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Introduction

WESLEY Y. LEONARD, LEANNE HINTON
University of California, Berkeley

The 11th Annual Stabilizing Indigenous Languages Conference (SILC) was held June 10-13, 2004 at the University of California at Berkeley. It was attended by over 250 people from the United States and Canada, along with several presenters from as far away as Taiwan and Australia. It was co-sponsored by the Advocates for Indigenous California Language Survival (AICLS) and the Survey of California and Other Indian Languages, the latter a research unit within the Linguistics Department at Berkeley. This year’s SILC conjoined the AICLS’ biennial Language is Life Conference for California Indians (usually held in the spring, but delayed until summer this year so that it would coincide with SILC). It was also held on the heels of the Breath of Life Language Workshop for California Indians Without Speakers, a biennial week-long workshop also sponsored by AICLS and the Survey. Funding for the Breath of Life and SILC conjoined events came from the Lannan Foundation and the Ford Foundation, and was supplemented by funds from the University of California. Keynote speakers at the conference were Daryl Baldwin (Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, and Director of the Myaamia Project at Miami University), and Christine Sims (Acoma Pueblo, and professor at the University of New Mexico).

The entire first morning of SILC was filled with presentations by Breath of Life participants; therefore we will explain something of the nature and content of Breath of Life. This workshop is attended by about 60 California Indians each year, the maximum we can accept. Participants stay in university dorms and attend lectures, workshops, and archive tours; the primary goal is to find, interpret, and use language documentation at the university for revitalization purposes. The University of California at Berkeley has the following four major archives, which together represent one of the largest collections of Native American linguistic materials in the world and have a major focus on California:

(1) the Bancroft Library, which, included in its great collections, are the papers of the Anthropology Department, from the early days of the department when a great deal of fieldwork was being done in California. Also in the Bancroft Library is a massive collection of materials from the Mexican period, including grammars, dictionaries, confesionarios, and other materials on California languages;
(2) the Phoebe Apperson Hearst Museum, which houses the audio recordings and films made by the Anthropology Department faculty from the end of the 19th century through the mid 20th century. This collection includes a very large number of wax cylinder recordings (duly transferred to modern media);

(3) the Survey of California and Other Indian Languages, whose archive houses copies or originals of the fieldnotes on American Indian languages collected by graduate students and faculty since the founding of the current Linguistics Department in 1952;

(4) the Berkeley Language Center, which holds the field recordings made by faculty and students in the Linguistics Department.

Many of the American Indian languages represented in the archives at Berkeley no longer have any living speakers. It is the communities whose languages no longer have speakers that the Breath of Life Workshop is designed to serve. Many of the descendants of the speakers of these sleeping languages yearn deeply for them, and the documents and recordings held at Berkeley and elsewhere are now their only resources for regaining knowledge of their languages.

Participants in the Breath of Life Workshop work intensively day and night during the week. They get tours of the four archives and learn how to find and order copies of the materials on their languages; they attend lectures and workshops on phonetics, grammar, curriculum development and language pedagogy, and have homework every night and give brief presentations every morning. Each language group is assisted by a graduate student or faculty mentor throughout the week. Since some of the mentors come from out of town, some stay at the dorms along with the majority of participants, and thus can provide onsite assistance in evenings as well as all day. Breath of Life workshops also have guest instructors. Our 2004 guest instructors included Professor Juliette Blevins, Professor Ian Maddieson, Professor Pamela Munro, and Miami language activist Daryl Baldwin.

The workshop participants produce a number of projects during the week. For example, after a day of workshops on how to read and pronounce materials written in their languages, they are asked to choose a paragraph in their language and prepare to read it out loud the next morning. After workshops on grammar, they are asked to present something about the grammar of their own language. Later in the week they are asked to prepare and teach a brief lesson on some aspect of their language. And finally, they do a project of their choice on some aspect of the language that interests them. Depending on their goals, they may compose a skit in their language, create a language game, learn a prayer or song, make a genealogy of their family using kinship terms in their language, or one of a myriad of other possibilities.
**Introduction**

At this year’s SILC, the first morning began with a welcome by elders of the local Muwekma Ohlone Tribe. The Muwekma language committee also had an excellent exhibit about their tribal history and language at the Bancroft Library during SILC, including a slideshow that was shown at the Bancroft several times during the conference. Daryl Baldwin then gave the keynote address *Miami Language Reclamation: Is it really all about fluency?*, in which he noted that conversational proficiency clearly plays a role in language reclamation efforts, but that the process by which fluency is eventually attained is in fact more important in that it entails larger purposes of language revitalization:

> When we talk about language and cultural revitalization, we are in essence referring to the revitalization of belief, value, and knowledge systems. It is through our language and culture that we express those ways of knowing. This all takes place as one interrelated process. So when I say, “Is it really all about fluency?”, the answer in my mind is “no”. Fluency is an outcome of the collective effort.

Baldwin’s insights guided the themes of the conference, as presentations ranged from direct issues of language to related social issues that underlie the process of language shift and reclamation. A common element throughout the event was a strong sense of cultural awareness and knowledge being intertwined with language stabilization.

Following Baldwin’s keynote address, the rest of the first morning was devoted to project presentations by the participants in the Breath of Life workshop, consisting of skits, games, songs, talks, and other events, including the first improvised conversation held in the Mutsun language in a century. While all Breath of Life workshops end with such project presentations, the audience is normally made up only of people involved in Breath of Life itself. This time, the presentations extended to the entire SILC audience, and carried with them a special poignancy in that these were primarily examples of languages often called “extinct” being newly spoken, heard, and used in contemporary times.

After that initial morning session, SILC settled into a series of simultaneous sessions over the rest of the three-day period. A theme throughout those three days was one of intense activity, passion, and people devoting many hours toward language and cultural work out of a conviction that these efforts are important. From this comes a common pattern where many people who do language revitalization work are often too busy doing it to take out time to give presentations on it, much less to formally write about their efforts. Fortunately for our purposes, however, in addition to presenting at the conference, several presenters were able to contribute written papers for this volume. As the other presentations also provided great insight to conference participants and formulated the collective wisdom that came out of the event, we are including the conference schedule to show the full diversity of presentations and events that took place (see page vii).
The papers in this volume cover an array of topics, but all are couched within the general principle that “language is life”, and speak to various issues that allow the important social function of language to persist. They collectively form one substory within the larger narrative of language stabilization and reclamation in practice, and we encourage all readers to keep this larger narrative in mind. One thing that is always true about language efforts is that they are multifaceted in scope, and the experiences of one specific effort will almost always provide insight for a different program, even when the languages in question are characterized by seemingly very different situations.

Martha J. Macri, Victor K. Golla, and Lisa L. Woodward begin our story with a report on the J. P. Harrington Project at the University of California at Davis. Given the juxtaposition of SILC with the Breath of Life Workshop, this report on the Harrington Project takes on special relevance to this particular set of proceedings; language documentation collected by Smithsonian linguist John Peabody Harrington represents much of the documentation being used by California tribes to reclaim their sleeping languages. Macri, Golla, and Woodward also speak to the notion of collaboration and of using academic work for immediate real-life purposes such as learning and teaching these languages, which is likewise a theme of both the Breath of Life Workshop and SILC.

Ivonne Heinze Balcazar extends these issues of learning and teaching into a discussion of her quantitative study of the bilingual acquisition of Kaqchikel Maya and Spanish by a group of children in Guatemala. Whether a sleeping language or one that is still widely acquired by children in the home, a question arises as to how children actually learn their indigenous heritage languages, particularly with respect to major world languages such as Spanish or English, which they also learn. Heinze Balcazar offers insights for developing appropriate curricula for teachers of indigenous languages in these situations of community bilingualism.

The next two papers expand the discussion of indigenous language maintenance and the role of formal school curricula, though they examine places in two different parts of the world. Ciwas Pawan reports on indigenous language education in Taiwan, particularly from the point of view of policy and general trends regarding the recognition of indigenous peoples. Michael Capurso brings the story back into the United States, in this case reporting on one specific school district and its specific policies and practices. In his report about this one district, however, Capurso lays out a general model and philosophy that may be applicable elsewhere in the United States, a country in which indigenous languages and peoples have significant diversity but nonetheless operate within a series of common issues that come from a partially shared legal and educational system. Formal schooling very often plays a role in language maintenance or reclamation efforts, and for this reason we are fortunate to have contributors who examine it so directly.

As Jocelyn C. Ahlers notes, however, school programs – particularly large-scale immersion or similar efforts – are usually not a first step, and more crucially...
require significant funding and other institutionalized backing. What are smaller communities without these resources supposed to do? Ahlers addresses this issue in her report on the first three years of revitalization efforts in the Elem Pomo community of California, which had essentially no funding and yet made significant strides because of the commitment by the individuals involved and the way they approached bringing Elem Pomo back into use. This paper will be of special interest for smaller communities or individuals who are just starting out in language efforts, but it is relevant for everybody in that it also outlines the ways in which collaboration and ongoing discussion facilitate success in language programs more generally.

From Ahlers’ discussion of Elem Pomo in California, we move north up the Pacific Coast to a story from the Stó:lō (Coast Salish) community. As with many other SILC participants, Stelómethet Ethel B. Gardner, an educator from that community and also co-editor of this volume, weaves into the story a highly personal account. In one sense, her paper reports on many of the main efforts associated with the revitalization of Halq’eméylem, the language of the Stó:lō. However, it also brings in the direct perspectives of many of the characters involved in this story. The title of her paper, “Without our language, we will cease to exist as a unique people”, in itself captures the importance placed on the language by these characters.

Finally, our story moves “down under” with two contributions that discuss Australia, a country that, as with others, has many indigenous languages that have gone or are going out of use due to a legacy of colonization. Echoing the sentiments heard throughout the Breath of Life workshop and increasingly common in the larger narrative of language stabilization and reclamation, Rob Amery argues that the Australian language Kaurna, one that had no speakers for a significant portion of the 20th century, is not extinct. Amery outlines several of the efforts that the Kaurna community has undertaken to breathe life back into their language, and he argues for what he terms the “formulaic” method of teaching language, in which learners master an increasingly larger set of well-formed chunks in the target language – in this case, in Kaurna. Finally, Kevin Lowe (Birri-Gubba) and Michael Walsh complete the narrative associated with this volume by bringing Australia into California in their paper. They outline language revitalization efforts in the Australian state of New South Wales – particularly with respect to a curriculum developed to meet Aboriginal language goals – and then explicitly compare those to efforts in California and discuss how the associated models can play off each other.

And with that paper, the narrative from this particular conference comes to a close, but the larger story of “language is life” continues. We hope that these papers will provide insights to others and will help this story continue to evolve in a positive way. The annual Stabilizing Indigenous Languages symposium has been a major influence on language reclamation in North America, and we are pleased to have been able to host it and to produce one of its volumes of proceedings.
THURSDAY, JUNE 10
2-6 p.m. CHECK-IN to hotels and dorms
4 p.m.~ REGISTRATION (MLK STUDENT UNION)

7 p.m. Pauley Ballroom
WELCOMING ADDRESS - Leanne Hinton (University of California at Berkeley)
KEYNOTE LECTURE - Nancy Steele (Karuk language teacher, member of the board of the Advocates for Indigenous California Language Survival)

RECEPTION

FRIDAY, JUNE 11

8:45 a.m. Pauley Ballroom WELCOME by elders of the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe

9-9:45 a.m. Pauley Ballroom KEYNOTE ADDRESS - Daryl Baldwin (Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, Miami University) Language Reclamation: is it really all about fluency?

9:45-10 a.m. BREAK

10-12 Pauley Ballroom Revitalizing sleeping languages - reports from the Breath of Life Workshop for languages without speakers

12-1 Lunch break (on your own)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Tilden</th>
<th>Tan Oak</th>
<th>E. Madrone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2:15</td>
<td>The Chinuk Wawa Immersion Preschool Confederated tribes of Grand Ronde’s Language Team</td>
<td>Nurturing Native Languages: a history of language revitalization on the United States mainland, and in Hawaii and New Zealand Dr. Jon Reyhner</td>
<td>Putting the J.P. Harrington materials online Martha Macri and Lisa Woodward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Friday – Continued)

2:15-2:30  BREAK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Tilden</th>
<th>Tan Oak</th>
<th>Pauley Ballroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3:45-4  BREAK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stephens</th>
<th>Tilden</th>
<th>Tan Oak</th>
<th>E. Madrone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FRIDAY EVENING
7 p.m.  Pauley Ballroom  FILM FESTIVAL
SATURDAY, JUNE 12

8:30-10:30  **Pauley Ballroom**  REVITALIZATION DOWN UNDER  
Speakers:  Michael Walsh and Kevin Lowe, New South Wales: *California Down Under*  
Rob Amery, Kaurna Language Reclamation  
Northwestern Australia:  Edgar Price, June Oscar, Michelle Martin

10:30-10:45  BREAK

**Bancroft Library**  10:30-1:30, SPECIAL EXHIBIT.  *Ohlone/Costanoan Language Revitalization: From Written to Spoken Word.*  (exhibit of original old documents and the language revitalization process)  Presentations by the Mutsun Language Committee and the Muwekma Language Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Stephens</th>
<th>Tilden</th>
<th>Tan Oak</th>
<th>E. Madrone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:45-11:30</td>
<td>Tainey</td>
<td>Naming inventory: GIS CRM map of Southern Sierra Miwok</td>
<td>Language Renewal in the Home: a case study Wesley Leonard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language: Jumping the Horizon Lois Provost-Turchetti</td>
<td>Danette Johnson, Sandra Gaskell, et al, Southern Sierra Miwuk Nation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-1</td>
<td>Lunch break (and don’t forget to go see the Bancroft exhibit!)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11:30-1-2:15  **Nambe Pueblo Language Revitalization Project**  
Brenda McKenna, Cora McKenna, Susan Buescatr, Melissa Axelrod, Evan Ashworth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Tilden</th>
<th>Tan Oak</th>
<th>E. Madrone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2:15</td>
<td>Nambe Pueblo Language Revitalization Project Brenda McKenna, Cora</td>
<td>Sustaining Indigenous Languages in a Contemporary Seneca Education Setting Barry J. White &amp; Lori V. Quigley</td>
<td>How literacy can help empower the adult language learner Valerie Wood, Maureen Loth, Margaret Martial, Celina Ritter (Dene)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2:15-2:30 - BREAK
### Saturday - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Humanities Computing Center, 33 Dwinelle</th>
<th>Tilden</th>
<th>Tan Oak</th>
<th>East Madrone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:30-3:45</td>
<td>Archiving your language online (+film, “Awakening First Voices”) Peter Brand and Ivy Charleston, First People’s Cultural Foundation</td>
<td>Writing systems and literacy (1) Jule Gomez de Garcia, Melissa Axelrod, et al When literacy emerges: a report from the Ixil Mayan community (2) Tung-Chiou Huang, Taiwan First steps towards revitalizing.. (3) Sheri Wells Jensen, Bowling Green - Braille Orthographies for endangered languages</td>
<td>Stories and Songs (1) Lucille Hicks (Kawaiisu) Coyote and Pitch (2) Ernie Siva (Morongo) Music and language learning (3) David Shaul Nursery Rhymes and classroom songs as a teaching tool for young children</td>
<td>Language revitalization in Northwestern Australia Edgar Price, June Oscar, Michelle Martin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Tilden</th>
<th>Tan Oak</th>
<th>East Madrone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-5:15</td>
<td>Roundtable on social, political and economic factors in language revitalization Paula Meyer, Daryl Baldwin, Anne Marie Goodfellow, Jon Meza-Cuero</td>
<td>AICLS Master-apprentice language program (1) Leanne Hinton The history and philosophy of the Master-apprentice program (2) Heather Souter The Challenges of Promoting the Master-Apprentice Program throughout the Métis Homeland (3) Nancy Steele and Leanne Hinton Master-apprentice demonstration</td>
<td>Gunqahe:sh me’i?” “Lashashi.” Song and language as a tool in recovery from illness Herman Holbrook, Laura Fillmore, et al (Wa:shiw)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 p.m. Buffet Dinner, Pauley Ballroom
7:30 RAFFLE
8:30 ELEM DANCERS
CULTURAL SHARING

SUNDAY, JUNE 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9-9:45</th>
<th><strong>Pauley Ballroom</strong></th>
<th>KEYNOTE ADDRESS: Chris Sims (Acoma Pueblo, University of New Mexico) Contemporary Challenges to Native Language Survival: Observations from the field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room: 10-11:15</td>
<td><strong>Tilden</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tan Oak</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11:15</td>
<td>Indigenous Mexican languages in California</td>
<td>Embracing change for Student learning - Diné language immersion school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anne Whiteside, Rosalia Canul, Carlos Hau Dzib, et al</td>
<td>Dr. Deborah Jackson-Dennison, Superintendent; Jennifer Wilson, School Improvement Specialist; Florian Tom Johnson, Dual Language &amp; Culture Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-12:30</td>
<td>Lunch break - on your own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room: 12:30-1:45</td>
<td><strong>Tilden</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tan Oak</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-1:45</td>
<td>Revitalization the world over</td>
<td>Growing up in Hawaiian: student experiences in Hawaiian immersion schools and transition to English-speaking universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Ciwas Pawan, Indigenous language education in Taiwan</td>
<td>Ku'uwehi Hiraishi, Holo Ho'opai, Keli'ihoalani Wilson, Graduates of the Hawaiian immersion education program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Ivonne Heinze Balcazar, CSU Dominguez Hills: Bilingual acquisition in Kaqchikel Maya children and its implications for the teaching of indigenous languages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45-2</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td><strong>Pauley Ballroom</strong></td>
<td>Business meeting and closing ceremonies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thanks

To the Lannan Foundation
To the Ford Foundation
To the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma
To these people and units of UC Berkeley:
  The Dean of Social Sciences
  The Department of Linguistics
  The Survey of California and
    Other Indian Languages
To Dave McKay and
  Smith & McKay Printing

And to the many volunteers who have lent
their time and expertise to the organization
of this conference
J. P. Harrington Project: Academic and Community Participation

MARTHA J. MACRI,1 VICTOR K. GOLLA,2 LISA L. WOODWARD1

1University of California, Davis, 2Humboldt State University

1. Goals of the J. P. Harrington Database Project
The J. P. Harrington Database Project, funded by the National Science Foundation (grants BCS-01-11487 and BCS-04-18584), is creating a computer database of the linguistic and ethnographic notes on American Indian languages collected by J. P. Harrington during the first half of the twentieth century. The men and women he interviewed were often among the last speakers of their languages. During the 1980s, Harrington’s original handwritten field notes, currently housed in the National Anthropological Archives at the Smithsonian Institution, were microfilmed, resulting in 477 reels from which the J. P. Harrington Database is being created. Harrington’s notes are being transcribed and coded for several linguistic and ethnographic categories in order to maximize their accessibility and usefulness. The notes can be printed from the database, and the possibilities for generating lexical lists and other useful data are virtually endless. Detailed guides to the materials on each language will be produced. These include dates and location of the fieldwork, a list of place names, and biographical information on consultants and field assistants. Guides for each language will have a detailed explanation of Harrington’s orthography and symbols, their equivalents in the electronic archived form, and ultimately a regularized transcription for materials to be used in language education.

Increased access to this enormous resource is of value to linguists, biologists, geographers, historians, anthropologists, and archaeologists. Perhaps its greatest value is to Native American communities for use in cultural and language revitalization, as well as for documentation of tribal histories and genealogies. It is invaluable to those studying the indigenous languages of California, and their complex historical relationships. The project depends on the combined efforts of both the academic community and native scholars engaged in the study of the languages and cultures Harrington recorded.

2. J. P. Harrington: Linguist and Ethnographer (from Golla 1994)
John Peabody Harrington (1884–1961) graduated from Stanford University, re-
solving to make his career in American Indian language studies, and in particular, to collect linguistic data from the nearly lost languages of California. In 1915 the Bureau of American Ethnology hired him as a Research Ethnologist. From then until his retirement, Harrington had virtually unbounded freedom to wander the North American continent carrying out his mission of linguistic and cultural documentation. Surely no linguistic field worker before or since clocked more months and years of field research.

After his death, Smithsonian curators began cataloguing his papers. By the late 1960s, with the bulk of Harrington’s materials finally located and consolidated, it became clear that Harrington’s extensive, accurate notes were a linguistic treasure of the highest order. The value of the documentation was especially great for languages such as Chimariko, Costanoan, Salinan, and Chumash, considered lost by some as early as the turn of the century, but for which Harrington discovered several aged speakers.

In the last thirty years several doctoral dissertations have been based largely, if not entirely, on Harrington’s notes, including grammars of Ineseño Chumash (Applegate 1972), Obispeño Chumash (Klar 1977), Mutsun Costanoan (Okrand 1977), Antoniano Salinan (Turner 1987), Kitanemuk (Anderton 1988), and Barbareño Chumash (Wash 2001). Chumash oral traditions that Harrington collected have also been published (Blackburn 1975).

Although focusing his energies on languages nearing extinction, Harrington collected data on over 135 languages in California and the Far West, supplementing his written record with hundreds of sound recordings. He also extended his work into recording Native culture, particularly traditional stories and geography.

3. Present State of Accessibility

By the 1970s, the National Anthropological Archives (NAA)—the final repository of most of Harrington’s materials—found itself devoting a good portion of its resources to cataloging the Harrington collection. To facilitate this, the NAA obtained funding from the National Historical Publication and Records Commission to microfilm Harrington’s linguistic and ethnographic notes, papers, and correspondence. Begun in 1977, the microfilming was completed in 1991, except for the photograph collection and some of Harrington’s personal and office records. The microfilm collection is divided into eight sections (Harrington 1981–91, Volumes 1–8), 477 reels in all (see Appendix I). Volume 9 includes 17 additional reels of correspondence and financial records; Volume 10 contains photographs.

The Guides to the Field Notes prepared by Elaine L. Mills and her assistants (Mills 1981–85, Mills and Brickfield 1986–89, Mills and Mills 1991) provide orientation to the notes including lists of the names of Harrington’s Native American consultants and abbreviations used by Harrington. Mills, the Smithsonian staff member assigned to the Harrington collection from 1977 to 1983, had primary responsibility for preparing the notes for microfilming. Many researchers have begun to make use this material. A growing number of these researchers are Native peoples—many of them direct descendents of the men and women Har-
Martha J. Macri, Victor K. Golla, and Lisa L. Woodward

An inaugural conference on the J. P. Harrington papers was held in Santa Barbara, California in June 1992. It was the first in a series of annual conferences and workshops (1992–1997) resulting in ten newsletters (Golla 1991–1996). The following excerpts from these newsletters describe the importance of the material and problems related to access of the microfilmed notes.

**J. P. Harrington Newsletter #1 November 1991**

- How can the microfilms and the Guides be made more easily accessible to scholars? I have tried to request both particular microfilms and particular volumes of the catalogues through interlibrary loan and I have waited for months on end and they just don’t come.

- One topic that should be addressed is JPH’s Spanish... Since so much of his work is bilingual, or simply in Spanish, a glossary of his Spanish usage, with equivalents in standard Spanish and English, would be extremely useful to many researchers.

**J. P. Harrington Newsletter #4 February 1993**

- My work has centered principally on the Serrano... and, to a lesser extent, on the Kitanemuk, Cahuilla, Gabrielino, and Luiseno... My task was interpreting Harrington’s notes to figure out and map the actual locations of the myriad place names they contain.

**J. P. Harrington Newsletter #6 February 1994**

- My wife Sonia and I learned about the Harrington Conference Newsletter from the article by Leanne Hinton in News from Native California. When we received copies, and learned that our language (Acagchemen, or Juaneño) had been extensively recorded on disc by Harrington, we were both taken aback. For many years we believed that our language was almost entirely gone, and that only a few words and songs were still remembered.

**J. P. Harrington Newsletter #10 May 1996**

- I’ve been surprised to find that there’s an enormous amount of Klallam (Straits Salish) material in the JPH microfilm (Volume I, Reels 16 & 30), much more than Elaine Mills’ guide seems to indicate. On these two reels there are over 2,000 pages of Klallam data!

Users of the Harrington materials must surmount a number of difficulties, largely philological in nature, ranging from determining the precise significance of Harrington’s phonetic symbols and deciphering shorthand devices he used (e.g., Latin nescit, usually abbreviated N. or n., ‘does not know’). Harrington’s phonetic transcription changed over time, and sometimes varied from language to language. He used a number of abbreviations and non-phonetic symbols. Some of these are listed in the appendices in Mills’ Guides; others require further elucidation.

A new series of newsletters is being produced by this project. Clearly Heard Forever provides scholars and community members with information on the goals.
and procedures of the project, recent trainings, languages currently being coded, and lists of materials as they become available. Clearly Heard Forever is produced several times a year. Copies are distributed by email and posted on the project website: nas.ucdavis.edu/NALC/home.html.

4. **Value of the Database**

The J. P. Harrington Database is first and foremost a detailed index—a way of gaining rapid access to the microfilmed original notes. Simply having a typed version of the material allows someone looking at the papers for the first time to be able to find information more quickly. Having the material in a database format allows for very efficient searching of the texts. For example, selecting the word *bear* in the text field will select all records that contain the string *bear*. Or one can search for *bear* and go from one example of it to the next, locating the mention of *bear* in each sentence or story that it occurs. Looking through 0 microfilm reels (nearly 20,000 handwritten pages) for all mentions of *bear* would be a daunting task indeed. Another feature of the database is the ability to generate wordlists ordered either by the Indian word or by Harrington’s gloss.

The database format also provides the ability to pick up “out of place” data and incorporate it into related material. For example, Harrington sometimes mentions words in one language while working on another. When he heard a word in Luiseño that reminded him of a word in Chumash he made a note of it, but in the Luiseño notes—those studying the Chumash languages would probably never see it. In a database, however, one need only search on the language family field to select words labeled Chumash, regardless of the reels on which they occur. In addition, our coders have located data from several languages that were incorrectly labeled or that were not included in the indices.

Another use of the database is to locate words borrowed among Indian languages. Selecting for a certain sequence of letters in the Indian word field finds all examples, and lists the language in which each occurs. Scanning this list shows whether the sequence occurs in more than one language. Selecting for a certain string in the English gloss field finds all examples of words with an equivalent meaning, immediately showing where possible cognates might occur or where there are likely borrowings. Searching on the semantic domain field generates lists of any subject that has been coded, e.g., bird names, toponyms, kinship terms, etc. These and other lists can be further analyzed, printed, and used for hypothesis formation and testing. The more subtle aspects of their phonological systems will be elucidated by further analysis of the accurate phonetic transcriptions that Harrington is so well known for. The data he has recorded so faithfully, when fully accessible, will also contribute to a better understanding of other aspects of the grammars of these languages, such as morphology and syntax.

5. **History of the Project**

The idea for a database of J. P. Harrington’s papers was first suggested in some of the earliest J. P. Harrington Newsletters. In 1994 Macri was approached by ar-
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archeologist Georgie Waugh with the idea of creating a database to make Harrington’s notes more accessible. The current database format was first developed in 1994. In 1995, Lisa Woodward, then an undergraduate at UC Davis, transcribed notes for the one reel of Fernandeño data, and additional material for Luiseño. The results of this pilot project were presented at Harrington Conferences in 1995 and 1996. Victor Golla, who was a visiting professor at UC Davis in 1995–96, contributed his experience in organizing the network of Harrington researchers, and has assisted in solving the problem of representing Harrington’s phonetic symbols and diacritics in an appropriate computer format.

Related projects include the 1990 NSF award to Marianne Mithun at UC Santa Barbara for the Barbareño Chumash Grammar based on Harrington’s notes. The examination of the over 70,000 pages of Barbareño material focused on texts in that language. Given the mass of Harrington data, we are coding the material in order of priority. Precedence is given to those notes that are of unique value to linguistic scholars (a sole or principal source), to indigenous communities engaged in the coding, and to students who are volunteering their time.

Totally unanticipated has been the enthusiasm and dedication on the part of members of the Native American communities in California. We had counted on their cooperation, but the ability and willingness of communities representing over a dozen separate languages has far exceeded our expectations. In the summer of 2002, Sheri Tatsch worked with Marina Drummer, Administrator of the Advocates for Indigenous California Language Survival, to author a brief article about the Harrington Database Project that appeared in News from Native California.

Several native communities have contributed to our volunteer trainings. The Tribal Digital Village, funded in part by NSF and Hewlett-Packard (Ross Frank, UC San Diego, principal investigator) provided funding for a training session in San Diego. The Barona Cultural Center contributed space for the workshop, computers for participants to use, and lunch for participants and presenters. The project continues to gain momentum. Graduate students, community volunteers, and research assistants have become progressively more efficient in transcribing and coding the notes. The number of trained transcribers continues to increase.

6. Project Methodology

Harrington collected language data throughout the Americas (Appendix 1). However, the languages of California and the West comprise the vast majority of notes and prove to be most crucial in language revitalization efforts. Although these notes are the product of a single individual, completion of this project may require more than one generation of scholars.

Reels vary in the number of frames they contain, as well as in the density of material and the complexity of phonetic detail. Some pages have a single word or sentence, while others are completely filled with notes. Our first priority is to code languages that have not been well documented by linguists other than Harrington, and those languages that are of most interest to contemporary communities.
As the project has developed it has become clear that our efforts in training community members to work with the Harrington data has a value independent of the actual coding of the data. Project personnel have made presentations to over 250 people (Appendix 2), and have conducted training session for more than 50 volunteers, coding 16 languages (Appendix 3). Many participants have expressed gratitude at being able to use Harrington’s notes more effectively. The project is serving an important outreach function for the University of California, Davis, and the academic community at large.

7. Project Work Plan
In this database the unit of analysis is a sentence. When eliciting, Harrington usually wrote in sentences, and frequently grouped them into paragraphs. In the event of more than one Indian word within a sentence, the sentence is divided so that only one Indian word occurs per record. This allows us to generate word lists directly from the text data. When an entire phrase, sentence, or longer passage is in the Indian language the phrase or sentence is entered as a single unit. These records can be searched, but they do not lend themselves to being used for generation of word lists until the data is further formatted. (Continuous texts in native languages are handled somewhat differently, with record breaks at phrases or sentences rather than individual words.)

