Lingua 52 (1980) 179–193

REVIEW ARTICLE

LINGUISTIC SALVAGE IN AUSTRALIA

Review of Diana Kelloway Eades, *The Dharawal and Dhurga languages of the New South Wales south coast**

J. G. BREEN

School of Australian Linguistics, Batchelor, N.T., Australia

The aim of the dedicated salvage linguist is to produce a final, definitive study of "his" language (or language group). However, even if there remain no living speakers, one can rarely, if ever, be sure that there are no written records remaining to be discovered. And even if there are no more data, the likelihood is that someone with a different background and different experience will look at some unexplained structure and say "Oh, yes! That's just like the way they say so-and-so in Such-and-such."

It is rash, therefore, for an author to claim, as Eades does in her study of the Dharawal and Dhurga (D and D) languages (p. 19) that "it is... undeniable that no more linguistic work can profitably be done with these languages". In fact, Eades' work is by no means the last word on D and D and its deficiencies provide material for a discussion of some of the problems and pitfalls of linguistic salvage. It should be noted, however, that these deficiencies are attributed to inexperience rather than incompetence, and that Eades has recently (1979) produced another work of salvage, a grammar of the Gumbaynggir language of North-east New South Wales, which is a great improvement on the work under discussion.

The more specific portions of the review are preceded by some introductory remarks on linguistic salvage in Australia and generally.

Linguistic salvage in Australia and R. H. Mathews

The study of the many Aboriginal languages of Australia is, to a large degree, a work of salvage. Of the two hundred or so separate languages (perhaps six hundred identifiable dialects) that were spoken in Australia at the time of first white settlement, twelve now have 500 or more speakers (Sutton 1975), probably two thirds have less than ten speakers and of

* Published by the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, Canberra, 1976.

these most are no longer actively spoken at all and many are extinct. A growing number of grammars of Australian languages is being published, many of them by the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, and the majority of these are of languages which will not survive this century.

Many of the salvage grammars yet to be written will, like the one under review, draw heavily on the work of R. H. Mathews, and a few words on this pioneer of Australian ethnography seem to be appropriate at this stage. Robert Hamilton Mathews was born in New South Wales in 1841 and became a qualified surveyor in 1867. During the next 28 years he worked in this profession, in the service of the governments of New South Wales and Queensland and later in private practice, in many parts of south-eastern Australia. Wherever he was stationed, and wherever he camped on his field expeditions, he seized every opportunity to fraternise with the local Aborigines and to gather information on their lives, their society and their languages. By 1895 he had practically retired from surveying to devote himself almost entirely to his anthropological and philological interests and in the ensuing years published, in many and varied outlets, the best part of two hundred articles. He died in 1918.

According to Dixon (1976b: 263 and with reference also to Schmidt 1919), Mathews "frequently doctored his field notes for publication" and his work must be treated with caution. This probably does not apply to his lexical data but may well be true of his grammatical material; I hope to have the opportunity to form my own opinion at some future date. (Dixon loc. cit. is not correct, however, in saying that Mathews gathered his material between 1897 and 1912). In any case, Mathews' published work and field notes are the major source of data on many Australian languages. A long paper on Mathews' contribution to Aboriginal studies (from which much of the above was taken) has been written by Elkin (1975–1976), but no detailed assessment of his linguistic work has yet appeared. This article is a step towards remedying that deficiency.

Salvage grammars

Salvage grammars are of various kinds. At one extreme are grammars based entirely on data elicited from the last speakers – or even the last speaker – of a language; recent Australian examples are Heath (1978) on Ngandi, Dixon (1977) on Yidiɲ and Birk (1976) on Malak-Malak. In these cases a more or less adequate grammar can be based on this modern study

with living speakers and other sources of data may be only of marginal interest. At the other extreme are grammars, usually very inadequate, based entirely on early (mostly nineteenth century) studies by amateur philologists, reinterpreted in the light of present day knowledge. In fact, no exhaustive studies of this type have yet been produced (but note Crowley's (1976) excellent paper on Nganyaywana and, as an example of a situation where the data are exceptionally meagre, Breen's (1971) preliminary study – a revised version is now in manuscript – of Yanda).

