

PERSPECTIVES

Language vitality: Theorizing language loss, shift, and reclamation (Response to Mufwene)

CLAIRE BOWERN

Yale University and Endangered Language Fund

Salikoko Mufwene's (2017) 'Language vitality' ranges across many topics related to language endangerment and loss (LEL). In this response, I agree that linguists do need a theory of the reasons LEL occurs, if we are to be effective in aiding communities with language maintenance and revitalization. I argue that there is an existing, important literature on language loss and language revitalization and reclamation. Finally, I argue that there is good reason to believe that indigenous minority language endangerment is worth considering as a distinct category of LEL.

Keywords: language endangerment, ethnographic fieldwork, language maintenance, Native American languages, Australian Aboriginal languages, language shift

1. INTRODUCTION. Salikoko Mufwene's (2017) 'Language vitality: The weak theoretical underpinnings of what can be an exciting research area' is a rich and thought-provoking position paper with much to discuss. Topics range across the use of endangered language data in mainstream historical linguistics, parallels between language and species endangerment (or rather parallels in the study of ecology and LANGUAGE ENDANGERMENT AND LOSS (LEL)), why languages become endangered, linguists' 'investment in language advocacy' (p. e203), and the use of the term 'indigenous' as a focus for LEL advocates. At the core, Mufwene argues that the LEL literature has focused too heavily on a particular type of community and language endangerment scenario, and that in order to understand language endangerment, LEL scholars need to also study languages with larger numbers of speakers and undergoing different degrees of language shift.

I agree, without reserve, that linguists need a theory of the reasons LEL occurs, if we are to be effective in aiding communities with language maintenance and revitalization. I also agree that a priori restricting the domain of study to a particular set of languages will limit our understanding of the subject we are studying. But I disagree with several of the premises of Mufwene's article, beginning with the idea that work on LEL has focused exclusively (or even primarily) on the indigenous minority languages of the colonial world. Furthermore, I argue that there ALREADY EXISTS an important literature on theories of language loss, language revitalization, and reclamation that looks at these questions from both general modeling perspectives and anthropological/ethnographic ones. We are not flying blind. Finally, I argue that there is good reason to believe that indigenous minority language endangerment is worth considering as a distinct category of LEL.

I begin this response in §2 with a brief summary of the state of knowledge of causes of language endangerment and loss, and the underpinnings of current theorizing on LEL. I then discuss in §3 several points that emerge from Mufwene's position paper: the role of individual agency and choice in language shift/language loss (§3.1), the reference of the term 'indigenous' (§3.2) and the extent to which the literature on LEL focuses only on a few types of language endangerment (§3.3), the role of language as a marker of ethnic identity (§3.4), and a few ways in which working with highly endangered languages in the United States and Australia needs special consideration (§3.5). I address these questions from the perspective of an 'outsider' who has primarily worked

with the last¹ elderly speakers in minority communities in Australia and language reclamation programs in North America.

2. WHY DO LANGUAGES BECOME ENDANGERED? It is one of those factoids brought up at dinner parties and receptions with university deans and provosts that 10% of the world's population speak roughly 90% of the world's languages (Lewis et al. 2013), and that about half of the world's languages are currently endangered. From studying the languages that have ceased to be spoken over the last hundred years, we have a picture of the different ways in which LEL proceeds.²

LEL may be divided into factors that fragment or destroy communities versus those that influence communities' language use. It is impossible to study the indigenous languages of the colonial world without repeatedly confronting the violence that has fragmented so many. This violence and subsequent racism continues and is well documented elsewhere (cf. Reynolds 1987 for Australia, for example). Under this notion of violence we can include not only settler colonial battles and physical attempts to displace or annihilate communities, but also continuing 'structural violence' (Farmer 2004, Trigger 1992): for example, the ways in which indigenous communities are negatively affected by government health, educational, and law enforcement structures. This history is also testament to resilience, resistance, and survival. Given this history, too, it is understandable that indigenous language advocates, communities, and scholars might wish to separate work on indigenous language endangerment from work on heritage languages or dialect shift, where these dynamics are different.³

There are at least three strands of approaches to studying LEL through language shift. Many of these ideas come under the rubric of LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE, a term that is by no means confined to endangered languages. First is LANGUAGE TRANSMISSION and the circumstances under which languages in a multilingual setting are or are not passed on. That is, who are children paying attention to when they acquire language, and which language(s) do they acquire? The second is the community-level factors that lead to LANGUAGE SHIFT, such as the role of top-down political policies mandating language use. The third is LANGUAGE POLICY and language support, particularly in education. Separate strands of research and praxis involve language documentation (recording, analyzing, and compiling corpora of languages), language revitalization (using existing records to create new speakers, contexts for language use, and new words in the language), and language contact (how languages are structurally affected by speakers' exposure to and use of multiple languages).

