



This item is Chapter 4 of  
Language, land & song:  
Studies in honour of Luise Hercus

Editors: Peter K. Austin, Harold Koch & Jane Simpson

ISBN 978-0-728-60406-3

<http://www.elpublishing.org/book/language-land-and-song>

## 'Don't tell them we're coming!': learning to document languages with Luise Hercus

David Nathan

Cite this item:

David Nathan (2016). 'Don't tell them we're coming!': learning to document languages with Luise Hercus. In *Language, land & song: Studies in honour of Luise Hercus*, edited by Peter K. Austin, Harold Koch & Jane Simpson. London: EL Publishing. pp. 57-69

Link to this item:

<http://www.elpublishing.org/PID/2004>

---

This electronic version first published: March 2017

© 2016 David Nathan

---

EL Publishing

Open access, peer-reviewed electronic and print journals, multimedia, and monographs on documentation and support of endangered languages, including theory and practice of language documentation, language description, sociolinguistics, language policy, and language revitalisation.

For more EL Publishing items, see <http://www.elpublishing.org>

# 4

## 'Don't tell them we're coming!': learning to document languages with Luise Hercus

David Nathan

*Batchelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education*

### 1. Introduction

Luise Hercus' pioneering and prolific fieldwork and scholarship are well-known in Australia (see Gara, this volume, Koch & Obata, this volume). This chapter describes her contribution to the author's understanding of a range of values, principles and methods in conducting language documentation, during two fieldwork-based collaborations during the late 1990s.<sup>1</sup> If the chapter reads like a compilation of Luise's brilliant advice and insights, it is presumably a combination of, on the one hand, Luise's wisdom and experience, and on the other hand my own ignorance and naivety (hopefully with the former being the greater factor). Looking back, it is clear that I was more than just a beneficiary of these collaborations with Luise; these journeys shaped me.

By the time I met Luise, in the mid-1990s, she was already a distinguished elder amongst Australianist linguists and fieldworkers, although she continued, as she does today, to work intensively, including undertaking fieldwork in remote locations in New South Wales, South Australia and Queensland. She had, however, lost her enthusiasm for driving, mainly due, I understood, to gradually failing eyesight. Her enthusiasm for motoring in former days, indeed her enthusiasm for many kinds of machines and technology, was evidenced by the trail of exhausted and broken Land Rovers distributed around her farm *Kintala* (see Sutton, this

---

<sup>1</sup> This chapter is largely autobiographical, and from this point onwards uses first person where appropriate. Since the chapter consists of accounts of journeys with Luise nearly two decades ago, not all of the information may be correctly remembered, and I apologise for any errors, omissions or misrepresentations.

volume). But for me – as it was for several other linguists and budding linguists – Luise’s reluctance to drive long distances provided a marvellous opportunity to partner her on field trips as ‘designated driver’.

Our first trip was in 1996, when we travelled to Ceduna, South Australia, so that Luise could conduct fieldwork at Bookabie in Wirangu country. Here, I was not much more than a driver; aspects of this trip are discussed in Section 4. The second, more significant collaboration took place over about a year, beginning in early 1999 and involving three field trips to western NSW and working closely together to develop *Paakantyi*, an interactive multimedia CD-ROM for use in revitalisation of the Paakantyi language.<sup>2</sup>

The launch in early 1996 of the *Kamilaroi/Gamilaraay Web Dictionary* (Austin & Nathan 1996; Nathan 1996)<sup>3</sup> drew the attention of some NSW Aboriginal communities to the potential of the new media for supporting languages. However, several people had lamented the lack of audio in the web dictionary, since audio is often the primary means of approaching language. In the late 1990s, the Paakantyi community (lower Darling River, NSW) expressed interest in a *talking* dictionary for their language, in particular to support a language revitalisation program taught by Murray Butcher at the Wilcannia Central School. If successful (as it was), this would turn out to be the first comprehensive talking dictionary of an Australian Indigenous language (Nathan 1996: 200). Our collaboration seemed natural enough: Luise was a long-standing scholar of Paakantyi, and I had recently been appointed at the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS) as Research Fellow in Interactive Technology. We submitted a funding proposal to the *Language Access Initiative Program* of the then Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC) and work began soon afterwards. A first fieldtrip was planned in order to meet members of the Paakantyi community and discuss a talking dictionary project with them, begin the design process, and do some initial elicitation and recording.