Intermediate types, needless to say, occupy the continuum between these extremes. In some cases early sources may be of interest only as showing minor changes in vocabulary in different parts of the area in which a dialect was spoken (Breen, forthcoming, on Margany and Gunya) while in other cases a comparatively detailed grammar of one dialect may be prepared from modern sources, while older sources may provide sufficient data to permit the grammars of extinct dialects of the same language to be compared (Crowley 1978). A case where a detailed amateur grammar can be evaluated and annotated in the light of modern knowledge is Smythe's study of Bandjalang, in Crowley (op. cit.).

Also classifiable as salvage grammars are those in which the results of modern salvage studies with living partial speakers are presented but the task of integrating the material obtained with material from older sources (which is, in some cases, far richer in grammatical data and vocabulary) is left for a later date, or for other workers. Such a study is that of Hercus (1969); further work, using all the written sources, is now in progress on the languages included in this study.

This article is concerned with salvage studies in which data from sources other than living speakers consulted by a modern linguist form a substantial part of the corpus.

An adequate salvage study of a language should not only enable interested parties to read the writer's interpretation of what the phonology and grammar and lexicon of that language were like; it should also allow them, as far as practicable, to form their own judgement on these matters. Thus, for example, any bound morpheme whose function is not clear should be profusely illustrated, with no examples omitted unless they obviously contribute nothing. If pronouns, say, cannot be fitted into neat paradigms they should be exhaustively listed. Lexical items, if reliable versions are not available from contemporary speakers, should be given in all the spellings used by old written sources, with, where possible, reference to apparent cognates from neighbouring or related languages. Eades' use of cover

symbols for doubtful vowels, as being "the most honest approach" (p. 9) is commendable, but a more speculative approach coupled with a list of source spellings so that readers have the opportunity to reach their own conclusions is to be preferred.

A linguist is not adequately prepared to write the final word on a language until he (or she) has prepared or has access to at least vocabularies of the neighbouring languages, and preferably also (necessarily, where the genetic relationship is at all close) has prepared or has access to descriptions of the grammars of these languages. In this context, 'neighbouring languages' does not mean just 'contiguous languages.' The wider the writer's experience, the less likely others are to be able to differ from the interpretations given. (This is not to suggest, of course, that such differing interpretations should not be welcomed.)

In addition, the salvage linguist who uses old sources must make a detailed evaluation of them. This involves studying the work of the early linguist in some language in which it can be compared with knowledge obtained from modern sources or, if this is impossible, from other old sources. (Eades did attempt to do this, at least for her main source – the work of R. H. Mathews; unfortunately for her, her consultant in this matter had herself made an incorrect evaluation of this source, as we will see below.) This is more difficult in the case of those word-lists gathered by poorly educated, uninterested amateurs (like many of the lists published in Curr 1886–1887). One has to try to think like them, to realise that their spelling is based on English in a most naive way, with no respect for spelling rules (so that, for example, a word spelt *onega* represents /wanga/ because *one* in English is pronounced [wan]).

The following story may further illustrate the necessity of being able to imagine oneself in the situation of the collector and his informant. In a certain vocabulary in Curr (op. cit.) the word glossed as 'excrement' is given as *thaline*. The expected form, occurring all over the region in question as well as in many other parts of Australia, is something representing the phonemic form /kuna/ – *goonna* or *koonner* for example. *thaline* is, however, reminiscent of the local word for 'tongue', /ṯalaŋ/ and in fact 'tongue' is given as *talina* in this particular list. The explanation is obvious when you know it; the collector would not have used the word 'excrement' which would certainly be meaningless to the informant even if it was in his own vocabulary. He would have asked for 'dung.' And his informant, a speaker of a language in which there is no voice contrast in stops, so that [d] and [t] are interchangeable in most environments, would have given him the word for 'tongue.'

Finally, an invaluable ingredient in the making of a salvage grammar is persistence (and the time to be persistent). It is not something to be worked at full time for a year and then published (in its final form). It is more like a difficult crossword puzzle; one comes back to it again and again, and every now and then a (metaphorical) ray of light shines through and illuminates something that was a complete enigma. (And if someone else can do it too the rays will come thicker and faster. Perhaps in an ideal world linguists would attach as much importance to studying and commenting on early drafts of the work of their colleagues as to writing up their own research.)