Here, in brief, is my current understanding of these topics. First, children acquire language from the speakers (or signers) they are exposed to (Ochs & Schieffelin 1982, Stanford 2015, among many others). This usually means that they learn language from their caregivers and slightly older peers. They first learn from their caregivers, but at some point around the time they start school, the peer group gains increasing importance (Romaine 1984). This makes sense if we think of the function of language as in

¹ I do not mean 'last' in Davis's (2017) sense of 'lasting', but as a group of individuals whose descendants have grown up under very different circumstances, with different relationships and usage of their ancestral language(s) and English from other members in their community.

² For other literature on this topic, see Bradley & Bradley 2013, Grenoble & Whaley 1998, Hale et al. 1992, Nettle & Romaine 2000, and Tsunoda 2006.

³ This is not to deny that heritage language speakers also suffer prejudice and pressures to assimilate to majority cultures.

part a group-signaling device; children at this stage of development are becoming more aware of peer structures and have started to form their own peer groups, learning how to use language to mark and reinforce group affiliations and thus beginning to accommodate to one another. This means for LEL that language preservation entirely in the home is unlikely to lead to long-term language maintenance, unless there is also a peer group with whom the children can interact in the language. This theorizing has led to various programs for language support to increase, foster, and support intergenerational and peer language transmission beyond the immediate family. The most well known of these programs is probably the language nests (Hinton 2011, Mita 2007), first begun in New Zealand to support families bringing up Māori children. Other programs designed to help peer groups and family support include the Myaamia family language days (Baldwin & Olds 2007) and Mohawk adult immersion programs (Maracle 2002).

Second, a variety of social and demographic factors lead to LEL. The most comprehensive global survey of such factors is Amano et al. 2014. In that paper, the authors examine three symptoms of language endangerment: population size, population growth or decline, and geographical speaker ranges (the size of the area that speakers of the language inhabit). They compile this information for 6,359 languages and link it to various cultural and socioeconomic indices from the field of economics. They provide discussion of interactions of factors that may lead to language endangerment risk, including total speaker numbers and economic development indices. They do this in order to identify regions both where languages are not yet highly endangered but are likely to become so, and where language shift is occurring particularly rapidly. Other work on this topic from a very different perspective is Anne Kandler's (Kandler 2009, Kandler & Steele 2008, Kandler, Unger, & Steele 2010); she uses demographic modeling from ecology and biology to study general patterns of linguistic and cultural competition. For example, she uses demographic models to model the tipping points for shift between stable multilingualism and language loss.

Minority and indigenous language education is also a well-theorized area. Teachers of indigenous languages already utilize insights from nonendangered languages to address issues of curriculum planning (see Amery & Buckskin 2012). It is true that many of the practitioners of language documentation have little or no qualifications in language pedagogy, and this is a problem. The rhetoric of language documentation in serving multiple constituents (writing grammars 'for the community'), for example, has shown at times a startlingly superficial grasp of the practicalities of using such materials in classrooms. This is not a novel point, however; linguists have been talking about this problem for nearly twenty years (Bowern 2008, Jones & Ogilvie 2013, Tsunoda 2006, and much earlier Reyhner 1999, Reyhner et al. 2003). This problem is also beginning to be addressed, as better classroom support is developed for minority and indigenous languages, and as more speakers of the languages acquire teaching qualifications.

Much educational theory and pedagogy has in mind very specific learning contexts that are rather different from prototypical indigenous languages of Australia and the US. Perhaps most basic is the notion of FOREIGN language instruction in curriculum frameworks. These curriculum documents are imbued with a notional function of a 'foreign' language, as can be seen, for example, in the State of Massachusetts's foreign language curriculum framework.⁴ In this document, for example, a distinction is drawn between modern and classical languages, governed in part by the purpose of students learning those languages (p. 6):

⁴ Available from <http://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/foreign/1999.pdf>, accessed June 1, 2017.