Transcription and coding of the materials are done on three levels of increasing detail. The following is a list and brief description of the fields coded.

7.1. Level 1: Sentence/Word Coding
The material is fully transcribed in the text field of the database. Text is entered exactly as it appears on the page. Wavy brackets indicate a coder’s description of letters, words, or sentences, or of Harrington’s drawings and maps. The Indian Word and Gloss fields allow for the generation of word lists:

Citation 2:005:358a:7:1 indicates volume 2, reel 5, frame 358, side a, paragraph 7, sentence 1. All references to the Harrington papers are to the reel number and the frame number as given in the microfilm collection prepared by Elaine Mills (Mills 1981).

Text Transcription of Harrington’s notes.
Level 1 Notes Clarification of the transcription, or a reference a previous entry.
Consultant Name Abbreviation The name of Harrington’s consultant.
Indian Word This field isolates the Indian word.
Harrington’s English/Spanish Gloss Harrington’s own translation.

7.2. Level 2: Coding for Historical, Linguistic, and Cultural Information
Additional fields provide coding of more detailed information.
Semantic Domain Category labels not otherwise obvious from the text itself.
Genre Categories such as story, dance, song, and word list.
Scientific Name (JPH) Harrington’s Latin name for flora or fauna.
Scientific Name Corrected/current scientific name.
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**Language Name (JPH)** Harrington often named language groups by their location.

**Language Family (Current)**

**Language Name (Current)**

**Dialect/Community** Dialect or the family, town, or region of the person being interviewed.

**Location of Interview**

**Date of Interview** dd/mm/yy (this format is for sorting purposes)

**Reference to Personal Communication**

**Reference to Written or Published Communication**

**Photograph** Reference to Harrington’s photographs in National Anthropological Archives.

### 7.3. Level 3: Detailed Linguistic Coding

Scholars with linguistic knowledge of specific languages will do more detailed coding of notes on those languages.

### 8. Computer Use and Software

The master database uses the application Panorama by ProVUE. Panorama is a flat file database allowing for easy transfer to and from any standard database or word-processing software. It has a variety of querying options, and allows for text funneling and complex searches and replacements, facilitating global mark-ups necessary for compatibility with some WWW projects, e.g., Electronic Meta-structure for Endangered Languages Metadata (E-MELD).

Perhaps the most difficult problem related to this project is the keyboarding of the numerous complex phonetic symbols used by Harrington. We are avoiding the use of specialized phonetic fonts for all but final printing of the material. All of the data is being keyboarded using only extended ASCII symbols. In fact, we are using a subset of extended ASCII symbols, those that are equivalent in Microsoft Word on both Mac and PC platforms. This manner of archiving the data will ensure its integrity for the future. As new symbols are encountered the list is revised. The files themselves are relatively small, and easily accommodated even by outdated computer hardware. Thus community members can participate in the project and make use of its products with a minimal investment in computer hardware and software.

### 9. Final Products and Dissemination

This project will result in increased accessibility of archived data and summary materials (search results, word lists, etc.) available for scholarly and community use. Some of the material recorded by Harrington includes sensitive information, either because it is sacred to the indigenous community, or because it is private information never intended to be circulated beyond Harrington himself. Even though Harrington’s notes are in the public domain by virtue of being part of the National Anthropological Archives, gossip or personal information that might be
harmful or embarrassing to descendents of Harrington’s consultants will be accorded the same kinds of protection from unethical use that linguists and other researchers customarily offer their consultants today. Material deemed by communities to be sacred, or culturally inappropriate for dissemination will not be circulated to the general public, for example, on the WWW, but will be available to scholars and to tribal representatives.

All coders sign a confidentiality agreement in compliance with this policy. The classification of material as culturally sensitive is made by the senior project personnel in consultation with appropriate community representatives. In at least one case, a native community has asked that Harrington’s notes relating to their language not be made available on the WWW. We will comply with such requests, but since this project is largely supported by federal funds, we will provide notes to those academic and community scholars who request them.

Language materials are made available for distribution as electronic files after they have been transcribed, coded, and checked for quality control. Database reports, such as units of text, or word lists will be available as printed paper copies to be ordered from the project office or, as electronic files (text files, word-processing files, portable document format (pdf) files, or database files) e-mailed, or sent on disk, or CD-ROM, or downloaded from the project website). Ultimately the searchable database will be available on line and on CD-ROMs. In the meantime, materials will be made available as they are completed.

In addition to providing an efficient way of retrieving the linguistic and ethnographic information stored in the vast Harrington collection, constructing the database will also provide ways for researchers and archivists to address questions about the structure of the corpus itself. The chronology of Harrington’s fieldwork has not been completely worked out; questions regarding the name, age, and first language of his consultants are not always known. Harrington’s reference in his letters to absent material suggests there remain “lost” chunks of data. Corrections and emendations cannot be made to the microfilm edition, nor can the correspondence be re-associated with the appropriate field notes. This can be done easily within the context of this database. Waugh, one of the senior researchers, is indexing the reels of correspondence (letters both to and from Harrington), providing a clearer picture of his activities.

Distribution of the database is being done in several ways. We have distributed to a few communities printouts of the text and word lists. We are in informal contact with linguists and other researchers who are specialists in the languages we are coding, and will soon be establishing a more formal data request process. We are currently in the process of preparing pdf-formatted files, similar to the printouts distributed to communities, for posting on the Native American Language Center website at UC Davis. Ultimately we will have data files and reports for languages available on the WWW as well as on CD-ROM. When, in the future, electronic scans of the pages including maps, and images of plants, animals, baskets, and objects drawn by Harrington are added, the size of the database will be considerably larger. The linking of records with external images can be done
Martha J. Macri, Victor K. Golla, and Lisa L. Woodward

quite efficiently. In the future, document management hardware and software may be used to record the entire Harrington collection as digital images linked to the records on this database. Thus the database would serve as an index and access point to the original material.
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Appendix 1. Listing of Language Reels by Volume Number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOLUME</th>
<th>REELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alaska, Northwest Coast (30 reels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aleut 1–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tlingit/Eyak 10–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• N Athabaskan 13, 14 (frames 1–996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nicola/Thompson 14 (frames 997–1194)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lummi/Nespelem 15 (frames 4–255)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Duwamish 15 (frames 256–898)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chimakum/Clallam/Makah/Quileute 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Quinault/Chehalis/Cowlitz/Yakima/Chinook Jargon 17–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Kwalhioqua-Tlatskanai 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tillamook 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Alsea/Siuslaw/Coos 21–24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Oregon Athabaskan 25–27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Galice/Applegate 28 (frames 2–120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Takelma 28 (frames 123–887)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Miscellaneous 29–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Northern / Central California (101 reels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Klamath 1 (frames 1–313)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wiyot/Yurok/Mattele 1 (frames 317–717), 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coast Yuki/N&amp;C Pomo/Kato 3–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coast Miwok 5 (frames 1–158)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lake, Coast Miwok/SE Pomo/Wappo 5 (frames 162–349)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nisenan/Northern Sierra Miwok 5 (frames 355–569)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• S Pomo/Central Sierra Miwok 5 (frames 573–978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Karok/Konomihu/Shasta 6–19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chimariko/Hupa 20–24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Achomawi/Atsugewi/Wintu/Yana 25–26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Yana/Achomawi/Wintu/Chimariko 27–35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Costanoan 36–80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Esselen 81–82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Salinan 84–88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Yokuts 89–101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Southern California / Basin (182 reels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chumash 1–96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tubatulabal 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Kitanemuk 98–100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Serrano 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gabrieliño 102–105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fernandeño 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cahuilla 107–114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Luiseño/Juaneño 115–129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cupeño 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chemehuevi 131–147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mohave 148–168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Diegueño 169–170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Paipai/Kiliwa 171 (frames 1–99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ute/Paiute/Shoshoni 171 (frames 100–791)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Miscellaneous 172–182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Southwest (58 reels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Apache/Kiowa Apache 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Films</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>2–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acoma/Laguna/Santo Domingo</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochiti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jemez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleta/Isleta del Sur/Piro</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picuris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tewa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Plains (17 reels)
- Kiowa 1–13
- Mandan/Hidatsa/Crow 14–15
- Caddo/Pawnee/Wichita/Comanche 16
- Siouan 17

6 Northeast & Southeast (18 reels)
- Algonquian 1
- Shawnee/Peoria 2
- Abnaki/Passamaquoddy 3–8
- Massachusett 9
- Mahican/Stockbridge 10–12
- N Iroquoian 13
- Wyandot 14
- Delaware 15
- Powhatan 16
- Cherokee 17
- Creek/Alabama/Choctaw 18 (frames 1–189)
- Miscellaneous materials 18 (frames 192–210)

7 Mexico / Central America / South America (36 reels)
- Pima/Papago/Seri/Opata 1
- Nahua 2–7
- Quiche 8–12
- Cakchiquel 13
- Yucatec 14–25
- Cuna 26
- South American languages 27–35
- Miscellaneous 36

8 Special Linguistic Studies (35 reels)
- Supplementary materials on volumes 1–7 1–3
- Linguistic & ethnographic notes 4
- Linguistic questionnaires 5
- Library related materials/inquiries 6
- Non-American languages 7
- Arabic origins of Spanish words 8–11
- Personal names/geography 12–20
- Siberian origin of the Indian 21
- Lectures 22
- Phonetics 23
- Writings on various topics 24–28
- Major writings on linguistics 29–35

9 Correspondence & Financial Records (17 reels)

10 Photographs (10 reels)
# J. P. Harrington Project: Academic and Community Participation

## Appendix 2. Presentations by Project Staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event Details</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temecula</td>
<td>Pechanga Cultural Resource Director (Luiseño)</td>
<td>01/08/03</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CSUS California Indian Conference</td>
<td>01/10/10</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan Capistrano</td>
<td>Juaneño Tribal Office (Juaneño)</td>
<td>01/12/21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Linguistic Society of America</td>
<td>02/01/06</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Group in American Indian Languages</td>
<td>02/02/05</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin Headlands</td>
<td>Language Is Life Conference</td>
<td>02/03/08</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Breath of Life Conference</td>
<td>02/06/07</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Breath of Life Conference</td>
<td>02/06/08</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeside</td>
<td>Barona Cultural Center (Kumeyaay, Luiseño, Cahuilla)</td>
<td>02/07/26</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Advocates for Indigenous California Language Survival</td>
<td>02/08/03</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jacinto</td>
<td>Saboba Cultural Center (Luiseño, Cahuilla)</td>
<td>02/09/12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Marin Museum of the American Indian (Miwok)</td>
<td>02/10/16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Native American Language Center (Karuk)</td>
<td>03/03/12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>Native American Language Center (Serrano)</td>
<td>04/03/26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Society for Ethnobiology</td>
<td>04/03/26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Stabilizing Indigenous Languages</td>
<td>04/06/11</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeside</td>
<td>Advocates for Indigenous California Language Survival</td>
<td>04/09/10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Appendix 3. Community Trainings Conducted by Project Staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coos</td>
<td>02/02/04</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obispeño Chumash</td>
<td>02/12/10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutsun</td>
<td>02/06/29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumeyaay, Luiseño, Cahuilla</td>
<td>02/07/24–26</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luiseño</td>
<td>02/07/31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luiseño, Ineseño Chumash</td>
<td>02/09/11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitanimuk</td>
<td>02/09/14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimariko</td>
<td>02/09/16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yana</td>
<td>02/10/03</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinan</td>
<td>02/10/07</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitanemuk, Wikchamni</td>
<td>02/11/08</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumsen</td>
<td>02/11/16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrielino</td>
<td>02/12/30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumsen</td>
<td>03/02/11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yokuts</td>
<td>03/03/21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paipai-Kiliwa</td>
<td>03/04/18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutsun</td>
<td>03/09/27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutsun</td>
<td>04/04/10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obispeño</td>
<td>04/07/10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juaneño</td>
<td>04/08/03</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrieltino</td>
<td>04/12/20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bilingual Acquisition in Kaqchikel Maya Children and its Implications for the Teaching of Indigenous Languages

IVONNE HEINZE BALCAZAR
California State University Dominguez Hills

1. Introduction
The Kaqchikel1 Mayas reside in Guatemala, which is one of the few countries in the western hemisphere with an indigenous majority. The Mayas, including the Kaqchikel Mayas, account for about 53 percent of the population. Of this 53 percent, 2 1/2 million Mayas speak approximately twenty Mayan languages. The type of language contact situation that exists in Guatemala resulted from Spanish colonial expansion, which subordinated and continues to subordinate the Mayan languages to the Spanish language. As a result, the linguistic range of the Mayan communities includes Mayan monolingualism, various types of multilingualism, as well as Spanish monolingualism. Shift toward Spanish monolingualism, which is a threat to the survival of the Mayan languages, has been occurring mostly due to socioeconomic reasons. There is ample evidence that the shift toward Spanish monolingualism is an economic survival strategy. Some parents choose not to use their Mayan languages and transmit only the prestigious language to their children, so that the children have economic success. Moreover, young people and children refuse to communicate in the indigenous language due to competence problems and sociolinguistic pressures.

I suggest that the promotion of bilingualism can be an important linguistic strategy for the survival of the Mayan languages. In order to make it an effective strategy for linguistic survival, it is essential that we have a better understanding of the levels of bilingual knowledge attained by children and young people, for if they feel that they know their indigenous language well, they are more likely to transmit it to the next generations. The present paper recaptures the results of an assessment of language acquisition and grammatical knowledge of Kaqchikel Maya children – in particular, the knowledge of those children who have acquired Kaqchikel Maya (L1) at home, and Spanish (L2) at school. It also points out implications that these results have for teachers of indigenous languages and makes suggestions for strengthening vocabulary and knowledge of verb morphology through act-out and picture description tasks.

1 The Academy of Mayan Languages of Guatemala (ALMG) has replaced the old written form Cakchikel with the new form Kaqchikel.
2. Determining Bilingual Competence

Mackey (2000) proposed that to determine mastery of a bilingual, it is necessary to test knowledge of the phonology, grammar, vocabulary, semantics, and stylistics of each language in the areas of comprehension, production, reading, and writing. He had in mind the ‘ideal’ bilingual, who comprehends, produces, reads, and writes in both languages. However, bilinguals in many indigenous communities are not provided the opportunity to develop their reading and writing skills in their indigenous languages. The Mayas in Guatemala as a whole have not been able to develop writing and reading skills in their native languages. In addition, Mayan-Spanish bilinguals can speak in both languages, but generally do not read or write in the Mayan language, and may not read or write in Spanish either. For this reason, the study presented here was conducted to test the bilingual children’s knowledge of grammar only in the area of oral production.

Specifically, I tested the knowledge of lexical items, particularly of nouns that refer to concrete objects. I also tested morphological and syntactic knowledge of the transitive verb to determine their levels of acquisition in Kaqchikel and Spanish. The motivation behind the choice of the transitive verb was twofold: (1) it is the nucleus around which sentences are built, and (2) the structure of the transitive verb differs sharply between the languages in that Kaqchikel is an absolutive-ergative language and Spanish is a nominative-accusative language.

2.1. Bilingualism and the Children Who Participated in this Study

The eight children who participated in this study acquired their Mayan language at home and learned Spanish in school. Hamers and Blanc (1989) have classified this pattern of bilingual acquisition as consecutive bilingualism. Thus, the children who participated in the study are consecutive bilinguals whose L2 was introduced before the age of 10;00. The children are from Tecpán, Guatemala and they acquired the Mayan language known as Kaqchikel, whose speakers number approximately half a million. Table (1) below lists the name of each child, her or his age, and the number of years in school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years in School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kot</td>
<td>8;02</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaxum</td>
<td>8;03</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Säqche$^2$</td>
<td>8;00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>María Angélica</td>
<td>9;00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ervin</td>
<td>9;10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tojil</td>
<td>9;05</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ixb’alam</td>
<td>9;08</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ixmukane</td>
<td>10;10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^2$ The Kaqchikel alphabet, proposed by the Academy of Mayan Languages of Guatemala (ALMG), uses the symbol [’] to represent the glottal stop or to represent glottalized consonants.
The patterns of language use in the families varied; however, one commonality among the parents was that they had made the conscious decision to speak to their children in Kaqchikel. Nevertheless, the Spanish language was present through television and radio programming. Of the eight children, only María Angélica had no access to these types of programming. However, her mother reported that whenever her sister visits them from the capital city, she speaks to them only in Spanish. Regarding the children’s first school experiences, one child reported to have suffered through the transition of starting school in an unknown language, i.e., in Spanish. The child reported that he was ridiculed by his schoolmates at first because he did not speak Spanish, and later because of his non-native Spanish pronunciation. The other children said that they felt a little strange and did not understand the teacher at the beginning, but that they learned quickly.

3. Methodology
I adopted the tasks of picture naming, picture description, and acting-out for this study. I consider these tasks as being various instances of the elicited production method. This is a method designed to reveal the grammars of children by having them produce particular structures. According to Thornton (1996), the elicited production method has two advantages. First, it reveals the child’s grammar without the need to make inferences from “yes” and “no” responses, as is necessary in a judgment task. Second, the experimenter can control the meaning that is to be associated with the targeted utterance. Furthermore, Thornton pointed out that such resulting data reveals what children “do say”, and if the correct controls are included along with this technique, “they also reveal what children cannot say” (1996:78).

Picture naming is a decoding task that has been amply employed and researched (Snodgrass 1993). According to Hochberg and Brooks (1962), children as young as two can perform this task fairly reliably, even without access to pictorial representations. This decoding task requires that the children first make a visual recognition, and then access their semantic knowledge. Thus, the picture naming task was selected to elicit the children’s bilingual knowledge of lexical items that refer to concrete objects.

Concerning the act-out task, Goodluck (1996) pointed out that this task has the following advantages: it is not intrusive, it allows subjects to volunteer their own interpretations, it is easy to administer, it is fun, and it avoids bias to a particular response. The principal motive for choosing this task for the methodology of this study was that it gives an exact indication of who does what to whom. This task was chosen to document and test the children’s knowledge of the transitive verb in Kaqchikel and Spanish. The act-out tasks of this study required that the children perform specific actions or that they observe the interviewers perform specific actions, interpret those actions, and then describe those actions by answering the interviewers’ questions about them. Thus, the act-out tasks along with the picture description tasks were selected to elicit the children’s knowledge of the Kaqchikel and Spanish transitive verb.
4. The Assessment of the Lexical Ability of Kaqchikel Maya Children

One hundred drawings, pictures, and objects were selected to test how balanced the children’s lexicons (vocabularies) were. Most of the items presented to the children formed part of their cultural and natural environment. Some of the ideas to represent objects of the Kaqchikel Maya culture were borrowed from a textbook that the Mayan Language Academy (1994) published for the purpose of teaching reading and writing to Kaqchikel Mayas. Also, core and noncore lexical items were selected to test lexical ability. The concept of core lexical items was proposed to account for the fact that certain lexical items are subject to lexical borrowing and interference, while others, known as core vocabulary, are not. Romaine (1995) proposed that body parts, numbers, personal pronouns, and conjunctions belong to the core vocabulary. Furthermore, Appel and Muysken (1987) suggested that items basic to society also be considered core vocabulary; examples include the words for fire, hands, two, and daughter.

Although the concept of a core and noncore vocabulary attempts to predict borrowing patterns in bilingual communities, the core vocabulary of the Kaqchikel speakers in Tecpán is permanently being impacted by the introduction of western items or objects that are named with loanwords or loan translations. Furthermore, some native terms are being replaced by loanwords; thus, Spanish loanwords are constantly being integrated and increasingly play an important role in the Kaqchikel community. For instance, numbers and colors are a focal point of Ladino-Kaqchikel Maya relations. At the market, I had opportunities to listen to Kaqchikel conversations in which the prices, colors and names of products such as banana and tomato were mentioned in Spanish. Also, all of the Kaqchikel monolingual mothers and some of the monolingual and bilingual children who were interviewed reported their ages in Spanish.

The results of the lexical assessment are listed in a graph from the lowest to the highest percentage for each language in (2). The children’s names are abbreviated as follows: Kot 8;2 (K), Yaxum 8;3 (Y), SäqCHE’ 8;00 (S), María Angélica 9;00 (A), Ervin 9;10 (E), Tojil 9;5 (T), Ixb’alam 9;8 (B), and Ixmukane 10;10 (M). In the graph, ‘lexemes’ is synonymous with lexical items or words.

The results graphed in (2) indicate that half of the group knew 50 percent or less of the elicited lexical items. These four children (Tojil, Kot, Yaxum, and Säqche’) scored an average of 43 percent. This percentage puts their Kaqchikel vocabulary behind their Spanish one. In comparison, the other half of the group (María Angélica, Ixb’alam, Ervin, and Ixmukane) knew 60 percent or more of the Kaqchikel items. Interestingly, these two groups had in common that they knew more of the Spanish lexical items that were elicited than they did the Kaqchikel ones. All the children scored above the 80th percentile in their Spanish testing and the group’s average in Spanish was 90 percent. This contrasts with their 58 percent average in Kaqchikel. As a group, the children’s knowledge of the Kaqchikel vocabulary lagged behind that of Spanish. This finding is significant since they acquired Kaqchikel first and were at different levels in their acquisition of Spanish.
Finally, the data partially substantiated Hoffmann (1991), who stated that the bilingual’s lexicon is rarely twice as big as that of a monolingual. For instance, the oldest child in the group, Ixmukane, scored the highest percentages in both languages. Nevertheless, her lexicon or vocabulary is not twice as large as that of a monolingual, but is instead 69 percent larger than that of a monolingual.

5. The Kaqchikel Verb System: What do Children Need to Know?
I present in this section a brief sketch of the inflectional system of the Kaqchikel verb, which the children were tested on to determine their various levels of grammatical knowledge. Children who acquire Kaqchikel need to have acquired the knowledge that Kaqchikel has a VOS constituent order in declarative sentences and is morphologically an ergative-absolutive language. That is, it is a language that has prefixes and suffixes for the transitive and intransitive verbs. These agree with the subject of an intransitive verb or with the subject and direct object of a transitive verb. The children would also need to know the constraints for each prefix in ergative and absolutive systems; they are also known as ergative case and absolutive case.

It is a tradition in Mayan language studies to name the ergative-absolutive systems as sets. The prefix paradigm that marks ergative case in the verb of a transitive verb is known as set ‘A’, while the prefix paradigm that marks absolutive case in the verb of an intransitive verb is known as set ‘B’. This set also marks the direct object in the transitive verb. These sets are shown in (3).
Each grammatical person has a prefix in set ‘B’, except for the third person singular, which is a null prefix. In set ‘A’, most grammatical persons have one preconsonantal and one prevocalic prefix or allomorph. However, the third person singular has two prevocalic prefixes: \( r^- \) and \( u^- \). The latter prefix can only be preceded by the absolutive third person singular null prefix. Some examples of verb inflections are listed in (4) and (5).

(4) Xojrunäq. ‘She/he bothered us.’
(5) Xinatin. ‘I bathed.’

The example in (4) shows the inflection of the third person singular ergative prefix \( ru^- \) ‘she/he’ that marks agreement with the subject. Agreement with the first person plural direct object ‘us’ is indicated with the absolutive prefix \( oj^- \). Also, the prefix \( x^- \) indicates the completion of the action, i.e., it indicates completive aspect. In (5), the prefix \( in^- \) ‘I’ marks first person singular in absolutive case and the prefix \( x^- \) indicates that the action has been completed.

5.1. Results of Kaqchikel Production

The results of the children’s inflection of the ergative-absolutive prefixes are presented in the graph in (10). Some of the findings regarding the inflection of Kaqchikel verbs show that the children did not inflect the absolutive prefix in third person plural to mark the direct object in the obligatory contexts, but inflected it in other contexts. The absolutive prefix \( e^- \) ‘them’ can only be inflected to mark a plural direct object that consists of humans or animals. The example in (6) illustrates how this prefix was used in the wrong context.

(6) Xeruya’ chuwäch mesa. ‘She/he put them (vegetables) on the table.’

The children were asked to describe a picture of a mother putting a plate of vegetables on the table. The third person singular ergative prefix \( ru^- \) ‘she/he’ was correctly inflected on the verb to agree with the subject, which was the mother in the picture. In contrast, the third person plural prefix was incorrectly inflected to agree with a direct object that referred to vegetables. Also, note that the Spanish word \( mesa \) ‘table’ was borrowed.
The example in (7) shows that some of the children inflected the prefix e- ‘them’ to mark a third person plural direct object in the right contexts.

(7) Yekitzüq la aq. ‘They feed the pigs.’

The sentence above describes a picture with two children who are feeding a couple of pigs. This context calls for the use of the e- ‘them’ absolutive prefix to mark a direct object that refers to animals. Here, the children used this prefix correctly. The third person plural ergative prefix ki- that marks the subject was also inflected correctly, as well as the prefix γ-, which indicates that the action has not been completed, i.e., incompletive aspect was used accurately.

The examples in (8) and (9) show how the children misused the prevocalic absolutive prefix in 2nd person singular to mark the direct object. The ergative-absolutive prefix combination exemplified in the adult verb form xaruq’etej ‘she hugged you’ caused problems for 87 percent of the children. Only one child produced this verb inflection.

(8) Xaturuq’etej. ‘She hugged you.’
(9) Xatruq’etej. ‘She hugged you.’

In (8), the child doubled the third person singular ergative prefix with u- ‘she/he’ and ru- ‘she/he’, and inflected the absolutive prefix at- ‘you’. In contrast, the child who produced the example in (9) inflected the absolutive prefix at- ‘you’ and the ergative prefix ru- ‘she/he’. Hence, both girls selected the prevocalic second person singular absolutive prefix at- rather than the prefix a- used in Tecpán as a variant prefix. Nevertheless, the verb form in (9) is grammatical, whereas the verb form in (8) is not grammatical. The graph in (10) plots the results for each child in both ergative and absolutive cases. The names of the children are abbreviated in the same manner as in (2) and they are arranged from the lowest to the highest percentages.

Regarding the inflection of both the ergative and absolutive case systems, it was found that the children scored higher percentages on ergative case inflection. The 41 percent average of the children’s scores on inflecting absolutive case stands in contrast to their 70 percent average on ergative case inflection. The children’s low productivity at inflecting absolutive case was affected by their misuse and lack of use of the absolutive prefix e- ‘them’. Seventy-five percent of the children used a prepositional phrase to indicate the direct object rather marking it with the prefix e- ‘them’. Some of the children were probably still sorting out the particular semantic features of the direct objects with which the absolutive prefix e- ‘them’ can be inflected.
In conclusion, each child has her/his own competence configuration regarding her/his knowledge of the ergative-absolutive prefixes that are inflected on the verb. Yet, the majority of the children (62% of the group) were knowledgeable of Kaqchikel’s inflectional verb system. The results indicate that María Angélica (A) was the most knowledgeable and productive at inflecting the Kaqchikel verb since she scored 95 percent in ergative case and 76 percent in absolutive case. Interestingly, she was not the youngest or oldest child in the group. In comparison, Yaxum (Y), who was 8;03, was the least knowledgeable of the Kaqchikel transitive verb. He scored 33 percent in ergative case and 21 percent in absolutive case. Perhaps he had not acquired this system well enough yet, or he was losing his knowledge of it.

I present in this section a brief sketch of the Spanish reflexive pronoun system, which the children were tested on – among other syntactic structures – to determine their various levels of grammatical knowledge. Kaqchikel Maya children who acquired Spanish need to know among other things that Spanish is an (S)VO language and that it is not an ergative-absolutive language, but rather that it is syntactically a nominative-accusative language. Spanish, unlike Kaqchikel, has a system of prefixes to mark agreement with the subject in the verb. It also has a system of pronouns known as *clitics* that refers to the direct object or indirect object, i.e., they indicate accusative, dative, or reflexive case. The table in (11) lists the reflexive pronouns of Spanish.

---

3 The term *clitic* is derived from a Greek word meaning ‘lean on’. Clitics are not regular pronouns since they ‘lean on’ and attach to a verb due to their lack of regular or emphatic stress. That is, their phonological weakness causes them to undergo phonological word-formation and join a constituent that bears stress (Zagona 2002).
(11) **Person and Number**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person and Number</th>
<th>Reflexive Pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg</td>
<td>me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg</td>
<td>te/se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
<td>se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl</td>
<td>nos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pl</td>
<td>se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pl</td>
<td>se</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spanish clitics adjoin, under certain conditions, to either the left or right of the verb.\(^4\) The example in (12) shows the use of the third person singular clitic me ‘myself’, which is attached or cliticized to the left of the verb.

(12) El niño se pone el calcetín. ‘The boy puts on his sock.’

The verb poner ‘to put on’ has the suffix -e, which agrees with the subject el niño ‘the child’ and the reflexive pronoun se ‘himself’ is in enclitic position. Moreover, in a structure such as the one in (12), the noun calcetín ‘sock’ may be modified only with an article. Thus, the Spanish example in (12) literally says ‘(I) The boy puts on the sock himself.’ Children acquiring Spanish as a second language need to acquire the knowledge of all these grammatical aspects to correctly produce a sentence with a reflexive pronoun.

### 6.1. Results of Spanish Production

The children were tested on their knowledge of reflexive pronouns, as well as on their knowledge of those pronouns that refer to the direct object or indirect object. In this section, I report about the children’s knowledge of the reflexive clitics. The data demonstrate that the children’s knowledge of reflexive clitics varied and could be placed at different interlanguage levels. The number of years in school correlated with the level of knowledge that a child had of a particular structure. In other words, it was found that the more years in school the higher the score of the child; thus, some children showed to be at the beginning, intermediate, and advanced levels. The graph in (13) shows the results for each child in the production of reflexive pronouns and the names of the children are abbreviated in the same manner as in (2). The scores are also rank-listed from the lowest to the highest percentage. Ervin (E) and María Angélica (A) were found to be at the beginning interlanguage level since their average score was a low 24 percent. Tojil (T), Yaxum (Y), Kot (K), and Säqche’ (S) were placed at the intermediate level and they scored an average of 78 percent. Ixmukane (M) and Ixb’alam (B) were representative of the advanced interlanguage level and scored one hundred percent.