Obviously, the extent to which the linguist can prepare to write up a salvage study depends on the language situation, and is very limited if he is dealing with a poorly recorded extinct language surrounded by even more poorly recorded extinct languages. This is more or less the situation Eades was in. Her study was written, in the first instance, as an undergraduate thesis and, judged as such, it is excellent. Judged by more absolute standards, however, it is inadequate, betraying the inexperience of its writer and failing to provide the data to enable the reader to form his own opinions, or the comparativist to compare the languages (in particular the vocabularies) with others. Since some of the major sources, such as R. H. Mathews' notebooks and Norman B. Tindale's vocabulary, are accessible only with difficulty, this is a serious deficiency. This is not to claim, of course, that the study should not have been published, nor that it is unworthy of praise; it is a major contribution to the study of D and D, but it is not the last word on them.

I will now make some more detailed comments on specific items, some very minor, in the book.

Identification of languages

Eades (p. 3) dismisses the name Turuwul, as used for the language of Port Jackson and Botany Bay by Ridley (1875: 99) as a corruption of the name Dharawal. On the face of it, this seems reasonable. However, Eades overlooks the fact that the same name is applied to the language of Port Jackson by Mathew (1899: 208 ff); this makes it rather more difficult to dismiss as a mistake (unless Mathew took the name from Ridley). The spelling, with single *r*, suggests that the first vowel is /u/ and it is possible that there may have been a name, say Dhuruwal, separate from, but

derived in a similar way to, Dharawal. Mathew gives his sources as Captain Hunter's 'Historical Journal of the Transactions at Port Jackson' and Lieut. Colonel Collins' 'New South Wales' and his vocabulary is of a dialect of Dharuk, quite distinct from Dharawal.

There must be some doubt about the second vowel of the name Dharawal (cf. pp. 6–7); it is difficult to distinguish between unstressed /a/ and /u/ before /w/. It is interesting, by the way, that Tindale spelt the name Thurawal in 1940 and Tharawal in 1974 and one wonders whether he was asked about the reason for this difference.

The mysterious name Gurungada (p. 4) could very well be nothing more than a mixed up spelling of the name Gundungurra.

Identification of sources

Where a collector's own identification of the language of his material is not accepted, some justification should be given. Eades (p. 5) dismisses a short vocabulary taken by Ridley (1875: 115) from "a man in jail at Twofold Bay" as "clearly Dhurga." However, Ridley, who was by no means a naive uneducated amateur, being at one stage of his life a university tutor in languages (Elkin 1975–1976: 5, note 5), does not say where the vocabulary was collected. He does, though, describe his informant as "an Eden black" and the language as that "spoken about Twofold Bay." (Eden is on Twofold Bay, which is a little way north of the New South Wales-Victoria border.) Similarity between this vocabulary and Dhurga could, therefore, be taken as evidence of similarity between the language of Twofold Bay (Thawa) and Dhurga.

Furthermore, Eades (p. 12) gives no reason for regarding Tindale's (1938) vocabulary as Dhurga. The fact that it was collected at Wallaga Lake (on the southern boundary of Dhurga country as shown by Eades's map) is not necessarily relevant, since the local tribes had been dispersed many years before. Tindale heads his vocabulary "ǀJu:inj" (i.e. /yuwiɲ/, a word for 'man' in languages of this area) but under this heading on the first page he writes "= Ṯaua", i.e. Thawa. (The subscript vertical stroke in Tindale's notation denotes interdental articulation (see Tindale 1940: 147, esp. footnote); note that Eades misquotes Tindale on p. 42 when she gives his word for 'foot,' as ǀḏana; it is ǀd̠ana.)