In modern languages, direct communication with native speakers is the ultimate goal. In Latin, however, communicative skills are developed in Latin and at the same time communicative skills in English are consciously developed. Students learn Spanish primarily to communicate in Spanish with Spanish-speaking people. In contrast, students learn Latin to have access to the mind and spirit of the Romans (and through them the Greeks), to gain awareness of their cultural heritage, and to improve their ability to communicate in English.

Now, of course, all of these curriculum discussions assume that the participants are working face to face. There is a growing amount of work on the digital and web presence of endangered and minority languages, from Icelandic (cf. Hálfðanarson 2005, Holmarsdóttir 2001) and Hawaiian (Warschauer et al. 1997) to Noongar (Buchanan et al. 2016, 2017). There is work on language support for far-flung communities. I do not think anyone has the expectation that a ‘word of the day’ phone app will produce new speakers of a language, but such work does speak to the role of language in ethnic identity and the varying ways in which language marks ethnicity. In short, the fact that some groups do not use language as a marker of ethnic identity is largely irrelevant to those that do. It is of course true in the abstract that language is only one marker of cultural identity, but it is a very salient one (see also further §3.4 below).

Thus in summary, there is a theory of language maintenance, language shift, and policy work that has a long history going back at least to Fishman (Eastman 1984, Fishman 2001, Fishman & García 2010). While we can always think harder, the field of LEL is not at all atheoretical.⁵

3. INDIGENEITY, ETHNIC IDENTITY, AND AGENCY IN LANGUAGE LOSS.

3.1. AGENCY AND PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY. The previous section discussed language policies that operate to make it easier for communities to speak an endangered language. That is, they are aimed at creating supportive environments and social networks for endangered language community members, to support people who speak that language. But as Mufwene points out, this overlooks the factors at an individual level that may also play a role in language maintenance and shift. For example, he says that ‘the success of such [LEL] efforts depends largely on whether a population wishes to save their language (variety) from the threat of another or does not care’ (p. e202). Of course, individuals have choices about what languages they learn and speak, but it would be idle to claim that those choices are free choices. It underestimates the time and effort needed to learn a language (for an adult), for example. A person might wish to learn their ancestral language but have very little time available for it (and the converse claim that if it is really important, they will make time, is a claim from the position of privilege of good job security and salary). Even when the community-wide attitude toward the language is positive, structural barriers exist that may shape or severely limit speakers’ choices. For example, Yaman (2017) interviewed Basque speakers about their language options and experiences in speaking Basque. They found repeatedly that even young Basque people who were politically active and keen to speak their language as much as possible, in a region where Basque language knowledge is overall high, still faced daily barriers in doing so. Davis (2017:44–45) analyzes endangered language discourse in the press and points out the ways in which Native American communities in particular are blamed for their ‘choices’:

⁵ Mufwene suggests that LEL practitioners have had nothing to say about mixed languages. I find this surprising, since there is a healthy literature on ‘young people’s varieties’ (e.g. Lee 1987) and their relationship to creole formation; in Australia this work is led by Carmel O’Shannessy and Felicity Meakins, building on a body of work that goes back to Schmidt’s (1985) *Young people’s Dyrbal*.

Such articles never lament the decline or demise of Indigenous sovereignty or autonomy, the loss of political, economic, or geographic stability and power, or even the strong correspondence of language attrition with the actual necropolitical dynamics in marginalised communities.

One remark of Mufwene's cannot pass without comment. It concerns the role of boarding schools in linguistic oppression and whether their effect has been exaggerated. Mufwene credits Leap (2012) with the argument that the role of boarding schools in suppressing Native American languages has been overstated. I disagree with Mufwene's reading of this work. For example, Mufwene suggests that children 'were apparently under pressure to speak their mother tongues when they returned home on vacation, and they often managed to speak them secretly among themselves at the boarding schools' (p. e210). The relevant material from Leap (2012:158–59) is worth quoting in full:

Indian student descriptions of boarding school life and boarding school language policies assure us that conditions in these schools were severe, intimidating, and (under some circumstances) life-threatening. We can understand why, under such circumstances, students who had not been proficient in English when they arrived at these schools became speakers of English in these settings. It is important to realize, however, that learning English did not always come at the expense of the students' ancestral language proficiency, nor did it indicate that Indian students were now devaluing the importance of ancestral language fluency in their lives.

