

4 CHANGING PLACES: EUROPEAN AND ABORIGINAL STYLES

Patrick McConvell

1 ENGLISH PLACENAMES: TAKING THE NAME OF YOUR HOME WITH YOU WHEN YOU MOVE

Gurindji people had special cause to note European-Australians' fondness for taking placenames with them when they moved, because this is what happened to the name of the most important cattle station in the region, where most Gurindji people came to live — Wave Hill. Buchanan (1935:71) records why Sam 'Greenhide' Croker gave this name to the camp the pioneer pastoralists made on the Victoria River in 1883:

Greenhide Sam, struck by the sharp undulations of the plateau, suggested the name of Wave Hill, by which it has been known ever since ...

The land formation is clearly visible from the bridge over the Victoria River to this day; the wave-like shapes along the hills beside the river are very striking and possibly unique in the region. This area is called Lipananyku and Karungkarni by the Gurindji after the two large waterholes in the Victoria River.

The first Wave Hill station was established a kilometre or so from there. A police station, and later a 'welfare' settlement, were established close to the station homestead also bearing the name Wave Hill until the 1970s. Gurindji found this transfer of the name Wave Hill relatively understandable, as the places so named were all within the same general area.

Much more puzzling to them though were the subsequent transfers of the name Wave Hill to new station homesteads quite far away from the original location. First, following the 1924 flood which washed away the original station at Malalyi-malalyi, Wave Hill was moved to higher ground to a new site further from the river at *Jinparrak*, which was occupied until after the 1966 strike at Wave Hill, when the station — with its name 'Wave Hill' — was moved even further away from the river to the 'new station' at *Jamanku*, some 30 kilometres from the original 'Wave Hill' and nowhere near any undulating hills. This was originally the Number One stockcamp site of Wave Hill, and was generally known as 'Number One' by Aboriginal people in the 1970s to 1980s.

For the Gurindji this behaviour with placenames is emblematic of a deep difference between Europeans and Aborigines. A sentiment often voiced by Aboriginal people is that Whitefellas are always changing their law, whereas Blackfella law stays the same. For

L. Hercus, F. Hodges and J. Simpson, eds, *The Land is a Map: placenames of Indigenous origin in Australia*, 50–61.

Canberra: Pandanus Books in association with Pacific Linguistics, 2002.

© Patrick McConvell

Gurindji the difference in treatment of placenames is an aspect of this difference. Since placenames are part of the Law (*yumi*) assigned by Dreamings (*mangaya, puwarraj*) to a specific place, mere human beings cannot lift those names up and drop them in other places. Of course, naming is not part of the important ‘law’ of Whitefellas in the same way; it is considered to be of symbolic significance, which often means of lesser importance.

In the light of this behaviour, it seems paradoxical to Gurindji that the Aboriginal people have been labelled ‘nomadic’ and their relationships to place seen as variable and transient. Rather they see European-Australians as the true nomads who shift from place to place taking names with them.

While many Gurindji may not be aware of this, the custom of transporting names to new locations and particularly ‘old country’ names to the colonies is an established part of European culture.

2 TRANSPORTING ABORIGINAL NAMES IN THE EUROPEAN DOMAIN

2.1 New centres of influence: the airstrip

As Europeans appropriate Aboriginal placenames as their own, or acquire power and influence over how such names are used in areas where Aboriginal people still use their own system, the tendency for such names to be shifted from place to place also increases.

The changing names in the Wave Hill area provide further examples of this. During the 1970s there was a move to ‘Aboriginalise’ the names of former missions and welfare settlements. In the case of Wave Hill Settlement this came about at the same time as the area was actually de-Aboriginalised. In 1974 an area was cut out from the Daguragu pastoral lease to form an open township which came to be dominated by White commercial interests. This move, of which the local Gurindji people were not aware at the time, also prevented this area from being claimed under the Land Rights Act (1976) when the rest of Daguragu was successfully claimed in 1981.

