Language Planning and Placenaming in Australia

Flavia Hodges
Maitland, New South Wales, Australia

**Before colonisation Australia was fully named by its Indigenous population, but that
complex network of naming was largely overlooked as Europeans introduced their
own names for features and settlements. Each of Australia's states and territories now
has a nomenclature authority, whose activities are coordinated through the Committee
for Geographical Names in Australasia. Recently there has been a focus on increasing
the number of placenames of Indigenous origin within the Introduced system through
assigning Indigenous names to places hitherto lacking official names; using dual
names; and replacing Introduced names regarded as offensive by members of
Indigenous communities.**

The Placenaming Background

Before Australia was colonised by European settlers, the Indigenous inhabitants had names for every topographical feature of significance to them. The essential characteristics of Australian Aboriginal placenames are discussed in Hercus and Simpson (2002) and by other contributors to Hercus *et al.* (2002) and its successor volume Koch and Hercus (2007). In important contrast with the subsequent introduced system of placenaming, Indigenous placenames form structured, interlinked networks in which places, together with their names and attributes, are related to each other in complex ways reflecting the relationship between people and the land they inhabit (see especially Wilkins, 2002: 31–33). Placenames are not arbitrary, but integral to the places to which they are attached, and derive from the activities of Ancestor figures in the Dreaming,[1] who emerged from the originally formless and featureless land mass, travelled across it performing everyday activities and causing it to assume shape and names, and eventually 'went down' into the landscape, 'becoming country'. Writing of a living Aboriginal culture of the Northern Territory, McConvell (2002: 57) explains that 'Most Australian Aboriginal people tend to deny that placenames are assigned by humans, but attribute them to the activities of the Dreamings', and Baker (2002: 127) that 'places that are named constitute the manifest embodiment of the ancestral creator beings'.

In the early phases of European settlement, these complex interlocking systems of placenaming were ignored. The first exploration of the continent was done by sea, and maritime explorers imposed placenames that were descriptive (Cook's[2] *Smoky Cape*, *Bustard Bay*, *Magnetic Island*), or else commemorated

individuals (Cook's *Point Hicks*, *Cape Howe*, *Hervey Bay*; Baudin's[3] *Cape Peron* and *Point Freycinet*), or memorialised the circumstances of naming (Janszoon's[4] *Cape Keerweer* 'Turn-about', where he set off to return to Java; Cook's *Whitsunday Passage* and *Cape Tribulation*). As colonisation began in the late 18th century, the names of pioneering settlements were usually determined by governors and other dignitaries. As first governor of New South Wales (1788–1792), Arthur Phillip named the pioneering settlement of *Sydney* after British Home Secretary Thomas Townshend, Lord Sydney, who had issued the charter authorising the establishment of the colony; third governor Philip King (1800–1806) later named *Port Phillip* after Governor Phillip. Sixth governor Lachlan Macquarie (1810–21) named many features and settlements, perhaps most notably the five 'Macquarie towns' of *Windsor*, *Richmond*, *Castlereagh*, *Pitt Town* and *Wilberforce*, the first two after places in England, and the other three after statesmen. Governor Macquarie also had many places (*Lake Macquarie*, *Lachlan River*, *Elizabeth Town*, *Henrietta Plains*, *Campbelltown*) named after himself and his wife. (For an early commentary on this tendency, see John Dunmore Lang's verses cited below.)

Gradually the interior of the continent was opened up by overland explorers, who continued the tradition of imposing names of their choice on the watercourses and prominences they passed. As land was opened up for occupation, accurate surveying became important, and in the early days the work of surveying overlapped considerably with exploration. Surveyor and explorer John Oxley named the harbour of *Port Macquarie* (1818) and the *Brisbane River* (1823) after successive governors of NSW under whom he worked. His successor as NSW Surveyor-General, Thomas Mitchell, preferred that Indigenous names should be sought and applied wherever possible, and frequently exhorted his staff on the subject, as for example in 1849: 'I have to request that you will consider the native name of a river to be the proper one in all cases where it happens to be short, and easily pronounced' (Mitchell, 1849; see further below on these significant qualifications).

As settlement proceeded, other placenames were bestowed by early settlers on minor features previously overlooked, on properties squatted[5] in advance of official survey, and on localities within settlements. In this phase descriptive, commemorative and 'incident' names continued to be important, but there were also many more names falling into the categories of 'transfer' (*Newcastle* and *Ipswich* from England, *Perth* and *Dundee* from Scotland, *Llanelly* from Wales, *Killarney* from Ireland), 'possessive' (*Archdale* on a run taken up by Mervyn Archdale in 1841, *Brodies Plains* on land taken up by Peter Brodie in 1839 but abandoned after a year), and especially names of Indigenous origin. Pioneer settlers generally had more contact with Aboriginal inhabitants than did the explorers and surveyors passing hurriedly through, but nevertheless the names have been considerably distorted in the recording, are often applied to the wrong feature, and in almost all cases both the literal meaning and the Dreaming story behind the name have been lost.

In the later 19th century the post office and railway authorities began to play a significant role in placenaming, usually operating from afar with little knowledge of the local situation. Working with an overview of a whole set of names originally assigned or arising in isolation from each other (unlike the Indigenous networks of names), they found many instances both of duplication and of

confusing similarity. Such duplication is rare and possibly coincidental in the Indigenous naming networks, where each name is regarded as a unique entity. Often the authorities would seek to alleviate these difficulties by arbitrarily modifying existing names or imposing new ones. A settlement near Albany in Western Australia was gazetted in 1899 as *Lakeside*, but in 1908 its name was changed to *Torbay Junction* as there was another Lakeside near Kalgoorlie in the interior of the state; another near Perth was declared as *Mount Baker* in 1897, but changed to *Bakers Hill* in 1902 in order to avoid confusion with the larger town of *Mount Barker* to the south-east (Department of Land Information, Western Australia, n.d.). In many instances placenames of Indigenous origin were selected from wordlists, as for example by railway authorities in Queensland and South Australia, without regard for their meaning or the language from which they were taken.

A final factor in Australian placenaming has been the influence of property developers, who from the time of the earliest subdivisions have been keen to use names with pleasant associations in order to attract purchasers. The suburbs of *Freshwater* and *Rosewater* in Port Adelaide were so named at the time of land sales there in the 1850s (Manning, 1990). *Green Valley* is a densely settled suburb of Liverpool in Sydney, developed in the 1960s as the largest single scheme yet undertaken by the NSW Housing Commission. [In contrast *Fairfield* in NSW is named after Fairfield in Somerset and *Fairfield* in Victoria after Fairfield in Derbyshire (Appleton & Appleton, 1992), which are probably named with the Old English element *fōr* 'hog' rather than *fæger* 'beautiful'.]

From early days official placenames were gazetted, that is listed in the periodical publication established for the purpose of notifying government actions and decisions.[6] However, many unofficial placenames were never gazetted, and little notice was generally taken of the official forms prescribed by government gazette. In 1900 E.J. Forbes had occasion to complain in a letter to the *Sydney Morning Herald* (2 June):

> Nothing is more bewildering to the stranger than the variations that mark the spelling of the same town or place in New South Wales. These variations are most marked with regard to aboriginal names, and it is easy to understand that they arose out of the efforts of early settlers to render the aboriginal pronunciation in English. It is not, however, so easy to understand why these variations are preserved in different official publications. (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 1900)

Standardisation began only well into the 20th century with the constitution of official nomenclature authorities, charged with determining which placenames are officially approved, the way in which they are to be written, and the location and extent of the places designated by them.