---

\(^4\) A clitic is said to be *proclitic* if it attaches to the right of the verb and *enclitic* if it is attached to its left. This process is technically known as *cliticization*. 
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The children’s production of reflexive pronouns developed thoroughly the period they were tested. Specifically, they showed development in the acquisition of the third person singular reflexive clitic *se* ‘her/himself’ with the verb *poner* ‘to put on’. During the first visit, I elicited this verb as well as the verb *cepillar* ‘to brush’.

All of the intermediate children cliticized *se* with the verb *cepillar*, but they did not cliticize it with the verb *poner*. Interestingly, during the second visit the children produced the clitic *se* ‘herself/himself’ with the verb *poner*, except for one child. In comparison, the beginning children did not produce the reflexive clitic *se* ‘herself/himself’ with either verb. An example of the type of sentence produced by a beginning level child is illustrated in (14).

(14) El niño pone el calcetín.  ‘The boy puts on his (the) sock.’

The reflexive clitic *se* ‘herself/himself’ was not produced, which indicates that the beginning level children transferred from L1 to L2. That is, María Angélica (A) and Ervin (E) assumed that certain Spanish verbs, especially cleaning and grooming verbs, have the same properties as their Kaqchikel equivalents. The most common acquisition pattern of Säqche’ (S), Kot (K), Yaxum (Y), and Tojil (T), who were classified at the beginning intermediate interlanguage level, was that they produced reflexive clitics with more consistency within a verb class and across verb classes than the children at the beginner interlanguage level. Thus, in order to acquire the Spanish reflexive clitic system, it is crucial that Kaqchikel-Maya children discover the reflexive properties of Spanish verbs vis-à-vis Kaqchikel verbs.

7. Levels of Bilingualism
This section addresses the issue of bilingual competence and whether the children in this study have achieved ‘balanced bilingualism’, which I assume is the sum of
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the competence in the Kaqchikel and Spanish languages. However, I suggest that
this competence should not be compared to monolingual standards. Monolingual
standards can provide a point of reference, but the competence of the bilingual is
not equal to the competence of a Kaqchikel monolingual and a Spanish
monolingual. For this study, these levels of competence are based on knowledge
of lexical equivalents, Kaqchikel ergative and absolutive inflection on transitive
verbs, and the verbal agreement and clitics of the Spanish transitive verbs.

In (15), a graph plots the scores of the children in both languages. The results
have been rank-listed from the highest to the lowest average percentage in
Spanish. The Kaqchikel percentages are based on averages for both ergative and
absolutive prefix production. The line that plots these average scores starts at 85
percent with María Angélica (A), but this line steadily drops to 27 percent with
Yaxum (Y). These two children represent the highest level and the lowest level of
Kaqchikel competence in the group.

(15) The Children’s Results for Both Languages

The graph above shows that María Angélica (A), Säqche’ (S), and Ervin (E), i.e.,
37% of the group, had configurations that identified them as Kaqchikel dominant
bilinguals; they had the highest average percentages in Kaqchikel and the lowest
percentages in Spanish. Tojil (T), Kot, (K), and Yaxum (Y) had configurations
that classified them as Spanish dominant bilinguals since they had averages in
Kaqchikel that ranged from 27 to 49 percent, and these were the lowest Kaqchikel
scores of the group. In contrast, they scored among the highest Spanish
percentages, ranging from 68 to 80 percent.

The scores of Ixb’alam (B) were lower than that of Ixmukane (M), and her
configuration in the two languages had not reached a state of equilibrium.
Although she scored an average of 66 percent in Kaqchikel and 80 percent in
Spanish, her knowledge of Spanish was higher than that of Kaqchikel by 14
percent. This indicates that her bilingualism was tipping slightly toward Spanish
dominance.
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Ixmukane (M) had not reached one hundred percent competence in Kaqchikel and Spanish, nor was she equally competent in these languages. Nevertheless, she had reached a state of equilibrium in her levels of competence in both languages. Her Spanish and Kaqchikel averages were 87 and 79 percent, respectively. Her scores in Spanish were the highest of the group, but not that of Kaqchikel, which might indicate that her Spanish has set back her complete development of Kaqchikel. Nevertheless, the results of Ixmukane did not vary as much as with the other children. Hence, she, the oldest child, had reached the most stable state of equilibrium within the group.

8. Conclusions and Implications for Teachers of Indigenous Languages
The results of this study indicate that to expect 100% balanced bilingualism in Kaqchikel Maya children is impractical. Nevertheless, I suggest that the levels of knowledge reached by Ixmukane, the oldest child of the group, are representative of the type of balanced bilingualism that researchers and language teachers should expect of consecutive bilinguals whose sociolinguistic conditions subordinate their indigenous languages to Spanish. Ixmukane scored 79 percent in Kaqchikel and 87 percent in Spanish, i.e., her Kaqchikel lagged behind Spanish by 8 percent. One might say that for Kaqchikel Maya communities such as the one in Tecpán, balanced bilingualism means to have reached a level of equilibrium in which the indigenous language falls behind the prestigious one.

A major finding of the study is that those children who were classified as Spanish dominant showed signs of language loss. That is, these children’s vocabularies in Kaqchikel were smaller than those of Spanish and they had problems conjugating the Kaqchikel transitive verb. I suggest that for these children, Spanish dominance means the loss of the Kaqchikel language. Thus, verb inflection should be practiced and encouraged for the development and maintenance of the indigenous language in this type of consecutive bilingual.

It was also found that the Spanish interlanguage levels of the children reflect their number of years in school. The children who had been in school the longest had acquired, although not perfectly, the Spanish grammatical structures that were tested. Another related and important finding was that if the child started school late, say at the age of 8, she or he had more opportunity to acquire and develop some of the important verbal structures of Kaqchikel. In other words, if the introduction of Spanish is delayed, the child has more probabilities to fully develop and maintain her/his native language.

I suggest that in the design of curricula for these consecutive bilinguals, special attention must be placed in the grammatical areas where the languages contrast. I propose that the methodology used to test the children’s knowledge of Kaqchikel and Spanish can be used as teaching methods for the strengthening of vocabulary and verb morphology in the indigenous language of the child. Through the tasks of picture naming, picture description, and acting-out, children can be taught essential aspects of the languages they are acquiring. These methods are not intrusive, are entertaining, and can be easily integrated into a curriculum.
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1. The Indigenous Peoples of Taiwan
The ancestors of Taiwan’s indigenous people were already living in Taiwan around six thousand years ago. The indigenous people of Taiwan belong to the Austronesian or the Malayopolynesian, the South Island tribe (The Association of Native Peoples’ Education in Taiwan 1999). According to several prominent linguists (e.g., H. A. Kern, Paul Li, and Robert Brust), and anthropologists Peter Bellwood and Barbara Theil, Taiwan is believed to be the Austronesian homeland.

Historically, there have been over twenty indigenous groups, including the “mountain” groups and the “plain” groups, who have made Taiwan their home. Only the following twelve groups (including ten “mountain” groups and two “plain” groups) are recognized by the government: the Amis, the Atayal, the Paiwan, the Bunun, the Rukai, the Puyuma, the Tsou, the Saisiyat, the Tao, the Thao, the Kavalan, and the Truku. The population of the indigenous people in Taiwan is reported to be 459,218, representing approximately 2% of the total population of Taiwan. Each indigenous group in Taiwan has its own distinct language variety, some of which are not mutually comprehensible among or within the groups.

The indigenous peoples of Taiwan did not traditionally have writing systems, and therefore, the speakers of these languages continued to pass on their socio-cultural knowledge and traditions by oral means up until the Dutch era (1624-1662). Most indigenous Taiwanese people live in the mountain areas of Taiwan and Lanyu Island. They continue to maintain a subsistence lifestyle based on hunting, agriculture, and/or fishing. The foreign colonizers (including the Dutch, the Spanish, the Chinese, and the Japanese) ruled the indigenous people of Taiwan for over three hundred and eighty years. These colonizers were known to

---

1 The plain group (also called the Pingpu group) refers to the indigenous people of Taiwan who live in the plain areas of Taiwan. This larger group is composed of the following nine groups: the Ketagalan, the Kavalan, the Taokas, the Pazch, the Papura, the Babuza, the Hoanya, the Thao, and the Siraya groups. Due to close contact with the Han people (a non-indigenous people), the plain indigenes have assimilated into Han communities. Most of them have thus lost their languages, cultures, and customs. However, the Thao and the Kavalan groups were recognized by the government in 2001 and 2002, and some other groups are still seeking recognition.

kill the indigenous people, burn their tribal villages, and force them to move, thus robbing them of their rich lands and mountain resources. The living space and resources of the indigenous people decreased as the colonizers sought to enlarge their territories. Political, economical, educational, and societal barriers continue to marginalize Taiwan’s indigenous population (Tai 2001, Pawan 2002). The world of the indigenous people in Taiwan was destroyed, occupied, and assimilated during colonization.

2. Language Loss in Taiwan

The languages of Taiwan are disappearing completely from use. According to Li (1994), of the original twenty ethnic languages of Taiwan, half have disappeared and the remaining half are endangered. The Council of Indigenous Peoples (1998) indicates that 40.12% of the indigenous respondents speak their native language at home. Several researchers (Hsieh 1998, Lai 1995, Lu 1996, Song 1995, Wang 1999, Wang and Pu 1995) find that, among the indigenous peoples of Taiwan, language loss is evident among those who are 50 years of age and younger, and most notably among individuals, residing in urban areas, who are twenty years of age and younger. A telephone survey conducted in 1999 by the United Daily Newspaper found that only 9% of the indigenous children in Taiwan are fluent speakers of indigenous languages. These researchers (ibid) conclude that the majority of young urban Taiwanese children, from preschool to junior high school, cannot speak their native languages and prefer to speak Mandarin Chinese, which is the official language of Taiwan. Because children do not understand the indigenous languages used by many grandparents, a pattern of language loss has clearly contributed to the weakening of intergenerational language learning. In Taiwan, language loss in the indigenous communities is a serious problem.

3. Language Policies in Taiwan’s History

Taiwan was ruled by the Dutch, the Spanish, the Japanese, and the Chinese for over three hundred and eighty years. According to Naqang (1995), these colonial governments used education to achieve the goals of their religion, politics, economics, and assimilation. “The Dutch missionaries used the Romanized Siraya language, which was spoken by the southwestern Plain indigenous groups, to teach and convert them to Christianity through textbooks and translated testaments” (Gao 2005:13). In the Japanese era, the colonial government pervasively educated the indigenous people under assimilationist policies for its political purpose of armed control, robbing the mountain resources, and occupying the land of the indigenous people. In the era of the Kuomintang (KMT; the nationalist party), the KMT implemented an assimilation policy to ensure its political stability and this required the Taiwanese people to speak Mandarin and provided punishment for speaking their native languages in school. In addition, it required that the Taiwanese be educated using Chinese-centered materials that did not recognize nor understand the Taiwanese languages and cultures. Thus, the colonial education and the assimilation policies forced Taiwan’s indigenous
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people to give up their traditional social and economic systems and to survive in the mainstream society that the Chinese structured, to become sorrowful and dissociated citizens without competitive capabilities. The KMT not only hastened the destruction of the indigenous people, but also helped to destroy their minority status (410 Educational Reform Affiliation 1996).

4. Current Situations of Indigenous Language Education in Taiwan

Indigenous language instruction in Taiwan began its experiment at Wulai Junior High and Elementary School in Taipei County in 1990. By 1996, under the “Local Instruction Activity”, indigenous language instruction was partially implemented in some elementary and junior high schools, and began to be a required course for elementary students and an elective course for junior high school students in 2001. The indigenous elementary schools in Taiwan used indigenous schoolteachers to provide indigenous language instruction (Chen 1999, Chen 2001, the Education and Culture Committee of the Control Yuan 2003, Hsieh 1998, Kao 2002, Lai 1995, Liu 2003, Lu 1996, Song 1995, Wang 1999, Wang and Pu 1995). They began to hire certified teachers who obtained indigenous language proficiency certificates and training certificates from 2001. The Education and Culture Committee of the Control Yuan (2003) indicated that 60.8% of teachers in indigenous language classes are these certified teachers. If schools still lack schoolteachers and certified teachers, some schools hire missionaries, elders, parents, and other local people to teach. In addition, indigenous schools may use teacher-, local people-, or expert-developed materials (e.g., textbooks, videotapes, CDs, DVDs, and website resources) to teach about the indigenous languages. The Education and Culture Committee of the Control Yuan (2003) indicates that the Ministry of Education (MOE) asked the Indigenous Language Education and Culture Center of the National Chengchi University to edit 39 indigenous language textbooks for elementary school students from 2002 to 2005.

The content of these teaching materials mainly includes elements of language and culture that may focus on conversation, vocabulary, pronunciation practice, grammar practice, tone practice, oral practice, supplementary materials, cultural components, real-life photos, traditional customs, stories, legends, traditional and children’s songs, and history (Ministry of Education 1996, 2002a, 2002b, 2003; Pingtung County Government 1992, 1993a, 1993b; Wenle Elementary School; Wulai Elementary and Junior High School 1993, 1994, 1995). In addition, the Wulai Junior High School and Elementary School developed an instructional VCD to teach about the Atayal spelling system in 2000. The Tenggong Elementary School made another instructional VCD to teach about Atayal children’s songs, idioms, and games in 2001 (Chen 2001).

Moreover, the teachers may collect some related cultural and ethnic information, such as traditional and children’s songs, as well as folktales, to make the curriculum more interesting and culturally relevant. The teaching content in this study includes family, numbers, body parts, animals, the sky, food, living tools, native plants, names, the name of the tribal village, and songs. Teachers Camak
and Hayung in this study also incorporate other subject matter such as art, lan-
guage arts (Mandarin), music, natural science, and physical education into the 
curriculum. Moreover, in order to promote the students’ motivation to learn, the 
curriculum may include pictures (drawing), photos, flashcards, musical CD, field 
trips, storytelling, and traditional songs and children’s songs and games to make 
the instruction more meaningful, interesting, and vivid. Liu (2003) indicates that 
to evaluate students’ progress in learning the indigenous languages, each school 
takes turns conducting native language speech contests, native language singing 
competitions, vocabulary contests, and listening tests. In addition, a Bunun school 
establishes a choir for students to learn traditional Bunun songs (ibid). Some 
Bunun schools even make a weekly “Bunun Day” so that everyone must speak 
Bunun on that day except the regular classes. The Kaohsiung’s Bureau of Educa-
tion asks two elementary schools to build online Bunun language databases for 
students to learn their heritage language online. Some tribal schools even conduct 
independent language class in the tribal village in the evenings. For example, the 
Pucunug Elementary School is used to teach the indigenous people about the 
Paiwan’s culture, history, and customs on Tuesday and Thursday evenings. This 
school also teaches other curricula, such as international pronunciation, parent 
education, and technology (Camak’s interview).

Community and parent involvement are two key components of Taiwan’s in-
digenous language program, yet interaction between the community and the 
school may vary from location to location. Each indigenous town or school rou-
tinely hosts an “Instruction Observation Day” for teachers, parents, community 
members, and experts to display how each school implements the native language 
instruction and to provide a forum for sharing their experiences with each other 
(Camak’s interview, Liu 2003). Some tribal communities host cultural events and 
some conduct education for parents and community members so that these groups 
may have more contact with one another. Moreover, Liu (2003) indicates that the 
tribal college in the tribal village also teaches an indigenous language class. Fur-
thermore, the town of Wulai conducted an “Indigenous Teacher’s Workshop for 
Designing Localized Materials for Five Counties” (Song 1995). Liu (2003) dem-
onstrates that three Bunkun villages have a “research and editing group for the 
Bunkun language material”. This group routinely discusses the content of the ma-
terial. They have the material taught in several schools and revise it after teaching. 
In addition, Song (1995) indicates that parents in Wulai may even help by editing 
the teaching materials, teaching the language, serving as consultants in language 
contests, or by donating traditional utensils and costumes for the school museum.

Government support plays an important role in indigenous language instruc-
tion in Taiwan. The majority of funds for indigenous language instruction are 
provided under the “Developing and Improving Taiwanese Indigenous Education 
for the Five-Year Plan” and an “Education Priority Area” plan. On April 31, 1993, 
the Provincial Bureau of Education allocated two hundred thousands dollars for 
independent language instruction (Chen 1995). According to Song (1995), the 
Wulai junior high and elementary school received twenty thousand dollars for
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native language instruction each year. Other schools also obtained funding from the Bureau of Education, County government, the Council of Indigenous Peoples, Executive Yuan, and the Ministry of Education (MOE). In 2001, native language teaching became a required course in elementary and junior high school. The MOE provides funds for hiring teachers and developing textbooks, and the Council of Indigenous Peoples provides funds for conducting an annual accreditation of indigenous language proficiency and related training classes. It also funds indigenous language-related projects for individuals, associations, and schools. Additionally, Nantou County held a yearly “indigenous language contest” to evaluate the effectiveness of indigenous language instruction in its elementary, junior high, and high schools (Liu 2003). From July 2001, the Indigenous Peoples Commission of Taipei City government began to implement an “indigenous language nest” to teach 11 indigenous languages for two hours per week in Taipei city. It also held indigenous language teacher training camps, edited indigenous language textbooks, hosted indigenous cultural events, and made indigenous language and culture education available on radio (Indigenous Peoples Commission of Taipei city government 2003).

Although indigenous language instruction has been implemented for 4 to 15 years in Taiwan, there are several issues surrounding it. First, within communities, although tribal members get involved in the school and community events, they may only use the native language in certain ceremonies and other gatherings. Second, some parents do not recognize the importance of speaking their native language because they think it is not useful in mainstream society. That is, they do not teach their children the mother tongue because they think it is not helpful to their children. Additionally, some parents cannot teach the mother tongue because they do not speak it fluently. Third, inconsistent funding causes several crucial projects and/or programs to be terminated and this negatively affects further program development. Fourth, unsatisfactory teachers may cause students to lose interest in learning because of inconsistent teaching methods and content. If the non-indigenous teachers are not familiar with such specific linguistic and cultural groups, it makes the teaching and learning even less effective. Fifth, there are insufficient indigenous language and culture materials. There are not enough good texts written in the indigenous languages. Liu (2003) indicates that those materials do not appropriately suit the students’ levels. The Education and Culture Committee of the Control Yuan (2003) states that those materials are too difficult to teach. Sixth, insufficient instructional time is a major problem with respect to implementing indigenous language instruction in Taiwan. The instructional time officially is forty minutes per week. However, if there is a public event or examination happening at the same time, indigenous language instruction must be cancelled. Seventh, indigenous language teachers indicate that there is a lack of opportunities for teacher training on indigenous language instruction that will help them improve their professional skills in native language instruction (Wang 2002). Eighth, the burdens of both learning and teaching the indigenous language present another difficulty. In addition to learning Mandarin, the indigenous language, and
English, the students must also study for entrance examinations.

Also, consider the burden from the teachers’ perspective. They are currently responsible for implementing new instruction under Taiwan’s nine-year compulsory education and they assume a share of administrative tasks within their schools. In addition, if there are not enough English teachers, they might also need to teach English. Finally, indigenous students can earn an additional score on their entrance exams by passing an indigenous language proficiency test, and there is thus pressure to gain a certain level of indigenous language proficiency. The former director of the Council of Indigenous Peoples, Yuhani, announced this idea for indigenous language education. He felt that parents did not have confidence in the native language because such knowledge was not useful for entrance examinations, and thus wanted to use “gaining higher scores for the entrance examination” to promote his idea. He also communicated that the native language is the primary identification of an indigenous person. However, his ideas were a source of controversy.

As a final issue, Kao (2002), Liu (2003), and Wang (2002) indicate that although native language instruction is required and has been implemented in 1126 classes (The Education and Culture Committee of the Control Yuan 2003), 39% of schools have not implemented it (www.nhctc.edu.tw/~aboec/89). In addition to these problems, the Education and Culture Committee of the Control Yuan (2003) states that people do not take indigenous language instruction seriously, and the lack of indigenous language instruction researchers poses yet another difficulty.

5. Conclusion
Taiwan is a multiethnic, multilingual, and multicultural society. At least fifteen ethnic groups and languages remain in Taiwan. Taiwan was ruled by the Dutch, the Spanish, the Japanese, and the Chinese for over 380 years. These colonizers all used education to achieve their goals of religion, politics, economics, and assimilation. However, after Martial law was lifted in 1987, speaking native languages was no longer prohibited. The Indigenous Right Advocate Association and other associations began to have a societal movement to fight for their rights including language rights. Indigenous language instruction was finally implemented at the Wulai junior high and elementary school in 1990, and it became a required elective course in 2001.

However, there are still many problems related to its implementation that need to be solved, and I offer the following six recommendations: 1. Language renewal should start from the home and the community. 2. Language immersion day-care centers, preschools, and kindergarten must be implemented. 3. Teachers must evaluate their teaching to meet the needs and the interests of the students. 4. A well-organized teacher-training program needs to be developed. 5. A specialized unit needs to be established in the government for the affairs of native language promotion and advocacy. 6. The indigenous people need to have self-determination in their children’s schooling. If efforts can be made to complete these tasks, Taiwan’s indigenous languages will survive.
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1. Introduction

The workshop from which this paper is derived summarized the circumstances and the stages of development of an innovative Native American education program I helped to establish, and provided participants with an overview of basic principles for use in creating similar programs in their own local situations. In the following pages I will explain in greater detail the reasons for the choices we made in designing the program, and suggest some ways to avoid setbacks that can undermine efforts to make the revitalization of First Nations languages and cultures a fundamental part of Indian students’ learning in public school settings. I maintain that the integration of indigenous language and culture into mainstream classroom instruction is a natural and necessary component of an overall strategy for saving endangered ways of life which are essential for our shared future.

Much of the work that led to the ideas I will present here was conducted in a place that I will not name. There are two reasons for this choice. The first reason is that the actual location is not essential to the value of the insights I hope to share. My role was not that of a researcher, but rather that of a curriculum specialist, program designer, and professional developer. The second reason is that I feel obligated to honor the trust placed in me by the Chiefs’ Council of the Native American nation involved, by respecting their privacy. Like many First Nations, their history is marked by instances of academics taking advantage of their generosity by learning from them and then publishing work based on their association without adequate regard to how it might affect the lives of the people concerned. While I do not in all cases repudiate such work and have learned a great deal from some of it, I will not emulate it needlessly.

I make mention of the relevant circumstances solely in order to place the achievements of the Nation and the school district, which serve as my primary inspiration, in a context sufficient to enable readers to appreciate their significance. The two entities exist side by side in a rural area of a northeastern state. Though the district was the first in its state to accept Native American students into its schools, some eighty years prior to the collaboration I will describe, their relations from that point up to the start of our work together had been strained.
Tensions and resentments resulting from real and perceived discrimination on the district’s part had resulted in such bitterness in the native community that when we began it was not uncommon to hear native students in the district’s elementary school describe teachers as “racists” in a “white man’s school.”

Such situations are not unusual in school districts throughout the United States that serve significant numbers of Native American students. Teachers and administrators in these districts often regard these students as academically disadvantaged due to cultural differences and poverty. Their response is to place native students in lower “ability level” tracks or reading groups, and to provide them with various forms of remedial assistance. Many end up being retained to repeat grades when this help proves ineffective. Others, in numbers disproportionate to their percentage of the general population, are eventually referred for special education evaluation and placed in programs for students with disabilities. Large numbers later in their school careers develop attendance problems and discipline problems. Far too many ultimately drop out of school. Those who remain often perform at levels considerably below their potential.

This had long been the case at the district in question. For over a decade I had attempted to persuade this district to implement an academic enrichment program for its Native American students to change this pattern of failure. District leaders had resisted, believing that their remedial approach was the best answer to the situation. They also probably were suspicious of my motives. I contended that one of the major contributing factors in native students’ school failure was their sense of alienation resulting from the fact that the district employed no native teachers, and that the curriculum included no meaningful attention to the Nation’s history or culture. Administrators and others took the position that no qualified native teachers were available, and held that the state curricula, an assembly program from time to time, and certain artifacts on view in a hallway display case were sufficient in their acknowledgement of their Indian students’ background.

During this same period, the Nation was facing a deepening crisis related to the gradual loss of its heritage language and traditional culture. With each succeeding generation, fewer children learned ways of life that had been sustained by their ancestors for generations despite the influences of missionaries, land grabs, and boarding schools. Several dedicated elders and aspiring young native teachers had established a small tribal school aimed at intervening in this pattern by teaching the language to small groups of young children in a culturally appropriate instructional environment. Their long-term efforts were hampered by the fact that parents who were motivated to send their children to the program for a traditional education during pre-school and kindergarten became less willing to do so beyond first and second grade, fearing possible negative effects on their children’s prospects for long-term economic security. They would withdraw their children from the tribal school and send them to the district elementary school instead, whatever concerns they might have about how they would be treated there, believing that their futures depended upon receiving a conventional American education. This limited the program’s language stabilization potential.
Both educational endeavors, operating in their separate spheres, were failing. The district, whatever its intentions, was not providing an equitable educational opportunity for its Native American students. The Nation, striving to rescue its language from oblivion, was hobbled by the reality of its children needing to make their lives in not just one world, but two. District administrators were growing concerned, as state and federal learning standards were being imposed, that native students’ academic underperformance would have a negative impact on the district’s standing. Nation educators dreamed of establishing a school of their own to teach their children from pre-school through high school, and thus provide them with continual language and culture training without depriving them of the advantages of mainstream education. However, an array of obstacles made this vision one that would take many years to realize.

Then the district hired a new superintendent. He initiated a new relationship with the Nation, and formed a task force of district and Nation personnel to redesign Indian education. I served as their advisor. In the first year, the district hired a full-time Native American teacher who had two primary responsibilities. The first was to provide lessons in the Nation’s culture and history to all elementary classes. These regularly-scheduled lessons, conducted initially by the teacher visiting other teachers’ classrooms and then later with whole classes coming to her own well-equipped classroom, were drawn from a curriculum written by a team of teachers from the elementary school and the tribal early childhood program. These lessons were designed to integrate the state standards with a local native world-view that made Indian students’ knowledge an asset in all students’ learning.

For example, when learning about local history and places of interest in their area, elementary students learned not only about the development of their town but also about the formation of the nearby reservation and the process of its gradual reduction in size over time, and how these patterns are related. When studying family structures and the roles of community leaders, they learned not only about the nuclear family but also about clans, and not only about the mayor and the town council but also about chiefs, clan mothers, and faithkeepers. Native history and ways of life would no longer confined to a single unit, but integrated into the entire mainstream curriculum through a parallel native curriculum designed and delivered for the mutual enhancement of both bodies of knowledge.

The second part of this teacher’s job was to provide intensive culture and language instruction exclusively to native students as part of their school-day schedule. These sessions grouped students by grade and were timed to ensure that they were not absent during the presentation of new content-area material in their regular classrooms. Some time in each session was devoted to discussion of how things were going in school, and conversation about any significant events taking place on the reservation or in students’ families. The teacher might discuss principles drawn from the Nation’s cultural and spiritual teachings about such topics as the importance of learning, being a friend, and making good personal choices. The bulk of the time was then devoted to lessons in cultural content objectives.
and heritage language development.

In the second year, students attending the Nation’s early childhood program began spending their mornings in district elementary classrooms for their core content-area lessons, and then returning to the reservation to spend the rest of the day learning language and culture. District teachers had professional development support to help them integrate these students into their classes, and tribal teachers became regular visitors to the elementary school to observe, serve as substitute teachers, and take part in workshops on methods and materials. Native students had better attitudes toward school, and were getting better grades. They also knew more about their traditional culture than before, and were speaking their heritage language more often and more fluently. This year, the district hired another Native teacher to teach the language to students in the middle grades.

I do not mean to suggest that this progress was made easily, or without some setbacks and frustrations for all concerned. The program continues to undergo refinement and expansion, and this process is not without its obstacles and concerns. But given the history of relations between the district and the Nation, and taking into account the rapid pace at which such substantive and lasting positive changes were accomplished, their shared success can only be described as remarkable. Credit for this achievement goes exclusively to the leaders and the educators directly involved in the work. My contribution was solely to affirm their good judgment, and facilitate in their setting of priorities along the way. This has given me a unique perspective from which to draw implications that may be of use to others who are contending with similar apparently conflicting objectives as they strive to stabilize and revitalize indigenous languages.

What follows will be my attempt to present some of the reasons for potential benefits of, and guidelines in, the creation of programs like the one I have briefly described. In bringing these introductory remarks to a close, it is important to stress that while a key element leading to change in our model district and Nation was the arrival of a new superintendent with new ideas, this alone would not have been enough to bring about the transformation that occurred. This individual was and remains extraordinary, but had he not adopted and operated from certain fundamental principles in implementing his reforms, he could not have succeeded. Such individuals are rare in any profession, but he would be the first to acknowledge that the principles matter most and that these are available to anyone, anywhere. First, indigenous language and culture survival and mainstream academic excellence can be mutually reinforcing. Second, native cultural heritages are powerful resources for meaningful, motivating learning for all students. And third, in negotiating the complexities of the first and second principles, Native American cultural and spiritual values must be the primary consideration.

2. Separation and Integration
Most First Nations children in the United States attend public schools where they are a minority of the student population. Given the extreme and increasing degree of segregation in American schools at the start of the 21st century, this may seem a
questionable statement unless it is remembered that nationwide more of these children live off rather than on reservations, and that there are at least as many who can claim native heritage as a significant part of their identity as there are those who are enrolled members of federally recognized tribes. It is not my intention here to make assertions about how a Native American child should or should not be formally identified as such. I wish only to point out that in terms of the circumstances of their education experience, the majority of students who can be considered potentially at risk as a result of learning environments that are insufficiently responsive to their native background do not have access to native-run programs that might help to reduce the negative effects of alienation.

Even in places where native-run programs designed to intervene in language death and culture erosion do exist, they can generally only reach limited numbers of young learners in those communities. For a variety of economic, political, religious, and other reasons many native students who might otherwise be seen as natural participants in language revitalization efforts end up not taking part. Most of these programs are aimed at the early childhood level or are designed for adults. Such programs as do exist for learners between early childhood and adult are almost exclusively after-school, weekend, or summer programs, and thus involve either considerable additional commitments of time and effort outside of school, extended interruptions in language learning, or both. These combined effects further limit the number of students likely to participate, and also undermine the maintenance over time of optimum language-learning conditions needed to produce as many fluent speakers as possible.

