This paper explores the interface between language planning and language revival, based on current efforts to reclaim and reintroduce Kaurna, the language of the Adelaide Plains. This language probably had not been used on a daily basis for the best part of 130 years, until recent efforts in the 1990s to revive it. Using written records, efforts are now being made to piece the language together and to develop a written and spoken language that addresses contemporary needs. Micro language planning is salient in the revival context. Indeed, language planning in this context typically involves individual learners and users of the language, small groups and very small organisations. This paper extends the vision of language planners to include languages hitherto regarded as ‘dead’ or ‘extinct’. Language planning has as much to offer in these situations as it does for major world languages.

There is currently a worldwide linguistic and cultural renaissance among the world’s Indigenous people, especially evident in developed nations such as Australia. There are no signs of this revival abating. Sociolinguists and language planners need to be cognisant of this and be willing to share their skills and expertise with Indigenous communities.

The purpose of this paper is to explore the interface between language planning and language revival. The term ‘language revival’ is used here as a cover term for efforts to reintroduce a language to younger generations of speakers (revitalisation); efforts to reinvigorate and extend a significant body of language remaining in the community, but in the absence of fluent speakers (renewal); and efforts to relearn a language on the basis of historical records (reclamation) (see Amery (2000a: 17–18) and SSABSA (1996a)). I will base my exploration on the current efforts by a small group of Kaurna language enthusiasts to reclaim and reintroduce Kaurna, the language of the Adelaide Plains in South Australia. This language probably had not been used on a daily basis for the best part of 130 years, until recent efforts in the 1990s to revive it. It has been without fluent speakers for at least 70 years and maybe much longer. However, on the basis of historical materials compiled in the mid-19th century, efforts are now being made to piece the language together again and to develop a written and spoken language that addresses contemporary needs.

In the language reclamation context, where corpus planning is extensive and where the functional links between the language and its speech community are tenuous, issues of authenticity and integrity come to the fore. As Bentahila and Davies (1993) argue, language revival necessarily results in transformation of the language (see also Jolly’s (1995) discussion of this in the Australian context). Will the reclaimed language be accepted as an authentic form of the ancestral
language, or will it be viewed as some kind of fabrication or artificial construct? How will outsiders view the reclaimed language and attempts by members of that ethnic group to begin to speak it again? Why do people embark upon such a difficult undertaking when the majority language already serves communication needs? How does regaining a knowledge of one’s ancestral language serve to re-empower and reinvigorate the community and heal the wounds of the past?

In terms of reintroducing the language, this paper proposes a new approach, the Formulaic Method. Tried and true methods, such as immersion and *Kohanga Reo* ‘language nests’, are methods which work well in situations where numbers of fluent speakers remain. Hinton’s (1994) Master – Apprentice method is ideal for situations where even one fluent speaker still remains, but none of these methods will work, at least in the early stages, in situations where the language has ceased to be spoken.

Micro language planning is salient in the revival context. While there are macro language planning considerations that determine the context within which we must operate, our efforts are focused on the smallest units. Indeed language planning in this context typically involves individual learners and users of the language, small groups and very small organisations. This paper is interested in pushing the boundaries, to extend the vision of language planners to include languages hitherto regarded as ‘dead’ or ‘extinct’. Language planning has as much, if not more, to offer in these situations than it does for major world languages.

**Language Planning and Language Revival**

Measures taken to bring about the revival of languages have received little attention in the language planning literature. Language planning has, by and large, been the preserve of large languages, or at least working towards the creation of large languages. In fact, language planning measures have often been applied at the expense of smaller languages or even to actively suppress them and reduce linguistic diversity (Tollefson, 1991), though in recent years the discourse in language planning has begun to change with more attention directed towards language rights (see Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). Language planning, as a discipline, grew out of the needs of developing Third World nations who needed to make decisions about the choice of national and official languages in complex multilingual societies with a history of colonisation. Most often the language of the coloniser was chosen. If a non-metropolitan language was chosen, such as Indonesian or Swahili, then language modernisation became an immediate priority, so that it was able to take over the functions formerly enacted through the language of the colonisers.

There are instances where deliberate language planning measures have been applied in language revival situations. Measures were taken to strengthen the position of French in Quebec or Welsh in Wales, for instance. There is a substantial literature on the revival of Hebrew and I will spend some time outlining language planning measures in this and several other large-scale language revival efforts. But scant attention has been given to very small-scale ethnic languages and languages where there are few or no remaining speakers. It is
these small, marginalised languages that will be the main focus of discussion in this paper.

Nonetheless, the discipline of language planning as it is currently understood is useful in these scarcely recognised situations. Many of the issues faced by a language with only a handful of speakers, or no speakers, and perhaps several hundred adherents, are exactly the same as those faced by a potential national language having many millions of speakers. Choice of orthography, corpus elaboration and modernisation, etc., are issues faced by all languages, irrespective of how large or small they are. But when it comes to languages that are being revived on the basis of written historical materials in the absence of native speakers, an additional set of problems not considered in the language planning literature must be addressed.

**Hebrew**

Formal language planning measures have been a feature almost from the inception of efforts to revive Hebrew. The Hebrew Language Council was formed in Jerusalem in 1890 by Eliezar Ben Yehuda in accordance with his dream to revive Hebrew as the everyday medium of communication in the life of the Jewish community in Palestine. According to Fellman (1974: 95) ‘its main aim was “to render the Hebrew language fit for use as a spoken vernacular” by resurrecting and or creating missing terms for it, all the while seeking “to preserve the Oriental character of the language”’. This language council ceased functioning after only six months due to lack of funds and personnel. However, it was revived 14 years later by the Teachers Union who were seeking a uniform standardised language for use in schools. The Academy of the Hebrew Language was established in 1953, shortly after the state of Israel gained independence.

In the Hebrew case language modernisation needs were even more pressing than in the case of Bahasa Indonesia or Swahili. This was because Hebrew had ceased to be used as an everyday language for the best part of 1700 years. So reviving Hebrew in the state of Israel entailed intensive lexical elaboration. Terms simply did not exist for the majority of household items, foodstuffs, personal effects, etc. Fellman (1973: 37–8) points to the difficulties faced by Ben Yehuda, recognised as the ‘founder’ of Modern Hebrew, in his efforts to use the language within the home:

> At the time, Hebrew lacked precisely those vital terms necessary for the performance of daily household tasks. Devora [Ben Yehuda’s wife] did not speak Hebrew and even Ben Yehuda himself was unable to express himself fluently and with ease...When Ben Yehuda wanted Devora to pour him a cup of coffee with sugar, he was at a loss to communicate words such as ‘cup’, ‘saucer’, ‘pour’, ‘spoon’, and so on, and would say to his wife, in effect: ‘Take such and such, and do like so, and bring me this and this, and I will drink.’

In this respect the language planning needs of Hebrew were quite different from those languages chosen as national languages elsewhere, because not only was it necessary to introduce the language into official domains and into formal education, but it had to be reintroduced into the home and into everyday discourse.
Fellman (1974: 102; 1976: 6) maintains that Hebrew is unique in this respect. However, Kurna and numerous other Indigenous languages being revived also share these gaps.

While Hebrew lacks many common everyday words, it had a head start, relative to many other newly appointed official languages such as Swahili or Maori, in technical domains. Hebrew had been used in Europe, alongside Latin, as a language of the educated elite and professions such as medicine and law (Jones, 1983). Consequently, development of scientific, legal, economic and administrative terminology was perhaps easier than it is for an Indigenous Australian language still spoken fluently, where societal institutions are significantly different.

The Academy of the Hebrew Language regularly publishes dictionaries, lists of new terminologies, journals and promotional materials (Fellman, 1974: 99). It has been preoccupied with planning the lexical corpus and, having a relatively receptive audience and very supportive Government, has been quite successful in this, though little attention has been directed towards syntax and discourse features. There is an extensive literature in Hebrew on efforts to modernise the language. English language articles on the topic include Alloni-Fainberg (1974), Fellman (1973: 76), Kutscher (1982) and Saulson (1979).

In terms of status-planning considerations, Hebrew already occupied a significant position in the lives of most Jewish people. It was used as a liturgical language and was revered. Many Jewish people, especially males, had a good knowledge of Hebrew grammar, but they had great difficulty in speaking the language. However, if forced to, they could make themselves understood in Hebrew. When Jewish people returned to Palestine from many different parts of the world, Hebrew was often the only language they shared. So a Jew from Baghdad was able to make himself understood via Hebrew to a Jew from Leningrad or Madrid. When Eliezar Ben Yehuda tried to promote Hebrew as a spoken language for everyday purposes, however, there was a strong ‘cultural cringe’ since most people did not see that Hebrew was capable of these functions.

Maori

Maori language revival has embraced language planning measures in a concerted fashion. Under the Maori Language Act of 1987, Maori gained official language status in New Zealand (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997: 20). Thus the language now plays a significant role in the national life of New Zealand. This is evident in symbolic ways through its use in the Haka, a traditional Maori greeting ceremony that has now been adopted by New Zealand football teams as well as by the New Zealand military. Maori language is compulsory for all teacher trainees, both Maori and Pakeha (non-Maori). Many more Maori place names are now evident in signage than in the past and efforts are being made to educate the general public about Maori place names (see Davis et al., 1990).

Major advances have taken place within the education sector, such that large numbers of second-language speakers of Maori have been produced. The now well-known Kohanga Reo (‘language nests’) have produced large numbers of Maori-speaking pre-school children, but despite significant gains, the language still remains endangered.

Maori have used legal means, through the Treaty of Waitangi, to establish a
firm foothold for the Maori language. Formal language planning bodies have been established in New Zealand. The Maori Language Commission, established in 1987, has worked to consolidate language rights, promote the language, foster research and publish Maori resources. Despite significant gains and official language status, much opposition is still encountered from the general public, businesses and institutions. Karetu (1995: 210) discusses the case of a newspaper refusing to publish an advertisement written in Maori alone. The Maori Language Commission attempted to place a job advertisement for a bilingual, bicultural secretary and obviously wanted a competent Maori speaker who could read the advertisement with ease. Even though an English translation was supplied to the newspaper for their own information, they refused to publish the advertisement without the accompanying translation.

Extensive corpus planning initiatives are taking place in Maori and the language is being rapidly transformed into a modern language capable of serving a similar range of functions to those of any official language. Maori now has established terms for the full range of government departments (Maori Language Commission, 1996: 278–80).

Thousands of new terms have been developed to talk about science, computers, the functions of government, economics, etc. Te Matatiki, a 289-page dictionary of contemporary Maori words probably lists in excess of 11,000 entries (see Maori Language Commission, 1996) including a list of the Maori titles of government departments, days of the week, months of the year and international place names. It includes a term for DNA – *pitau-ira* from *pitau* ‘perforated spiral carving, young succulent shoot of a plant, circinate frond of a fern’ + *ira* ‘gene’ which is itself derived from *ira* ‘freckle, mole’ and is also used for ‘dot’, ‘decimal point’ and ‘particle’ (in physics). The atomic particles ‘electron’, ‘proton’ and ‘neutron’ are encoded as *ira-hiko* (from *ira* ‘particle’ + *hiko* ‘electricity’), *ira-oho* (from *ira* ‘particle’ + *oho* ‘be awake’) and *ira-moe* (from *ira* ‘particle’ + *moe* ‘sleep, repose’) respectively. Subatomic particles such as ‘neutrino’ and ‘quark’ are not listed, however. According to Harlow (1993) much scientific terminology has been encoded using Maori roots, without having to appeal to borrowings from English, Greek or Latin. A general word for metal was developed by compounding *konga* ‘fragment’ with *nuku* ‘earth’ to form *konganuku*. This was then shortened to form a prefix *konu-* used to encode specific metals such as *konukura* ‘copper’ (*konu*-’metal’ + *kura* ‘red’), *konukata* ‘lead’ (*konu*- ‘metal’ + *kata* ‘bullet’ < ‘flint’), *konutai* ‘sodium’ (*konu*- ‘metal’ + *tai* ‘salt’ < ‘seawater’) and *konuruke* ‘uranium’ (*konu*-’metal’ + *ruke* from *ira rukeruke* ‘radioactive’). *Ira rukeruke* ‘radioactive; radioactivity’ is itself derived from *ira* ‘particle’ + *rukeruke* ‘throw about’.

A website of new and technical terms in Maori was established in 1991 and by 1994 it had grown to over 14,000 entries. The website had the stated objective of promoting a degree of standardisation in the way in which new terms are developed and adopted across New Zealand (Keegan, 1997a).

**Australia’s Indigenous languages**

There were probably some 250 or more distinct languages spoken across Australia at the time of colonisation. Most of these 250 languages were further differentiated into regional and social dialects and registers, so that there were probably some 600 to 800 languages in existence from an Indigenous perspective.
Some of these languages have disappeared without trace, some are known by name only. Only about 20 languages remain in a relatively healthy state and continue to be transmitted from one generation to the next by normal means. Others still have a generation of older speakers, or perhaps only a handful or even one or two speakers remaining. Many other languages are no longer spoken fluently, though often some words are used in the local variety of Aboriginal English spoken. Some languages were documented relatively well by missionaries during the 19th century or by linguists during the 20th century, while many others are supported only by meagre word lists. For further detail see Dixon (1989), McConvell and Thieberger (2000), McKay (1996), Schmidt (1990) and SSABSA (1996c).

**Language planning and Australia’s Indigenous languages**

The loss of Australia’s Indigenous languages has been due in large part to repressive policies, sometimes directed at the languages themselves, but more often as a by-product of more general social policies. For instance, in Adelaide, following a brief ‘honeymoon’ period, Governor Grey forbade the missionaries to preach in the Kaurna language and forcibly relocated the children to the English-only Native School Establishment where they were housed in dormitories cut off from their family and kin. Five years later, these same children were relocated to Poonindie, far away from their ancestral lands. The now infamous ‘stolen generations’ policies removed thousands of Indigenous children from their families, thereby cutting them off from their languages and cultures. Even more insidious was the threat of having children removed. Many parents, grandparents and other kin refused to teach or even speak their languages in the presence of children, because if the children spoke the language, that was a sure sign that they were not assimilating and reason enough to remove them from the ‘negative’ influences of their parents. Such attitudes towards Indigenous languages were promulgated by politicians, education authorities and the church. Aboriginal languages were characterised as ‘primitive’, even as a series of grunts without any grammar (see Dixon, 1980). As a result, these attitudes were internalised by society at large and sometimes by Indigenous people themselves. These negative attitudes still persist to this day in many quarters. The diversity of Australia’s languages was not recognised. It is still commonplace to be asked ‘Do you speak Aboriginal?’, as if to assume that there is just one language. The corresponding questions ‘Do you speak European?’ or ‘Do you speak Asian?’ would be unthinkable. I am frequently asked ‘What is the Aboriginal word for ____?’.

Some missions had more progressive policies which allowed for education to be conducted in an Indigenous language. But even the most progressive missions usually forced the people to choose just one language from the several spoken by the Indigenous people moved to the mission from different ancestral lands and therefore language groups. This language was privileged over others for the purpose of Bible translation, hymns, liturgy and education. Other missions actively tried to suppress the use of languages through meting out punishment and inculcating negative attitudes.

It was not until 1972 with the election of the Whitlam Labor Government that the first Government policies to impact positively on Indigenous languages
were enacted. The Whitlam Government implemented bilingual education programmes in a range of languages in the Northern Territory. Here again, communities were forced to choose just one language from those spoken in the area, to be taught alongside English within a given school or community, and the ultimate aim was assimilationist. Indigenous languages were being used as a means to promote more rapid acquisition of English. Initial literacy skills were taught in the vernacular languages, but they were progressively phased out so that by Year 5 the programme was taught predominantly in English thereafter. See Gale (1990) and Harris and Devlin (1997) for a more detailed discussion. In December 1998, the Northern Territory Government announced the axing of bilingual education programmes.

Bilingual education impacted only on the strongest languages and no thought was given to languages in need of revival. In fact, a programme had been commenced in Nunggubuyu at Numbulwar in 1975 but the principal of the school had noticed that the children were in fact speaking Kriol as their first language. He had the programme withdrawn in 1979 because the policy stated that bilingual education was to be conducted using the children’s mother tongue as the medium of instruction. He carted the Nunggubuyu books to the dump (personal communication Richard Jeeves, 1990). Fortunately, some were rescued by a concerned teacher and later formed the basis of a course in Nunggubuyu literacy in 1990 for future teachers of a Nunggubuyu LOTE (Languages Other Than English) programme introduced into the school at Numbulwar in 1994.

For the first time, in 1987, funding was allocated by the Commonwealth Government for language maintenance initiatives in Indigenous languages on the recommendation of the National Policy on Languages (Lo Bianco, 1987). The sum of $3 million was allocated to the National Aboriginal Languages Program (NALP) over three years. This funding continues in the form of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Languages Initiatives Program (ATSILIP) now administered by the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC). Prior to this, programmes were run on goodwill or supplemented by one-off grants obtained from other sources, such as the South Australian Jubilee. A chain of Aboriginal language centres has been established under the umbrella of the Federation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Languages (FATSIL). While there is some sharing of ideas and lobbying of Government on language issues, there is little discussion of language planning strategies, such as corpus planning, in the newsletters produced.

In 1991 Australia adopted a national language policy (DEET, 1991) which channelled some funds from the Commonwealth Government for the support of Indigenous languages. But again the emphasis is on the so-called ‘strong’ languages. In reality, however, much of the funding is being used to support languages no longer spoken fluently or in their full form. There is a mismatch between policy and what is actually happening on the ground.

The National Policy on Languages recommended that:

The study of at least one language in addition to English ought to be an expected part of the educational experience of all Australian students, ideally continuously throughout the years of compulsory education. In
addition the policy advocates strongly that all educational planners embrace this objective and aim for students in every Australian school to be offered soundly-based, continuous and serious programs for learning a second language. (Lo Bianco, 1987: 120)

This recommendation was adopted as official national language policy which proposed that ‘By the year 2000 all Australians will have the opportunity to learn a language other than English appropriate to their needs’ (DEET, 1991: 62).

However, South Australia had already prepared its own state languages policy which set 1995 as the year by which ‘all students [will] have the opportunity to study a LOTE’ (EDSA, 1986) and proceeded to implement this through the Languages Other Than English Mapping and Planning Project (LOTEMAPP) which scarcely mentioned Indigenous languages. Nonetheless, the spectre of compulsory LOTEs in South Australian schools gave Indigenous languages an important psychological boost.

In 1993 a national curriculum initiative was commenced which resulted in the accreditation of a framework for the teaching of Indigenous languages at senior secondary level. Mercurio and Amery (1996) discuss reasons for the neglect of this area for so long. The Australian Indigenous Languages Framework (AILF) attempts to accommodate the full spectrum of diversity (see SSABSA, 1996a). To do this, several different programme types were established. In 1994, the first accredited programmes were begun in just five languages, one of which was Kaurna.

This, then, is the broader context within which efforts to revive Kaurna and other Indigenous languages must be considered. While national or state language and education policies can have far-reaching effects in terms of encouraging or stifling language revival activity, when it comes down to it what actually happens depends to a great extent on the vision, will and motivation of individuals. Great things can happen despite the system. It would be nigh impossible to plan at the national level to revive languages X, Y and Z, even if prerequisite resources such as a reasonable grammar, extensive word lists and texts were known for these languages.

The main aim of language planning in these circumstances is the ecological one, to reunite the language, which has lain dormant for a period of time, with its community of potential speakers, or as Mühlhäusler et al. (forthcoming) say, to re-establish the functional links and support systems that sustain the language. Ecological and motivational factors supporting the revival of Indigenous languages in South Australia were investigated by Mühlhäusler et al. (forthcoming).

Language ecology is a holistic approach that looks beyond the language itself to the broader context in which the language is embedded, or in the case of a language like Kaurna, into which it is being embedded. Indeed, for Fettes (1997; forthcoming) an ecological approach to language revival begins with people. The language itself is of secondary concern.

Einar Haugen, a Norwegian linguist, coined the term ‘language ecology’ in a paper first presented in 1970. He defined it simply ‘as the study of interactions between any given language and its environment’ and defined environment as follows:
The true environment of a language is the society that uses it as one of its codes. Language exists only in the minds of its users, and it only functions in relating these users to one another and to nature, i.e. their social and natural environment. Part of its ecology is therefore psychological: its interaction with other languages in the minds of bi- and multilingual speakers. Another part of its ecology is sociological: its interaction with the society in which it functions as a medium of communication. The ecology of a language is determined primarily by the people who learn it, use it, and transmit it to others. (Haugen, 1972: 325)

Haugen goes on further to flesh out his concept of language ecology by asking a series of questions, which apply in a general way to Indigenous languages, but also stimulate additional more specific questions:

For any given ‘language’, then, we should want to have answers to the following ecological questions:

1) What is its classification in relation to other languages? This answer would be given by historical and descriptive linguists;
2) Who are its users? This is a question of linguistic demography, locating its users with respect to locale, class, religion or any other relevant grouping;
3) What are its domains of use? This is a question of sociolinguistics, discovering whether its use is unrestricted or limited in specific ways;
4) What concurrent languages are employed by its users? We may call this a problem of dialling linguistics, to identify the degree of bilingualism present and the degree of overlap among the languages;
5) What internal varieties does the language show? This is the task of a dialectology that will recognise not only regional, but also social and contactual dialects;
6) What is the nature of its written traditions? This is the province of philology, the study of written texts and their relationship to speech;
7) To what degree has its written form been standardised, i.e. unified and codified? This is the province of prescriptive linguistics, the traditional grammarians and lexicographers;
8) What kind of institutional support has it won, either in government, education, or private organisations, either to regulate its form or propagate it? We may call this study glottopolitics;
9) What are the attitudes of its users towards the language, in terms of intimacy and status, leading to personal identification? We may call this the field of ethnolinguisitcs;
10) Finally we may wish to sum up its status in a typology of ecological classification, which will tell us something about where the language stands and where it is going in comparison with the other languages of the world. (Haugen, 1972: 336–7)

An ecological approach to language engages linguists in action-oriented endeavour, to move beyond observation and description to become ‘shop stewards for linguistic diversity’ (Mühlhäuser, 1996: 2).

In language reclamation, the role of linguists is vital in the process of trans-
forming the language from purely a material cultural artefact, in the form of written records, into a living, dynamic entity in the minds of people. Of course, this is primarily in the hands of members of the community who are attempting to relearn and revive the language, but linguists can make a significant contribution in helping to interpret the records and in reassembling the language. Crawford (1996: 64) makes the point linguists should never forget, that ‘language shift cannot be reversed by outsiders, however well-meaning…If language preservation efforts are to succeed, they must be led by Indigenous institutions, organisations and activists’.