At that time, the intensive community consultations for the construction and launch of the *Kamilaroi/Gamilaraay Web Dictionary* were foremost in my mind. For that earlier project, I had attempted to thoroughly put into practice the values that I had learned at AIATSIS for consultation and engagement with a community at all levels. The initial Paakantyi fieldtrip, I proposed, would involve identifying key Paakantyi individuals and organisations, contacting them, and arranging various permutations of meetings to ensure that all views were heard and shared. Luise however, to my slight horror, counselled against arranging any such meetings, advising me, ‘don’t tell them we’re coming!’ The subsequent unfolding of events illustrates the wisdom of this counter-intuitive advice, as well as its role in the project’s success.

---

<sup>2</sup> At the time, multimedia products were typically called CDs or CD-ROMs, after their physical carriers. Today, with different forms of distribution, I prefer to call such products ‘apps’. A further issue of nomenclature is that Luise prefers calling the app *Wiimpatya Palku* (Paakantyi/Aboriginal language).

<sup>3</sup> Initially published from ANU’s Coombsweb; now at <http://dnathan.com/language/gamilaraay/dictionary>.

The most effective way to reach and travel around Paakantyi country (Mildura, Wentworth, Menindee, Broken Hill, Wilcannia) is to take the 800km drive westwards from Canberra. Two events of our first two-day journey stand out in my memory. The first was our stop in Balranald to visit a Paakantyi woman who Luise had known since she first visited Paakantyi country in the 1960s.<sup>4</sup> It was an informal, social visit; and how social it was! The two ladies spoke for what seemed like hours about which Paakantyi people had married, had children, lived here and there, moved, or passed away, over the years since their last chat. During the time that Luise had visited the Paakantyi communities, children had been born and grown up; some middle-aged adults, such as Badger Bates, remembered Luise having been regularly present during their childhood. I learned that Luise was so much more than a researcher, or even a friend; she was part of that community. They talked, and we all drank tea, but no field notebooks or audio equipment were unpacked, no recordings made; this visit had other priorities.

I realised that Luise had several motivations for not wishing to make advance arrangements with the community for our field trip. She believed that a successful project should work 'from the bottom up' rather than 'top down', in the sense that we would prioritise meeting and working with elderly ladies who were speakers or part-speakers, rather than people employed in organisations who typically might be juggling a variety of priorities, not all of which would be helpful for practical language work. Her plan was to work with interested elders first, moving northwards through Paakantyi country (from Mildura in the south eventually to Broken Hill in the north; most of the organisational infrastructure such as the ATSIC and Land Councils offices were in Broken Hill). By the time we would reach Broken Hill and the organisational and bureaucratic folk learned about the project, it would already be a *fait accompli* due to the keen participation of the elders. Another reason for not making advance arrangements was recognition of the lifestyle and values of the people we intended to visit: Luise explained that they do not generally make such long term plans, and trying to do so would be self-defeating, confusing, or at least an inconvenience. If, for example, fish are discovered to be running in the Darling River, several people would like to be out on the river and would not welcome feeling pressured to be at home. Of course, the key to being able to successfully pull off such a plan was the fact that Luise was a *de facto* member of the community.