Placenaming in Australia remains a state rather than federal responsibility.[7] Clause 51 of the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1900* defines 39 areas in which the federal Parliament may legislate. Included are interstate and international trade, taxation, postal services, defence, banking, marriage and divorce, immigration, external affairs and railway services. Excluded are a number of important subjects including education, criminal law – and placenaming.

Nevertheless, cooperation between state jurisdictions has been the practice since the time of Federation in 1901. The Postmaster-General's Department was created at that date to control all postal (and later, telecommunications) services within the new nation, and played a role in avoiding duplication. A settlement south of the Georges River near Sydney was named *Bangor*, after the town in Wales, by early settler Owen Jones when it was established in 1895, but because there was also a Bangor in Tasmania, the name of the NSW town was in 1910 changed by the Postmaster-General's Department to *Menai*, after the straits lying between the Welsh Bangor and the Isle of Anglesey (Pollon, 1988).

In 1904 an agreement was made between the states and the new Commonwealth by which the states undertook that when assigning new placenames they would not duplicate names already in use elsewhere in Australia. In Western Australia at least, this decision had a considerable influence on the development of nomenclature, especially since it came at a time when the rail network was expanding and many new settlements and stations were being established. A decision was made to give preference to names of Aboriginal origin wherever possible, as it was only these names which were unlikely to be duplicated.

From 1916 the states and territories began to establish official nomenclature advisory bodies.[8] The way in which placenaming activities are carried out by the nomenclature authorities varies between administrations. In most cases there is an advisory committee representing various interests, coordinated by a secretariat within a government department, which makes recommendations to a government minister. NSW and Tasmania have boards rather than committees, with the power to make decisions subject to the right of appeal to the minister. Queensland has no regular consultative committee, but interested parties are consulted on an ad hoc basis. Victoria has devolved most placenaming activities to local government authorities, overseen by the Registrar of Geographic Names, an office currently combined with that of Surveyor-General.

The types of places for whose names nomenclature authorities are responsible also varies between jurisdictions, being governed by the relevant legislation. Generally they control the naming of natural features and settlements, whereas the names of constructed features and administrative divisions may be in the hands of other authorities. For example, the names of schools are generally determined by state departments of education and the names of streets by local councils. Nevertheless, the nomenclature bodies usually have a role in providing guidelines for such naming, and in some cases the names are included in the databases that they maintain.

Despite these variations, placenaming in Australia is becoming increasingly coordinated, on a voluntary basis, through the activities of the Committee for Geographical Names in Australasia (CGNA). On this are represented all the state and territory nomenclature authorities, along with the New Zealand Geographic Board/Ngā Pou Taunaha o Aotearoa; other Australian bodies with placenaming functions such as the Australian Hydrographic Office, Australian Antarctic Division and Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority; and other interested parties such as the Australia-Pacific Institute for Toponymy and the Australian National Placenames Survey. The CGNA was established in 1984 (initially as the Committee for Geographical Names in Australia) and since 1993

has been constituted as a committee of the Intergovernmental Committee on Surveying and Mapping with the support of what is now the Geospatial and Earth Monitoring Division of Geoscience Australia.

At an international level, Australia is an active participant in the coordinating activities of the United Nations Conferences on the Standardization of Geographical Names (UNCSGN) and the United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names (UNGEGN). Members of CGNA are active within the Asia South-East and Pacific South-West regional division of UNGEGN, and are represented in the working parties on training courses in toponymy, on toponymic terminology, on pronunciation, and on the promotion of Indigenous and minority group names.

Significant achievements of the CGNA have included the drawing up of a nationally agreed set of *Guidelines for the Consistent Use of Place Names* (CGNA, 2001a) and *Guidelines for the Recording and Use of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Place Names* (CGNA, 2001b). Members have also collaborated to produce a union National Gazetteer of Australia (Geoscience Australia, 2005). Members of the CGNA have recently been occupied with a programme of determining boundaries for all officially named settlement localities, and are also collaborating in a programme of educational outreach. Forward plans include the reduction of duplicate place names (though this endeavour tends to meet strong community resistance), standardising feature designations across jurisdictions, and the development of a web feature server.

Reinstating Indigenous Names

In the recent past, most notably within the last decade, there has been a growing interest by Australian nomenclature authorities, as part of a more general social change, to increase the number of names of Indigenous origin within the official placenaming system, and to represent them in a more accurate and respectful manner. In some instances these developments have taken place within the context of an official policy on Aboriginal languages, such as that published in NSW in 2002 or currently under development in Victoria. Other moves towards the increased use of placenames of Indigenous origin have come about in the context of language maintenance or language revival programmes sponsored by Aboriginal organisations. These initiatives have generally received the support of the wider community, which is increasingly interested in Aboriginal culture and inclined to take pride in placenames of Indigenous origin as being uniquely Australian.

This is not entirely a new sentiment, as traces of it may be found from early colonial times. A voice of dissent at Introduced names was raised by John Dunmore Lang (1873), first Presbyterian minister in the colony of New South Wales, in often quoted doggerel:

'Twas said of Greece two thousand years ago,
  That every stone i' the land had got a name.
Of New South Wales too, men will soon say too,
  But every stone there seems to get the same.
'Macquarie' for a name is all the go:
  The old Scotch Governor was fond of fame.

> Macquarie Street, Place, Port, Fort, Town, Lake, River:
>   'Lachlan Macquarie, Esquire, Governor', for ever!
> I like the native names, as Parramatta,
>   And Illawarra, and Woolloomooloo;
> Nandowra, Woogarora, Bulkomatta,
>   Tomah, Toongabbie, Mittagong, Meroo. (Lang, 1873)

The main processes involved in increasing the representation of placenames of Indigenous origin within the official placenames system are assigning names to hitherto 'unnamed' features, dual naming, and the changing of names offensive to Indigenous people. Each will be discussed in turn below, with a consideration of some of the issues involved, and followed by a discussion of some wider issues involved in the whole programme of integrating increased elements of Indigenous language and Indigenous placename networks into the official placenames system.

Assigning names to unnamed features

This is a relatively straightforward process by which names of Indigenous origin, traditional or new, are assigned to natural or built features that currently lack official names.

In the case of natural features it is sometimes possible to assign a traditional Indigenous name to a feature that has been overlooked in the Introduced naming system. For example, in South Australia field investigations commencing in 1984 were able to record many previously undocumented Adnyamathanha place-names in the northern Flinders Ranges, and these are now official placenames within the South Australian State Gazetteer. It must be remembered that features named in the Indigenous placenaming network are not always the same as those that have drawn the attention of Europeans: often rock holes or specific faces of relief features have traditional names, and on the basis that no feature is in theory too small to be named, these may be adopted into the set of official placenames.

Suitable traditional names may be found in archival documentation or through the recording of oral history. In recent years several projects have been undertaken to gather and make available information about traditional place-names drawn from such sources. A notable example is Clark and Heydon (2002), the fruit of a three-year project, sponsored by the Victorian Aboriginal Corporation for Languages and funded by the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission, to mine a wide variety of written sources for information on over 3500 placenames in what is now the state of Victoria. Another is Ash *et al.* (2003), which includes details drawn from the knowledge held by remaining language speakers about the form, etymology and stories of placenames in the lexicon of the NSW languages covered by the *Dictionary*. In 2004 the NSW Geographical Names Board digitised a large body of unpublished material relating to placenames that had been gathered by the Royal Anthropological Society of Australasia at the very beginning of the 20th century, and distributed it through a series of workshops and training sessions for members of Aboriginal communities arranged in collaboration with the Asia-Pacific Institute for Toponymy and the NSW Aboriginal Languages Research and Resource Centre.