For a few years the ‘township’ was known as Libanangu which was as close as people who wrote the name could get to the traditional name of the Wave Hill area — Lipananyku. However, following the upgrading of the airstrip, which was between Libanangu and Daguragu, it was decided (by whom is not clear) that the airstrip should have a new name; and soon after the township itself was assigned that name (without consultation with Aboriginal people as far as I know). The airstrip was named Kalkurung but variations, with a *-ji* ending unknown among the Gurindji, also circulated at the time. The town is now known as either Kalkaringi or (since 1986, officially) Kalkarindji. This was named after the waterhole on Wattie Creek downstream from Daguragu which was closest to the airstrip — Kalkarriny. As usual White people had problems with the palatal nasal ‘ny’ at the end of the word. Somebody heard it as ng and transcribed it like that (the spelling Kalkaring can also be found ephemerally at that time); someone else I think must have had an inkling of the actual sound and known that this was transcribed *-nj* by some earlier linguists: hence Kalkarinj. I think people then pronounced it ‘Kalkarindge’. What happened next was that someone added a vowel *-i* to this word to make it easier on the tongue. I assume this was an English-speaking European, although it may have been done with the cooperation of Warlpiri residents of the township, whose language does not favour consonant-final words (although adding *-u*, *-pa* or *-ku* is their usual way of dealing with this, not adding *-ji*).

No Gurindji person would have dreamed of applying the name Kalkarriny to Lipananyku, the township, since they are quite different places on different rivers. The central meaning of many Gurindji names is a waterhole, and while that name can be and often is applied to a small creek running into a main river at the waterhole, applying the same name to waterholes on different creeks because they are relatively close to each other seems impossible. However, it is worth drawing a distinction between the process involved here and the earlier one of transferring the name Wave Hill to different places as people moved. The extension of Kalkarriny, the airstrip (or airport, as it was then more grandly called by some), to the township is one of extending a major name of a place to satellite places in its vicinity. This is not completely alien to the Aboriginal practice, as will be discussed below, although basic rules were broken, as noted above. What is alien is the principles that decide how such extensions are made: in this case from an airstrip to a town — indeed a town that has been established in one form or another for more than one hundred years under the name Wave Hill, and presumably for at least hundreds under the name Lipananyku. Actually extension of a name of an airstrip to a town (already named) is fairly strange even in European-Australian terms. Imagine renaming Sydney Mascot.

2.2 The influence of historical Aboriginal immigrants in shifting names

The establishment of Hooker Creek settlement, later called Lajamanu, provides another example of transfer of names from one place to another, at least according to Gurindji and Wanyjirra people. The settlement was established primarily because Vestey's cattle stations wanted a labour pool (Berndt & Berndt 1987; McConvell 1989). The process of setting up the settlement seems to have been a comedy of errors, from its initial siting in a place different from that surveyed, to the several attempts to bring reluctant Warlpiri there from the southern Tanami to a place on Gurindji/Kartangaruru land, followed by the departure of many of them back to their own country. When the fashion of naming settlements with versions of Aboriginal names came into vogue in the late 1970s, the name Lajamanu was provided by the Warlpiri residents. This is the Warlpiri version of the name Lajamarn, which actually refers to a place 30–40 kilometres west of where the settlement was. The traditional owners and custodians of sites associated with the *Wampana* (hare wallaby) Dreaming that passes through Lajamarn were disgruntled that the name had been appropriated and misapplied. They regarded this as yet another slight on them by the Warlpiri and Europeans, in collusion, in a long line beginning with their failure to consult with them over the siting of the settlement. This then is yet another type of transfer of place by either a mistake or perhaps manipulation by Aborigines from elsewhere with the help of European authorities, who were either unaware of the other story about the name, or ignored it.