I do not mean to imply that native-run early childhood language programs as presently constituted are doomed to fail. On the contrary, they are indispensable, and many have achieved impressive and increasing success. (The same is true of adult programs, although for a variety of reasons to a lesser degree.) I do contend, however, that such early childhood programs by themselves will probably not be enough to produce the numbers of fluent speakers needed to save many of the indigenous languages now facing extinction. One fundamental reason for this is that too few students are likely to attend them long enough to achieve or maintain the necessary levels of fluency required to create adequate numbers of speakers. The vast majority of these students speak English as a first language. The desire to immerse them in their second, indigenous heritage language early in their lives is in keeping with the research in second language acquisition that indicates that young children can in the right circumstances learn second languages quickly and easily. The prevailing pattern of subsequently suspending the learning of these endangered languages when children leave these programs to attend mainstream schools where the languages are not taught confirms another, less widely acknowledged lesson of the research, namely that young children can also forget languages at least as quickly as they learn them.

Faced with the stark choice of either keeping their children in programs designed to teach them their heritage language and culture or pulling them out to send them to mainstream public schools where they will learn the subject matter
that leads to a high school diploma, the vast majority of Native American parents will choose the latter. Even those who are prepared to delay this choice by keeping their children in tribal programs through the kindergarten and first grade years will almost without exception sacrifice tradition for a greater chance at economic security in their future lives. This is a contemporary version of the same force that undermined the transmission of indigenous languages in previous generations. These parents, unlike many of their predecessors, are highly motivated to have their children learn the languages that they themselves in many cases do not speak. But this motivation, out of parental concern, typically cannot help but yield to economic imperatives operant in the larger society.

Numerous Native American nations have sought to respond to this difficult choice by establishing their own schools to provide the same content-area education students receive in mainstream public schools, hoping in this way to persuade native parents to keep their children in settings where they will be able to continue learning their heritage language and culture throughout their school careers, in addition to learning math, science, English, and social studies. Some of these nations have succeeded in this endeavor, and others will succeed in the years to come. But for most First Nations, creating their own schools is at present too great a burden to bear for a host of financial and logistical reasons, and the time it will take to achieve the goal may be longer than the time their languages have left.

Saving a dying language is one of the most complex and consuming endeavors that a community can undertake. More than simply a full-time job, it demands every resource of funding, energy, will, and genius that those committed to it can summon. Training teachers, devising materials, creating curricula, conducting community events, doing publicity, recruiting students and staff, learning ethnographic and linguistic techniques, nurturing mentor relationships with elders, and continually assessing progress and programs are only some of the essential activities (apart from actual teaching and learning) that must be attended to. To simultaneously take up the task of creating a school capable of serving all grades with all subject areas is to guarantee that to some extent language revitalization work will be diminished in its focus and effectiveness.

The reason why many Native American educators have chosen to pursue this daunting double task is no mystery. They often have their own painful memories of struggling to keep their spirits alive in schools where their identities as First Nations people were ignored or insulted. They may since have seen their own or others’ children going through similar hardships in the more recent past. They have concluded that the best way to ensure that native students get a traditional education is to take control of their entire education. They are by no means the only minority American educators who, over fifty years after Brown v. Board of Education, have despaired that mainstream American schools will never take integration seriously enough to achieve it in a thorough and meaningful way. I share their concerns, and will never hesitate to assist them in their efforts in any way that I can. But from my experience as a language and culture minority education advocate who has worked in hundreds of schools over the past two decades, I
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now perceive a change that has created an opportunity we cannot afford to ignore if we are serious about doing everything possible to save Indian languages from extinction.

Whatever ill effects have resulted from misguided priorities in standards-based school reform initiatives, the emphasis on improving all students’ academic performance has had one significant benefit. For essentially the first time, public schools are under real pressure to live up to their responsibilities to provide minority students with the support they need to succeed. It has already become evident to all but the most “back to basics”-oriented educators that purely remedial interventions are not effective in meeting this goal. Many district and building administrators who not long ago would have refused to consider programs like the one described in the introduction are now prepared to listen. One reason is that high-stakes tests all students must pass to graduate are requiring a more thorough understanding of subjects such as history and language arts than was previously the case. The increased potential of instructional enrichment resources drawn from local indigenous cultures offers us a chance to connect “modern” and “traditional” approaches to the education of all our students, and especially Native American students, in mutually reinforcing ways.

3. Benefits of Integration
Existing definitions of “modern” and “traditional” ways of learning are proving increasingly inadequate as educators strive to re-invent schools that will be capable of preparing students to meet higher standards and the challenges of living in the imperiled global biosphere of the 21st century. Mechanistic and hierarchical approaches to grouping students and addressing content-area knowledge, typical of “modern” education, are being revealed as a primary source of learners’ alienation from one another and from what they are supposed to learn, contributing to an undemocratic, ecologically unsustainable view of the world. The cultural wisdom of indigenous peoples, which has too long been characterized as “traditional” and thus irrelevant to or non-existent in the “modern” world, is rooted in the principle of interdependence among learners and in the areas of knowledge they attain. When infused with “traditional” values and methods, “modern” teaching becomes more meaningful to the learner, and more responsible for the life of her community on both a local and a global level.

The most powerful outcome that results from integrating local Native American culture and history in substantive and ongoing ways into mainstream content-area curricula and lessons can be seen in the attitudes and performance of Indian students in the classroom and in school life. Where once such knowledge may have been at best peripheral and at worst ignored or distorted, it becomes invested with genuine status in the institution which determines children’s success or failure, and the contributions children can make from their own life experiences to activities and discussions with classmates are linked in valuable ways to the lessons everyone is expected to understand. Non-Indian students’ early intrinsic interest in First Nations’ ways of life is confirmed as important in a range of
contexts by the de-facto arbiters of what matters in children’s worlds: their teachers. Native classmates become privileged knowers where knowing counts.

This reinforcement and affirmation of their heritage in school has been seen to have two profound effects on Native American students. First, by positioning them as experts in areas of minority knowledge seen as valuable by the majority society as embodied in the classroom and school, they can develop awareness and skills needed to live in these two sometimes-conflicting worlds. Second, and perhaps even more importantly for our purposes, this experience motivates native students who might otherwise be largely indifferent to their cultural and linguistic heritage to learn more about them, and to make them a more fundamental component of their sense of their own individual identities. An echo effect is seen among non-native students, who become more likely to respect and seek to better understand local native cultures. This has a beneficial influence on peer relationships among members of both groups in and out of school, and may be expected over time to promote better community relations among adults.

When non-native as well as native students at all levels are provided with culture-rich lessons and activities, drawn from local Native American ways of life and conceptually and specifically linked to content-area material across curriculum boundaries, conducted by native and non-native teachers working together with each making reference to the other’s ideas and objectives, the pedagogical effect is to reveal multiple inter-relationships among content disciplines and to restore some sense of wholeness to students’ courses of study. It also embeds abstract history, literature, and science content in a local context that connects past, present and future aspects of the places where learners are living their lives, providing teachers with a rich source of ideas and experiences from which to draw material that makes lessons more meaningful and memorable.

As potentially valuable as the integration of native perspectives into classroom learning is for non-native and native students to learn together. The benefits of the approach I am advocating are especially powerful for Native American students. This is because the program design described in the introduction requires the hiring of a native teacher in order to be fully credible and effective as a vehicle for the transmission of local indigenous culture and language. When native children have even one native teacher in a predominantly non-native school setting, it becomes possible for them to perceive their place in the school in a new light. It is their place, too. Someone who understands their situation is present to provide encouragement and advice, and to serve as a role model for living in two worlds. Not incidentally, non-native students are afforded the useful experience of interacting with a native adult as a person of knowledge and authority, which also influences native students’ perceptions of what is possible for them personally.

Native students are further benefited by the presence of a native teacher in their school because such a professional can also provide their non-native teachers with a colleague who can offer them guidance in how to respond to Indian students’ cultural orientations to learning, can assist them in interacting positively with parents and other family and community members, and can serve as a re-
source person in recommending local resources to enhance lessons, field trips, special events, community service opportunities, committee work participation, and so on. Apart from the project of creating an instructional enrichment program, it is often difficult for administrators to justify the hiring of a native person specifically because she is a native. In the context of such an integration-oriented initiative, however, the reasons become compelling enough to persuade local and state education officials to consider specially targeted measures (such as obtaining emergency certification status, or support for course-work toward a teaching degree) which may be necessary to establish and operate the program in its first few years. Choosing a teacher the Nation can accept is the crucial first step.

4. Guidelines for Program Development
Nothing will be more apparent by now than the fact that good leadership plays an essential role in initiating any program of the kind we have examined in the preceding pages. While relatively limited in terms of its overall size, expense, or direct impact on the general instructional program of the school or district, such a program will for many mainstream educators represent a profound shift of priorities and approach in meeting the needs of Native American students. Some, without considering the potential benefits for non-native students, may view this form of enrichment-oriented intervention as catering to a minority on whose behalf a great deal of effort and expense is already being exerted. Others, without taking into account the prohibitive expense and ineffectiveness of remedial approaches, may object that the idea is too extravagant an indulgence at a time of tight budgets and do-or-die standardized test scores.

In order to themselves be persuaded and then to persuade others, school district and building leaders will in most cases need to be convinced that the proposed program is not designed or intended exclusively to benefit Indian students. While this fact does not entirely eliminate the risks for these leaders in advocating change in Native American education in their institutions, it creates parallel risks for the First Nations leaders who must be engaged as program advocates in their own political and community contexts. Some will assert that their first duty is to protect and advance the interests of native children without subsuming these in the achievement of any imagined benefits for already-privileged non-natives. Others will maintain that native cultural teachings should not be entrusted to the use of institutional settings that have a poor record of respecting them in the past.

The objectives raised on both sides cannot be ignored. The only way for leaders to address them on or off the reservation, in council sessions, or in school board meetings, is by taking shared risks. The initial risks need to be taken by the people in whom the relevant power is most concentrated, and with whom the primary responsibility for education resides: the school district’s top-level administration. Native leaders who are obliged to entrust their community’s children to public school districts have long been forced to be close observers of the workings and decisions of school boards, superintendents, and principals. Even where
relations are not good, communications are typically ongoing and occur on an
influential level. A good-faith gesture by a district, especially where such gestures
have been few, can have a galvanizing effect on Nation perceptions of the possi-
bilities for progress. Stakes have grown high enough on both sides to make such
gestures and responses more viable than they have ever been before.

The shared nature of the risks involved is nowhere better demonstrated than in
the consistent reiteration by district and Nation leaders that the benefits of inte-
grating indigenous culture and language into public school life must benefit both
native and non-native students, and that incorporating the work of a native teacher
into the work of all teachers benefits the entire faculty. Every aspect of program
design and implementation must express and reinforce this objective. Many ma-
ajority educators will characterize this as privileging one minority group over
others. Some native educators and advocates will claim that it dilutes a necessar-
ily exclusive focus on the needs of native students. But a shared insistence on the
part of non-native and native leaders in their respective spheres of influence that
their aspirations for any child will be best served by improving the education of
all children creates a third, intermediary space within which those on both sides of
the divide can gather their support. This has the effect of relegating oppositional
voices from the center to the margins, and gives a plurality of teachers and parents
a chance to further their own interests by advocating for the interests of others.

Lasting change can result from the kind of consensus that such a political and
pedagogical position permits. When programs are instituted primarily by one or
another set of interests in the context of progressive or conservative district lead-
ership, they are vulnerable to elimination when the political pendulum swings
back again in the opposite direction. Representing a range of interests makes this
effect far less likely. In order to build a foundation of trust where constituencies
often may have been at odds, it is advisable once again to observe the principle of
affording primacy to the more vulnerable of the two sets of interests. Many pro-
ponents of Native American language revitalization are uneasy at the prospect of
their heritage cultures and languages becoming subjects of study in public
schools. The spiritual content of these inheritances is not to be discounted by non-
native educators who embrace the goal of keeping them alive for future genera-
tions. We must always be guided by our native partners in what to do in order to
avoid doing further damage to that which we wish to help save.

Toward this end, it makes sense in program development and initial imple-
mentation to begin with cultural content, and defer the often more sensitive
element of language until the program has begun to demonstrate its responsibility
and effectiveness. While it is seldom easy to definitively demarcate the sacred
from the secular in either the cultural or linguistic domains of native tradition, it is
generally not difficult for native educators to identify elements of their way of life
and worldview that they would like their non-native neighbors to understand
better, and that they would value having become a part of native students’ lives in
school. Elements that are manifestly sacred in nature will always be reserved for
native teachers to transmit in their own ways and on their own terms. These
boundaries must be made clear and respected by non-native educators as the program proceeds. A native faculty presence helps to ensure this without quelling a spirit of proper inquiry or instilling unwarranted inhibitions or resentments.

Having stressed the inclusiveness of benefits for all students as the program’s most fundamental principle, it becomes possible to pursue and protect essential provisions for native students as an integral component of that overarching goal. The two-tiered nature of the program, with native students receiving content-area enrichment lessons from a native teacher together with their non-native peers but also receiving more intensive and personalized small-group tutoring in native culture and language as part of the school day, is essential to the program design. Neither of these two components can be fully effective without the other. To do only the former would reduce native teachings to the status of an adjunct role in pursuit of other instructional objectives. To do only the latter (even if it were possible in the context of the general program without first benefiting the general program) would have a segregating effect on native students’ school experience, in part because it would be viewed by most non-native teachers as an irrelevant entitlement detracting from the achievement of the academic goals native students must share with their non-native classmates.

Once having established generally accepted grounds for the creation of this specialized space for native students’ learning of native teachings from a native educator, it must be scrupulously and steadfastly guarded from incursions by the general program. It must never be allowed to lapse into another form of remedial program, providing homework help or reinforcement of basic academic skills in the service of other classes. This protection is accomplished in two ways. First, however much planning is devoted to the enrichment curriculum provided to all students, twice as much must be devoted to that provided exclusively to native students. The extent of the units, lessons, and materials developed by the native teacher in consultation with other native educators must be continually made known to district and building administrators and other teachers to ensure their understanding that the work being done is substantive and intensive. Second, native students’ progress must be evaluated in an ongoing qualitative and comprehensive manner to document that specific objectives are being met.

These guidelines for implementation would be incomplete without making mention of one potential pitfall that must be taken into account in order to avoid what could become a serious obstacle for an otherwise successful program in its early stages of development. Many Native American communities are faced with complicated and sometimes heartbreaking differences surrounding the question of which children are to be accepted as members of the Nation and which cannot be. This question may emerge, for example, in whether or not a child has a designated clan, or an Indian name. It may become a problem for the program in determining which individual students may be permitted to take part in the small-group sessions reserved for native students. To refuse such permission to a child who may be half Indian, and who is thus subject to all of the difficulties any native child faces, would be to add to those difficulties by denying her what could prove to be
an important part of an answer in her search for meaning in her life. This is not a choice any teacher would ever want to have to make.

It is not my place to say how such a choice should be made in all instances. I will only suggest that it be considered carefully, on a case-by-case basis, through balanced consideration of the Nation’s judgment, the district’s regulations, the child’s parents’ wishes, the best interests of the program and the other students included in it, and, most of all, the child’s own needs. Once the child is included in the sessions, if she ultimately is, it is for the teacher in her best wisdom to determine how to respond to the complex realities of her circumstances. I will add that in the case of the program I have described, and others that I have been privileged to work with, when students in this situation have been included rather than excluded they have often made some of the greatest gains of any students involved. Moreover, other students whose native identity is uncontested have also learned what seem to me to be valuable lessons from them as a result.

One final recommendation concerns the issue of what levels should be included in the initial phase of program implementation. Even in the unlikely event that a district is prepared to attempt to institute a program from kindergarten through twelfth grade in its first year, I would in almost all cases advise against this. Wherever there are significant enough numbers of Native American students in a district to warrant the consideration of such a program, there is also invariably a long history of tension and distrust due to educational inequity (even if the non-native education establishment remains oblivious to it). The effects of this inequity may or may not be subtle, but they always begin in less obvious ways during the elementary grades. They then become steadily more evident as students move up into the secondary grades, where they become less readily amenable to remedy and where attempts that fail make further attempts difficult or impossible.

It is best to begin in the elementary grades, where curricula are more open to flexible and inventive enrichment possibilities, and where students are still relatively unselfconscious and open-minded in the process of their identity formation and their sense of one another. Consider starting with kindergarten and grades one and two for the first year, with firm plans to move up to third, fourth, and fifth grades in the following year or two. This works better for several reasons. First, it builds confidence among all concerned by laying a foundation of success, and allowing additional planning time. Second, it enables practitioners to learn from their inevitable mistakes and missed opportunities so these can be avoided as the native enrichment instruction moves up to be integrated with increasingly complex content-area material in later years. Third, the students move up along with the program, and are thus better prepared to benefit from it.

This is not to suggest that a decade must elapse before high school students may be directly affected by the positive influences that such a program might have in their lives. What happens in one part of a school district has a profound impact on all the other parts, even if that impact is at times indirect and subtle. Secondary students have younger siblings who are elementary students, and they will be cognizant of what their brothers and sisters are learning, and of the im-
pression this has on their parents, who may well themselves be involved in the program as advisors, guest presenters, and planning team members. A range of program dimensions more directly significant to native teenagers themselves also becomes possible, however, from the first year onward. As native teachers join the district’s faculty, they can become available to serve as consultants and mentors to secondary school students, and to offer occasional guest presentations in various courses and special programs. They can also reach out to native students in the upper grades to visit elementary classrooms and native small-group sessions to share their experiences, tell stories, dance, sing, make art, play games, teach skills, and otherwise serve as cultural ambassadors and role-models for younger non-native and native students. The value of such experiences for middle and high school students can be immense. Apart from constituting a meaningful form of community service, it may even inspire some to consider careers as teachers.

5. Conclusion

Readers of this contribution to a compendium of proceedings from the Stabilizing Indigenous Languages Conference (SILC) may justifiably ask whether my subject is sufficiently concerned with the urgent challenge of intervening in language death to warrant its being included here. I am half inclined to respond simply by quoting John Lennon’s line in “Revolution 1” that says “We’re doing what we can…” and leave it at that, but I think there may be a bit more worth saying. Obviously, the approach I have outlined will not in and of itself save anything (with the possible exception of a considerable amount of money presently being expended in misguided and ineffective attempts at the academic remediation of far too many Native American students). Public school-based programs are not and never can be a substitute for language-saving work done in native communities, by native people, in their own programs.

I hope it is by now evident, however, that programs such as the one I have described, built and run by native and non-native people together, can be a worthwhile supplement to other kinds of programs that are aimed specifically and solely at teaching and learning endangered languages. In the district I have referred to, high school courses in the Nation’s language were long offered, but very few of the native students there ever took them. The social, psychological and emotional barriers to reclaiming this part of their heritage, even if they once got some of it when they were little, had by then grown too great. Many of the most successful students who did take those courses were non-natives. Now there are good prospects that those courses will begin to be filled with native students who have had a chance to learn the language continuously throughout their school lives. This will improve the prospects for the language’s survival.

Public school administrators and teachers who read this textual version of my workshop given at the 11th annual SILC may also be skeptical about the possibilities for creating a program that integrates Native American culture and language into content-area learning in a comprehensive way, regardless of how much they
might consider the idea appealing. School districts in America are presently under tremendous stress due to the pressures of “No Child Left Behind” and the stringent standardized testing regimens being imposed to enforce it. I can only turn to John again: “You tell me it’s the institution….“ This cycle of school reform has provoked a widespread “back to basics” reaction that is tragically self-defeating, and largely self-inflicted. We need to use this moment of crisis as an opportunity to implement long-overdue changes in how we educate language and culture minority students, and all students. In other words, “You better free your mind instead …” We may not get a chance like this again.

In order to revitalize First Nations languages, it is necessary to transform the lives of First Nations children. For the vast majority of these children, in addition to addressing still unresolved issues of dire poverty, this will mean transforming the public school classrooms where they must learn to read, write, think, and live together with others in the pluralistic society we need to start building if America is to survive much longer as a democratic republic. That vision cannot be realized without present and future generations of Native America fully involved in the process. Their involvement requires the restoration of their heritage languages and cultures as fundamental elements of their overall education. To assume that such a monumental task can be achieved by working only on the margins of children’s educations without transforming their core, or that it is solely the responsibility of First Nations people themselves to make the necessary changes, is almost certainly to ensure losses from which none of us will fully recover.
Language Restoration Before Funding:
Or, What to Do Before the Grants Come Through

JOCELYN C. AHLERS
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When members of Tribes whose languages of heritage are endangered first find themselves able to turn their attention to issues of language documentation and revitalization, the examples of successful efforts which are most frequently cited are typically well-known cases such as Hawaiian and Maori (not to mention Hebrew). While these are all excellent examples of language revival in practice, they share one feature in common that can be rather intimidating for Tribes beginning the road to revitalization: large amounts of organized funding. Immersion schools of any kind can require a great deal of money to get up and running. This includes funding to train teachers, to develop curricula, to pay for space for teaching; the list goes on. It would be unfortunate for any person interested in working on the revitalization of his or her language of heritage to feel unable to begin such work until a large grant has been acquired, or to assume that an immersion school must be the first goal. The purpose of this paper is to suggest that it is possible to strike while the iron is hot, to begin to achieve meaningful and important steps in the revitalization process before any funds have been found to support large-scale efforts. In order to show this, I report on the steps achieved by the Elem Pomo Language Group in the first three years of revitalization efforts, which were completed largely without any large-scale funding. Each of the actions taken by the Language Group during these three years comprises a step which was necessary for the process of language revitalization to continue, but was also small enough, and in this case done in such a way, that large amounts of funding were not necessary. In this way, we ensured that we would be ready to take advantage of funding opportunities as they arose.

It is useful to begin with a brief description of the status of Elem Pomo. Elem (Southeastern Pomo) is a Pomoan language spoken near Clear Lake, California, in Lake County, on the Elem Pomo Indian Colony. As late as the 1970s, as many as one-third of Tribal members still had some knowledge of their language (McLendon 1975), although it was rarely used in conversation. The Tribe gained federal recognition in the 1970s, and now has somewhat fewer than 200 enrolled members. Elem underwent a process that could be referred to as “gradual death” (Campbell and Muntzel 1989), with at least two stages of bilingualism, first with
Spanish, and then with English, although it should be noted that, traditionally, Tribal members probably spoke two or more of the local Pomoan languages. Historically, there was a great deal of intermarriage among Tribes around the Lake, and many members of Elem have more than one Pomoan language as a language of heritage. At the time we began our revitalization project, there were two remaining speakers of the language, one of whom was in her fifties, and the other of whom was in her seventies. The speaker with whom I have been able to work is Mrs. Loretta Kelsey; she used her language in regular communication with her mother until she was in her thirties, but, until our work together began, had not used it regularly since that time. There is some prior documentation of Elem Pomo, which I list and discuss below.

The Elem Pomo Language Group first met at the Breath of Life, Silent No More, Language Restoration Workshop in June of 2002. The purpose of this workshop is to introduce the holdings of the UC Berkeley archives to Native Californians whose languages have one or no speakers. Linguistic mentors aid workshop participants in deciphering the linguistic materials that have been found for their languages, and in beginning to think of ways to use those materials in the language revitalization process (see the Introduction to this volume for a more complete description). At that workshop, I was assigned to be the linguistic mentor for Robert Geary, Gary Thomas, and their aunt, Mrs. Loretta Kelsey, all members of the Elem Pomo Tribe. Robert was especially interested in learning more about his language, and in finding ways to begin to use his language again. We spent the week together, gathering as much of the documentation of Elem as we could find. The final list of documentation included a copy of approximately 500 file slips (Grekoff, date unknown), a copy of a grammar written in the 1970s (Moshinsky 1974), copies of fieldnotes and texts gathered in the 1940s (Halpern 1940), several audio recordings burned onto CDs, and several word lists collected at various times during the 1900s by unknown fieldworkers working with unknown speakers. This material has formed the basis for the historical documentation with which we have been working. We have added to it over time, gathering copies of books written about Pomo culture in general, but these works are specific to the language, and have been an important resource in our work together.

After the workshop ended, Robert and Mrs. Kelsey and I decided that we should work together to begin to document Mrs. Kelsey’s use of Elem Pomo. Since then, we have met on a regular basis, and Robert and I are regularly in touch by phone. Each step that we have taken since that time has been decided upon collaboratively. In general, Robert formulates a statement of the next goal that he would like to achieve in our work together. I then suggest some of the ways in which we might go about reaching that goal. Robert and Mrs. Kelsey then decide which of those options would be most appropriate for them and for their community at that time, and we go forward. Frequently during the process, we revisit our sense of where we are going and how we are getting there, readjusting as necessary to meet everyone’s needs while still moving forward with our work.
In this way, the language revitalization process has been driven by the needs of the community from the beginning.

Our first step was to create a practical orthography with which to write the language. While Robert had been introduced to the International Phonetic Alphabet during the Breath of Life workshop, as well as to the various writing systems used by linguists who in the past had worked with speakers of Elem Pomo, we felt that the IPA was too unwieldy for use as a day-to-day writing system. A number of linguists have discussed the information that must be taken into consideration when creating a practical orthography (see, e.g., Hinton and Hale 2001), so I will not provide a detailed discussion of the theoretical implications of creating writing systems here. In general, however, a writing system must strike a balance between accurately representing all of the sounds of a language, and having so many symbols recording so many nuances that it is not useful for everyday life. In this case, the Tribe wished to have a writing system which mirrored that of English, so that children who are literate in English and are learning Elem would be comfortable working with it. The members of the Language Team also wished to have a system which could be used easily on a standard computer keyboard, to facilitate email communication, and the typing of educational materials. Finally, as a linguist, I felt that it was necessary, if at all possible, to adequately represent the phonemic structure of the language. In other words, I wished to avoid potential spelling pitfalls like that of English -ough, which is pronounced differently in words such as *though*, *through*, *cough*, and *tough*. Taking all of these considerations into account, I created a writing system (see Figure 1 below), which we have used since that time.

While this work was time-consuming and required an understanding of the phonological system of the language, it was not a project that needed funding to complete. Furthermore, once the orthography was in place, it opened up the use of
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Figure 1. Elem Pomo Practical Orthography

```
FRONT <- CENTRAL <-> BACK
HIGH
  i  oo

MID
  e  u  o

[oy]

LOW
  [aw]  a
```
email for communication about the language, since we had deliberately developed
the orthography to be compatible with a western keyboard, something that we
were lucky that the phonology of the language permitted.

The creation of this practical orthography was a vital first step in our
documentation and revitalization process, and had a number of repercussions.
First, it meant that Robert could begin to create materials which were easily
understood by other members of the Tribe. Moreover, the creation of those
materials indexed an active interest in language documentation and revitalization,
in a way that utilizing a writing system developed by a linguist for linguists would
not have done. Over time, we have made minor adjustments to the writing system
to reflect information which Robert and Mrs. Kelsey feel is important to represent
in the written form of a word. For example, while stress in Elem Pomo generally
falls on the penultimate syllable of the word, there are some cases where it falls
on either the antepenultimate, or the ultimate syllable instead. At this point, we
have not discovered whether these differences are predictable from the
phonological structure of the word, and, in any case, these stress patterns are not
predictable for language learners who are reading a word for the first time. We
have therefore recently decided to begin marking stress on words when it does not
fall on the penultimate syllable, and thus will be adding an accent to the vowel in
a stressed syllable in such cases. This ability to adjust our practice when we have
added new knowledge has been an important part of our work together for two
reasons. First, it emphasizes the collaborative nature of the work. It is vital that
the considerations of all those who will be using the documentation be taken into
account in developing materials. Second, our ability to adjust our working
practice when new information comes to light means that we have not waited to
produce learning and teaching materials until we have all possible information
regarding the Elem language and its structures. To wait that long would mean that
we might lose the opportunity to make use of one of our greatest resources in the
language documentation and revitalization process: the speaker of the language.
Moreover, it would restrict Robert’s ability to devote time and energy to the
language whenever that is possible for him. When working on a small scale in this

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Alveolar/retroflex</th>
<th>Palato-alveolar</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Post-velar</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stop</strong></td>
<td>p/b</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>t/d</td>
<td></td>
<td>k</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glottalized stop</strong></td>
<td>p'</td>
<td>th’</td>
<td>t’/d’</td>
<td></td>
<td>k’</td>
<td>q’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affricate</strong></td>
<td>ts'</td>
<td>ch’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fricative</strong></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nasal</strong></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liquid</strong></td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glide</strong></td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
way, it is necessary to take each day’s work and immediately put it to use in the community, and a working practice that allows for some flexibility in material development is an asset in such a situation.

Robert immediately took this writing system and began to develop a series of flashcards to use with his children in their home. Before the development of the practical orthography, he had learned a fairly large lexicon of basic nouns from Mrs. Kelsey, but had had no easy way of writing those words down or of conveying that information to others when he was not present. By creating flashcards, he was able to go home and play games like Concentration with his children. Our next step was to learn how to say each of those nouns in the context of a complete sentence, so that, instead of simply saying “eagle”, Robert could ask his children, “Is this an eagle?” and they could respond, “That is an eagle.” In this way, each lexical item that was on a flashcard could be used in a communicative act, rather than in a list of words. The creation of these flashcards, like the development of the practical orthography, was something that could be done with a minimal budget. Each card had a picture on both sides, with the Elem word on one side, and the English word on the other. Robert had them all laminated for durability. While they were printed in color, even that isn’t entirely necessary when a color printer is not available. Moreover, once the template was in place for creating the flashcards, Robert could make more each time we developed and verified a new list of vocabulary items. (See Figure 2 below for an example of some of these early flashcards.)

The creation of the flashcards was another small but important step on the road to language revitalization. By introducing words and phrases to children, the documentation project that we were engaged in became the source of information for immediate work in revitalization. It was no longer an academic, static affair.