Interpretation of source material

It seems likely that both Eades and Donaldson (quoted by Eades, p. 9) may be mistaken in believing that Mathews has arbitrary doubling of consonants in his spelling system. It appears that they have tried to correlate consonant doubling with consonant length and, finding no evidence to support this, have regarded it as arbitrary. In fact, for a nonlinguistically trained collector, it is much more likely that it is correlated with vowel length and quality, as in English spelling. I cannot comment on Mathews' spelling in his Ngeumba (Ngiyambaa) vocabulary (on which Donaldson's evaluation is based), but I can check his system in two languages in which I have data from present-day informants. (Vowel length is not significant in either, so I cannot comment on this aspect of his spelling.) In his Baddyeri (Badjidi) vocabulary (1905) *u* followed by a single consonant followed by a vowel or word boundary represents /u/ on 56 occasions (in items I can check) and *never* represents /a/. Where a doubled consonant follows *u* the phoneme represented is /a/ on 33 occasions, /u/ on 3 (plausibly mistakes – and not necessarily on the part of Mathews; I am relying on field notes, not having yet transcribed the tapes). Where two different consonant letters follow *u* the phoneme is frequently /u/, but also often /a/, and although many of the cases of /u/ involve a following consonant represented by a digraph, such as *ny* or *rd*, there are still a significant number of counter-examples.

The figures for Mathews' Kogai (Gunggari) vocabulary (1904) are essentially the same, although here he also sometimes uses *ū* (always /u/) and *ŭ* (always /a/). The evidence from these sources suggests strongly, therefore, that the phonemicisation of *u* in his spelling is determinable with 90% or more accuracy if it is followed by only one consonant symbol (when it represents /u/) or by a doubled consonant (when it represents /a/) and is unpredictable only when two different consonant symbols follow it.

The same comparison can be made for thirty or so items in Mathews' (1903) Thurrawal vocabulary with items heard by Eades and it is clear that the same conclusions apply. (Thus, for example, Eades must be wrong in phonemicising the word for 'breast,' spelt *ngumminyang* by Mathews, as /ŋuminaŋ/ (p. 74), especially since a word with this meaning, and beginning with /ŋam/, is one of the most widespread and frequently recurring of all Australian words.) Furthermore, Mathews' use of *oo* in his notebooks must surely allow many of the otherwise doubtful items where, in his published work, *u* is followed by two different consonants to be elucidated.

In fact, Mathews' transcriptions are so reliable (with the reservation noted above, and one or two others) that they should, in my opinion, be given at least equal status with forms heard from the very unreliable modern informants. Thus, where Mathews gives *bangang* and modern informants give [bæŋgaɔŋ] and [bæŋgaŋ] for 'old man' (not 'man,' as on p. 31) the phonemicisation /baŋgaŋ/ seems quite justified, especially in view of the tendency of modern "speakers" to diphthongise vowels (see Eades pp. 28–31). The variant pronunciation should, of course, be noted in the lexicon.

While Eades is no doubt right in believing (p. 33) that the two pronominal suffixes written *-dyen* 'my' and *-dhan* 'me' have different initial consonants, she has weak grounds for suggesting that the vowels are different. Mathews sometimes uses *e* for the raised and fronted realisation of /a/ conditioned by a contiguous palatal consonant, as in *yenngulaia* /yangulaya/ 'he came' (p. 56) and *dyedyung* /ɟaɟuŋ/ 'moon' (p. 60). /ɟin/ would have a raised, rather than a lowered, allophone of /i/ and would be spelt with an *i* by Mathews.

Eades' argument (p. 34) for rejecting the possibility of retroflex consonants is unsatisfactory. She says, firstly, that "Mathews gives no hint of retroflex consonants"; he would not, of course, because he would think of them as clusters. A few words from Mathews Dhurga vocabulary which seem, from their spelling, to have retroflexed nasal-stop or lateral-stop clusters are listed (the Dharawal bound form *ŋarndi* is overlooked); these are explained away by saying that the *r* indicates vowel quality or quantity. It is difficult to see, however, what vowels (of those that occur in Dhurga – see p. 22) could be represented by *oor* in *goorn-dee-ra* 'ironbark' or *ur* in *burn-da* 'penis.' (And note that the word /baɳɖa/ 'penis' does occur elsewhere, e.g. in Margany and Gunya of Southern Queensland (Breen, forthcoming).) This argument is not extended, however, to the other occurrences of *rd*, *rt*, *rn* and *rl* in the vocabularies, presumably because these can be regarded as clusters without introducing the problem of three-consonant clusters (which do not seem to be permitted in these languages). Note, however, that clusters of rhotic plus apical consonant are not permitted in most Australian languages.