Language revival entails a deliberate reshaping of the language ecology to extend the domains of use of the language, to increase the numbers of language users and to develop the language itself. The process necessarily begins with consciousness-raising. But consciousness-raising must move quickly beyond mere talk into activity, for it is only through hands-on working with the language and using the language that a true awareness of the possibilities and issues involved becomes apparent. Through working with the language, people will come to appreciate the immensity of the task and difficulties involved. It is thus important that achievable short-term goals be set that put language products into the hands of the people and that allow people to begin to use the language immediately in meaningful ways. People need to be inspired through doing.

For a language which has ceased to be spoken, niches need to be carved out. In the experience of the Kaurna language revival group, it is easiest to begin with symbolic use of the language.

Language planning scenarios will vary enormously from one language or language ecology to the next depending on a multitude of factors, not the least of which includes what remains of the language itself, the quality of the records, whether or not records of related languages exist, whether the language community resides in a large urban centre or a small rural community, the demographics of the community, etc. I cannot adequately account for the multitude of possible situations. What I can do is describe in some detail language planning initiatives in the context of Kaurna and draw some parallels and contrasts with certain other situations. But I will have to leave it up to other writers to flesh out the details for their own situations and push the boundaries further than I am able to do on the basis of efforts in Kaurna.

**Kaurna Language Reclamation**

Kaurna is the original language of Adelaide and the Adelaide Plains. It was probably last spoken on a daily basis some time in the 19th century, perhaps as early as the 1860s. No sound recordings survive of the language as it was spoken in the 19th century. Rather, we have to rely on written documentation recorded by a range of observers, primarily Lutheran missionaries Christian Teichelmann and Clamor Schürmann (henceforth referred to as T&S). See Amery (2000a: 112) for a complete listing of extant Kaurna primary sources. All in all, between 3000 and 3500 words, a sketch grammar and hundreds of translated Kaurna sentences were recorded. Unfortunately, only a few short texts were ever recorded.
Kaurna people first started taking notice of their documented linguistic heritage in the late 1970s and early 1980s. The first known use of the language by Kaurna people in the modern period was the naming of Warriappendi Alterna-
tive School by Auntie Leila Rankine, who sent Peter Buckskin off to the archives in search of a name. The spelling of Warriappendi ‘to seek; find’ clearly indicates that it was taken from T&S (1840). Interest in reviving Kaurna as a spoken language was first articulated in about 1985 by Georgina Williams, who is a Kaurna woman who worked for the South Australian Museum in the early 1980s, researching the Tjilbruke Dreaming track, and has been at the forefront of efforts to re-establish Kaurna identity, recognise Kaurna heritage and revive the language. Georgina tried to interest the School of Australian Linguistics at Batchelor near Darwin in the Northern Territory in running a course in Kaurna linguistics, but they would only do so if a minimum of six students were prepared to participate. As Georgina was the only Kaurna person at that point willing to travel to Batchelor, the course did not eventuate. It was not until a songwriter’s workshop in March–April 1990 that the first novel Kaurna sentences were constructed and in a workshop in June of that same year the first neologisms were formed.

Why attempt to revive Kaurna?

All Kaurna people speak English as a first language and have done so for several generations. Most are monolingual English speakers. Some Kaurna people have commented that while they know the language is theirs, learning it is like learning a foreign language. In addition to standard English, Kaurna people also speak Nunga English among themselves and with other Aboriginal people in southern South Australia. Nunga English is an Aboriginal English variety, a social dialect, which in part draws on pre-existing Indigenous phonological patterns and syntactic structures. Some words in Nunga English are drawn from a range of Aboriginal languages, primarily Ngarrindjeri, Narungga and Pitjantjatjara, though the word Nunga itself comes from Wirangu on the west coast of South Australia. There are also several Pidgin and archaic English forms (such as ‘gammon’), and just a few Kaurna words (see Clarke, 1994; and Foster et al., in press, for etymologies of Nunga English words). The recent trend is for Nunga English to diverge further from Standard English through the incorporation of more and more Indigenous lexemes. Nungas take a certain amount of pride in having a language which is not easily understood by most non-Aboriginal people in Adelaide. So there is already a linguistic vehicle by which Indigenous people in Adelaide can identify as Nunga or Aboriginal, but prior to Kaurna language reclamation efforts, there was not a distinctive means by which they could identify as Kaurna people. Attempts to revive Kaurna are fundamentally an act of identity.

Since as early as 1850, the Kaurna people have been said to be ‘extinct’ or ‘virtually extinct’. In the early 20th century Ivaritji was ‘discovered’ as the last surviving member of the ‘Adelaide Tribe’ and for a time became somewhat of a celebrity (see Gara, 1990). Despite what the literature says, Kaurna people have survived and are determined to show it.

So how are Kaurna people embracing the language? In what ways do they seek to use it? Kaurna people first began to embrace the language through naming activity in 1980, and to this day, this continues to be an important language function. But the symbolic use of Kaurna language has expanded
greatly into additional domains and there is significant potential for further expansion in the public domain.

Kaurna language revival efforts began primarily within the education sector, and to this day schools and other teaching programmes remain the power house driving these efforts. Even before Kaurna language programmes were started in schools, writers of Aboriginal Studies curricula were making use of Kaurna word lists.

The private or in-group use of Kaurna, to this point in time, remains relatively limited and not well developed. But use in this domain requires considerable effort.

**Status planning and corpus planning**

A fundamental dichotomy in language planning measures is that of status planning vs. corpus planning. The former concerns measures that affect or determine the position held by the language while corpus-planning measures are those which affect and shape the language itself as a linguistic system. In the context of language revival, status planning might include gaining official status or a measure of official status through the reinstatement of place names, etc., while corpus planning includes the establishment of norms of pronunciation and grammar, establishing a spelling system, elaboration of the lexicon, etc.

While status planning and corpus planning might be conceptualised as quite distinct processes, such measures always work hand in hand (see Clyne, 1997: 4–5). Certain corpus-planning measures will need to be implemented in response to certain status-planning measures. For instance, if the language enthusiasts plan to use the language for certain purposes, for example as an auxiliary language of religion, then liturgy, hymns, prayers, creeds, Bible translations, etc., need to be undertaken in the language being revived. On the other hand, corpus-planning measures may have far-reaching and unwanted consequences vis-à-vis status of the language. For instance, if norms of pronunciation are established which reflect English phonological patterns to a large extent, then efforts to speak the language may be held in contempt or become a laughing stock in the eyes of native speakers of other Indigenous languages. Or if new words are introduced into the language then the reasons why they were introduced need to be carefully explained, otherwise we run the risk of rejection from those who claim the language as their own. These examples will become clearer in later discussion.

Status planning and corpus planning measures are discussed separately here because the distinction is useful, but there is always a complex interplay between the two.

**Status-planning considerations**

Status planning is crucial for successful language revival. Seldom is it possible, however, to gain official or national language status as was possible in the case of Maori. In the case of languages no longer spoken, in Australia, it is extremely unlikely that any Indigenous language will ever gain official or national language status because of the marginalised position of these languages, low speaker numbers and, by contrast with New Zealand, the degree of linguistic diversity. Australia has done little to accord the Indigenous
languages of this country the status they deserve. They are a long way from receiving official language status, as has been achieved for Maori in New Zealand, Guarani in Paraguay or the Indigenous languages of South Africa. Only recently have the numbers of speakers of any specific Australian language been counted in the census, despite the fact that numerous smaller immigrant languages have been counted for some time. Funding for Indigenous languages is pitiful. The federal Government chooses to pour far more money into English programmes designed for Aboriginal people, than it does to support Indigenous languages.

While gaining full official or national language status may be out of the question, there are lesser status goals that are attainable. For instance, the languages may be given priority status in the establishment of school language programmes. Indigenous place names may be officially reinstated through dual naming policies. Local government may afford status to the language through the erection of signage, commemorative murals and public artworks that incorporate the language.

For the Kaurna, there is no intention of replacing English entirely. Rather, Kaurna is being introduced in an additive fashion to complement the use of English. Ultimately, Kaurna might replace English for certain purposes, such as a football team’s ingroup language on the field, conducting meetings within Kaurna organisations, or home use within certain families. Most of the time, however, the languages will coexist. Even in tightly defined domains such as funerals, it may be possible to develop a liturgy for the entire proceedings in Kaurna, but it is difficult to imagine a scenario where a majority of those attending the funeral will be speakers of Kaurna or even a majority of Kaurna people. The Kaurna liturgy would most likely be accompanied by English liturgy, or at the very least, detailed English explanations.

Prior to a renewed interest in Kaurna heritage with the establishment of the Tjilbruke Monuments Committee, the development of Aboriginal Studies curricula and subsequent initiation of language revival activities, the status of Kaurna was that of an ‘extinct’ language that few people even knew ever existed. The only vestige of this language that remained in the public domain was a range of Indigenous place names which were used, though the meanings or the source language were not known. When meanings of Kaurna place names were proffered by local history publications or books on place names (e.g. Cockburn, 1990; Manning, 1986) the stated meanings were often demonstrably false (see Amery, forthcoming). In short, the status of Kaurna was virtually rock bottom. Likewise, the Kaurna people, the original inhabitants of the Adelaide Plains, were thought to be ‘long extinct’.

Not surprisingly, Kaurna people are outraged, indignant, dismayed or saddened at this and simply will not accept this view. The main driving force behind language reclamation efforts is a statement of identity, to ensure that the community at large knows that the Kaurna people have survived and that they still have connections to the Adelaide Plains.

Reinstatement of place names

One of the goals of language planning is the standardisation of place names and reference to geographical features. In some contexts, for example decolonisation...
sation or revolution, the new government might seek to replace the coloniser’s names with Indigenous or revolutionary names as in Indonesia or the then Soviet Union. In the context of Adelaide, there is little desire to replace English names and even less likelihood of this happening. Rather, Kaurna names are being applied to unnamed features or are proposed for use alongside existing names.

Some place names on the Adelaide Plains, such as Yankalilla, Myponga, Aldinga, Willunga and Waitpinga, have always been in use. These localities have always been known by their Indigenous names and only by their Indigenous names. Yankalilla, for instance, was in use by sealers based at Kangaroo

\[ Figure 2 \] Some prominent Kaurna place names on current maps
Island prior to colonisation and also recorded by George Augustus Robinson on 2 June 1837 in an interview with Kalloongoo, a Kaurna woman who had been kidnapped from the district some years earlier (see Amery, 1996b). The name appeared in the journals of William Light, the founder of Adelaide, and was in frequent use prior to the establishment of a settlement in the district. However, while these names are used in the same vicinity of the original place, it is not clear whether any of these names now refer to the same place that they did 200 years ago. For instance, Myponga now refers to a town, a district, the Hundred of Myponga and a reservoir. The district of Myponga is probably not coextensive with Maitpangga as known to Kaurna people in the early 19th century. T&S indicate that it then referred to a plain. The remaining entities (the town, reservoir and hundred) of course did not even exist in those days.

In the minds of most non-Aboriginal Australians the link that these names once had with the Kaurna people and the Kaurna culture has long been broken. To most people they are just names, devoid of meaning and devoid of traditional associations. Knowledge of the original feature to which they once referred has, in most cases, been lost entirely. Even the rivers probably bore several names for different tracts of the watercourse.

In some cases (e.g. Yankalilla\(^6\) or Onkaparinga\(^7\)) the name is the key to understanding the landscape from a Kaurna perspective. So there is a need, not only to reinstate the names themselves, but to rehabilitate the understandings behind existing names. This is beginning to happen through the delivery of Kaurna language programmes and awareness raising through local government initiatives and the reconciliation\(^8\) movement.

Reinstating Kaurna place names is not exactly new. In fact, George Gawler, South Australia’s second governor (1838–1841) appears to have reinstated at least one Kaurna name (see Amery & Williams, forthcoming). There are more recent examples where non-Aboriginal people or government agencies have reinstated Kaurna names without reference to the Kaurna community. For instance, the Osmond Terrace Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre was renamed Warinilla in 1985 after the original homestead there (pers. comm. Robin Brandler, 7 November 1997).

Kaurna names reinstated and promoted by the Indigenous community

Knowledge of Indigenous place names of the Adelaide Plains not already on the map is derived solely from archival material, though there is a remote possibility that some additional information may be held in the oral traditions of certain Nunga families.

Two decades ago Kaurna people started to turn to their own language as a source of names for a variety of purposes. The establishment of Warriappendi Alternative School in 1980 was the first instance of the bestowal of a Kaurna name that was instigated and controlled by Kaurna people. Since then, Kaurna people, and others, have been turning to the historical materials more and more as a source of names. This activity has extended to the reinstatement and institution of toponyms in Kaurna country, including metropolitan Adelaide.
Warriparinga

Warriparinga, on the Sturt River, Marion, is perhaps the first toponym to have been reinstated by Kaurna people. This site is highly significant (Allen, 2000: 2–3; Williams & Chapman, 1995: 89) because of its centrality in the Tjilbruke Dreaming story which tells of the creation of springs and other sites to the south of Adelaide and of the iron pyrites deposits at Brukunga. Warriparinga marks the site where Kulultuwi, Tjilbruke’s nephew, was killed. As such, it is recognised as the start of the Tjilbruke Dreaming track. It was from here that Tjilbruke collected his nephew’s body, wrapped it up and carried it down the coast. The Kaurna name was recorded by several observers as follows:

- Warriparri the Sturt River (T&S, 1840: 73);
- War-rey par-rey the creek that runs from the hills into Holdfast Bay (Williams, 1840);
- wari pari Sturt River meaning ‘wind river’ or ‘river of the west wind’ (Black, 1920: 82);

**Figure 3** Sites of significance in metropolitan Adelaide
• War: pari Sturt Creek (Tindale, 1987: 8);
• Walpari on Sturt Creek at Marion (Berndt & Berndt, 1993: 233);
• Warriparri Sturt River meaning ‘creek fringed with trees’ (Cockburn, 1990: 209);
• Warri-Pari Sturt River meaning ‘The Throat River’ (Webb, 1936–7: 308)
• Warripparinga ‘windy place by the creek’ (Sturt River probably refers to its strong gully wind) (Cooper, 1962: 35);
• Warriparri ‘windy creek’ Sturt River (Cooper, 1962: 35).

Black’s (1920) record probably indicates that it was still known by Ivaritji, recognised as the so-called ‘last speaker’ of Kaurna, while Berndt’s and Tindale’s records indicate that the name was known to their Ngarrindjeri informants in the 1930s and 1940s.

Until recently, the Warripparinga site has been officially known as Laffers Triangle, whereas the river itself has been, and still is, known as Sturt River. In 1992, a proposal was put forward by Kaurna people, Paul and Naomi Dixon, for the establishment of the Warripparinga Interpretive Centre, though the site itself was still being referred to as Laffers Triangle (see Boynes, 1992). A local environment group initially known as The Friends of Laffers Triangle became known as Friends of Warripparinga in 1992 or 1993. The name was soon applied to the entire reconciliation project planned for the site, no longer just the planned interpretive centre. An article reporting on an interview with Paul and Naomi Dixon in the Salisbury, Elizabeth, Gawler Messenger (19 October 1994: 5) refers to the ‘Warripparinga area’. The site is now officially known as the Warripparinga Reserve and the adjacent wetland established in 1998 was named Warripparinga Wetland. Official road signs are now in place.

The site now is virtually only referred to as Warripparinga by the Kaurna community, environment groups, the Marion City Council and the general public alike. Many are not even aware of the existence of any other name. The name has been fully accepted as the name for the site, almost totally precluding the use of other names.

In April 1997, a new wetlands reserve not far from Warripparinga was named Tartonendi by the Marion City Council and a plaque erected reading ‘Tartonendi. This Reserve is named Tartonendi which is a Kaurna word meaning “transforming the land into wetlands”. The Kaurna people are the original inhabitants of the Adelaide Plains’.

Adelaide city case study: Place naming proposal

In December 1996, I was approached by the Adelaide City Council to research original names and the history of the Kaurna people within the Adelaide city and North Adelaide areas under the jurisdiction of the council. This area, including the surrounding parklands, makes a good case study in which to investigate issues associated with Indigenous place names and their reinstatement.

Within this area there were just three names on the map of Indigenous origins in official use: Moonta Street, Morialta Street and Medindie Road, all of them
minor thoroughfares. Moonta derives from Yorke Peninsula, having Narungga origins. Morialta is taken from Morialta Falls in the eastern foothills while Medindie Road is named after the adjoining suburb to which it leads. Both are probably Kaurna names. Morialta possibly derives from mari ‘east’ + yertalla ‘cascade’ while Medindie may derive from mettindi ‘to steal’. Tindale (1974: 213) refers to the ‘Medaindi (horde living near Glenelg)’ with a variant spelling Medaindie, though he does not suggest an etymology. So none of the names in use in 1996 (ignoring the names applied to buildings and organisations, most of which have been adopted recently)\(^{10}\) were names used by Kaurna people to refer to natural features in the area.

The only possibility of an original retention still in use is that of Pinky Flat near the Adelaide Oval which may derive from Kaurna pingko ‘bilby’\(^{11}\) (Praite & Tolley, 1970: 139f.), though it and some other sources say it derives from English. According to Manning (1986: 169) during the depression years of the 1930s, it was used as a camp by unemployed, and cheap wine called “Pinky” was consumed there’. ‘Pinky’ or ‘pinkie’ appears in the Australian National Dictionary meaning both ‘bilby’ and ‘cheap or home-made (fortified) wine’ (Hughes, 1989: 411), giving further credence to both etymologies.

However, names for geographical features in the area were recorded by several observers. The Torrens River was recorded as Karrawirraparri (T&S, 1840: 75), the ‘redgum forest river’. Wyatt (1879) records Korra weera, yerta and perre ‘Adelaide, and the Torrens’, so it would appear that the land surrounding the Torrens was known as Karrawirrayerta ‘redgum forest land’. Other names recorded are listed in Table 1.

Table 1 Recorded Kaurna names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaurna name</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>English name/location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tandanya</td>
<td>‘red kangaroo rock’</td>
<td>Adelaide south of the Torrens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piltawodli</td>
<td>‘possum home’</td>
<td>‘Native Location’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tambawodli</td>
<td>‘plain house’</td>
<td>‘Emigration Square’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinninyawodli</td>
<td>‘rib house’</td>
<td>‘the Ironstores’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kainkawirra</td>
<td>‘redgum forest’</td>
<td>North Adelaide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kainkawirra</td>
<td>‘redgum forest’</td>
<td>lake in Botanical Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngamaji</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>GPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walinga</td>
<td>‘house place’</td>
<td>city of Adelaide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At least one of these names clearly refers to a post-colonial imposition on the landscape. Tinninyawodli (lit. ‘rib house’) was the name given to the ‘Ironstores’ or Colonial Store. It appears that the word for ‘rib’ was extended to ‘iron’,\(^{12}\) probably because iron was imported into the colony in lengths resembling a rib. Other names, such as Walinga ‘house place’ and Tambawodli ‘plain house’ referring to Emigration Square, where there were rows of temporary huts and tents to house new arrivals in the colony, are probably similar.

As part of the reconciliation process, a naming proposal was developed which suggested Kaurna names for the 29 parks within the parklands area surrounding...
the city and names for the seven city squares. I developed a set of naming principles which promoted the use of original names. Where names were not recorded, I proposed names which related to a particular plant species found in the area or known to have existed there. I also proposed several names which related to current use of the park, e.g. naming Park 02 Padipadinyilla ‘swimming place’ because of the presence of the Acquatic Centre there. Furthermore, I proposed that the squares and four high-profile parks be named after prominent Kaurna individuals, such as Mullawirraburka ‘King John’, while the golf course greens at the Piltawodli ‘Native Location’ site on Park 01 could be named after Kaurna children and adults who were known to have lived there.

While few of these names are original retentions, the names applied do give a Kaurna perspective and serve to remind people of an Indigenous heritage through the names of prominent leaders known to have frequented the area, and the names of Indigenous plants that formerly dominated the landscape. It is important, though, that the signs be accompanied by information, so that residents and visitors have the opportunity to appreciate deeper understandings of Kaurna culture and history.

The Adelaide City Council considered five Kaurna names at its meeting of 13 March 2000 and made a formal request to the Geographical Names Board to dual name the Torrens River as Karrawirraparri (lit. ‘redgum forest river’). It is anticipated that this will be officially adopted following a period of consultation. Four additional names of parks (previously unnamed) were also adopted by the council (Table 2). Of these four names, three are documented in T&S (1840: 75). The fourth, Wirranendi ‘being transformed into forest’ was constructed through regular word-forming processes from the known word wirra ‘forest’ and the suffixes -ne ‘inchoative (i.e. to become)’ + -ndi ‘present tense’ and applied to Park 23 in recognition of a regeneration project promoting the growth of plant species indigenous to that particular tract of land which takes in West Terrace Cemetery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaurna name</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piltawodli</td>
<td>‘possum house’</td>
<td>Park 01 – North Adelaide golf course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karrawirra</td>
<td>‘redgum forest’</td>
<td>Park 12 – near University footbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wirranendi</td>
<td>‘being transformed into forest’</td>
<td>Park 23 – includes West Terrace cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tambawodli</td>
<td>‘plain house’</td>
<td>Park 24 – Glover Ave and West Terrace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On 5 February 2001, a further four Kaurna names were put forward at a meeting of the Adelaide City Council for high-profile, high use parks (Table 3). The first three of these names refer to the three main burka ‘senior men’ who dealt with the colonial authorities in the 1830s and 1840s, while Kainka Wirra is the original name for the waterhole (now the lake) in the middle of the Botanical Gardens. The Adelaide City Council Place Naming Proposal demonstrates that
only a certain amount can be done in terms of reinstating the rightful original names.

Table 3 Kaurna names proposed for four additional parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaurna name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mullawirraburka Womma</td>
<td>Rymill Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ityamaiitpinna Womma</td>
<td>Rundle Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadlitpinna Womma</td>
<td>Park 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kainka Wirra</td>
<td>Botanic Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Owing to the paucity of records, the potential for reinstating authentic Indigenous toponyms on the Adelaide Plains is limited. However, there are a number of important Kaurna names known from the historical record, where dual naming would be a possibility. Some of the most prominent of these are shown in Table 4.

Table 4 Recorded Kaurna names of places on the Adelaide Plains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaurna name</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yertabulti</td>
<td>‘land of sleep or death’</td>
<td>Port Adelaide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaleeya ~ Kaleeeya</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Gawler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattawilya15</td>
<td>‘gum tree foliage’</td>
<td>Glenelg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karraundongga</td>
<td>‘redgum chest place’</td>
<td>Hindmarsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warkowodliwodli</td>
<td>‘? houses’</td>
<td>Klemzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putpayerta</td>
<td>‘fertile ground’</td>
<td>Lyndoch Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yerltoworti</td>
<td>‘? tail’</td>
<td>Hindmarsh Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parriworta</td>
<td>‘river behind’</td>
<td>Hutt River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witongga</td>
<td>‘reed place’</td>
<td>The Reedbeds (Fulham)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are basically two approaches in the reinstatement of Kaurna names. The Kaurna community and their supporters can seek to make them official by working through the relevant authority having jurisdiction over naming in that area for the purposes proposed. For instance, the Geographical Names Advisory Committee, local council, etc., can be approached or lobbied for their placement on the map. Alternatively, people can simply begin to use the Kaurna names and encourage the public to follow suit. Of course, both processes can work together, but the latter is much more meaningful. As Bill Watt of the Geographical Names Advisory Committee pointed out on ABC Radio (25 October 1999), the technical process of changing a name is easy. More demanding is the need to conduct the appropriate consultation and develop a sense of ownership of the changes within the community. In 1918, many German place names in South Australia were removed and replaced with English and Indigenous names. However, in some cases the community did not embrace the changes and following the cessation of hostilities many of the places reverted to their German names.

