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State-of-the-Art in the Development of the Lokono Language

Konrad Rybka
University of Amsterdam

Lokono is a critically endangered Northern Arawakan language spoken in the peri-coastal areas of the Guianas (Guyana, Suriname, French Guiana). Today, in every Lokono village there remains only a small number of elderly native speakers. However, in spite of the ongoing language loss, across the three Guianas as well as in the Netherlands, where a number of expatriate Lokono live, language awareness is increasing and measures are being taken to develop the language. This paper employs the UNESCO’s language vitality framework to assess the Lokono situation. I give particular attention to the state-of-the-art in language development activities, including language documentation. The aim of this paper is to provide the readers with an updated picture of the Lokono sociolinguistic context in order to facilitate future work between the Lokono and the academic community.

1. INTRODUCTION. In 2009, while conducting my first field research among the Lokono, I visited an ethnically mixed settlement called Orealla on the Guyanese side of the Corentyne River. During the ten days that I spent in this otherwise exciting and thriving locality, I found only five native speakers of Lokono, a mere trifle among the 1500 inhabitants of the village. The ratio later turned out to be quite representative of Lokono settlements today. In Orealla, I worked with an elderly Lokono consultant named Eddy who had moved there from another village. He was talkative, knowledgeable, and above all excited at the possibility of talking to someone in his own language. To Eddy’s regret, he had to use the Guyanese Creole English (the local lingua franca, also known as ‘Creolese’) to talk with younger people in his new village. When discussing language shift in Orealla, Eddy made the following memorable comment:

I would like to thank the Lokono people who are engaged in language development activities, and everyone else who contributed information to this article. In particular I want to thank Mr. Martin Purci, Mr. Willem Visser, Mrs. Ursula Visser-Biswane, Mrs. Sonia Orassie, Mrs. Carla Madisian, and Dr. L. van Broekhoven. I also want to thank Prof. P.C. Hengeveld and Dr. E.B. Carlin for their comments on the first draft of the article, and the two anonymous reviewers. The research presented here was carried out within the project When “what” and “where” fall into place: the ontological status of place terms in Lokono, funded by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (grant number 322-70-005).
When they [the children] look at me [the elderly speaker], I see their faces; they look as if they were hungry.

Today, this metaphorical hunger for the Lokono linguistic and cultural heritage is growing. Members of both the Lokono and the academic community are actively trying to document the Lokono linguistic and cultural heritage and contribute to its preservation. This paper reassesses the vitality of the Lokono language and gives a detailed overview of the activities, past and present, with particular focus on Suriname. Its aim is to provide scholars with an updated picture of the Lokono context in order to facilitate future work between the Lokono and the academic community.

As part of the assessment, I discuss the state-of-the-art in language documentation, a term that requires a word of definition (see also recent volumes by Chelliah and Reuse 2011; Gippert, Himmelmann & Mosel 2006; Grenoble & Furbee 2010). Thieberger (2011) aptly summarizes what language documentation means today and what practices this ‘new paradigm of research’ represents:

This paradigm focuses on collaboration with the speakers and on the interdisciplinary nature of knowledge systems, of which language is one part. A further focus is on primary data as the warrant for analytical claims, and emphasizes replicability of the analysis resulting in such claims. From this new paradigm flows the need to create reusable primary data, and to provide for its accessibility and longterm curation. (Thieberger 2011:1)

Language documentation defined in this way contrasts with the older ‘grammar and dictionary’ paradigm. It emphasizes accessibility of primary data (audio and/or video recordings), which can be reused for the same or for other purposes (replicable/reusable), and the focus on language as a part of a larger knowledge system. This paper gives an overview of the language documentation outcomes in Lokono in order to facilitate the use of the collected primary data for new purposes.

The paper is structured in the following way. After providing background information on Lokono (§2), I re-assess its vitality following UNESCO’s language endangerment guidelines (§3). I then discuss language development activities, including language documentation as defined above (§4). As a way of summing up, I bring the insights from previous sections together, re-evaluate the vitality of the language and consider the prospects for future language- and culture-related activities (§5). In the Appendix, I provide a link to an online catalog of scholarly work on the Lokono language and culture, as well as an overview of the organizations working within the Lokono community.
In the three Guianas (French Guiana, Republic of Suriname, Republic of Guyana), there are three official languages (French, Dutch, and English respectively), three creole lingua francas with their dialectal continua (Guianese Creole French, Sranantongo, and Guyanese Creole English respectively) and a number of other languages of Eurasian origin (e.g., Javanese, Hakka Chinese, Hindustani, Brazilian Portuguese). On top of that there are Amerindian languages. These include Lokono, Wapishana, Mawayana, and Palikur from the Arawakan stock, Kali’na, Trio, Wayana, Waiwai, Akawaio, Patamona, Makushi, Pemon, Katuena, and Sikíiana from the Cariban stock, Emerillon (Teko) and Wayäpi from the Tupian stock, as well as Warao and Taruma (both unclassified).

Lokono represents the Northern Arawakan language family, and is closely related to Wayuu and nearly extinct Parajuano, the languages of the La Guajira peninsula (Colombia/Venezuela). Its other relatives are the now extinct Taino and Island Carib, whose descendant, Garifuna, is a vital language of Honduras, Belize, Nicaragua, and Guatemala (Captain 2005; Hickerson 1992; Patte 2004; Taylor 1962). Lokono is, however, only remotely related to the other Arawakan languages of the Guianas (Aikhenvald 2012; Dixon & Aikhenvald 2006). Lokono has two mutually intelligible dialects. Western Lokono (or Guyanese Lokono) is spoken in Guyana, and Eastern Lokono (or Surinamese Lokono) in Suriname and French Guiana. The Western dialect is more conservative in terms of phonological processes such as palatalization across morpheme boundaries and syllable reduction processes (Baarle 1996). The two dialects also differ lexically and syntactically due to prolonged language contact with different languages (Warao, Akawaio, Kali’na, English, and Guyanese Creole English in the case of the Western dialect, and Dutch, Sranantongo, and Kali’na in the case of the Eastern dialect). There are few modern linguistic materials on the Western dialect, which makes a detailed comparison impossible at the moment. However, at the University of West Indies at Mona, Ph.D. student Daidrah Smith is currently working on a grammar based on fieldwork in Guyana. The approximate dialectal divide (purple line) between Lokono territories (indicated in red) is marked in Figure 1 (map by the present author).