In his Baddyeri vocabulary Mathews uses *rd*, *rt*, *rn* and *rl* consistently and exclusively to represent retroflex consonants. He does not use *r* to denote vowel length or vowel quality. It seems highly likely then that retroflexes did occur in D and D (and that, for example, Mathews' *ngurnuñ* 'throat,' presumably /ŋaɳuɲ/, is more correct than Eades' /ŋaniŋ/ 'neck.' The suggestion that Eades' informant had forgotten the correct pronuncia-

tion and had the meaning slightly wrong is far more plausible than that the reliable Mathews made three mistakes in spelling the word and interchanged the words for throat and neck – his *guru*.)

See below (under 'Argumentation') for some remarks on the interpretation of Tindale's data.

Comprehensiveness

A Dhurga source which was not known to Eades is Howitt's (n.d.) list of kinship terms, headed "Yūin, Moruya" and further identified on one page as "Tūrka language." (There may well be other data on languages of this area in other Howidt manuscripts.)

While much of the treatment of the grammar seems adequate (I have not compared it with Mathews), it is less than comprehensive in some parts. Thus on p. 50 we read that the possessive free form pronouns in Dharawal are "S–O+ /wuli/, or /guli/ with some irregularities" but we are never told what the irregularities are. Similarly for Dhurga. On p. 60 we learn for Dharawal, and later for Dhurga, that certain demonstrative forms are "more or less regularly inflected for dual and plural." No further details are given.

Wordlists in extinct languages, even if only of moderate length, normally yield some data on compounding and derivation (the word for 'pig,' referred to below, is a case in point). This does not seem to have been fully utilised by Eades. Thus she does not mention the pair given by Ridley *jowā* 'run', *yumunjā* 'make to run' (admittedly the relationship is problematical) or Tindale's *jaranjbara* 'person with beard' ('beard' is *jaranj*, i.e. /yaraɲ/). The suffix /bara/ presumably belongs with the many other 'having' suffixes of this or similar form listed by Sutton (1976: 302). Undoubtedly there is more grammar yet to be extracted from the old vocabularies; its presence there should be regarded as a bonus, rather than an excuse to leave material out of the lexicon (p. 5).

Apart from a few items, Eades' lexicon contains only those words heard from her own informants. There are large gaps (for instance, there are hardly any verbs) and so it does not relieve those who wish to compare the vocabularies with those of other languages of the need to go through the old sources (some in manuscript and relatively inaccessible), comparing the various spellings and deciding on the most likely phonemic form for all items. Even those items which Eades does give in her vocabulary should

be rechecked in view of the unreliability of her informants and the comparative reliability of some of the old sources. The lexicon should be complete and comprehensive, giving not only all sources but all source spellings. If it is necessary to conserve space the alphabetical vocabulary could be omitted; its main advantage seems to be that it gives the reader a chance to spot mistakes (as indicated by discrepancies such as those between the words for 'head' – and compare 'egg', which in some languages is the same as 'brain' – 'beard' and 'mouth' in sections A and C). But this should not be necessary; there should be no mistakes.

Some items in the lexicon need further explanation and this can require some knowledge of (or research into) such fields as the material culture of the speakers of the language, and the meaning of rare or obsolescent items in the English of the informants. To illustrate the former, most readers will find the gloss 'knob on tree for honey' (p. 79) puzzling. As an example of the latter, the plant name glossed by Eades (p. 75) as "ɖibaŋ tree" is, of course, a geebung tree (Persoonia sp.); the word *geebung* is well known although perhaps many people do not know its meaning. Perhaps a better example is the item glossed 'cobra' in Eades' Gumbaynggir grammar (1979: 356). This is grouped with reptiles, presumably because it is the name of a well-known species of snake; however, it is not a name for any species of Australian snake. It is most likely the loan-word mentioned by Baker (1966: 322) meaning 'marine worm' (although a homophonous word, sometimes spelt *cobbra* and meaning 'head' is another item borrowed by Australian English from an Aboriginal language – probably Dharuk, the northern neighbour of Dharawal).