Long distance car travel, especially the drive west towards Mildura through relatively unchanging and unpopulated country, provides a splendid opportunity for uninterrupted and focussed discussion. We had planned to use this time to work on methods for carrying out the project. We started with a long discussion about recording spoken words for the talking dictionary. I was concerned that, given the parlous state of the language and the very small number of (semi-)speakers, it may be difficult to record enough words to create a worthwhile talking dictionary. I launched into describing how we might identify those people who were, from a

---

<sup>4</sup> I regret that I have no reliable notes or recollection of her name.

community perspective, ‘authorised’ to pronounce words, and other methodological details such as the selection and arrangement of elicitation lists, and avoiding list-reading intonation effects (I had prepared some lists before leaving Canberra). Luise, however, did not agree – possibly she found my proposals distasteful – arguing strongly that we should only be interested in and record *what people actually knew*, regardless of the faded state of their language knowledge (see also Gara, this volume, on Luise’s methodology). What if we only end up recording one or two dozen words, I asked. But Luise’s approach proved not only correct but critical to several aspects of the project’s success (see Nathan 2006b). Eventually, I understood that her approach derived from respect for the complexity and beauty of languages, best expressed, she explained, as recognition of and admiration for the knowledge of the previous generation of ‘old people’ who spoke those languages fully. Koch & Obata (this volume) also describe Luise’s penchant for recording more conversation-like material where possible. So there were to be no lists, and no-one would be recorded on the basis of rank or role rather than their willingness to discuss and share the language.

Once we reached Mildura, Dareton and Wentworth to begin the fieldwork in earnest, our decision to take a conversational, knowledge-based approach was vindicated. The fieldwork was multifaceted; Luise was also interested to find out the present state of language knowledge, and she was open to the possibility of uncovering new linguistic data, even though so much language knowledge had been lost since her fieldwork in the 1960s. And indeed we did record new types of information, both richer lexicographical data, and data on the processes of grammatical loss and overgeneralisation as the language fades from active use.

Because we did not prescribe what should be recorded, consultants could express a variety of things that they might not have done otherwise. For example, they remembered (without explicit ‘linguistic’ prompting) metalinguistic knowledge such as minimal pairs. They established a pattern of providing a word followed by an example phrase or sentence for it. Another pattern was to say a Paakantyi word followed immediately by its English equivalent. While initially I felt this ‘pollution’ of the language by English was unwelcome, as the project evolved, I realised concretely how valuable it was for a talking dictionary of a severely endangered language to have the complete lexicographic unit (word plus gloss-translation) in audio form.

The strongest vindication came from the way that Luise’s approach influenced how the consultants *felt* about the activity. Sessions were relaxed; consultants enjoyed the free-flowing discussion that allowed them to shape the outcomes and to savour again the language that was in the further reaches of their minds. As news of our activities spread, and community members saw the draft CD taking shape, more offered to record with us. Over the three fieldwork trips, our growing ‘team’ evolved comfortable working styles and consultants found it increasingly easier to recall and pronounce words and expressions that they had not heard or used for decades. Nathan 2006b describes several aspects of the CD that were corrected, improved, and added as a result of open and collegial collaboration with Paakantyi community members.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> This echoes the paradigm shift from ‘fieldwork on a language’ to ‘fieldwork for’ a community (Grinevald 2003: 58).



The consultants also argued for authenticity; they always commented if they were prompted with words that they were not familiar with (the sessions were fully recorded, so that in the later editing process, we were able to apply their judgements to decide on the inclusion of words in the spoken dictionary). Ultimately, the number of words (and other information, see below) recorded was well beyond what any of us had expected.



*Figure 1: Murray Butcher showing rock art at Mutawintji. The hand stencil at right was to become the graphic motif for Wiimpatya Paalku. For an account of an interesting error (and its resolution) in the use of that motif, see Nathan 2006b. Photo: David Nathan.*

## 2. Setting out on the audio journey

As one of Australia's earliest and most prolific field linguists, Luise was one of the greatest recorders of Aboriginal languages (see Koch & Obata, this volume). However, in truth, she was not the greatest recordist. I had noticed, for example, in the earlier fieldtrip to Bookabie in Wirangu country (100 km west of Ceduna), that Luise recorded the sisters Doreen and Gladys Miller at their dinner table by placing her recorder and microphone fairly randomly on the table; I found this curious but did not think too much further on it at the time.

Nevertheless, the experiences I shared with Luise on the Paakantyi project set me on a path to learning about the science and technique – and the art – of audio recording. Later, when regularly training language documenters at the

Endangered Languages Archive at SOAS, University of London, and serving as technical advisor for the Endangered Languages Documentation Program, I was able to inject my audio skills, experience and enthusiasm to raise (I hope) awareness of audio and recording quality for the next generation of documenters (Nathan 2009).

