



Fig. 8: Entry for *djagal* viewed from Internet Explorer.

This indicates the need for metadocumentary linguistics as a field of linguistics with a somewhat broader scope than documentary linguistics (as it is generally conceived), a domain that addresses the theoretical approach of a documentation or description of a language, incorporating this into the scheme of information representation. In such a discipline theoretical neutrality of documentations would not be held as an ideal to be attained (as it generally is in documentary linguistics).

Such a metadocumentary approach also holds some important advantages over the mere representation of Nekes and Worms's documentation and description in either a book format or a more modern electronic format. To simply publish the work in book form as it is (as was done with J. R. B. Love's 1934 grammar of Worrorra [Love 2000]) would serve no useful purpose, and the majority of users would be seriously disadvantaged since the interpretation of the original documentation is not a straightforward enterprise. On the other hand, if it were transferred and translated into

a modern linguistic format, users would remain uncertain as to where the division of labour fell between the re-documentation and the original: just how much flexibility has the editor allowed himself? The present edited work attempts to fulfil an intermediary role, and in doing so potentially serves more functions than would either of these alternative products. Thus it presents data relevant to the history of linguistics, Australian Aboriginal linguistics, and anthropology, and descendants of speakers. It also forms a basis on which informed and useful modern linguistic documentations could be compiled of any of the languages dealt with, or existing documentations augmented.

References Cited

- Amery, Rob, and Mary-Anne Gale
forthcoming But Our Language Was Just Asleep. A History of Language Revival in Australia. In: W. B. McGregor (ed.).