In cases where no traditional placenames are available, it may be appropriate to create new names using elements of local Indigenous vocabulary. Amery

and Williams (2002: 257) describe how minor natural features within a national park on the outskirts of Adelaide, South Australia, were named by Parks Commissioners in the early 20th century, apparently using a wordlist of the local Kaurna language (although the correlation with known published vocabularies is not exact), with the majority of the names representing words for locally represented flora combined with the English generic elements 'ridge' and 'creek' (e.g. *Yulti-Wirra Ridge*, from Kaurna *yulti* 'stringy-bark gum' + *wirra* 'forest'; *Kurru Creek*, from Kaurna *kurru* 'grasstree'; *Tarnma Creek*, from Kaurna *tarnma* 'banksia'). The NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service (now an agency within the Department of Environment and Conservation) has a policy of using Indigenous names for parks and features within them. Recently created parks include the *Arakwal National Park* (created 2001), managed in collaboration with the Arakwal Aboriginal community of Byron Bay; *Gulaga National Park* (created 2001), named with the traditional name of the feature renamed by James Cook as *Mount Dromedary*; and *Wollumbin National Park* (created 2003), named with the traditional name – made an official dual name in 2006 as described below – of Cook's *Mount Warning*.

There are also rare opportunities to name newly discovered natural features. Bonyhady (2002) describes the controversy over the naming of an impressive cave discovered in 1977 among the limestone outcrops surrounding Tasmania's Franklin River. The first choice of the discoverers was to name it *Fraser Cave* after the then Prime Minister of Australia, Malcolm Fraser, but the Tasmanian Nomenclature Board objected that established placenaming guidelines (cf. CGNA, 2001a: Clause 4.6) discouraged the naming of features after living people – a policy established to minimise controversy. The Tasmanian Archaeological Society suggested that it would be appropriate to name the cave with a word from a local Aboriginal language. The Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre proposed the word *kutakina* 'spirit' as a suitable term in use among the contemporary Tasmanian Aboriginal community. However, this word is not to be found in archival sources documenting the Tasmanian languages, gathered in Plomley (1976), and the Board initially preferred to use a word recorded at a period when the languages were still fully spoken, agreeing to the use of *kutakina* only at the firm insistence of the Aboriginal Centre. This incident underlines the importance of consultation with Aboriginal communities in using words from Indigenous languages in the placenaming process.

However, most significant natural features already bear official placenames, in which case dual naming (discussed in the following section) may be the appropriate approach.

In the case of constructed features there can be no applicable traditional Indigenous name, but nevertheless there is often a desire for naming with Indigenous vocabulary items. Amery and Williams (2002: 258–259) describe how by the middle of the 20th century, placenaming in the Belair National Park in South Australia had extended beyond the naming of natural features with words from the local Kaurna language to encompass the naming of constructed features with Aboriginal words apparently drawn from outside the immediate area, combined with English generic elements (e.g. *Kaloola Track* and *Wypanda Track*).

Street names are a category of placename for which there is a regular need of creation, due to increasing density of population and the establishment of new

suburbs and settlements. These are generally determined by local councils, with or without the involvement (concurrence, gazettal or inclusion in the official placenames register) of state or territory nomenclature authorities.

The Australian federal capital Canberra, in the Australian Capital Territory, has grown up as a planned city from the earliest phase of construction in 1913. The street names within each suburb conform to a prescribed theme, such as Australian dams and reservoirs (Duffy), industrialists and aspects of industry (Gungahlin), or aviators (Scullin) (ACT Department of the Environment, Land and Planning, 1992). The suburbs of Reid, Pialligo and O'Malley have a theme 'Aboriginal words', but in fact most of their streets are named from settlements elsewhere in Australia themselves bearing names of Aboriginal origin. For example, *Allambee* (in Reid), described as an Aboriginal word meaning 'rest', is the name of a town in Victoria; *Beltana* (Pialligo), described as an Aboriginal word meaning 'water', is the name of a town in South Australia; *Cabarita* (O'Malley), described as an Aboriginal word meaning 'by the water', is the name of a town in NSW; *Callemonda* (O'Malley), described as an Aboriginal word meaning 'many hills', is the name of a town in Queensland; *Kallaroo* (Pialligo), described as an Aboriginal word meaning 'a road leading to water' is the name of a town in Western Australia. It seems that many of these placenames have been selected for use in street names because of their 'pleasant' meanings as given in the most accessible reference sources such as Reed (1967): for example, in Reid *Amaroo* 'beautiful place'; in O'Malley *Dalman* 'place of plenty', *Gerogery* 'pleasant place', *Kanangra* 'beautiful view', *Kiah* 'beautiful place', *Numeralla* 'valley of plenty', *Taronga* 'a beautiful view'. All of these etymologies are highly suspect, as Reed is notoriously uncritical and unreliable in respect of placenames of Aboriginal origin. In the suburb of Aranda – itself named with a formerly current spelling of the name of the Arrernte people of Central Australia, although the suburb name is usually pronounced with the stress on the second rather than first syllable – the streets are named after various Aboriginal groups, albeit not in the forms now most commonly used or preferred by the peoples concerned: for example, *Nungara Street* is named after the Noongar people of Western Australia and *Bandjalong Crescent* after the Banjalang people of the northern coast of NSW.

Reid (not to be confused with Reed) (2002) describes his experience as a professional linguist employed as a consultant by Armidale City Council in NSW to create a body of elements for use in street names from the local language Anewan (historically Nganyaywana), which is no longer spoken and is poorly documented. He characterises this as a process of 'commodification', that is creating from Anewan materials resources that did not exist in Anewan itself, and discusses the linguistic compromises suggested, negotiated and accepted during the process, such as the neutralisation of certain phonemic contrasts, the imposition of English stress patterns, and the partially inconsistent representation of some sounds.

Indigenous groups are playing an increasingly prominent role in such projects, and being paid for their services. In 2006 the South Australian Indigenous organisation Kaurna Warra Pintyandi reviewed for the Port Adelaide-Enfield Council a list of 79 possible names for streets in a new waterfront development: some have been deleted, others corrected, and additional,

more relevant, names have been included. The property developer AV Jennings has drawn on the expertise of members of the Kaurna Heritage Board in choosing names (subject to approval by the local government authority) for a new subdivision in the southern metropolitan area of Adelaide.

Amery (Amery & Williams, 2002), a leading figure in the revival of the Kaurna language of the Adelaide region, has gone much further in this process of commodification, by creating Kaurna names for a set of Adelaide parks based on their current use, including *Padipadinyilla* 'swimming place' (from *padeni* 'to swim' + the locative *-illa)*, *Wikaparndo Wirra* 'netball park' (from *wika* 'net used to trap wallabies or fish' + *parndo* 'possum skin ball used as a football' + *wirra* 'forest'), *Tartonendi* 'becoming wetland' (from *tarto* 'swamp' + *-nendi* 'to be transformed into'), and *Wirranendi* 'becoming woodland' (from *wirra* 'forest' + *-nendi* 'to be transformed into'). It is notable that the use of the verbal forms exemplified in the last two of these examples has no precedent in the traditional Aboriginal placenames of the region.

