

GUGADJ AND GOG-NAR: A CONTRASTIVE SKETCH

G. Breen

INTRODUCTION

Gugadj was spoken about the lower part of the Flinders River, which flows into the Gulf of Carpentaria about thirty miles west of Normanton, Queensland. Its eastern neighbour was *Gudhand*, which belongs to the Man Pama sub-group of the Pamic group of languages. Its southern, southern and south-western neighbours were probably *Mayagulan*, *Yipi* and *Mayaguduna* respectively — all members of what is probably best described as the *Bandjil* sub-group of the Maric group (formerly classified as a separate group under the name *Mayapic*). On the west, according to Tindale, was *Kalibamu*; this seems to have disappeared without trace and present day informants regard *Mayaguduna* as the western neighbour of *Gugadj*.

My corpus in *Gugadj* consists of 5½ hours of recording with Joker Jack at Normanton in 1972, a further nine hours from him at Doomadgee in 1973, and two hours from Mrs Mabel Sambo at Normanton in 1973.¹ However, this description of the language is based mainly on the 1972 material as the later tapes have not been completely transcribed and the material on them has been analysed only partly in the field.²

Wurm (unpublished) has classified *Gugadj* as a group on its own, not closely related to any of its neighbours. This is presumably based on the work done on the language by Flint and/or Dutton.³ My own original tentative classification of *Gugadj*, based only on vague impressions and greatly influenced by such vocabulary items as pam 'man', kurek 'dog' and kok 'language', was as a sub-group of the (then) Pama-Maric group. The present study supports Wurm's classification.

Some further field work, including 5½ hours of recording, has now been done with Joker Jack (June 1974). Mrs Sambo died in late 1973 or early 1974.

I am grateful for the support of the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies who have financed all my work on the languages discussed in this and my other paper in this volume, and to Monash University who have provided office accommodation and other support.

³See Oates and Oates (1970:105).

The reasons for comparing *Gugadj* with *Gog-Nar*,¹ a language separated from it by the languages of what I call the Norman Pama group, are two. Firstly, *Gog-Nar* is the only Pamic language of which I have more than minimal knowledge and so the only one, apart from some geographically more distant languages as *Oykangand* for which descriptions are available, with which I could compare *Gugadj* without a good deal of preliminary work. Secondly, the superficial (mainly phonological) resemblances between the two are much greater than between *Gugadj* and the Norman Pama languages. For example, while both *Gugadj* and *Gog-Nar* have pam 'man', kow 'nose' and miny 'meat, animal', the corresponding words in the intervening Norman Pama language *Gurdjar* differ in lack of the initial consonant. Other differences are illustrated by 'dog', kurək (G, N), rwak (*Gurdjar*); 'faeces', kun (G), kunuŋ (N), nwak (*Gurdjar*) and 'tongue', ŋinytyil (G), ŋintj (N), nytyer (*Gurdjar*).

1. LEXICAL COMPARISON

A cognate count using 200 vocabulary items, based on my 250 word list of Western Queensland languages,³ was made. The items included 41 body part names, 37 verbs, 22 fauna names, 21 nouns referring to inanimate nature, 15 descriptive terms, 14 terms referring to Aboriginal material culture and 50 other items belonging to several other categories. There were a total of 29 items the same or apparently cognate in the two languages, that is, 14.5 per cent. Of these, thirteen were exactly or virtually the same, suggesting that they may be borrowings and/or belong to a regional lingua franca.

Dixon (1970:661) suggests that verbs and adjectives are much less likely to be borrowed than nouns, so that if two languages have a high proportion of verbs and adjectives in common they are likely to be generally closely related even if they have only a low proportion of nouns in common, and vice versa. My own work with Western Queensland languages tends to confirm Dixon's belief as far as verbs are concerned, but words corresponding to English adjectives (which may be nouns or verbs) tend to vary a lot between related languages. In the present case, twelve of the twenty-nine cognate or same items are body part names and most of the others are nouns; none are adjectives and only two are verbs.