Leap (2012:159–60) then goes on to give two examples of ways in which particular students found creative ways around boarding school rules that allowed them to continue to use their languages, *DESPITE* the conditions they found themselves in.⁶ The boarding school language policies did not lead to immediate language shift for all communities. But the general setup—a large (though unknown) percentage of children taken off reservations, often far from their families, to be policed by both staff and peers to act in a particular way—is indicative of the very type of language ecology that restricts language choice and disrupts language transmission.⁷ This is precisely the type of situation where to argue that children 'have a choice' in what language they speak is to deny the realities of the contexts of their 'decisions'. Just because a child (or anyone else, for that matter) chooses a path that minimizes their exposure to physical violence, it does not mean that they did not *ALSO* value their native language and that they willingly switched to English.

3.2. WHO IS 'INDIGENOUS'? As Mufwene notes, the term 'indigenous' came into English in the meaning of native to a particular place, or 'born or produced naturally in a land or region' (*Oxford English Dictionary*). However, the term also has a specific definition in the context of the United Nations, where it refers particularly to minority groups affected by colonization.⁸ This definition clearly encompasses Aboriginal people in Australia and Native American, First Nations, and Alaska Native peoples in the US and Canada. It applies less clearly in mainland Europe (except perhaps to Basque and Kalaallisut) and would not apply to Bantu peoples in Africa. The Indigenous Peo-

⁶ Remember also that Leap's discussion of boarding schools is in the context of the formation of Indian English—he charts the ways in which boarding school both disrupted communities and brought English into Native American communities.

⁷ Not least, consider that even the 1928 Meriam report (Meriam & Work 1928) noted that students died in Indian boarding schools at a rate six times that of other boarding schools.

⁸ Compare, for example, the UN report on the World's Indigenous Peoples, or the UN's Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (where *indigenous* is not defined in the document but clearly refers to minority groups adversely affected by European colonization): http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf, accessed June 1, 2017.

ples of Africa Coordinating Committee defines ‘indigenous’ in the African context as hunter-gatherer, nomadic pastoralist, and drylands horticulturalists, and says that this definition is tied to characteristics that include ‘economic marginalization rooted in colonialism’.⁹

To get a sense of how the term is used beyond the immediate sphere of linguistic-centered endangered language research, I looked for examples of types of groups who are categorized as ‘indigenous’ in different places. For example, Wikipedia has a subcategory for pages relating to ‘indigenous peoples of Africa’. The *Urban dictionary* includes a number of offensive entries (particularly relating to indigenous women) and blends of *indigenous* with other words. These relate particularly to North America. The online interface to the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA)¹⁰ gives collocation frequencies; the most frequent terms to collocate with *indigenous* are *people(s)* and *population*. The most frequent geographical designation to collocate with *indigenous* is actually *African*, followed by *European* and then *Australian* and *Mexico*. Looking within COCA at the collocates with the phrase *indigenous African*, the most frequent results are *Xhosa*, *Igbo*, *Oromo*, and *Zulu*: three Niger-Congo languages and a Cushitic language. This suggests that contemporary colloquial use of the term ‘indigenous’ is not restricted to its UN definition.

3.3. IS THE LEL LITERATURE JUST ABOUT ‘INDIGENOUS’ LANGUAGES? I disagree that the literature and practices around language endangerment have been focused purely on ‘indigenous’ languages, narrowly defined in the UN context. I take as evidence several pieces of information.

First, consider publications about specific languages in *Language Documentation & Conservation*, a premier journal related to language endangerment, its consequences, and endangered language documentation, published by the University of Hawai‘i. Special publications (SPs) of this journal have focused on endangered languages in Europe (SP 9) and South Asia (SP 7); SP 1 is a special volume on documenting and revitalizing languages of the Austronesian family. The last three years of *Language Documentation & Conservation* include articles about endangered languages from all over the world. Stated language areas include North and South America, Australia, Malaysia, India, Central America, Africa, Asia, New Guinea, China, Canada, and Nigeria, with the majority of articles being about languages of North America, Australia, and Papua New Guinea. This might be seen to reflect a focus on languages in Australia and the US, but it also suggests that the field views LEL as by no means restricted to languages from those countries.¹¹

Another potential metric of the association of particular languages with the term ‘endangered’ comes from grants. The Endangered Languages Documentation Programme (ELDP; <http://www.eldp.net/>) has funded grants from all over the world, as detailed on their ‘grants awarded’ page, and the Endangered Language Fund (ELF; <http://www.endangeredlanguagefund.org/>) also supports endangered languages. The ELDP is based in the UK and primarily provides grants to academic institutions; the ELF is based in the US and funds a range of programs related to language documentation and revitalization, and grantees are communities, academics, and individuals. ELF’s 200+

⁹ <http://www.ipacc.org.za/en/africa%E2%80%99s-indigenous-people.html>, accessed June 1, 2017.