Such bold actions are the cause of some linguistic and social controversy. Georgina Yambo Williams, the senior Kaurna woman who worked closely with Amery on the Adelaide 'Reclaiming through renaming' project, is personally opposed to the use of names reflecting current use, but was out-voiced by other members of the local community. The Tasmanian Aboriginal Language Centre is opposed to the use of elements from Aboriginal languages in naming features that are not part of the traditional Aboriginal environment. Nevertheless the desire to give an appropriate name of Aboriginal origin to buildings and institutions informs a steady stream of enquiries from members of the public to both the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies and the Australian National Placenames Survey. It was this interest that lay behind the 1996 *Macquarie Aboriginal Naming Book: an Australian Guide to Naming your Home or Boat.* Publication of this caused some consternation among contributors to the work from which it was derived, the acclaimed 1994 *Macquarie Aboriginal Words: a Dictionary of Words from Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Languages*, and it was rapidly allowed to go out of print.

Considerations

Most of the common considerations in evaluating a proposed new name of Indigenous origin for an unnamed feature relate to its linguistic form, and have changed little since Thomas Mitchell's (1849) remark that names of Aboriginal origin used within the Introduced system should be 'short, and easily pronounced'. The CGNA Guidelines (2001a: Clause 4.7) specify that 'Place names should be easy to pronounce, spell and write; simple, concise and preferably of 50 or fewer characters' – a generous limit. Many early writers on Australian placenames extolled the virtues of certain names as being 'euphonious', an epithet that seems to combine the qualities of being pleasing to the ear and easy to pronounce, both highly subjective notions.

Reid (2002: 245) describes how Armidale City Council favoured specific elements that are neither too long nor too short, preferring them to be of two or three syllables, even though prototypical Australian placenames of Aboriginal origin such as *Parramatta*, *Illawarra* and *Goondawindi* have four and many Introduced street name specifics such as *High*, *Broad* and *King* have only one.

Although placenames of Indigenous origin have historically often been truncated and simplified in their transition into the Introduced system, any such deliberate process would today be condemned as inauthentic and disrespectful.

With increasing coordination between placename authorities and the automation and centralisation of functions such as postal deliveries and emergency response, there has been an increased desire that new placenames proposed should be not too similar to existing placenames so as to avoid possible confusion either orally or in writing.

Comparatively little attention is given to the appropriateness of the meanings of Aboriginal words used as placenames. There is a marked preference for nouns, in particular those relating to flora, fauna, elements of traditional culture, and concepts with positive connotations. Verb forms are less commonly used, and function words only occasionally. Surprisingly, descriptive adjectives are seldom chosen. Genuine Aboriginal placenames exhibit a much greater range of morphological composition, including bare nouns, suffixed nouns, noun phrases, verb complexes and relative clauses.

On occasion there is a concern that a placename of Aboriginal origin should not be too similar to an inappropriate English word: Armidale City Council (Reid, 2002: 247) was worried that *Loona* would be too easily associated with 'loony'.

Issues

The main issues that arise when a name of Indigenous origin is proposed for a feature hitherto lacking an official name revolve around questions of spelling, pronunciation, and the use of generic elements.

When a traditional name is under consideration, it must be decided whether the spelling to be used is one taken from archival sources (in which there may be variation), a rendering of the presumed pronunciation into a consistent orthography, a version preferred by the present-day Aboriginal community (which may be divided on the question), or a form constructed to generate an appropriate pronunciation by non-speakers of the language. Compromises may be made in the direction of the standard orthography of Australian English, as when Pitjantjatjara *Uluṟu* (in which the underlining represents a retroflex articulation) becomes *Uluru* as part of an official Northern Territory dual name (see further below), or elements from Tasmanian languages (known generically by the local community as *palawa kani* 'Aboriginal language') receive initial capitals when used as specific elements of official placenames. Hyphenation and word division may also be used in order to make the names seem less daunting to monolingual speakers of Australian English. The CGNA guidelines (2001a: Clause 4.13) state that 'English language place names do not have diacritical marks. In the case of place names derived from languages other than English, any diacritical marks are not to be carried over to the English form'.

A further question is whether it is desirable to avoid or adapt names with unfamiliar sounds, combinations or positions. Wilkinson *et al.* (2007) cite 1968 deliberations of the Northern Territory Place Names Committee that took into consideration submissions that the Yolŋu placename *Nhulunbuy* 'is difficult to spell … in a non-phonetic way that ensures correct pronunciation by the

general public' and in favour of the 'short, simple and concise' alternative Introduced name *Gove*. Similarly, the originally proposed dual name (Amery & Williams, 2002) for Victoria Square in Adelaide, *Ngamatyi*, was not used because of the supposed difficulty of English speakers in articulating the initial velar nasal, and the longer *Tarndanyangga* was substituted. Against this may be cited the observation that speakers of New Zealand English are increasingly approximating the correct sounds of Māori in vocabulary items derived from that language, such as *kākāpō* 'night parrot' and *whenua* 'land'.

A third factor of some controversy is the desirability of adding an English generic term indicating the feature type, so that the Indigenous placename becomes the specific element in a macaronic complex name. With certain interesting exceptions, such as the Adnyamathana names described by Schebeck (2002) and the many traditional Kaurna names containing elements such as *-parri* 'river', *-wirra* 'forest' and *-womma* 'plain', traditional Indigenous placenames do not include generic elements; possible reasons for this are discussed by Baker (2002: 127). However, in the Introduced system, following the pattern of most European languages, it is normal for the names of topographical features (though not of settlements) to include a generic element indicating the feature type. The CGNA guidelines (2001a: Clause 4.17) state that 'Aboriginal, Torres Strait Islander and External Territory names of geographical features are generally to have a generic term in the English form as published', but this is frequently objected to by members of Indigenous communities and is often disregarded in cases of dual naming.

Dual naming

Dual naming has begun to be used in the past couple of decades by certain Australian nomenclature authorities as a way of restoring traditional Indigenous names of features for which an Introduced placename is well established. It recognises that the outright replacement of the Introduced name is rarely a realistic option; Kostanski and Clark (2007) describe the uproar over the proposed 1989 renaming of the Grampians range in Victoria with the traditional name *Gariwerd*. Although some implementations of the policy contravene the principle of univocity or 'one name for one place' (within a single language context), this is seen as being a lesser evil than the continued ignoring of Australia's traditional placenames. CGNA guidelines accept that 'Dual or multiple naming of features, recognised in some States and Territories, is a legitimate means of recording feature names drawn from Aboriginal, Torres Strait Islander, European and other cultures' (CGNA, 2001a: Clause 4.11) and that 'A dual naming system or use of alternative names may be used as a management and educative tool for the naming of physical and environmental features of significance to the local Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander community when an official name already exists and when a name change is not possible or acceptable' (CGNA, 2001b: Clause 3.5.1).