Figure 2: Pomo Language Flashcards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T’an T’an Kin</th>
<th>Luq’ol q’ol Kin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tho Tho Kin</td>
<td>Ts’ya Ts’ya Kin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instead, it was a process which had immediate results in language use among this small group of Tribal members. As a next step, Robert and I worked with Mrs. Kelsey to develop Elem equivalents for a number of phrases used regularly in ceremonies in the Tribe’s Roundhouse, and Robert began to use them in that context right away. Again, this small project had immediate repercussions, in that Tribal members began to see, in a fairly public venue, language use that was practical and accessible to everyone.

Throughout these stages, none of these projects required any significant resources other than the willing participation of a speaker, a learner, and a linguist. All of us were working without any reimbursement, and were meeting in the Tribal office or in Robert’s home. We met once a month, when I traveled to Clear Lake from San Diego. At first, our meetings were hard to schedule, as we all lived in different parts of the State, but when Mrs. Kelsey moved back to Clear Lake, we found it easier to create times to meet. These once-a-month meetings took place from about 9 until 5. Even lunch became time to hear about the history of the language and its speakers; although we were not gathering linguistic data per se during that time, our lunchtime talks provided the cultural background so necessary for placing language use in context, and led us to ask further questions that expanded our knowledge about both the language and the culture, both vital components of a language revitalization project.

Once we had a writing system and flashcards, and the language had been reintroduced to some ritual situations, we were ready for a larger project. We decided to begin the work necessary to create a phrasebook. While we knew that we could decide on the content of the phrasebook, and gather the linguistic material needed for the phrasebook, on our own as we had been working, we also realized that it would cost money to produce the phrasebook and began to look for funding to pay for publication and materials costs. In the meantime, we gathered together a number of examples of phrasebooks that had been published by other California Tribes, and began to decide what we wanted to include, and what we wanted the final phrasebook to look like.

We decided that the goal of the phrasebook would be to provide useful, everyday language to members of the Tribe, and that it would also serve as a vehicle for introducing the practical orthography and the pronunciation of each of the symbols. These considerations determined the content that we began to gather. The phrasebook begins with a section that introduces each symbol in the orthography, with an English word or description to show the pronunciation, and an example of the sound in an Elem word (with its meaning). The next section is entitled “chit chat”, and includes a great deal of the material that enables speakers to use the later lists of words in complete and communicative sentences. This page has phrases like, “This is a __”, and “That is a __”, as well as questions like, “What is that?” and “What is this?” Such phrases enable language learners and users to place individual words into the context of the sentence, changing those words from lists to actual communicative acts. We have also included basic conversational phrases like, “How are you?”, “Thank you”, “What is your
The next section we have entitled “Commands”, and it includes a list of basic, everyday commands that might be used in a home or classroom, such as “Sit down”, “Be quiet”, “Hand me the ____”, etc. Again, each of these phrases constitutes a communicative act in that it allows a speaker to create circumstances in which a hearer would respond to a verbal cue, whether it is a question or an order. In this way, Elem becomes not just a list of words on a page, but a language that can be used in real-life, if limited, situations. Further sections of the phrasebook contain lists of terms for household items, food, animals, days of the week, numbers, seasons, plants, and so on. There are also sections including adjectives (colors, feelings, temperatures, etc.) and verbs (basic actions). The end of the phrasebook has an alphabetized list of all the Elem words and English words contained in the book, with their page numbers. The purpose is to create a reference that will allow members of the Tribe to find places in their daily lives to use their language of heritage.

The phrasebook is nearing completion, and we are considering publication options. Our hope is that this book will become an heirloom that each Tribal family can use for years to come, and we would like its format to reflect the unique nature of the book; in particular, we plan for the book to be pocket-sized, so that it can easily be carried. A phrasebook serves a number of purposes in a language documentation/revitalization program. It is a useful tool in language teaching and learning, and can be used to begin a language teaching program. It can also be an important step in the language documentation process, in that it begins the work of creating a dictionary, and the knowledge necessary to document and form the basic sentence forms that are provided at the beginning of the book can serve as material to begin a practical grammar of the language. Thus, while a project like this can be done expensively, if funding is available, it is also worth doing inexpensively, as a useful interim step in working with a language.

In Summer 2004, Robert and Mrs. Kelsey were accepted into the Master-Apprentice Language Learning Program, funded by the Advocates for Indigenous California Language Survival (described in detail in Hinton and Hale 2001). This program provides support for Robert and Mrs. Kelsey to meet regularly for their language work. It also provides training in creating and sustaining a one-on-one immersion language learning experience. Finally, it has provided equipment and training for recording language, and using that language to create teaching materials. This program has allowed Robert and Mrs. Kelsey to progress more quickly with Robert’s learning of the language.

Our next step in working together was to hold a series of language immersion camps on the Elem Pomo Indian Colony reservation. The information that was gathered during each of the steps listed above was used to inform these language camps. The curriculum was decided upon based on a series of conversations among the Language Group regarding what kinds of linguistic information would best serve the Tribe in several realms, including usefulness in day-to-day living, and cultural appropriateness. Each language camp was designed to include a series of ritual language activities that occur in every lesson, and that students can
use in day-to-day living. The first is introductions, in which students are taught to say, “My name is ____”, and “What is your name?”, using immersion techniques. They also learn to answer the questions, “What is his name?” and “What is her name?” In this way, they not only learn the word name, as well as a polite way to introduce themselves, but they learn, inductively, the different articles my, your (singular and plural), his, and hers. Furthermore, they learn how to turn statements into questions. With the question, “Is his name ___?” they learn to create yes/no questions, and that different kinds of questions require different markers. Thus, these rituals of language use serve several language-learning goals. The introduction is followed by the offering of drinks. The instructors go from student to student asking if they would like water or soda. Again, this serves several purposes: it reinforces question formation, it teaches the words “water” and “soda”, and it teaches a politeness behavior that is important and culturally grounded, especially as younger people are expected to think of the needs of their elders in any gathering.

The four language lessons that we initially developed for our camps cover a wide variety of themes. (See Appendix A for a detailed lesson plan from one of the camps). The first taught the names of clothes and body parts, as well as a series of sentences in which those names could be used, including the basic sentences “Is this a ___?”, “What is this?” and “Hand me the ___”. Each of these sentences can be used in a communicative situation, particularly the last. The second camp introduced kinship terminology, and students created their own family trees with the appropriate terms of address and reference for each of their relatives. This camp focused less on immersion than the first camp, in part because it was difficult to act out each of the family members on the tree – Elem kinship terminology is complex. However, we all felt that teaching this terminology was important from a cultural perspective, so that Tribal members could have a sense of the ways in which their language encodes the complex relationships among family members, and could use their language to refer to, and address, relatives and elders in a culturally appropriate manner. The third language camp introduced terminology for cooking and food, as well as sentence structures that can be used in the kitchen, including sentences about setting the table, cutting food, and cooking food. And the last camp reinforced these terms in a lesson on cooking acorn soup. Each camp ended with a game of Bingo, using cards with the terminology learned during the lesson.

Each of these camps took place outside the Elem Pomo Roundhouse, the Tribe’s sacred space. This location served a number of purposes. First, it is at the center of the reservation, easily accessible, and open to everyone. Second, because of its proximity to the Roundhouse, it serves to highlight the importance of language learning to the Tribe. The costs associated with these camps were minimal; at each, I brought the materials necessary for teaching (e.g., bags of children’s clothing and a huge poster of a family tree with all of the kinship terminology written on it). At the first, we served a potluck dinner for all of the participants; at subsequent camps, we ordered pizza for everyone. Other costs
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included nametags, soda and water, and Bingo prizes. In essence, however, these camps were a fairly low-cost way of introducing the Tribe both to their language, and to the Language Group’s efforts at documentation and revitalization.

As I stated at the beginning of this paper, its purpose has been to show readers that, while obtaining funding for language revitalization is an important long-term goal of individuals, groups, or Tribes working on language documentation and renewal, it is not a prerequisite for beginning language work. Each step that the Elem Pomo Language Group took during the period reported on in this paper – the creation of an orthography, making and using flashcards in language teaching, gathering data for a phrasebook, and holding immersion language camps – has been an important move forward in the renewal of Elem. Furthermore, each of these achievements places the Language Group in a stronger position to take advantage of funding opportunities as they arise. We have since received grant monies to support the publication of the phrasebook, and the Tribe is working with the Administration for Native Americans (ANA) on a three-year grant which will provide support for some of the Language Group’s ongoing activities. The lesson, if we can say that there is one, is that language renewal can progress at many levels, all of which are powerful venues for language work.
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Appendix A

Workshop #1: Body parts/clothing

Introductions:
(During this section, instructors will first introduce themselves to the students and to each other, to model an introduction. Then they will turn to students and ask what their names are, one by one. When students respond with only their names, instructors will model for them, “Weyuk xin (student’s name)” and encourage the students to repeat. Then they will hand students a name tag and tell them to write their name. Finally, can test comprehension by asking, “Is your name ___?” Or, “Is his name ____?” To this, students can simply respond “yes” or “no”.)

• “My name is ____.” Weyuk xin ____.
• “What is your name?” Theyuk xin awiye?
• “Write the name____.” Ma xin _____ asoon.
• “Is your name ____?” Theyuk xin ____ ha?
• “Yes.” I.
• “No.” Hele.
• “Is his/her name ____?” Ooith/ometh xin ____ ha?
• “Do you understand?” Ma fdikith ha?

Materials needed: Name tags.

Drinks:
(During this section, instructors will ask each student individually whether they’d like coffee, juice, etc., and ask them to respond with “yes” or “no”, as learned in the last section. This section can be followed by a short break for students to drink their beverage of choice.)

• “Do you want coffee?” Ma kofi xatsith?
• “Do you want milk?” Ma letse xatsith?
• “Do you want sugar?” Ma muqabats xatsith?
• “Do you want juice?” Ma mukayin Xa xatsith?

Materials needed:
• coffee
• cups
• milk
• sugar
• juice
Introduce clothing terms and body parts:
(Instructors begin this by pointing to the various pieces of clothing and body parts
(on themselves and each other) and naming them. Students are asked to repeat the
names of the items. Probably best to just do clothes to start, and then to do body
parts, if time and attention allows. Labeling should be done in complete
sentences, “This is a ____”, although the word for the particular items can be
repeated again before asking students to say it. Have them point to the body part
or nearest example of the item of clothing. All three instructors should also be
pointing and indicating and saying the terms to help students along.)

- “clothes” aba
- “hat” sumlelo
- “glasses” ooikunchim
- “shirt” kamisa
- “jacket” kapothe
- “skirt” nawash
- “pants” k’abok
- “dress” thonekoo
- “socks” kalsetha
- “shoes” sapatho
- “boots” wothas
- “coat” kapothe
- “belt” moshnets

- “This is a ____.” Mi ______.
- “That is a ____.” Ooi ______.

Materials needed: One of each kind of clothes.

Opportunity for student practice/comprehension:
(Instructors start with yes/no questions to the group, and work up to individual
student questions.)

- “Is this ____?” Mi _____ ha?
- “Is that ____?” Ooi _____ ha?
- “Touch your _____,” Theyak _____ atha.
- “Where are your _____?” Theyak _____ hey’e?
- “Who is wearing ______?” Ts’a _____ ashamath?

Materials needed: None
Guided practice/labeling charts to take home/preparing for Bingo:
(Hand out sheets of paper with picture of the body, and pictures of clothes on them. Tell students to find a particular piece of clothing or body part (not in order); as one last test of comprehension, then tell them to write the label next to the item. Labels will be placed on the large posters so that students can see and copy them.)

- “Find the ____.”
- “Where is the _____?” _____ hey’e?
- “Write the word _____.” Ma _____ asoon.
- “Here is the word _____."

Materials needed:
- Sheets of paper with body and clothes on them to label.
- Large charts with pictures of body and clothes.
- Labels for the large charts, printed large enough for students to read.

Bingo:
(Gives students one more chance to practice comprehension of all the words. Instructors will require students to say, “I have a ___”, before marking a square.)

- “Who has a _____?”
- “I have a ______.”
- “Bingo!”

Materials needed:
- Bingo cards
- Markers for the cards
- Prizes

Dinner:

- “Do you want some?”
- “Thank you.”

Materials needed:
- Spaghetti
- Drinks
- Forks, knives, plates, napkins
- Cookies
“Without Our Language We Will Cease to Exist as a Unique People”

STELOMETHET ETHEL B. GARDNER
Stó:lō (Coast Salish)

Language is central to cultural identity. Language enhances self-esteem and pride which promotes effective social adjustment. Language expresses the world view of its speakers, i.e. the uniqueness of a culture in terms of food, housing, clothing, methods of travel; how the world was created; the interaction of plant, animal, bird and human life; ways we organize our society, games, songs, dances and art. Language is the principal means by which culture is brought together, shared and transmitted to successive generations (Leon 1988:2).

1. Language is Culture, Culture is Language
The Stó:lō community adopted the above mission statement in 1988. Siyámtelot, otherwise known as Shirley D. Leon, in the paper Language is Culture, Culture is Language asks, “Why bother retaining a language which is no longer a viable part of modern Indigenous lifestyles?” Her rhetorical question reflects the current state of Stó:lō Halq’eméylem. She reiterates the contents of the mission statement quoted above and lists some of the benefits of ‘why bother’: “… can be crucial to physiological well-being, a sense of self-esteem, and social development…. [I]ntellectual growth and educational achievement flow from the ability to have command of more than one language” (Leon 1988:6). The elders of the Stó:lō community agree with a similar view regarding the importance and benefit of retaining the Stó:lō Halq’eméylem language. Siyámtelot quotes this view:

Our language embodies a value system about how we live and relate to each other. It gives a name to relationships among kin, to roles and responsibilities among family members, to ties with broader groups. There are no English words for these relationships because, in general, social and family lives are different from ours. If our language is destroyed, these relationships break down and will inevitably destroy other aspects of our way of life and culture, especially those that describe man’s connection with nature, the Great Spirit, and the order of things. Without our language, we will cease to exist as a unique people (Leon 1988:7-8).

The elders’ statement, “Without our language, we will cease to exist as a unique people,” implodes in my mind as a Stó:lō person who is acutely aware of the critical state of our language. The implications of what that statement means
concerns me deeply. That critical state, according to Bauman’s (1980) classification, shows how Halq’eméylem is verging on obsolescence in that

- only a few older adults speak the language fluently
- the language is not taught to children in the home
- the number of fluent speakers declines as the population increases
- English is the preferred language in most situations
- there are minimal literacy skills among fluent speakers.

Obsolescence is the stage before extinction in Bauman’s classification which includes flourishing, enduring, declining, obsolescent and extinct languages. Only a handful of fluent speaking elders are involved in the language work, so what we do now as a language community is crucial to determining whether we reverse the process, or allow Stó:lō Halq’eméylem to become extinct.¹

We are the Upriver Halq’eméylem people. Our language is one of three dialects of Halkomelem, a member of the Salishan language family. Twenty-three languages of this family span an area extending over southern British Columbia, Washington, northern Idaho, western Montana, and northwestern Oregon. Kinkade (1992) divides it into five branches:

1. Bella Coola
2. Central Salish
   Comox/Sliammon, Clallam, **Halkomelem**, Lushootseed, Nooksack, Pentlatch, Sechelt, Squamish, Straits Salish, Twana
3. Interior Salish
   Coeur d’Alene, Columbian, Kalispel/Flathead/Spokane, Lilooet, Okanagan/Colville, Shuswap, Thompson
4. Tillamook
5. Tsamosan
   Lower Chehalis, Upper Chehalis, Cowlitz, Quinault

Halkomelem,² of the Central Salish branch, is closely related to its neighbor to the north, Squamish, and its neighbors to the south, Nooksack and Straits. It is divided into three principal dialects: Upriver, Downriver and Island.

---

¹ David Crystal states that since we can now make a true assessment of the extent of language death, and the possibility that we might have only one language in the world in a few hundred years, proposes that it is this generation that can make a difference, to either “sit back and do nothing…” or “to act, using as many means as possible to confront the situation…” (2000:165-166).

² Halkomelem is an Anglicization of the Upriver term for the language. Due to different names for the language in different dialects, this Anglicization is adopted to avoid favouritism when speaking about the whole language.
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Halkomelem Territory

The Upriver dialect is spoken from as far as Yale down to Matsqui in the lower Fraser Valley of southwestern British Columbia. The Downriver dialect is spoken in the Vancouver Metropolitan area, and the Island dialect is spoken on southeastern Vancouver Island from north of Saanich Arm to Nanaimo (Elmendorf and Suttles 1960:1). Halq’eméylem is used when referring to the language from the Upriver perspective, and is further broken down into five sub-dialects, including Sumas, Pilalt, Chilliwack, Chehalis and Tait (Gerdts 1977).³

Upriver Halkomelem Territory (Halq’eméylem)

Index: 1 Chawathil, 2 Skawahlook, 3 Ohamil, 4 Peters, 5 Seabird Island, 6 Popkum, 7 Cheam, 8 Skway, 9 Squiala, 10 Skwah, 11 Aitchelitz, 12 Kwawkwawapilt, 13 Yakweakwioose, 14 Skowkale, 15 Tzeachten, 16 Soowahlie

³ Gerdts’ thesis indicated four dialects of Upriver: Sumas, Chilliwack, Chehalis and Tait; however, later descriptions include Pilalt.
2. **Halq’eméylem Origins**

Our Stó:lō origin stories tell us that we have lived on our land since *time immemorial*, while western science dates the earliest occupation of North America to approximately 15,000 years ago (Thom 1996a, 1996b). Stó:lō origin stories are centered on Xá:ls who brought order into the world, and Xá:ls changed people into animals, plants and stones back and forth, and “and [many] Stó:lō have a special relationship to these natural resources, for they considered them their ancestors.”

They are stories about how we became fully human and connected to the world as we understand it today.

Nine thousand years ago salmon was an important food staple alongside land mammals, which made our ancestors distinct from other cultures in the New World and beyond. Our Stó:lō culture developed from a hunting-gathering lifestyle dependent upon fresh catches of fish and wildlife to complex communities of people, with social status and ranking systems, regional trade networks, and elaborate artistic and ritual life. The Stó:lō developed social classes, formed through inter-married family groups that gained wealth by controlling access to the best fishing, hunting and gathering locations. Radiocarbon dating, in the mid-1950’s placed the origin of the Salish people at the Lower Fraser Valley Canyon. Evidence showed that people moved from the coast into the interior as the salmon shifted up the inland waterways (Carlson 2001). Kroeber (1999) dates Proto-Salish at 3,000 years ago based on differences in phonology and morphology; Swadesh (1950) dates it at 6,000 years ago based on his glottochronological study.

Early in the nineteenth century the Chilliwack people lived up the Chilliwack River in the mountains and spoke a dialect of Nooksack. Logjams caused the Chilliwack River to change its course and to flow north into the Fraser. The Chilliwack people then moved into the valley, and by the middle of the nineteenth century they had some twelve villages and started abandoning their original language for Halkomelem (Galloway 1985:416-418, also cited in Suttles 1990:455-456). By the 1940’s the Nooksack language was largely replaced by adjacent Upriver Halkomelem, the northern dialect of Northern Lushootseed, or English.

3. **Stó:lō Halq’eméylem Today**

Stó:lō organization today consists of a Stó:lō Nation Government which includes nineteen of twenty-four First Nation Bands within Stó:lō territory, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aitchelitz</th>
<th>Skawahlook</th>
<th>Scowlitz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chawathil</td>
<td>Seabird Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheam</td>
<td>Skowkale</td>
<td><em>Yale</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwantlen</td>
<td>Skway</td>
<td><em>Union Bar</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Kwaw Kwaw Apilt    Soowahlie     *Peters
Lakahahmen          Squiala       *Chehalis
Matsqui              Sumas         *Skwah
Shxw’ow’hamel       Tzeachten
Popkum              Yakweakwioose  (*Independent Stó:lō Bands)

Stó:lō, our Halq’eméylem word meaning “River,” is the collective name for all people whose Aboriginal Right it is to speak the Halq’eméylem language. Today, Stó:lō traditional territory covers an area of approximately 1.7 million hectares along the lower 190 kilometers of the Fraser River. The Fraser River and fishing are at the heart of Stó:lō culture.

Prior to European colonization it is estimated that there were 10,000 to 30,000 Halq’eméylem speakers (Carlson 1997:141), which declined to about 1,300 by 1928. Today the Stó:lō population has steadily risen to the level of about 5,700 by 1993 (ibid:165-166), but with only a handful of elders who speak the Halq’eméylem language fluently. English is used predominantly. In 1991, the entire First Nation and non-First Nation population in S’ólh Tééméxw (ibid:53) in Stó:lō and Musqueam territory, was recorded at 2.7 million, and was projected to increase rapidly within the following ten years.

Our Stó:lō, or River, culture, Halq’eméylem and its direct ancestors evolved for 10,000 years in the Stó:lō area (ibid:164), and within 200 years of European contact, our Halq’eméylem language was nearly completely annihilated from ever being a spoken, functional thriving language again. For 200 years, the colonizers tried to make us forget who we were, in effect to make us all st’áxem (ibid:90) “worthless people” who do not know our history. But despite the hardships of the past, we can now aspire to become smelá:lh (ibid:90) “worthy people”, who know our history, who know our language. The Stó:lō are nearly 6,000 people strong now, a force to carry forward a legacy of 10,000 years of cultural development and change on S’ólh Tééméxw, the land of the River People.

4. Halq’eméylem Revival

A key group of people in the Stó:lō community are working to reverse the process toward language death, despite the fact that Halq’eméylem has been identified (Foster 1982) as one of the many Aboriginal languages in Canada headed for extinction. We have a handful of older adults who speak Halq’eméylem fluently; three of them can also write in the language. These key people strive to revive the language with a determination that defies all predictions of extinction. These people have been active participants in the work of the Skulkayn Heritage Project of the early seventies, the Coqualeetza Education Training Centre, and in the Stó:lō Shxwélí Halq’eméylem Language Program.

The Coqualeetza Centre conducted a great deal of the earlier work with the Stó:lō elders, of documenting the language and developing language and culture resources for teaching. The linguist Brent Galloway, together with a team of elders, produced the writing system, the first linguistic grammar of Halq’eméylem, a 50-
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page grammatical sketch, a 3,000-word list and a 15,000-card dictionary and teaching materials. Adult courses, including three teacher training programmes for ten fluent speakers, were offered through a local college. The teacher training programmes included Edna Bobb, Nancy Phillips, Elizabeth Phillips, Tillie Gutierrez, all of whom became Halq’eméylem teachers and introduced the new writing system in the classroom. This led to local language courses for adults and children, but predominantly in the Band Schools.

Two issues became evident. First, the school programs were highly influenced by a linguistic approach. This type of programme, which stressed pronunciation, vocabulary, and sentence patterns, failed to promote a strong understanding of the cultural aspects inherent in the language. Second, the elders were in the classrooms teaching the young children, but the parents were not able to reinforce the language at home. Thus, the language was not being transmitted and reinforced naturally from one generation to the next.

The Stó:lō Shxwelí Halq’eméylem Language Program began in 1995 as an endeavour to educate adults who would become fluent in Halq’eméylem, and who would pursue a course of study leading to a teaching certification. Shxwelí means spirit or life force in Halq’eméylem (Carlson 1997:55), and denotes a level of deep importance afforded the language renewal effort. By teaching the adults, the Shxwelí program is addressing the missing link, the inter-generational gap evident in the previously mentioned school programs. However, we know very little about what learning the language means in the context of these peoples’ lives – how they use it in the community; how they value it; how the language relates to the Stó:lō culture today. By examining the lived experience of the people, we can learn how the spirit or life force of the Stó:lō is reflected in their use of Halq’eméylem. In 1997 and 1998, I became more intimately aware of the language renewal effort while taking Halq’eméylem linguistics classes with the Stó:lō Shxwelí Halq’eméylem Language Program located at the Coqualeetza grounds in Sardis, British Columbia, Canada.

My reasons for enrolling in the courses initially were purely selfish; I wanted to learn the language of my people, the Stó:lō. However, while observing my peers and learning some of the intricate meanings of Halq’eméylem words through the elders, I was touched deeply. Sitting in a class of 25 Stó:lō people who were determined to learn the language to eventually become Halq’eméylem language teachers impacted powerfully on my sense of identity, on my understanding of what it means to be Stó:lō. Among my classmates, I discovered a reflection of myself that I had experienced only with my immediate family. They resembled me in many ways, in their quiet respectful accommodation, their easy laughter, and their mannerisms. They knew my relatives and shared with me what they knew about them. I was among kin who were as deeply concerned about reconnecting with our language, culture and identity as I was. I became interested in knowing more about what they were experiencing in learning Halq’eméylem and in being involved with the language revival work. I determined that I wanted to contribute to the Halq’eméylem renewal effort in some way. That became the work of this study.

65
5. Research Method

My entire study is truly an heuristic investigation, an internal search for understanding the phenomenon of how learning Ḥalq’eméylem can provide a key to understanding my Stó:lō identity and worldview. Moustakas (1994:17-18) describes heuristic research as

… a process that begins with a question or problem which the researcher seeks to illuminate or answer. The question is one that has been a personal challenge and puzzle in the search to understand one’s self and the world in which one lives. The heuristic process is autobiographic, yet with virtually every question that matters there is also a social – and perhaps universal – significance…

Heuristics is a way of engaging in scientific search through methods and processes aimed at discovery; a way of self-inquiry and dialogue with others aimed at finding the underlying meanings of important human experience.

Issues of identity and worldview and how these are reflected in Aboriginal languages have been emphasized strongly as reasons why we might want to focus a great deal of energy, time and commitment to reviving Ḥalq’eméylem. Thus, in my heuristic search, I investigated three topics related to these issues, incorporating personal reflections, literature and conversations with others. First, I explored what happened in the rise and demise of our language, and how what happened affected this Stó:lō person’s life and identity reflected first in bewilderment and ambivalence and then in a growing pride in our Stó:lō heritage and language. In exploring my own experience from my earliest memories of Ḥalq’eméylem to my developing passion to learn more about my people’s language, I began to develop an understanding of a Stó:lō worldview by examining how Ḥalq’eméylem expresses best the Stó:lō’s relationship to the land, to S’ólh Téméxw. I discovered how we, our word and our world blend intimately and spiritually. I examined more closely how our culture, our identity and our worldview are embedded in words of the Ḥalq’eméylem language to illustrate how Ḥalq’eméylem brings these aspects into focus. These explorations stemmed from my need to know and understand what happened to our language in its demise and rise, to understand what the elders mean when they say “language is central to cultural identity and expresses the worldview of its speakers,” and to understand what is meant when they say “language is a gift from the creator.”7 By understanding these concepts, it became clearer how Ḥalq’eméylem expresses intricate cultural nuances important to the Stó:lō. Understanding these concepts were important to this research in order for me to understand the background context of my co-researchers and myself, and to provide a backdrop upon which to depict our experiences.

The co-researchers in my study included nine remarkable people who were, or have been, associated with the Skulkayn, Coqualeetza, and Shxwelí programs, and who were dedicated to reviving the Stó:lō Ḥalq’eméylem language. My main

7 “Language is a Gift From the Creator” was the theme for a special issue of the Canadian Journal of Native Education. The theme is drawn from a quotation by Chief Mike Mitchell (Mitchell 1989:1).
research question was the following:

- What does language renewal mean in the lives of the people whose language is being renewed? In this case, people of the Stó:lō community.

This study was designed to tell the story of a community’s drive to revive their language despite predictions for its extinction, to document what this effort means to a community of people who believe that without the language they will cease to be a unique people, and finally, to illustrate how this revival effort directly affects people’s lives. I depicted how specific events in the context of people’s lives illustrated what is meant by “language is central to cultural identity,” how “language enhances self-esteem and pride which promotes effective social adjustment” and the ways “language expresses the world view of its speakers.” As such, my intention was to reveal the ways in which language revitalization delivered the promises declared in the Stó:lō Halq’eméylem Language mission statement.

I wanted to know what language renewal means to people and to their lives, what inspires people to learn “a language that is no longer a viable part of modern Indigenous lifestyles,” and to reveal how the language identifies who we are in a contemporary context, how it reflects our worldview today. Thus, by examining meaning, value or inspiration, identity and worldview, I aimed to connect the use of Halq’eméylem to a contemporary cultural context.

Documenting what Stó:lō Halq’eméylem language renewal means in the context of people’s lives contributes to the dearth of knowledge on language revival. Little is written about how individuals who make up the community are affected by the effort, about what inspires them against all odds, and in what ways language revival might restore wholeness to a community. By conducting this study, I wanted to reveal to the community the fruits of their labour, and to inspire other communities to revive their own languages despite the difficulties and barriers they might face.

6. A Very Special Wild Strawberry Patch

The story of Stó:lō Halq’eméylem language renewal is meant to be more than a documentation of facts. The story intends to serve as an act of “making special” (Kenny 1996:94) the meaning of Halq’eméylem renewal in our lives today by crafting it as an aesthetic experience.8 In the presentation of my research, I resonate the aesthetic “qualities”9 of beauty, celebration, triumph and power, qualities of Stó:lō Halq’eméylem language renewal manifested in the lives of my co-

---

8 As detailed later, the idea of incorporating aesthetic experience in my research was highly influenced by Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis’s method of The Art and Science of Portraiture, a method that explicitly “combines systematic, empirical description with aesthetic expression” (1997:3).
9 Ibid, p. 90
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researchers. “Wild strawberries” is a metaphor that weaves throughout this research on what Halq’eméylem language renewal means to the Stó:lō in the context of their lives today. “Wild strawberries” is borrowed from the Cheam people in S’ólh Téméxw. The Halq’eméylem name for Cheam is Xwchiyóm or Chiyó:m and translates as “where there are always wild strawberries.”

7. Gathering Wild Strawberries

“Gathering wild strawberries” refers to how I approached acquiring and presenting the richly shared experiences of my co-researchers, the nine Stó:lō people who participated in our study. They shared generously, and with enthusiasm, the sadness, hope and joys of Halq’eméylem language work, all bundled into an hour to an hour-and-half of interview time each. My emotions stir every time I re-read through each “poetic monologue,” reliving how each person disclosed to me their innermost thoughts about their involvement with Halq’eméylem renewal.