Use of comparative data

It seems likely that some of the consonant clusters which are listed (p. 40) as occurring in D and D but are not permitted in other Australian languages – such as /nl, gl, ɖl, gr, mr, ɖr/ – are not genuine, but result from the anglicisation of the pronunciation of the informants. To give an example, Eades gives the word for 'pig' in Dhurga as *nugrVba*. However, the name for 'pig' is derived from the word for 'nose' in some Australian languages (because of the way it roots about with its snout, or because of its prominence) and it seems that this is the case here; 'nose' is *nugur* and 'pig' is probably *nugurVba*. Incidentally, the word for 'horse' also is sometimes derived from the word for 'nose.'

The "cluster" *ly*, found in Mathews, could well represent a palatal lateral phoneme; note that the related language Ngarigu has such a phoneme (Hercus and Mathews 1969: 200).

The derivational suffix *mara* attached to nouns referring to persons (pp. 60–61) – or more precisely, perhaps, to nouns referring to kin – is reminiscent of the proto-form **mara* discussed by Breen (1976: 295) and no doubt refers to the 'owner' of the kinship; thus, for example, *ḏalinmara* probably means 'my husband' (or perhaps 'your husband' or even 'her husband'; the context may elucidate this point).

See also the remarks on the suffix *bara* in the preceding section.

Argumentation

Eades can find no evidence for a contrast between two rhotic phonemes in D and D (p. 35) although she admits that "we cannot categorically say that there is no rhotic contrast" and "it would understandably be a contrast lost with long contact with English". She abandons this caution later, however, when she mentions (p. 41) the possession of only one rhotic as a feature of D and D which is uncommon in Australian languages.

But surely if no evidence, either for or against a contrast, can be found, one is not justified in concluding that these languages differed from the vast majority of other Australian languages in lacking such a contrast. Most Australian languages have two rhotics; the majority of those that do not have three; hardly any have only one. Some positive evidence is required to justify adding D and D to this group; the presence of an alveolar/retroflex contrast for stops, nasals and laterals is in itself a good reason for believing that it exists also for rhotics.

Eades claims also (loc. cit.) that "from the nature of the sources it is impossible to know whether the rhotic is trilled or untrilled." But Mathews says, in his grammar of Dharawal (1901) that "*r* has a rough trilled sound." (I have not consulted his grammar of Dhurga.) This tells us that there was a trilled [r]; it does not tell us that there was no other. Mathews said the same thing about Gunggari which does have two rhotics. In the case of Badjidi he did notice different pronunciations but made no attempt to allow for them in his spelling. This lack of recognition of rhotic contrasts is another of the few reservations with which Mathews' spelling has to be interpreted.

Tindale also normally failed to recognise the rhotic contrast; however, his spellings (and occasional notes) show that he did sometimes notice the difference (at least on a phonetic level). In his Ju:inj wordlist (perhaps not Dhurga but certainly closely related) he writes the word for 'back' as *ˈba(r:)ka* and adds "(rolled r)," and the word for 'brown snake' as *ˈma(r)umbal* with the note "(rolled guttural r)" while a couple of other spellings, such as *ˈira*, *ˈi(hr)a*, perhaps also suggest a trill. (It may be, in the last example, that the informant – like this reviewer – finds it difficult to trill after /i/ and gave a fricative realisation.) Bracketing seems to be a device used by Tindale to draw attention to the sound which differs in an alternative spelling or that to which a comment refers. The absence of such hints from other words containing *r* suggest that Tindale found nothing noteworthy about them and that perhaps they resembled the English /r/. (Incidentally, some of Tindale's spellings, especially when compared with his spelling of words from other, better known, languages, suggest that his informant's speech had retroflexes, e.g. *ˈmarna* 'hand' and *kaˈbarnu* 'head.')

It is surprising that, despite the "overwhelming influence of Australian English on the sound systems" (p. 18) the *only* rhotic heard from the informants was a flap (p. 21). The phoneme /r/ in Australian English is almost universally realised as a glide and the tap (or flap) occurs only with some speakers and only as a realisation of intervocalic /t/ or /d/, and then only in rapid speech. It would be interesting to have some information on the use of the tap in the informants' English.