The Northern Territory was the first Australian jurisdiction to adopt dual names, in the well known case of *Ayers Rock/Uluru* and *Mount Olga/Kata Tjuta*, so officially named in 1993. The former, an enormous monolith in remote central Australia, was named in 1873 by surveyor William Gosse in honour of Sir Henry Ayers, then Premier of South Australia (which had jurisdiction over the

area at the time), but it had always been known by the local Pitjantjatjara people as *Uluṟu*. The latter is the highest of a group of around 30 domed hills (known colloquially in English as 'the Olgas') standing close together not far from the monolith. The Introduced name was given by explorer Ernest Giles in 1872 in honour of Queen Olga of Württemberg, a patroness of his own patron Ferdinand von Mueller. The more appropriate Pitjantjatjara name *Kata Tjuṯa* means 'many heads' and refers to the group as a whole; the issue of this mismatch in referential extent is discussed further below. These 'dual names' are officially gazetted as a single name, with the components separated by a solidus (/); the full name should be used in official documents and publications, but in unofficial contexts either part may be used on its own. The order of the two parts is determined by the Place Names Committee after consultation with all interested parties, and may be changed: in 2002 *Ayers Rock/Uluru* and *Mount Olga/Kata Tjuta* became *Uluru/Ayers Rock* and *Kata Tjuta/Mount Olga* at the request of the Regional Tourism Association and in response to increasing use of the Indigenous rather than the Introduced name.

Also in 1993 the South Australian cabinet accepted a set of guidelines by which both an Aboriginal name and a name from another source could be assigned to the same feature, and this possibility of dual naming was enshrined in a 1999 Amendment to the 1991 Geographical Names Act. Dual naming has been implemented on a large scale in the case of features in the Flinders Ranges for which traditional Adnyamathanha names had been collected during field research in the late 1980s: over 600 places have now had traditional names officially assigned alongside the introduced equivalents. For example, *Mount Woodroofe*, given its introduced name in 1873 by William Gosse in honour of Surveyor General George Woodroffe Goyder, now also officially bears its traditional name of *Ngarutjaranya*. In contrast with the situation in the remote north of South Australia, where Pitjantjatjara and other Aboriginal languages are still fully spoken, the Kaurna language of the Adelaide Plains is no longer in daily use, and many traditional placenames are preserved only in archival sources. The watercourse with the introduced name of the *Torrens River* (named in 1836 by Colonel William Light, Surveyor General of the new colony, in honour of Robert Torrens, Chairman of the South Australian Colonisation Commissioners) was officially dual named in 2001 with the traditional Kaurna name of *Karrawirra Parri* (from *karra* 'red gum' + *wirra* 'forest' + an unusual but authentic generic element *parri* 'river'). Dual names have also been assigned by Adelaide City Council to several built features. For example, the central *Victoria Square* has since May 2002 also been officially named as *Tarndanyangga* (from Kaurna *tarnda* 'red kangaroo' + *kanya* 'rock' + the locative suffix *-ngga*), a traditional placename originally applied to a location somewhere within Adelaide south of the Torrens. Some parks also have dual names: for example, *Brougham Gardens* (named after the statesman Henry Brougham, whose support for the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1832 paved the way for the foundation of the colony of South Australia) is now also named *Tandotittinga* (from Kaurna *tandotitte* 'native lilac' + locative *-ngga*); *Rymill Park* (named after Sir Arthur Cambell Rymill, lord mayor of Adelaide 1950–1954) is now also named *Mullawirraburka* (the name, dry forest elder, of a 19th-century Kaurna leader also known to the colonists as 'King John' and 'Onkaparinga Jack').

The names finally assigned differ in detail from the proposals outlined in Amery and Williams (2002).

The background and history to dual naming in NSW is described in Windsor (2007). The policy was established in 2001, and the first gazetted dual names were *Dawes Point/Tar-ra* in 2002 and *South Creek/Wianamatta* in 2003. These were followed by a group of 20 names on Sydney Harbour, derived from the research of Attenbrow (2007), that were, as described by Troy and Walsh (2007), discussed with members of local Aboriginal communities in 2003, put out for general consultation during 2004, and finally gazetted in 2005. *Mount Warning/ Wollumbin* on the NSW north coast was added to the list in 2006, and other proposals are at various stages in the process of consultation with Indigenous communities and the general public. In NSW, as in South Australia, the Indigenous and Introduced names are gazetted separately as official names with equal validity rather than as parts of one name. Either or both may be used; if both are shown together they are to be separated by a solidus, as in the case of the Northern Territory dual names with single status.

In Victoria an additional Indigenous name can be assigned to already named 'places or features' so that assignment of the Indigenous name will result in the place having a dual name in which an introduced and an Indigenous name apply equally. These are gazetted as single names with the secondary name placed in parentheses, as for example *Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park*. Although, as discussed below, it is not automatically the Introduced name that is regarded as primary and the Indigenous one as secondary, this means of presentation has not been popular with Indigenous communities and several groups have declined to cooperate with dual naming proposals on that basis. Kostanski and Clark (2007) describe a study commissioned by the Department of Sustainability and Environment in order to apply dual names to areas within state forests. In this case the Ballarat and District Aboriginal Cooperative has been concerned that the dual names chosen should have known meanings and be attested in multiple sources.

The introduction of dual naming is currently under discussion in the Australian Capital Territory and Western Australia. In the ACT a preliminary report (Jackson-Nakano, 2005) has uncovered a wealth of archival evidence yielding over 50 traditional names for natural features. There are currently no plans to introduce dual naming in Queensland or Tasmania.

An important factor in the development and implementation of a programme of dual naming is the need for extensive consultation with communities, both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal. Generally it is necessary to first consult with Aboriginal groups and Elders to ensure that there is consensus for the use of the particular traditional name proposed, and then with the community as a whole about the dual naming. The recognition of traditional Indigenous names alongside the Introduced ones has become increasingly well received as the concept of dual naming has become more familiar through media coverage. It is important to develop a sense of ownership of the names in the community, and as Amery and Williams remark (2002: 264–265), it is possible to get the ball rolling by starting to use the desired names in everyday contexts so that they become familiar and natural in advance of official recognition.

Issues

   In addition to the range of issues concerned with spelling, pronunciation and the use of generic elements discussed above in relation to the adoption of names of Indigenous origin for features hitherto lacking official names, a further set of issues relates specifically to dual names.

   The first of these, of some fundamental theoretical importance, is the question of whether the features designated by the Indigenous and Introduced names are really 'the same' in representing the same feature type with the same extent. In fact it is clear that names from Indigenous networks and within the Introduced system rarely map against each other with neat one-to-one relations. The Indigenous name may be either more inclusive than the Introduced one, as for example in covering both a hill and the surrounding area, or more restricted, as for example in being used for only a specific reach of a river (Hercus & Simpson, 2002: 14). The consequence of this is that a certain amount of fudging may be needed in establishing equivalencies between matched 'dual names' within the official placenaming system. As noted above, the Pitjantjatjara name *Kata Tjuṯa* refers to the whole group of 'the Olgas' rather than just the most prominent hill with which it is linked in the composite name *Kata Tjuta/Mount Olga*. The researches of Jackson-Nakano (2005) seem to indicate that the two most prominent hills in the Australian Capital Territory seem not to have had individual names: rather Mount Ainslie is merely part of the *Byalegga* (Pialligo) range and Black Mountain part of the *Ngambri* (Canberra) range. Kostanski and Clark (2007) discuss the possibility of assigning multiple Indigenous names as the equivalent of a single Introduced one.

   As well as the frequent occurrence of different Indigenous names applying to different parts of what is in the European perspective a single feature (Clark, 2007), it is known from areas of continuing traditional Aboriginal culture that a significant feature may have different names among different language groups – Hercus and Simpson (2002: 18) cite among other examples the semantiacally equivalent Warlpiri and Warumungu doublet *Yankirri-kirlangu* vs *Karnanganja-kari*. Although it is generally recognised that one group had the primary claim to 'speak for' the country in which the feature is located, this knowledge may be lost in the case of languages no longer fully spoken. The possibility of multiple rather than dual naming is recognised in the CGNA guidelines (2001a: Clause 4.11), but has not yet been taken up by any jurisdiction.