Geographically, the Lokono people live in the pericoastal villages (indicated in red) as well as in the three capital cities of the Guianas: Cayenne, Paramaribo and Georgetown.

---

2 Among the Lokono speakers the language is known as Lokono Dian or Lokono for short. Next to this endonym, the language is also known, both within and outside of the community, under the exonym Arawak (Arowak in Dutch, Arawak in French), a term probably first written down by Captain Wyatt during his voyage of 1594–1595 (Patte 2010).

3 I use the term Amerindian, rather than Indigenous, since the latter term is heavily politicized, and can be misleading. Maroon groups in Suriname, for instance, also have the status of Indigenous People (Kambel & MacKay 1999).

4 The reader should be aware that the autodesignations used by the Amerindian peoples show some variation, and may not coincide in some cases with those used here. For example, Kali’na is the term used by Tyewuji dialect speakers, while Aretwy dialect speakers prefer Kari’na, a spelling that reflects their pronunciation (with an [r] in place of the [l]).

5 Within the Eastern dialect (at least), there is also some linguistic variation between the villages, though the recent increase in mobility, makes it difficult to judge which features belonged to which variant. In any case, these are minor differences such as the presence or the absence of an initial [h]. According to the speakers, the differences were more marked in the past allowing speakers to deduce from the way one speaks the village from which one comes.

6 Figure 1 only indicates relative locations of the communities; the size and shape of the polygons do not represent the respective village territories. Figure 1 was created using ArcGIS software by Esri; background maps courtesy of Esri, HERE, DeLorme, TomTom, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBASE, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap and the GIS User Community.
The rural settlements are scattered throughout the Guianas, intermixed mostly with those of the Kali’na people (speaking a Cariban language), and in Guyana with those of the Warao people (speaking a linguistic isolate). They form a belt stretching from east to west across the Guianas. Above that belt, there is only the actual coast of the Guianas where the majority of the countries’ populations reside and where most of the economy is concentrated. The coast is the realm of the official languages, the lingua francas, and the languages of Eurasian origin. South of the pericoastal belt, on the other hand, one finds the interior, inhabited by the Maroon groups and other Amerindian groups. According to an unpublished report by the Summer Institute of Linguistics (2002), there is also a small Lokono community in Venezuela, not far from the Guyanese border. Finally, there is also a sizable community of Lokono people living in the Netherlands who emigrated from Suriname in the last few decades for economic, educational, and political reasons. Patte (2014) also mentions an expatriate Lokono community in Great Britain.

While the number of Lokono villages in French Guiana appears to be growing, the Surinamese settlements have since long been suffering from depopulation. Many Lokono move to the urban and/or industrialized complexes in pursuit of employment and educational opportunities (see Wekker, Molendijk & Vernooij 1992). The present Lokono communities around Cayenne in French Guiana were established only in the second half of the 20th century, mostly as a result of such migrations out of Suriname (Grenand 1981). These movements escalated during the War of the Interior (1986–1992) in Suriname, when many villages had to be abandoned for safety reasons. Many of the resultant urban refugees never returned to their home villages. This sudden dislocation to the city for many meant separation from Lokono language and culture. As a consequence some villages disappeared
completely (e.g., Kopi in Suriname) and intergenerational language transmission was disrupted (§3.2).

However, as asphalt roads and electricity are reaching the Lokono villages located closer to the urbanized or industrialized areas, a trend to move back to such settlements is increasing. The trend, supported by the Surinamese government which funds new housing schemes outside the capital, attracts not only the Lokono but also other ethnic groups. As a result, Surinamese villages such as Powakka (in the vicinity of the SURALCO bauxite plant), or Matta (in the vicinity of Paramaribo and the International Airport at Zanderij) continue to grow, though their ethnic profile is slowly changing towards a mixed Lokono-Creole composition. Similarly in Guyana and French Guiana other ethnic groups are absorbed into the Lokono villages.

3. LANGUAGE VITALITY. The assessment of the vitality of a language is a complex matter. In order to make it more comparable in the analysis presented below I follow the UNESCO’s guidelines for assessing language endangerment listed in (2) (UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages 2003, henceforth UNESCO). In the list I also included language contact, which is not part of UNESCO’s framework, but was added here in order to give a more complete picture of the Lokono context.

(2) (a) Number of speakers (3.1).
(b) Intergenerational language transmission (3.2).
(c) Domains of language use (3.3).
(d) Language attitudes and policies (3.4).
(e) Language contact (3.5).
(f) Availability of materials for language education and literacy (4).
(g) Type and quality of documentation (4).

In this section, I look at factors from (a) to (e). Factors (f) and (g) are discussed in detail in §4 as part of the description of language development activities. In the UNESCO framework, a language can score from 0 to 5 on each factor. The grading system is given in (3).

(3) 0 = extinct.
1 = critically endangered.
2 = severely endangered.
3 = definitely endangered.
4 = unsafe.
5 = safe.

Based on data from Carlin & Arends (2002) and Queixalós & Renault-Lescure (2000), Lokono has previously been classified as severely endangered (Moseley 2010), but no detailed discussion of its situation has been provided. In the following sections, I re-evaluate its status by discussing each factor in detail.