¹⁰ <https://corpus.byu.edu/coca/>

¹¹ Compare also Bower and Warner’s (2015) list of types of language documentation environment, where indigenous languages of the US and Australia are only one type of speech community linguists might be involved with.

grants have supported projects in sixty-two countries, including countries in Europe, Africa, and the Middle East.

Finally, Mufwene suggests that there is a ‘framing of LEL as deleterious almost exclusively to “indigenous peoples” ’ (p. e203). There is a strand of work in LEL that refers to language loss as a loss to science, perhaps embodied most succinctly in Ken Hale’s description of language loss as like ‘dropping a bomb on ... the Louvre’¹² (cf. also Moore et al. 2010 and the discussion of ‘extractive’ language in Davis 2017). While Mufwene suggests that minority languages of Europe are absent or underrepresented in talk of language endangerment, Basque is well represented in the LEL literature, in work by Fishman (2001), Romaine (2000), Tsunoda (2006), and others. In short, I simply do not see a focus on ‘indigenous’ languages (in the narrow sense) to the exclusion of other endangered languages in the literature on LEL.

3.4. LANGUAGE AND ETHNIC IDENTITY REVISITED. Mufwene talks about an emotional connection to language, and that not all groups tie their identity to language in identical ways. Emotional connections to language are everywhere. We see them in responses to misplaced punctuation and behavior that gives rise to terms like ‘grammar Nazi’. We see them in the publicity surrounding the Scripps™ spelling bee. We see these emotional responses in the fear that some English speakers show to Arabic script, and in the retaliation that other English speakers show with tote bags with Arabic on them, even if they cannot read what the tote bag says.¹³ It should therefore be unsurprising that members of minority communities also have emotional responses to language use, even if language is not, of itself, an integral marker of ethnic identity. Linguists working on endangered languages are privileged to witness the emotion that both language loss and language reclamation provoke, from delight at having someone to talk to, to anger and dismay that the linguist recording the language is a member of the ethnic group whose actions directly led to the language becoming endangered in the first place. The same group who vilified the minority language and its speakers as a threat now celebrate it as a curiosity, or as evidence of ‘the oldest continuous culture in the world’. In short, emotive responses to language are utterly embedded in human culture.

Mufwene provides examples of communities where language is not a crucial marker of ethnic identity. Fishman & García 2010 discusses this topic in detail and is one of the many books curiously not cited in Mufwene’s position piece (see also Bradley & Bradley 2013). In short, just as languages vary, the role that language plays in ethnic identity varies around the world as well. Here again I find Mufwene’s dismissal of ethnic identity puzzling. If ‘[l]abels such as *Italian-American* or *German-American* today have to do more with genetic ancestry than with cultural retentions’ (p. e206), why is the Saint Patrick’s Day parade so important in New England? Why are Wisconsin and Texas so famous for their beer? Why is Columbus Day such a big deal in New Haven’s Italian community? Why is my fifth-generation (English-)Australian family’s Christmas dinner still plum pudding, turkey with all the trimmings, and other food uniquely unsuited to Australian summer?

3.5. ADDITIONAL POINTS. Before concluding, I have a few small additional points to make. One is in regard to Mufwene’s comment that ‘American cities have no Native American neighborhoods’ (p. e211). This is not entirely accurate. US census data from

¹² Obituary on Kenneth Hale. *The Economist*, November 1, 2001. <http://www.economist.com/node/842743>, accessed October 1, 2017.

¹³ See, for example, <https://rps-mafia.myshopify.com/collections/frontpage/products/the-bag>, accessed June 1, 2017.