It is evident that many people in the community would like to see the restora-
tion of Indigenous names, but there are strong indications that they are still a minority. Over the last few years with the restructuring and amalgamation of local councils, names have been needed for the new entities. Several times I have been asked for advice by councils themselves, councillors and residents who are wanting to promote Kaurna names, and especially original names from the respective areas. Alternatives have been put forward, but in every case non-Indigenous names have won the day. Five years ago, the Australian Labor Party suggested that the name for Adelaide should be changed to Kaurna in the year 2000 (The Advertiser, 24 November 1994: 1–2), but only a small minority interviewed by The Advertiser supported the proposal. Similarly, when Mark Brindal MP proposed changing the name of Victoria Square in the heart of the city to Tandanya, most callers to the ABC talkback programme (ABC Radio, 25 October 1999) did not support the idea. So a lot of groundwork needs to be done before Kaurna names can be reinstated in a way that is acceptable to and owned by the community at large.

The best way to ensure the reinstatement of Kaurna names where these are known is to simply begin to use them in our teaching programmes, our writings and in our everyday conversations, and to familiarise the public with these sites and their history. I recall that in 1974 during an acute accommodation crisis at the Australian National University, some students were allowed to occupy rooms at Toad Hall before its completion and before it had been named officially. It was then referred to by the administration as ‘the Fourth Hall of Residence’. One student made an official-looking sign out of polystyrene and, as residents, we had mail sent to us at Toad Hall. In the end, the administration had no option but to follow suit.

It is taking some time for the Adelaide City Council proposal to be implemented in its entirety, and the frustration of Indigenous people is beginning to show. At a meeting of the Indigenous advisory group to the Adelaide City Council on 24 January 2001, it was suggested that Indigenous people should take the matter into their own hands and place an advertisement in the paper advising the public that from now on Victoria Square will be known to the Indigenous community as Tarndanyangga. This suggestion was strongly supported by all at the meeting and people were urged simply to start using the Kaurna name themselves. The name was publicly announced on 26 May on the third anniversary of National Sorry Day during a reconciliation event in the square which was preceded by an article in the paper (The Advertiser, 23 May 2001).

If Kaurna names are to be accepted officially, then we need to do a lot of work to promote them within the community. To totally replace high profile existing names such as Victoria Square is exceedingly difficult. Of course it can be done, as was the case with St Petersburg becoming Leningrad and Batavia becoming Jakarta, but these were renamed following revolution and expulsion of a colonial power. Far less threatening than total replacement is the application of a Kaurna name alongside an existing name. Fortunately in South Australia, such legislation exists, known as the Dual Naming policy, which has been applied in the Flinders Ranges, but not within Kaurna country as yet. Under the Dual Naming policy, the Indigenous name may eventually gain more popularity than the existing English name, as is the case with Uluru which was initially introduced alongside of Ayers Rock in the face of considerable resistance.
In 1991 the Victorian Labor Government adopted Geriwerd, the Jardwadjali word for ‘mountain’ for the Grampians National Park. The name was dropped by the newly elected Kennett Liberal Government in 1992 following the tabling of a petition of some 57,000 signatures. Despite this, according to The Age (15 March 2000: 6), ‘the park’s ranger-in-charge, Mr Graham Parkes, said yesterday that the park’s management, locals and tour operators continued to use Geriwerd’.

Of course, for locations such as Tambawodli or Piltawodli which currently do not have an established English name, the process is much easier, but even here resistance can be expected.

**Authenticity and integrity of names**

In reinstating or placing Indigenous names on the map, additional language planning considerations come into play. The place names must be correct and appropriate. However, in the Adelaide City Council area a number of names had been drawn from out of area and from other Indigenous languages. Similarly, within Belair National Park, the names applied to creeks, ridges and walking trails around 1900 are Kaurna, but those applied later, during the 1960s, are drawn from other languages, including some from interstate languages (see Amery & Williams, forthcoming). Norman Tindale, of the South Australian Museum, compiled place name card files and annotated maps from many parts of Australia, including the Adelaide Plains, with Indigenous names. Many of his published papers on ethnography and Dreaming stories are filled with place names. So Tindale’s work is a logical source of Indigenous place names. However, much care needs to be taken with Tindale’s materials. Firstly, there is an orthographic problem. Tindale used a modified IPA orthography which uses ‘ņ’ where others use ‘ng’, and ‘j’ where others and the general public would write ‘y’. Tindale’s orthography is not designed for or suited to signage and necessarily causes mispronunciation of the words. In a display at Mt Lofty Summit established in 1997, a panel telling of the Urebilla story talks of ‘jureidla, the two ears of the great ancestral giant Urebilla (pronounced Yura-billa)’. Will visitors link Jureidla with Urailda, the name of a small town nearby, which is also derived from yurridla ‘ear-dual’? Certainly the visitor information desk was not aware of the connection in November 1997. Perhaps more serious in relation to names on the Adelaide Plains is the fact that most of Tindale’s sources were Ngarrindjeri people from the Lower Murray and Coorong. Consequently, many of the names he imposed on the Adelaide Plains are Ngarrindjeri names or Ngarrindjeri adaptations of Kaurna names. For instance, he records the name for Glenelg as Pattawilyangk with the Ngarrindjeri locative suffix -ngk as opposed to Pattawilyanga with the Kaurna suffix -ngga. Many other names begin with ‘r’ or ‘l’ (see Amery, 1998a: 199–202, 207–8; Tindale, 1987). Yet Kaurna words, as we know them from all of the Kaurna sources, never commence with ‘r’ or ‘l’. Those words that are clearly of Ngarrindjeri origins should be avoided or attempts should be made to ensure that these words are Kaurnaised – Kaurna suffixes should be used to replace the Ngarrindjeri suffixes. The Kaurna sources record a number of names, such as Ngalta ‘the Murray River’ and Parnka ‘Lake Alexandrina’ (T&S, 1840: 75) for locations deep inside Ngarrindjeri territory and no-one would suggest that these Kaurna names should be accepted as the official names for those locations when Ngarrindjeri names are available.
In May 2000, the Holdfast Bay Reconciliation Group produced a 28-page booklet (Allen, 2000) outlining the early contact history of Glenelg. It includes several Kaurna and Ngarrindjeri place names for sites in Kaurna country. In the second edition I discuss the circumstances under which place names were recorded, provided meanings where known, and have attempted to Kaurnaise those names with Ngarrindjeri endings. This is a potent example of how members of the Kaurna community and I are reinterpretting and rewriting history through place names and planning the place names corpus.

Many local councils, often working in conjunction with the Kaurna community and local reconciliation groups, are installing plaques, public artworks and signage in recognition that their public spaces are located on Kaurna land. And they are engaged in naming, or renaming, some of these public spaces with Kaurna names.

Kaurna people are understandably concerned that the use of Kaurna names is not trivialised. Georgina Williams (in Amery & Williams, forthcoming) writes:

As a Kaurna person, I have grown up with oral traditions and understandings about places and their significance, that do not necessarily appear in the historical record. As a child, I was in the presence of old people and my grandfather who shared the stories of the spirit beings. As a younger woman I travelled over the country with my dad to places on the Adelaide Plains and surrounding hills. He explained these things to me as he remembered stories which had been passed on to him.

The placenames that have survived in an Anglicised form are part of the story and law and lore of the land formations and places in which they are located. These placenames are the ‘skeletal remains’ of the historical surviving reality of Kaurna First Nation peoples, once a peaceful and intact body of lore/law of the land...

I believe that the placing of Kaurna names to places today creates identity of a superficial nature unless they are relating to some source of relationship to the land and through this to the spirit of the land. The language of the Kaurna, and all other Aboriginal language names, should stay true to the original nature of the land and spirit relationship or we are contributing to even further dispossession by putting anything anywhere because some people might think this is a ‘nice’ gesture of remembrance to a now extinct people to meet a fashionable and acceptable fetish of the day...

Naming activity that is not rooted in the land and in the people of the land runs the risk of being a shallow and meaningless activity that misappropriates our language and culture.

**Other Kaurna naming activity**

While a certain amount of Kaurna naming and renaming activity is happening in the physical landscape, much more is happening in the cultural landscape. There are numerous dimensions to this naming activity. Since the early 1980s, numerous Aboriginal organisations based in Adelaide have been given Kaurna names, while just a few, like Nankuwarrin Yunti, have been given Ngarrindjeri names, and some have been given names which are a combination of Kaurna and Ngarrindjeri. This was true in the case of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission Regional Council, Patpa Warra Yunti, from Kaurna *patpa*
‘south’ and *warra* ‘language’ together with Ngarrindjeri *yunti* ‘together’ and conceptualised as ‘talking together in the south’. Many of these organisations were awarded a Kaurna name upon their establishment, but there are a number of instances where an existing organisation has replaced its English name with an Indigenous name, as in Patpa Warra Yunti.

Nunga sporting teams, social clubs, and cultural organisations are being given Kaurna names. Cultural events too, are gaining Kaurna names. A representative selection includes:

- *Kura Yerlo* ‘near the sea’, an Aboriginal community centre at Largs Bay, named by Lewis O’Brien in 1986;
- *Lartelare Kudlyo* Coalition, Kaurna landowners and their supporters working for the return and rehabilitation of the Lartelare site on Kaurna land at Glanville, named by Veronica Brodie and the Coalition in early 1995, with *kudlyo* ‘black swan’ being the totem of Veronica’s great grandmother;

**Figure 4** Locations of some Aboriginal organisations bearing Kaurna names
- *Yaitya Warra Wodli* ‘Indigenous language place’, the South Australian Aboriginal Language Centre opened in 1993; initially based at Tauondi, it is now located in Prospect; named by Snooky Varcoe;
- *Narna Tarkendi* ‘the door is open’, Australian Indigenous Performing Arts Coalition based at Tandanya, launched in February 1995 and named by Katrina Power;
- *Paruparruappendi* ‘to place oneself in an attitude of challenge’, Northern Metropolitan Basketball team, named by Pearl Nam in 1995;
- *Tarni Burkanna* ‘people belonging to the surf’, Nunga Boardriders Association, Moana, named in July 1996 by Georgina Williams;
- *Tappa Inbandi* ‘pathway to meet’, youth programme similar to Blue Light discos, named with advice from Alice Rigney, 1991;
- *Yerliko Taikurringga* ‘belonging to males’ or ‘(what) males have in common’, a new Kaurna men’s group, named by Karl Telfer.
Some of these names, such as *Kura Yerlo*, were obtained or bestowed by Kaurna people acting quite independently, but often my advice is sought for a translation of a particular phrase. For instance, Lewis O’Brien sought an expression for ‘the winds have changed’. This particular expression was somewhat difficult to translate directly into Kaurna. I suggested a number of possibilities. In the end Lewis settled for *Warri Yeltanna Wanggandi* ‘the wind blows fresh’ as the name of a youth group based at the *Kura Yerlo* community centre.

Within the education sector, too, many Kaurna names have been applied to agencies, such as *Tauondi*, that deliver programmes aimed at Aboriginal students, to Aboriginal programmes within universities (*Yunggorendi* and *Wiltong Yerlo*), to buildings such as the Yungondi Building at the City West Campus of the University of South Australia which houses the Unaipon School that delivers Aboriginal Studies programmes, and to specific education programmes (such as the *Yerta Birko*, a landscaping project and team of eight men at Tauondi College). Kaurna phrases are being used as conference themes or mottos, such as *Tangka Manninendi* or Pathways to Excellence at the University of South Australia.

**Personal names**

As Jernudd (1995: 121) observes, ‘names are intensely individual and mark identity both of the unique person and of the person as a member of a group’. The reintroduction of Kaurna names adds a new dimension to Jernudd’s discussion, which focuses on bans and constraints imposed by the state and pressure from the Other to change one’s name. Change of names within the Kaurna community results from individual and group desire to reassert an identity. In a similar vein, some migrants in Australia are abandoning their Anglicised names (see Jernudd, 1995: 121 for a discussion of this practice) and reinstating their original names complete with phonology and spelling conventions of the source language for use in the public domain.

Increasingly, Kaurna people are drawing on Kaurna vocabularies as a source of personal names for themselves and their children. Possibly the first instance in the modern period was the naming of Kudnarto Watson, born in 1986, who was named after the prominent Kaurna ancestor, known only by her birth-order name, at the suggestion of Georgina Williams. Since then, a number of children have been given Kaurna names. A number of adults have adopted Kaurna names for themselves, drawing on a perceived characteristic or role. For instance, Lester Rigney, a young Kaurna language activist, has taken the name Irabinna ‘warrior’. He uses his full name, Lester Irabinna Rigney, when he authors papers, gives a public address or lecture and in most areas of life. His daughter is named Tarni Warra ‘the noise of the breakers’, his non-Indigenous wife has adopted Kurraki ‘white cockatoo’, while his mother, a prominent Kaurna language activist, uses Wallara ‘clear headed, intelligent’. So far apparently no one has actually changed his or her name by deed poll, though a number have talked about doing it.

When Kaurna language programmes were first introduced at senior secondary level in 1994, I encouraged students to adopt Kaurna names, both personal names and birth-order names, in keeping with what was known of Kaurna naming traditions, and I drew up a list of suitable names to choose from. I did this for pedagogical reasons, trying to increase exposure to, and use of, the language,
and gave no thought to the implications this might have for identity and that it might be viewed as misappropriation. I no longer encourage non-Indigenous students to adopt personal names, though I still promote the use of birth-order names within the language-learning context.

Kaurna people also use Kaurna names for their pets. In a number of instances pet dogs, cats and birds have been given Kaurna names. Kaurna words are often used for computer passwords, etc. This, of course, is a very private use. In most cases no one else, apart from the individuals themselves, are aware of Kaurna words used in this way. Kaurna naming activity is documented in detail in Amery (1998a, vol. 2: 276–302) for the period up until 1997. This naming activity has continued unabated since then.

**Signage**

Apart from place names discussed above, no signage was to be found in the Kaurna language prior to the advent of Kaurna language programmes in the 1990s. Signs began to be posted at Kaurna Plains School, Para West Adult Campus, Tauondi College, the Aboriginal Education Unit at Enfield and the Faculty of Aboriginal and Islander Education, University of South Australia. Signs, such as Meyu ‘Gents’ and Murki Turra ‘face painting’ also began to be used at Kaurna events.

At Warriparinga, Stage 1 of the Warriparinga Project, the Tjirbruuki Narna ‘Tjirbruki Gateway’ installation, was opened on 30 October 1997. A commemorative board was erected which featured the text Tjirbruuki narna arra’ ngatpandi ‘entering through the Tjilbruuke gateway’. A set of 18 signs, many of which feature extensive Kaurna text, were posted at Warriparinga in July 2000 at the various entrances to the area and sites of significance. One sign also features a Kaurna translation of Georgina Williams’ poem ‘Coming Home’.

Welcome signs in Kaurna were proposed on the major arterial roads entering the city of Adelaide by Dot Davy, a Kaurna woman working for the Adelaide City Council. Perhaps Kaurna signage may be displayed at high profile sites such as Victoria Square and the Festival Theatre concourse at some time in the future.

Other proposals have been put forward for Kaurna signage on the proposed Piradli Trail in Belair National Park, but this seems to have stalled, despite considerable work by Nunga ranger Malcolm Lane on the text for the 17 proposed signs (see Amery, 1998a: 378–9 for details).

**Murals and installations**

The first Kaurna language ever to be displayed in a public place, apart from place names and the plaque on North Terrace dedicated to Charles Witowito Cawthorne, whom his father named with the Kaurna witowito ‘tuft of feathers worn as an ornament by young men on the fore part of the head’, was the Yerrakartarta mural created by Milika or Darryl Pfitzner. This mural, unveiled on 1 February 1995, is located within the Adelaide Plaza off North Terrace. In addition to the title, the mural incorporates a number of Kaurna words and a sentence taken directly from T&S with a translation rendered in slightly more idiomatic English. This sentence inscribed on a brass plaque reads:

*Natta atto nanga; yakko atto bukki nakki. Kaurna yerta.*

I know it now. Before I didn’t. This is Kaurna country.
In 1996, two West Australian architecture students created a ‘Ruins of the Future’ installation. This installation included a Kaurna text written by me and a six-minute loop tape consisting of songs and spoken Kaurna which played throughout the Adelaide Festival. The written text, posted on a sign, comprised the following:

**BULTO TARKARIKO**

*Martuityangga Kaurna meyunna ngadlu wangiindani ‘Marni na budni pangkarra Kaurnaanna.’*

*Yurringgarninga warranna bukkiunungko, birko Kaurna pintyandi. Warranna bukkiunungko warranendi tarkarirlo.*

**RUINS OF THE FUTURE**

The Kaurna people welcome you to their country. Listen to the voices of the past as they rebuild the Kaurna nation. The words of the past are being transformed into the future.

A major work of public art is planned for development at the entrance of the Festival Theatre. This mural, located in a prime location, will incorporate Kaurna language in some form or another, as it has been written into the artist’s brief.

**Piltawodli and the Journey of Healing**

Piltawodli was established as the ‘Native Location’ in 1837 on the banks of the Torrens opposite the Old Gaol. It is a highly significant site because it was here that the roots of the ‘stolen generations’ policies in South Australia can be seen. And it was here that most of what we know about Kaurna language and culture was recorded from Kaurna people, such as Mullawirraburka, Kadlitpinna, Ityamaiitpinna, Wattewattipinna, Wauwityina, Tilti Midlaitya and others, who built huts and lived on the site. Most of the Europeans who took an interest in Kaurna language and culture either lived on the site or lived nearby and frequented the site. These observers include Clamor Schürmann, Christian Teichelmann, Samuel Klose, William Wyatt, Mathew Moorhouse, William Williams, James Cronk and William Cawthorne. These observers account for well over 90% of what we know of the Kaurna language. Only a few short word lists were recorded elsewhere.

Kaurna language classes had begun visiting the Piltawodli site in 1997. Piltawodli excursions are now a regular activity for Kaurna language classes and teacher in-service courses as well as for international visitors. In the 1990s there was nothing to be seen except a golf course, a restaurant and the restaurant car park. The Piltawodli site had been first noted by Tom Gara in 1989 and its history written up by Rob Foster (1990). We used this material extensively, together with the writings of Schürmann, Teichelmann and Klose in our initial visits. Over the last few years archaeologists and historians have carried out more intensive investigations (Hemming & Harris, 1998; Harris, 1999) which have increased our knowledge of the site substantially.

On 26 May 1999, on the second anniversary of National Sorry Day a symbolic Journey of Healing was organised. Participants marched to five sites of significance, beginning at the Old Gaol where the Journey was opened with a Kaurna speech, then to the edge of the Torrens where students of Immanuel College
re-enacted Governor Gawler’s speech to the Kaurna people which was translated by Wyatt. The Journey proceeded to the third site, Piltawodli, where children from Kaurna Plains School sang Kaurna songs and mock-up plaques were unveiled. The actual plaques were finally erected the following year, on 26 May 2000 (see below). The Journey then proceeded to the steps of Parliament House and then on to Victoria Square, where current concerns, notably the 54 recommendations from the *Bringing Them Home* report (Commonwealth of Australia, 1997), were addressed.

The Journey of Healing in 1999 was attended by several thousand people, including many school children. One of the main features of this reconciliation event was a recognition of Kaurna history and of places of significance to Aboriginal people in the heart of Adelaide. Briefing notes were prepared which outlined some of the history behind these places and speakers spoke of the events of the past and their relevance to the present. Nelson Varcoe composed and sang songs in Kaurna and English which told this history in a particularly moving way.

The Journey of Healing event in 2000 took place at Piltawodli where a set of plaques, mounted on granite boulders, was unveiled. The main plaque began with a line from a Kaurna song:

*Wanti nindo ai kabba kabba? Ningkoandi kuma yerta.*

Where do you push me to? You belong to another country.

This song was recorded by Matthew Moorhouse from a Kaurna man, Ngurpo Williamsie, in the early days of colonisation who sang it in protest against the intrusion of Europeans into his country, or against the Murray River peoples who had been persuaded to come to Adelaide by Moorhouse and the colonial authorities. Or perhaps it was a protest against both.

A number of other plaques, including images of Kadlitpinna, Teichelmann and Schürmann, the schoolhouse and a letter written in Kaurna by Pitpauwe, a 12- or 13-year-old boy who attended the Piltawodli school, were also positioned together with a map of the site.

Thus the Kaurna language is playing a significant role in the reconciliation movement in Adelaide. This movement seeks to recognise Indigenous perspectives in Australia’s history.

**Cultural tourism**

Cultural tourism is an extremely important and effective means of reclaiming Adelaide and the Adelaide Plains as a Kaurna landscape, and the use of elements of the Kaurna language plays an important part in this. Kaurna language is taught within the Cultural Instructors and Tourism course offered by Tauondi College. Students learn how to introduce themselves in Kaurna and learn salient vocabulary for Kaurna artefacts, fauna and flora, ochres, seasons, kin terms, etc. Tauondi has also established a tourism agency to provide employment for their graduates. There is much potential for future development in this area and for Kaurna people to promote their own interests through cultural tourism.

**Performances**

A Kaurna man, Joseph Williams, formed the Tjilbruki Dance Group, performing first at Warriparinga Open Day in January 1996. His brother, Karl Telfer, together with Steve Goldsmith and several other young Kaurna men, later
formed the Paitya Dancers. Karl introduces these performances with an introduction in Kaurna and introduces salient Kaurna terms during the performance. It is likely that the Kaurna language will increasingly play an important role in dance performances in the future.

**Kaurna speeches of welcome**

‘Welcome to land’ speeches, as they are known, have become Indigenous protocol and are now often given in Kaurna by a range of senior Kaurna people. The first speech of welcome was given in Kaurna by Elder Lewis O’Brien in 1991 on the occasion of a visit by world-renowned ecologist, David Suzuki. These speeches are most often given at gatherings of Indigenous people or at meetings and rallies concerning Indigenous issues, but increasingly they are being given at large public events not specifically addressing Indigenous issues in an effort to be inclusive of Indigenous peoples and in recognition of the Kaurna people as the original owners of the Adelaide Plains. Accordingly, the last two Adelaide Festivals of Arts have been opened with Kaurna speeches and performances.