Our approach to audio has changed massively over the last half century as a result of the evolution of recording technology and as linguistics paid greater attention to the content and methods of recording. Field audio recording was not even feasible until the late 1950s due to both the cost and size of equipment before that time.<sup>6</sup> Luise has told of how she travelled by foot along the Murray River in the 1960s with her young son having to walk alongside because his pram was occupied by a large reel-to-reel recorder. Until recently, the genres of content to be recorded were constrained: Luise recounted that even once cassette recorders were easily available, linguistic fieldworkers funded by AIATSIS (then AIAS) were instructed not to ‘waste’ tape by recording stories (see also Koch & Obata, this volume). Only wordlists and that strange predilection of linguists, grammatical elicitation, were *de rigueur*. In addition, the lack of actual usage, dissemination, or publication of audio in its own right – a gap that is only starting to be addressed today – meant that audio was collected as *evidence* rather than *performance*, often just representing an unavoidable inconvenience to be faced on the way to producing transcriptions.

It was not until the emergence of Documentary Linguistics in the 1990s that a rethinking of the role of audio was possible. Documentary Linguistics is particularly concerned with the value of primary records of spoken languages to a variety of academic disciplines and other audiences including language speakers and their communities; hence, it has an emphasis on the collection of ‘authentic’, spontaneous, socially contextualised language usage (Himmelman 1998, Woodbury 2003). Given that language endangerment is a major (although not the only) reason for undertaking language documentation (Himmelman 2006: 1), that period also saw flourishing ethical discussions amongst linguists about making the goals, practice and outcomes of their work take more account of language community aspirations, participation and control. It also saw the rise of language revitalisation movements in several countries, signalled by earlier work such as by Fishman (1991) but perhaps better represented by publications such as Grenoble & Whaley (1998) and Hinton & Hale (2001). Looking back, it is interesting that we undertook the Paakantyi project at that heyday of change in field-oriented linguistics. Three related factors influenced our audio recording. First, the community had explicitly requested a *talking* dictionary, so that audio was to be at the centre of the activity and its outcome. Secondly, the resulting

---

<sup>6</sup> Although recording equipment and indeed field recording had been possible earlier, there were few standards, little mass production of recorders or media, and such equipment as available was typically large, heavy and unwieldy. While from today’s perspective we might also think that the audio quality was too poor, Milner (2009: 4) notes that quality is so historically-located and subjective that listeners to early Edison phonographs could not actually distinguish recordings from live performances.

CD was to be produced specifically for use in the language revitalisation program at Wilcannia Central School. Thirdly, it was the first project where I was charged with creating high quality media (audio) content.<sup>7</sup>

At the time, I was rather a novice at audio technologies, although I had studied physics and mathematics at university and was a hifi enthusiast. However, Luise placed total trust in my research, preparation, and decisions about equipment and techniques. This provided me with a unique opportunity to learn about audio and start my journey to specialisation in that area.



Figure 2: Luise Hercus, Renie Mitchell and Lottie Williams at Dareton, NSW in 2000. Photo: David Nathan.

We spent several days recording with sisters Renie Mitchell and Lottie Williams, both of whom Luise had known and kept in regular contact with for more than a generation. For these intensive sessions, we stayed and worked at the Coomealla Club Motel in Dareton NSW, having booked four rooms, one for each of us. I admit with slight shame my surprise at Luise's decision to book separate rooms for each of the sisters; my previous experience with anything similar had been as a member of the film crew for the telemovie series *Women of the Sun*, where the production company crammed whole extended families of the cast (Yolngu from Gapuwiyak/Lake Evella, Arnhem Land) into single rooms. Staying in a motel meant that rather than recording in the typical field situation (in the consultant's environment), where one can encounter myriad constraints and problems, I could set up my own room for recording. I could experiment with the location and orientation of the consultants relative to noise sources, turn off the refrigerator, and move