7The names of the two villages are given in their official spellings. In Lokono Powakka is known as Pwaka and Matta as Korhopa.
8I use the UNESCO’s guidelines, as opposed to, for example, Fishman’s (1991) Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS) or the framework used by Ethnologue (Gordon 2005; Grimes 2000; Lewis 2009), since Lokono has previously been graded with respect to the UNESCO’s criteria (Moseley 2010). This adds a comparative diachronic dimension.
3.1 NUMBER OF SPEAKERS. Both the number of ethnic Lokono (i.e., the total ethnic population), and the percentage of Lokono speakers in the three Guianas are hard to estimate. In Table 1, I give the previously published estimates. It should be stressed, however, that there has been no proper sociolinguistic survey of the Lokono.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>Number of Speakers</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French Guiana</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>a few hundred</td>
<td>Patte (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Forte (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>SIL (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Mink (1992)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on long-term fieldwork and collaboration with Lokono organizations from the three Guianas since 2009, I conclude that the figures today are much lower. The percentage of fluent speakers, that is, speakers who have an active knowledge of many linguistic domains, is around 5% of the ethnic population. There is a sizeable community of semi-speakers possessing different degrees of passive knowledge, but very few people can actually speak Lokono. Although the precise data are missing, a similar picture emerges from the last population census in Suriname. The census conducted in Suriname in 2012 lumps all Amerindian groups of the country into one group: Inheems ‘Indigenous’. According to this source, 20,344 people declared themselves Inheems (Algemeen Bureau voor de Statistiek 2013, I:46). Additionally, the census reports that in 368 households, inhabited cumulatively by 1340 people, an Amerindian language is the main medium of communication. Additionally in 329 households, an Amerindian language is the second-most used language (Algemeen Bureau voor de Statistiek 2014, III:53). In this latter case, the number of inhabitants is not given, but assuming the same ratio, we can expect 1198 inhabitants. Amerindian languages, on the whole, are therefore used as main languages at home by around 6.5% of the ethnic Amerindian population. Knowing that Cariban languages are on the whole more vital, it seems reasonable to expect that Lokono is spoken as a main language at home by around 5% of the ethnic Lokono population. In UNESCO’s terms, Lokono scores therefore as “critically endangered” (Grade 1), since “very few speak the language” (UNESCO 2003:9).

3.2 INTERGENERATIONAL LANGUAGE TRANSMISSION. The Lokono language is not being transmitted to children anymore. Lokono children are raised speaking the official languages and the lingua francas. The break in transmission took place, more or less, two generations ago. This change is attributed by many speakers to social stigma and institutional oppression. In Suriname, for instance, the older generations report that it was forbidden to speak Lokono at school, even between students. In all three Guianas, Amerindians were con-

---

9 It should be mentioned that the Lokono have used creole languages at least since the 19th century to communicate with the colonizers, though it is quite likely that this phenomenon has an even longer history. It has also been claimed that in the 19th century there were already Lokono communities who spoke Berbice Creole Dutch as their mother tongue (Robertson 1987:24), and it is a fact that Berbice Creole Dutch is heavily influenced by Lokono vocabulary (see Kouwenberg 1994).
considered to be the lowest cohort of society by other, more numerous, ethnic groups. In the case of Lokono, who live close to the urbanized centers, this meant that the parents often preferred to teach their children the lingua franca and the official language, so that their children could fit in better within the society. Many Lokono report also that they spent part of their childhood in the city due to the War of the Interior (1986–1992), which further contributed to language attrition. As a result, the Lokono linguistic community today is best described as a continuum of language proficiency. Since, again, quantitative data are missing, in Figure 2, I schematically represent the language skills of different Lokono age groups based on my fieldwork in the three Guianas.\(^{10}\)

![Figure 2. Schematic representation of language skills among different age groups](image)

For comparative purposes we can describe the speaking skills of the Lokono represented schematically in Figure 2 in terms of the proficiency guidelines of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). ACTFL uses the following five major categories: superior, distinguished, advanced, intermediate, novice (for details, see American Council on Teaching of Foreign Languages 2012).

The oldest generations of Lokono (70+) are fluent Lokono speakers, that is, they have active and passive knowledge of many domains, corresponding to the categories ‘superior’ and ‘distinguished’ in ACTFL terms. This group also often has ‘advanced’ to ‘intermediate’ speaking skills of the lingua franca, and usually ‘novice’ knowledge of the official language. The knowledge of the lingua franca varies a lot in this group on an individual basis. Lokono language skills are decreasing with age. People between 50 and 70 are usually ‘advanced’ speakers of all three languages, but use Lokono sporadically, due to the fact that the use of official languages, lingua francas, and Lokono is dictated by different sociolinguistic factors (see §3.3). The generation of 30- to 50-year-olds has, at best, ‘intermediate’ (usually passive) knowledge of Lokono, but ‘advanced’ to ‘distinguished’ knowledge of the official language and the lingua franca. The youngest generation has neither active nor passive knowledge of the Lokono language, but ‘advanced’ to ‘distinguished’ knowledge of the official language and the lingua franca, with clearly more proficiency in the latter.

Gender plays a secondary role in the distribution of Lokono language skills, with women (less mobile) tending to be more fluent.

\(^{10}\)Gender plays a secondary role in the distribution of Lokono language skills, with women (less mobile) tending to be more fluent.
3.3 DOMAINS OF LANGUAGE USE. The domains, in which Lokono is used today, are very limited, while the official languages dominate most of the formal, and the lingua francas most of the informal, contexts. Official languages are used exclusively in the educational systems of the three nation-states. They also dominate the mass media and the politics. The creole lingua francas are today also present in the media and this trend is clearly increasing when compared with the situation from a few years ago. Noteworthy is the fact that since the 1980s, Desi Bouterse, who is the present president of Suriname, often addresses the masses both within and outside the country in Sranantongo instead of Dutch. In any case, lingua francas are the de facto languages of daily interaction for many, though certainly not all, inhabitants of the Guianas. The omnipresent official languages and lingua francas leave very little space outside the home to use Lokono.

In Suriname, there used to be a Lokono radio broadcast every week that continued for decades up to the middle of the 1990s. However, after Just Orassie, the Lokono radio voice of Suriname, retired, there was no one to take over his position. Since 2010, an Amerindian quarterly has been published in Suriname by the Vereniging Inheemse Dorps hoofden in Suriname ‘Association of Amerindian Chiefs in Suriname’. The title of the publication is Maraka ‘medicine-man’s rattle’ in Lokono and the Cariban languages of the area, but except for occasional Lokono titles of columns such as Hiyaro Diadiadwan ‘Women’s Conversations’, its content is exclusively in Dutch.

The Lokono language seems also, on the whole, closed to new domains. Coinage of terms for novel items is rare, especially when compared with its intensity in the past (see Penard & Penard 1926; Rybka forthcoming). The Lokono used to eagerly coin new terms for concepts and tools borrowed from other cultures, often by means of complex descriptive nominalizations as in (4).

(4) *faretho bian koti darhidikwana*

*faretho*  *bian*  *koti*  *darhidi-kwana*

white.man two foot run-NOM_instr

‘bicycle, lit. white man’s two-feet running implement.’