Early in 1993, I worked with Nelson Varcoe on the Kaurna translation of his speech on the occasion of the opening of Yaitya Warra Wodli, South Australia’s Indigenous Languages Centre. This speech included an expression taken directly from the letter written by Itya Maii in 1841. Several of the expressions used in Nelson’s speech have been used subsequently in the speeches given by others.

The giving of speeches has struck a chord within the Kaurna community and with the public. The frequency with which Kaurna speeches are given has increased exponentially and the number of individuals who give speeches in public has increased markedly. See Figure 6 and 7. Educational institutions, conference organisers, planners of cultural activities, the reconciliation move-
ment and others are requesting Kaurna speakers with increasing frequency, such that Kaurna people cannot keep up with the demand. Kaurna people are requesting courses to assist them to deliver Kaurna speeches.

**Kaurna songs**

Kaurna songs have also proved to be very popular and are an excellent means for the introduction of a language. Kaurna language revival activity began with the writing of seven songs in Kaurna (Ngarrindjeri, Narrunga and Kaurna Languages Project, 1990). A steady stream of new Kaurna songs has been produced since then, with a flurry of activity in 1995 when we recorded the tape for *Kaurna Paltinna – A Kaurna Songbook* (Schultz et al., 1999). More than 50 Kaurna songs have now been written, covering a huge range of topics and styles. Kaurna songs are also often performed in public, at reconciliation events or launches of cultural and educational projects. See Figure 8.
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**Figure 8 Performance of Kaurna songs in public (1992–1997)**

**Kaurna language in education**

Kaurna language reclamation activities began in conjunction with education programmes. Workshops were held for childcare workers and for teachers and parents from Kaurna Plains School. The workshops were held within the school context and songs and role-plays, etc., were written with school programmes in mind.

In 1992, Kaurna was introduced as the LOTE programme at Kaurna Plains
School, and in 1994 as a Year 11 subject at Elizabeth West Adult Campus and Elizabeth City High School. Kaurna is now taught at all levels of education from pre-school to tertiary education. However, the numbers of learners of Kaurna is relatively small, and the majority of learners are not Kaurna people. Nonetheless, the Kaurna programmes collectively provide an excellent venue for language teachers to develop their language skills and for the Kaurna language revival group to develop the Kaurna language itself.

When the Kaurna programmes were first introduced, few materials existed. To this day there is no established Kaurna language curriculum. Teachers have to create many of their own materials.

Language teaching materials need to be tailored to the specific needs of Indigenous languages. In particular, there needs to be a focus on place names, the local environment, kinship and the people. Generic language teaching programmes, which are currently being promoted by the education department, are highly problematic. The kinds of things one might want to teach in a major world language are not necessarily the kind of things one would want to teach in Kaurna. For instance, there is little point in learning how to ask how much a room costs for a night at the Hyatt Hotel or learning how to order food at a restaurant. These are not contexts in which Kaurna is used, nor are they contexts in which Kaurna is likely to be used in the foreseeable future, if ever.

When the South Australian Secondary School of Languages (SASSL) was involved in the delivery of Kaurna programmes, there was a strong desire to develop a self-contained teaching package that any good language teacher could pick up and implement in another programme. While this might make sense from the standpoint of planners within the education system, it ran contrary to Nunga values. SASSL wanted a transportable programme that was not dependent on personalities, but the Kaurna community wants to maintain control over where the language is taught and seeks a personal relationship of trust with those who deliver it.

In July 1997, a Kaurna linguistics course was introduced at the University of Adelaide, and is one of a handful of Indigenous languages taught in the tertiary sector. The Kaurna course is unique in teaching about historical language sources and ways in which they are being used now. There is a high level of involvement by members of the Kaurna community in the delivery of the course, which supports the teaching of the language in schools through professional development for teachers.

**Use of Kaurna within Nunga families**

Until now the use of Kaurna has been predominantly outward oriented. Relatively little Kaurna is used to serve narrow communicative functions. Rather, the language is used symbolically as a badge of identity. At this stage, it is not particularly important that the language is understood by others. Having said this, a number of families have made concerted efforts to use the language at home. Some have plastered their walls with the Kaurna names of household objects. Some make use of a number of Kaurna phrases, especially commands and requests. Kaurna songs are especially important in a number of Kaurna households. The songbooks have reportedly been used so much in some families that they have fallen apart. But many members of the Kaurna community are yet to
embrace the language in an active way, though they might still view its use by others with considerable pride.

The language needs to be introduced very carefully, so as not to exclude people. It is easy for the language movement to become elitist or to be perceived as elitist and it is important to ensure that the entire community is kept informed of language developments, whether they have been directly involved in them or not.

Promotion of the Kaurna language

The Kaurna language movement has received a small but increasing amount of coverage in the local and national press and some television coverage. A story was run on the national ABC current affairs programme, the 7.30 Report, on 28 February 2001.

Greetings in the Kaurna language are now used on a number of websites, including the University of South Australia, Kaurna Plains School, Port Youth, etc., and there are plans to load much more Kaurna language onto the Aboriginal Australia website, in an effort to promote the language more effectively.

Corpus-planning considerations

Assembling the corpus

In the context of language reclamation, one needs first to assemble the sources and identify the corpus itself. In contrast to strong, viable languages where the basic corpus may be taken for granted as it is possessed by numerous speakers, in revival contexts much of the corpus, including pronouns and basic verbs, may reside only in written records of dubious quality.

Nor can one ever divorce corpus planning from status planning. In assembling the corpus, decisions must be made about what qualifies for inclusion in the corpus and in what form a given item should be included. It is not uncommon for word lists retrieved from archival sources to be a mixture of several different languages. Wyatt (1879), for instance, is a mixture of Kaurna spoken in Adelaide, the Kaurna dialect spoken at Rapid Bay and Raminjeri from Encounter Bay. While he makes some effort to identify these different varieties, he has wrongly assigned many of the words in the list. Word lists recorded in the 19th century seldom record the names of the Indigenous contributors, though in some cases circumstantial evidence indicates that the word list has been recorded from just one individual (e.g. Robinson, n.d. – see Amery, 1996b) or maybe two (e.g. Gaimard, 1833 – see Amery, 1998b). Lengthier word lists compiled over a period of time (e.g. Teichelmann, 1857; T&S, 1840; Williams, 1840; Wyatt, 1879) were undoubtedly recorded from many individuals who most likely spoke a variety of dialects. In fact, on several occasions T&S identify alternate dialectal forms and provide a short text from Mullawirraburka and Kadlitipina for the purpose of illustrating dialectal differences. Despite this, most of the time it is impossible to discern dialectal differences in the materials, though they must be present.

Another source, Koeler (1842), includes a range of pidgin forms in his Kaurna word lists and provides a number of Pidgin Kaurna sentences, unaware that they adhere to a different linguistic system from the language that he thinks he is recording (Amery & Mühlhäuser, forthcoming). A thorough knowledge of Pidgin English sources and sources on neighbouring languages can help to elimi-
nate such forms from the corpus. Of course, it is difficult to determine whether the presence of a given form in such a list is in fact a borrowing into the language under study or whether it is due to the observer mixing languages, having obtained the words from a range of sources.

Invariably there are discrepancies between forms retained in oral traditions handed down within the community and those recorded in written records. How do we resolve these discrepancies? Which are to be regarded as the true, authentic forms? It could be that the oral form of the language had changed over time; often such changes are heightened in situations of language obsolescence. Alternatively, errors may have been introduced by observers through mishearing, mistranscription, introduced typographical errors, misunderstanding, etc. There are also likely to be numerous discrepancies among the written sources themselves.

Who decides what qualifies for inclusion in the corpus? The ultimate decision rests with those who identify with the language and claim it as their own, but hopefully this decision will be informed by linguistic and sociolinguistic knowledge.

**Establishing norms of pronunciation**

Language planners do not usually decide how words in a language should be pronounced. They may indeed make choices between a range of existing social or regional dialectal variants to establish a standard language pronunciation to be promoted in the media and the education system. It is often the case that the variety spoken by the elite or powerful members of society is privileged. But in language reclamation situations, the language planning process is more far-reaching.

If there are no sound recordings of the language in existence and revival attempts are based entirely on written historical sources, then the only option is to examine each of those sources for internal consistency, draw comparisons between the records made by different observers, and use comparative linguistic techniques to gain insights from closely related languages. In other words, the pronunciation has to be deduced on the basis of all available evidence. Even then there will be a large element of guesswork.

In the Kaurna case there are some 18 known individuals who made original records of aspects of the Kaurna language between 1826 and the 1920s, but no sound recordings exist of the language as it was spoken in the 19th or early 20th centuries. Very few Kaurna words have been passed down in oral history. Even so, the pronunciation of these words sometimes provides useful clues and confirmation of our deductions and sometimes some unexpected findings. So how do we know how to pronounce Kaurna words? This is discussed in some detail in Amery (2000a: 115–18). Some of the main points are reiterated here.

We are fortunate indeed that a linguist, Luise Hercus, was able to record several hundred words in the early 1970s from Nukunu people who were rememberers of the language. Hercus’s sound recordings were sufficient for her to analyse the Nukunu sound system with some confidence. Fortunately, Nukunu and Kaurna are quite closely related and many words are shared by the two languages. For instance, Kaurna karro ‘blood’ is equivalent to Nukunu kaaru, as spelt by Hercus (1992), indicating a long vowel in the first syllable and a glide
As in English. On the other hand, Kaurna warri ‘wind’ is equivalent to Nukunu wari ‘wind’, but Kaurna warra ‘language’ is cognate with Nukunu warrarla ‘language’. Thus T&S in these instances used ‘rr’ to spell three different rhotics, a glide /r/ as in English, a tap and a trill. In 1997, Lester Irabinna Rigney, Cherie Warrara Watkins and I recorded a series of lessons on tape, including a guide to pronunciation consisting of words illustrating the sounds of Kaurna which had Nukunu cognates (see Amery et al., 1997).

For the sake of the integrity of the language, it is important to get this right, or at least as accurate as we can. If Kaurna people are to be taken seriously by native speakers of other Australian languages when they use Kaurna in public, they need to work at pronunciation and cultivate the sounds, phonotactics and stress patterns characteristic of Australian languages. These include retroflex, interdental and alveopalatal stops, nasals and laterals, the trill or rolled ‘r’ and the initial velar nasal. Kaurna, like Pitjantjatjara and many other Australian languages, has just three short and three long vowels /a/, /i/, /u/, /aː/, /iː/, and /uː/ and diphthongs /ai/, /au/ and /ui/. It is extremely important that vowels are pronounced as such and never as /æ/ or /ɛ/, etc., as in English. Stress is always on the initial syllable. When Kaurna is spoken using spelling pronunciations based on English intuitions, for instance yerlo ‘sea’ pronounced [jɛlou] rather than [jalu] or purlaitye ‘two’ pronounced [pəlâtʃi] rather than [pulaici], their efforts are diminished in the eyes of anangu (Pitjantjatjara or Yankunytjatjara-speaking peoples from the north-west of South Australia) who sometimes speak in mocking, critical or sceptical tones with comments such as ‘shame job’, ‘so embarrassing’, etc. Thus it is vital that the influence of English pronunciations be minimised and that fluency and a smooth delivery be developed. There have been continual improvements in these areas with practice and positive reinforcement, but it is an area that needs managing carefully.

**Choice of orthography**

This is a language planning issue which confronts every language that is committed to writing. As a consequence, there is a large literature to draw from. Some speech communities, such as Allemanic, may have very laissez faire attitudes towards spelling and accept whatever spelling that a writer chooses to use (personal communication, Peter Mühlhäuser). Phonemically-based writing systems are generally favoured for previously unwritten languages, though syllabic and logographic writing systems do have distinct advantages. A range of principles in developing a practical orthography are generally accepted. These include: systematicity; transparency; ease of reproduction on a word processor or typewriter, thus disfavouring diacritics; use of the same characters and conventions as the national language to facilitate acquisition; use of different characters and conventions from the national or neighbouring languages to signal difference and maintain a separate identity.

In language revival situations there are additional factors to be considered. In any large modern language, every native speaker knows how most everyday words are pronounced. Thus it is not important that there be a close relationship between sounds and their representation. Indeed, in the case of Chinese Hanzi, or Japanese Kanji, writing bears no relationship to the spoken form. This has the distinct advantage in that it allows written communication between speakers of
quite different languages. In the revival context, however, it is a distinct advantage to have a spelling system that tells the reader precisely how the word is pronounced because in the early stages, most people will not instinctively know. While a phonemic spelling system might be optimal, it may be preferable to build more redundancy into the spelling system in the context of language revival. T&S’s overrepresentation of Kaurna vowels may not be such a bad thing.

For languages being reclaimed from written historical sources, there are additional problems. Authors of these written sources, such as missionaries, explorers, pastoralists and government officials, used a variety of different spellings depending on their own language background, education, training, exposure to other languages and personal preferences. It is fortunate indeed if the language has been recorded by a trained linguist, but if we are relying on 18th- and 19th-century sources then transcriptions may be difficult to interpret. Some observers’ transcriptions may be partially systematic, others will defy analysis.

In the Kaurna case we have opted to continue to spell words according to conventions adopted by T&S (1840) or Teichelmann (1857). This is because most of the known Kaurna words were recorded by these observers. Fewer than 200 additional words are recoverable from other sources. When these are incorporated into the main corpus, they are respelt according to T&S conventions. For example, Cawthorne’s (1844) vocaltee has been respelt wakalti. Fortunately, T&S were reasonably consistent in their transcriptions, though there are shortcomings. They overrepresented the vowels, though they did not consistently indicate vowel length. They failed to adequately distinguish between interdental, alveolar and retroflex consonants and were inconsistent in transcribing the rhotics. T&S were also inconsistent in their use of ‘ng’ word medially, which they use for the velar nasal, a velar nasal + velar stop cluster and possibly also alveolar or retroflex nasal + velar stop cluster. On the other hand, they often use double consonants between vowels, making Kaurna words unnecessarily long (for example, writing kammammi ‘mother’s mother’ when they could have written it as kamami).

Some would argue that the old missionary spellings do not adequately reflect the Kaurna sound system and that it would be better to adopt a truly phonemic spelling system, as is in use in Adnyamathanha. The problem is that in many cases we would have to make blind guesses at the pronunciation. The status of the letters ‘t’, ‘l’ and ‘n’ in word-medial position is uncertain. If the word containing these letters is not attested in a neighbouring language then there is little to indicate whether they might be interdental, alveolar or retroflexed. Similarly, the quality of the rhotic cannot be predicted from T&S transcriptions. Their use of the single ‘r’ usually coincides with the tap, while the double ‘rr’ usually indicates a trill or glide, but there are a number of exceptions and there are several instances of inconsistency where the same word is spelt with a single ‘r’ and a double ‘rr’. In the vocabulary section, taralye ‘chip; splinter; board; timber’ (T&S, 1840: 43) is spelt with a single ‘r’, but in example sentences in the grammar and phraseology sections it appears with double ‘rr’ as in tarralyilla ‘on the table’ (T&S, 1840: 21), Tarralyoanna mutyertanna wondando, yerta buttonettoai ‘Put the clothes on the table, lest they be (or become) spoiled’ (T&S, 1840: 18) and Kura pappaltoarra tarralye ngatpainga ‘Close by the side of the stump, put the fence’. Murrendi ‘to go; walk; travel’ as it appears in the vocabulary, appears with both single and double
'rr' in the phraseology, even within the one exchange as in Ninna wanti mureta? – Karra ngai murreta Yultiwirraanna ‘Whither will you go? – Up to the Stringy-bark Forest will I go’ (T&S, 1840: 66). Hercus and Simpson have proposed using capital letters T, L, N and R in cases where the phonemic status is uncertain and writing the phonemes /th/, /t/, /rt/, /lh/, /l/, /rl/, /nh/, /n/, /rn/, /r/, and /rr/ where they are known with a reasonable level of confidence. While this is an excellent means of writing the language for the purpose of linguistic analysis, it is not suitable as a practical orthography where upper-case letters are needed for other purposes. By continuing to use T&S spellings, people can continue to easily access the primary historical sources themselves. If we were to change the spellings this would no longer be possible. Authenticity and integrity of the language is very important at this stage, more so than switching to a system that might be more accurate and more pleasing to a linguist. Here is yet another instance of the interaction between status planning and corpus-planning considerations.

The lexicon

Somewhere between 3000 and 3500 Kaurna words were recorded in the historical sources, but any decent dictionary of an Australian language could be expected to contain at least 10,000 words. Naturally there are many obvious gaps. Filling in gaps in the lexicon is a language planning concern that is unique to languages which have ceased to be spoken or are in an advanced state of language obsolescence. In these situations, we know there would have been terms in the language for most entities in the local environment, for local cultural practices and a full range of verbs, and words denoting the qualities of entities (usually adjectives) and the manner of actions and processes (usually adverbs), just as there are in any natural language. In languages which are still spoken, of course, it is simply a matter of observing or eliciting these terms and recording the lexicon, but in the case of languages being reclaimed from archival materials, other means must be found to flesh out the lexicon where these terms are needed. This involves a certain amount of interpolation and extrapolation from what is known of the language itself and what information can be gleaned from neighbouring languages and other Australian languages as to what we would expect to find.

The paucity of fish terms, despite the importance of fish in the Kaurna diet, as shown in the archaeological record and in the eating habits of Kaurna people today, is an obvious gap. The languages of other coastal-dwelling Aboriginal peoples have extremely well-developed nomenclatures for this domain. The dictionary of Djambarrpuynyu (Galpagalpa et al., 1984), a language spoken in north-east Arnhem Land, includes no fewer than 64 head entries for sharks and rays. Most of the words are monomorphemic, bearing no similarity to other words in the language. While some are synonyms, there are at least 30 terms referring to different species of sharks and rays.

We have begun to address gaps in the lexicon in an ad hoc fashion as the need arises. Teachers of Kaurna language, Kaurna Elders and I suggest various options which are discussed within the group, often within the context of a workshop or language class. Indeed, exercises or assignments are sometimes set for language learners (e.g. translation of a section of the children’s story ‘Wombat
Stew’) that require the students to come up with some kind of solution that addresses a particular lexical gap.

To date, several strategies have been used to address gaps in the lexicon. Borrowing is generally resisted by Kaurna people, but it is sometimes hard to avoid and in this context it is more acceptable to borrow from some languages than it is from others. Words have seldom been borrowed direct from English. The whole purpose in engaging in Kaurna language revival is to reclaim a distinctive linguistic and cultural identity. Borrowing from English is the antithesis of this, or as Harlow (1993) observes in the Maori context ‘an admission of defeat’. Despite this, a few English terms were borrowed, especially in our earlier work, such as Maikoko Birko, a translation of the children’s story Tucker’s Mob (Mattingley, 1992). In that book I borrowed ‘brolga’ (a large silvery-grey crane which performs an elaborate dance. Also known as ‘native companion’), ‘banana palms’ and ‘lilies’ direct from English, but would probably make more strenuous efforts to avoid English altogether if I undertook the task today. For instance, ‘brolga’ would be given as purrarka, a form closer to the original source language (see Dixon et al., 1990), just as ‘koala’ has been adopted as kuula in its original Dharuk form. This gives the Kaurna word its own identity distinct from English, but in this case also serves to correct the error introduced in the English form. ‘Koala’ was originally spelt ‘coolah’ and ‘koolah’ by early observers of the Sydney language (Dixon et al., 1990: 72). It would appear that an error has been introduced, probably through misreading the second ‘o’ in the handwritten manuscript as an ‘a’. The current pronunciation of the English word is derived from the current spelling and deviates markedly from the original Dharuk pronunciation. In a recent workshop we developed the term nurlomai for ‘banana’, derived from nurlo ‘curvature; corner’ compounded with mai ‘vegetable food’. So nurlomai wirra could be used in the context in which ‘banana palms’ was used in Tucker’s Mob, where wirra ‘wood; forest; bush’ refers to the ‘grove’ or ‘plantation’ of bananas.

Some words have been borrowed direct from neighbouring, closely related languages. In the very first songs we wrote, nyani was used for ‘sheep’, a Kukatha word known to some of the workshop participants. Later, nhaalha ‘echidna’ was borrowed from Nukunu as no observer seems to have ever recorded a Kaurna word. As Nukunu and Kaurna share many words, there is some chance that nhaalha may in fact have been a Kaurna word. Returning to the poorly documented domain of fish terms, a number of fish terms have been documented in neighbouring Narunggga, even though only about 900 Narungga words in total were recorded. Numerous fish terms have also been recorded in Ngarrindjeri, a neighbouring but not closely related language located to the south-east of Kaurna. It seems that it is acceptable to borrow words from Narunggga, though not from Ngarrindjeri. The latter would more likely be viewed as theft by Ngarrindjeri speakers. Not all words are borrowed directly, however. Sometimes loan translations are employed where these are possible. For instance, the Narunggga word for ‘octopus’, mar: awitji means ‘many hands’ so the loan translation marrawitte has been adopted. Similarly, ‘flounder’ in Narunggga is ta jukuli (lit. ‘crooked mouth’) which has been adopted as ta yokunna in Kaurna. The fact that the Kaurna word is somewhat different from the Narunggga word makes all the difference.

Additional methods can sometimes be used, drawing on the principles of
historical linguistics. Certain sound changes have taken place in Adnyamathanha relative to Kaurna. Kaurna seems to be the more conservative, having preserved initial consonants which have been lost in Adnyamathanha, and resisted the lenition of $p > v$ that has taken place in Adnyamathanha. When we locate terms in Adnyamathanha that have not been recorded in Kaurna, rather than borrow them directly from Adnyamathanha, they can be borrowed in the more conservative form before these sound changes operated. For instance, a ‘pitfall trap’ in Adnyamathanha is *vata*. Allowing for the sound changes that have taken place, if the same term ever existed in Kaurna, it would have been in the form of *pata*. Adopted in this form, the word has its own identity distinct from the Adnyamathanha term.

On still other occasions, gaps have been filled by forming new compounds or derivations. For instance, no word for ‘platypus’ was ever recorded, so a new term *kauwilta* was developed as a reduced compound from *kauwe* ‘water’ + *pilta* ‘possum’. New terms such as this are marked with an asterisk (*) in the dictionary.

**Expanding the lexicon**

All modern languages are expanding their lexicon in response to technological change and innovation and in response to contact with other languages and cultures and subsequent incorporation of new cultural practices. For some languages, e.g. English, this is a process that is taken for granted. It happens with little conscious attention given it by language planners. For languages whose status suddenly changes to that of an official language requiring its use in education and administration, etc., there is an immediate need to expand the lexicon to enable it to function in these new domains.