2015 shows census tracts within several larger cities—Minneapolis, Los Angeles, and Tucson, for example—with concentrations of Native American households.¹⁴ On Long Island, the Unkechaug Reservation is a city block in Mastic, NY. Where I live in New Haven, CT, there was a Quinnipiac neighborhood (the area formerly part of the Quinnipiac reservation) around Fairmont Avenue in Fair Haven. In Brooklyn, ‘Little Caughnawaga’ had many Mohawk families. While not denying that Native American neighborhoods are less obvious in American urban landscapes than neighborhoods of other ethnic groups, it is not correct to say that there are no Native American neighborhoods in US cities, and therefore that this explains differences in patterns of language transmission and shift.

Second, there are both ethical and practical considerations of working with very small communities that make LEL work in many indigenous communities distinct. To take just a few examples from my personal experience, when preparing language planning and writing materials, I am usually writing not in general terms, but for specific individuals. It is probable that I will know every student who will make use of the materials that are being compiled over the next few years. This makes the projects very personal and increases the sense of obligation. More generally, such work raises ethical issues that are either absent or different in larger (and nonendangered) language communities (Rice 2006).

Third, LEL work with highly endangered languages is often portrayed as surrounded by the mystique of ‘saving the language’. Examples are not hard to find in the media.¹⁵ This is a trope that, I think, academic linguists reject and are mostly embarrassed by, but it is nonetheless perpetuated by popular news outlets. It reinforces an ‘Indiana Jones-like’ (Bowern 2008) view of what fieldwork is and the role that academic linguists have in researched communities, a view that is offensive to language communities and assumes that no researchers come from indigenous communities (which is false). Such portrayals are embedded, of course, in a history of colonial interaction that intrudes everywhere.

4. CONCLUSION: IS LANGUAGE SHIFT MALADAPTIVE? Mufwene asks whether it is necessarily a bad thing if speakers shift languages. I cannot answer that for all cases. My own work with endangered language speakers has been predicated on it being **SPEAKERS’ GENUINE CHOICE** as to how they want to engage with their ancestral language. That is, if language is an important part of their identity, it is important that their access to language materials recorded by linguists be facilitated in a genuine and meaningful way. That does not mean that they should be forced to be speakers of their ancestral language, or not learn another language, but it does mean that it is my responsibility—as a linguist who has a long-term job **BECAUSE OF** my work on those languages—to use my professional expertise to facilitate community-driven reclamation projects. Language is not important to everyone, but it is to some, and LEL linguists have many professional skills they can use to help individuals and communities with language reclamation. Given that language reclamation in small communities has been shown to have positive health effects (Whalen et al. 2016), this provides some indication that, indeed, LEL is

¹⁴ I thank Colleen Fitzgerald for suggesting this approach. The relevant census figures are available from <http://www.census.gov> (accessed June 1, 2017).

¹⁵ <https://www.technologyreview.com/s/409990/saving-a-language/>; <http://articles.latimes.com/2013/mar/23/local/la-me-mien-dictionary-20130324>; <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/13/us/in-california-saving-a-language-that-predates-spanish-and-english.html>; <http://www.aljazeera.com/programmes/livingthelanguage/2012/04/20124161467967300.html> (all accessed June 1, 2017).

‘maladaptive’ (in Mufwene’s terms); or, put more positively, language reclamation is worth fostering.

In summary, language vitality is an exciting research field, and language endangerment is a crucial part of it. Linguists could certainly consider the implications of their LEL rhetoric better (Davis 2017, Hill 2002, Perley 2012). Further work can only serve to clarify the different ways in which language endangerment, language loss, language maintenance, and language reclamation proceed in the large number of affected communities around the world.