A count of *Gugadj* and *Gudhand* (55 items) and *Gurdjar* (70 items) gave figures of 33 per cent and 21 per cent cognate, respectively. However, most of the items counted were nouns and the percentages are certainly inflated. Of the 18 items *Gugadj* had in common with *Gudhand*, 13 were body part names and the other included the widespread terms for man, dog, meat and vegetable food.⁴

¹For information on *Gog-Nar* see the paper 'An Introduction to *Gog-Nar*' (pp. 243-259, this volume).

²The abbreviations G for *Gugadj* and N for *Gog-Nar* are used where applicable with examples.

³Breen (1971:2-5).

The lexical evidence, therefore, strongly suggests that *Gugadj* is genetically closely related to the Pamic group. It is worthy of note that in addition to those widespread lexical items that *Gugadj* has in common with Pamic languages, there are others it has in common with non-Pamic, but not Pamic, languages, such as kam 'water' and yamp 'ground'.

PHONOLOGY

The phonological diversity of the Pamic languages illustrates the reliability of phonology as an indicator of genetic relationship. *Gugadj* seems to have shared in some of the phonological changes which have taken place in the Pamic languages, but it is more conservative than *Nar*, which in turn is more conservative than the Norman Pama and other Pamic languages.

Vowels

Gugadj has at least five vowel phonemes /i e a o u/; length and/or stress may also be phonemic and there may be a phoneme /ə/. /æ/ has been heard but is rare and may not be a phoneme.

The centralised vowel [ə] is very common but does not occur in unstressed syllables. Word-final [ə] seems unlikely to be phonemic and has not been used in the orthography; it is heard especially after final /r/ and /r/. Word-medially, the presence or absence of [ə] seems often to depend on the stress pattern. Thus we have:

1. [ɲúrmeŋànd] and [ɲúrəmŋándəgəl]
spear-OP spear-OP-it
2. [gurək] and [gurguŋkəl]
dog dog-DIM
3. [káməŋànd] and [kámŋánd]
water-LOC water-LOC

[ə] may also separate the two parts of a reduplicated word or morpheme, for example, putəput 'having', waɣəwaɣ 'crow', and the constituents of a compound stem where an unacceptable or unusual consonant cluster would otherwise result, for example yeləwom 'tears' from yel 'eye'.

Vowels do not occur word-initially. Most vowels do not occur stem-finally; /i/, /u/ and /a/ do so rarely. A few verbal affixes such as a 'future' and uru 'irrealis' result in word-final vowels.

In its vowel phonology — number of vowel phonemes, frequent use of a centralised vowel which is not easily dismissed as non-phonemic in all environments nor easily assigned to any other phoneme, and absence of vowels from word-initial and, to a large degree, word-final position — *Gugadj* strongly resembles *Gog-Nar*.

2.2 Consonants

Gugadj differs from *Gog-Nar* in lacking fricative phonemes and (possibly) in having a series of apico-post-alveolar (retroflex) phonemes — stop, nasal and lateral. However, the latter are not common and may belong to the same phonemes as the corresponding apico-alveolars. The consonant symbols tabulated below are used in this paper.

TABLE 1 Gugadj consonants

	Peripheral		Apical		Laminal	
	Labial	Velar	Alveolar	Post-alveolar	Dental	Palatal
stop	p	k	t	t̪	t̪	ty
nasal	m	ŋ	n	ɳ	ɳ	ny
lateral			l	ɭ		
trill				rr		
flap				r		
glide		w		ɹ		y

Most of the consonants may occur in any position — word-initial, final, intervocalic and in clusters. Word-initial consonant clusters as in *Nar*, are rare and only homorganic nasal-stop; ŋka 'now' and certain words derived from it are common, but the entire corpus includes only four other nouns (including the main informant's own name) with initial clusters. There are a great number and variety of biconsonantal clusters occurring intervocalically and word-finally, although some particular types are quite rare. Triconsonantal clusters are rare but well attested, mostly of the form lateral or rhotic plus nasal plus stop. In all these respects *Gugadj* resembles *Nar*.