A large body of literature is available that documents the circumstances under which this lexical expansion has taken place and the methods employed to incorporate new terminology in a range of languages, including Bahasa Indonesia, Filipino, Mandarin, Hebrew, Maori and a range of Indigenous languages such as Navajo and Apache in North America. Alisjahbana (1984: 87) reports that Indonesian has coined or adopted more than 500,000 new terms. There are only a few articles which deal with the development of new terminology in Australia’s Indigenous languages. See for instance Amery (1986a; 1986b), Black (1993), O’Grady (1960) and Simpson (1985).

In the case of Kaurna, as in Hebrew, the language has lain dormant for a period. The world has changed considerably since the language was documented in the mid-nineteenth century. Fortunately, the German missionaries recorded in excess of 100 new terms (see Amery, 1993). Now that Kaurna people are attempting to use Kaurna again in their daily lives, there is an immediate need for new vocabulary to talk about numerous items, including foodstuffs, personal effects, technologies, institutions and abstract concepts which are now an integral part of life. To date, ad hoc development of these neologisms has been as the need arises during a translation task (see Amery, 2000a: 140–41). Occasionally, new terms have been developed in a more considered manner. For instance, in workshops held in November 2000, we set out to develop words and expressions for use in a variety of situations in which parents interact with children, including bathing, nappy changing, mealtimes, cooking, shopping, etc. Accordingly, we set out to develop terms for salient items needed, such as ‘soap’,
‘shampoo’, ‘nappy’, ‘microwave’, ‘fridge’, ‘newsagent’, ‘bank’, etc. (see Amery & Gale, 2000). Suggestions for these new terms were put forward by workshop participants and discussed by the group of Kaurna language enthusiasts present until a consensus was reached. The tertiary level Kaurna linguistics course also acts as a forum for the development of such terminology, and on occasion practical assignments have required the development of several new terms. Many new terms, however, are developed by me working in relative isolation in response to a request for a name, a phrase or a longer translation task. I do, however, try to consult with Kaurna Elders in relation to new terms I have proposed, but there is a need for a more orderly process whereby Kaurna people are more in control of the process.

In 1996 I developed a base-10 number system based on the roots of Kaurna birth-order names (see Amery, 2000a: 143; 1996a). This was a radical departure from the traditional system. The proposal was enthusiastically embraced, with minor amendments, and is now taught at Kaurna Plains School and in other programmes. In 1997 I worked with Lester Irabinna Rigney to develop terms and expressions for use in sport (see Amery, 1997: 71–3).

It is anticipated that the Kaurna lexicon will be elaborated in certain chosen domains and that it will proceed only so far. It is unlikely that highly technical domains such as rocket science will be elaborated, though the word ‘rocket’ itself might be needed. So language modernisation will be more limited than in languages which have gained official language status at a national level.

**Filling in semantic space**

Even if a comprehensive dictionary exists that documents the majority of terms in the language, no matter how good the definitions are a dictionary never gives a complete picture of all the senses attached to the word or all the permissible collocations into which the word may enter. Much of this information, known instinctively by native speakers, must be slowly absorbed by second-language learners through immersion in the language and use of the language.

Now in the case of a language like Kaurna, many definitions are clearly deficient. Some glosses, such as *pillge* ‘a species of fungus’ indicate that T&S probably knew what the item was but were unable to communicate this in English. That is, they may well have seen the fungus in question and even been able to identify the fungus on subsequent occasions, but had no idea what it was called in English. Indeed, at that time many items of South Australian fauna and flora were probably unknown to science. For example, Edward Stephens, manager of the South Australia Company Bank, sent bird specimens to London together with labels in Kaurna. Of the 36 specimens sent, English equivalents for nine of the bird species were not known. Until such time as we are able to locate the specimens and reunite them with the Kaurna labels, there is little use we can make of these Kaurna terms. In cases such as this, once all possible avenues to pin down the meaning have been exhausted, perhaps meaning can be arbitrarily assigned to such terms to fill prominent lexical gaps (Amery, 2000a: 128–9).

Terms for fauna and flora or other physical items are relatively easy to deal with. But even here, such terms often have extended meanings or are used meta-
phorically. Not surprisingly, little metaphorical use of these terms was ever recorded and while some extended meanings have been documented (e.g. *pari* ‘maggot’ extended to *pari* ‘rice’) there would no doubt have been many more extensions that were not recorded.

It is known, for instance, that Australian languages, like English and numerous other languages, use terms for animals in a metaphorical sense to refer to people and their personal qualities. For instance, ‘He is a pig’ refers to the greedy or uncouth characteristics of the person’s behaviour, or perhaps to the fact that the person is a policeman. English uses numerous such terms metaphorically in this way. Perhaps this usage is a linguistic universal. In any case, a perusal of dictionaries of better described Australian languages, such as Yolngu Matha, reveals that *wunggan* ‘dog’ refers to a ‘playboy’ and that *kaanka* ‘crow’ in Pitjantjatjara refers to an untrustworthy person (Goddard, 1992: 26). Not surprisingly, such metaphorical usages of Kaurna terms for animals were not recorded by the German missionaries. Now Kaurna people can use these Kaurna terms in the same metaphorical senses as they would use the corresponding English terms or Nunga English terms, or they can investigate how the corresponding terms are used in other Australian languages, especially those closely related such as Adnyamathanha. No doubt this will result in a different mapping of this metaphorical semantic space.

One area that has already arisen is the use of ‘heart’ in English as the seat of emotions. In Kaurna *tangka* ‘liver’ is the seat of emotions and many other emotion terms are derived from it. However, for many Nunga people who have grown up in an English-speaking world, the liver makes no sense to them in relation to feelings. This became an issue when Jo Procter and Mary-Anne Gale compiled a book of poetry produced by Nunga students at Tauondi College. They titled the book *Tauondi Speaks from the Heart* and wanted to translate the title into several Indigenous languages with which the students identified. A number of contributors were quite unhappy with the use of Kaurna *tangka* ‘liver’ or Ngarrindjeri *miwi* ‘small intestine’ in the translation and insisted on *bulta* ‘heart’ and *ngele* ‘heart’ in Kaurna and Ngarrindjeri respectively. The compromise solution was to produce two versions of the title in each language (see Procter & Gale, 1997: back cover).

There are several Kaurna words which translate as the verb ‘to know’ in English. These include:

- *nakkondi* ‘to see; look; know’
- *tampendi* ‘to know; recognise; be acquainted with’
- *tirkandi* ‘to know; understand; learn’
- *paiandi* ‘to bite; chew’; *warra paiandi* ‘to understand the language’
- *mukabandi* ‘to remember; recollect; know; show’

There may well be more terms that would translate as ‘to know’ in English, but assuming for the moment that these terms cover the semantic space of knowing in English, how do we know which verb to use in Kaurna?

First, we can search for all instances in which T&S used the verb ‘know’ in their English translation and we can assemble all known uses of the above verbs. This results in the following:
• *yakko padlo burro nakkondi*. ‘He does not yet know it’;
• *yakko ngatto warte voltu nakkondi*. ‘I see no difference; I know or see no exit, no escape’;
• *yurlo imbarendi [sic] ‘to see one’s face again’, or ‘recognise, know again’;
• *ngarpa bia kungareninna nakketti*. ‘(The cat) has perhaps perceived the smell of a mouse;
• *ngaityo warranna nakkonina*. ‘Consider my address (to you)’;
• *nindo ngadlu nintini ( = kuteni) pipangga nakolyerni appeta?*. ‘Will you let us again look upon the paper?’ (i.e. instruct us?).

It would appear that *nakkondi* ‘to see; look; know’ is the main verb of knowing and some of the sentences recorded demonstrate that its semantics go beyond vision or even knowing via visual perception, to include an instance of knowing through hearing or a sense of smell. Thus the semantics of *nakkondi*, in addition to seeing, includes knowing as a result of direct perception, as opposed to cognition, recognition or learning. There are many sentence examples with the verb *nakkondi*, but very few examples of usage of the other verbs.

While the definition provided for *tampendi* suggests that this verb is used in relation to knowing someone, in fact *yurlo imbarendi* (lit. ‘forehead’ + ‘meeting one another’) ‘to see one’s face again’ or ‘recognise, know again’ also occurs in Teichelmann (1857). Are these terms synonyms? Unfortunately there are insufficient information and examples to say.

It is relatively easy to predict, with some confidence, which verb to choose in attempting to translate some sentences. For instance:

I know the Marion district like the back of my hand. – *nakkondi*
I know many people in the Kaurna community. – *tampendi*
I know all about astronomy. – *tirkandi*
I know how to spell encyclopedia. – *tirkandi*
Do you know German? – *paiandi*

In other cases, however, the choice is more problematic. Consider the following sentences. Perhaps there are several options for the sentence ‘I know the answer to that question’, depending on the nature of the answer to the question and how the interlocutor came to know the answer, whether it was a result of learning, recognition, memory or perception.

Similarly, in answer to a question like ‘Do you know where Bill is?’, the choice of verb may depend on whether the questioner thinks the interlocutor might know as a result of having seen Bill, in which case ‘know’ would be translated by *nakkondi*, or whether the interlocutor knows because he or she knows Bill’s schedule. The verb used to translate ‘know’ in ‘I know just what you mean’ might also depend on the nature of what is known.

And what about sentences like ‘I know horses. I know what they’re like.’? It is more difficult to predict in this case. Knowing here is more a matter of understanding as a result of experience over a long period of time.

**Derivational morphology**

A range of productive derivational affixes were recorded in Kaurna, such as *-tidli* ‘having’, *-tina* ‘without’, *-butto* ‘full of’ or *-tti*, a nominaliser of wide seman-
tics. The suffix -tti often derives a concrete object. For example, nurlitti ‘key’ is derived from the verb nurlendi ‘to twist; turn’. But -tti may also derive a social event, such as ngunyawaietti ‘corroboree’ (from ngunya ‘joy’ + waiendi ‘to move’). Letters written by Pitpauwe and Wailtyi in 1843 reveal that ngunyawaietti also derives a ‘toy’ (lit. ‘the moving with joy thing’) as opposed to ‘corroboree’ (‘the moving with joy event’).

Some derivational processes are a little more complicated. Agents are derived by adding the suffix -lla to the verb root and then reduplicating this minus the first syllable. For example:
kamballamballa ‘baker’ (= kamba+lla+mba+lla) from kambandi ‘to cook’
kanggallanggalla ‘caretaker’ (= kangga+lla+ngga+lla) from kanggandi ‘to look after’
mettillattilla ‘thief’ (= metti+lla+tti+lla) from mettindi ‘to steal’

New terms, such as *paru bakkillakkilla ‘butcher’ (derived from paru ‘meat’ + bakkendi ‘to cut’), have been formed using this process.

We are not restricted to the somewhat small range of derivational suffixes recorded. Additional suffixes may be generated as needed as reductions of independent words. After all, this is the way in which suffixes have usually emerged historically. In Maori, for instance, konu- a prefix for metals, was developed as a reduced form of konga ‘fragment’ + nuku ‘earth’ (Harlow, 1993: 101).

In the Kaurna language development workshops held in November 2000 we developed the suffix *-rllo ‘pertaining to’, a reduction of burllo ‘sign, symbol, trace’ and proposed that words such as *nguttoatparllo ‘education’ could be derived from nguttoatpandi ‘to teach’ using this suffix. Additional suffixes could be developed to increase the flexibility and adaptability of the language.

Syntax and inflectional morphology

Our knowledge of Kaurna syntax is far from complete though much can be gleaned from the sketch grammar and the hundreds of recorded sentences in T&S (1840) and the phrases and sentences in Teichelmann (1857). These sources are yet to be fully analysed and absorbed, but we try to make use of the examples as best we can. In working with these historical sources, however, we should bear in mind that the German missionaries were recording the language before the advent of sound recordings. Thus they had to rely on memory to a significant extent. Under these circumstances, mother tongue interference from German and perhaps English may have played a significant role, especially in relation to word order constraints.

Word order within the clause appears to be relatively free, and within the noun phrase both orders Adj + N and N + Adj occur. But coordination is not clear. Some other languages, like Pitjantjatjara, have conjunctions but Kaurna seems not to possess them. However, T&S (1840) list the numeral kuma ‘one’ separately as a conjunction kuma ‘also; too’ but there are not actually any examples where it is used to conjoin two objects or entities. On occasion we have used kuma as in Ninna ngai kuma padni ‘You and I went’, but we have also borrowed the conjunction ka ‘and’ from Pitjantjatjara or Yolngu Matha. It occurs frequently in the translation of Tucker’s Mob (Amery, 1992a) to conjoin both nouns and verbs. Note that Yolngu Matha has also borrowed the English conjunction wo (from ‘or’).

Certain decisions need to be made in relation to Kaurna morphology and
syntax. It would appear that Kaurna, like most other Australian languages, had several verb conjugations. This is evident only in example sentences which use verbs in the past or future tenses. For instance, the past perfective forms of *yunggondi* ‘to give’, *punggondi* ‘to hit’, *wanggandi* ‘to speak’, *kanggandi* ‘to bring forth’ and *nakkondi* ‘to see’ are *yunggi*, *punggi*, *wanggi*, *kanggi* and *naki* respectively where the final vowel of the root has been replaced with an *i*, but the past perfective forms of *kaityandi* ‘to send’, *kundandi* ‘to strike’, *pudlondi* ‘to tell’ and *nangandi* ‘to see’ are *kaitya*, *kunda*, *pudlo* and *nanga* respectively, where this vowel alternation does not occur. This vowel alternation is not motivated by semantics or phonology. One simply has to know the verb class membership. All verbs in the vocabulary are listed with an invariant -*ndi* present tense suffix, so unless a given verb happens to have been used in other tenses in an example sentence, there is no way of knowing from within the Kaurna sources themselves which conjugation it belongs to.

Among neighbouring related languages, the materials in adjoining Narungga, Ngadjuri and Nukunu are too poor to be of any assistance. Adnymathanha, still spoken in the Flinders Ranges, has only one verb conjugation, so it sheds no light on the problem. Languages some distance away, like Pitjantjatjara, still share a considerable level of vocabulary and morphology with Kaurna. Pitjantjatjara has four verb conjugations, referred to by Goddard (1992: xi) as the zero, *la*, *wa* and *ra* classes. Several of the verb Pitjantjatjara inflections are reproduced here for comparison in Table 5.

Table 5 Pitjantjatjara verb conjugations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Nominal form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(Ø)</em></td>
<td>wangka</td>
<td>wangkangu</td>
<td>wangkanyi</td>
<td>wangkaku</td>
<td>wangkanytja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(l)</em></td>
<td>patjala</td>
<td>patjanu</td>
<td>patjani</td>
<td>patjalku</td>
<td>patjantja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(ng)</em></td>
<td>puwa</td>
<td>pungu</td>
<td>punganyi</td>
<td>pungkuku</td>
<td>pungkunytja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(n)</em></td>
<td>tjura</td>
<td>tjunu</td>
<td>tjunanyi</td>
<td>tjunkuku</td>
<td>tjunkunytja</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the *(ng)* or *wa*-class, the past tense suffix is -*ngu* and the velar nasal is retained in many other suffixes as in -*ngama* ‘continuous imperative’, -*nganyi* ‘present’, -*ngangi* ‘past continuous’, -*ngkuku* ‘future’, -*ngkupai* ‘characteristic’, etc. This additional velar nasal is not apparent in other conjugations. Inchoative verbs in Pitjantjatjara belong to this *wa*-class. Interestingly, in Kaurna there appears to be at least two forms of the future tense suffix, -*ta* and -*nguta*. The inchoative-*ni* and the reciprocal/reflexive-*ri*21 always precede the -*nguta* form in the future tense. That is, as in Pitjantjatjara, there appears to be a *(ng)* verb class which they belong to. The prohibitive suffix has been recorded by the German missionaries in no less than 13 variant forms as follows:

Some of these variants are no doubt simply due to inconsistency in spelling, but one of the noticeable features is the reappearance of the additional -ngu syllable being additional evidence of a (ng) conjugation. Again, reciprocal/reflexive verbs often take the -ngutti variant. Some of the remaining variation may be explained by the presence of additional conjugations differing in the place of articulation of the stop. Potentially there are allomorphs containing an interdental, alveolar or retroflex stop /-thi/, /-ti/ and /-rti/. This kind of variation occurs in the Pitjantjatjara verb conjugations, where one of the main differences between the respective conjugations is the place of articulation of the nasal. When a nasal is present, it is often retroflex in the la-class, alveolar in the ra-class and velar in the other two. For instance, the past tense suffix is realised as -nu, -nu, -ngu and -ngu respectively. Now the past imperfect, or ‘preterite’ suffix, as T&S (1840) referred to it, was variously recorded as -tti, -rti. It might be that this suffix has allomorphs too, determined by membership of these verb classes.

Having established compelling evidence for the existence of verb classes in Kaurna, what should we do with them in terms of planning and developing a reclaimed Kaurna language? Several options are available. One is to simplify the verb system and promote the use of one invariant past, future or prohibitive suffix and simply ignore the confusing array of forms evident in the materials. However, there is a strong desire on the part of Kaurna language enthusiasts to recover the language to the maximal extent and strive for integrity and authenticity. There is good reason to retain the /-nguta/ future suffix and the /-ngkuti/ prohibitive suffix for the inchoative and reciprocal/reflexive verbs, but deciding on the quality of the stop and assigning specific verbs to one or other conjugation is highly problematic. It would be mostly pure guesswork. Some Kaurna verbs are cognate with Pitjantjatjara verbs, so verb class membership in Pitjantjatjara might perhaps provide some clues here, but most verbs bear no relationship.

This matter, like all others, remains a matter for Kaurna people themselves to decide, informed by a linguistic analysis of the historical records and relationships with other languages. My practice to date has been to use the recorded forms as much as possible and to use the (ng) class forms for reciprocal/reflexive and inchoative verbs. When it comes to verbs for which only present tense forms have been recorded, I use the dominant -ta ‘future’, -tti ‘non-specific past’ and -tti ‘prohibitive’ but guess the form of the past perfective. That is, sometimes I substitute an i for the final vowel in the root. At other times I leave it unchanged. Perhaps this matter, along with many others, should be the subject of more deliberate planning in future.

**Developing a corpus of useful expressions**

Some hundreds of Kaurna sentences, most accompanied by an English translation, were recorded by T&S (1840) and later by Teichelmann (1857). Very few phrases or sentences were recorded by other observers and most of these are Pidgin or Jargon Kaurna used in communication with colonists (see Simpson, 1996), not the ‘traditional’ language that was used between Kaurna people themselves. For instance, Koeler (1842), Williams (1840) and Wyatt (1879) all use possessive pronouns ngaityo ‘my’ and ninko ‘your’ instead of ngatto ‘I’ (ergative), ngai ‘I’ or ‘me’, nindo ‘you’ (ergative) and ninna ‘you’ (nominative and accusative) irrespective of the case role. Thus sentence material recorded by these three
observers is not suitable for use in the context of language reclamation and provides a defective model for the formation of new sentences by analogy.

The corpus of phrases and sentences recorded by the German missionaries provides a stock of ready-made expressions, some of which are extremely useful and readily applicable in contemporary contexts. However, most of these sentences were clearly uttered in the context of adult male to adult male conversation. Few are indicative of child to child communication, adult to child interaction or conversation involving women. If intergenerational transmission is ever to be restored or if more modest goals such as the reintroduction of some use of the language into the home is to be achieved, then people need access to suitable expressions for use in those contexts. This again presents a corpus-planning challenge that is unique to language revival. Similar challenges must have faced Hebrew in the early stages of reintroduction of the language.

Most often expressions are developed as a by-product of constructing and teaching a course, developing language learning materials, writing a song, translating a speech or addressing a specific request. We have just begun to address this area in a more planned way through a series of language development workshops, and more are planned for the future. We sketched out a number of language functions and domains of use in line with suggestions from workshop participants as follows:

**Language Function**
- Endearment – expressing affection
- Positive reinforcement
- Warnings
- Placating, reassuring, comforting
- Calling, beckoning, attention seeking
- Naming and categorising
- Body awareness, parts and functions
- Introducing kin

**Commands**
- Verbal games, e.g., same and different
- Greetings
- Leave takings
- Counting
- The environment – weather and seasons
- Places and place names

**Language Situation**
- Feeding and mealtime (and cooking)
- Bathing
- Getting dressed and ready to go out
- Nappy changing and toilet training
- Sleep time and story time
- Play – around the house and in the garden
- Kindy and Early Childhood Centre
- School – in classroom and yard
- Outings – going for walks and in car
Crying baby and sickness
Shopping
Sport
Dealing with pets and animals (from Amery & Gale, 2000: 20)

Our method was to elicit desired expressions in each of these areas till the whiteboard was full and then attempt to devise Kurnara equivalents or similar expressions that could be used in the same context as the English expression. For instance, the expressions associated with getting dressed and getting ready for school were developed as follows:

Getting dressed and getting ready for school

Vocabulary
*maityowampi ‘bicycle’ (from maityomaityo ‘bat’ + wampi ‘wing’ by analogy with Adnyamathanha)
*medomutyerta ‘pyjamas’
*ibitti ‘shower’

Expressions
Karrikarri! ‘Come on, get up!’
Natta! ‘Now!’
Mila burrindunna! ‘Five minutes!’
Kauwe marrandi! Ibittianna! ‘The water is running! Into the shower!’
Medo mutyerta marendo! ‘Take off your pyjamas!’
Kawai ibittiunangko Natta! Kumatpi! ‘Get out of the shower! Now! At once!’
Mutyerta tarrendo! ‘Get dressed!’
______ tarrendo! ‘Put your ______ on!’
Ngaintya ninna padlonendi panyimaitya? ‘What do you want for breakfast?’
Ninko tando manmando! ‘Get your bag!’
Niwako tandurla manmaingwa! ‘Get your (2) bags!’
Naako tandunna manmainga! ‘Get your ( > 2) bags!’
Yuldamai ngatpappi? ‘Have you got your lunch?’
Yuldamai ngatpappi ninko tandungga? ‘Have you got your lunch in your bag?’
Tialla wirki? ‘Did you clean your teeth?’
Yoka wirkando! ‘Brush your hair!’
Wodliwarlapai madlari? ‘Have you finished your homework?’
Nattadli! Padniadli! ‘Now let’s go!’ (us two)
Nattadlu! Padniadlu! ‘Now let’s go!’ (us mob)
Maityowampirlo padni! ‘On your bike!’
Padnipadnittianna ngatpa! ‘In the car!’ (one child)
Padnipadnittianna ngatpainga! ‘In the car!’ (more than two children)
(from Amery & Gale, 2000: 5 part 2)

Workshop participants are all well aware that this is just a beginning. Many more expressions are needed in each of the designated domains and language functions, and there are many other areas not yet addressed. But hopefully this
will get the ball rolling. By the time we have the next series of workshops, participants should be able to specify many more needed expressions.

