. Underdevelopment is not the lack of something; rather it is a positive system which intends to maintain itself and which will re-