Deletion of consonants, as occurs, especially with /ŋ/, in *Nar*, is not a feature of *Gugadj*.

3. MORPHOLOGY

3.1 Nouns

Gugadj resembles *Nar* (and many other languages) in its system of noun stem formation: most stems are simple, a few are compound (for example, some body part names made up of the word yel 'eye' plus another morpheme) and some are reduplicated (for example, yirmpərirmpər 'red' from yirmpər 'blood', paŋtəpaŋt 'weak, light (in weight)'). A few fauna names (for example, purkəntanyty 'wallaby', ŋuwətanyty 'plain turkey') have the appearance of verbs in the present tense, but if this is so the verbs do not occur otherwise in the corpus. The word pam 'man, person' appears to be sometimes prefixed to kinship terms; thus we have paməpul 'father', paməŋiŋil 'mother' and paməkaty 'young brother'. katy (but not pul or ŋiŋil) also occurs in the corpus without the preceding pam.¹

¹A homophonous morpheme of unknown meaning occurs occasionally, most commonly in the phrase:

ŋanyinka pam 'What for?'
what for

Like *Nar* and other Pamic and Maric languages, *Gugadj* has a nominative-ergative system of inflection of nouns and a nominative-accusative system for pronouns. Nominative case of nouns is unmarked while other cases are marked by suffixes. The locative coincides with the operative (operative/instrumental), possibly because of loss of an earlier final marker. Both languages have several allomorphs of the operative/locative marker, varying considerably in form; these are compared in Table 2. Genitive/causal forms are *ŋin* (G) and *in* (N), but *Gugadj* differs from *Nar* in that the same suffix marks the ablative. Both have (ə)k as the marker for the allative, but in *Gugadj* there is also another allomorph, *u*, used with personal nouns.

TABLE 2 Operative/locative allomorphs

<u>GUGADJ</u>		<u>GOG-NAR</u>	
allomorph:	Used with:	Allomorph:	Used with:
	most nouns	<i>ŋimənt</i>	most nouns
	'man', 'dog', 'camp'	<i>imp</i> , <i>limp</i>	a few odd words
	genitive pronouns,	<i>uŋ</i>	a few odd words
	few others	<i>iŋ</i>	a few odd words
	'hand', 'foot',	<i>aŋk</i> , <i>əŋk</i>	'hand', 'foot',
	possibly a few		few others
	others	<i>nt</i>	most kinship
	kinship terms,		terms
	possibly some other	<i>p</i>	one word,
	personal nouns		'animal'
	one kinship term	<i>inyty</i>	one word, 'house'
	one word, 'camp'		

Productive noun stem forming suffixes added to noun stems include the possessive ('having') *putəput* (G), *woləm* (N) and a privative marked by cognate forms *aŋəŋ* (G), *aŋ* (N). A possessive form used with kinship terms, *marəŋk* (N), is at least approximately equivalent to (G) *tyira*. The comparative ('like') is *oŋ* (N) and *kəra* (G). Unlike *Nar*, *Gugadj* has a productive dual, *ampukar* (from *təmpukar* 'two') and plural (*paŋ*) and also a diminutive *uŋkəl*¹ as in *payimpuŋkəl* 'little boy', *tyirtyuŋkəl* 'a little money', *minyūŋkəl* 'bird' (miny 'animal') and *paŋriyūŋkəl* 'torch battery'. *Nar* has one reduplicated plural *kuŋakuŋak* 'children'; *Gugadj* has a few, including *yirkiyeləwur* 'children' (perhaps not really a reduplication; *yeləwur* 'child'), *yakənəkən* 'women', *kurəkurk* 'dogs'. The diminutive *uŋkəl* has a plural form *uluŋkəl* (for example, *yeləwurulūŋkəl* 'little children').