The shifts in domains are also visible in the naming pattern of new settlements. These do not receive Lokono names anymore, but are rather named in the official language (e.g., *Klein Powaka, Hollandse Kamp*, both villages in Suriname; *Cecilia* in French Guiana). In UNESCO’s terms, Lokono is therefore rated again as “severely endangered” (Grade 2) for shifts in the domains of use. In the UNESCO’s report this category is characterized in the following way:

The non-dominant language is used only in highly formal domains, especially in ritual and administration. The language may also still be used at the community center, at festivals and at ceremonial occasions where older members of the community have a chance to meet. The limited domain may also include homes where grandparents and other older extended family members reside and other traditional gathering places of the elderly. Many people can understand the language but cannot speak it. (UNESCO 2003:10)
For response to new domains, however, Lokono scores zero, falling into the category of languages that are “not used in any new domains” (UNESCO 2003:11).

3.4 LANGUAGE ATTITUDES AND POLICIES. It is noteworthy that the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples was translated into Lokono. However, very few Lokono people are actually familiar with the document—a problem of distribution that applies to all materials in the Lokono language. Also notable is the fact that in all three countries there is a national Amerindian day, during which the Amerindian peoples of the Guianas celebrate their cultural heritage with the rest of the society. However, the governmental policies and practices regarding the Amerindian languages are less encouraging. In more general terms, even though the situation differs per country, in all three Guianas there is a discrepancy between theory and practice when it comes to language attitudes and policies.

In Suriname, the exoglossic language policy (or in fact lack of any official policy) has since the colonial times endorsed Dutch as the sole official language, and the ministry will most likely continue upholding this stance for the decades to come. Amerindian languages in Suriname do not have an official status.

On the other hand, in Guyana, the Ministry of Amerindian Affairs tries to implement policies that facilitate cultural, social, and economic development of the Amerindians (§4.4). However, the efforts are still far from constituting a well-planned, sustainable, and consequent policy, and are limited to smaller projects. Lokono, together with other Amerindian languages, is recognized as a regional language in Guyana.

In French Guiana, Lokono, together with other Amerindian and Maroon languages, at least theoretically, has the status of a regional language of France. The local government has on more than one occasion supported the activities of the Lokono organizations in French Guiana. This, however, happens on a project-by-project basis, and it is highly unlikely that Lokono will be endorsed on any long-term basis in this French department.

Despite clear differences between the three countries, in none of them is there an actual implemented language policy aimed at sustaining and developing the Lokono language. The governments’ actions have been until now limited to, at best, small, short-term projects. In UNESCO’s terms, when we look at the practical side of language policy, Lokono scores again as “critically endangered” (Grade 1).

In the settlements themselves in all three countries, there is support for language revitalization, especially among the adult ethnic Lokono who do not speak the language anymore (including the expatriates in the Netherlands). However, not many Lokono actively participate in the attempts at revitalizing the language. The language, due to the already ethnically mixed profile of the group, is not a strong component of the Lokono identity; hardly any Lokono today would see it as a prerequisite to claims of Lokono ethnicity. Although the social stigma of being Amerindian is still present in some form, the Lokono are part of the fabric of society. The Lokono are not ashamed anymore of speaking their language publicly, although this hardly ever happens due to the limited number of fluent speakers. They eagerly participate in the celebrations of the Amerindian day, manufacture handicrafts for sale, and engage in international collaborations with the Lokono from the other countries. In UNESCO’s terms, Lokono scores therefore as “severely endangered” (Grade 2) with re-


gard to community’s attitudes and policies: “some members support language maintenance; others are indifferent or may even support language loss” (UNESCO 2013:14).

3.5 LANGUAGE CONTACT. Contact-induced phenomena in Lokono, especially borrowing, are described in a number of publications (Baarle 1995; Jubitana 1998; Patte 2005; 2012a; see Rybka forthcoming). Suffice it to say that Lokono shows both lexical and structural borrowing from the languages it is in contact with. I want to mention here, however, a metalinguistic category that speakers use, namely ‘deep Lokono,’ that is a reflection of the contact situation. Eihne Carlin (p.c.) suggests that the distinction is parallel to the distinction made for Sranantongo, in which *dipi dipi* ‘deep deep’ stands for archaic forms and more elaborate style, “not riddled with Dutch and which is difficult for most urban Creoles” (Carlin 2004:201). Similarly in Lokono, the term ‘deep’ is used to describe words or structures that are not part of the active knowledge of particular speakers. As such the ‘deep’ category serves as a mechanism allowing speakers to talk about their own depletion of Lokono vocabulary and grammar in a face-saving manner. In other words, instead of saying *I do not know that word or structure*, one can say *This is deep Lokono*. I have not attested any equivalent term for the distinction in the Lokono language itself, which again shows that it is a phenomenon limited to the speakers who already shifted to other languages and are thus in need of verbalizing the changes in their linguistic repertoire. Interestingly too, there is no lexicalized term for the opposite of ‘deep.’ The language-contact criterion is not part of the UNESCO’s framework, and is therefore omitted in the final assessment.

4. STATE-OF-THE-ART IN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT. Below, I discuss language development activities in the case of Lokono. With regard to the UNESCO’s vitality factors, in spite of the long historical record of Lokono, the language scores merely 2 on the availability of materials for language education and literacy. The existing grammatical descriptions leave much to be desired (§4.1) and the existing literacy materials in Lokono have reached very few speakers (§4.2). This is clearly attributable to the fact that until very recently writing and reading in Lokono has been a matter exclusive to missionaries, researchers, and a few interested Lokono. It also shows that, as is often the case with less-known languages, little effort has been done on the part of the researchers to produce materials for the community. Only in 2010 have steps been taken by the community to standardize and popularize the Lokono writing system in the three Guianas (§4.3). The next step in language development is the publication of literacy materials popularizing the standard and setting up Lokono language courses for children. With respect to UNESCO’s criteria, Lokono scores therefore only 2 on the availability of literacy and educational materials. It falls into the category described in the following way: “*written materials exist, but they may only be useful for some members of the community; for others, they may have a symbolic significance. Literacy education in the language is not a part of the school curriculum*” (UNESCO 2013:12).