My research stemmed from wanting to understand my own life experience, but learning Halq’eméylem linguistics in a class of Halq’eméylem revivalists served as the catalyst for arriving at my topic. I was in awe of these people who were persevering to learn whatever they could of the language. They understood that they were learning something very precious and that they would be shouldered with the responsibility of carrying this learning to others. This class included some twenty people, mainly women. Elders usually presided in these classes; they were Yómalo, Ts’ats’eloxwót, younger elder, Tseloyóthelwét (Shirley Julian) and sometimes Xwiyólemot (Tillie Gutierrez). The classes were part of the Simon Fraser University (SFU)/Secwépemc Cultural Education Society’s Halq’eméylem Linguistics Proficiency Certificate Program taught variously by Strang Burton (sometimes co-facilitated with Martina Wiltshco), Brent Galloway, Susan Russell, and Suzanne Urbanyck. I knew Burton from our collaborative work at the University of British Columbia where I was employed as the Associate Director of the First Nations House of Learning. He was doing post-doctoral studies there at the time, and suggested that I participate in the course offered in Sardis.

In the fall of 1997, I was travelling by bus from Vancouver to Chilliwack once a week to participate in the linguistics class. I sensed immediately that my classmates knew they were participating in something special, something unique, and timely. Students would bring food to share. A great deal of reverence was shown toward the elders who were always ready to receive hugs and exchange smiles and laughter. Students addressed each other in Halq’eméylem, “Láw! Líchexw we éyo? (Greetings! How are you?)”; a common response was “Ts’ats’el éy! (Very good!)”. It was a class like no other in which I had ever participated, and I looked forward enthusiastically to this weekly trip. After I began my research, I continued to participate in Halq’eméylem linguistics courses.

Gwen invited me to Stó:lō Nation to meet with her and others who would compose my steering committee.

My first instructions were to exercise sensitivity in working with the elders so that their time and energy would not be taxed. They were often called upon to share their rare knowledge of Halq’eméylem and Stó:lō culture. Secondly, I was asked to submit a description of my research project to the Stó:lō Archives, which was approved by the Executive Director of Stó:lō Nation’s Aboriginal Rights and Title Department. Third, I was asked to request my co-researchers to sign a consent form to have their taped interviews submitted to the Stó:lō Archives, and finally, that I submit a copy of my final research paper to the Archives. I had little contact with the “steering committee” regarding the development of my paper, other than receiving instructions at the initial meeting.

My research into the issues of Stó:lō identity and worldview intensified when I was hired by Stó:lō Nation in November 1999 as Education Manager to replace Gwen Point, who was on a two-year leave from her position. My new responsibilities included overseeing the work of the Stó:lō Shxwelí Halq’eméylem Language Program. This was a great opportunity for me to be immersed in the topic of my study, to see how people were using the language more broadly and to participate in and observe community activities, some of which are referred to throughout this paper. Being in the community allowed me to become familiar with a number of individuals who were involved in a broad range of activities in Halq’eméylem language renewal. From these individuals, I selected my co-researchers.

From September 1998 to July 2000, I delved into researching several topics to set the context for my research. First, I set the socio-historico-politico context, and discovered how to treat as metaphors the concepts of st’áxem, “lower-class people,” or “worthless people who do not know their history” and smelá:lh, “upper-class people” or “worthy people who know their history.” I use these as metaphors for the effects of Canada’s practiced government assimilation policies, and our efforts to transcend their effects through language and cultural revitalization. To determine what it means “to know our history,” I explored Stó:lō people’s worldview defined by our traditional relationship with S’ólh Témexw (Our Land), and the interrelatedness of Stó:lō people, language, land and identity. I then examined how Riverworld, or Stó:lō worldview, permeates the Halq’eméylem language, as defined by our ancestors and their relationship to Riverworld. I discovered that reconnecting with our Halq’eméylem language is the link that can serve to bring wholeness to understanding our Stó:lō identity and worldview. The inclusion of the co-participants in my investigation served to depict how our identity and worldview are manifest in a contemporary cultural context through language revitalization.

My research approach was highly influenced by the work of Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis’s method called The Art and Science of Portraiture (1997:xv), which seeks to blend art and science to capture the richness, complexity and dimensionality of human experience. In particular, I was drawn by portraiture’s focus on a narrative style and its intention to make the research accessible to a
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wider audience, and uses a language that is not coded or exclusive.  
Portraiture concerns itself with supplying rich contextual description, and makes explicit that 
“voice is the research instrument, echoing the self of the portraitist.” In portraiture, 
empathy and reciprocity with the co-researchers is central to representing their lives 
as authentic and legitimate to the participants themselves.  
Portraiture presents the 
data in a way in which the participants can proclaim, “This is who we are. This is 
what we believe. This is how we see ourselves.”  
An aesthetic whole in portraiture means that the research resonates with the researcher, with the actors and with the 
audiences, achieving a standard of “authenticity,” portraiture’s response to 
“validity.”  
For the research on Stó:lō Halq’eméylem renewal, resonating with the 
researcher means that I will have written a credible and believable story about my 
topic; resonance with the co-researchers means that they will see themselves, their 
images and experiences mirrored in the “poetic monologues,” and in the 
discussions about them; and resonance for the readers means that they will be able 
to say, “yes, of course, now I understand better what it means to the Stó:lō people to 
revive their language!”

I draw on Kenny’s concepts of “humans as aesthetic” to establish the nature of 
the relationship between myself as researcher and my participants as co-researchers 
in this study. In this concept, the assumption is made that “as one moves toward 
beauty, one moves toward wholeness.” This assumption befits my research of what 
Halq’eméylem means in the lives of people who are working to revive it to bring 
wholeness to their lives as Stó:lō people, to reconnect with their Stó:lō aesthetic. I 
used a creative expression format, poetic monologues, as a medium for involving 
the reader in a dynamic of “play.” The “poetic monologues reflect a “trans-
formation into structure” what the co-researchers shared, a creative expression 
format designed to engage the reader in the lived experiences of the co-researchers.

I asked each co-researcher who participated in my study to share the limited 
time we had together to talk about their life experiences, their thoughts, their 
dreams, and about their motivation in their work as Halq’eméylem revivalists. I 
coined the term ‘revivalists’ only after having interviewed them all. They chose, 
with a great deal of enthusiasm, to participate in this academic exercise, and I was 
honoured that they did. The co-researchers chose where we would meet to 
talk, their home or mine or elsewhere. They were comfortable with me, and 
spoke freely, with an outpouring of detail I had not expected. I laid out my plan to 
each of them, explaining as carefully as I could the nature of the phenomenon I was 
trying to understand. Each person led the way from there with only a little 
prompting from me at intervals. I receded in the background and listened intently as 
their voices flowed forth loud and clear.

The presentation of the co-researchers’ words, isolated from my own interaction

---

10 Ibid., p. 10
11 Ibid., p. 85
12 Ibid., pp. 148-149
13 Ibid., p. 193.
14 Ibid., pp. 245-247.
with them, lay bare for the reader the essence of what each co-researcher shared. I call them “poetic monologues”.

Although the “monologues” were derived from our interaction, I call them so because they reveal, in essence, the co-researchers’ own search for understanding the phenomenon they were asked to talk about - their experience. Speaking about their experiences as they did was as much, if not more, for their own sake, as it was for mine. I qualify the monologues with “poetic” because each “monologue” represents a unique character and style that is reflected in the diction and vernacular of each co-researcher. Collectively, we ponder how people are experiencing Halq’eméylem language revival work by examining our individual experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents with Children</th>
<th>Junior Elders</th>
<th>Senior Elders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katelila</td>
<td>Xwelíxwiya</td>
<td>Épelel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koyalemot</td>
<td>Kwósel</td>
<td>Siyámíyatéliyot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrone*</td>
<td>T’ít’elem Spá:th*</td>
<td>Yómalo1t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Sto:ló participants fall into three categories equally distributed: Elders, Junior Elders, and Parents with children at home. Of the nine, only two (*) are male, one Parent and one Junior Elder. (There are no living Male elders who are fluent speakers doing active language work.) Of the Parents, Katelila and Koyàlemót teach in an organized setting, while Tyrone is actively learning, informally teaching his children, and promotes Halq’eméylem language work in the Sto:ló community. Of the Junior Elders, Kwósel teaches the language at Seabird Island Community School, and T’ít’elem Spath teaches the community Halq’eméylem classes to adults. Junior Elder, Xwelíxwiya teaches more informally, at every opportunity, to whomever is willing to learn. The Elders’ group includes Épelel, Siyámíyatéliyot and Yómalo1t. Épelel is the youngest of the three elders and is training to become a highly fluent Halq’eméylem language teacher. Siyámíyatéliyot is one of the very few fluent Halq’eméylem speakers who also knows how to write Halq’eméylem. Yómalo1t, the most senior of the three, works diligently to share her vast knowledge of Halq’eméylem. It is important here to acknowledge Ts’ats’elexwót (Elizabeth Herrling), Xwiyólemot (Tillie Gutierrez), and Tseloyóthelwet (Shirley Norris), three other Sto:ló elders who are also making significant contributions to the Halq’eméylem renewal work. It is wonderful to be writing all these Halq’eméylem names in this paragraph. Halq’eméylem naming is increasingly gaining momentum in Sto:ló communities, giving prominence and validation to this important aspect of our language.

The experiences of this set of co-researchers span the era of community driven Halq’eméylem renewal efforts: the Skulkayn Project of the early 1970s, then the Coqualeetza Cultural Education and Training Centre, which also began in the 1970s.

15 The fully edited transcriptions can be found in my dissertation, Tset Hikwstexw Te Sqwelteltset, We Hold Our language High: The Meaning of Halq’eméylem Renewal in the Everyday Lives of Sto:ló People, from which this research report is derived.
and continues today, and more recently, the Stó:lō Shxwelí Halq’eméylem Language Program. Three linguists are mentioned at various points in the “poetic monologues.” They are Jimmy Harris, who conducted work on Halq’eméylem in the 1960s, and has been volunteering with Stó:lō Shxwelí in helping to develop the Intensive Halq’eméylem Language Fluency Program; Brent Galloway, who has been working on the language since 1970 conducting work with the Coqualeetza elders and the Stó:lō Shxwelí Halq’eméylem Program; and Strang Burton, who currently works with Stó:lō Shxwelí and has taught some of the linguistics courses. Each participant in our study will have had a variety of experiences in any combination of the above-mentioned initiatives. Halq’eméylem language work has also been conducted extensively in community schools in Chehalis and Seabird Island. The Chilliwack School District, where many Stó:lō children attend, has been highly supportive of the Halq’eméylem language work, and is very much looking forward to hiring teachers being produced as a result of all the efforts. Other Halq’eméylem language initiatives have been established in the First Nations communities of Kwantlen, Skwah, Matsqui, Sumas, and Chawathil, and possibly others. The Halq’eméylem language renewal momentum is growing. The following table will be useful to the reader in understanding how the Halq’eméylem language “movement” evolved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td><strong>Canada’s White Paper Policy.</strong></td>
<td>A government document introduced by Prime Minister Pierre Elliot Trudeau, which proposed to extinguish special rights for Indians. Aboriginal communities across Canada joined forces in opposing the implementation of this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-1974</td>
<td><strong>Skulkayn Project.</strong></td>
<td>The earliest community-driven project established to document and preserve Halq’eméylem. Elders were audiotaped talking about Halq’eméylem language and Stó:lō culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-1995</td>
<td><strong>Coqualeetza Cultural Education and Training Centre</strong></td>
<td>Conducted extensive work with Stó:lō elders on Stó:lō history, culture and language. Produced materials for community language efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td><strong>Early Skowkale Halq’eméylem Immersion Program.</strong></td>
<td>This pre-cursor to the Stó:lō Shxwelí Halq’eméylem Program aimed to train teachers with Halq’eméylem fluency in six months. It produced the community language courses: Halq’eméylem Levels I-IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-2019</td>
<td><strong>Stó:lō Shxwelí Halq’eméylem Language Program.</strong></td>
<td>Delivers community language programs and trains Halq’eméylem language teachers. Students in this program have taken any combination of Halq’eméylem levels I-IV, the Halq’eméylem Linguistics Proficiency Certificate, the Native Adult Instructors Diploma (NAID), and the Provincial Instructors Diploma (PID), and other courses and workshops. Many of the participants now teach Halq’eméylem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Stó:lō Nation Developmental Standard Term Certificate (DSTC) in First Nations Language and Culture, in a landmark decision by the British Columbia College of Teachers, was officially approved for delivery on December 6, 2001. On January 25, 2002, Stó:lō Nation celebrated this historic event in a traditional witnessing ceremony with feasting, drumming, singing and speeches. Fifteen participants began the education component of this program, which ran from Jan-Dec 2003, and many of them are ready to undertake studies toward full professional teacher certification. The co-researchers in this study have participated in some or all of these activities.

8. **Dessert of Wild Strawberries**

I began this labour of love in 1998 to tell the story of Stó:lō community’s drive to revive our Halq’eméylem language despite predictions made for its extinction, to document what Halq’eméylem revival means to a community who believe that without our language we will cease to be a unique people. My questions were aimed at finding out what Halq’eméylem renewal means in the context of the participants’ lives. More specifically, I set out to determine how events in the context of peoples’ lives illustrate what is meant by the following points:

- language is central to cultural identity
- language enhances self-esteem and pride, which promotes effective social adjustment
- language expresses the worldview of its speakers

These promises, promulgated in the Stó:lō Halq’eméylem language mission statement, indeed, have shown to be manifest in the lives of the Halq’eméylem revivalists as illustrated in their “poetic monologues.” The co-researchers’ stories in this study have shown how strongly they feel about learning the language, how it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept 2001</td>
<td><strong>Intensive Halq’eméylem Language Fluency Program (IHLFP).</strong> Established to help future teachers become <em>highly fluent</em> in Halq’eméylem and to learn how to teach this type of program. The initial program was delivered five hours a day, five days a week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2001</td>
<td><strong>Developmental Standard Term Certificate (DSTC) in Halq’eméylem Language and Culture.</strong> Incorporates much of the prior work into an accredited teaching certificate recognized by the British Columbia College of Teachers. Developed with many community stakeholders, Stó:lō and other, in partnership with Simon Fraser University’s (SFU) Faculty of Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Dec 2003</td>
<td>The teacher education component of the DSTC was delivered to Stó:lō language teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-May 2004</td>
<td>The DSTC participants completed a Bridging into Education program to prepare them for entry to SFU’s Professional Development Program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
transformed their lives from *st’áxem*, not knowing who they were as Stó:lō people, to *smelá:lh*, growing in knowing their Stó:lō identity and worldview through language revitalization. Their stories have shown how the Halq’eméylem revivalists bravely transcended their fears, anxieties and insecurities associated with the language work. Their stories have illustrated their intense commitment, sacrifice, and tremendous personal effort to learn and teach Halq’eméylem, to use it in their daily lives, and to transmit it to the next generations. They have shown a deep reverence and spiritual understanding of the precious Halq’eméylem knowledge over which they have become stewards.

Historical developments, such as Canada’s assimilation aim, and the demise of our language and cultural traditions, are reflected similarly in each co-researcher’s story. I coined the term “*st’áxem* effect,” to refer to the effect on Stó:lō people when we do not know our history, do not know our culture; and how the *st’áxem* effect hurts our sense of identity. “Becoming *smelá:lh*” refers to reconnecting with our history, language, and culture to rebuild a strong sense of identity in being Stó:lō, “becoming worthy.” The “poetic monologues” reveal how reconnecting with our Halq’eméylem language through the various means illustrated can serve to bring healing to our community, to bring pride in our identity, strengthening what it means to be Stó:lō, to be “people of the River.” For a long time we did not know how it was, or why, that even though our skins were brown, and we were called “Indian,” we spoke “that white language (Yómalot).” Even “white” people had no idea of what had happened to us. They would ask, “Do you speak your language (Koyàlemót, Xwelíxwiya)?” The situation was confusing for everyone. We are coming out of a dark era, acknowledging and facing what happened to our language and culture, and our rightful Stó:lō identity is resurfacing. As Xwelíxwiya states, “It just has to burst through!”

The elders have watched the world of Halq’eméylem diminish swiftly before their very eyes, swiftly slipping away to be replaced by English. Of all the participants, the elders, who have once seen the language flourish, are the most skeptical that it will become fully revived again. Siyàmiyatéliyot has been involved in the work of Halq’eméylem renewal for thirty years and has witnessed only a few people become moderately fluent speakers of Halq’eméylem. Siyàmiyatéliyot and Yómalot have seen people struggle with uttering even a few words and phrases in Halq’eméylem. Nonetheless, they never fail to give themselves to the work of Halq’eméylem revival; they never give up.

We can be grateful to Yómalot and Siyàmiyatéliyot who shared their experiences of how they managed to “put it [Halq’eméylem] away (Siyàmiyatéliyot),” despite the residential schools’ aim to make them forget Halq’eméylem, and to forget that they were Xwélmexw (First Nation). Because of their tenacity, their “stubbornness (Yómalot),” we have been able to arrive at the level of development in Halq’eméylem revival we are at today. The elders were determined to keep Halq’eméylem alive inside their minds and hearts, while it swiftly slipped away all around them. We raise our hands in thanks and respect to them for their great feat.
The elders are the main source of inspiration for the Halq’eméylem revivalists who are picking up the language, to “put it away” in their own minds and hearts for future generations to come. The new Halq’eméylem revivalists, all who are learning Halq’eméylem and transmitting what they know to others, look to the elders for solace when the cause seems unattainable, or difficult. They are ever inspired at how the elders never quit though difficulties may arise. These few elders who remain who are fluent in Halq’eméylem will be gone one day soon. This knowledge strikes fear in the hearts of the ones charged with carrying the language forward. The Halq’eméylem revivalists will then be on their own. They are the ones who will bear responsibility for taking the breath of our language from the remaining fluent elders and breathing it into the young ones coming up. This realization saddens the hearts of those who have gained so much from the elders, who yet feel like babies, worried whether they can stand alone without the support of the fluent elders. It is they who must now stand up and support the legacy of the elders and ancestors, though at this time they may feel wobbly in the knees. “It’s a race against time,” says T’ít’elem Spá:th, who is learning what he can of the language. Nonetheless, the spirits of our ancestors and elders will carry on in the Halq’eméylem revivalists through work conducted over the past thirty years to preserve the voices of our ancestors on tapes and CDs, now available in the Stó:lō Nation Archives.

The Junior Elders, baby boomers, are the warriors, promoters, supporters, champions of the language work. They have lived long enough to be wise, and to direct that wisdom to work for the common good. The younger Halq’eméylem teachers look to them for their leadership and experience. They may not have the benefit of gaining full fluency in the language for themselves in their lifetime, but they will be good role models and show the younger ones that it is worth their time and effort to learn Halq’eméylem and to be proud of it. In many ways, they have come to terms with the hurts of the st’áxem effect. They can be patient with the time it takes to remember and honour the legacy of language and culture passed on by the elders and ancestors before them.

The Parents with children at home are the most hopeful for a future that will include Halq’eméylem being spoken by their children and grandchildren. These are the ones who will be carrying the responsibility for the revival of intergenerational transmission of Halq’eméylem as they teach their children in the natural settings of their homes. They are bursting through the old st’áxem stereotypes with a passion, so their children and grandchildren will know who they are as Stó:lō people, as people of S’ólh Téméxw.

As each Halq’eméylem revivalist grows in the language, it creates a ripple effect of first an acknowledgement that our language is worth speaking, then arriving at a place of being able to put those first words on our tongues, and healing our sense of who we are as Stó:lō people. All of their efforts have come together, to establish “a movement afoot (T’ít’elem Spá:th)” “to pick it [Halq’eméylem] up,” to “hold it up again (Tyrone).”

The language, embedded in the collective memory of Stó:lō people, feels natural to them. “It seems natural today (Tyrone),” “it wasn’t anything different; it
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was just the way mom said things (Épelel).” Even a few words and phrases heard in times gone by was enough to give some people a strong sense of the language and its sounds. What little was spoken, was remembered as being spoken with a great deal of pride, “when they talk, they strut,” says Xwelíxwiya. This little bit of language shone through the st’áxem effect in some cases, planting a seed of Stó:lô identity that with nourishment and enlightenment grew into the Halq’eméylem revivalist movement we see today.

The challenges of Halq’eméylem revival are many, but not so insurmountable that they cannot be overcome, and the learning curve is great. It is difficult to learn a language when there are so few people in the entire world one can talk to, and when there are so few easily accessible text and audio-visual resources upon which to draw. The work needs to be concentrated with much sacrifice from the ones who take it on. It’s a noble and honourable effort and often not greatly appreciated by others outside the work. It will not be fully appreciated until Halq’eméylem revival comes to full fruition. Everyone will be able to see and appreciate the beauty, power and wonder of the rich heritage embedded in our Halq’eméylem language. More people will begin to understand and appreciate the work and sacrifice of the Halq’eméylem revivalists, and the revivalists can feel full satisfaction with themselves for the legacy they are carrying forward for the elders and ancestors.

The fluent speaking elders can appreciate deeply how our Stó:lô culture and worldview is embedded in our Halq’eméylem language. This knowledge is being passed on to the rest of us today, how our land, language and selves are inextricably interrelated, how spirit permeates everything and how these concepts are expressed best in our Halq’eméylem language. When we begin to understand these precious gifts, our hearts soar, our emotions are stirred, and we feel the healing of coming to know ourselves as Stó:lô people, River people, as Xwelmexw. We become knowledgeable in how to express our love and affection for our people and for Riverways, through our songs and prayers in Halq’eméylem. We come to learn that respect is the fundamental philosophical value that ties all things into one interrelated creation. Halq’eméylem is being spoken today in this Riverworldview. People are introducing themselves using Halq’eméylem names, talking about their history, saying who they are related to, where they are from. Events are being opened with prayers said in Halq’eméylem; Halq’eméylem is used during traditional ceremonies. People in S’ólh Téméxw are addressing each other informally when they meet, and speak what they know to each other.

We have gained immensely in our understanding of how our culture is embedded in the language, yet we know that a tremendous amount has been lost, so much so that some fear that in learning to speak our language, “instead of being unique Stó:lô people, we’ll be people who speak Halq’eméylem (Tyrone).” Yes, with what was lost, we will indeed “lose a part of our identity (Tyrone).” But, on the other hand, it is not all lost, and we will surely have captured the important essences of meaning in our language. We need to come to terms with managing our ancient, yet persistent language, in a contemporary context, in a context where settler languages have prominence over ours, and in a context of global
communication where endangered languages draw little, if any, attention. Maybe our language will evolve into a kind of “Halq’éméylish” as Katelíla describes the prospect, and she is perfectly comfortable with the idea. Languages do mesh, but this does not mean that they must necessarily lose their uniqueness.

Some of the challenges to Halq’éméylem renewal refer to the new technological terms that are being created at a fast pace in our contemporary times. And though we might bemoan the ills of modern technology, it is modern technology that may be a boon to Halq’éméylem revitalization. We can now digitize the elders’ words for posterity. We can listen repeatedly to the same words and phrases over and over; we can jump around from one word or phrase to another easily on a CD ROM (i.e., Seabird Island Community School 2001). We can even see animated images that show us how our physiology works when we make certain sounds (i.e., Stó:lô Nation 2001), and we can make learning Halq’éméylem fun with games on CD ROM (i.e., Stó:lô Nation 2000). These kinds of resources have been developed. We can put Halq’éméylem on the web to create greater accessibility of the language (i.e., Gerds and Compton 2002). “We got technology, so why can’t we use those on-line,” says Katelíla, “So every day I check my hotmail, I’m doing Halq’éméylem, signed “te’ si:yaye, your friend.” We can use the technology that our children are becoming ever more expert at using; we can involve children in developing technological resources. And it is ultimately the children, their future children, and their children’s children, that we remember when we make the sacrifices that we do today, remembering the sacrifices and challenges our elders and ancestors had to make.

As a result of all the past work and sacrifice, Halq’éméylem is being taught to children on many fronts: in two Kindergarten classrooms in the Chilliwack School district; in Headstart programs; at Skwah, Matsqui, Sumas, and Chawathil Bands; and at Seabird Island and Chehalis Schools. Most importantly, we can see that Halq’éméylem is being transmitted from parent to child in the home.

I teach my own kids. Sometimes they’re not good. I mean like I scold them. ‘Emétliha! Emét! I would tell them, Sit down (Katelíla).

When we first want to learn Halq’éméylem, we usually want to learn it for our own sake, to connect for ourselves a sense of who we are, to become healed and whole as Stó:lô people, as Xwélmexw, as People of the River. The greatest reward for Halq’éméylem revivalists is to see the fruits of their labour expressed in the children, who are echoing the legacy of our ancestors as they speak, pray and sing in Halq’éméylem.

9. Conclusion and Implications
As a Stó:lô researcher my ruminations throughout the study were based on my personal experience of trying to understand the phenomenon of what happened to our language, and grew into a passion to delve ever more deeply into understanding what Halq’éméylem means to Stó:lô people. My own experiences mirror those of
the co-researchers in my study who also wrestled with ambivalence over the issue of identity. What did it mean to be “Indian?” We did not know any “Indian” language, or stories, or traditional ceremonies. At least, that was the case for most of us for a period of time. Many of our people today continue to struggle with these questions. We discovered we are Stó:lō, that our language is Halq’eméylem, and that there is a rich and powerful heritage attached to being Stó:lō. With this knowledge, we finally came home to the River, to the Stó:lō, and realized that we and the River are one identity. Our language tells us so.

We have gained a brief glimpse of our Riverworldview and begin to feel intimately connected to who we are as Stó:lō people, People of the River. By reconnecting with our language and culture, we can re-create Riverworldview into its meaning for us in a contemporary context. We need our Xwelméxwqel (language) and Sxwɔ̱xwiyám (traditional stories) to be made visible to our collective consciousness once again, to be learned by all our community members, and incorporated in all our educational learning environments. The young children especially need to learn the beauty and wonder reflected in our language and culture, because they are the ones who will carry this legacy of our ancestors forward for the benefit of future generations. Everyone can share our pride and connection with S’ôlh Térmexw in this Riverworldview way, appreciating the Stó:lô’s contribution to the “full creative capacities of the human mind” (Mithun 1998:189). The implications of Halq’eméylem revitalization is that the legacy of invention and creativity of a Stó:lô aesthetic can continue on into the future.

Let’s now review Bauman’s classification that illustrated how Halq’eméylem is verging on obsolescence. Only a few older adults speak the language fluently. Yes, this is true for Halq’eméylem, and the few elders we have are dedicated, committed and contribute tirelessly to the revival effort. The language is not taught to children in the home. No, we cannot say this is completely true anymore. The most important factor in making Halq’eméylem a functional living language is transmission of the language from parent to child in the home. The Halq’eméylem revivalist parents are making this happen. A growing number of adults are learning Halq’eméylem through the community program and many of those people are teaching their children and/or grandchildren. Parents and children together in the Headstart Program are learning the language. Children who are learning the language are forcing learning on adult family members who need and want to understand what they are saying. The number of fluent speakers declines as the population increases. Yes, this is true at this time; however, increasing numbers of new speakers are now working to become highly fluent in Halq’eméylem through the Intensive Halq’eméylem Language Fluency Program. English is the preferred language in most situations. Yes, English continues to be the language of use in most situations; however, “preferred” might not be the right term here. For example, many Stó:lô youth would choose Halq’eméylem over any other language as their second language requirement in school. With greater opportunities to learn and use the language, Halq’eméylem will be the preferred language of use for many people. There are minimal literacy skills (reading and writing) among fluent
speakers. Yes, this is true. We have few fluent speakers who are also literate in Halq’eméylem; however, the movement toward creating highly fluent speakers includes literacy skills, and use of modern technology.

This study concludes that Halq’eméylem is a viable part of modern Indigenous lifestyles. The Halq’eméylem revivalists are making it happen, as they work diligently and tirelessly at reversing the trend toward its extinction. During the relatively short period of time since the Skulkayn Heritage Project was established thirty years ago, Stó:lō people have persisted against all odds to develop a multi-dimensional Halq’eméylem revival movement to “hold our language high.” Stó:lō people are speaking Halq’eméylem throughout S’ólh Téméxw, echoing the spirit of our ancestors, echoing the spirit of the River, the Stó:lō. The Halq’eméylem revivalists’ stories have shown us that learning our Halq’eméylem language reconnects us with our Riverworldview aesthetic, restoring us to wholeness as Stó:lō, people of the River. Yú:wqwlha! (How beautiful!)
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Kaurna Language Reclamation and the Formulaic Method
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1. Introduction

This paper is based on an oral presentation given on 12 June 2004 at the 11th Annual Stabilizing Indigenous Languages Conference, held at the University of California, Berkeley. As this paper concerns the use of Indigenous languages in the public domain, I would like to begin with my introduction at that conference:

Ngangkinna, Meyunna (Ladies & Gentlemen)
In accordance with Indigenous protocols practised in Australia, I recognise that we are meeting on Muwekma Ohlone land here at Berkeley. In the words of the Kaurna people where I come from:

Marni ngadlu banbabanbalyarnendi yaitya warrannabirra warrabatitya.
‘It’s good that we are meeting together at this conference to discuss Indigenous languages.’

In this paper there are four main areas that I want to address:
• The use of language in the public domain
• Language development and caretaker speech
• The Formulaic Approach for the introduction of sleeping languages
• Language Planning for sleeping languages and specifically, the emergence of Kaurna Warra Pintyandi, an informal Kaurna language planning body.

First, however, I need to provide some background and contextual information. Kaurna, the Indigenous language of the Adelaide Plains in South Australia, is a ‘sleeping’ language documented by German missionaries Christian Teichelman and Clamor Schürmann in the mid-nineteenth century. There are no sound recordings of the language as it was spoken in the nineteenth century and there are many gaps in the documentation. However, we are fortunate in that some 3,000 to 3,500 words were recorded, a reasonable sketch grammar was written and many hundreds of sentences together with their English translations were recorded. The language is now being reclaimed from these historical records.
The Kaurna community is small, fragmented and dispersed across a metropolitan city and surrounding areas. There are several thousand Kaurna descendants, but the number of people who actively identify primarily as a Kaurna person number in the hundreds. There is no Kaurna village, ghetto or suburb. The Kaurna have no land that is under their full control, though increasingly local government is consulting and working with the Kaurna community in the protection, recognition and development of certain sites of importance. All Kaurna people speak English and have been doing so for many generations. In these circumstances, how might the language be introduced?