---

<sup>7</sup> I had already been producing multimedia for nearly five years, culminating in the widely-distributed *Spoken Karaim* (Csató & Nathan 2001, 2003; Nathan 2000), however, that title exclusively used audio and video recordings already made by Csató.



furniture and rugs. Why rugs? Because Renie, one of the last ‘full’ speakers of Paakantyi, was weak following a recent stroke; the volume of her voice was little greater than her breath. To make quality recordings with high signal to noise ratio, I spent the days literally on my knees before Renie (who was seated on a sofa), all the time carefully holding and directing a hypercardioid microphone just a few centimetres from her mouth.<sup>8</sup> Obviously, such a method involves careful if unspoken negotiation about personal space, and it is highly likely that it would not have been possible without the trust and intimacy conferred by Luise’s long relationship with these ladies and their families.

Luise had recorded and worked on Paakantyi since the 1960s (Hercus 1982, 1993), so audio recordings were hardly new to her. But one event, relatively insignificant at the time, marked, I believe, a sea-change for audio in language fieldwork (cf. Nathan 2009). Luise and I were sitting at her computer, listening to recordings of words for the talking dictionary and comparing them to the written word forms in her earlier printed dictionary (Hercus 1993). We dwelt on one newly recorded word that seemed to have been spoken with a retroflex consonant but which had been previously written as the corresponding apico-alveolar in the original dictionary (or vice versa; I have no record of the actual word we were dealing with). As we listened repeatedly, Luise finally exclaimed, as if in a moment of epiphany, ‘yes, we can decide from the recording!’ I realised that until that moment, audio recordings for her had been subordinate to field notes and memory as reliable records of acoustic form. Linguists’ collections of tapes were seen less as evidence about linguistic form than evidence of having been to the field and made recordings. However, now, with good microphones, suitable digital equipment<sup>9</sup> and good techniques, definitive and publishing-quality recordings *could* be easily made.

### 3. Building the app

Building an interactive multimedia title is a complex process, especially when it involves careful integration of the work of several contributors and their respective skill areas such as linguistics, art, graphic design, language teaching, interaction design, and programming. Luise is well known for her love of machines of all types, ranging from cars, tractors, and welders to computers (White 1990). It also turned out that she was the finest collaborator I ever worked with on a multimedia project, despite her never having worked

---

<sup>8</sup> This anticipated the advice of film-maker Simon Atkins during documentation training at SOAS in 2008: ‘if either you or the speaker has to suffer in the process of making recordings it had better be you!’

<sup>9</sup> For the Paakantyi project, we recorded using a Sony Minidisc machine. Deprecated today due to their compressed storage format, they were, however, able to produce higher-fidelity recordings than the prevailing cassette-based field recorders of the time (Sony Walkman Professional). Nevertheless, the success and sustainability of the resultant CD underlined the much greater significance of microphone choice and deployment for recording quality, and helped me understand later that absolutist rejection of compressed formats *per se* was not productive.

in or had much experience with the genre before. Our multimedia app was created by a team with Luise and me at the core but consisting also of four main Paakantyi speakers,<sup>10</sup> a Paakantyi art manager (Badger Bates: for more on his role, see Nathan 2006a), and a graphic designer. Luise’s flexibility in undertaking unfamiliar tasks and her willingness to accommodate gaps and inconsistencies were extraordinary. We were able, for example, to quickly and painlessly create a hypertext sketch grammar together by radical adaptation of her printed grammatical description into concise screen-sized chunks and by inventing a simple notation so that Luise could describe hyperlinks that I could later implement in the software.



Figure 3: Screenshot of one of 23 screens telling the story “Moon and his nephew”, told by George Dutton to the anthropologist Norman Tindale. Here it is displayed using a unique 5-line interlinear format.

Luise worked hard on a re-interlinearisation of the story ‘Moon and his nephew’ told by George Dutton to the anthropologist Norman Tindale in 1938, which we implemented<sup>11</sup> as the only example of a 5-line aligned interlinearised text (until today, as far as I know). All this, despite the fact that the main purpose of the Tindale text for the Paakantyi community was

<sup>10</sup> Renie Mitchell, Lottie Williams, Badger Bates and John Mitchell, with additional materials from Doreen, Julie and Leanne Mitchell.