3.2 Personal pronouns

Table 3 shows the personal pronoun (free form) paradigm.

¹Such a formative is quite rare in Australia. Another language which does have a diminutive is *Gidabal* (B. and H. Geytenbeek, 1971:11).

TABLE 3 Gugadj personal pronouns (free forms)

	<u>Singular</u>			
	1	2	3	
Nominative	ɲuwal	yit(al)	yil, yilinil	
Accusative	ɲawəny	yitiny	—	
Genitive	ɲiya:ntək	na:ntək	wa:ntək	
Dative	ɲiya:npən	nampən	wa:npən	

	<u>Dual</u>			
	1 incl.	1 excl.	2	3
Nominative	ɲal, ɲila	ɲiny, ɲanyin	wil, yuwəl	pil
Accusative	ɲalin (?)	—	winp	
Genitive	ɲalintək	ɲanyilintək	wilintək, yuwilintək	pilintək
Dative	ɲalpən	ɲanyi(li)npən	wi:npən, yuwinpən	pi:npən

	<u>Plural</u>			
	1 incl.	1 excl.	2	3
Nominative	ɲin, ɲan	ɲinyən, ɲanyin	yira, yirmp	tin
Accusative	—	—	yirmp (?)	tinp
Genitive	—	ɲanyinintək	yirint(ək), yirinka	tinintək
Dative	ɲa:npən	ɲanyinpən	yirmpən	tinpən

Gugadj differs from *Gog-Nar* in having an inclusive/exclusive distinction in the first person dual and plural pronouns. However, it appears that many Pamic languages do have some such distinction: *Oykangand* (Sommer, 1972) and *Wik-Mungkan* (Godfrey and Kerr, 1964) have it in both dual and plural, *Gugu-Yalandji* (Hershberger, 1964) in plural only and *Linngithigh* (Hale, 1966) has a non-singular exclusive and a dual/plural distinction for the inclusive.

Gugadj differs from *Nar* also in having a set of bound form pronouns which are shown in Table 4. It appears that this feature is shared by a few Pamic languages (Capell, 1956, mentions *Wik-Mungkan*, *Umpila* and *Kaantju*) and it has developed independently in several other parts of Australia.

The *Gugadj* bound pronouns are unusual in that the nominative forms (with the probable exception of *u*) can occur as the first morpheme in a word, with another bound pronoun suffixed. Thus:

4. yok taŋ 'Give it to me!'
 give-IMPER you-me

5. laip kərarpinyty 'He's frightened of u'
 he-us (du, in) afraid-CONTIN-PRES

TABLE 4 Guḡadji personal pronouns (bound forms)

	<u>Singular</u>			
	1	2	3	
Nominative	u	t	l	
Accusative	aŋ	—	nt	
Genitive	ant	nant	—	
Dative	amp	—	wamp	
	<u>Dual</u>			
	1 incl.	1 excl.	2	3
Nominative	ŋil	ŋiny	wil	pil
Oblique	alp	anyimp	winp	pinp
	<u>Plural</u>			
	1 incl.	1 excl.	2	3
Nominative	ŋin	—	r	ṭin
Oblique	anp	anyinp	—	ṭinp

some cases, of course, because of the similarity of bound and free forms, there is no distinction in word-initial position.

6. tinalp kərarpinyty 'They are frightened of us.'

The bound nominative pronouns are often attached to carrier-phemes which seem to have no meaning themselves. These carriers are and (a)kə. The latter, and possibly also the former, may be suffixed to another word. The ə of the latter is deleted when u is suffixed. Thus we may have such combinations as word + bound pronoun(s), na + bound pronoun(s), word + akə + bound pronoun(s), kə + bound pronoun(s) (illustrated in examples 7 to 10) and probably others.