REFERENCES

- AMANO, TATSUYA; BRODY SANDEL; HEIDI EAGER; EDOUARD BULTEAU; JENS-CHRISTIAN SVENNING; BO DALSGAARD; CARSTEN RAHBK; RICHARD G. DAVIES; and WILLIAM J. SUTHERLAND. 2014. Global distribution and drivers of language extinction risk. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 281(1793):20141574. DOI: 10.1098/rspb.2014.1574.
- AMERY, ROB, and JACK BUCKSKIN. 2012. Handing on the teaching of Kurna language to Kurna youth. *Australian Aboriginal Studies* 2.31–41.
- BALDWIN, DARYL, and JULIE OLDS. 2007. Miami Indian language and cultural research at Miami University. *Beyond red power: American Indian politics and activism since 1900*, ed. by Daniel Cobb and Loretta Fowler, 280–90. Santa Fe, NM: SAR Press.
- BOWERN, CLAIRE. 2008. *Linguistic fieldwork: A practical guide*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- BOWERN, CLAIRE, and NATASHA WARNER. 2015. ‘Lone wolves’ and collaboration: A reply to Crippen & Robinson (2013). *Language Documentation & Conservation* 9.59–85. Online: <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/24634>.
- BRADLEY, DAVID, and MAYA BRADLEY. 2013. *Language endangerment and language maintenance: An active approach*. Oxford: Routledge.
- BUCHANAN, JENNIE; LEN COLLARD; INGRID CUMMING; DAVID PALMER; KIM SCOTT; and JOHN HARTLEY. 2016. Kura koorliny—Introduction: What is the project? *Cultural Science Journal* 9(1).1–21. Online: <http://cultural-science.org/journal/index.php/culturalscience/article/view/97>.
- BUCHANAN, JENNIE; LEN COLLARD; INGRID CUMMING; DAVID PALMER; KIM SCOTT; and JOHN HARTLEY. 2017. Noongapedia karnany balang—Responses to challenges. *Cultural Science Journal* 9(1).158–75. Online: <http://cultural-science.org/journal/index.php/culturalscience/article/view/106>.
- DAVIS, JENNY L. 2017. Resisting rhetorics of language endangerment: Reclamation through Indigenous language survivance. *Language Documentation and Description* 14.37–58. Online: <http://www.e-publishing.org/PID/151>.
- EASTMAN, CAROL. 1984. Language, ethnic identity and change. *Linguistic minorities, policies and pluralism*, ed. by John Edwards, 259–76. London: Academic Press. DOI: 10.1016/B978-0-12-232760-5.50016-9.
- FARMER, PAUL. 2004. An anthropology of structural violence. *Current Anthropology* 45(3). 305–25. DOI: 10.1086/382250.
- FISHMAN, JOSHUA A. (ed.) 2001. *Can threatened languages be saved? Reversing language shift, revisited: A 21st century perspective*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- FISHMAN, JOSHUA A., and OFELIA GARCÍA. 2010. *Handbook of language and ethnic identity*, vol. 1. New York: Oxford University Press.
- GRENOBLE, LENORE A., and LINDSAY J. WHALEY. 1998. Toward a typology of language endangerment. *Endangered languages: Language loss and community response*, ed. by Lenore A. Grenoble and Lindsay J. Whaley, 22–54. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- HALE, KEN; MICHAEL KRAUSS; LUCILLE J. WATAHOMIGIE; AKIRA Y. YAMAMOTO; COLETTE CRAIG; LAVERNE MASAYESVA JEANNE; and NORA C. ENGLAND. 1992. Endangered languages. *Language* 68(1).1–42. DOI: 10.2307/416368.
- HÁLFANARSON, GUHMUNDUR. 2005. From linguistic patriotism to cultural nationalism: Language and identity in Iceland. *Languages and identities in historical perspective*, ed. by Ann Katherine Isaacs, 55–67. Pisa: Edizioni Plus.