Particular attention is paid here also to language documentation, for which Lokono scores relatively high (score 3). There are a few grammatical sketches, scientific articles, dictionaries, and even glossaries of specialized vocabularies such as plant names (§4.1). More importantly, a repository of reusable primary Lokono language data is being created

---

14 Similar distinction is also found in the Trio language (Cariban), where the locative *antinho* ‘deep (in water or ground)’ in its extended use means ‘difficult to understand’. As such it refers, for instance, to the ceremonial dialogue used by the Trio until about the 1960s (Carlin 2004:201).
However, most of these materials focus on the Eastern dialect, while the Western dialect remains understudied. In terms of UNESCO’s criteria, Lokono scores therefore 3 for the Eastern dialect, representing languages that may have “an adequate grammar or sufficient numbers of grammars, dictionaries and texts but no everyday media; audio and video recordings of varying quality or degree of annotation may exist” (UNESCO 2003:16). The Western dialect scores, however, only 1, since “there are only a few grammatical sketches, short word-lists and fragmentary texts. Audio and video recordings do not exist, are of unusable quality or are completely unannotated” (UNESCO 2003:16).

4.1 LANGUAGE DESCRIPTIONS. In spite of the fact that Lokono boasts a long history of research, there is, as of today, still no modern comprehensive grammar of the language. Important historical references include the works of Claudius Henricus de Goeje (1926; 1928; 1929; 1942; 1943;) as well as a Lokono-German dictionary (Crevaux, Sagot & Adam 1882a) and a grammar (Crevaux, Sagot & Adam 1882b). The first modern grammatical sketch was a dissertation by Pet (1987). It was, however, theory-driven, as his main purpose in describing Lokono nominal phrase was to test a hypothesis of generative grammar. Patte’s (2003) doctoral dissertation gives a fuller picture of Lokono grammar, but as it remains unpublished, is not readily available. Both dissertations describe the Eastern dialect of Lokono. Up until today there is no linguistically sound description of the Western dialect. Daidrah Smith, a Ph.D. at the University of West Indies at Mona is currently working on a grammar of Lokono, based on fieldwork in Guyana, which will hopefully soon fill in this gap.

Lexicographical works include the already mentioned historical Lokono-German dictionary (Crevaux, Sagot & Adam 1882b) but also a few modern dictionaries of varying sizes. For the Western dialect, there is one quite comprehensive dictionary by Bennett (1989). Also originating in Guyana, are the lists of Lokono names of fauna and flora by Fanshawe (1947; 1948; 1949; 1950), reprinted recently as Fanshawe (1996). For the Eastern dialect, there are two small dictionaries printed as part of Pet’s (1987) dissertation and Baarle et al.’s coursebook (1989). Finally, Patte published a dictionary which is a compilation of the previous lexicographical work and her own data (Patte 2011).

4.2 LITERACY MATERIALS. As is the case with many Amerindian languages, one of the first materials ever produced in Lokono were translations of biblical texts. An overview of the mostly unpublished translations of parts of the Bible is given in the online Lokono catalog (see Appendix) and in other publications (Baarle 1999; Benjamin 1987; 1991; Ziel et al. 2009). Here I want to mention only the recent works that contribute to the development of the Lokono language today.

In the 1970s, the Instituut voor Taalwetenschap in Suriname (the Surinamese branch of the Summer Institute of Linguistics) produced a number of texts in the Lokono language. Many of these texts are Lokono stories about events from daily life told by the inhabitants of different villages. Others are tales from the life of Jesus. All the texts come with a Dutch translation, often accompanied by drawings, suggesting that they were written for a younger audience. All these texts are today available online from the webpage of the Summer Institute of Linguistics and have also been deposited in the Archive of the Lokono language.

---

15In this section, I highlight only the most important works on Lokono. For more references on the Lokono language, the reader should consult the online Lokono catalog (see Appendix).

State-of-the-Art in the Development of the Lokono Language (§4.5). Traditional Lokono stories have also been published in a few different publications (Baarle et al. 1989; Bennett 1995; Boven et al. 1989; Patte 2012b).

More or less at the same time, another evangelical organization, the Global Recordings Network, created digital recordings of short Bible stories told by anonymous Lokono speakers. The recordings are of high quality and the stories are told in a natural, story-telling manner. The recordings can be found on the webpage of Global Recordings Network, together with a free translation.\(^{17}\) A modern translation of the Testaments, however, has never been taken up, apparently due to the small size of the community of speakers and the ongoing and conspicuous shift to both lingua francas and the official languages. Attempts to attract Bible translation organizations on the part of the religious groups in the villages did not bring a change either. One such organization *Adajali Wabaroseng* ‘God, Our Chief’, based in Matta, Suriname, has been struggling with this problem for a couple of years now. In 2009 supported by the *Surinaams Bijbelgenootschap* ‘Surinamese Bible Society’, *Adajali Wabaroseng* recorded a number of new recordings of Biblical stories told by fluent elderly speakers. They later distributed them in the form of CDs in the community. Recordings from the workshops can be found in the Archive of the Lokono Language (§4.5).

The literacy materials available in Lokono also include Lokono songs that were published either as separate publications or as part of larger volumes (Baarle et al. 1989; Bruin 1992; Lewein 1967; Penard & Penard 1925). Lokono songs were also recently made popular in Suriname by the Lokono band Kurupa, named after the Lokono village *Korhopa* (Matta in Sranantongo) from which many members of the formation originate.\(^{18}\) The band released songs that became immediate number-one hits in Suriname and reached the Netherlands. This resulted in collaborations with famous Surinamese artists such as *Kayente*.\(^{19}\) The lyrics of the songs, however, have not yet been published in the new orthographic standard.

However, most potential literacy materials have in common that they have not been made available to the Lokono people. The availability of literacy materials is therefore very limited—only in a few households I have seen one or two publications in Lokono, usually a gray copy of one of the short stories of the Summer Institute of Linguistics. It is therefore a prerogative to make this linguistic heritage more accessible to the communities.