7. yukurul ki:niya, kaŋet nau yina
when-he go-FUT, sleep I lie-FUT

'When he goes away I'm going to have a sleep'

8. ki:luku ki:nil kurəkəl nalaŋ ki:yin
here-alla-I go-IMPERF dog-OP he-me bite-PAST

'As soon as I came here the dog bit me'

9. maṛaku kimparpaŋ 'I cut my hand'.
hand-I cut-REFL-PAST

10. ŋaŋŋinka kətin kaŋanyty 'Where do they come from?'
where from they (pl) go-PRES

A pronoun may appear in both forms, bound and free, in a clause, the free form often being added for emphasis.

11. ŋaŋŋinkat yital 'Where are you from?'
where from-you you

12. pelanparpanytyaku, ŋuwal 'I'm scratching myself'
scratch-REFL-PRES-I I

3.3 Demonstratives

The *Gugadj* demonstratives are tabulated below (Table 5). The differences between the items in the first two rows are not clear; it may be that the items in the first row are demonstrative pronouns and those in the second row demonstrative adverbs. The differences in meaning between k-initial forms and the corresponding t-initial forms are not known; they seem to be interchangeable. The dual formative *ampukar* may be added to a demonstrative, in which case it follows any inflectional affix. Demonstratives may also be pluralised but the method is not yet clear. The forms *kil* and *kul* may be suffixed to other words, often with the vowel *i* or *a* (respectively) intervening.

TABLE 5 *Gugadj* demonstratives

	<u>this, here</u>		<u>that, there</u>	
Nominative	<i>kil</i>	<i>t̥il</i>	<i>kul</i>	<i>t̥ul</i>
Nominative	<i>ki:n̩</i>	—	<i>ku:n̩</i>	<i>t̥u:n̩</i>
Genitive	<i>kin̩in</i>	—	<i>kun̩in</i>	—
Locative	<i>kikəl</i>	—	<i>kukəl</i>	<i>t̥ukəl</i>
Dative/Allative	<i>ki:luk</i>	<i>t̥iluk</i>	<i>kuluk</i>	—

These demonstratives seem to be quite unrelated, both in phonological form and in the way they inflect, to those of *Gog-Nar*.

3.4 Interrogatives

The main 'wh'-type interrogatives are *ŋana* 'who?' (or 'someone'), *ŋanəŋin* 'whose?', *ŋany* 'what?' (or 'something'), *ŋanyinka* 'what for?', 'why?', *ŋatək* 'where?', *ŋatəŋar(a)* 'where to?', *ŋatəŋink(a)* 'where from?' and *ŋant̥in̩int(a)* 'when?'. Of these only the first has any resemblance to the corresponding *Nar* form (*ŋanaŋ*).

A 'choice' question (requiring a 'yes' or 'no' answer or a choice between alternatives) is marked by *kiya*. Like other *Gugadj* interrogatives mentioned so far, but unlike its *Nar* counterpart *t̥in̩*, it occurs as first word of the clause.

Another interrogative heard only rarely and occurring as a bound form is *kulu*, translated 'how about?'. For example, *ŋuwakulu* 'how about me?' (or, in the context where it was first heard 'Can I come?').

3.5 Verbs

Verb stems in *Gugadj* are normally monomorphemic, and compounding of noun and verb, very common in *Nar*, is infrequent; where it does appear to be used (as in *kururk yerinyty* 'hopping', *wurarr yimpinyty* 'playing about')

apparent constituents do not normally occur in any other contexts in the corpus. One word which does act as an auxiliary in this way is a causative compound verb formative, for example,

13. yeyakəl kanyilka '(I'm) going to make him laugh'
 laugh-he make-FUT

that the auxiliary does not necessarily immediately follow the verb.

There seem to be no other morphemes in *Gugadj* corresponding to several causative and stative formatives noted in *Nar* (except for the causative m). The only well-attested bound morpheme in *Gugadj* that acts as a verb stem formative is one that is lacking in the reflexive/reciprocal (tyarp ~ arp).

Verb inflection in *Gugadj* is rather different from the *Nar* system, as regards the concepts that are expressed in the verb and the morphemes used to express them. Also *Gugadj* differs in that nearly all verb inflections are the same or basically the same for all verbs; apart from imperative markers there is no division into conjugations.

