

Revitalization Lexicography: The Making of the New Tunica Dictionary. By Patricia Anderson. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2020. 168 pages. \$50.00 cloth; \$100.00 electronic.

In *Revitalization Lexicography: The Making of the New Tunica Dictionary*, author Patricia Anderson presents relevant research regarding Indigenous dictionary making and argues that the *New Tunica Dictionary* is a potential lexicographic model for language communities engaging in reclamation and revitalization. Significantly, the author's title references a new genre of lexicography specific to dictionary making in language reclamation and revitalization projects. Eighteen years ago, the renowned book *Making Dictionaries: Preserving Indigenous Languages of the Americas*, edited by William Frawley, Kenneth Hill, and Pamela Munro was published, and also profoundly impacting dictionary research was "A Dictionary for Whom?," in *Making Dictionaries* by Leanne Hinton and William Weigel. Anderson takes lexicography to the next level. A book that both academics and tribal community members will be inclined to read, *Revitalization Lexicography* is an essential book in order to understand community-driven research and its importance, the functions of dictionaries, and the strengths and weaknesses of both print and digital dictionaries.

Revitalization Lexicography features six chapters covering diverse areas of lexicography and the Tunica language, a language isolate spoken by the Tunica-Biloxi tribe, a federally recognized tribe located in Marksville, Louisiana. Anderson's overarching theme is community-driven research (CDR), a methodological approach which appears in scholarly articles in the early twenty-first century used in the making of the *New Tunica Dictionary*. Not to be confused with community-based research, CDR allows communities to be at the forefront of their research and decide how to advance their research with scholars of their choice that fulfill their needs. Communities that engage in CDR do not need outside researchers to be successful. Anderson refers to Bertney Langley and colleagues in defining CDR as "research which is driven entirely by the language community . . . the community decides what research is needed and seeks out specific researchers to provide expertise" ("The Koasati Language Project," 2018, 145). CDR connects to what Paul Kroskrity calls "language ideologies," or beliefs about language. The process of "language ideological clarification" spells out the language community's ideologies to produce productive language revitalization ("Designing a Dictionary," 2015, 142). Anderson approached the Tunica language community similarly: by prioritizing CDR as the basis for the *New Tunica Dictionary*, the tribe's linguistic and extralinguistic goals, and a user-friendly structure. Anderson calls for the lexicography specialization in language revitalization movements and asserts *Revitalization Lexicography* can serve as the basis for dictionary work in other tribal communities reclaiming and revitalizing their language.

Historically, dictionaries were colonial projects intended to weaken tribal sovereignty (“Designing a Dictionary,” 2015, 141). In 1933, working from correspondence with the last Tunica speaker, Sesostrie Youchigant, Mary Haas recorded the Tunica language. Based on the *Tunica Grammar*, Haas then published her dissertation in 1935, followed by the *Tunica Text Collection* in 1950, and a *Tunica Dictionary* in 1953. Youchigant had passed in 1948; in 2010, the status of the Tunica language changed from “sleeping” to “reawakening” due to the creation of the Tunica Language Project (TLP). With Haas as one of the first linguists to document Tunica, she did not indicate the tribe’s language ideologies or intend to revitalize Tunica. For the Tunica-Biloxi tribe, the function of Haas’s *Tunica Dictionary* was to understand written Tunica, but not produce it (47). Through time, the functions of dictionaries have changed from promoting authoritative language, controlling language, and researching language, and now dictionaries may also produce language and expand into new lexical domains; producing Tunica was the aim of Anderson’s *New Tunica Dictionary* (12).

The head lexicographer of the New Tunica Dictionary project, Anderson is a linguistic anthropologist well informed of the community’s wants and needs. Linguists without lexicographical training who approach dictionary projects notoriously have contributed to the difficulties of learning Indigenous languages. Planning a functional dictionary was one of Anderson’s priorities. The goals of the New Tunica Dictionary called for it to be structured entirely differently from Haas’s *Tunica Dictionary*, which lacked “complete grammatical and semantic information [which often led] to incorrect and confusing usage of Tunica” (48). As a result, Tunica language learners would have to look up the meaning of a word more than once. Anderson designed the new model to contain more English–Tunica words, reducing the need for double searches. To create a user-friendly resource for potential language learners, Anderson not only organized the dictionary’s macrostructure alphabetically but also used “nesting,” or integrating a preexisting dictionary when needed. A dictionary’s macrostructure is applicable to print dictionaries, where the order of headwords may appear alphabetically or semantically. Haas relied on semantic organization and nesting by compiling other Tunica documentation into her *Tunica Dictionary*. Between this organization and Haas’s confusing morphology, Anderson and the TLP decided to use nesting only for Tunica cultural practices (99).

Anderson further displays an apparent use of CDR by including community feedback in the online version of the *New Tunica Dictionary*. It is inspiring that the TLP and Anderson addressed and applied Tunica speakers’ concerns. Anderson addresses the pros and cons of digital versus print dictionaries, but further analysis is needed to understand the entire argument. A digital dictionary is accessible, allows for recurring edits, and includes recordings but only serves a particular audience. A print dictionary serves as a permanent reference for language learners, but may never be published if both the community and lexicographer hold it to an extremely high standard. As noted by Hinton and Weigel, a dictionary may take years to formulate (“A Dictionary for Whom?” 2002, 167). The *New Tunica Dictionary* is only available online, as the TLP continues to work on example sentences. There are debates on whether the

new dictionary should ever get published in print form, due to Anderson's and TLP's expectations.

Overall, the book is an outstanding contribution to lexicography and language revitalization research. Anderson provides a model for revitalization lexicographers, especially with the incorporation of CDR. Future scholars should consider consulting *Revitalization Lexicography* to advance their knowledge of dictionary making. The book takes preexisting dictionary research and critiques some dictionaries' negative impacts on society. Indigenous communities wishing to address their language ideologies and future community-driven projects must consider research conducted by Anderson. As a member of the Tunica-Biloxi tribe, I cannot recommend *Revitalization Lexicography* enough for scholars and Native communities.

Abby Gallardo

University of California, Los Angeles