<sup>11</sup> By complex programming which aligns multiple lines of text in variable-width fonts in real time.

its assertion in regard to contested land rights in Mutawintji (a mountainous national park northwest of Broken Hill, officially known as Mootwingee). At a more abstract level, we both understood that some of the app's assets, like the grammar and maps, were not that germane to the community's goals but were important ingredients in establishing the app's credibility as an authoritative linguistic resource.

More importantly, a number of inconsistencies and gaps in the dictionary material came to light. There were many differences between what we recorded and the data in Luise's previously published dictionary (Hercus 1993), such as the retroflex example given above. In some cases, differences were explicable in terms of declining language knowledge; for example, one of the main speakers overgeneralised the participial form of verbs (*V-ana*); in other cases inconsistencies may have been due to individual and situational variation, or the reason was simply unknown. However, each of these cases needed a concrete response because the app included the earlier published lexical data, which was to be juxtaposed with the newly recorded data. As in the retroflex example, Luise was open to re-evaluating (and changing) the main printed dictionary data in some cases. But the most interesting thing was that she was content to simply leave several earlier dictionary written forms displayed next to *different* forms transcribed from our field recordings. For example, the earlier dictionary entry *kaangkaru* ('horse') is shown together with the transcription of the audio spoken by Badger Bates: 'there is horse: *kaangkuru*' (note the different penultimate vowel). She is, in a sense, leaving it to the app's *users* to decide which information they wanted, a most modern approach to information presentation.



Figure 4: Luise with the Wirangu ladies, ca 1996. L-R: Doreen Miller, Gladys Miller, Luise Hercus, Iris Burgoyne. Photo: David Nathan.

## 4. Sausages for wombats

This final section shares a story, which, although on a lighter note, illustrates Luise's larger-than-life approach to fieldwork and her relationships with Aboriginal people. I refer to our 1996 trip to South Australia. Luise was collecting morphosyntactic and typological data on the language Wirangu, spoken around and to the west of Ceduna. We flew to Ceduna, rented rooms there and rented a car in order to drive each day to Bookabie, another 100 km to the west, where the two sisters Doreen and Gladys Miller lived on their farm. Luise worked with the sisters for about three days, and on each day, we made the long, straight drive from Ceduna and back. Working with these ladies posed a particular problem for Luise: while she is a wildlife conservationist and has given over part of her farm as a refuge for wombats, the Wirangu community have a tradition of hunting and eating (southern) hairy nosed wombats (*Lasiorhinus latifrons*). For Luise, this presented not only an ethical but also a practical problem. Her solution involved us stopping at a butcher shop in Ceduna each morning, and buying several kilograms of familiar meat – chops, sausages and the like. When we arrived at the farm, she ceremoniously presented the meat to the ladies together with an admonition not to eat wombats. Not for Luise any politically correct tongue biting, seeking refuge in ethnographic essentialism, or even expressing her opposition without demonstrating her resolve. The ladies, however, as I recall, exacted a humorous revenge, continually teasing Luise by changing her elicitation examples into sentences involving hunting, killing and eating wombats.

## 5. Conclusion

This chapter has described just a few of many learning experiences whilst in collaboration with Luise Hercus. They involved complex juxtapositions, if not curious contradictions, such as the apparent contrast between Luise's long social and professional association with the Paakantyi community versus her advice 'don't tell them we're coming', or her respect for Aboriginal people and cultures versus her attempts to stop people eating their traditional foods; her strong respect for the knowledge of former 'full' speakers versus a tolerance for gaps and variation in language presentation; her careful linguistic scholarship versus her adept embracement of new forms such as hypertext grammar. Nevertheless, all these apparent oppositions turned out to reflect deeper wisdom and to emphasise the value of relationships, experience, and personal resolve.