2.3 Substituting the name of a planned destination for the eventual site in a move

Finally in this set of examples from the Victoria River District, there is the case of Yarralin. When the Aboriginal people on Victoria River Downs (VRD) station went on strike in 1972, following the example of the Wave Hill strikers, they went to live at Daguragu. During their exile at Daguragu they made plans to return to an area they could use for living not too far from the station, again on the pattern of the establishment of Daguragu by the Wave Hill strikers (Rose 1991:229–30; 1992:22). The place they chose was the waterhole Yarraliny on

the Wickham River. However, the strikers were being assisted by Jack Doolan, then a Department of Aboriginal Affairs officer, who came up with a different plan (perhaps after talking to the VRD management) of occupying the old Gordon Creek homestead area, known as '6-mile', called *Wangkurlarni*. Doolan's account of this (1977:111) suppresses the disagreement over the site, which was quite acrimonious at the time, and claims that the Aboriginal people call Gordon Creek, Yarralin. This is what happened when they did move back to '6-mile' in 1973: it was officially called Yarralin, but it took many people who knew better many years to use that name, and some never did. This name transfer was a result of a political 'fudging' process in which the name of an original intended goal of a move is substituted for the actual goal — like calling the Caribbean the West Indies. Here European intervention and motives seem to be paramount, but most of the Aboriginal people involved played along, probably judging in this case that getting some land back was more important than arguing over names. An additional factor could be that the real 'Yarraliny' was only 4–5 kilometres away from the 'new' Yarralin and on the same river, thus one could be considered to be within the sphere of influence of the other.

2.4 Summary

The survey above could be continued, but it is sufficient to show, I think, that Aboriginal placenames assigned by official 'Whitefella' processes are much more likely to be the wrong names according to Aboriginal law than the right ones. A variety of motivations including some Aboriginal interventions and plain mistake lie behind these results, but a key issue is the Whitefella's conviction that humans can arbitrarily alter names, a belief vigorously denied by most Aboriginal people.

3 EXTENSION AND CHANGE OF PLACENAMES BY ABORIGINAL PEOPLE

This is not to say that Aboriginal people themselves do not change or shift placenames. Changing of placenames becomes necessary because of death taboo, for instance, where a name is similar to that of a recently dead person. The focus in this paper, however, is on taking the name of one place and applying it to another place.

My hypothesis here is that this arises overwhelmingly because of extension of one name, which is at the centre of a sphere of influence, to other places that are considered in some sense part of, or attached to, that sphere. This kind of extension of a 'big name' to a wider associated zone has been noted frequently in Aboriginal Australia, for example among the Yolngu of north-east Arnhem Land (Morphy 1984:26; Keen 1995:509). For various reasons the extensions might come to be considered more central than the original centre over time.

The 'sphere of influence' and 'centrality' within that sphere are social concepts rather than purely geographical, whether the change or extension is explicitly mediated through a social group associated with a place or not. The nature of such spheres is changing as the configurations of Aboriginal life change, but it is not clear that Aboriginal people are adopting European patterns of transporting names to any significant extent. Below we shall look at some patterns of extension of names to determine how far they fit with the hypothesis above.

3.1 'Big places' and waterholes as centres of spheres of influence

A common occurrence in Gurindji country is for the following group of places to have the same name:

- (a) a waterhole on a main creek or river;
- (b) a creek flowing into that waterhole or nearby;
- (c) a large hill near the waterhole;
- (d) the general area around the waterhole.

Such places may be called *ngurra jangkarni* which could be glossed 'important place', but also 'big camp' and the 'sphere of influence' around the place tended to be associated in people's minds with the immediate foraging range around a large camp. Thus groupings of people are associated with name extent.

The whole question of the size of the 'sphere of influence' around a place came to be hotly debated when sacred sites legislation and more particularly the NT Land Rights Act placed great legal weight on the existence of a 'site' on the land. The case of *Julama* was a test case which followed on the Daguragu land claim as a result of a repeat claim by the Gurindji (McConvell & Hagen 1981; Toohey 1982).

Justice Toohey (1982:22) had excluded a small area in the south-west of the claimed area on the grounds that it was part of a clan estate which was largely outside the claim and that there was not a named site within the area. It was successfully argued that the sphere of influence of named sites extended across the area in question, which was mainly part of a river bed. The Gurindji were bemused, some amused and some annoyed, about the apparent obtuseness of *kartiya* (White people) in not recognising something blindingly obvious to them, that this part of the river links to and is part of the same owned area as other parts where names are more centrally located. The word *ngurra* 'place' can be translated 'site', and can be used to mean a 'camp' in a specific and confined space, but also means a wider 'country'.

