Broken Bay ~ two bays or one?

Cook’s Broken Bay?

Today's Broken Bay lies beyond the northern beaches suburbs of Sydney, Australia, at the entrance to the Hawkesbury River, and south of Cook’s Cape Three Points (see Figure 3, page 4 below), but is this the feature Lt James Cook named in 1770?

*Endeavour* sailed out of Botany Bay on the morning of 6 May 1770 and at noon Cook recorded that he was ‘about 2 or 3 miles from the land and abreast of a bay or harbour wherein there appeared to be safe anchorage which I called Port Jackson’ (site of modern Sydney). Continuing north with ‘little wind and serene pleasant weather’ at 5.30 p.m, as the sun was setting:

> the northernmost land in sight bore N 26 E [apparently the area between today's Broken Bay and Cape Three Points] and some broken land that appeared to form a bay bore N 40 W distant 4 leagues [more than 22 km]. This bay I named Broken Bay, Latitude 33 36 S.

The above extract comes from J. C. Beaglehole’s edition of the *Endeavour* Journal, based on the Holograph MS journal (held in the National Library of Australia, Canberra) which gives 33.36S as Cook’s position for Broken Bay. Beaglehole, though, provides a footnote to this entry which gives a second latitude, 33.42S, recorded by Cook for his Broken Bay:

> [The Admiralty Manuscript Journal held in the Public Records Office, London] has a marginal note by Cook, ‘Bay in the Lat 33 42 S’. This is not the present Broken Bay, a few miles further north, which Cook missed during the succeeding night, but the land in the neighbourhood of the Narrabeen Lagoon [see Figure 1]. This is seven or eight miles north of Port Jackson, and the ‘land has, from the distance at which Cook saw it, the appearance he notes, and would bear exactly N40W.’ – Hist. Rec. NSW. I, p.162, n.16. Flinders was first to note this discrepancy, *Voyage to Terra Australis* (1814), II, p. 2.

The Narrabeen Lagoon area is today generally accepted as the intended location of Cook’s Broken Bay.

**Figure 1. A reduction of Cook’s original chart of the east Australian coastline 1770 from originals in the British Museum, South Sheet (part). State Library of Victoria, MAPS 805.8 AJ 1770-1890**
The pronunciation of names has produced some surprises for us this month. First of all, Jeremy Steele has suggested that the way we pronounce Canowindra may not be as cut-and-dried as we thought. Secondly, Tony Dawson’s research on Georgina county has revealed that 200 years ago the spelling Georgina was often regarded as a mere variant of the same name. Furthermore, it would seem that both forms had only three syllables, and for many speakers they both sounded rather like <jaw-jay-nuh>. Who knew! (I certainly didn’t—I’ve always pronounced Georgiana to rhyme with Gloriana.) It just goes to show—toponymy is full of surprises.

From the Editor

David Blair
<editor@anps.org.au>

What we’re working on...

Readers ask us from time to time what our current placename projects are. Here’s what the team is involved with this month...

Stuart Duncan: NT and WA coastal placenames, pre- and post-1800—currently, those from Baudin’s exploration
David Blair: coastal beach names of southern NSW
Jan Tent: 17th and 18th century Dutch toponyms in the Pacific

Notes and queries

Heathmont: street names responses
Many thanks to those readers who responded to Gerry Robinson’s article (December ’18 issue) on suburban street names. Those who supplied helpful information included:
- Alan Monger (Benalla Museum)
- David Nash
- Anne Holmes (Collingwood HistSoc)
- Roger Stanley
- Trevor Patrick
- Karen Phillips
- Bill Forrest (Tamworth HistSoc)
- John Bunyan (Campbelltown & Airids HistSoc)

Alphabetically challenged names
David Astle passed on a query about W Tree, the name of a locality in East Gippsland (Vic) near W Tree Creek and W Tree Falls. We noted an old reference to the creek as Wattle Tree Creek, and thought that might be a clue—though we did wonder why anyone would try to abbreviate ‘wattle’ to ‘double-u’! But Rafe Benli (Geographic Names Victoria) came to our rescue: he’s found some 1970 correspondence with Tambo Shire Council which stated that ‘there did exist a tree for many years which had grown in the shape of a w’.

Terrible Billy update
In our March ’18 issue Jan Tent reported that T.L. Mitchell’s surveying team was responsible in 1831 for transforming the creek Carrabobbila into Terrible Billy. The creek is known these days as the Currajubula and flows past the village of that name, south-west of Tamworth. The odd thing is that although there are two hills in NSW by the name of Terrible Billy, both are over 100 km away, to the south of Gloucester! So if the Carrabobbila connection is merely coincidence, where does Terrible Billy come from? Was it a 19th century meme, we ask!

Searching for pronunciations
We can recommend two websites useful for discovering proper name pronunciations. Cofactor Ora is of NZ origin: https://cofactor.io/ora
The other is the ABC’s ABC Pronounce site: https://www2b.c0.abc.net.au/abcpronunciation-external/
The Colonists’ Broken Bay

Soon after the arrival of the First Fleet, Governor Arthur Phillip explored the coast north of Port Jackson and found today’s Broken Bay:

On the 2d of March [1788] Governor Phillip went with a long boat and cutter to examine the broken land, mentioned by Captain Cook, about eight miles to the northward of Port Jackson, and by him named Broken Bay. This bay proved to be very extensive.\(^2\)

Eight nautical miles (nearly 15 km) northward of Port Jackson puts Cook’s Broken Bay near to Narrabeen Lagoon. The Broken Bay which Phillip assumed was what Cook named is about twice that distance, nearly 30 km. Phillip does not address this discrepancy.