These were more than attitudes and ideas, they were key to achieving a practical outcome. While our Paakantyi CD-ROM may not rank significantly amongst Luise's enormously valuable and irreplaceable outputs, it was completed on time, within budget, and I can say in all honesty that it was the most smoothly run and enjoyable of all the multimedia projects I have participated in.

But the most important aspect of our collaboration was that by providing collegiality and guidance, as well as the space to explore areas of my own interest (such as audio), Luise enabled me to learn approaches, strategies and skills that I have subsequently been able to develop and, during a decade as a trainer, to share with hundreds of other language documenters.

## References

- Austin, Peter K. & David Nathan. 1996. Gamilaraay Web Dictionary. <http://www.dnathan.com/language/gamilaraay/dictionary> [accessed 2015-04-15]
- Csató, Éva Á. & David Nathan. 2001. *Spoken Karaim CD*. Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- Csató, Éva Á. & David Nathan. 2003. Multimedia and the documentation of endangered languages. In Peter K. Austin (ed.) *Language documentation and description*, vol. 1, 73-84. London: SOAS.
- Fishman, Joshua. A. 1991. *Reversing language Shift: Theory and Practice of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Grenoble, Lenore A. & Lindsay J. Whaley (eds.) 1998. *Endangered Languages: Current Issues and Future Prospects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grinevald, Colette. 2003. Speakers and documentation of endangered languages. In Peter K. Austin (ed.) *Language Documentation and Description*, vol 1, 52-72. London: SOAS. Online at <http://www.ejournals.org/PID/007>
- Hercus, Luise A. 1982. *The Baagandji language*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Hercus, Luise. A. 1993. *Paakantyi dictionary*. Canberra: L. A. Hercus.
- Hercus, Luise & David Nathan. 2002. *Paakantyi*. Canberra: ATSIC.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus. 2006. Language documentation: What is it and what is it good for? In Jost Gippert, Nikolaus Himmelman, & Ulrike Mosel (eds.) *Essentials of language documentation*, 1-30. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus. 1998. Documentary and descriptive linguistics. *Linguistics* 36, 161-195.
- Hinton, Leanne & Ken Hale. (eds.) 2001. *The Green Book of language revitalization in practice*. San Diego & New York: Academic Press.
- Milner, Greg. 2009. *Perfecting Sound Forever: The Story of Recorded Music*. London: Granta.
- Nathan, David. 1996. Caught in a Web of Murri Words: Making and Using the Gamilaraay Web Dictionary. *Library Automated Systems Information Exchange* 27(4), 35-42.
- Nathan, David. 2000. The Spoken Karaim CD: Sound, Text, Lexicon and 'Active Morphology' for Language Learning Multimedia. In Asli Goksel & Celia Kerslake (eds.) *Studies on Turkish and Turkic Languages*, 405-413. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Nathan, David. 2006a. Thick interfaces: Mobilising language documentation. In Jost Gippert, Nikolaus Himmelman, & Ulrike Mosel (eds.) *Essentials of language documentation*, 363-379. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Nathan, David. 2006b. A Talking Dictionary of Paakantyi NSW. In Laurel Dyson, Max Hendriks & Stephen Grant (eds.) *Information technology and Indigenous People*, 200-204. Hershey, PA: Idea Group.



- Nathan, David. 2009. The soundness of documentation: towards an epistemology for audio in documentary linguistics. *Journal of the International Association of Sound Archives (IASA)* 33, 123-140.
- Nathan, David & Éva Á. Csató 2006. Multimedia: A community oriented information and communication technology. In Anju Saxena & Lars Borin (eds.) *Lesser-known languages of South Asia. Status and policies, case studies and applications of information technology*, 257-277. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- White, Isobel. 1990. Introduction. In Peter K. Austin, R. M. W. Dixon, Tom Dutton & Isobel White (eds.) *Language and History: Essays in Honour of Luise A Hercus*, 1-20. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Woodbury, Anthony C. 2003. Defining documentary linguistics. In Peter K. Austin (ed.) *Language Documentation and Description*, vol 1, 35-51. London: SOAS. Online at <http://www.elpublishing.org/PID/006>.