Two possible analyses of the diphthong [ai] – as /a/ and /ay/ – are considered (p. 29); a third possibility – /ayi/ – is mentioned only later (p. 30) and briefly dismissed. However, the sequence /ayi/ is very often reduced to [ai] in Australian languages, more so by poor speakers under the influence of English but also by good speakers. I will not exemplify or enlarge on this point, however, because there seems to be a strong argument supporting Eades' decision to postulate word-final /y/ – for Dharawal at least, which she has completely overlooked. This is the existence of allomorphs of the instrumental suffix (p. 47) occurring only after final /y/ or /ɲ/ – /ɖa/ if the preceding vowel is /a/ and /ɖu/ if it is /i/ or /u/ – which is quite different from the allomorph occurring after a final vowel (/yi/).

Note, by the way, that Eades states that the four words with possible termination /ay/ that she lists (p. 29) are "the only words in all the data for both languages with word final /y/," but nevertheless she lists an instrumental allomorph for words ending in /iy/ and /uy/. These endings – especially /iy/ – are intriguing. Mathews would certainly not have spelt a word

with final *iy* and it would be interesting to know what led Eades to the conclusion that such words existed and why she forgot about them when writing up the phonology.

Eades seems to extrapolate her stress rules (pp. 26-27) to an unjustifiable extent in suggesting (p. 30) that stress would fall on a long vowel in a word-final open syllable.

Eades says (p. 54) that "it seems most appropriate to analyse all Dharawal and Dhurga verb stems as ending in a consonant." Some justification for this is needed, especially as it seems to lead to the odd state of affairs (as noted by Eades, p. 56) that the purposive suffix co-occurs with the future or present tense suffix.

Organisation

In general this book is logically arranged and easy to use. Chapters deal with the language situation at the time of European settlement, the sources, the present state of the languages, phonology, grammar and lexicon. Internal organisation of chapters is mostly good.

A feature of the chapter on grammar, however, is its strange organisation. Nouns are dealt with in section 3 but 'adjectives,' which are not a separate class at all but are nouns, in section 6. Verb morphology is covered in section 5 except for the imperative; this is the subject of section 8. First and second person pronouns are in section 4 but third person pronouns – which are probably, as Eades says, really demonstratives – are in section 10.

In the chapter on phonology D and D are combined for some statistical purposes (pp. 25, 35, 39–40); the implication is that they are identical in the relevant features, but this is not made explicit.

The lexicon is organised into a number of sections, most of which could be dispensed with. There is firstly a brief list (section A) of basic vocabulary (drawn from all sources but sources not identified), then (section B) an alphabetical (Aboriginal-English) list of that vocabulary recorded from modern informants (sources including old ones, identified), then (C) a semantically arranged list of the nouns from B, then (D) a list of widespread Aboriginal words found (as loans, sometimes via English) in the corpus for D and D, then (E) a list of loan-words from English (eight items), then (F) a list containing English "slang" words used by the informants and finally (G) a list of all the phrases and sentences (in D and D) occurring in the corpus of modern data.

Parts 2, 3 and 4 of section G (p. 93) are redundant as all the entries are already given, with explanations, on pp. 71–73. In any case, sentences do not belong in a lexicon (except as illustrations of particular lexical items) but should be in the grammar.

Sections D, E and F would be relevant as part of a study of the English of the informants or perhaps to illustrate the discussion on the "Nature of language remembered" (pp. 17–18) but seem out of place in this lexicon.

Sections A and C could be combined and made complete and, as mentioned above, the alphabetical vocabulary could be omitted. The vocabulary could be arranged in semantic fields with, on each page, three narrow columns giving the English gloss, the Dharawal word (as phonemicised by the author) and the Dhurga word (ditto) together with a broad fourth column, extending to two or more lines if necessary, in which all source spellings, identified by initials, are given. Alternatively, glosses and phonemicisations might be confined to left hand pages while source material spreads across the remainder of this page and the whole of the right hand page.