Gugadj verb inflections are:

imperative:	lk, iy, n, k, nk
negative imperative:	nytyar or nytyar
past tense:	n, n
imperfect tense:	l
present tense:	nyty
future tense:	imperative + a
purposive:	nyink
continuing action:	partial reduplication
irrealis:	uru
consequence:	niŋ (?)

Of the imperative allomorphs listed, the first is most common, followed by the second. The allomorphs of the imperative are reminiscent of the two purposive forms in *Gog-Nar* (which has no separate imperative).

The negative imperative could be compounded of the present tense and privative (noun stem formative).

The functions of the three non-future tense forms seem to be similar in the two languages. The two *Nar* purposive forms both seem to have the same functions (imperative, purpose, future) and are regarded as two separate morphemes only because some verbs have both forms; these functions are fulfilled in *Gugadj* by the imperative, future tense and purposive. The *Gugadj* purposive is used only in a subordinate clause and refers to the purpose of the action described by the verb of the main clause.

14. ʃo:mərrəkəl kaŋaniya ki:luk yernkənyink
 white man-he go-FUT here-ALLA, talk-PURP

'The white man is going to come here to have a talk.'

The function of the irrealis is fairly similar to that of what is called the past purposive in *Nar*. However, 'nearly' is not expressed

by irrealis but by the adverb *ɣka:rəkəra* 'nearly'. The consequence marker marks the consequence of an action and so is comparable, but with a narrower range of function, with the *Nar* complement.

Potential ('might') is not marked in the *Gugadj* verb; either one of two particles, *yalək* and *pəl(a)*, both translated as 'might' or 'maybe', can be used instead.

The mechanism of the partial reduplication process is not completely clear. Examples include *pili:li* from *pili:* 'to hit', *ɲana* from *ɲa* 'to sit', *kityaltya* from *kitya* 'to burn', *kərarpi* from *karpī* 'to be afraid', *kətata* from *kəta* 'to fall', *ɲururəma* from *ɲurəma* 'to cover', *kulalunki* from *kulnki* 'to run', *ɬururpa* from *ɬurpa* 'to make' and *piri* from *pirmi* 'to tell'. In most cases the main stress is on the second syllable of the reduplicated form, but on the first of the simple form. Basically, initial $C_1V_1C_2$ becomes $C_1V_1C_2V_1C_2$; perhaps there is no rule to cover the exceptions.

3.6 Other morphemes

Gugadj does not have directional adverbs (cf. (N) *ɲuntaŋ*, *ɲalək*) but uses the allative forms of the demonstratives.

Common *Nar* particles which have equivalents in *Gugadj* include *pal* 'let' (G *mutal*), *kan(əŋk)* 'now' (G *ɣka*), *ɲaŋ* 'only, just' (G *yanp*), *kunaym* 'self' (G *korint*).

In addition to having a negative imperative, *Gugadj* forms negative sentences with *yara* 'not' (usually in first place in the sentence) and *ka:liŋ* 'no', 'don't' (often as an interjection). In addition, of course, the privative noun stem formative can be used to form a negative (normally verbless) clause. The four types of negative sentence are illustrated below.

15. *ka:liŋ kalk* 'Don't (kill it), leave it!'
don't leave-IMPERF
16. *yarakəl yokəl minyənt* 'He didn't give it any meat.'
not-he give-IMPERF meat-it (ACC)
17. *kutyilinpanytyar yaləkit pili:lka*
hold-NEG. IMPER, maybe-you hit-FUT
'Don't keep on handling it, you might hurt it.'
18. *tyirkələrəŋakəl, payimpunkəl*
girl-PRIV-he, boy-DIM
'It's not a girl, it's a little boy.'

Gugadj seems to make much less use of emphatics than does *Nar*. The suffix *ma* seems to have this function, as may the word *pam* (see footnote on p. 154, this volume).