   An important question that is likely to be raised at an early stage of any dual naming proposal is which of the two names or parts of the name is to be considered the primary one. This question is answered in different ways in different jurisdictions. In the Northern Territory the order in which the parts of the name is gazetted is determined by the Place Names Committee, and may be changed over the course of time, as described above. In South Australia, the policy is that the primary name is the one more likely to be used by the local community: in the remote Flinders Ranges with an almost exclusively Aboriginal population, it is the Indigenous name; in Adelaide it is at the present time the Introduced name. In NSW the intention is that neither of the names is primary – they are gazetted separately as official names and have equal status; but this has caused some difficulties, discussed below. Victoria applies the interesting criterion that

the name with better documentary support is to be considered primary (Department of Sustainability and Environment, 2004):

> Where the European name has little or no associated information, but had been recorded on maps for a considerable time, and the origin and meaning of the Indigenous name are well documented, the Indigenous name should take precedence over the European name (appearing as the primary name on official maps).

> In cases where the Indigenous name has little or no detail of origin or meaning, the European names should remain as the primary name.

It is notable that the New Zealand Geographic Board/Ngā Pou Taunaha o Aotearoa takes the view that traditional Māori names, as having been in prior use, are generally to be regarded as primary, although each case is considered on its merits.

Related to the question of primacy is the practical question of the depiction of dual names on cartographic products. As discussed above, the use of parentheses has not been well received, as it is felt to give insufficient recognition to the name so treated. Also, this is the traditional cartographic way of depicting exonyms, that is placenames used in the area for which the map is produced, but not by the local people, as for example *Firenze (Florence)* or *Krung Thep (Bangkok)*. In NSW it was initially planned that when both names were used side by side (in either order) separated by a solidus, the Indigenous name would appear in italics, but this is problematic as the use of italics is also a cartographic convention for the labelling of water bodies. Probably there is no need for the two names to be typographically distinguished. There is also the problem of fitting both names into the limited space of a map.

Replacement of offensive names

The third possibility for increasing the representation of Indigenous placenames within the Introduced system is in association with the replacement of names offensive to Aboriginal people. In such cases the replacement name need not necessarily be of Indigenous origin, although that would usually be the first choice. In this respect the procedure is similar to that involved in proposing a new name for an unnamed feature, with the difference that the existing name will first be discontinued. The discontinuance of names in widespread and/or long-standing use will not be taken lightly, and the views of all members of the community, Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal, must be taken into consideration.

The main category of offensive names is those containing offensive lexical items such as *gin* (a now derogatory term for an Aboriginal woman, from Dharug *diyin* 'woman') or *nigger*. Each such name is considered on an individual basis and there must be a proposal for a specific replacement name. Kostanski and Clark (2007) describe how attempts to rename *Mount Niggerhead*, the *Niggerhead Range* and *Niggerhead Creek* in Victoria have so far failed through lack of consensus within the Aboriginal community on suitable alternative names. In the United States there are parallel moves to replace names containing the element *squaw* (and to a lesser extent *papoose*); debate there has been inflamed through the widespread propagation of the notion that the word *squaw* derives from a

Mohawk term for the female genitals, although in fact it clearly (Bright, 2000) comes from the Algonquian language family and means simply 'woman'.

A second category of names that are offensive to some Aboriginal people is 'incident' names commemorating murders or massacres of their forebears, such as *Convincing Ground* in Victoria or *Red Rock* near Coffs Harbour in NSW; the latter, although ostensibly an innocuous descriptive name, is remembered in oral history as being an allusion to the spilling of blood in a genocidal incident. As an extension of this principle, some Aboriginal groups wish to replace 'possessive' placenames that commemorate early settlers known to have been involved in murderous attacks on the Indigenous population, such as *Coutts Crossing* near Grafton in NSW (commemorating Thomas Coutts, who caused some 20 deaths by adding arsenic to flour that he left to be stolen shortly after taking up a holding in 1840), and *Pagans Flat* near Tabulam in the same state (preserving the name of a settler who was killed in 1841 during armed conflict with the Aboriginal population). Others, both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal, are opposed to such moves as representing the whitewashing of history. Similar debates have also taken place in the United States, for example in relation to *Hangman Creek* in the state of Washington, so named after the treacherous hanging on the orders of Colonel George Wright of 16 Palouse Indians attending negotiations for a treaty.

Because of the difficulties in achieving consensus, first on the desirability of replacing the existing official name and secondly on an appropriate alternative, no name changes of this type have yet taken place.

Another possible type of remedial action sometimes urged is correcting the form of names of Indigenous origin that have been mutilated when adopted as official placenames. This has been done in northern South Australia for some Pitjantjatjara and Yankunytjatjara names, and is likely also to happen with some Ngarrindjeri names in the near future. In the Northern Territory the Aboriginal township of Wave Hill was in 1976 given the traditional name *Kalkaringi*, but in 1985 a review of the spelling by community elders led to the name being amended to *Kalkarindji* in order to encourage a more accurate pronunciation. In the more densely settled areas of Australia, where Australian English is the predominant language, such moves are unlikely in the short term, since the use of the authentic forms as dual names alongside the altered ones would be too confusing, and a proposal to officially change the spelling probably too confronting. The official change in name of the prominent NSW feature *Mount Kosciuszko* (until 1997 *Mount Kosciusko*) to match the surname of the Polish patriot Tadeusz Kosciuszko (after whom it was named in 1840 by explorer Paul Strzelecki, who himself used the incorrect spelling) was extremely controversial and has had no effect on the vernacular pronunciation.

Wider Issues

In addition to the issues canvassed above that relate specifically to choices to be made in increasing the proportion of placenames of Indigenous origin within the official placenames system, there are several wider issues relating to researching Aboriginal languages (whether or not they are still fully spoken), to disseminating the results of that research, and to increasing the use of elements from Aboriginal languages in public arenas.

At the heart of these issues lies a fundamental difference between Indigenous and European attitudes to access to knowledge. In European society knowledge is regarded as being 'out there', available for acquisition by all; in Aboriginal society the receipt of knowledge from those with prior access to it is a privilege and not a right. This is evident in social norms such as the avoidance of direct questions regarding even everyday matters, and applies particularly in the areas to which placenames are linked: placenames are part of the Law assigned by Dreamings (McConvell, 2002: 52) and as such are not to be spoken of freely. Knowledge is restricted and controlled: different members of the group have access to different levels of understanding, depending on factors such as gender, age, expertise and inherited or acquired affiliation. Within the network of placenames there may be some that are 'open' or publicly available and others that are 'closed' (secret/sacred). Bowern (2007) notes that some Bardi localities associated with initiation rituals and with key events in the lives of culture heroes have gender-restricted names. Bradley (2007) explains that while open placenames may be used in everyday conversations about location and movement, any direct and detailed reference to them involves a certain etiquette in which junior speakers must seek the agreement of Elders; there is a difference between knowing a placename and actually 'calling' it – the act of speaking the name that synchronically brings it into being.