**Texts**

Like all other Australian languages, Kaurna was unwritten prior to records made by a range of observers and the introduction of literacy by German missionaries. Investigation of other Australian languages indicates the existence of a vast store of oral literature in the form of Dreaming narratives and song lines. See, for instance, Rockman and Cataldi’s (1994) compilation of Warlpiri narratives, Dixon’s (1991) Yidiny texts and Heath’s (1980) *Nunggubuyu Myths and Ethnographic Texts*. Closer to home, Berndt and Berndt (1993) recorded numerous Dreaming narratives and some songs in the late 1930s and 1940s in the Ngarrindjeri language at a time when this knowledge was rapidly being lost. It stands to reason then that Kaurna would have possessed an equally complex and rich oral tradition of which only a few snippets have been recorded in the language itself. This has been compiled and analysed in Amery (2000a) and in a more detailed fashion in Amery (2000b).

The only extant Kaurna Dreaming narrative to have been recorded in the Kaurna language is that of the Munana story told by Kadlitpinna (‘Captain Jack’) to the part-time Protector of Aborigines, William Wyatt. It is just 33 words including repetitious phrases, originally published in the following form:

*Aichoo ngaicherle erleeta wangan ‘Monána aráche kaia pemáne, ea pamáne, ea pamáne, boora kaia kurra pemáne, kaia kurra yewáne, kotinne kaia yewáne, kotinne kaia yewáne, boora yerta yewane; Monana kaia tattee ne kurra winneen.’*

My father’s great-grandfather (or ancestor) said – ‘Monana threw many spears, here threw, here threw, by and by a spear upwards threw, the spear above stuck fast, again spear stuck fast, again spear stuck fast, by and by in the ground stuck fast; Monana (by the) spears climbed, above went.’ This statement is in the words of Monaicha wonweetpeena22 konoocha23, or ‘Captain Jack’ (Wyatt, 1879: 25).

Schürmann makes reference to this same story in letters written in 1839. The missionaries also refer to other Dreaming narratives in their correspondence, but regrettably failed to record these in Kaurna. In several instances versions of these Dreaming narratives, such as the Kondolli or Fire and Whale story, have been recorded in the neighbouring Ngarrindjeri language. Several entries in the vocabulary also indicate the existence of this rich oral tradition.

In addition to the Munana story, two short passages contributed by Mullawirraburka ‘King John’ and Kadlitpinna ‘Captain Jack’ to illustrate dialect differences and some secret sacred initiation songlines are published (T&S 1840: 72). There are also four short songlines referring to post-contact phenomena (peas, a road, the bullock and foreigners) in both published and unpublished sources, indicating a vibrant culture which adapted to change and incorporated new elements into existing structures.

**Written Kaurna texts**

Clamor Schürmann and Christian Teichelmann established a school taught in the Kaurna language on 23 December 1839. In 1840, the running of this school...
was taken over by Samuel Klose who operated it until July 1845 when its closure was ordered by Governor Grey.

The missionaries translated the ten commandments into Kaurna and they had a school prayer which the children recited daily in Kaurna, though I have not been able to locate it. It would appear that they also translated several Biblical texts. The missionaries also translated six German hymns into Kaurna and their journals indicate that these hymns became popular among the Kaurna children.

A brief literary tradition emerged among the children educated at Piltawodli, the ‘Native Location’, on the banks of the Torrens River. In 1840, Klose sent a page from Kartanya’s copybook to Germany. On it were just three lines repeated as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Yeowarnalitya tondari mangaringa;} \\
\text{Jehovah-to always worship-IMP(Pl)} \\
\text{‘Always worship Jehovah.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ngadluko pinggalinggala pa;} \\
\text{our creator 3Sg} \\
\text{‘He is our creator.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{wakinnaanangko padlu ngadlu tiraappeta.} \\
\text{bad-from 3Sg+ERG we protect-FUT} \\
\text{‘He protects us from evil.’}
\end{align*}
\]

A group letter written by Itya Maii and signed by eight other children was sent to Governor Gawler in May 1841, urging him to stay and look after their interests. In 1843, two 12- or 13-year-old boys, Pitpauwe and Wailtye, sent letters to Germany requesting some more toys and in 1845 Itya Maii penned a short note to Governor Grey and his wife and attached it to some watermelons that the children had grown in their garden. It is possible that more of these letters and texts might exist, but this is the extent of materials located so far.

William Wyatt, the missionaries and others also acted as interpreters and translators. Governor George Gawler made a practice of having his speeches translated into Kaurna and two of these, the first by Wyatt in October 1838 and the second by Schürmann in May 1840, have been recorded for posterity, published in the newspaper of the time.

The few letters written by Kaurna children, snippets of Dreaming stories, songs written down by European observers, and texts composed or translated by missionaries do provide a useful starting point, but their usefulness is somewhat limited for the preparation of the kinds of texts that Kaurna people wish to write today.

**Texts created in the context of Kaurna language revival**

A range of Kaurna texts has been created since the 1990s. These include numerous songs and speeches, but also several poems and extended text used in signage and public art installations. Texts have been created to accompany Kaurna language learning materials and published children’s stories have been translated. And a protest letter to the Prime Minister, John Howard, was written in 1997 drawing on some of the structures in the 1841 letter.
By necessity, most Kaurna texts created today are the product of translation. Some are translations of pre-established texts. This is the case with seven of the 25 songs published in *Kaurna Paltinna* (Schultz et al., 1999) most of which are well-known and loved nursery rhymes, such as ‘Twinkle Twinkle Little Star’. We have also since translated a number of other songs, such as Bob Randall’s ‘My Brown Skin Baby’, as well as Christmas songs including ‘The Twelve Days of Christmas’ and ‘Rudolph the Red-nosed Reindeer’. Sometimes the Kaurna version is a wide departure from the original song. In the case of Rudolph, for instance, we used Wailtji, the name of one of the signatories of the letter written to Governor Gawler in 1841, a name which refers to a species of kangaroo.

In 1992 we attempted a translation of Marion Sinclair’s ‘Kookaburra Song’ and wrote a number of additional verses to the same tune. When we produced the Kaurna songbook we were not able to include the translation of the ‘Kookaburra Song’ or reproduce the original tune because of copyright restrictions, so we rewrote the kookaburra verse and composed a new tune. While *Ipila Wirra* began as a translation, the final version no longer depends in any way on the original ‘Kookaburra Song’.

Many more translations of songs would be undertaken if it were not for copyright. Songs are an ideal means of introducing a language, because it is much easier to sing in a foreign language than speak it, especially if one already knows the tune. It is a relatively small step for children to learn a new set of words to a tune they already know and love. Hymns are easier because many older hymns are not subject to copyright. Indeed, several old favourites, such as ‘The Old Rugged Cross’ and ‘What a Friend We Have in Jesus’ have been translated.

Even when new Kaurna songs are composed, including those intended only as Kaurna songs without an accompanying English version, they are usually written in English first and then a translation attempted in much the same way. Until Kaurna people have a more active knowledge of the language, writing a Kaurna song without reference to English is not possible. English is the first and often the only language spoken by all Kaurna language enthusiasts.

Because Kaurna words tend to be longer than English words, there being very few monosyllabic Kaurna words, typically a literal translation of a song results in far too many syllables to fit easily to the tune. As a result, extensive modification of the original takes place with whole phrases and sometimes entire lines of the song being omitted.

During the very first Kaurna language workshops, several participants attempted to write Kaurna stories. These were written in English first and then translated. Nelson Varcoe (1990) produced *Wai Yerlitta! ‘But Dad!’* and Bonny Wanganeen (1990) wrote *Freddy Kanto* ‘Freddy the Frog’. They were written with children in mind to support the teaching of Kaurna. Some literature has been produced by staff at Kaurna Plains School. This includes counting books, books about animals, the sea, etc., or books about projects such as the establishment of an Indigenous plant foods garden at the school.

In the development of senior secondary curricula (SSABSA, 1996a; 1996b), students are encouraged to write stories and prepare materials with primary school programmes in mind. For instance, a brief Kaurna version of the Tjilbruke Dreaming narrative was produced by a group of Year 11 students in 1994 when the course was first run. But this literature needs checking because students and
teachers of Kaurna do not have a sufficient grasp of Kaurna grammar. It would be like using a high school Chinese language class to produce reading materials for Chinese programmes in primary schools. Indeed, as consultant linguist to the programmes, I do not have sufficient grasp of Kaurna grammar to enable these tasks to be carried out with a high level of confidence. But we do the best we can. I often make corrections and revisions to my own translations, much to the frustration of the students. For instance, several shortcomings in the Kaurna songs produced in the first songbook (Ngarrindjeri, Narrunga and Kaurna Languages Project, 1990) were noted in our more recent songbook (Schultz et al., 1999: 122). Ideally, several linguists should work on this material, to help identify oversights and misinterpretations. Over the years Jane Simpson, my PhD supervisor, whose research interests include Kaurna, has provided much advice and guidance, including in relation to Maikoko Birko below.

Maikoko Birko (Amery, 1992a) which is a translation of Tucker’s Mob (Mattingley, 1992) was undertaken at an early stage in the Kaurna language movement, before I had such a detailed knowledge of the Kaurna sources. The Kaurna translation of this 30-page book amounted to around 460 words. The original story was set at Barunga, near Katherine in the Northern Territory. It revolves around a cat named Tucker who wanted to join in the school activities of his human friends. Because the story is situated in a place with a very different climate, I had to grapple with items like banana palms and sweet potatoes for which there are obviously no Kaurna equivalents in the historical sources. For the former I used the English term and the latter I encoded as a loan translation *barngutta pinyatta* (lit. ‘potato’ + ‘sweet’). Activities and objects in the classroom and playground (reading, writing, painting, pictures, marbles, chairs, windows, doors, etc.) also occur in the story. Fortunately, some of these concepts, such as *makkitau* ‘window’ and *narna* ‘door’, were already encoded in Kaurna, having been recorded by T&S (1840). For ‘writing’ I used *warra wandiappendi* (lit. ‘putting the language down’), but used ‘reading’ as an unassimilated borrowing from English. At the time I had little familiarity with the Kaurna sources, and have since located *peenjáne* ‘to write’ in Wyatt (1879: 18) which is equivalent to *pingyandi* ‘to raise; make; construct; form &c’ (T&S, 1840: 39) and *pintyandi* ‘to make, produce, create’ (Teichelmann, 1857). It is this latter form that we use today for ‘writing’. We have also since developed a neologism *tampitirkandi* ‘to read’ formed as a compound verb from *tampendi* ‘to know; recognise; be acquainted with’ and *tirkandi* ‘to know; understand; learn’.

Georgina Williams’ poem ‘Coming Home’ was written in 1985 and published the following year (Williams, 1986). This poem epitomises what Kaurna linguistic and cultural revival is all about. Georgina had recited this poem in English on many occasions. In 1999 I undertook a Kaurna translation of this poem in consultation with Georgina so that it could appear on one of the signs at Warripparinga. This signage was installed in July 2000. The first verse appears below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaurna translation</th>
<th>Original English version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ngaityo Wodlianna Parni Budnandi</td>
<td>Coming Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my home-to towards arriving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngai bukkiana towilla</td>
<td>I am an old spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I old/ancient spirit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two other poems, Warrabarna Kaurna! ‘Let Kaurna Be Spoken!’ and Wiltarninga! ‘Be Strong!’ (Telfer, 1997) were composed specifically as Kaurna poems. Warrabarna Kaurna! was written by Nelson Varcoe in 1994 as part of the Kaurna language teaching programme and published in the local school newsletter. He later narrated this poem on the Warranna Purruna: Pampi Tungarar: Living Languages video (DECS, 1997) and it appears in print in the accompanying publication (DETE, 1998).

Karl Telfer wrote Wiltarninga! specifically for inclusion in a book of poetry (Procter & Gale, 1997: 50–51) emanating from a creative writing course at Taundi College. Like Varcoe’s poem, Wiltarninga! began with the author jotting down thoughts in English first. But it was also influenced by the turn of phrase encountered in the Kaurna sources themselves. The phrase Wiltarninga! ‘Be strong!’ which is derived from a longer phrase Warpunna wiltarninga, meyunna, nganta makketitya ‘Men, let your bones be strong so as to shake well (as at the native dance)’ appears in the phraseology section of T&S (1840: 71). The initial jottings in English are significantly different from the published English version of the poem. The English version is not a strictly literal translation of the Kaurna version, though it is a fairly close translation.

Towards an authentic Kaurna literature

Kaurna texts are being produced in the absence of literary critics. Of course when Kaurna texts are produced, Kaurna people want to know who is producing them and what right they have to produce them. Issues of authenticity and ownership are foremost in people’s minds. But there is little attention given to the form of the text, which is one of the main preoccupations of literary critics. The form of Kaurna texts is produced according to our understanding of Kaurna grammar. This involves a fair element of guesswork. Very few members of the limited audience are in a position to criticise the form or suggest alternative expressions. The language in the main book produced to date, Maikoko Birko, is pitched at a level beyond learners and teachers of Kaurna. As a result, to date it has not been utilised to any extent.

The more we work with the Kaurna language and the old sources, the more we come to understand certain Kaurna idioms and the Kaurna turn of phrase. Unfortunately, too few idioms were recorded, but there are some such as Parnu
‘Sing according to his tooth’ (i.e. imitate the singer). T&S’s exposure to the Kaurna language was limited and their knowledge was incomplete. Under such circumstances, Kaurna people would have tried to avoid figurative language in their presence, and had the missionaries overheard it they would have been less likely to record it. Operating in a time before sound recording equipment, as initial language learners they would have been more likely to record what they understood.

In general, then, Kaurna texts are essentially translations of English texts, and as a result are heavily influenced by English discourse features. Undoubtedly, Kaurna people from the 1840s would find our texts very strange and stilted.

While there has not been any criticism of the structure of Kaurna texts and Kaurna translations by first-language speakers of Australian languages, there could conceivably be this kind of criticism at some time in the future. First-language speakers of other Indigenous languages might notice that the syntax of some Kaurna sentences mirrors English syntax and that discourse structure reads like English.

How can we avoid this? One way to avoid English influence might be to work intensively with speakers of other Indigenous languages that are still spoken on a daily basis. Kaurna texts might be modelled on Indigenous language texts. While there is no certainty that Kaurna discourse structure was the same as Warlpiri or Pitjantjatjara discourse, there is bound to be a closer affinity than with English. This would be a very costly and time-consuming process but might well be worth the investment.

If and when Kaurna is ever acquired as a first language, something not considered possible by many linguists though it apparently has taken place for a handful of Cornish children who have grown up speaking both English and Cornish as first languages, the language might be expected to go through a process similar to creolisation. It would be expected to expand rapidly and would probably be subjected to enormous English influence in the grammar as it took on a life of its own and began to serve peer-group interests. It might be expected to diverge markedly from the Kaurna language known from the historical sources.

Beyond Kaurna

Language planning in relation to the Kaurna language has been considered here in some detail. To what extent can these measures be replicated? Can Kaurna language reclamation efforts serve as a model for other language communities to emulate and copy?

In answer to this question, at the level of fine detail the Kaurna situation is no doubt unique. For instance, another sleeping language would not be supported by precisely the same set of historical materials. Gaps in the data are bound to be different. Even among the Kaurna sources themselves, what one person observes and records is quite different from what another observes and records. This reflects the training and interests of the observers and their own particular set of experiences with members of the language group. There may or may not be a common core of material recorded by two or more observers.

The Kaurna community in the 21st century is also unique, reflecting a particular set of historical circumstances. Kaurna language reclamation efforts operate
within a particular political and educational context which will differ from one situation to another. Reviving a language in the context of a large metropolitan city is a very different proposition from attempting to revive a language in a small rural town.

Having said that, no doubt there are lessons that can be learnt from the Kaurna experience that can be applied in other situations.

**Historical linguistics**

The application of the principles of historical linguistics would seem to be a particularly useful method for filling in gaps in the language in a situation where closely related languages have been more comprehensively recorded. In the Kaurna situation, the application of historical linguistics is limited because few sound changes are evident between Kaurna and neighbouring closely related languages and these neighbouring languages have been poorly recorded. But one can imagine situations where neighbouring closely related languages have been better described than the language being reclaimed and where pronounced sound changes have occurred. In such circumstances, the methods of historical reconstruction offer the means to fill lexical gaps such that the words incorporated are distinct from the surrounding languages and in keeping with the language itself.

**Narungga**

Of the languages which have ceased to be spoken, many have not been recorded as extensively as Kaurna. Narungga from nearby Yorke Peninsula, for instance, is a language with which many Nungas identify, but which was poorly documented. Only about 120 words were known by older Narungga people and recorded by Brian Kirke (ASTEC Key Centre, 1987). Several hundred words have been recorded, but no grammar. Just a little grammatical information can be extracted from the handful of sentences recorded by Black (1920). Unfortunately, no sentences in the past or future tenses seem to have been recorded, though several imperative sentences were obtained. Twenty or so verbs were recorded, including many of the most often used and basic verbs such as ‘see’, ‘hear’, ‘sit’, ‘lie’, ‘come/go’, ‘hit’, ‘cry’, ‘laugh’, ‘speak’, ‘sing’, ‘burn’, ‘eat’, ‘drink’, ‘give’, ‘carry’, ‘make’ and ‘die’. Fortunately, Black (1920) has recorded the ergative first, second and third person pronouns and several possessive pronouns. Black employs a phonetic script for his transcriptions and his work is certainly much easier to make sense of than the other sources (Kuhn, in Curr, 1886; Johnson & Tindale, in Tindale, 1936). Few new terms are included in the Narungga sources, though there are a number of clothing items, and there is little evidence of productive word-forming processes. Most new terms recorded in Narungga are semantic extensions, but a few clothing items are derived from balta ‘covering’.

What can be done with this limited Narungga corpus? Using the Narungga corpus alone, it would certainly be possible to construct simple stories, written in the present tense. It would also be possible to incorporate some direct speech in these stories using imperative forms and questions. But the story line would have to be chosen carefully, making use of the limited range of verbs and other vocabulary. We are, however, restricted to single clause sentences, which tends to make a text sound stilted.
If the language were to be used in the context of school, there is a complete absence of terms for almost every conceivable object in the classroom. Furthermore, verbs associated with learning, such as ‘learn’, ‘teach’, ‘know’, ‘think’, ‘read’, ‘write’, ‘count’, ‘paint’, ‘ask’, etc., have not been recorded. It would thus be difficult to construct many expressions relevant within the classroom context. Similarly, language use in the context of the playground would also be restricted without access to verbs like ‘jump’, ‘run’, ‘kick’, ‘hop’, ‘throw’ and nouns such as ‘ball’, ‘bin’, ‘seat’, etc.

In this situation, if people wish to use the language in extended conversation or to create a range of more complex texts, etc., there are basically two choices. Either they can make use of Narungga words within English or they can graft Narungga words into Kaurna where the grammar has been better documented.

The first option, making use of Narungga words in English, is in fact what Narungga people do in their use of Aboriginal English or Nunga English, which is adopting more and more words of Indigenous origin as people become familiar with them from historical sources.

The second option was used in a Narungga version of Tucker’s Mob in 1992 (Amery, 1992b). I took the Kaurna translation I had done with some help from Jane Simpson, and substituted Narungga words where these were known. For instance, I used yukuli instead of yokunna ‘crooked’. I also substituted Narungga suffixes where these are known. For instance, I used the present tense -dja instead of -ndi and the transitive imperative -ru instead of -ndo. Finally, I deliberately used slightly different spelling conventions – ‘tj’ instead of ‘ty’, and voiced stops instead of voiceless stops. This approach was discussed with a group of Narungga Aboriginal Education Workers at the time, who approved of the resultant Narungga version.

It would appear that little or no use has ever been made of the Narungga version of Tucker’s Mob, probably because the language in it is unfamiliar to people and there are no support structures or in-service courses in place to familiarise people with it. Recent discussions (6 March 2001) with a group of Narungga people wanting to kick-start Narungga language activities revealed that they were keen to pursue the Narungga sources themselves and see what they can do with them, without drawing on Kaurna and Nukunu or resorting to English to provide the framework in which to use Narungga words. For them, questions of identity are paramount, and if that means that the language can only be used in a restricted way then so be it. Others in the group, seeing the limitations of existing sources, are keen to draw on Kaurna grammar to provide the framework on which to hang Narungga words, and possibly look towards developing a composite Kaurna-Narungga language. It should be noted that some areas of the vocabulary, such as fish terms and flora terms, are better documented in Narungga than in Kaurna. Some at the meeting also expressed a desire to draw maximally on distinctive features of Nunga English, such as the postvocalic /r/ and stress and intonation patterns, in the development of a Narungga language.

What if only word lists remain?

What are the options for communities where only word lists of their languages exist, and the grammar has not been documented? This is, in fact, a
reasonably common scenario. The pastoralist Edward Curr, missionary George Taplin and others collected numerous word lists from around Australia in order to draw comparisons between languages. Norman Tindale of the South Australian Museum also recorded numerous word lists and some texts, but only rarely made remarks on grammatical structures and never wrote grammars of Australian languages. Grammars of languages, such as Kaurna, that ceased to be spoken before the era of modern linguistics, are relatively rare. These include Ramindjeri, Yaralde, Ngayawang, Dieri, Barrngarla and Awabakal. However, there are many other languages for which only a word list remains.

Even with just a short word list, there are still meaningful and relevant things that can be done to use the language to strengthen or enhance a sense of identity and to raise awareness. Two obvious areas are naming activity and the writing of songs.

Naming activity

Much that has already been discussed in relation to Kaurna naming activity can also be applied to languages where the records are more limited. Some naming activity is possible, no matter how limited the corpus. Note that efforts are being made to reinstate Narungga place names where these are known. Nearly 60 Narungga place names have been recorded by Johnson and respelt by Tindale (Tindale, 1936).

Songs

Songs can be constructed with a minimum of vocabulary and grammar. There is a good chance that even the shortest word list will contain body parts which lend themselves to use in songs for young children. A translation of the well-known song ‘Heads, shoulders, knees and toes’ requires the use of just four body parts and a line ‘we all clap hands together’. But even this last sentence can be replaced with something else, perhaps the repetition of a verb. Tamsin Donaldson has pointed out that songs can be created by the repetition of just one or two words (personal communication, 1989).

The languages of Tasmania

Numerous word lists were recorded for the languages of Tasmania. These have been collated by Plomley (1976). However, precious little can be said about the grammar of Tasmanian languages. Crowley and Dixon (1981) have tried to extract what grammatical information they can from these records, but little can be said with any certainty. What is worse is that the Tasmanian languages are not closely related to languages on the mainland. Tasmania has been cut off from the mainland for around 15,000 years when the sea level rose significantly. It would appear that during this period major changes took place on the mainland with the expansion of the Pama-Nyungan languages. If these assumptions are correct, it would be expected that the closest relatives of Tasmanian may be spoken in the Kimberley area or Western Arnhemland, rather than nearby Victoria, since the Pama-Nyungan languages which spread out over southern and eastern Australia are believed to be innovative. However, the Tasmanian materials are of such poor quality that meaningful comparisons simply cannot be made. In this situation, the application of the tools of comparative linguistics can only be applied among the Tasmanian word lists themselves.
Palawa in Tasmania are busy attempting to revive Tasmanian. While information is hard to come by, it would appear that they are trying to create a single Tasmanian language, as an amalgam of all the recorded material. Crowley and Dixon’s analysis indicates that there were perhaps as many as 14 or more distinct languages spoken in Tasmania. Articles such as Brown (1995: 3) indicate that sentences are being constructed, but it is not clear as to the nature of the grammar being used.