4. CONCLUSION

Certain points are suggestive of a close genetic relationship between *Gugadj* and *Gog-Nar* — for example, the forms of the operative/locative morpheme and the privative, the similarity between the *Gugadj* imperative

the *Nar* purposive forms, the use of two past tenses with similar
 tions, and perhaps the use of an optative particle (G mutal, N pal).¹
 ever, the bulk of the evidence (taking into account the general
 similarity of Australian morphologies) suggests strongly that the
 relationship is not close. In particular, the differences in lexicon,
 each of the verb morphology, and the morphology and syntax of the
 pronouns seem to be significant. It is therefore concluded that *Gugadj*
 does not belong to the Pamic group of languages.²

References

- Breen, J.G. 1971 Aboriginal languages of western Queensland.
Linguistic Communications, 5:1-88.
- 1973 Bidyara and Gungabula: grammar and vocabulary,
Linguistic Communications, 8:1-227.
- Capell, A. 1956 A new approach to Australian linguistics. Sydney,
 University of Sydney. (Oceania linguistic monograph, no.1).
- Dixon, R.M.W. 1970 Languages of the Cairns rain forest. In Wurm, S.A.
 and D.C. Laycock, eds. Pacific linguistic studies in honour
 of Arthur Capell:651-687. (Pacific linguistics, ser. C, no.13).
- Geytenbeek, B. and H. Geytenbeek 1971 *Gidabal grammar and dictionary*.
 Canberra, Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies. (Aust-
 ralian Aboriginal studies no.43; Linguistic series no.17).
- Godfrey, M. and H.B. Kerr 1964 Personal pronouns in Wik-Munkan. In
 Pittman, R.S. and H.B. Kerr, eds. Papers on the languages of
 the Australian Aborigines:13-34.
- Hale, K.L. 1966 The Paman group of the Pama-Nyungan phyletic family. In
 O'Grady, G.N., Voegelin, C.F. and F.M. Voegelin. Languages
 of the world: Indo-Pacific fascicle six. *Anthropological
 Linguistics*, v.8, no.2:162-197.
- Hershberger, R. 1964 Personal pronouns in Gugu-Yalanji. In Pitt-
 man, R.S. and H.B. Kerr, eds. Papers on the languages of the
 Australian Aborigines:55-68.
- Oates, W.J. and L.F. Oates, eds. 1970 A revised linguistic survey of
 Australia. Canberra, Australian Institute of Aboriginal
 Studies. (Australian Aboriginal studies no.33; Linguistic
 series no.12).

¹Such a particle is also known to occur in some Maric group languages —
Bidjara (see Breen, 1973:128), and *Warungu* (see Tsunoda, 1974:235).

²Since this paper was written Dr Paul Black has been engaged in a study
 of *Gurdjar* and *Gudhand*, the languages between *Gugadj* and *Nar*. The
 data he has obtained, together with his criticisms of some of my argu-
 ments, especially in section 1 above, lead me to agree with him that
Gugadj may after all be a Pamic language.

- O'Grady, G.N., Voegelin, C.F. and F.M. Voegelin 1966 Languages of the world: Indo-Pacific fascicle six. *Anthropological Linguistics* v.8, no.2:1-197.
- Pittman, R.S. and H.B. Kerr, eds. 1964 Papers on the languages of Australian Aborigines. Canberra, Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, no.3; Linguistic series, no.2).
- Sommer, B.A. 1972 Kunjen syntax: a generative view. Canberra, Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies. (Australian Aboriginal studies, no.45; Linguistic series, no.19).
- Tindale, N.B. 1940 Distribution of Australian Aboriginal tribes: a field survey. In Royal Society of South Australia. Transactions, v.64:140-231.
- Tsunoda, T. 1974 A grammar of the Warungu language, north Queensland. MA thesis - Monash University).
- Wurm, S.A. and D.C. Laycock, eds. 1970 Pacific linguistic studies in honour of Arthur Capell. (*Pacific Linguistics*, ser. C, no. 1).