*Appendix

Nordhoff's maxims

The following is a list of Nordhoff's (2008) maxims:

1. Data quality.

1.1. Accountability. We value application of the scientific method.

   (1) Every step of the linguistic analysis should be traceable to a preceding step, until the original utterance of a speaker is reached.

   (2) Every phenomenon described should be sourced using an actual utterance.

   (3) More sources for a phenomenon are better than fewer sources.

   (4) The context of the utterance should be retrievable.

1.2. Actuality. We value scientific progress.

   (5) A GD should incorporate provisions to incorporate scientific progress.

   (6) The GD should present state-of-the-art analyses.

1.3. History. We value the recognition of the historic evolution of ideas.

   (7) The GD should present both historical and contemporary analyses

2. Creation

2.1. Layout assistance and templates. We value speed of creation and comparability.

   (8) Layout should be automatic as far as possible.

   (9) A GAP which provides templates is better (Weber 2006a:430, 434).

2.2. Creativity. We value the individual mind's expressive abilities.

   (10) A GAP that does not interfere with the creativity of the author is better

2.3. Collaboration.

(11) A GAP that does not require the writers to be present at the same place is better

(12) A GAP should show which collaborator has contributed what.

(13) A GAP which can be used both online and offline is better

2.4. Backup. We value safety of the data.

(14) A GAP should provide the author with regular automated backups

3. Exploration.

3.1. Ease of finding. We value ease and speed of retrieving the information needed.

(15) A GD which has a table of contents, an index, and full text search is preferable

(16) A GD that does not require internet access is preferable

3.2 Individual reading habits. We value the individual linguist's decisions as to what research questions could be interesting

(17) A GD should permit the reader to follow his or her own path to explore it.

(18) A short path between two related phenomena is better.

3.3. Familiarity. We value ease of access.

(19) A GD that is similar to other GDs known to the reader is better

3.4. Guiding. We value an informed presentation of the data.

(20) The GD should present the data in a didactically preferred way

3.5. Ease of exhaustive perception. We value the quest for comprehensive knowledge of a language.

(21) The readers should be able to know that they have read every page of the grammar.

3.6 Relative importance. We value the allocation of scarce resources of time to primary areas of interest.

(22)   The relative importance of a phenomenon for (a) the language and (b) language typology should be retrievable.

3.7. Quality Assessment. We value indication of the reliability of analyses.

(23)   The quality of a linguistic description should be indicated

3.8. Persistence. We value citability.

(24)   In order to facilitate longterm reference, a grammatical description should not change over time.

3.9. Multilingualization. We value the interest of every human in a given language, especially interest from the speakers of the language in question.

(25)   A GD should be available in several languages, among others the language of wider communication of the region where the language is spoken.

3.10 Manipulation. We value portability and reusability of the data.

(26)   The data presented in a GD should be easy to extract and manipulate

3.11. Tangibility. We value the appreciation of a grammatical description as a comprehensive aesthetic achievement.

(27)   A GD that can be held in the hand is better.