**Approaches to Language Revival**

Language immersion is generally accepted as the ideal way to learn a language, particularly in early childhood (see, for instance, Keegan, 1996). French immersion programmes in Canadian schools have proved very successful (Cummins & Swain, 1986: 55–6). However these programmes, mounted in a major world language, do not translate easily into the language revival context. The principle of language immersion can be applied in certain language revival situations, but in others new methods are needed.

**Kohanga Reo ‘language nests’**

Innovative language immersion programmes pioneered in New Zealand have made substantial progress in the revitalisation of Maori. In 1982, the now well-known Kohanga Reo ‘language nest’ movement was initiated, linking the grandparent generation, who still spoke Maori, with the pre-schooler children. Between 1981 and 1989, 500 Kohanga Reo were established, catering for about 8000 children. By 1995, more than 14,000 children were enrolled in these programmes (Keegan, 1997b: 15). These language nests have produced hundreds of fluent Maori-speaking children. Despite the success of the Kohanga Reo, the language is still on the brink of extinction, even though there are now at least as many fluent speakers of Maori as there were in the 1880s and 1890s, and many more New Zealanders have some knowledge of Maori compared with last century. The problem lies in the demographic profile. Half of the fluent Maori speakers were over 60 in 1990. While there are a good number of preschool children with demonstrable fluency, only a small proportion of the generations in between are fluent Maori speakers.

Unfortunately, few children emerging from the Kohanga Reo have an opportunity to continue their education in Maori and consolidate what they have acquired. Benton (1993: 12) notes ‘As many Maori parents already know to their bitter disappointment, where the language is concerned, three or four years’ effort in kohanga reo can be undone in three or four months at school’. The Kohanga Reo have given rise to some bilingual Kaupapa Maori schools, but in 1990 less than 2% of Maori children attended these schools. The situation has improved since (see Keegan, 1997b: 18), but still less than 20% of Maori children have access to any form of Maori immersion education. There is an acute shortage of Maori-speaking teachers. The Kohanga Reo have created a demand for adult language classes, giving rise to the Te Atārangī movement, so that parents can learn and support their children’s Maori language development.

The Kohanga Reo approach has been hailed as an outstanding success and has been successfully replicated in Hawai’i where it is known as Punana Leo ‘lan-
guage nest’ (Schütz, 1994: 365–9). In 1992 there were 131 children between the ages of three and five enrolled in Punana Leo programmes. They hear and speak only Hawai’ian for ten hours a day, five days a week.

The ‘master–apprentice’ method

Hinton (1994), while recognising the outstanding success of the Maori and Hawai’ian language nests, questions their applicability to the languages of California:

Despite the inspiring nature of the Hawaiian program, the number of speakers and even of people who might ever be interested in speaking a given language is so small for each of the California languages that the idea of training hundreds or thousands of children to speak one seems unthinkable. In California, teaching even one child to speak is a great feat. (Hinton, 1994: 229)

Instead, she proposes a master–apprentice method which she claims is more suited to the Californian situation where the languages are no longer used on a daily basis. In the master–apprentice method, an older fluent speaker is paired with a motivated young adult keen to learn the language on a full-time basis. The pair spend about four months together with their living expenses funded so that they can devote all their time to language learning. The ‘apprentice’ accompanies the ‘master’ participating in a range of activities, including traditional pursuits such as hunting, the making of traditional crafts or participating in ceremonies, and non-traditional activities such as repairing a car, going to the store, etc. At least 20 hours per week are spent actively learning the language.

Both the language nest and master–apprentice approaches are based on the principles of language immersion. In the Kaurna situation, language immersion is impossible for us to achieve, at least in the early stages of language reclamation. Still, there are lessons to be learnt. We can strive to create immersion-like experiences, but until the teachers of Kaurna programmes gain more fluency in the language and there are more situations in which learners can hear, see and use Kaurna, immersion is simply not achievable.

Paul Dixon, then Chair of the Kaurna Aboriginal Community and Heritage Association (KACHA), asked me at a meeting of the committee held in 1995 if I thought it would be possible for them to conduct their meetings in Kaurna. In response I prepared a short tape with an accompanying transcript of a number of Kaurna expressions that would be useful in a meeting context. Short, easily learned utterances such as Wadu! ‘Agreed’, Ngana wanggi? ‘Who said?’ Warratti! ‘Be quiet!’ could be dropped into what was otherwise English conversation. In the earliest stages, the learning of just one expression each week would be a useful start so that it will become established as a habit, an accepted normative use within KACHA or within the community. Once people get into the habit of learning and using the new expressions and feel comfortable with them, the rate of incorporation of new expressions into the speech repertoire would increase.

Prompted by Paul’s request, and drawing on my experiences and observations of Kaurna language use at Kaurna Plains School and in the community, I have proposed what I call the Formulaic Method for language revival.
The Formulaic Method

The Formulaic Method entails the staged introduction of well-formed utterances. By contrast with language immersion, or Hinton’s master–apprentice method, this method, particularly in the early stages, involves the use of vast amounts of English with just a little Kaurna. However, it introduces only grammatically well-formed and complete utterances which draw to a maximal extent on Kaurna grammar as we know it from the 19th-century sources.

Initially, minimal one-word utterances that can stand alone as questions, responses, commands, greetings, leave-takings and the like should predominate in the repertoire taught and used. Words which are short, easy to pronounce, easy to remember and, most importantly, carry a high functional load are introduced first. We might begin by teaching the word *paitya* ‘deadly’. ‘Deadly!’ meaning something like ‘terrific!’ or ‘super!’ is a frequently used utterance that Nungas identify as Nunga English. As it stands alone, children can drop it into their speech and use it at the appropriate time. The expression *paitya!* can be used often and is easily pronounced. *Kurrukarril* ‘Shame!’ is another expression which draws on Nunga English, where the expression ‘Shame job!’ is an entrenched defining feature of the social dialect, uttered (often in jest) when someone steps out of line, does something outrageous or breaks cultural mores.

Swear words and insults also serve as self-contained expressions. Several ‘opprobrious terms’, as T&S (1840) called them, were recorded in the German sources. Additional loan translations of some mild English obscurities, such as *kudnabutto* ‘full of shit’, were introduced at Kaurna Plains School in 1997 and 1998 and have served as a strong motivating factor, with students finding their own friendly insults. Staff report that their introduction has been empowering for students at Fremont-Elizabeth City High School and has had something of a calming effect. Students can say things in their own language without teachers and students in the mainstream school getting upset. The introduction of these kinds of terms might also work well in the context of reintroducing the language into the Kaurna community, but as yet is untested.

Other useful one-word expressions that stand alone and can be used often in answer to questions might include:

- **ne** ‘yes’
- **tiati** ‘true, correct’
- **marni** ‘good’
- **ko** ‘OK’
- **yakko** ‘no’
- **madlanna** ‘none; nothing’
- **wointye** ‘maybe’
- **muinmo** ‘more; again’

Pronouns, too, are useful as single-word responses in certain contexts, although there are certain grammatical complexities, with the need to distinguish between nominative and ergative cases and singular and dual number.

Question words are very useful one-word expressions and should be introduced early. In Kaurna they include:

- **ngana?** ‘who?’
- **wa?** ‘where?’
- **ngaintya?** ‘what?’
- **wanti?** ‘where to?’
- **ngannaiya?** ‘why?’
- **wadangko?** ‘where from?’
- **waminna?** ‘what’s up? what’s wrong? what’s the matter?’
Simple commands are also useful as high-frequency stand-alone expressions. But here again there is some complexity, with the need to distinguish between singular, dual and plural addressees and between intransitive and transitive imperatives. Useful singular imperatives include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intransitive</th>
<th>Transitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tikka! 'Sit down!'</td>
<td>Wappendo! 'Do it!'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karrikarri! 'Stand up!'</td>
<td>Mannmando! 'Get it!'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parni kawai! 'Come here!'</td>
<td>Parniappendo! 'Pass it!'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurnti padni! 'Go away!', etc.</td>
<td>Nakkondo! 'Look!'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is an easy matter to expand the use of the transitive imperatives by the addition of an object, for example bakkadla parniappendo! ‘pass the salt!’ or tarltimanmando! ‘get the pen!’, etc. In the context of the classroom, additional plural imperatives are also very useful, as are negative imperatives, not distinguished for number. They include:

| Yurringgarninga! 'Listen!'         | Warratti! 'Be quiet!'             |
| Parni Nakkainga! 'Look here!'      | Bilyabilyatti! 'Quieten down!'    |
| Tikkainga! 'Sit down!'             | Waietti! 'Don’t move!', etc.       |

These kinds of expressions were among the first sought by teachers and childcare workers in the very first Kaurna workshop, in 1990.

In addition, the greeting Ninna marni? (sg.) and Naa marni? (pl.) and response Marniai, welcome Marni ninna budni (sg.) and Marni naa budni (pl.), leave-taking Nakkota ‘will see (i.e. goodbye)’, thanks Ngaityalya! and apology Yakkalya! ‘I’m sorry’ should be introduced first because of their high functional load, even though some of these expressions are a little longer.

People are encouraged to use these expressions in preference to English whenever and wherever appropriate within the conversation, and to use them as often as possible. Initially, the interlocutor should feel under no pressure to respond in Kaurna; nor should the speaker expect a response in Kaurna. The expressions need to be incorporated into the conversation as natural and automatic elements of the speech event.

Once the basic one-word expressions are known and used confidently, longer and longer expressions can be introduced in succession. Useful examples are as follows:

- Padniadlu! ‘Let’s go!’
- Parni ngatpa! ‘Come in!’
- Wanti ninna? ‘Where are you going?’
- Warruanna padni! ‘Go outside!’
- Ngai kuma. ‘Me too.’
- Nauwe X? ‘How many X?’ (e.g. Nauwe mejunna? ‘How many people?’)
- Ngai taityo! ‘I’m hungry!’
- Ninna burli? ‘Have you had enough?’ (T&S ‘Are you satiated?’)
- Maiimpi? ‘Do you want something to eat?’

Even longer expressions that could usefully be introduced fairly early include:
Ngai kudnawodianna padnendi.30 ‘I’m going to the toilet.’
Ngai wodlianna padnendi. ‘I’m going home.’
Ngai tittawodianna padnendi. ‘I’m going to the shops.’
Marni milindo worta! ‘Have a good weekend.’
Wanti ninna padnendi ngultingga? ‘Where are you going tonight?’
Nallaallatti ngadlu padnendi? ‘When are we going?’
Ngaintya nindo wappendi milindo wortarlo? ‘What are you doing at the weekend?’

Of course, the usefulness of particular expressions will depend somewhat on the individual’s situation, whether they intend to use the language at home, within KACHA meetings, at school, Nunga social gatherings or on the football field, etc.

The formulaic method entails building up a stockpile of speech formulas of increasing complexity that will gradually replace English in conversation. This method sits well with the ways in which Kaurna is currently being used. Most Kaurna language, including longer pieces like speeches, is learnt and used as speech formulas. Within speeches, certain phrases such as Martuityangga Kaurna meyunna ngai wanggandi ‘I am speaking on behalf of the Kaurna people’ are frequently used.

A theoretical basis for the Formulaic Method

Applied linguists such as Corder (1973) have looked at the question ‘What does it mean to know or speak a language?’ within the context of teaching foreign languages or English as a second language. Traditionally, the answer to this question focused on grammar and lexicon, ignoring subtler questions of idiomatic usage and ‘ways of talking’ (Grace, 1987: 92). This grammar–lexicon model of language, as Pawley (1985: 85) refers to it, while accounting for much linguistic behaviour, is deficient in a number of ways.

Communicative competence31 involves more than the ability to construct grammatical sentences. Rather, it entails the ability to use language appropriately. In addition to ‘linguistic competence’ it includes pragmatics, paralinguistics, cultural knowledge and other more peripheral aspects.

Pawley (1985: 87–8) identifies a range of ‘ordinary language-users’ understandings of what it takes to know a language’ distilled from anecdotes of what they say about learning and using languages. They are as follows:

- grammaticality;
- pronunciation of consonants and vowels;
- musical conventions: intonation, stress and rhythmic patterns, voice quality, modulations of volume, etc.;
- productive fluency: conforming to norms of tempo, structure and quantity for chunking utterance elements into fluent units;
- hearing fluency: being able to decode fluent speech;
- idiomaticity: the selection of familiar, native-like ways of saying things as opposed to things that are merely grammatical;
- lexical knowledge: including the ability to distinguish between those expressions that are lexicalised (standard designations) and those that are ad hoc descriptions;
- contextual appropriateness: saying the right thing at the right time;
coherence: saying things that make sense in terms of normal understandings of the world shared by a particular speech group, and in terms of standard procedures of inference;

inference: being able to make sense of ordinary discourse: to work out conversational implicatures, to understand the communicative intentions of particular utterances;

creativity, of various kinds, including:

- phonological – making up new word forms;
- syntactic;
- semantic;
- contextual – apt matching of expression with situational context in a non-routine way. A distinction (not sharp) may perhaps be drawn between rule-governed creativity and special kinds of creative use of language in which conventions are broken or manipulated to achieve special effects; as in Pig-Latin, puns, metaphors, etc.

According to Pawley and Syder (1983), fluency is achieved by learning a vast number of pre-formed ‘chunks’ of language in the form of lexicalised sentence stems:

fluent and idiomatic control of a language rests to a considerable extent on knowledge of a body of ‘sentence stems’ which are ‘institutionalized’ or ‘lexicalized’. A lexicalized sentence stem is a unit of clause length or longer whose grammatical form and lexical content is wholly or largely fixed; its fixed elements form a standard label for a culturally recognised concept, a term in the language. Although lexicalized in this sense, most such units are not true idioms but rather are regular form–meaning pairings. The stock of lexicalized sentence stems known to the ordinary mature speaker of English amounts to hundreds of thousands. In addition there are many semi-lexicalized sequences, for just as there is a continuum between fully productive rules of sentence formation and rules of low productivity, so there is a cline between fully lexicalized formations on the one hand and nonce forms on the other. (Pawley & Syder, 1983: 191–92)

They go on to provide many examples of these ‘lexicalized sentence stems’. Further, Pawley (1991) gives a detailed analysis of the complexity involved in being able to ‘talk cricket’. Other authors (e.g. Kuiper & Haggo, 1984) have analysed speech events such as livestock auctions, race calling and oral poetry, where remarkable feats of oral language fluency are required – fluency that is achieved by a good command of speech formulas.

The formulaic approach draws on these insights. Reviving languages from written records is more than learning the vocabulary, internalising the rules of grammar and memorising the corpus of sentences contained in the historical sources, even though this is all that is available. Relatively few pre-formed chunks exist and in most cases we do not have a good sense of the contexts in which the recorded utterances were said. Conversational routines, speech formulas, idioms, ways of talking about things and of expressing ideas need to be developed. In so doing, language conventions are established. This makes acquisition of Kaurna doubly hard because this repertoire of pre-formed chunks of
language has to be built up bit by bit. The Kaurna language learner needs to acquire these pre-formed chunks just as learners of any other language do.

Addressing lexical gaps and developing neologisms is the more obvious end of a wider spectrum of language development, many aspects of which are more subtle and more difficult to pinpoint and describe.

**Introducing the language into the Kaurna community**

The formulaic approach, outlined above, is as yet largely untested. Despite showing some interest, Kaurna organisations are yet to introduce Kaurna expressions into their meetings in a systematic way. The Kaurna sports terminology and expressions developed by Lester Rigney in 1997 have been partially utilised by some classes at Kaurna Plains School, but are yet to be embraced by a Nunga sporting team. Some speech formulas have been introduced at the school, but the classroom is an artificial situation. Several Kaurna people are gradually introducing an expanding range of fixed expressions into their speech, but this is happening on an *ad hoc* basis using their own initiative.

The Kaurna language development workshops we held in November 2000 are beginning to construct the speech formulas and expressions needed for use in high frequency domains and specifically in the context of child-rearing.

Perhaps the greatest failure of the formal Kaurna language programmes has been an inability to attract many Kaurna people as active learners and participants in the programmes. Over the eight-year period 1990–1997, only about 40 Kaurna adults have ever accessed any of the formal language learning courses. This is despite very positive and supportive comments made by Kaurna Elders and members of KACHA.

The desire to introduce the language into the Kaurna community is an issue which concerns Kaurna language enthusiasts, such as Lester Irabinna Rigney, who observed:

> if we are going to reclaim Kaurna language, it must not just go with the school, right? like the goonyas [non-Aboriginal people] have done. We’ve got to have a mechanism in our structures whereby there is a whole group learning. Let’s dream for a possibility. Why isn’t language taking place in the community?…Why isn’t there a community aspect of trying to get these things up and running? Why aren’t Aboriginal organisations taking on the language acquisition … it’s only done at schools and universities. (Interview with Jenny Burford, 21 October 1997)

Fishman (1991: 408) points to the relative difficulty of establishing the language at the grass roots level:

> It is obviously harder to build Xish families, neighbourhoods and communities than to establish Xish schools, publications or non-print media. However, the former immediately provides a base for intergenerational continuity and a point of departure for stages that come after it and can be supported by it, whereas the latter do not because they are too restricted in time and place and have no daily, intimate, socialisation foundation underlying them. At best they can contribute to the ‘spirit’ necessary for such a foundation to be laid, but they do not lay it themselves.
The difficulty in actively involving Kaurna people is due, I believe, to a multiplicity of reasons. There are some obvious logistical problems. Kaurna people are dispersed widely across Adelaide and may live some distance away from the venues where Kaurna language is offered. Many do not own motor vehicles, relying on public transport. The Kaurna course at Para West Adult Campus is run in the evening and is located on the northern fringe of the metropolitan area. It is simply inaccessible for most Kaurna people. Some students rely on others for transport. One student’s non-attendance may result in several not attending. Also, a number of Kaurna people, who might otherwise be involved in programmes, work full time and have family commitments after hours.

However, there are more subtle reasons, many of which reflect the relatively poor participation rate of Aboriginal people in the education process (see SSABSA, 1998). Some older members of the Kaurna community have expressed a wish to be able to learn and speak Kaurna, but consider themselves too old. There is perhaps an unwillingness to participate in language classes for fear of being shown up by younger learners. Age, of course, is not a barrier in itself; it is simply perceived to be so by some. People may feel insecure about the fact that they are not able to speak their own language. This is highlighted by the fact that some non-Aboriginal people, such as myself, have a much greater knowledge of their language than they have. Coupled with this is a reluctance to learn from a non-Aboriginal person. This is a factor which has been mentioned to me on a number of occasions and one which is probably very important in explaining the relatively low rates of participation. The Kaurna people who do actively participate are often those operating within the education system or who have experience in working alongside non-Aboriginal people.

Kaurna language activities tend to revolve around a handful of people, as noted by Lester Rigney:

I think that the Kaurna reclamation is almost personality driven. And if tomorrow Ngarpadla Cherie, Mum and Rob were to go, touch wood, I think that the whole process would fall. So we’re not good at training new ones to come through. (Interview with Jenny Burford, 21 October 1997)

The credibility of the teachers, and their own personal networks and associations with the community, are often pivotal in determining who is attracted to the courses. Kaurna people tend to get involved in activities or issues as families, not individuals. The involvement of family members may encourage others to attend. On the other hand, the presence of some families may inhibit or preclude the attendance of others.

There is perhaps a reluctance to learn the language in public. A number of Kaurna people have requested tape recordings for use at home, to avoid embarrassing themselves in public. Some do in fact spend considerable time perusing the Kaurna materials in private. Perhaps it would be a good idea to produce a ‘Teach Yourself Kaurna’ kit using a multimedia computer program, video tapes or cassette tapes. This could give people at least some familiarity with Kaurna, thus raising their confidence to the point of being willing to participate actively in a course of study. Part of the motivation for producing the language learning tapes for the tertiary level course was to be able to make this material available, at
low cost, to members of the Kaurna community. These tapes have not yet been widely disseminated due to non-resolution of the copyright issue.\footnote{33}

While many Kaurna people acknowledge the importance of learning the language, it is not the highest priority for most. Kaurna organisations such as KACHA have been more concerned with material culture and non-linguistic aspects of cultural heritage. KACHA is a small organisation which is concerned with Kaurna heritage issues. The committee has had pressing concerns, such as the Southern Expressway which threatens sites of significance, forced upon them by government agencies and developers. They have had to contend with multiple issues concurrently. In this atmosphere of rapid change, language issues are a much lower priority.

Of all the Kaurna programmes ever run, attendance has been poorest within the course actually set up at the request of Kaurna people, for Kaurna people. The Kaurna Warra Patpangga programme at Warriparinga was located on the Kaurna people’s ‘home turf’ at the then location of the KACHA office. Despite the availability of funding with support, this course ceased because of non-attendance within just five months of its establishment. This non-attendance was primarily due to internal conflicts and division within the Kaurna community.\footnote{34} It has never been restarted despite periodic requests from certain members of the community. The course could have easily been recommenced at Warriparinga and run at any time of the day under the aegis of Tauondi College had ten names of committed Indigenous learners been put forward.

There is a big gap at times between an individual’s expressed intention to become actively involved in learning the language, and actually following it through. In addition to the 40 or so Kaurna people formally involved at one time or another, there are others who have said that they would come along or would like to. For them other things have come up or they do not ‘get their act together’, or when it comes down to it, it is just too hard and potentially risks too much loss of face. As Dixon (1997: 111) rightly points out, ‘a language is a difficult thing to learn, other than as a young child, and requires application and concentration’. Most Kaurna people have had only limited exposure to other languages and many have had limited success with formal education processes.

The Kaurna language movement is not yet a mass movement with widespread appeal to the general Kaurna population. It is restricted to a small but growing body of language enthusiasts. Only time will tell if it will ever gain the critical mass required for its use on an everyday basis alongside English in a truly bilingual community.

Despite the desire to see the language used again in the home and the community, not too much progress has been made yet. Again, there is something of a gap between intentions and actions. Identity politics and internal factional politics within the Nunga community, and the response of particular individuals and families, are likely to be the major factors in determining the extent to which the Kaurna community replaces English with Kaurna for instrumental and communicative purposes. Kaurna politics have become more complicated over the last few years with the emergence of three organisations, KACHA Inc., Kaurna Meyunna Inc., and Kaurna Elders, claiming to represent the Kaurna people. Government recognition has shifted from KACHA Inc. to Kaurna Meyunna Inc.