In addition to the complexities of differential access to knowledge within Aboriginal society, other issues arise when elements of Indigenous languages are to be used outside those communities. These issues revolve around the concepts of cultural and intellectual property rights. In European society language is not owned: the names of people and places are considered to be facts, and ordinary words and names cannot be copyrighted. In Aboriginal society, on the other hand, the people affiliated with a language do indeed 'own' it, although the connotations are rather different to those familiar to Europeans. Broadly, in Indigenous understanding, a particular 'country' (traditional land) has a certain language, and in turn that language has a certain group of people who are responsible for it, as custodians or keepers rather than owners. Part of the responsibility of that custodianship lies in preventing the language from being used in inappropriate or disrespectful ways. This has important implications for language revival and language planning, and particularly in relation to registering traditional or new names of Indigenous origin within the official placenames system, since once a placename is gazetted as official, it becomes public property and no longer under the care and control of its custodians. For example, a non-Aboriginal business entity associated with the place could use the name as a tradename without the permission of the relevant Indigenous group.

A final thorny issue involved in moves to increase the visibility of Indigenous placenames lies in the links between knowledge of placenames and land rights, especially in relation to current native title claims. Native title is the legal concept that Indigenous groups may hold certain rights (not rights of ownership but of access and use) over land by virtue of their prior occupation of it. However, according to current legal interpretation, if a group has lost connection with the land as defined by traditional law and customs then the rights are irredeemably lost. The questions of how substantial the connection must be and

whether a spiritual connection can be maintained in the absence of physical contact are matters of contention. Many Indigenous groups have been separated from their country either forcibly or under coercion, but claim to maintain a spiritual connection, so possibly retaining the right to native title. In this context, knowledge of traditional placenames is one way of demonstrating a continuing connection to country in the face of physical separation. The country that each group 'owns', or is the custodian of, is determined by the Dreaming stories that relate the travels of the Ancestors who formed the land and caused it to bear names; to establish a connection with the land, a group or individual must know the songs, stories and placenames of the relevant Dreaming. Retaining and transmitting such knowledge is difficult in the absence of continual reinforcement through regular access to the country in the company of others from the same cultural group. In the context of rival, competing claims to country, knowledge of placenames may be an important factor in that those who know more placenames may be argued to have a closer connection with the land, and so groups and individuals may not be willing to share or reveal their knowledge except under conditions of complete confidentiality.

Acknowledgements

Correspondence

Any correspondence should be directed to Flavia Hodges, 61 Lee Street, Maitland, NSW 2320, Australia (fhodges@bigpond.net.au).

Notes

1. The Dreaming is the essential mythology of Aboriginal culture, which underpins the whole of traditional relations between the land and all (not merely humans) who inhabit it. Central to the Dreaming are stories describing the activities of spirit figures who are both ancestral to present species and living presences in the landscape. To those who believe in it, the Dreaming is not shadowy or vague, but more real than the phenomenal world that it sustains. The concept is also known in English as the Dreamtime (now deprecated since its stories are imminent in the eternal present rather than being creation myths) and by words taken from specific Aboriginal languages such as Alcheringa (from Arrernte *altyerre*) and Tjukurrpa (from the Western Desert language). The English word Dreaming can also be used to refer to a particular story or to one of the central figures within it.

2. The British explorer James Cook (1728–1779) led the first documented European expedition to reach the eastern coast of Australia and lay claim to the continent. Between April and August 1770 his ship the *Endeavour* sailed northwards from the headland (in Victoria, although its precise identification is disputed) named by Cook as *Point Hicks* after the first member of his party to sight land, past what is now New South Wales and Queensland, to the Torres Strait island of Bedanug, named by Cook as *Possession Island* in commemoration of his territorial claim on behalf of King George III.

3. The Frenchman Nicholas-Thomas Baudin (1754–1803) led an expedition, carried by the *Géographe* and the *Naturaliste*, to chart the coast in more detail and document the flora and fauna of the new land. In April 1802 his expedition met with that of the British explorer Matthew Flinders (1774–1814) at the place in South Australia named by Flinders as *Encounter Bay* in commemoration of the event, which completed the charting of the Australian coastline.

4. The Dutchman Willem Janszoon (*c*. 1570–1630) led the first documented European expedition to reach Australia, although he made no territorial claim. In March 1606 his ship the *Duyfken* made landfall on the west coast of the continent's north-eastern-most peninsula; and some three hundred kilometres of coastline were charted before Janszoon decided to 'turn about' because of the inhospitable nature of both the terrain and the inhabitants.

5. In Australian colonial history, squatting refers to the unofficial occupation of Crown land not yet officially released for settlement. Although illegal, the practice was wide-spread, and by the middle of the 19th century increasingly regularised by the granting of leases to pioneers already established as *de facto* landholders.

6. The *Sydney Gazette and New South Wales Advertiser* (now *NSW Government Gazette*) began in 1803; the *Hobart Town Gazette* (now *Tasmanian Government Gazette*) in 1816; the *South Australian Gazette and Colonial Register* (now *South Australian Government Gazette*) and *Western Australian Government Gazette* (now *Government Gazette of Western Australia*) in 1836; the *Port Phillip Government Gazette* (now *Victoria Government Gazette*) in 1842; the *Queensland Government Gazette* in 1859. The *North Australian and Northern Territory Government Gazette* began in 1883, was incorporated into the *Northern Territory Times* in 1890, resumed separate publication in 1916, and since 1977 has been named the *Northern Territory of Australia Government Gazette*. The *Australian Capital Territory Gazette* began in May 1989; before self-government in that year notices requiring gazettal were published in the *Commonwealth of Australia Gazette*.

7. The Commonwealth of Australia was formed of a federation of the six self-governing states – New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria, Tasmania, South Australia and Western Australia – in 1901. Two territories – the Northern Territory and the Australian Capital Territory – were carved out from the states in 1911. [Never under-estimate how much overseas readers don't know about Australia! This endnote should clarify references to the various states and territories in the text.]

8. The first systematic approach to the standardisation of Australian placenames was taken with the establishment of a Nomenclature Committee in South Australia in 1916. Although its initial role was to oversee the alteration of names of German origin during World War I, it remained as a functional body without any legislative base until 1969, when a *Geographical Names Act* was passed, establishing the South Australian Geographical Names Board (which became the Geographical Names Advisory Committee in 1991). A Nomenclature Advisory Committee (later Geographic Names Committee) was established in Western Australia in 1936 to assist the state Minister for Lands. The Northern Territory published *Nomenclature (Public Places) Ordinances in* 1945 and 1966, and after the granting of responsible government in 1978 established a Place Names Committee by a *Place Names Act* in 1983, revised in 2004. The Nomenclature Board of Tasmania was established in 1953 by amendment to the *Survey Co-ordination Act 1944*. A Place Names Board was established for Queensland by the *Place Names Act* of 1958 and disbanded by a revised Act in 1988; a third Act of 1994 is supplemented by a 1995 regulation. The Geographical Names Board of New

South Wales was established by the *Geographical Names Act* of 1966, currently under review. Placenaming in the Australian Capital Territory is regulated by the *Public Place Names Act* of 1989. Placenaming in Victoria was regulated by the *Survey Coordination Act 1958* and *Local Government Act 1989* before the passing of a specific *Geographic Place Names Act 1998*.

References

Amery, R. and Williams, G.Y. (2002) Reclaiming through renaming: The reinstatement of Kaurna toponyms in Adelaide and the Adelaide Plains. In L. Hercus, F. Hodges and J. Simpson (eds) *The Land is a Map: Placenames of Indigenous Origin in Australia* (pp. 255–276). Canberra: Pandanus Books.