In this context, both Kaurna language programs in schools and use within the public domain appear to be the key. Kaurna is now taught to small numbers of students at all levels of education from preschool to university level. I am not going to say very much about the school programs as such in this paper, except to
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acknowledge their importance and centrality as the powerhouse for language revival (see Amery 2000:153-178). Rather, I wish to focus here on language use in the public domain. The use of Kaurna language in the public domain, whilst superficial and perhaps somewhat artificial, plays a very important role in awareness raising, paving the way for more communicative use of the language. Although private domains, such as the family and the home, are typically the last bastions of retention of a language, a fact also noted by Hinton (2001:415), the family home is also one of the most difficult places in which to bring back the language, probably because it entails changing intimate behaviours and the most automatic and deeply engrained responses that operate outside conscious control.

2. Kaurna in the Public Domain

2.1. Songs

Work on Kaurna language began with songs, in particular a Songwriters Workshop in March 1990 funded by the Commonwealth government through the National Aboriginal Languages Program (NALP). Thirty-three songs were written in the three languages local to Adelaide and surrounding areas. Whilst most interest was focussed on Ngarrindjeri and Narungga, six Kaurna songs were included at the insistence of the local Elder, Auntie Josie Agius. In 1995 we embarked on a more ambitious Kaurna songbook project featuring more linguistically complex songs. This was finally published several years later (Schultz et al. 1999). Songs are still a very important aspect of Kaurna language revival. The Kaurna Plains School choir is frequently called upon to perform at public events. In June 1997 they wrote their own school song with both English and Kaurna versions. The Kaurna version is always sung with more passion and volume, a sure sign of the value that the children place on the Kaurna language. Nelson Varcoe, an Indigenous musician and songwriter involved in the original Songwriters Workshop in 1990, continues to write songs in Kaurna for special occasions, as detailed in Table 1 below:

Table 1: Nelson Varcoe’s songs composed for special events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song Title</th>
<th>Event Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karrauwirraparri (Torrens River)</td>
<td>Written for the Water Music project, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguya Nguya Murradlu (Reconciliation)</td>
<td>Alberton PS Choir; South Australian Public Schools Music Society concerts, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yertabulti (Port Adelaide)</td>
<td>Alberton PS choir at the opening of Port Adelaide Visitor Information Centre, Nov. 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piltawodli</td>
<td>Journey of Healing reconciliation event, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karra (river redgum)</td>
<td>Karra Exhibition, Telstra Adelaide Festival. Published in the catalogue (Thwaites 2000), March 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrabarna Kaurna (Let Kaurna be Spoken)</td>
<td>Launch of Warrabarna Kaurna (Amery 2000), 2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2. Naming Activity

Naming activity is a very important aspect of Kaurna language restoration, though some might regard this as a trivial or superficial exercise. The act of naming asserts an identity of place or person. Many people won’t think twice about it – it’s just a name – but some will stop to think. Even amongst those who don’t stop to think about the name but simply use it, this usage may have a deeper subconscious effect, just as advertising has been shown to have such subliminal power amongst those who say they take no notice of advertisements. When people understand the name and its historical and cultural significance the impact of course is even greater.

The use of Kaurna names in the modern period began in 1980 when a Kaurna woman sent a young Indigenous man off to the archives in search of a name for a new alternative school being established. Warriappendi ‘to seek; find’ is still used to this day. Since then, a number of Kaurna placenames have been officially reinstated, most notably Karrawirra Parri (lit. ‘redgum forest river’) the original name for the Torrens River, which runs through the centre of the city of Adelaide. The Adelaide City Council has embarked on an extensive Kaurna naming project, culminating in the Kaurna naming of all 30 parks and six squares within its jurisdiction and the installation of signage with full explanation of the names and the known Indigenous heritage of these localities. It has done this within its Aboriginal Reconciliation initiatives (Adelaide City Council 2004).1

Moves to dual name Tarndanyangga - Victoria Square, in the very heart of Adelaide, began when members of the Aboriginal Reconciliation movement held an event there for National Sorry Day on 26 May 2001. People just started using the name Tarndanyangga unofficially and the Council followed suite the following year with its official recognition.

Kaurna Warra Pintyandi, consisting of a small group of Kaurna language activists, undertook a project to install recordings of the Kaurna names on the Adelaide City Council’s website so that the public may become more familiar with the way these words sound. I will say more about Kaurna Warra Pintyandi later.

Other local councils within the metropolitan area and surrounding country towns are also engaging in a certain amount of Kaurna place-naming activity.2 Previously un-named creeks, newly established wetlands and parks etc. have been given Kaurna names. Probably the first and most important original place-name to be re-instated is that of Warripparinga (lit. ‘windy river place’) in 1992, used in

---

1 The Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation was established in 1991 by an Act of federal parliament supported by both houses of parliament and both sides of politics. The vision adopted by the Council was one of “a united Australia which respects this land as ours: values the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander heritage; and provides justice and equality for all” (Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation brochure Reconciliation and Its Key Issues).

2 The four southern councils (City of Onkaparinga, Holdfast Bay, Marion and Yankalilla) together with the Geographical Names Unit and KWP have established a Kaurna Places website (http://www.kaurnaplacenames.com).
reference to an area of land opposite Flinders University on the Sturt River (Warripparri). This site is immensely important to Kaurna people, being the site where the Kaurna Dreaming ancestor Tjilbruke’s nephew Kulultuwi was killed for having broken the law. Whilst the Warripparinga site was previously known as Laffer’s Triangle, after the Laffer family who owned a small vineyard there, it is now known universally as Warripparinga.3 An interpretive centre, sculptures and signage have been erected featuring a significant amount of Kaurna text. Warripparinga has become a regular gathering site each month when friendship fires are lit every full moon. These occasions are very relaxed affairs where anyone is welcome to come and sit around the fire and share in stories and learn about the history of the site and of the Kaurna people. An evening Kaurna language course is taught at the centre each week.

Many Indigenous organizations, such as Tarndanya National Aboriginal Cultural Institute, or Indigenous units or programs within government departments that are located within Kaurna country now bear Kaurna names. Buildings and rooms within certain premises are sometimes given Kaurna names.

Some Kaurna people have adopted Kaurna names and have named their children officially with Kaurna names. For instance, Auntie Alice Rigney, Principal of Kaurna Plains School for 10 years, adopted the name Wallara ‘clear-headed; intelligent; clever’. Her son, Lester Rigney, an academic at Flinders University, adopted the name Irabinna ‘warrior’ and named his children Tikari ‘future’ and Tarniwarra ‘the noise of the breakers’. Pets belonging to Kaurna people are also often given Kaurna names, such as a cat named Milte ‘red’, dogs named Marni Kadli ‘good dog’ and Ngaityo Kadli ‘my dog’ and a magpie named Kurraka ‘magpie’.

Indications are that this Kaurna naming activity is increasing as exposure to the language increases and people become more familiar with Kaurna words and expressions.

2.3. Public Art
We also witness the use of Kaurna words, phrases and text in public artworks throughout the metropolitan area. The first such usage was in the Yerrakartarta installation established in the forecourt of the Adelaide Convention Centre on North Terrace in 1995. This installation, in addition to the name Yerrakartarta ‘at random’, featured numerous Kaurna words (names of animals and natural features) plus a short text:

\[
\text{Kaurna yerta. Natta atto nanga; yakko atto buikki nakki.}
\]

Kaurna land now 1SgERG see not 1SgERG before saw

‘This is Kaurna country. I know it now. Before I didn’t.’

This was taken directly from Teichelmann and Schürmann (1840) with the addi-

3 See http://www.marion.sa.gov.au/Web/webmar.nsf/Lookup/Warripparinga
tion of the words *Kaurna yerta*. Since then public art featuring Kaurna text has appeared in a range of high profile locations including the Adelaide Festival Centre, the State Library of South Australia, the Adelaide Railway Station and within Adelaide’s three universities.

The Kaurna language is also used verbally in the public domain to deliver speeches of welcome, discussed later, to introduce cultural performances and to sing Kaurna songs.
2.4. Welcome Protocols

In about 1991, Uncle Lewis O’Brien gave the first speech of welcome to Kaurna country in the Kaurna language. Nelson Varcoe gave an extended speech at the opening of Yaitya Warra Wodli, South Australia’s Aboriginal Languages Centre in February 1993. Since then, the rate at which Kaurna speeches are given has increased exponentially, as shown in the following two graphs:

Graph 1: Number of individuals giving Kaurna speeches in a given year (1991-1997).


There is demand from Kaurna people to learn how to give Kaurna speeches. Accordingly, we sought funds to mount a project to develop a set of Kaurna welcome protocols, and to disseminate these on a CD and accompanying booklet. We set out to produce two CDs, one a pedagogical tool with a basic range of speeches, and a second archival CD that included a number of speeches given at major events so that these might be recorded for posterity. The following minimal speech, devised in a workshop on welcome protocols, has been established
as a template for Kaurna people to learn and expand according to their ability and
the context (specific occasion) of the speech:

A Minimalist Kaurna Speech of Welcome
Ngangkinna, meyunna! Na marni?
Ngai narri _________.
Martuityangga Kaurna meyunna, ngai wanggandi “Marni naa budni
Kaurna yertaanna.”

Ngaiityo yakanandalya, yungandalya.

Translation
Ladies and gentlemen, are you (all) good? (i.e. hello)
My name is ________
On behalf of the Kaurna people I say “It’s good that you (all) came to
Kaurna country” (i.e. welcome)

My dear sister(s) (and) brother(s). (i.e. thank you)

More recently there has been a desire from some non-Indigenous people to
acknowledge the fact that they are on Kaurna land, just as I acknowledged that we
were meeting on Muwekma Ohlone land during the conference at Berkeley. At its
meeting of 27 May 2002, the Adelaide City Council accepted the need to acknow-
ledge the traditional lands of the Kaurna people at the opening of every Council
meeting with the following words:

“Adelaide City Council acknowledges that we are meeting on the traditional country of
the Kaurna people of the Adelaide Plains.

We recognise and respect their cultural heritage, beliefs and relationship with the land.
We acknowledge that they are of continuing importance to the Kaurna people living
today.”

We are encouraging Council to go a step further with a brief acknowledge-
ment in the Kaurna language. A full translation of their English statement would
be something like

Adelaide City Councilirlo tampendi, ngadlu Kaurna yertangga banbabanbalyarnendi
(inbarendi). Kaurna meyunna yaitya mattanya Womma Tarndanyako.

Parnako yailtya, parnuko tappa purruna, parnuko yerta ngadlu tampendi. Yellaka
Kaurna meyunna itto yailtya, tappa purruna, yerta kuma burro martendi, burro
wariappendi, burro tangka martulyaiendi.

This would be far too much of a challenge for Councillors to learn, at least in-
itially. But a very brief statement of acknowledgement in the Kaurna language
might be more acceptable as follows:

*Kaurna meyunna, Kaurna yerta, ngadlu tampendi.*
Kaurna people Kaurna land we recognise
‘We recognise Kaurna people and their land.’

The Catholic Education Office approached us in 2002 for a set of Kaurna words that students in Catholic schools could utter at school assemblies in acknowledgement of the owners of the land on which the school is built. The following statement was formulated:

*Ngadlu tampendi Kaurna meyunna yerta mattanya Womma Tarndanyako.*
We recognise Kaurna people land owner plain Adelaide-of
‘We recognise (that) Kaurna people are the landowners and custodians of the Adelaide Plains.’

As has been seen, there is wide scope for use of the Kaurna language in the public domain, precisely because it is the language of the land where a large metropolitan city is now located. With a population of about 1 million, Adelaide is Australia’s third or fourth largest city (on a par with Brisbane) and is the only sizable city in South Australia. In the same way, there is considerable scope for the use of Indigenous languages of other major cities, for example Dharuk in Sydney, Woiwurrung in Melbourne, Ngunnawal in Canberra, Noongar in Perth and Larrakiya in Darwin. On the other hand, there is considerably less opportunity for the use of other South Australian languages in the public domain. Thus, for example, there are many more Ngarrindjeri people than there are Kaurna, and more documented language resources are available for Ngarrindjeri of the lower Murray and Coorong to the east of Kaurna country, and whilst there would be opportunities for the use of Ngarrindjeri in public events in a range of towns along the Murray River, these opportunities simply would not arise so often as in a large city. Diyari, a sleeping language from the northeast of the state fares much worse still in this regard, as there is no town or centre of human habitation at all within Diyari territory. As a result, practically all Diyari live on someone else’s land in centres like Port Augusta, a linguistic crossroads where the Nukunu landowners themselves are outnumbered by neighbouring Adnyamathanha, Kukada and Barngarla, as well as Arabana, Pitjantjatjara, Yankunytjatjara and others from further afield.

I imagine many opportunities would exist in North America for the similar use of sleeping languages that are associated with large urban centres.

3. **Kaurna Language Development**

From the outset of attempts to reclaim and re-introduce Kaurna, steps have been taken to transform the language for use in the modern world, as opposed to learning and using the language as a relic. In the 1990 Kaurna workshop, Kaurna
Elder, Auntie Josie Agius, noticed the word *tikketikketti* ‘chair’ (derived from *tikkandi* ‘to sit’) and *bakkebakketti* ‘knife’ (derived from *bakkendi* ‘to cut’). Accordingly when Nelson Varcoe wrote a short children’s story that year in Kaurna we used the word *padnipadnitti* ‘car’ developed by analogy with the former. Cars were not around when Kaurna was documented, so either we had to borrow from English or develop our own term using word formation patterns existing in the language. Since then scores of new terms have been added as the need arises. Some examples are found in Table 2.

Of course, many languages do this. Many thousands of new terms have been added to Maori (Harlow 1993, Maori Language Commission 1996). Hebrew has been completely modernized (Kutscher 1982), such that Israeli jet fighter pilots are able to communicate with each other in Hebrew. Many languages in North America have also embraced new terminologies. In Australia, there has been some reluctance to develop new terms in some languages, where the languages are viewed as a relic and attempts to introduce new terms might be viewed as interference by linguists and outsiders.

Table 2: Kaurna neologisms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Kaurna Term</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Etymology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>mukarndo</em></td>
<td>computer</td>
<td><em>mukamuka</em> ‘brain’ + <em>karndo</em> ‘lightning’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>warraiyatti</em></td>
<td>telephone</td>
<td><em>warra</em> ‘voice’ + <em>kaitya</em> - ‘to send’ + -tti ‘thing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>turraityatti</em></td>
<td>television</td>
<td><em>turra</em> ‘image’ + <em>kaitya</em> - ‘to send’ + -tti ‘thing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tampitirkandi</em></td>
<td>to read</td>
<td><em>tampi</em> - ‘to know; recognise’ + <em>tirka</em> - ‘to know; learn’ + -ndi ‘present tense’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tipomarngo</em></td>
<td>switch</td>
<td><em>tipo</em> ‘spark’ + <em>marngo</em> ‘button’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>wornubalta</em></td>
<td>nappy (i.e. diaper)</td>
<td><em>wornu</em> ‘bum’ + <em>balta</em> ‘covering’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kurimai</em></td>
<td>pizza</td>
<td><em>kuri</em> ‘circle’ + <em>mai</em> ‘food’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nurlemai</em></td>
<td>banana</td>
<td><em>nurle</em> ‘curved’ + <em>mai</em> ‘food’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tukuwingkura</em></td>
<td>microwave</td>
<td><em>tuku</em> ‘small’ + <em>wingkura</em> ‘wave’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Yiitya</em></td>
<td>Easter</td>
<td>borrowed from English and adapted to fit the Kaurna sound system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we wish to teach languages in schools, the first thing teachers and curriculum writers want are terms for numbers and colours. Kaurna, like many other Indigenous languages in Australia has few number terms as such:

- *kuma* ‘one’
- *purlaitye* ‘two’
- *marnkutye* ‘three; a few’
- *ngarraitya* ‘many’
In addition the constructed numbers *yerrabula* ‘four’ (derived from *yerra* ‘separate; distinct’ and *bula* ‘two’) *purlaitye* *purlaitye* ‘four’, *yerrabula kuma* ‘five’ and *yerrabula purlaitye* ‘six’ are documented.4

Fortunately in the case of Kaurna, and other neighbouring languages of the Thura-Yura subgroup, whilst the Kaurna had a restricted set of numbers as such, they had a set of birth-order names from first-born up to ninth-born and also differentiated between male and female. Thus I was able to use the root of these birth-order names to construct a set of numbers five to nine. Then by using *irka* ‘heap’ for tens, *parto irka* ‘big heap’ for hundreds, and reduced forms of *tauatta* ‘many’ for thousands and *wiwurra* ‘multitude’ for millions, a full-blown base-10 number system was born. This still left *kutyo* ‘a few’ and *ngarraitya* ‘many’ operating outside the number system with their original meanings.

Whilst I had some reservations in proposing this new number system as it is a radical shift away from the original language, it has been warmly embraced by Kaurna people and taught for a number of years now at Kaurna Plains School.

### 3.1. Caretaker Speech

Normal patterns of intergenerational transmission have been totally disrupted for sleeping languages such as Kaurna. How do we go about re-establishing intergenerational transmission? Do we teach the children and get the children to teach the adults? There is some evidence to suggest that parents of children attending Kaurna Plains School are learning some words and expressions from their children. However, if we teach the adults they are in a position to introduce the language prior to attending school.

Learning to speak a language can be a threatening experience, especially if it is one’s own language where to make mistakes or stumble in public carries with it potential loss of face. But if we can encourage mums, dads, aunties, uncles, grandmothers, grandfathers and significant others to use Kaurna with babies and very small children, these children will only give positive feedback and reinforcement, irrespective of which language in which they are spoken to. But in order for this to happen, at least in the Kaurna case, we first need to provide them with the linguistic ammunition and develop a range of Kaurna expressions suitable for use in these contexts. Recorded Kaurna sentences, almost without exception, emerged from contexts of men addressing men (often the missionaries themselves). There are certainly no recorded utterances such as “Let me change your nappy”5 or “Have you got wind?” However, using the grammar, extant vocabulary and a knowledge of Kaurna word-forming processes, it is not overly difficult to devise equivalent expressions. This is exactly what we began to do in a series of workshops in November 2000.

---

4 An early French observer, Gaimard (1833), tried to elicit numbers 1 to 10 and the numeral 20, but these are most unreliable (see Amery 1996).

5 “Diaper” is the American English of the Australian English “nappy”.
We first set about identifying a range of situations in which adults might interact with babies and young children, and a range of associated language functions as outlined in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE FUNCTION</th>
<th>LANGUAGE SITUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Endearment - expressing affection</td>
<td>Feeding &amp; Mealtime (&amp; Cooking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive reinforcement</td>
<td>Bathing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warnings</td>
<td>Getting Dressed &amp; ready to go out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placating, reassuring, comforting</td>
<td>Nappy changing &amp; Toilet training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling, beckoning, attention seeking</td>
<td>Sleep time &amp; Story time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naming and Categorizing</td>
<td>Play - around the house &amp; in garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Body awareness, parts &amp; functions</td>
<td>Kindy &amp; Early Childhood Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Introducing Kin</td>
<td>School - in classroom &amp; yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commands</td>
<td>Outings - going for walks &amp; in car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal games - e.g. same &amp; different</td>
<td>Crying Baby &amp; Sickness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greetings</td>
<td>Shopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave takings</td>
<td>Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counting</td>
<td>Dealing with Pets and Animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Environment - weather &amp; seasons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places &amp; Placenames</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(From Amery and Gale 2000:20)

This area has been further developed and included within our Kaurna Learner’s Guide with accompanying CD (Amery and Kaurna Warra Pintyandi 2007).

### 3.2. Funeral Protocols

The idea of developing a set of protocols, so that funerals could be conducted in the Kaurna language, also emerged during the Kaurna Warra Pintyandi (Developing Kaurna Language) workshops in November 2000. Accordingly, in 2003 we sought funds from the University of South Australia for the Kaurna Funeral Protocols project. We began by translating several often-sung and well-loved hymns: *What a Friend we have in Jesus, Amazing Grace, The Old Rugged Cross, Till We Meet Again* and *How Great Thou Art*. We also translated the Lord’s Prayer and the 23rd Psalm into Kaurna and have discussed possible formats for liturgy, rang-
ing from straight translations of existing Lutheran funeral service liturgy to devising liturgy centred on Indigenous spiritual beliefs embodied in the Dreaming. Kaurna people have been engaged in discussing amongst themselves aspects of traditional culture that have survived (such as the use of gypsum to whiten the face of mourners), aspects that are known from historical sources, but no longer practised (such as building a fire on the grave or wrapping the corpse in paperbark), drawing comparisons with funeral rites of neighbouring groups and working out which of these practices are feasible to reinstate now. The project culminated in the publication of a book, CD and sympathy cards (Amery and Rigney 2006).

Funerals are what bring Nunga together all too frequently, both because of the very short life expectancy and the remarkably strong and intact extended family networks. Funerals are situations that require ceremony and formulaic speech. As such they are an important strategy for language re-introduction.

A number of Kaurna individuals are actively planning their own funerals and their own liturgy in Kaurna language. For this to be enacted they need to be planned well beforehand with all the family involved, because it is the family who has to carry it off. It will be difficult to initiate a funeral with Kaurna liturgy, because the language is probably not at the forefront when family are grieving. Once the first few take place, no doubt it will become easier to implement. At the moment we are still in the preparation phase.

Nelson Varcoe, who has been involved in Kaurna language revival for many years, is completing his training as a pastor in the Lutheran Church. He should be well placed to initiate activity should the family so desire.

4. The Formulaic Approach

All these projects, development of caretaker speech, welcome protocols and funeral protocols, are in keeping with the Formulaic Approach, which I have proposed (see Amery 2000:209-212, 2001:200-204) for the reintroduction of sleeping languages. Rather than teaching grammar or attempting language immersion, the language is introduced bit by bit in the form of well-formed chunks, within Kaurna people’s English.

Within the Formulaic Approach I propose that people be encouraged to learn and use frequently used utterances, beginning with exclamations (such as Paitya! ‘Deadly!’ or Paia! ‘Wow!’), question words (such as Wa? ‘Where?’, Ngaintya? ‘What?’ Nganna? ‘Who?’, Waminna? ‘What’s up?’ or ‘What’s the matter?’) and

---

6 Nunga is a term of self-reference used by Indigenous people of southern South Australia. It derives from Wirangu, a language spoken on the far west coast of South Australia, where it simply means ‘person’. This term contrasts with Yura in the Flinders Ranges, Angaju in the northwest of South Australia, Koorie on the east coast of Australia, Noongah in the southwest of Australia, Yoln in northeast Arnhemland, Northern Territory, Murri in much of Queensland etc.

7 Deadly is used in Aboriginal English in much the same way as terrific is used in mainstream English varieties. The use of deadly in this way may well be derived from the similar use of its counterpart paitya in Kaurna.

---
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responses (such as Ne! ‘Yes!’, Yakko ‘No’, Wointye ‘Maybe’, Marni ‘Good’ etc.), which are easy to learn and can stand alone. In the early stages the response to these Kaurna utterances might be in English.

Mealtimes are contexts in which the same phrases (for example, Bakkadla parniappendo! ‘Pass me the salt!’; Pinyatta padlonendai ‘I’d like some sugar’, Taityoai ‘I’m hungry’, Burliai ‘I’m satiated’, etc.) can be used meaningfully every day, even several times a day. Furthermore, all can be used as stand-alone well-formed utterances. Once the easiest, shortest utterances have been mastered, the level of complexity can be gradually increased with longer, more complex constructions introduced, but always stressing the utterances that are used most often.

As this repertoire expands, gradually understandings of grammar will emerge as learners begin to recognise the same patterns recurring. For instance, in the utterances cited above, learners might notice -ai reoccurring on the end of padlonendai, burliai and taityoai. In fact, -ai here is a pronominal first-person singular clitic ‘I’. Adult learners will enquire about the similarities they notice when they are ready to find out, and at that stage some explanation of aspects of grammar can be given.

There are several different positions or perspectives taken by different researchers as to the relationship between English and the reviving language. Leanne Hinton strongly advocates no English for prolonged periods of the day in her Master-Apprentice approach (Hinton 1994:235-247). Whilst I see the need to break away from English, I argue that insisting on no English for long periods is probably not feasible in situations, such as for the Kaurna, where the language has long lain dormant.

The natural tendency is for people to relexify their English, and certainly this is what is happening with attempts to speak Ngarrindjeri, a language located to the east of Kaurna. Ngarrindjeri people will insert Ngarrindjeri words, often with English plural, possessive or tense suffixes, into their English. As they learn more words from historical sources, these too are incorporated. The result might be a text where all the words are Ngarrindjeri, but the grammar is entirely English.

In the Kaurna context, I have argued for a middle course and have encouraged the use of well-formed utterances within English. I try to encourage people to move beyond isolated words and engage with the grammar. In a recent review of Amery (2000), I have been criticized for this approach (Bowern 2003:196).

5. Language Planning
Kaurna Warra Pintyandi (KWP) grew out of a series of Kaurna language development workshops held in Nov.-Dec. 2000. We decided to continue meeting each month, to deal with requests as they arose and to continue our work on projects to expand and develop the Kaurna language. In this way, the informal language planning body we call Kaurna Warra Pintyandi was born. We set an agenda for the meeting each month and maintain formal minutes, but we are not an incorporated body. Funds, including a small grant from the Adelaide City Council and
several small donations, are auspiced by the University of Adelaide.

Publications, such as the Kaurna wordlist (Amery 2003) are now published by KWP and redevelopment of the Kaurna pages on the Adelaide City Council website have been accomplished through KWP.

Since KWP has been established, many groups and individuals have approached us for advice on Kaurna names, translations, maps and protocols. This includes government departments, private companies, education providers and students. Some have attempted to consult with us about broader issues, though we have had to remind them that our focus is specifically on the language. For matters beyond language we refer people to the representative Kaurna organisations.

5.2. Relationship Between KWP and Other Kaurna Bodies
There are several organisations that claim to represent the Kaurna people. The Kaurna Heritage Committee was initially established in about 1985. This grew into the Kaurna Aboriginal Community and Heritage Association (KACHA Inc.). As a result of internal governance issues and an impasse with the state government, Kaurna Meyunna Inc. and Kaurna Elders were established, though KACHA Inc. continued as an organisation representing a subsection of Kaurna people, based mainly around Warriparinga and the southern metropolitan area. When the Kaurna Native Title claim was being formulated, there was considerable pressure on the Kaurna to speak with one voice. Kaurna Yerta Incorporated (the Native Title claimant group) was formed and includes Kaurna people from all three groups. Several other groups have also emerged in recent times.

These representative Kaurna bodies are primarily concerned with heritage and land issues such as site clearance work for major developments. Whilst language and cultural heritage certainly comes within the scope of these organisations, it has never been a high priority.

In 2003, a letter was sent by KWP to the other Kaurna organisations, informing them of our existence and outlining our role as we see it. There has been no formal reply to KWP correspondence, and no objections have been raised. Members of KACHA Inc. and Kaurna Meyunna Inc. have attended KWP meetings. For a full history and up-to-date account of the activities of KWP see Amery and Rigney (2007).

5.3. Requests for Kaurna Names
As mentioned previously, Kaurna naming activity in the modern period began in 1980. Since then many requests for Kaurna names have been directed towards Kaurna Elders, such as Uncle Lewis Yerloburka O’Brien and Auntie Alice Wallara Rigney, or to Aboriginal organisations, to institutions such as the South Australian Museum that deal with Indigenous issues, or to others with knowledge and expertise in the language. Many, though not all, of these requests are directed or re-directed to me.

For a number of years I provided technical advice in relation to requests for names, though I always felt a little uncomfortable in doing this, and advised the
person making the request that they should consult Kaurna people for permission to use the name. If the request came by e-mail I would usually send a copy of the reply to Uncle Lewis, or if I remembered I might mention the matter to him or other Kaurna people when I met them next.

We needed a process so that more than one or two people were involved in making decisions about the language. For some years we talked about the need for a committee to provide advice and approval for naming requests and I was pleased when Kaurna Warra Pintyandi was formed and people were keen to meet and deal with these matters.

At our meeting of 24 September 2003 we decided to establish some terms of reference for the KWP group and a set of procedures for dealing with naming requests. I drew up a draft information sheet that also set out the terms of reference for KWP. This was prepared so that it might be sent out to people who approached us for Kaurna names or translations. This draft information sheet was discussed and refined at the following meeting on 22 October 2003. Nelson Varcoe was commissioned to design a logo for the group. He came up with message sticks in the form of the letter K. With that, KWP became a little more formalised.

5.4. Ownership and Copyright Issues

Like it or not, the Kaurna language is in the public domain. The main source, Teichelmann and Schürmann (1840), is not subject to copyright because more than 50 years have passed since the death of the authors. However, Kaurna people take a different view and assert moral ownership over this and other Kaurna language material. There has been much talk of copyrighting the language as an Aboriginal relic under the Indigenous Heritage Act, in the same way that items of material culture might be registered.

Kaurna people themselves have been reluctant to post much Kaurna language on the web and have generally disapproved of others doing so. Consequently, course material I have posted is password protected and, theoretically, only available to students of Kaurna and Kaurna people themselves. However, in the last few years a non-Indigenous person living in Canberra, Bill Woerlee, has posted the Teichelmann and Schürmann (1840) Kaurna wordlist on his webpage, and introduced a number of errors in the process. His introductory pages make statements about the Kaurna language that are quite out of step with the thinking and feeling of Kaurna language enthusiasts as follows:

Efforts are being made now to resurrect the language in the Adelaide region. While these efforts may be interesting for historical and cultural reasons, the imperative for learning the language has long since passed away. The good folk of Adelaide will not accept the learning of an ancient language as a substitute for English because of sentimental reasons. Even these attempts to revive the Kaurna language are beset with massive problems. The main being to express the ideas and concepts contained within the 250 million [sic] recorded English words so that Kaurna could be a functional language. Thus we look at the Kaurna language as a historical record of these people rather than a pathway to the future.