3.2 'Runs' and the influence of social groups on placename extension

There is variation in different parts of Australia as to whether local group countries or 'clan estates' have names. In the Victoria River District they generally do not, although the tendency for them to be named increases as one moves further north. Occasionally, however, a particular named feature so dominates a local group area that the two names are used virtually synonymously. This is most evident in the case of distinct named ranges of hills such as *Martpirilin* in southern Daguragu station, or *Yunurr* north-west of Mistake Creek.

Among the Gurindji and Malngin country the association between a person or group is marked by linguistic forms. The suffix *-ngarna* has the meaning 'denizen, inhabitant of' but in conjunction with such country names it designates a more specific type of relationship in Aboriginal law (*yumi*).

In all cases I know of such a name being generally recognised, the person is both a traditional owner by descent and a person who lived most of their life in the area and/or consistently camped and foraged there.

Martpirilin-ngarna and *Yunurr-ngarna*, for instance, were interpreted as meaning particular individuals, traditional owners who had also spent a lot of time in the area concerned. In the

latter case, when a man formerly known as *Yunurrngarna* died, an older woman, also a traditional owner who knew the area well, came to be called by this name.

The suffix *-mawu* is similarly used with areal placenames to signify a group of people associated with the area, for example *Marpirlin-mawu*, *Yunurr-mawu*. Once again traditional ownership (through descent) is often implied but long-term residence is probably the most important factor.

Where there is no dominant named feature, in the sense of a large range of hills occupying most of the area or a creek running right through it, a name of a single important site may come to stand for the whole area in a metonymic way, in expressions like the above. However, this usage does not generally extend to using such placenames alone to signify the whole area.

The use of terms derived from areal extensions to describe territories connected to groups of people opens up the possibility that the social group and its range are as significant as environmental features in determining the way a placename can be extended.

Similar patterns are found in wide areas of Australia. In a large area of eastern Queensland local groups are known by a term which has a suffix *-barra*. Among the Girramay and Jirrbal, the group and the area are known by such a term. (In fact, the suffix is a regular productive one in this language meaning ‘connected with’ — although whether this indicates that this is the centre of diffusion of this suffix in its toponymic/ethnonymic sense is unsure.) The root to which this suffix is attached can be either of two types: (a) a dominant environmental type usually either a soil type or a dominant plant species; or (b) an important placename, for example:

(a)

Marrany-barra ‘Yellow stringy-bark — connected’

Jagurru-barra ‘Fan palm sp. — connected’

(b)

Yinyja-yinyja-barra ‘Mount Smoko — connected’

Girjal-barra ‘Mount Bronco (?) — connected’ (The English placename for the mountain where the Storm story originates is given in Dixon and Koch (1996:311) but I could not elicit or confirm this name among Girramay people or from maps.)

These terms are called ‘family runs’ in local Aboriginal English and are associated both with traditional ownership and residence in, and use of, the area. The names of type (b) may have a more restricted use applying to smaller groups and countries and a wider usage encompassing a number of smaller local groups and countries which may have their own *-barra* names. The important factor in whether this two-tier extension of the placename is possible seems to be the relationship between the groups involved: if they are considered to be part of a larger whole then the placename of one can achieve broader application.

3.3 Innovations in names and apparent shift

The above cases of application of extension of placenames to wider areas on the basis of the range of connected social groups do not constitute cases of actual shift of names from one place or another. However, it is possible that an appearance of such a shift might be brought

about if, after an extension of a name, the original referent of the name were to be assigned a different name.