### 4.3 Orthography Standardization

One of the main obstacles that the Lokono community struggled with for a long time, when it came to language development, was the lack of a common orthographic standard. To be more specific, the problem was not that there had been no written work on Lokono that could be adopted as a standard. As already clear from §§4.1 and 4.2 and as the online catalog further illustrates, there were in fact quite a few researchers who worked on the language, coming both from within and from outside the community of speakers, and many of them produced written materials in Lokono. However, each of them adopted their own way of putting the sounds of the language on paper. Even more importantly, none of these orthographies was ever popularized among the speakers themselves. The authors also paid little attention to explaining the writing rules to the potential readers who are speakers of an unwritten language. In (5) I give an example of the differences between three authors who worked on the language in the last forty years.

\(^{17}\)http://globalrecordings.net/en/program/C20630.


\(^{19}\)http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NumRnEUQsow.
I will not discuss the orthographies in detail here, nor the new standard, which is described in Rybka (2013), available online.\(^{20}\) It should be said that it is almost identical to the spelling used in recent publications by Patte. It is worth explaining, however, that there were two types of differences between the different writing systems: those stemming from an erroneous linguistic analysis (e.g., the lack of recognition of long vowels in the work of Pet) or those stemming from an arbitrary choice (usually biased by the linguistic background of the author, as in the case of the palatalized consonants in the work of van Baarle). The former type of differences could be dealt with by improving the analysis of the phonological system of Lokono. The latter, however, are a matter of agreement, an arbitrary decision, and therefore could only be dealt with by discussing what the majority of the Lokono prefers.

The Lokono recognized the lack of a common standard and the problems it entailed. I was first confronted with it in 2009 by a group of women in Apoera, Suriname, who were trying to organize a Lokono language course and found themselves puzzled at how to write their language. A year later, I started working with Kayeno, an organization in French Guiana, on a common orthographic standard for the Lokono in all three Guianas. Together, we decided on a publication that would:

- present the orthographic rules.
- prefer simpler, more regular rules, reflecting the Lokono system.
- explain why these rules are ‘better’ than those in other publications.
- reach the speakers in the Guianas.
- be freely available to everyone.
- be created by the community.

When the first draft was ready, a weeklong workshop was organized to receive feedback from the representatives of Surinamese and French Guyanese villages and the Vereniging van Inheemse Dorpshoofden in Suriname ‘Association of Amerindian Village Chiefs in Suriname’. The latter were at the time working on a bilingual mathematics program (§4.4), which would also make use of the new standard. At the same time, workshop participants decided to set up a foundation to preserve their linguistic and cultural heritage, called Wadian Bokotothi ‘Language Keepers’. In June 2012, representatives of Wadian Bokotothi and Kayeno gathered in Georgetown, Guyana, where the orthography was presented to the Guyanese Lokono. Finally, in 2013, the publication entitled Samen Schrijven in het Arowaks ‘Writing Together in Lokono’, sponsored by the Gesellschaft für bedrohte Sprachen ‘Society for Endangered Languages’, was published in Suriname in 1200 copies. The book was distributed for free in the villages during one-day long orthography workshops in which the content of the publication was introduced to the participants. A report of the whole process can be found on the webpage of the Gesellschaft für bedrohte Sprachen.\(^{21}\)

The book was also immediately made available online for download, for those Lokono who


\(^{21}\)http://www.uni-koeln.de/gbs/Berichte/Rybka_Arawak.pdf.
have (mostly mobile) access to the Internet. The book was received with great enthusiasm in the Netherlands and was used as one of the materials during a Lokono language course in Amsterdam (§4.4).

4.4 LANGUAGE EDUCATION. In all three Guianas, and in the Netherlands, there have been recent attempts at developing learning materials and organizing Lokono classes. Lack of a common writing standard has, until now, hindered progress in this domain. Therefore there are still no modern Lokono teaching materials for children. The recent developments in orthography standardization described above will change the situation. Nonetheless, the Lokono organizations have not been idle.

In French Guiana the organizations Kayeno, based in Saint Rose de Lima, Hanaba Lokono, located in Saint Laurent, and Cécilia Tokorho, from the village Cécilia, have been working on educational materials (e.g., collections of stories, phrase books). However, due to limited funding, few of these projects have been accomplished. Kayeno, which has a long record of cultural activities, has also organized occasional classes in local schools, focusing on the Lokono material culture, not the language. In October 2013, the French organizations prepared an international Lokono seminar attended by Lokono language activists, linguists, and policy makers from the three Guianas in order to tighten international cooperation. Importantly, there are modern educational materials on Lokono in French: Baarle, Sabajo & Patte (1997); Patte 2008, the former of which is a translation of Baarle et al. (1989). However, the content of both works is not suitable for a language-learning course but rather intended as self-study materials for a mature readership. There is also a Lokono-French dictionary (Patte 2011), which is mostly a compilation of previously published, but less available, lexicographical work on Lokono.

In Guyana, since the times of Father John Bennett, who wrote a Lokono-English dictionary and a small coursebook, no modern language educational materials have been developed (Bennett 1989; 1995). This is an important gap since the government is eager to support Lokono classes in the settlements. In September 2013, Father Jones Richards, a fluent speaker of Lokono and an avid Lokono activist, aided by the Guyanese Ministry of Amerindian Affairs, started a ten-month long Lokono course in Capoey village, using Bennett’s materials. The Lokono classes take place three times a week after school and are attended by children from 5- to 10-years-old. This pilot project is part of a new initiative of the Ministry of Amerindian Affairs, called the Arawak Language Project. It remains to be seen whether the project will continue and spread to other villages.

In Suriname, since 2008, the Vereniging van Inheemse Dorpsheoofden in Suriname ‘Association of the Amerindian Village Chiefs in Suriname’, in collaboration with a Dutch organization called Rutu Foundation, is developing bilingual educational projects, inspired by the Maya and the Garifuna (Arawakan) schools in Belize. The project Natuurlijk Rekenen ‘Counting Naturally’ started with the development of bilingual and culturally appropriate materials for basic mathematics in Kali’na and was piloted in two Kali’na villages in 2010. In 2011, a Lokono pilot was launched in Powaka and Washabo. The linguistic context of the Kali’na and Lokono classrooms is, however, different. The children who attend the classes in the Kali’na villages speak Kali’na, therefore teaching them mathematics in Kali’na improves their results at school. Lokono is already a heritage language to the children who attend the classes in the Lokono villages; therefore teaching them mathematics in Lokono

22\footnote{http://dare.uva.nl/document/513676}.
is a way of teaching them their heritage language. The Lokono specialist responsible for the content of the counting books has also previously published a short Lokono phrase book.

