**Goal:** We will present a description of the current collaborative project involving Mohave and Chemehuevi, discuss the relevant aspects of project design and implementation and share examples of text, audio and video documentation developed by the team. Our goal is to suggest a theory of language documentation for Indigenous communities.

1. **Background:**
   The languages in focus are Chemehuevi, a Uto-Aztecan language with 3-5 fluent/semi-fluent speakers remaining, and Mohave, a Yuman language with approximately 30 remaining fluent speakers, both still in use on the Colorado River Indian Tribes Reservation (CRIT) where the project is being conducted. CRIT community members and researchers from The University of Arizona are working together as a team to accomplish the documentation of these two languages by assigning specified roles to each group. This project is funded by the NSF/NEH program for Documenting Endangered Languages (DEL) and builds on previous work by the PI under a grant from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation aimed at language revitalization, rather than documentation.

2. **Project Design:**
   Our project was designed from the outset to balance the work load and responsibilities between linguists affiliated with the institution and the community members based at CRIT.
   
   Tribal member responsibilities include:
   
   - data collection
   - learning basic descriptive linguistics
   - establishing protocols for access of archived materials

   The university group's responsibilities include:
   
   - training CRIT participants in documentation
   - training in descriptive linguistics and archival methods
   - assuming the primary responsibility for electronic formatting and archiving of material.
Both groups are committed to using documented materials to support the tribe's desire to revitalize these languages. This point is central to the development documentation practices which feed directly into revitalization efforts.

3. The Challenges: Planning, Training, Archiving

A. Planning
   - Conceptualizing
     • What is documented?
     • Who does it?
     • What is taught?
     • Who teaches and how?
     • What are the effects on collaborative projects and training models?
   - Background data
   - Travel
   - Distance communication
   - Financial considerations
   - Community support

B. Training
   - When /where/ how
   - Equipment
   - Language education

C. Archiving
   - Local
   - Electronic
   - Establishing protocols

D. Language education
   - Understanding what linguists do
   - Community education about:
     descriptive linguistics, language acquisition, dialectal difference, language attitudes, bilingual education, training them to be researchers, explain linguists’ motivation…
   - AILDI (and other native language institutes) as a resource

American Indian Language Development Institute: Summer 2006
20 Fellowships for the most endangered language communities funded by NSF (SGER). (1) Grant writing (2) Language Documentation
Aims for DEL grants by NSF primarily.
Details available at: www.u.arizona.ed/-aildi

E. Documentation as part of revitalization:
   - What can be done?
   - What types of materials are needed?
   - The best practice is to document for the purpose of revitalization.
-What is documentary adequacy from a community perspective?
  All things that support the revitalization/pedagogical goals: grammars, dictionaries, pragmatics, conversation, and discourse.

  For communities, revitalization and documentation are inseparable ---they energize each other.

4. Technology can enhance both documentation and revitalization.

A. Recent explosion in interest and techniques
B. Websites:
  - Technology-Enhanced Language Revitalization:
    http://projects.ltc.arizona.edu/gates/TELR
  - Indigenous Language and Technology Listserv
    Search the archives: http://www.u.arizona.edu/~cashcash/ILAT.html
  - Online Language Environment: www.ole.arizona.edu
    The OLE board technology (OLE) –a voice, video and text environment for asynchronous communication
  - E-MELD: Electronic Metadata for Endangered Language Documentation
    http://emeld.org/index.cfm
  - OLAC: Open Language Archives Community http://www.language-archives.org/
  - AILLA: Archive of the Indigenous Languages of Latin America
    http://www.ailla.utexas.org/site/welcome.html

5. Progress so far: Chemehuevi

Evidence of Language Loss; Beginnings of Language Revitalization

A. In the older texts taken from Harrington’s field notes we find vibrant agreement morphology in the form of enclitics:

    Tell-mom-pres-3sg/anim/invis husband-obl-own dead-get-nomin
    She told her about her husband’s death.

(2) haita-’ungwa ma’üpütsi-ungwa ‘an-ampaga…
    then-3sg/anim/invis old woman-3sg/anim/invis mom-speak
    Then the old woman spoke…
(3) ya’ai-kwai-ka-ni kūsavita-’ukwa kūanukwi-va.
dead-become-RES-1sg hawk-2sg.imper marry a relative of a deceased spouse-fut

When I die, you will marry my relative Hawk.

(“The Horned Owl’s Feet Frozen with Snow”)

B. In the samples collected in 1970s by Press, we also find agreement clitics, however she mentions that they are optional, and gives an example of two possible versions of the same utterance, one with independent pronouns and the other with agreement enclitics:

(4) a. Ann ung pagüci nüü-ni maga-vü
Ann that fish 1sg-obl give-past

b. pagüci-a-ung-n maga-vu Ann ung
fish-obl-3sg-1sg give-past Ann 3sg
Ann [that one] gave me a fish.

(Press 1979:121)

C. In our consultant’s speech, we consistently find independent pronouns, not enclitics:

(5) *Manga-k* ma’üpütsi (h)ambagar-ka-t
3sg/anim/vis-cop old woman speak-past-prt
The old woman spoke.

(6) Nüü-k manga-y huwütu-tü-ya.
1sg-cop 3sg/anim/vis-obl sing-caus-pres
I am making her sing.

(7) Nüü-k *umi-ya* monokos tünia-sumai…
1sg-cop you-obl all tell-remember
I’d like to tell you a story…

On-going research: conduct an in-depth study of a longer discourse

5. Using documentation for revitalization:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intransitive sentences in Chemehuevi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nüük nukwiya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (am) running.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manjak nukwiya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He (is) running.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manjak aipatci nukwiya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That boy (is) running.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitive sentences in Chemehuevi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mangok maapütci kania patcagant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That woman (the) house cleaned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangok aipatci sünaavia punikikat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That boy coyotes saw.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangok na’üntcitci tasonia patcaga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That girl socks (is) washing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Toward a working model for community partnerships:

What constitutes ‘Best Practices’ for documenting languages in the community context?

A. ‘Best Practices’ are still being defined in the context of working within a community…going far beyond just knowing how to collect quality linguistic data.

B. Best practices must include:
   - Permissions …on many levels
   - Needs analysis / language planning
   - Finding consultants…team building
   - Checking the adequacy of existing documentation
   - Documenting with an eye toward revitalization

Conclude that there are four essential elements:

• Collaborative effort
• On site training
• Documenting toward revitalizing
• Community based protocols for use of materials
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