Appleton, R. and Appleton, B. (1992) *The Cambridge Dictionary of Australian Places*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Ash, A., Giacon, J. and Lissarague, A. (2003) *Gamilaraay Yuwaalaraay Wuwaalayaay Dictionary*. Alice Springs: IAD Press.

Attenbrow, V. (2007) Aboriginal placenames around Port Jackson and Botany Bay, New South Wales, Australia: Sources and uncertainties. In H. Koch and L. Hercus (eds) *Aboriginal Placenames Old and New* [working title] (Aboriginal History Monographs). Canberra: ANU e-Press.

Baker, B. (2002) 'I'm going to where-her-brisket-is': Placenames in the Roper. In L. Hercus, F. Hodges and J. Simpson (eds) *The Land is a Map: Placenames of Indigenous Origin in Australia* (pp. 103–129). Canberra: Pandanus Books.

Bonyhady, T. (2002) So much for a name. In T. Bonyhady and T. Grffiths (eds) *Words for Country: Landscape and Language in Australia* (pp. 141–161). Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.

Bowern, C. (2007) Naming Bardi places. In H. Koch and L. Hercus (eds) *Aboriginal Placenames Old and New* [working title] (Aboriginal History Monographs). Canberra: ANU e-Press.

Bradley, J.J. (2007) What's inside a placename: History and memory at Manakurra. In H. Koch and L. Hercus (eds) *Aboriginal Placenames Old and New* [working title] (Aboriginal History Monographs). Canberra: ANU e-Press.

Bright, W. (2000) The sociolinguistics of the 's-word': *Squaw* in American placenames. *Names* 48, 207–216.

Clark, I. (2007) Reconstruction of Aboriginal microtoponymy in western Victoria: Case studies from Tower Hill and the Hopkins River. In H. Koch and L. Hercus (eds) *Aboriginal Placenames Old and New* [working title] (Aboriginal History Monographs). Canberra: ANU e-Press.

Clark, I. and Heydon, T. (2002) *Dictionary of Aboriginal Placenames of Victoria*. Melbourne: VACL.

Committee for Geographical Names in Australasia (CGNA) (2001a) *Guidelines for the Consistent Use of Place Names*. On WWW at http://icsm.gov.au/icsm/cgna/consistent_pnames.pdf. Accessed 3.5.07.

Committee for Geographical Names in Australasia (CGNA) (2001b) *Policy Guidelines for the Recording and Use of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Place Names*. On WWW at http://icsm.gov.au/icsm/cgna/aboriginal_names.pdf. Accessed 3.5.07.

Department of the Environment, Land and Planning, ACT (1992) *Canberra's Suburb and Street Names: Origins and Meanings*. Canberra: ACT Government Printer.

Department of Land Information, Western Australia (n.d.) *History of Country Town Names*. On WWW at http://www.landgate.wa.gov.au/corporate.nsf/web/History+of+Country+Town+Names. Accessed 5.10.06.

Department of Sustainability and Environment, Victoria (2004) *Guidelines for Geographic Names in Victoria, October 2004*. On WWW at http://www.land.vic.gov.au/land/lcnlc2.nsf/LinkView/4720A88DD9B07E3B4A256B510002C9F1960B73A E58FA5B3BC A256E4C00187954. Accessed 3.5.07.

Geoscience Australia (2005) *National Gazetteer of Australia*. On WWW at http://www.ga.gov.au/map/names/. Accessed 3.5.07.

Hercus, L., Hodges, F. and Simpson, J. (eds) (2002) *The Land is a Map: Placenames of Indigenous Origin in Australia*. Canberra: Pandanus Books.

Hercus, L. and Simpson, J. (2002) Indigenous placenames: An introduction. In L. Hercus, F. Hodges and J. Simpson (eds) *The Land is a Map: Placenames of Indigenous Origin in Australia* (pp. 1–23). Canberra: Pandanus Books.

Jackson-Nakano, A. (2005) *Ngambri Ancestral Names for Geographical Places and Features in the Australian Capital Territory and Surrounds*. Canberra: ACT Government Printer.

Koch, H. and Hercus, L. (eds) (2007) *Aboriginal Placenames Old and New* [working title] (Aboriginal History Monographs). Canberra: ANU e-Press.

Kostanski, L. and Clark, I.D. (2007) Reviving old Indigenous names for new purposes. In H. Koch and L. Hercus (eds) *Aboriginal Placenames Old and New* [working title] (Aboriginal History Monographs). Canberra: ANU e-Press.

Lang, J.D. (1873) 'Colonial Nomenclature'. In *Poems Sacred and Secular* (pp. 153–156). Sydney: William Maddock.

Manning, G.H. (1990) *Manning's Place Names of South Australia*. Adelaide: privately published.

McConvell, P. (2002) Changing places: European and Aboriginal styles. In L. Hercus, F. Hodges and J. Simpson (eds) *The Land is a Map: Placenames of Indigenous Origin in Australia* (pp. 51–61). Canberra: Pandanus Books.

Mitchell, T.L. (1849) *Out Letters Surveyor General NSW*. State Library of New South Wales Film Z2828.

Plomley, N.J.B. (1976) *A Word List of the Tasmanian Aboriginal Languages*. Launceston: Tasmanian Government Printer.

Pollon, F. (1988) *The Book of Sydney Suburbs*. Sydney: Angus & Robertson.

Reed, A.W. (1967) *Aboriginal Place Names*. Sydney: A.H & A.W. Reed.

Reid, N. (2002) Creating Aboriginal placenames: Applied philology in Armidale City. In L. Hercus, F. Hodges and J. Simpson (eds) *The Land is a Map: Placenames of Indigenous Origin in Australia* (pp. 241–254). Canberra: Pandanus Books.

Schebeck, B. (2002) Some remarks on placenames in the Flinders. In L. Hercus, F. Hodges and J. Simpson (eds) *The Land is a Map: Placenames of Indigenous Origin in Australia* (pp. 141–153). Canberra: Pandanus Books.

Troy, J. and Walsh, M. (2007) Reinstating Aboriginal placenames around Port Jackson and Botany Bay. In H. Koch and L. Hercus (eds) *Aboriginal Placenames Old and New* [working title] (Aboriginal History Monographs). Canberra: ANU e-Press.

Wilkins, D.P. (2002) The concept of place among the Arrernte. In L. Hercus, F. Hodges and J. Simpson (eds) *The Land is a Map: Placenames of Indigenous Origin in Australia* (pp. 1–23). Canberra: Pandanus Books.

Wilkinson, M., Marika, R. and Williams, N.M. (2007) This place already has a name. In H. Koch and L. Hercus (eds) *Aboriginal Placenames Old and New* [working title] (Aboriginal History Monographs). Canberra: ANU e-Press.

Windsor, G. (2007) The recognition of Aboriginal Place Names in New South Wales. In H. Koch and L. Hercus (eds) *Aboriginal Placenames Old and New* [working title] (Aboriginal History Monographs). Canberra: ANU e-Press.

The Author

Flavia Hodges was Director of the Asia-Pacific Institute for Toponymy at Macquarie University, Sydney from its foundation in 2002 until its dissolution through the cessation of funding at the end of 2006. She was previously (1998–2001) Research Fellow on the Australian National Placenames Survey, which continues under the auspices of the voluntary association Placenames Australia. She has also published reference works on the origins of European surnames and given names, and has extensive experience in the worlds of lexicography (including working on *The Macquarie Dictionary*, Australia's national dictionary, and its derivatives) and language publishing (including as senior commissioning editor for Periplus Editions' Asian language learning materials).