Innovation of placenames is not as common a feature of Australian Aboriginal culture as it is of other cultures around the world (cf. Basso 1997), although processes of discovering new signs of Dreaming action, which may lead to new placenames, have received some more attention recently (Povinelli 1993:149–150; Merlan 1998:216ff.). Most Australian Aboriginal people tend to deny that placenames are assigned by humans, but attribute them to the activities of the Dreamings. However, some names clearly have been changed in recent times: a few places take their name from where a person of that name was initiated in living memory; or from the special bereavement name of someone who died at a place.

Moreover some names are recent types of coinages which can be distinguished in their form from older placenames which are either unanalysable in terms of the present language or use archaic morphology. Among the Ngarinyman and Gurindji, the newer names by contrast tend to be of the types:

Plant species + jarung ‘having’ e.g. Jalwarr-jarung ‘Having fig trees’ or

Dreaming name + LOCATIVE e.g. Jantura-rla ‘Turkey –LOC’ ‘Turkey dreaming’

Contrast Dreaming + LOC + rni in older placenames

While it would be stated by local Aboriginal people that the Dreaming put the fig trees there, or the turkey had travelled that way, the placename itself may not be in the song for the place and there may not be such insistence that the name came from the ancient time. People regard such names as more descriptive of the dreaming action in the place than direct from the Dreaming’s voice, which is the case with many other placenames.

3.4 Repeated names in different countries

Another pattern which looks something like shifting or copying of names to new locations is the phenomenon of the same placenames being found in different countries. In some cases placenames associated with a particular Dreaming Story are repeated, in two or more local group countries, either along the same Dreaming Track, or where the same story is enacted at different places. This is not a question of humans taking the names to different places, but of the Dreamings repeating the same words and actions at different places in their travels, according to local people. Some of these examples may involve succession processes, whereby the stretch of the songline belonging to one group is extended using the reference point of the same placename.

3.5 Modern placename shift and new spheres of influence

As the conditions of Aboriginal life change it is inevitable that there will be change in what motivates the assignment and transfer of names. People do not tend (at least at present) to spend as much time hunting and gathering in inaccessible ranges of hills, but prefer to go where motor vehicles can take them. It is uncertain then if, for instance, anyone will merit the name *Yunurrngarna* or other similar epithets in future. There will be traditional owners, but not those who additionally spend a lot of time in the particular area they own, if it happens to be inaccessible by vehicle. It is possible, however, that the intensive foraging formerly needed

to validate such naming will be dropped as a requirement. If, for instance, a community is set up on the outskirts of these hills and referred to as *Yunurr*, the leading person in this community could be called *Yunurrngarna*, and the central reference of the name transferred to the settlement area, not the range.

This residential aspect of Aboriginal life has changed markedly over the last 30 years thanks to the ‘outstation’ or ‘homelands’ movement. The Gurindji and Malngin people, who spent time in their traditional country and were given names like *Yunurrngarna* as a result, lived most of the year on cattle stations in Aboriginal camps near the homesteads or stockcamps, and were able to live and forage on their country only by luck during stockwork or during the ‘walkabout’ stand-down in the Wet season (McConvell 1989). Other groups less involved in the pastoral industry, like the Warlpiri, were initially herded into large government settlements or missions, but in the 1970s these began to break up and people set up ‘outstations’ in more isolated areas.

Mary Laughren (pers. comm.) reports the following regarding the Warlpiri placename *Nyirrpi*:

When people moved out to Nyirrpi — a soakage on Waite Creek — in the 70s to form an outstation from Yuendumu they found that there wasn’t a sufficient amount of water there to warrant the building of a bore. For a while, when Nyirrpi soakage dried up they were camped around another soakage called Walyka (= cold to touch). Later when sufficient water was found and a bore installed on the banks of Waite Creek near yet another soakage called Jirtirl-parnta, people moved there for good and started calling it Nyirrpi — as this name had become that used by Whites and indeed others to refer to this group — ‘the Nyirrpi mob’. It is the gazetted name for the place and most young people probably do not know they are actually living at Jirtirlparnta, not the original Nyirrpi. For a while people used the term ‘New Nyirrpi’ but then dropped that modifier and it became Nyirrpi.