Rob Amery

Woerlee seems not to have consulted Kaurna people in relation to these remarks, certainly none of those who have been active in efforts to reclaim the language. Kaurna Warra Pintyandi is currently considering options for taking action on this issue.

Kaurna Warra Pintyandi has provided sound recordings and information on Kaurna names which have been installed on the Adelaide City Council website so that the public may become more familiar with the way these words sound.

6. Conclusion
Language ecologies are highly differentiated and arise in response to a specific set of social, political, historical, geographical, demographic and linguistic parameters. What holds true for one set of circumstances cannot necessarily be easily replicated in another. Nonetheless, Kaurna language reclamation has been informed by language movements elsewhere in Australia, in New Zealand, North America, as well as by Cornish and Hebrew language revival. In turn, I hope that the Kaurna language movement will afford insights and ways forward for other language movements operating in similar circumstances, particularly those sleeping languages associated with large urban centres.

The Formulaic Method and associated development of caretaker speech forms, welcome protocols, funeral protocols and other formula-driven speech offers a non-threatening means of re-introducing a sleeping language that is within the grasp of most people and performs functions in accordance with the needs of those attempting to re-assert, affirm or reclaim a distinct cultural identity.

Kaurna Warra Pintyandi is a small informal body, but it performs a very important function within the context of Kaurna language reclamation and revival. It works because of the passion and continuing interest of a small band of Kaurna language enthusiasts, teachers of Kaurna language and linguists. It provides a forum whereby requests can be dealt with in a transparent way and brings people together to focus on the language.

The projects I have discussed here are works in progress. Whilst there are many good ideas, finding the time and resources to complete these projects is a constant challenge. Kaurna people involved stress the importance of the process, or ‘the journey’, and are well aware that there are no quick fixes. They often say, “… it has taken 200 years to destroy our languages. It will take at least that long to get them back.” Engagement in the language revival process, however long it takes, is culturally affirming and reinforces identity for these language activists.

Yaitya warranna warrabarna! ‘Let Indigenous languages be spoken!’
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1. Introduction
The state of New South Wales [henceforth NSW] in Australia shares a number of similarities with language revitalization in California as well as some significant differences. In this paper, we provide a brief overview of the Indigenous language situation in NSW. Then we focus on language revitalization in NSW particularly over the last five years, with a special emphasis on education. We turn then to the comparison between NSW and California. Although California’s efforts have been more sustained and focused over a longer period, NSW has made rapid gains in a short period and has received considerable government support. We conclude with some remarks on future directions in NSW.

2. NSW and its Indigenous Language Situation
NSW was the first part of Australia to be settled by outsiders. From 1788 a process of Indigenous language shift began so that many of the 70 languages originally spoken in this state at first contact are no longer in daily use. As in many other parts of the world the region first settled was the hardest hit in terms of indifference, disregard and hostility towards its languages. All too often Aboriginal people were actively discouraged from using and passing on their languages through educational, and wider government, policy.

In a volume dealing with endangered languages around the world a major academic authority on Australian Aboriginal languages makes the following “authoritative statement”:

There are today many people of part-Aboriginal descent in highly settled parts of Australia (New South Wales, Victoria and the southern parts of Queensland, South Australia and Western Australia) but virtually no full bloods. Only one language is still spoken in this area (Bandjalang, in northern New South Wales), and that only by a handful of old people; over 100 languages have already become extinct (Dixon 1991:235).

This is a curious statement in that it suggests a correlation between language viability and degree of intermarriage. In fact in parts of northern Australia there are many so-called ‘full-bloods’ who do not have an active command of an
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Australian language. This has led to a divide, at least in the minds of some, between some regions of Australia which are said to have retained their languages and traditions and other regions which have not. Not surprisingly, the situation is more complex than that.

Although the state of NSW has sometimes been viewed as less ‘traditional’ than other parts of the country, particularly northern Australia, which experienced contact with outsiders much later and in a less sustained way. However, many Aboriginal people in the south, including NSW, see knowledge and use of an ancestral language as a key feature for what it means to be traditional. Because they see their knowledge and use as less than their northern counterparts they also see themselves as somehow less traditional. And this view receives plenty of reinforcement from the wider Australian community. In fact many NSW people are not only intensely interested in the Indigenous languages of their region but also identify themselves and each other through language. This is not just a matter of adopting the language label but often involves a number of words from that language and a few stock phrases – intermingled in their English. The process is not random or haphazard: these people will usually only use material from their own language and are likely to draw attention to material from someone else’s language. Why? Because Aboriginal languages can be seen as a form of property which one inherits from a parent and then owns (Walsh 2002).

But such knowledge and use as NSW people have is often measured against the yardstick of the ‘full’ fluency to be found in the north. During a major survey of NSW languages (Hosking et al. 2000), Aboriginal people would often be dismissive of their knowledge and use. We have often observed an Aboriginal person who had just claimed that the language was no longer spoken address another Aboriginal person in that very language. Otherwise their English was distinctive by its use of words from local Aboriginal languages. In short, we believe that NSW people have been underreporting their knowledge and use of ancestral languages. In any case, this survey amply demonstrated that there was a very strong interest in reclaiming languages.

To underline this discrepancy if we focus on a number of NSW languages, in particular: Baagandji in the northwest; Gamilaraay in north central NSW and Gumbaynggirr on the north coast, the situation appears bleak:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baagandji</td>
<td>3??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamilaraay</td>
<td>4??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumbaynggirr</td>
<td>1??</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More generally, the 2001 Census claimed that just 788 (out of a total of nearly 200,000 Indigenous people in NSW) speak an Indigenous language. Other surveys support this apparent low level of use and knowledge (Nash 1998, McConvell and Thieberger 2001).

There are many reasons for such low figures. Aboriginal people were often
actively discouraged from using and passing on their languages through educational, and wider government, policy. Adapting to the new circumstances brought on by ‘settlement’, Aboriginal people moved away from their traditional territories to maintain traditional hunting and gathering activities. Sometimes, Aboriginal people moved away for employment purposes; often, Aboriginal people were removed from their parents and sent to distant locations. In these ways speech communities were broken up and dispersed.

However, more recent investigations indicate that Aboriginal people were underreporting the state of language use and knowledge in their communities and that an initial air of pessimism could be offset once people felt that their languages could be reclaimed. In the case of the 3 languages mentioned above each has made great strides within the last 10 to 15 years (for further detail on Gumbaynggirr, see Walsh 2001).

2.1. Some Highs and Lows in the Study of NSW Languages

In 1788 the First Fleet arrived in Sydney. On board were soldiers, settlers and convicts from the British Isles as one purpose for the new settlement was to be a penal colony. The first colonial governor of NSW, Captain Arthur Philip, had instructions to foster communication with the local inhabitants:

*You are to endeavour, by every possible means, to open an intercourse with the natives, and to conciliate their affections, enjoining all our subjects to live in amity and kindness with them* (George III 1787).

Ironically his instructions came from the King who had not long before lost the War of Independence in what had become the United States of America. As we will see this king’s instructions were not always carried out as he might have hoped. By December of 1788 Philip had captured and manacled a Dharuk man, Arabanoo, so as to learn his language and for him to learn English. By May 1789 Arabanoo had died of smallpox. This representative of the Indigenous language of the Sydney region was thus one of the early casualties of diseases introduced by outsiders. Not to be deterred, by November 1789 Philip had detained two other Dharuk men, Benelong and Colbee, presumably once more ‘to open an intercourse with the natives’. Colbee escaped almost immediately as did Benelong but he was re-captured and later escaped in May 1790. In December 1790 Philip launched a punitive expedition on the local population and this led to an altercation with one of his naval officers, Lieutenant William Dawes. Dawes made the first extended study of an Australian Indigenous language and was quite sympathetic to the plight of the original inhabitants. This empathy led to Dawes being sent home taking his notebooks of Dharuk grammar and vocabulary with him in December 1791. These important materials remained unknown to scholars and the descendants of people like Arabanoo, Benelong and Colbee until the notebooks were rediscovered in a London library in 1972.

A little to the north of Sydney an Anglican missionary, Lancelot Edward
Kevin Lowe (Birri-Gubba) and Michael Walsh

Threlkeld, arrived in the Newcastle area in 1825 and began to study Awabakal, the local Indigenous language. Threlkeld was a dedicated researcher who made considerable progress with the language but in 1841 he had decided to abandon his mission:

… solely from the Aborigines becoming extinct in these districts, and the very few that remain elsewhere are so scattered, that it is impossible to congregate them for instruction, and when seen in towns, they are generally unfit to engage in profitable conversation. The thousands of Aborigines, if ever they did exist in these parts, decreased to hundreds; the hundreds have lessened to tens, and the tens will dwindle into units, before a very few years shall have passed away (from Threlkeld’s Final Report to the Mission to the Aborigines, New South Wales, 1841).

For the rest of NSW there was not much recorded for most languages for the rest of the 19th century. In the late 19th century there was some material collected during what has sometimes been referred to as the ‘golden age of the questionnaire’. An individual or organization would send out a questionnaire to numerous locations to gather various kinds of information about the local peoples and sometimes the inquiries were specifically language oriented. Although the quality of the information gathered in these surveys is variable, it is sometimes one of the most substantial sources of information available. For most of the 20th century up to the 1960s very little was recorded. From the 1970s onwards there was an explosive growth in the recording of Indigenous languages across Australia as a whole but still precious little in NSW, and even then it was often enough a case of ‘too little, too late’. In this period for one NSW language, Gumbaynggirr, Diana Eades reported in 1979 that there was just one person with a fluent command of the language: Mr. Harry ‘Tiger’ Buchanan. Mr. Buchanan was about 80 at the time and has since died. Before his death Tiger Buchanan would use the language for prayer and to talk to his dog (Walsh 2001).

This overview of research on NSW languages has tried to give a feel for how little had been documented and therefore how much of a challenge language revitalization has faced in NSW in recent times.

3. Recent Developments

Recent developments in NSW Aboriginal languages can be summarized as follows:

- 1999-2000: NSW language survey: Strong Language, Strong Culture (Hosking et al. 2000). Asked the following two main questions:
  - What is the current situation with regard to Aboriginal languages in NSW?
  - What do Aboriginal people want to see happen in the future?
- 2000 onwards: Aboriginal Curriculum Unit at the Office of the NSW Board of Studies – introduction of an Aboriginal Languages Syllabus into NSW schools
- 2002 onwards: NSW Department of Aboriginal Affairs has been developing a
NSW Aboriginal Languages Policy1
- March 2003: NSW Aboriginal Language Research and Resource Centre established
- June 2003: Aboriginal Languages K-10 Syllabus published by the NSW Board of Studies
- September 2003-August 2004: NSW Aboriginal Languages K-10 Syllabus Support Documents
- November 2003-June 2004: setting up the NSW Aboriginal Languages Database
- October 2003-December 2004: trial of the Syllabus in a number of NSW schools
- January 2005: the Syllabus begins official operation in a number of NSW schools

4. The Place of Education in Language Reclamation
4.1. Education and Language Access to 2003
The funding of school-based programs in NSW (along with other states) has to date, been highly problematic. In part this is due to an apparent lack of priority from both the states and commonwealth in providing an ongoing source of funding and support required to develop effective language programs. Presently, most funding for Aboriginal education programs comes to the states by way of Indigenous Education Strategic Initiatives Program (IESIP) grants. These grants, as the title suggests, were meant to be strategic in focus and non-recurrent, but have instead become the main funding source used to employ Aboriginal education workers and to support mainstream educational programs. School systems have prioritized the valuing of literacy and numeracy programs above a commitment to support the aspirations of Aboriginal people in reclaiming learning their languages. The harbouring of these resources for mainstream educational programs has severely impacted on schools attracting the necessary financial support needed to commit to the long-term implementation of language programs.

While IESIP funds are provided to the states specifically to support Indigenous education programs, similarly the commonwealth has funded Languages Other than English (LOTE) program to support the teaching of languages in schools. Funds of A$120 million over the quadrennium 2001-2004 were used to support the teaching of languages other than English across Australia. Though there was a capacity for states to use these resources to support Aboriginal language programs, most chose instead to use their already overextended IESIP funds.

This decision, in the case of NSW has impacted unfavorably on the health of school-based Aboriginal language programs. In the year ending 2003, the NSW Department of Education and Training (DET) spent less than $150,000 in imple-
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menting language programs across the state. These funds were split across 23 schools and were primarily used to fund local language tutors in each of the schools. Schools were expected to absorb the often-substantial additional costs from their very small discretionary budgets. The administration of this program has been criticized by schools and Aboriginal community members as being too small and untimely in the delivery of funds. Schools have also been critical of program evaluation processes that have ignored the need to engage in an appropriate assessment of progress made in student achievement of language outcomes. In addition to this lack of program clarity, there has been an unwillingness in NSW to provide a language consultant to assist schools develop quality language programs. This level of support has been demonstrated in other programs to provide schools with practical support in developing curriculum, supporting effective pedagogic practices and facilitating school and community partnerships. This type of support has been demonstrated to be highly effective in both Western Australia and South Australia, where specific Aboriginal language consultants facilitate school/community links, language teaching and curriculum development training as well as being overall advocates within the system.

The lack of a strategic plan to support both community and school delivered Indigenous languages programs has exposed a deep policy disjuncture between the states and commonwealth, as well as between different commonwealth agencies themselves, who variously fund school-based language programs, Indigenous education program initiatives and community language programs. The lack of a clear plan or an advocate within government has led to a piecemeal approach to supporting language programs across Australia.

It was within this broader policy environment that the Board of Studies NSW (BOS) developed its *Interim Aboriginal Languages K-10 Framework* (BOS 1998) [Interim Framework]. The *Interim Framework* was the Board’s attempt to support schools that had expressed an interest in developing school-based Aboriginal language programs. Initial work emanated from the Board’s response to the *Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody* (1991) that had identified the aspirations of Indigenous peoples to reconnect with their traditional language, culture and identity. The *Interim Framework* provided both schools and communities with guidance on scoping a coherent language program and identified broad learning objectives and outcomes. More generally, the *Interim Framework* positioned Indigenous languages in NSW as having a legitimate place previously denied to them in contemporary Australia by the system through a failure to acknowledge their existence or to have them cast as dead or non-functional. The positive response to the *Interim Framework* provided the Board with the legitimacy to commence the development of a more comprehensive syllabus in 2000.

The introduction of courses developed from the *Interim Framework* identified a range of issues which schools, communities, peak consultative bodies (such as the Federation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Languages [FATSIL] and the NSW Aboriginal Education Consultative Group [AECG]), the NSW Depart-
ment of Aboriginal Affairs (DAA) and the Board have worked to identify and address. These issues centre on the chronic undersupply of Aboriginal people who are confident and competent to teach the local language and the critical lack of language teaching and learning resources such as dictionaries, grammars and readers, grammatical primers etc.

Work has commenced, since the release of the *Aboriginal Languages K-10 Syllabus* (BOS 2003c) [Syllabus] and the *NSW Aboriginal Languages Policy* (DAA 2004) on identifying the range of problems that continue to affect the successful implementation of language programs. DAA, and other key NSW government agencies such as the Board, DET, Juvenile Justice and Correctional Services, have commenced developing an overall strategic plan for NSW. FATSIL has also played a key role assisting in this process by making strong representations to the commonwealth on diverse matters including assured access to funds and the development of a national training framework for language workers interested in working in educational programs. At present there is a sense that significant progress is being made in addressing the plethora of issues that have held back the successful implementation of programs.

Some of the issues that schools started to address included the following:

- acknowledgment that the ownership of language is situated within the community
- identification of Aboriginal languages teachers/tutors who are capable and able to support school-based language learning
- need for ongoing training and development to support community language tutors working in schools
- assured funding to schools so that employment contracts can be honoured and programs commenced on time
- development and adoption of protocols that outline effective and appropriate ways of interacting with Aboriginal communities and individuals
- development of clear guidelines on copyright ownership of language knowledge used to support language programs

### 4.2. Syllabus Development Process

On the surface, the development of the *Aboriginal Languages K-10 Syllabus* (BOS 2003c) followed a familiar path used by all other syllabuses in NSW. While all developmental milestones were followed in the development of this syllabus, at key points crucial language decisions were required before the project could advance and the Board could comfortably endorse the development of this language course. General community agreement was necessary on the place and role of the *Syllabus* in language education, along with the broad directions that its development would take before the project could be effectively scoped. An initial step was to commission several educator/linguists to provide the Board with key issues papers on comparable language programs in both Australia and North
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These papers provided the Board with authoritative advice on the critical issues such as:

- whether to attempt to develop a ‘generic’ syllabus that potentially allowed all 70 NSW languages to be the target language taught in schools, or alternatively to develop several language specific syllabuses.
- whether the course would be a language program (i.e., focusing on developing communicative language skills), or a linguistic type course that focused on the development of skills that would assist in the reclamation of languages.

4.3. The Syllabus

The document sets out to clearly and unambiguously map previously uncharted territory, melding community ownership, language pedagogy and linguistic principles and practices into one document for potentially all of the 70 languages of NSW. Extensive consultation during the developmental stages with Aboriginal communities has ensured input on such matters as language curriculum and pedagogy; language ownership and protocols; links between language, culture, and identity; and acknowledgement of the variety of language situations across NSW. Both Indigenous and non-Indigenous linguists and teachers were involved in the writing of the outcomes-based Syllabus to ensure that it was appropriate to NSW Aboriginal languages. The implementation of the Syllabus in schools is one strategy within a broader mosaic of language revitalization activities that include community-based language activities, adult language classes and the production of language resources.

There are a number of crucial principles that the Syllabus wanted to embed within both its outcomes and content, or within the approach to curriculum and pedagogy implied within its construction. Centrally developed curriculum is far from being benign or value free when it comes to positioning Indigenous peoples, their culture, language or identity. Though in some locations this may be a more benign process than in others, there is little doubt that Indigenous students continue to suffer from the lack of real choices that they are presented with when studying within a mainstream educational environment.

4.4. Principles of the Syllabus

It has been acknowledged that the development of this particular syllabus challenged some of the central tenets upon which other syllabuses are based. In mapping out the rationale, the syllabus document made a clear case to the Aboriginal peoples of NSW that a study of their languages was ‘more’ than a language program. The Syllabus had to resonate with their aspirations, allay fears about the further colonization of identity, and empower communities to master both the implementation processes and syllabus content, and to demonstrate that
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the syllabus provided an opportunity to develop a coherent course of study that would be lead to effective communicative language learning. The empowerment of each community was to be achieved by both providing them with the decision making power, and assuring them that engagement with it would lead to real and sustainable learning outcomes for students. Within this regime, purposeful learning is linked to the development of positive senses of identity. In addition to the issue of community control are the following:

- **linkage of language, culture and identity.** The Syllabus unambiguously links language acquisition to the development of positive senses of Aboriginal culture past and present, and the capacity to talk the ‘lingo’, to the ratification of positive attitudes to being an Aboriginal person.
- **acknowledging the uniqueness of Australia’s Indigenous languages.** The Syllabus is predicated on an acknowledgment of the inter-relationships between languages and location and the impacts that invasion and colonization had on the state of Aboriginal languages.
- **school supporting community aspirations.** One of the key underpinning syllabus objectives was to build sustainable partnerships between communities and schools through their engagement in the implementation of language programs. The essential authority for these programs has to be the community and their desire to see the reclamation of their languages. The aspirations of Aboriginal people to re-establish a place for their languages have been long known (Hoskins et al. 2000).
- **developing effective language teams.** The inclusion of community members and language teachers, schools, students and linguists into language teams has proven to be a key factor in establishing language work within a school and/or wider community language program. Each member brings a range of skills necessary to the development of an engaging language experience for students.
- **sustained learning experience based on the K-10 learning continuum, developing communicative competence.** The syllabuses’ construction has been built on providing students with an opportunity to:
  - experience Aboriginal languages in a range of contexts through the integration of listening, reading, speaking and writing skills
  - gain knowledge of, and develop skills in the application of vocabulary and grammatical structures
  - compare and contrast linguistic features of Aboriginal languages
  - gain knowledge of, respond to and take pride in the unique heritage and contemporary culture of Aboriginal communities
  - be active in the revitalization of Aboriginal languages in NSW
- **building student-community links.** One of the stated aims of the Syllabus (BOS 2003c:14) is to increase links between schools, students learning and community language revival in the local Aboriginal community. It is hoped that students will become closely identified with language elders and other lan-
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guage learners within their communities and they will forge strong links that build on a desire to become life long learners of language. It is also envisaged that students will work on writing, translating or re-writing old texts as part of their course assessment. This material could be a part of the developing language texts required to support language reclamation.

4.5. Syllabus Support

The Syllabus and associated support documents acknowledge the diverse language environment of NSW in regard to the extent of language resources available and the stage of language revitalization that has been achieved. This diversity largely correlates with language location, as languages requiring the greatest reclamation are often found in the more urbanised areas of NSW. In these localities, language knowledge comes almost entirely from historical sources, and even those in the community who strongly identify with the language may remember only a few words. Active language revitalization programs, on the other hand, tend to be located in the central, west and north of the state, where language knowledge comes from both historical resources including oral recordings of fluent speakers, as well as from a few current speakers of the language. Sadly, many of these Elders with more extensive language knowledge have passed on in the last few decades. As Amery notes, there is “a big difference between the nature of an Awabakal or Dharuk program on the one hand, which are necessarily Language Reclamation programs, and Bundjalung or Gumbaynggirr programs, which are probably Language Revitalisation programs” (2002:13-14).

The Board of Studies has developed a suite of support resources to assist schools, Aboriginal languages teachers, and the broader Aboriginal community to understand the breadth of social, cultural and language issues embedded in successful implementation of the syllabus. Each of the documents/CDs addressed specific issues seen to impact on success of this project. These included assistance on language programming and assessment, facilitating positive school involvement and advice to parents/community in using the syllabus. These include

- **Aboriginal Languages: Advice on Programming and Assessment for Stages 4 and 5** (BOS 2003a)
  - community consultation and protocols advice
  - sample programs and teaching units Years 7-10
  - integration of curriculum development, effective language pedagogy and assessment for learning

- **Winangaylanha Dhayn-gu Gaay: Understanding Aboriginal languages** (BOS 2004b)
  - CD ROM – developed deeper community and teacher understanding of the Syllabus and its support documents, including the implementation of appropriate school and community protocols and the basics of effective language teaching methodology
advocacy for successful language revitalization efforts, such as the advisory documents on a range of contentious issues including those provided by teachers and community members:

- language choice for teaching
- language resource development
- effective models for community consultation

- Aboriginal Languages K-10: Assessment for Learning in a Standards-Referenced Framework (BOS 2004a)
  - while this advice is pertinent to all of the years of schooling, the curriculum materials are of particular interest to the years 7-10
  - interactive CD linking teaching, evidence of learning and effective curriculum development. This material and associated student work samples link the Syllabus, the Aboriginal Languages: Advice on Programming and Assessment for Stages 4 and 5, specifically the linked sample units of work and
  - focus – assessment of language learning as a key pedagogic tool for student learning
  - student work samples exemplifying the performance of students and how their work can be judged in accordance with the draft levels of achievement (BOS 2003b)

In addition to these specific support documents and interactive CD ROMs, the Board endorsed in 2003 the concept that an ongoing commitment was required to support schools in the implementation of the Syllabus. Project sites have been chosen to exemplify a range of locations and implementation issues that continue to impact on the success of language programs. The intention of this program has been to trial the Syllabus in a wide range of language ecologies represented within NSW. The program includes the following key features:

- variable language resources and contexts
  - there is a broad range of language ecologies represented within the state, with some languages well serviced with contemporary dictionaries, grammars and a developing range of teaching and learning resources to support a range of different stages of learning.

- effective teaching and learning
  - the dearth of trained Aboriginal people with either language knowledge or teacher training (especially in language teaching methodology) has meant that schools are encouraged to develop a team approach that incorporates language speakers (at the best level available within a given community), linguists and language teachers.

- school/community partnerships and language teams
  - schools are encouraged to develop an overarching group whose primary task is to provide a conduit to both the school and community and to advocate for the program within appropriate educational and local forums.
5. **Some Comparisons Between NSW and California**

Both California and NSW were settled early and each experienced a devastating downturn in the knowledge and use of Indigenous languages. In California there were around 100 Indigenous languages in 1800 (Hinton 1994) but more recently the situation can be described in these terms:

California has more indigenous languages than almost any other part of the world; some fifty different languages still have speakers (Hinton 1994). But there are at least thirty and maybe more that have no speakers left; and every one of the approximately fifty languages still spoken is in what Michael Krauss labels a moribund state (1992). No language endemic to California is being learned at home by children; most are spoken only by elders (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:58).

One means of addressing these challenges has been through the Master-Apprentice Language Learning Program. This began in 1993 under the auspices of the Advocates for Indigenous California Language Survival [AICLS – see www.aicls.org]. Basically the idea is to bring together an older person with language knowledge and one or more younger members of the language group for one-on-one language immersion (Hinton 1997, 2003; Hinton et al. 2002). We hope to emulate this very successful program in NSW and discussions have already begun with key stakeholders.

The following table summarizes some of the similarities and differences between California and NSW. It can be seen that although NSW is nearly twice the area of California, it has less than 20% of the population. Much of the population in both these states is concentrated along the coastline in major population centres like San Francisco, Los Angeles and Sydney – Sydney alone (4,000,000) has well over half the total population of NSW. In each case the Indigenous population is around 2% of the total state population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>California</th>
<th>New South Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td>157,000 square miles</td>
<td>c. 312,745 square miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coastline</strong></td>
<td>700 miles</td>
<td>c. 1250 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geography</strong></td>
<td>More than San Francisco, Los Angeles, and the coast</td>
<td>More than Sydney and the coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td>34,488,000 [March 2003]</td>
<td>6,663,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indigenous population</strong></td>
<td>627,562 – 1.9% of California; 15.2% of the whole Indigenous population of the U.S. [2000 census]</td>
<td>135,319 – 2% of NSW; 29.4% of the whole Indigenous population of Australia [2001 Census]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indigenous languages</strong></td>
<td>c. 100 in 1800 but more like 50 currently known</td>
<td>20-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language health</strong></td>
<td>variable</td>
<td>variable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall it can be seen that California has started earlier than NSW in assisting with the revitalization of its languages. However, NSW has made substantial gains over a short, recent period and will continue to look to California as a model for effective but appropriately consultative intervention.

6. Issues Impacting on Existing School-based Programs

While NSW now has an endorsed Aboriginal languages syllabus that schools can draw on to develop language programs, an array of issues impact on the efforts of parents and communities, who with schools, struggle in delivering effective language programs.

Schools and teachers can and must play a vital part in the reclamation processes as they can provide a regime of learning based on developing and implementing an increasingly complex exposure to language that mirrors what is available in the home and within the community. For this to be a reality, teachers (whether Aboriginal or non-Aboriginal) need to be skilled in language methodology as well as the language itself. It is envisaged that effective learning will be based on a coherent course designed around a consistent language teaching methodology that focuses on communicative language.

To achieve a critical mass of language learners in any community will require a commitment that has hitherto been singularly missing in many other educational programs. One of the critical issues to be addressed is to develop a level of pedagogic consistency that is based on pre-service and in-service training for certified teachers and a regime of training for Aboriginal language teachers. FATSIL is currently working with several commonwealth agencies on developing

| State Govt Policy on languages | ??unlikely | NSW State Govt Policy on Indigenous languages |
| State-funded center for Indigenous languages | role handled by AICLS but without State funding | NSW ALRRC |
| Database for languages of the state | ??this role handled by the Survey of California and other Indian Languages | NSW ALDB [funded through ATSIS via NSW DAA] |
| State Syllabus for Indigenous Languages in schools | none | NSW Aboriginal Languages K-10 Syllabus |
| Language restoration workshops | Breath of Life since 1996 (Hinton 1996) | Workshops/training for whole state still in planning stages |
| Master-Apprentice program | Operating since 1993 | Approved in principle by Commonwealth for funding in 2005 but still in planning stages |
a training framework that takes into account the widely differing contextual needs across Australia. It is seen that this framework will enable postsecondary and tertiary education providers to develop a range of educational programs that will allow for multiple entry and exit points for students. An essential aim of this project is to ensure that all training is accompanied with appropriate accredited recognition and with links to employment. This project is a critical component of the long-term aim to have school systems employ trained language Aboriginal teachers who have undertaken training in both mastering their language, as well as in tools of effective language teaching.

While the first two issues alerted the need for curriculum and pedagogic consistency to underpin effective language learning, the third issue focuses on the role and responsibilities of schools and their authorities to implement supportive policies and practices that properly acknowledge the clear aspirations of Aboriginal people in respect of the long-term reclamation of their languages, and which enable the development of effective teaching and learning environments. Schools will not be able to sustain the momentum for such programs without long-term commitments to fund, staff and provide on-going training and development and consultancy support for these programs. Schools must also be encouraged to develop partnerships with parents and community based on respectful protocols (BOS 2003b, FATSIL 2004).

7. Conclusion

The languages of NSW have remained dormant as spoken languages for decades in many of the state’s Aboriginal communities. For many, it may appear that the aspiration to rekindle the ancestral Indigenous languages of Australia is a forlorn hope, rooted in the past and ignoring the realities of 220 years of colonization. However, a deeply felt sense of identity invested in an affiliation to their language, along with a growing awareness of the possibilities of language reclamation has provided a keenness to the current activity occurring across the state and revived a hope that one day many of the original languages will once again be heard.

In this environment, the implementation of the Aboriginal Languages K-10 Syllabus is one step in helping to support the revitalization of NSW Aboriginal languages. It has strong foundations in community consultation, constructivist curriculum theory, language pedagogy and linguistic principles. It aims to respond to the aspirations of Aboriginal people to reclaim their languages, and for their languages to be given the respect they deserve. As Jeannie Bell (2003:170) proclaims,

Now, we’re making this strong statement. We’re saying we haven’t lost our languages, we are still here, our languages are still here, our culture’s still here, our land’s still here. We want to see our identity as Aboriginal people recognized and respected in all its dimensions. Languages are a very strong part of that, and we want to see respect from non-Aboriginal people in the same way that they regard other languages of the world.
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