

work on our widely differing fieldwork experiences—and reactions to fieldwork—that we can adequately get across to novice linguistic fieldworkers some idea of what they are getting themselves into. The present chapter is my contribution to that nascent body of literature.

Notes

- 1 Thanks to Colleen Cotter, Megan Crowhurst, Miriam Meyerhoff, Marianne Mithun, Joe Salmons, Peggy Speas, Sara Trechter, Tony Woodbury, and many others for their feedback on this paper. Thanks also to my professors (especially Leanne Hinton) for doing their best to bring me along as a linguist and fieldworker. Thanks are most especially due, though, to the many Mixtec speakers who led me towards a greater understanding of the appropriate place of a linguist among native peoples. I realize now that I was an especially slow learner. [Editor's note: This text of this chapter was first published in *Anthropological Linguistics* (Summer 2004, Vol. 46 Issue 2: 194–209) and is reproduced here (without revision of content or style) with the kind permission of the author and of the editors of *Anthropological Linguistics*.]
- 2 Newman (1992) apparently shares my view of the training linguistics graduate students get (or do not get) before they go out into the field: 'the position of [field methods] in the training of our graduate students is indeed marginal and is likely to remain so. This combined with the fact that publications by linguists on FM have essentially ceased to appear and relevant books and articles by anthropologists and sociologists are generally ignored means that the number of new field workers will remain small and many scholars undertaking fieldwork for the first time will be untrained and unprepared' (1992: 6).
- 3 The excerpts from my field journal are very personal and somewhat melodramatic (I was in my 20s, after all). They are not the kind of thing I would normally put in a paper, yet I think they communicate almost better than my description what I went through in my first experience with fieldwork.
- 4 Apparently being stood up is not uncommon. Henry (1969: 43) describes the same problem with government officials in Trinidad, and Saberwal (1969: 50–52) describes it in his work with the Embu of Kenya.
- 5 There is one note I am obliged to make here: while working on this chapter, I went back to the small number of works that were available on the subject of linguistic fieldwork in 1982. To my chagrin, I discovered that Samarin (1967) does have some warnings I wish I had paid attention to, for example: 'In his preoccupation with data...the linguist can very easily forget the human factors in his investigation of language. His collection and analysis of language phenomena are dependent on and in some way influenced by the people among whom he works and by his own personality and training. Without some understanding of himself, the language community, and the informant the linguistic investigator goes ill-prepared to the field' (Samarin 1967: 7). But aside from a short section addressing such issues, most of Samarin is dedicated to linguistic analysis.
- 6 I have recently heard of three in-progress field guides for linguists, so this situation may be changing shortly after publication of this article. [Recall that this chapter was originally published in 2004.]