Conclusion

This book is a useful contribution to the literature on D and D (and is refreshingly free of the annoying misprints that plague the readers of many earlier grammars of Australian languages) but the definitive study of these languages has yet to be written.[1]

References

Baker, Sidney J., 1966. The Australian language. Sydney: Currawong Publishing Co.

Birk, D. B. W., 1976. The MalakMalak language, Daly River (Western Arnhem Land). Pacific Linguistics, Series B, No. 45, Canberra: Australian National University.

Breen, J. G., 1971. The classification of Janda. Appendix 2 of 'Aboriginal languages of Western Queensland.' Linguistic Communications 5: 1–88.

Breen, J. G., 1976. Proprietive markers and kinship terms. In: Dixon 1976a: 290–297.

Breen, J. G. (forthcoming). Margany and Gunya. To appear in: R. M. W. Dixon, B. J. Blake, Handbook of Australian languages, Vol. 2, Canberra: Australian National University.

[1] I am grateful to Steve Johnson, Ian Smith and Kevin Ford for reading and commenting on the manuscript.

Crowley, Terry, 1976. Phonological change in New England. In: Dixon 1976a: 19–50.
Crowley, Terry, 1978. The middle Clarence dialects of Bandjalang. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
Curr, E. M., 1886–1887. The Australian race. 4 Vols. Melbourne: J. Ferres.
Dixon, R. M. W. (ed.), 1976a. Grammatical categories in Australian languages. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
Dixon, R. M. W., 1976b. Review of S. A. Wurm, Languages of Australia and Tasmania, Language 52: 260–266.
Dixon, R. M. W., 1977. A grammar of Yidiɲ. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics no. 19, London: Cambridge University Press.
Dixon, R. M. W., B. J. Blake (eds.). Handbook of Australian languages, Canberra: Australian National University.
Eades, Diana Kelloway, 1979. Gumbaynggir. In: R. M. W. Dixon, B. J. Blake (eds.), Handbook of Australian languages, Vol. 1, 244–361. Canberra: Australian National University.
Elkin, A. P., 1975–1976. R. H. Mathews: his contribution to Aboriginal studies. Oceania 46: 1–24, 126–152, 206–234.
Heath, Jeffrey, 1978. Ngandi grammar, texts, and dictionary. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
Hercus, Luise A., 1969. The languages of Victoria: A late survey. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
Hercus, Luise A., J. E. Mathews, 1969. Southern Ngarigu. In: Hercus 1969: 198–210.
Howitt, A. W. (n.d.). Relationship terms, in his Papers, Box 7, folder 7, paper 5. (National Museum of Victoria, Melbourne).
Mathew, John, 1899. Eaglehawk and Crow. Melbourne: Melville, Mullen and Slade.
Mathews, R. H., 1901. The Thurrawal language. J. Proc. Royal Society of New South Wales, 35: 126–160.
Mathews, R. H., 1903. Vocabulary of Kamilaroi and Thurrawal words. J. Anth. Inst. Great Britain and Ireland, 34: 294–299.
Mathews, R. H., 1904. Language, organization and initiation ceremonies of the Kogai tribes, Queensland. Zeitschrift für Ethnologie, 36: 28–38.
Mathews, R. H., 1905. Ethnological notes on the Aboriginal tribes of Queensland. Royal Geogr. Soc. Australasia, Queensland Branch Proceedings, 20: 49–75.
Ridley, W., 1875. Kamilaroi and other Australian languages. Sydney, N.S.W. Government Printer.
Schmidt, W., 1919. Die Gliederung der Australischen Sprachen. Vienna.
Smythe, W. E., 1978. Bandjalang Grammar, Appendix to Crowley (1978).
Sutton, Peter, 1975. How many Aboriginal languages are there? Aboriginal News, 2, no. 1: 22–23.
Sutton, Peter, 1976. The 'having' affix and other morphemes in fifty Australian languages. In: Dixon 1976a: 297–305.
Tindale, Norman B., 1938. [Manuscript vocabulary of Ju:inj].
Tindale, Norman B., 1940. Distribution of Australian Aboriginal tribes: a field survey. Trans. Royal Society of South Australia, 64 (1): 140–231.