The formulaic approach and the painstaking language reclamation process
that underpins it in the context of languages ‘no longer spoken’ are not, however, the only options for language revival. Alternative approaches have been developed which are considerably easier to implement and are more in keeping with the ways in which people actually use elements of their ancestral languages within Nunga English.

‘Artificial pidgins’ and Ngarrindjeri ‘language renewal’

Jay Powell, working with Quileute in the north-west of the United States, advocates the development of what he refers to as an artificial pidgin formed by the incorporation of Quileute words, one by one, into English sentence structure. Powell (1973: 6–7) provides the following example to illustrate his method:

Increasing vocabulary size allowed rapid progress from

Give me half that candy.

to  give me half that lape’,
to  hes me half sa’ lape’
to  hes me tal’a sa’ lape’

a lopsided sentence according to Quileute syntactic structure but a functional statement full of real Quileute words that could be understood by members of the in-group.

While Powell’s approach is a deliberate strategy in the revival of Quileute, a somewhat similar result is occurring in an ad hoc fashion in the context of Ngarrindjeri language revival. Within that community, some people claim to speak Ngarrindjeri, but the language they speak is in fact a kind of relexified English. Ngarrindjeri programmes taught at Murray Bridge High School and other locations also seem to be heavily dependent on English grammar. Word order is strictly Subject-Verb-Object, following English word order. English sentences tend to be translated word for word, even to the extent of using Ngarrindjeri case suffixes as separate words in translating English prepositions. English expressions tend to be translated literally, even when it is apparent from the sources that Ngarrindjeri used a different idiom. And there is a concerted rejection of involvement of linguists in the development of the language.

In the production of the video Warranna Purruna: Pampi Tungarar – Living Languages, a Ngarrindjeri text was written by Rhonda Agius which was published in the booklet accompanying the video (DETE, 1998: Preface). That text is substantially a one-to-one, isomorphic translation of the English version, where nominal case suffixes are used as independent words, functioning as prepositions. A variety of means is used to cope with words like ‘the’, ‘a’, ‘an’, ‘or’ and ‘and’, which are typically absent in Australian languages. Verbs always appear in their present tense citation form and the interrogative yange ‘where?’ appears to have been used for ‘were’. A poem entitled ‘Ikay Ruwe – This Land’ was also published by Rhonda Agius in Tauondi Speaks from the Heart (Procter & Gale, 1997: 6) which demonstrates the same features.

The strength of Agius’s approach is the ease with which the language can be constructed and used. It allows individuals and communities to revive their languages themselves, without having to first acquire an in-depth knowledge of linguistics and the grammar of Aboriginal languages. Unlike language reclama-
tion, there is no need to engage the services of a linguist or outsiders. This has the obvious advantage that it is much easier to maintain control over the process. So long as people feel happy with the resultant language, which seems to be the case with Ngarrindjeri, this appears to be a useful approach in these circumstances.

Nor is the approach taken by Agius without historical precedent. Nissaya Burmese, as reported by Burling (1970: 181–4), is a variety of Burmese that has developed from the translation of Pali religious texts. Initially, an interlinear gloss, whereby each Pali word was given a Burmese equivalent underneath, was used as an aid to learning the foreign Pali texts. This pattern persisted for hundreds of years. However, around 1800 the texts began appearing in Nissaya Burmese without the original Pali text. As such, Nissaya Burmese no longer functions as an aide to learning Pali, but is an independent language in its own right. Its grammar is almost pure Pali, while the lexicon is drawn entirely from Burmese. Because it is still associated with religion, Nissaya Burmese is the high status variety of Burmese, while everyday Burmese which maintains its original indigenous grammar is held in low regard. Written Burmese and literary forms are heavily influenced by Pali grammar.

Another well-known case from the Indian subcontinent involves three languages, Urdu, Marathi and Kannada, the first two drawn from Indo-Aryan while the latter belongs to the unrelated Dravidian language family. The three languages have developed a common grammar in the village of Kupwar (Gumperz & Wilson, 1971), where speakers of the languages have lived side by side for centuries. Yet their lexicons have remained distinct. According to Foley (1997: 389f.) ‘it may not be far off the mark to say that Kupwar residents actually speak just one language, with three different lexicons’. So for members of Kupwar village, ethnic identity is maintained through the lexicon while grammatical differences have been ignored.

Other modern languages, particularly those varieties spoken by the Western-educated elites, are also showing rapid convergence with English, both in lexicon and grammar. Foley (1997: 415) discusses the case of Modern Thai in which the high-status form has incorporated many European features, partly as a result of King Rama VI having translated Shakespeare into a highly Anglicised form of Thai.

So the deliberate ‘pidginisation’ approach taken by Powell in Quileute and the unplanned ‘language renewal’ introduced in Ngarrindjeri by Agius and others are but additional examples of a more widespread phenomenon that sometimes occurs in situations of intense language contact. However, this Ngarrindjeri ‘language renewal’ is a fundamentally different approach from that taken in language reclamation in the Kaurna situation, which seeks to draw on the grammar of the language as it was spoken at the time of colonisation, and to capture the essence of the language in its original form. It should be recognised, though, that both Modern Ngarrindjeri and Modern Kaurna are major departures from the traditional languages. Both are undoubtedly heavily influenced by English. In Modern Kaurna, this influence is primarily at the level of discourse and idiom whereas in Modern Ngarrindjeri, the influence of English extends down into the syntax and grammar.

The formulaic approach is similar to Powell’s ‘artificial pidginisation’ in that both methods promote a staged, gradual introduction of the target language into
conversation or text which is otherwise English. However, the two methods differ sharply in that in Powell’s approach, words from the target language are deliberately introduced into English sentences, while in the formulaic approach only well-formed utterances which preserve the original grammar of the target language are acceptable.

The relationship between minority and majority languages

One of the most important parameters in the language ecology of reviving languages is that of the relationship between the minority languages undergoing revival and the dominant majority languages with which they are forced to coexist. Language revival is about expanding functions and domains of use of a language, and, of course, increasing the numbers of speakers of the language. In the Kaurna case, this involves carving out niches within English and Nunga English which are currently used for all purposes within Nunga society.

In Nunga English, words drawn from Indigenous languages are inserted into English sentences as in, for example, ‘Go and wash your marras (hands)’ or ‘Nakkunt that kathari korni over there!’ (Look at that handsome man over there). Ngarrindjeri language renewal, and Quileute language recreation as Thieberger (1988) refers to it, build on this pattern of language use. This contrasts markedly with the formulaic approach whereby only well-formed Kaurna expressions are introduced into English conversation. For the language to develop with integrity, only well-formed expressions, I believe, should be promoted in conjunction with English.36

While both Powell’s artificial pidginisation and the formulaic approach advocate the gradual introduction of the target language into English discourse, the language nest and master-apprentice models advocate the total exclusion of English, at least for certain periods of the day or week, or even more extended periods. As Hinton (1994: 242) says ‘the single biggest challenge’ facing the master-apprentice teams is ‘leaving English behind while developing the habit of speaking in the language’. She strongly discourages the use of two languages in her ‘Eight Points of Language Learning’ where she urges both teachers and apprentices not to use English:

- Teachers
  2. Don’t use English, not even to translate

- Apprentices
  2. Don’t use English, not even when you can’t say it in the language. Find other ways to communicate what you want to say. (Hinton, 1994: 243)

We have found through experience that insistence on the total exclusion of English, even for short periods, stifles conversation and serves as a major demotivating factor. It is simply too difficult for beginning learners of Kaurna to engage each other in Kaurna only, even for half an hour. Further, it is difficult for us as teachers to continue to use Kaurna in an animated impromptu manner responding to the situation at hand. Often we have to stop and think how to say something, or worse still, stop to devise new expressions.

Steven Harris (1990: 80), writing from the perspective of bilingual education programmes in Indigenous languages in the Northern Territory where two languages are employed, argues for strict separation between English and Indig-
enous languages. Code-switching has often been viewed as a sign of language breakdown and is generally discouraged in these programmes. However, in the context of language reclamation, code-switching can be viewed in a more positive light to reintroduce a language in an easier and less threatening way than having to know a lot of language before being able to use it.

Harris makes a distinction between ‘code-switching’ which ‘involves the conscious changing between two languages within a discourse for stylistic, humorous or authority-seeking purposes [which are] neither random nor of roughly equal proportions’, and ‘code-mixing’, ‘the unconscious use of two languages within the same phrase or sentence on what appears to be a random basis’. Harris regards code-switching as legitimate, but sees code-mixing as an indicator of ‘“pidginisation” and the ultimate death of a traditional language’ (S. Harris, 1990: 80). While Harris’s characterisation of code-switching as conscious and code-mixing as unconscious is open to question, his general distinction between them is useful for our purposes. Code-switching is preferable to code-mixing in terms of modelling patterns of language use. If vernacular words are dropped into a sentence or discourse structure that is otherwise English, people may learn new individual lexical items, but they will gain little appreciation of a distinctive grammar that is organised on different principles from English. However, code-switching in Harris’s terms is a deliberate strategy to be pursued and promoted in the formulaic approach.

The formulaic approach, as outlined here for Kaurna, would seem to be generally applicable in situations where a ‘sleeping’ language is to be revived. It sits well both in terms of the ways in which speakers learn and use languages in general, and with the functions that a newly emergent ‘awakening’ language first acquires. This method is likely to have more appeal to the average community member than a highly structured approach, such as grammar translation, and seems to be the only feasible communicative approach in a situation in which there are no fluent speakers.

A Kaurna Language Congress and Kaurna Language Institute?

Fishman (1993) documents the earliest stages of formal language planning for a number of languages. Likewise, it is time for the Kaurna language to move into a more formal language planning phase. We have had discussions for several years about holding a public forum with the Kaurna language movement to enable all interested to have their say about the future direction of Kaurna language development. This forum will also provide a venue for dissemination of information about Kaurna language reclamation efforts, including language modernisation and the formulaic method. Indeed, in 1999 Lester Irabinna Rigney and I prepared a submission to the Aboriginal Languages Initiatives Program for funding to hold the congress. Unfortunately, despite earlier assurances, it became apparent that the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission was not prepared to fund submissions lodged by universities. The traditional source of funding within the university sector, the Australian Research Council, would not fund such a proposal, even though it is closely allied with more theoretical language planning questions, because it is seen as community focused and beyond the responsibility of the tertiary sector.
The Kaurna language congress idea is not dead, but it is looking more remote. Internal politics within the Kaurna community have become more difficult and fractured, and it would take considerable effort to ensure that the congress is organised with the involvement of a broad range of stakeholders. My Kaurna research is but a small part of my workload teaching Aboriginal studies. The same is true for other key members of the Kaurna language movement. But we need to find ways by which genuine control and ownership of the language movement can be vested in the community.

A funded Kaurna research institute is needed so that a linguist and Kaurna trainee can work together full time in a mentor relationship, to organise workshops, forums and Kaurna language activities, provide support for the teaching programmes and develop and publish Kaurna language resources. A Kaurna language committee should be set up to make decisions about use of the language and provide direction for language development. The Kaurna language workers could prepare briefing notes for the committee and implement their decisions. One important role that such a Kaurna research institute should perform is to document the use of the language along the lines of those documented in Amery (1998a, vol. 2). A register of Kaurna names should be kept, and requests for names should be dealt with in a systematic and orderly fashion.

How to set this up is the question. At the University of Adelaide, Kaurna is not a priority, despite the groundwork that has been done and an enormous amount of goodwill that has been built up within the community. Kaurna language research and the teaching of Kaurna ceased at the University of Adelaide from June 2001. Supporting Kaurna language teaching and research at the current level (about one third of a salary) within the University of Adelaide is not a costly undertaking within the bigger scheme of things. We now have to start over again and try to embed Kaurna studies within the University of South Australia where there are pre-existing teaching and course redevelopment priorities which, it seems, have to be attended to first, leaving Kaurna on the fringe.

We are entering a new phase where the use of Kaurna is continuing to expand, but where it is becoming increasingly difficult to support and maintain existing programmes. As Kevin Duigan, teacher at Kaurna Plains School, commented, ‘the wheels are beginning to spin on it. We need these workshops to generate a momentum and move the programmes forward’ (Kaurna Language Development Workshops, November 2000).

**Conclusion**

In this paper, I have investigated in some depth the nexus between language revival and language planning. While language revival activities, especially for small Indigenous languages, have been largely ignored by language planners, language planning has a lot to offer. By their very nature, language revival activities involve implementing deliberate strategies to increase the number of speakers or expand the domains and frequency of use of the language.

Linguistics is essential in language reclamation. The skills linguistics provides enable us to work with a somewhat limited historical corpus in meaningful ways. Linguistics helps to make sense of the corpus, but more than that, to
expand this corpus and fill in the gaps in a systematic and well-motivated fashion.

While there is a significant level of deliberation involved in the ways in which the Kaurna language is being developed, much of this activity is *ad hoc* in response to requests and needs as they arise in the context of teaching programmes. A greater level of planning is warranted in order to put the language and its development more in the hands of Kaurna people.

Language reclamation offers new challenges to language planning because additional factors in relation to orthography choice and corpus planning activity come into play. Status planning, too, needs to be looked at in a new light, where a set of lesser goals than those traditionally advocated are pursued. Nonetheless, the skills, techniques and experience that language planners bring are invaluable in attempting to work with ‘sleeping’ languages and marginalised communities.
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**Notes**

1. This group is made up of a number of Kaurna people (some of whom are teachers, academics, performers and activists), several non-Aboriginal teachers and spouses of Kaurna people, and myself, a non-Aboriginal linguist.

2. Note that this dictionary only lists technical terms in Maori. It does not list terms for fauna and flora or body parts, for instance, though some have been co-opted in the development of new terms as in examples given here.

3. The Dreaming is an all-encompassing concept explaining the creation of the land and life as we know it, and underpins all aspects of life in traditional Aboriginal society (see Edwards, 1988: 12–25). It is sometimes thought of as an era, but this ignores other important aspects of the concept which place it in the present. The term the Dreaming is problematic, as in most Australian languages the term for the Dreaming bears little or no relationship to the bodily function of dreaming, though it does in some Central Australian languages. However, the term is widespread and for want of an adequate alternative it is used here too.

4. Nunga, pronounced [nʊŋə], is a term of self-ascription used by Aboriginal persons in the southern parts of South Australia, contrasting with Gunya, pronounced [gʊŋə], used to refer to non-Aboriginal persons. Nunga seems to have originated from Wirangu, a language from the west coast of South Australia (Wilson, 1996: 6m7). It is used in the same sense as Koori or Koorie in NSW and Victoria, Murrie in Queensland, Palawa in Tasmania, Nyungar or Noongah in the south-west of Western Australia and Yura in the Flinders Ranges.

5. Tjilbruke is the name of a creator ancestor. See later section on Warriparinga.

6. Yankalilla, derives from *yernkandi* ‘to hang down, on; to join; impart; infect, as with a disease; to depend’ (T&S, 1840: 61) + -lya + -illa ‘place’ (i.e. ‘place of the fallen bits’ Manning, 1986: 237; see Amery (forthcoming) for further details). In the Tjilbruke
Dreaming narrative, Tjilbruke carries the remains of his dead nephew’s deteriorating and flaking body which falls to the ground at Yankalilla.

7. Onkaparinga derives from *ngangkiparringga* (lit. ‘woman river place’ or ‘women’s river’).

8. The reconciliation process was established in 1991 by an Act of Federal Parliament supported by all sides of politics. Following Prime Minister John Howard’s refusal to apologise to the ‘stolen generations’ (persons removed from their families without consent), the official reconciliation process has faltered, but continues as a grass roots movement.

9. The word *tarto* ‘low, swampy country’ appears in T&S. The word *tartonendi* was formed by myself through the addition of the inchoative suffix. That is, *tartonendi* literally means ‘becoming low, swampy country’ (i.e. being transformed into wetlands).

10. A number of Aboriginal organisations bearing Kaurna names and names drawn from other Indigenous languages including Ngarrindjeri and Pitjantjatjara are located in the Adelaide City Council area. These include Tandanya, Kumangka, Patpa Warra Yunti and Nunkuwarrin Yunti. Educational institutions, notably the University of Adelaide and the University of South Australia have adopted a number of Kaurna names for various buildings and centres, including Wilto Yerlo, Mattanya Housing, Wirranga Health Service and the Yungondi Building. Several businesses in the area also bear Indigenous names. These include Ngapartji multimedia consortium andWirranendi urban ecology centre.

11. A bilby is a small mammal, also known as a rabbit-eared bandicoot.

12. Wyatt (1879: 20) gives *tinninya* ‘iron’ and *tinninye werle* ‘an iron store’, though he does not list a word for ‘rib’. T&S give *tinninya* ‘rib’ and *Tinninyawodli* ‘the Ironstores’.

13. The issue was reported in *The Advertiser* (15 March 2000: 11) in an article entitled ‘Reconciliation’s sign of the times’ which quoted Kaurna Elder Lewis O’Brien.

14. In the original proposal drafted in 1996, I had suggested naming these parks with the names of the wives of these three men, and using the men’s names for the squares in the city.

15. Pattawilya is retained in the name of the Patawolonga watercourse in the vicinity.

16. The findings of the Government’s inquiry (Commonwealth of Australia, 1997) into the separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children from their families, known as the ‘stolen generations’, were handed down on the 26 May 1997. This day is now observed as National Sorry Day.

17. The adoption of Karrawirra Parri for the Torrens River by the Adelaide City Council awaits ratification by the Geographical Names Board. If approved, it will be the first application of the Dual Naming Policy involving a Kaurna name.

18. Kaurna and several other closely related languages have distinctive names for children according to the order in which they were born up until the ninth born. The names are further differentiated by gender. See Amery (1996a:3–4) for a complete listing in Kaurna and neighbouring languages.

19. Actually the text on the plaque appears as *Wanti nindo ai kabba?* The second *kabba* having been inadvertently deleted when the text was transferred from the temporary plaque to a new design. *Wanti nindo ai kabba?* actually translates literally as ‘Where have you pressed me?’

20. There may well have been more occasions than this. It is likely that I am unaware of some events at which Kaurna songs were performed in public, though most are probably included in this graph.

21. Note that the Kaurna reciprocal/reflexive suffix -*ri* is the same form as the Pitjantjatjara inchoative, and both belong to an (*ng*) verb class.

22. Wonweetpeena is likely to be a typographical error where ‘n’ has been substituted for ‘u’, perhaps originally Wouweetpinna = Wauwitpinna ‘father of Wauwe “female kangaroo”’. Wyatt corrected three instances of this type of error in his paper but perhaps overlooked this one. However the error, if it is indeed an error, is repeated in the word list itself where Wonweetpeena is again cited. Paradoxically, Kadlitpinna’s wife was known as Wahwey = ? Wauwe (*Southern Australian*, 17 Sept. 1847; cited in Gara, 1998: 29)
23. Wyatt seems to have recorded two birth-order names here – Monaicha = Munaitya ‘fourth born (masculine)’ and konoocha = Kudnuitya ‘third born (masculine)’. This appears to be a contradiction as presumably the three names all apply to ‘Captain Jack’. Konooha is listed by Wyatt with identical spelling in the word list, though Monaicha is not. Schürmann gives Captain Jack’s full name as Minno Gudnuitya Kadlitpinna, adding weight to the proposition that he was most likely the third born.

24. These lines were left untranslated. I have supplied interlinear glosses and free translations.

25. Try as we might over a period of two years of correspondence and telephone calls, we were not able to negotiate a satisfactory arrangement with the company which now owns the rights to the song following the death of the author. Music Sales insisted on ownership, not only of the translation of the original song, but also the additional Kaurna verses.

26. Most pronouns in Kaurna are disyllabic (ngatto ‘I’, nindo ‘you’, ninna ‘you’, parna ‘they’, purla ‘they two’, etc.) whereas in English all pronouns are monosyllables. When Kaurna pronouns take on certain case roles they may become very long indeed. ‘With me’, for instance, translates as ngattaityangga in Kaurna. That is, two syllables in English become five syllables in Kaurna.

27. As in most Australian languages, there is no voicing distinction in Narungga. The choice of symbols for voiced or voiceless to represent stops is quite arbitrary. Both systems are well represented throughout Australia. In contemporary Narungga, stops tend to be pronounced as voiced while in Ngarrindjeri they tend to be realised as voiceless.

28. Māori and Hawai’ian, while suffering serious decline and shrinkage of domains of use since colonisation, never ceased to be spoken. Efforts to revitalise Māori started in the 1970s. See Te Hemara (1993: 189).

29. According to Keegan (1996: 2), ‘Kura kaupapa Māori means schools which run according to Māori principles and values, and which teach through the medium of Māori. Schools in New Zealand may be designated kura kaupapa Māori under the Education Act 1989 and receive funding from New Zealand’s Ministry of Education capped programme’.

30. This expression has been introduced into Kaurna Plains School and its use is enforced by the students themselves. If a new child comes to school, another child whispers the expression in the newcomer’s ear, but until the child utters the expression, he or she is not permitted to go (personal communication Cherie Watkins; Kevin Duigan, 1998).

31. A fundamental distinction is that between ‘linguistic competence’ and ‘communicative competence’, originally conceived by Hymes in 1966 (Hymes, 1972: 269) as a major rethink of Chomsky’s ‘competence’ vs. ‘performance’ dichotomy and Saussure’s langue vs. parole. According to Saville-Troike, ‘Hymes repeatedly emphasises that what language is cannot be separated from how and why it is used, and that considerations of use are often prerequisite to recognition and understanding of much of linguistic form’ (Saville-Troike, 1989: 3). See also Gumperz (1972).

32. Though small, 40 is a significant number within the context of the Kaurna population. The number of adults who actively identify as Kaurna probably numbers several hundred.

33. It has proved difficult to bring the parties together to discuss the issues. We need to establish who owns the tapes and how these ownership rights should be exercised before tapes are sold.

34. This conflict was in no way due to dispute over the language. Rather it concerned the leadership of KACHA and differences over management of Kaurna heritage. The conflict resulted in one section of the community preferring to stay away.

35. Use of the Kaurna suffix -unangko ‘from’ was also observed in use as a preposition in a speech of introduction by one Ngarrindjeri participant in the Journey of Healing on 26 May 1999.

36. Having argued against the use of Kaurna words within English sentences, I should note that a number of songs produced by staff and students at Kaurna Plains School
and by students at Para West Adult Campus have introduced Kaurna words in this way. While this practice is not encouraged, there is some merit in it. At least children learn the words and their meanings in this way, whereas with a song written entirely in Kaurna, they might learn it off by heart but not fully appreciate its meaning, or indeed be able to associate individual words with specific meanings.

37. The Aboriginal Languages Initiatives Program was an initiative administered by the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission. It was aimed at community-based language programs.
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