In the Netherlands, the Lokono community actively collaborated first with Peter van Baarle. This led to the publication of coursebook containing a small dictionary, and a few texts (Baarle et al. 1989), which was later translated into French by Patte (Baarle, Sabajo & Patte 1997). However, the book was designed rather as a self-study material than part of a course, and is written for a mature audience, not for children. In the spring of 2014, a basic Lokono language course was organized in Amsterdam by the Lokono diaspora organization Amazone Khonanong ‘People of the Amazon’. The course was designed and taught by the present author, and was video-recorded and published on YouTube in order to reach a wider audience.23 The participants were twenty ethnic Lokono adults who do not know their heritage language anymore. Similar activities in the Guianas are still hindered by lack of modern educational materials and lack of Lokono teachers.

4.5 ARCHIVE OF THE LOKONO LANGUAGE. In July 2014, the Archive of the Lokono Language (henceforth ALL) was set up. The archive is a “lasting multimedia digital record of the language” (Gippert, Himmelmann & Mosel 2006:1). The aim of ALL is to provide a platform where all data on Lokono can be deposited, stored securely, and made available to both researchers and communities. It includes language materials in formats such as audio and video files, scans of written documents, and photographs. All files come with metadata, including information about the creator, the consultants, the date and location of the recording, the topic, etc. The archive includes, at the moment, mostly materials documenting the Eastern dialect collected since 2009 by the present author, which include different types of speech genres such as:

- Lokono animistic folklore.
- Biblical stories in Lokono.
- Instructional narratives concerning subsistence practices.
- Personal narratives telling the life stories of the speakers.
- Descriptions of places within the village territories.
- Elicitation sessions focused on spatial language.
- Translation sessions.
- Scans of publications.
- Educational materials.

Many of the files are accompanied by Lokono transcripts, and sometimes Dutch or English free translation. Beside these data, the archive also includes scans of older Lokono documents and recordings created by other authors who have agreed to deposit their data in the archive, for instance, the already mentioned Global Recordings Network and the Summer Institute of Linguistics. The Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics in Nijmegen, the Netherlands, hosts the archive, which can be accessed online through the portal of The

23http://thiscourse.com/uva/lok01/wi14/.
Language Archive.^{24} Some parts of the archive will be open to the general public without restrictions, while for other parts a password will have to be obtained from the archive’s curators. There are also recordings in the archive that pertain to culturally sensitive knowledge that can only be accessed by a limited number of people. At the moment, the communities from which the recorded speakers come are discussing the details of the accessibility protocol.

A large part of ALL contains data documenting the Lokono geographic knowledge as it is expressed in the Lokono language, which are part of the present author’s Ph.D. research. Within this project, the present author looks at the way natural environment is divided into geographical features in the Lokono language. In other words, what landscape terms (common terms) and place names (proper terms) exist in Lokono: What are their denotations? What are their connotations? What morphosyntactic features do they exhibit? How are they related to one another and do they form a language-internally definable class? (see Bohnemeyer et al. 2004; Burenhult & Levinson 2008; Mark et al. 2011). The data also zoom in on the cultural and social importance of landscape to the Lokono.\(^{25}\) The ultimate goal of the project is to determine what constitutes Lokono geographical knowledge and what role language plays in this system. This subpart of the ALL zooms in on the Eastern dialect, in particular the expression of landscape in the speech of Lokono living in the Para district, Suriname. The data include elicitation sessions focusing on the grammar of space with tabletop arrangements (Rybka 2010), as well as elicitation sessions focused on geographic-scale phenomena, for instance, landforms, vegetation assemblages, and water features (Rybka 2014; forthcoming). The data contain also a number of narratives about particular places within the territory of Cassipora village and their cultural significance to the people.

Another interdisciplinary project exploring Lokono knowledge systems is the initiative started in 2007 by the National Museum of Ethnology Leiden, in the Netherlands. The project’s main aim was to study its Surinamese collections from a plurivocal angle, thus enhancing our knowledge of the artifacts and their contexts of use (Buijs, Hovens & Broekhoven 2010). The project opened up the museum’s depots to a group of representatives of the source communities, that is, the Amerindian people, and discussed the collections with them during consultation sessions. Following Wayana and Kali’na in 2007, and Trio and Kali’na in 2009, in 2010 the representatives of the Wayana and the Lokono were invited. During weeklong consultations, the Lokono experts together with specialists on Amerindian cultures of Suriname (archeologists, anthropologists, and linguists, including the present author) discussed a number of artifacts.\(^{26}\) The Lokono experts provided add-on commentaries concerning, among other things, ritual objects, feather collections, etc.

\(^{24}\)http://tla.mpi.nl/. The Archive of the Lokono Language is located under Donated Corpora.

\(^{25}\)This part of ALL reflects this preoccupation with land among the Amerindians. In Guyana the Amerindians have, at least in theory, full control over their territories, though in practice big companies are encroaching on their territories often without the Amerindians’ permission. In Suriname the government is reported to give away Amerindian land to mining and logging companies without the inhabitants' consent, and often knowledge (Kambel & MacKay 1999). Irrespective of the legal situation, the Amerindians of the Guianas are striving to demarcate their territories. This applies to the Lokono as well. In 2010, the Lokono villages in West Suriname presented their first results: a map, a report of archival research concerning the settlement of the area (de Jong 2007), and a book describing the modern Amerindian forms of land use (VIDS 2008). Later, in 2010, the Surinamese Lokono attended a cartographic training in Rio Branco, organized by Instituto Internacional de Educação do Brasil. In 2012, Amazone Conservation Team organized a similar workshop in Suriname. In 2014, another demarcation training took place in the Pierre Kondre, Para district, Suriname.

\(^{26}\)The collaborations between the Amerindian communities and museums are also taking root in the Guianas. In 2012, the Musée des Cultures Guyanaises ‘Museum of Guyanese Cultures’ in French Guiana, the Stichting Surinaams Museum ‘Surinamese Museum Foundation’ in Paramaribo and the Museo Paraense Emilio Goeldi in Belém
headdresses, clubs, and musical instruments, with particular focus on the Lokono names for the materials, techniques of production, and uses of the artifacts. The consultations were filmed and the present author is now negotiating the depositing of the videos in the Archive of the Lokono Language.