Nowadays Nyirrpi has many houses and other facilities and is ‘like Alice Springs’ according to residents, far removed from when I first saw it in 1975 — a couple of tin sheds with an uncertain water supply. See Walsh (this volume).

This is reminiscent of the case of Yarralin above, where the original proposed destination name was carried over to the actual site where people settled. However, while White involvement is evident in this case, the major factor appears to be the identification of the social group as the ‘Nyirrpi mob’ by other Aboriginal people as well as by Whites.

In this sense the transfer is perhaps parallel to the extension of a term for a central site to an area occupied by the group, as discussed above as an old traditional practice. The nature of the social group is naturally somewhat different as it is formed round a modern ‘outstation’ movement; but the processes and principles of the transfer of names, based on a group interest centring around a main place, seems to be at least as much due to Aboriginal tradition in this case as to European influence.

3.6 Naming after placenames

Identification of individual Aboriginal people with places, through both the places and people being named from the words of the Dreaming’s song, is a key part of Aboriginal culture in many regions. Within the Aboriginal domain in its modern manifestations, placenames also become the source of names for other things, such as buildings and institutions. In Darwin, for instance, Nungalinga College is named after the important Larrakia site Nungalinga ‘Old Man

Rock'. When I was at Strelley people named the community newspaper Mikurrunya after the nearby range of hills. In both these cases, however, the institution was only a short distance from the place that provided the name — maybe 3 kilometres in the case of Nungalinya; and about 5 kilometres in the case of the distance from Mikurrunya to the community and school. The institutions would fall within the same 'sphere of influence' geographically.

The process started by these developments can lead to a shift in the reference of a placename. Aboriginal people in Darwin are generally aware of the original meaning of Nungalinya, but the combination of the use of an English term for the original site and the application of the old term to a new location could easily lead to a change. If you asked most people in Darwin 'Where's Nungalinya?' they would direct you to the college.

4 IMPLICATIONS FOR HISTORY

I wrote about European-Australians' influence and interference in the question of where Aboriginal placenames were assigned at the start of this paper. These examples were drawn from places where Aboriginal people are in the majority and at least nominally could have wielded some power. In this area of the Northern Territory most of the Aboriginal names that eventually made it onto the Whitefella 'map' (albeit perhaps in the wrong places) could do so because of the increase in interest in applying Aboriginal names to Aboriginal communities in the 1970s. In fact in the VRD there are still very few Aboriginal placenames on the maps — nearly all of the names remain English, despite hundreds of Indigenous placenames being known throughout the region. When this region was settled, very few Indigenous placenames were used. There are therefore no examples of European settler treatment of Indigenous names in the area in the early days.

This is somewhat unlike a number of areas in southern Australia where there are many towns and other features with Aboriginal names. Those names were appropriated early on by European Australians and used by them as they wished, with little or perhaps no consultation with the Aboriginal people who remained in the areas. Given what we know of the European culture of placenames, it would seem likely that they would shift them from the original location to one more centred on European social groups and 'spheres of influence', and from then on from one homestead or township to another as they moved. Rob Amery has told me of a number of such examples in the Adelaide area, and it is likely that there are many others not so well documented. Such a history could well obscure the early Indigenous location of the place, but early maps and records might reveal at least a good part of the story. In some cases it may be that the existence of Aboriginal groups attached to named places and areas may have constrained such complete absorption of the names into the Whitefella placename culture, at least for a while.

CONCLUSIONS

This paper began by pointing out a great divergence between how Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people treat placenames, at least as perceived from the Aboriginal side. Whitefellas transfer names from one place to another as they move; such behaviour is 'not law' in the Aboriginal domain. Names belong to certain places forever and human beings who tamper with this law display a dangerous level of hubris.

However, at another level, the fundamental process involved in the extension of names from central locations to other parts of a zone shows a definite similarity across the two cultures. In both cases, the zone across which a name can be moved is defined by the social networks licensed, and the law and ideology that define human/land connections in the respective societies. As David Nash reminded me, the movement of the name 'Wave Hill' from one homestead location to another, while perplexing to local Aboriginal people, is perfectly in accord with the relevant zone in Anglo-Australian understanding and law — the cattle station 'property'. Indeed this maintenance of one name for the central point in such a property is a legal requirement, which would entail changes in numerous official records if altered.