- HILL, JANE H. 2002. 'Expert rhetorics' in advocacy for endangered languages: Who is listening, and what do they hear? *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 12(2).119–33. DOI: 10.1525/jlin.2002.12.2.119.
- HINTON, LEANNE. 2011. Language revitalization and language pedagogy: New teaching and learning strategies. *Language and Education* 25(4).307–18. DOI: 10.1080/09500782.2011.577220.
- HOLMARSDOTTIR, HALLA B. 2001. Icelandic: A lesser-used language in the global community. *International Review of Education* 47(3–4).379–94. DOI: 10.1023/A:1017918213388.
- JONES, MARI C., and SARAH OGILVIE. 2013. *Keeping languages alive: Documentation, pedagogy and revitalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- KANDLER, ANNE. 2009. Demography and language competition. *Human Biology* 81(3).181–210. DOI: 10.3378/027.081.0305.
- KANDLER, ANNE, and JAMES STEELE. 2008. Ecological models of language competition. *Biological Theory* 3(2).164–73. DOI: 10.1162/biot.2008.3.2.164.
- KANDLER, ANNE; ROMAN UNGER; and JAMES STEELE. 2010. Language shift, bilingualism and the future of Britain's Celtic languages. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 365(1559).3855–64. DOI: 10.1098/rstb.2010.0051.
- LEAP, WILLIAM L. 2012. *American Indian English*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- LEE, JENNIFER R. 1987. *Tiwi today: A study of language change in a contact situation*. Canberra: Australian National University.
- LEWIS, M. PAUL; GARY F. SIMONS; and CHARLES D. FENNIG (eds.) 2013. *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*. 17th edn. Dallas: SIL International.
- MARACLE, BONNIE JANE. 2002. Adult Mohawk language immersion programming. *McGill Journal of Education* 37(3).387–404. Online: <http://mje.mcgill.ca/article/view/8645>.
- MERIAM, LEWIS, and HUBERT WORK. 1928. *The problem of Indian administration: Report of a survey made at the request of honorable Hubert Work, secretary of the interior, and submitted to him, February 21, 1928*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- MITA, DESLIE McCLUTCHIE. 2007. Māori language revitalization: A vision for the future. *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 30(1).101–7.
- MOORE, ROBERT E.; SARI PIETIKÄINEN; and JAN BLOMMAERT. 2010. Counting the losses: Numbers as the language of language endangerment. *Sociolinguistic Studies* 4(1).1–26. DOI: 10.1558/sols.v4i1.1.
- MUFWENE, SALIKOKO S. 2017. Language vitality: The weak theoretical underpinnings of what can be an exciting research area. *Language* 93(4).e202–e223.
- NETTLE, DANIEL, and SUZANNE ROMAINE. 2000. *Vanishing voices: The extinction of the world's languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- OCHS, ELINOR, and BAMBI SCHIEFFELIN. 1982. *Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories and their implications*. (Working papers in sociolinguistics 105.) Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
- PERLEY, BERNARD C. 2012. Zombie linguistics: Experts, endangered languages and the curse of undead voices. *Anthropological Forum* 22.133–49.
- REYHNER, JON. 1999. Some basics of indigenous language revitalization. *Revitalizing indigenous languages*, ed. by Jon Reyhner, Gina Cantoni, Robert N. St. Clair, and Evangeline Parsons Yazzie, v–xx. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University. Online: http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~jar/RIL_Intro.html.
- REYHNER, JON; OCTAVIANA TRUJILLO; ROBERTO LUIS CARRASCO; and LOUISE LOCKARD (eds.) 2003. *Nurturing native languages*. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.
- REYNOLDS, HENRY. 1987. *Frontier: Aborigines, settlers and land*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- RICE, KEEN. 2006. Ethical issues in linguistic fieldwork: An overview. *Journal of Academic Ethics* 4(1).123–55. DOI: 10.1007/s10805-006-9016-2.
- ROMAINE, SUZANNE. 1984. *The language of children and adolescents: The acquisition of communicative competence*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- ROMAINE, SUZANNE. 2000. Multilingualism, conflict, and the politics of indigenous language movements. *Estudios de Sociolingüística* 1(1).3–25. DOI: 10.1558/sols.v1i1.13.
- SCHMIDT, ANNETTE. 1985. *Young people's Dyirbal: An example of language death from Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- STANFORD, JAMES N. 2015. Language acquisition and language change. *The Routledge handbook of historical linguistics*, ed. by Claire Bowerman and Bethwyn Evans, 466–83. Oxford: Routledge.

- TRIGGER, DAVID SAMUEL. 1992. *Whitefella comin': Aboriginal responses to colonialism in Northern Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- TSUNODA, TASAKU. 2006. *Language endangerment and language revitalization: An introduction*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: 10.26530/OAPEN_626366.
- WARSCHAUER, MARK; KEOLA DONAGHY; and HALE KUAMOYO. 1997. Leoki: A powerful voice of Hawaiian language revitalization. *Computer Assisted Language Learning* 10(4).349–61. DOI: 10.1080/0958822970100405.
- WHALEN, D. H.; MARGARET MOSS; and DARYL BALDWIN. 2016. Healing through language: Positive physical health effects of indigenous language use. *F1000Research* 5:852. DOI: 10.12688/f1000research.8656.1.
- YAMAN, ALINA LALE. 2017. Agency, access, and reclamation in the Basque language revival movement. New Haven, CT: Yale University senior thesis.

Department of Linguistics
Dow Hall, 370 Temple St.
New Haven, CT 06511
[claire.bowern@yale.edu]

[Received 23 June 2017;
revision invited 2 July 2017;
revision received 14 July 2017;
accepted 2 August 2017]