5. CONCLUSIONS. In the sections above, I looked at a number of factors that are crucial to the assessment of the vitality of a language. I used UNESCO’s framework, which applies the following ranking system:

(7) 0 = extinct
1 = critically endangered
2 = severely endangered
3 = definitely endangered
4 = unsafe
5 = safe

The scores are summed up in Table 2 below. They have been presented by country, though the differences between the three nation-states are not of great importance.

<p>| Table 2. Lokono vitality scores following UNESCO’s guidelines for vitality assessment |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Grade Guyana</th>
<th>Grade Suriname</th>
<th>Grade Fr. Guiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of speakers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational language transmission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domains of use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Shifts in domains</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Response to new domains</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language attitudes and policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Governmental/Institutional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Community</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language documentation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy and educational materials</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vitality assessment itself, however, is not a matter of simply adding scores, as language vitality is deeply entrenched in the community’s linguistic, social, historical, and political context:

The vitality of languages varies widely depending on the different situations of speech communities. The need for documentation also differs under varying conditions. Languages cannot be assessed simply by adding the numbers; we therefore suggest such simple addition not be done. Instead, the language vitality factors given above must be examined according to the purpose of the assessment (UNESCO 2003:17, original emphasis)

organized a heritage workshop in order to discuss with the Amerindians the preservation of historical and cultural heritage. As part of the project, the digitized collections of the museums are also being deposited on computers in the villages for the communities to browse through and comment on.
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In keeping with the above, it is important to make explicit the aim of the assessment. The aim of this paper is to facilitate cooperation between the Lokono communities and researchers. It is thus important to establish the trajectory, in which the vitality of Lokono is changing. Let us, therefore, look at the scores in Table 2 from a diachronic perspective. This angle reveals two different trends in the factorial analysis. On the one hand, we see a decrease in scores of the following four factors: number of speakers, intergenerational language transmission, shifts in domains and response to new domains. On the other hand, there is on the whole an increase in scores of the remaining factors, that is: governmental/institutional attitudes and policies, availability of literacy and educational materials, and language documentation.

It is important to notice that the first three factors reflect the state of the language itself. Lokono is clearly critically endangered. The community of speakers is shrinking, the language is not transmitted anymore today, its domains of use are very limited, and it is inactive with respect to new domains. The other four factors reflect the involvement of all parties in improving that very state. The language attitudes in the community are becoming more positive; the speakers are becoming more aware of language loss and are beginning to take steps to revive their language. The governmental attitudes are improving, though clear differences between theory and practice still exist. Finally, language documentation and language development activities are slowly gaining momentum.

The question remains whether this positive trend can counterbalance the negative one, and what the focus should be in order to maximize the positive outcomes of this friction. Clearly, at the moment the biggest challenge for the Lokono communities is the lack of professional Lokono educational materials for children. The creation of such materials should therefore be prioritized—the language has been documented enough to allow for the development of such materials, based on the available grammars and the primary linguistic data amassed in the Archive of the Lokono Language. The second obstacle that the Lokono face is the lack of skilled teachers. The teachers who work in Lokono villages are either not Lokono or are from the cohort that already shifted to other languages.

Finally, the Lokono organizations listed in the Appendix are interested in collaboration with researchers and developers in order to document and develop the Lokono linguistic and cultural heritage further. The emerging Archive of the Lokono Language is a result of such collaboration and will hopefully facilitate future work aimed at revitalizing Lokono, on the one hand, and stimulate further research on the Lokono language and culture on the other.
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CONVENTIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS PAPER

All examples are rendered in an orthography developed and accepted by Lokono organizations and the present author (Rybka 2013). The spelling includes the following less obvious choices: <u> mid-central vowel; <o> mid back vowel realized as high back vowel if the front high vowel <i> follows; <rh> retroflexed apical flap contrasting with <r>, a tap/trill; <kh> and <th>, aspirated <k> and <t> respectively; combinations <ti>, <th>, <di> palatal-ized variants of <t>, <th>, and <d> respectively; <n> realized as [ŋ] at the end of a word and as [m] before a [b]; <y> semivowel.

List of abbreviations:

- A (subscript) pronominal prefixes of group A used to mark the subject of transitive predicates, intransitive predicates denoting actions and encode the possessor of nouns (opposed to enclitics of group B used to mark the subject of intransitive predicates encoding states and the object of transitive verbs)
- APRX aproximative
- ATL atelic
- EV empty verb
- COND conditional
- DAT dative
- DES desiderative
- LOC locative
- F feminine
- NOM<sub>INSTR</sub> instrument nominalizer
- SG singular
- SML similative
- PL plural

6. APPENDIX. A digital catalog of the works concerning Lokono language and culture is available at the Zotero webpage under the link below. Notice that the category Unpublished Manuscripts contains different types of sources (grammars, dictionaries, biblical texts).

https://www.zotero.org/groups/the_lokono_collection/items/collectionKey/DQU2N925

The Lokono, as well as general Amerindian organizations, operating in both the Guianas and the Netherlands, are listed below.

**Guyana**

*Ministry of Amerindian Affairs*

Homepage: www.amerindian.gov.gy

*Arawak Language Project*  
Father Johnes Richards (teacher)  
Telephone: +592 6018868

**Suriname**

*Vereniging Inheemse Dorpshoofden in Suriname* [Association of Surinamese Village Chiefs]  
Email: infovids@vids.sr
State-of-the-Art in the Development of the Lokono Language

tel: +597 520 130/+597 520 131 [office]

Wadian Bokotothi [Language Keepers Association]
  email: melvin_mackintosh@hotmail.com
  telephone: +597 850 69 74

French Guiana

Kayeno
  email: willem.visser@mediaserv.net
  telephone: +594 594 694 960 797

The Netherlands

Sociaal Culturele Vereniging Wajonong [Social Cultural Association Wajonong]
  homepage: http://www.wajonong.com/
  email: wajonong@gmail.com

Rutu Foundation
  homepage: http://www.rutufoundation.org/
  email: info@rutufoundation.org

Amazone Khonanong [People of the Amazon]
  facebook: Amazone Khonanong
  email: akhonanong@gmail.com

Konrad Rybka
  k.a.rybka@uva.nl