On a larger scale, the transfer of names from one part of Australia to another, and even from Britain to Australia, is a symbolic gesture which makes a statement about continuity — even in a vague sense — of some (usually Anglo-Celtic) network of settlers.

Traditionally oriented Aboriginal people are following the same patterns of extension of naming, in a certain sense, but not the same types of zones or social networks. The ability to move is highly restricted by a set of geographical constraints and customary rules about zones. Now, however, all groups have become enmeshed in European-Australian social and legal structures and have been affected by the patterns of movement imposed on them. These include the concentration in settlements during most of the twentieth century, followed by the possibility of moving back to homelands in the last 30 years, an option which for most Indigenous people is highly restricted by the availability of land not already claimed by Whites, and other practical factors.

Contradictions will surely arise over naming practice due to these changes. Say an Indigenous group owns or leases a cattle station, for instance, and wishes to move its station headquarters to a different location (as was mooted for a while at Daguragu). Would the group have to retain the station name in defiance of Aboriginal tradition, or adopt the new (traditionally correct) name of the new location in defiance of European-Australian pastoral practice?

Other examples in this paper concern the fact that people ended up in different outstation locations from where they had originally planned, for a variety of practical, and often European-imposed, reasons. Here the application of the 'wrong' name to the eventual location is disputed by many, but usually eventually accepted by most. The reason is that the people setting up the outstation have become a socially defined group of 'settlers' by their focus on the place, even before they move. Those going to X are referred to as the 'X mob', and this naming of the social group is then transferred to their settling place, whether or not that was strictly X previously, as long as it is in some sense in the same zone as X. This process of a shift of placename from one location to another nearby, mediated by association of the name with a social group or band, is one that probably has parallels in traditional life, although the context has changed, and is still changing.

REFERENCES

- Basso, Keith, 1997, *Wisdom Sits in Places: landscape and language among the Western Apache*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Berndt, Ronald M., ed., 1977, *Aborigines and Change: Australia in '70's*. Canberra: AIAS.

- Berndt, Ronald M. and Catherine H. Berndt, 1987, *End of an Era: Aboriginal labour in the Northern Territory*. Canberra: AIAS.
- Buchanan, Gordon, 1935, *Packhorse and Waterhole*. Sydney: Angus and Robertson.
- Dixon, R.M.W. and Grace Koch, 1996, *Dyirbal Song Poetry: the oral literature of an Australian rainforest people*. St Lucia: University of Queensland Press.
- Doolan, Jack, 1977, Walk-off (and later return) of various Aboriginal groups from cattle stations: Victoria River District, Northern Territory. In Berndt, ed., 1977:114–123.
- Keen, Ian, 1995, *Knowledge and Secrecy in an Aboriginal Religion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- McConvell, Patrick, 1989, Workers and camp-mob: indigenous articulations in the cattle industry. Unpublished MS.
- McConvell, Patrick and Rod Hagen, 1981, *Land Claim by Gurindji to Daguragu Station: anthropological report*. Alice Springs: Central Land Council.
- Merlan, Francesca, 1998, *Caging the Rainbow: place, politics and Aborigines in a north Australian town*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Morphy, Howard, 1984, *Journey to the Crocodile's Nest*. Canberra: AIAS.
- Povinelli, Elizabeth R., 1993, *Labor's Lot: the power, history and culture of Aboriginal action*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rose, Deborah Bird, 1991, *Hidden Histories: black stories from Victoria River Downs, Humbert River and Wave Hill Stations*. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.
- 1992, *Dingo Makes Us Human: life and land in an Australian Aboriginal culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Toohey, J., 1982, *Land Claim by Gurindji to Daguragu Station*. Report by the Aboriginal Land Commissioner. Canberra: AGPS.