It is significant that Phillip’s party sailed north from Port Jackson in small boats which would have kept close to the shore, giving a different view of the coast to Cook, who named his bay from 22 km away when sailing 14 km from the nearest shore. Phillip would have seen the low lying land which fronts Narrabeen Lagoon and sailed past it, coming upon the wide entrance to today’s Broken Bay soon after. It is unsurprising that, from its appearance at least, the new arrivals quickly concluded that the bay they had found was Cook’s Broken Bay. Maps and charts have placed it there ever since.

Phillip’s view of the Narrabeen shore is well illustrated by Edward Close’s 1818 painting ‘South of Broken Bay’ (Figure 2). The low land between the sea and the lagoon would not have been visible to Cook from out at sea and it is easy, from Close’s painting, to see how Cook might have imagined that this was a bay entrance. Today the dune system which separates the ocean from the lagoon seems to be much more elevated than it was two centuries ago. A road with buildings on either side runs along much of the top of the dunes between the headlands, and the lower-lying connection between lagoon and ocean is at the northern end beneath Narrabeen Head. In addition, the coast here is indented, forming a bay bounded by Long Reef Point to the south and Narrabeen and Turimetta Head to the north.

Matthew Flinders’ Broken Bay

When Matthew Flinders sailed this coast in Investigator he recorded in his journal on the morning of 22 July 1802, ‘The entrance into Broken Bay (Cape three points) bears S 55 W 8 or 9 miles’.\(^3\) He places Broken Bay near Cook’s Cape Three Points, which lies just to the north of today’s Broken Bay and where Governor Phillip had placed it 14 years earlier (see Figure 3, next page).

Later, and having examined Cook’s data more carefully, Flinders recorded in A Voyage to Terra Australis in 1814:

At eleven o’clock, the south head of Broken Bay bore W. by N. three leagues…. The colonists have called this place Broken Bay, but it is not what was so named by captain Cook; for he says it lies in latitude 33° 42’ (Hawkesworth III. 103), whereas the southernmost point of entrance is not further than 33° 34’ south. There is, in captain Cook’s latitude [i.e. 33.42S], a very small opening, and the hills behind it answer to his description of “some broken land that seemed to

---

Figure 2: South of Broken Bay, New South Wales, ca. 1818 by Edward Close (Narrabeen Lagoon area), National Library of Australia, NLA obj-138901461

...continued next page
form a bay,” when seen at four leagues, the distance he was off; but in reality, there is nothing more than a shallow lagoon in that place. In consequence of this difference in position, Cape Three-points has been sought three or four leagues to the north of Broken Bay; whereas it is the north head of the entrance into the bay itself which was so named, and it corresponds both in situation and appearance.4

Flinders' source for the latitude of Broken Bay, 33.42, is Hawkesworth's version of the Endeavour Journal, probably based on the Admiralty Manuscript. The 'shallow lagoon' that Flinders refers to is today's Narrabeen Lagoon at 33°43'30"S. Cape Three Points is not 'the north head of the entrance into the bay itself' but a group of three capes further to the north of the entrance. Hawk Head (today's Box Head) is usually regarded as the north head of this Broken Bay (see Figure 3). The south head is shown as Baranjo Head, today's Barrenjoey Head, which is at 33°35'S. By its latitude this appears to be the feature that Flinders refers to as 'the southernmost point of entrance is not further than 33°34' south'. Stokes shows the south entrance of Broken Bay at 33.35S, the same as its current position according to the Geographical Names Register NSW, which is very close to Cook's 33.36. This raises the question of why there are two different latitudes shown in different Cook manuscripts, one approximating to that of the south entrance to Broken Bay, and another approximating to the Narrabeen Lagoon area. Did Cook record two features, today's Broken Bay and Narrabeen Lagoon?

Did Cook see today's Broken Bay?

Examination of Endeavour's track on Cook's chart (Figure 1) illustrates the difficulty Cook was having in advancing northward along the coast, the result of calm weather and a south-going East Australian Coast Current. The ship was often 'taken aback'. Following his naming of Broken Bay on the evening of May 7, by the early afternoon on May 10, the ship was very close to Cape Three Points which it had passed three days earlier:

In the PM had the wind at NE b N with which we stood in shore until near 4 oClock when we tack'd in 23 fathom water being about a Mile from the land and as much to the Southward of Cape Three Points.5

On his approach to this position Cook would have had a clear view of the entrance to today's Broken Bay (see Figure 1). Could this have been the point where he recorded the latitude as 33.36—the actual latitude is 33.35? Did Cook make two sightings, the first, 33.42S, on the evening of 7 May and the second, 33.36S, in the afternoon of 10 May?

There is no remark in either the Journal or the log recording a second sighting, or of Cook questioning...
his earlier positioning of the feature. Curiously, Cook’s chart shows a very wide entrance to Broken Bay, indeed it seems to be a double bay, the entrance of which stretches from about 33.47 to 33.42, and much closer to Port Jackson than to today’s Broken Bay which is close to Cape Three Points. The coast in this area is similarly rendered in charts made by other crew members. In this way the chart favours Flinders’ explanation that what Cook sighted and named as Broken Bay was the Narrabeen Lagoon area. The chart is consistent with his 33.42 latitude observation and with the fact that there is no mention of a second sighting or the discovery of any discrepancy between latitudes either in the log or Journal on 10 May.

Further, the amendment of the latitude to 33.42 in the Admiralty Manuscript of the *Endeavour* Journal by Cook also supports this as the location of the feature Cook named. However the amendment seems likely to have been made some time after the event and closer to 2 July 1771 when the Journal was submitted to the Admiralty, so there is potential for error here.

Beaglehole writes of the Admiralty Manuscript:

This MS is on all grounds the best and most careful, as it is the only complete fair copy that exists... It is apparently the copy handed over to the Admiralty at the end of the voyage, and is possibly that from which Hawkesworth worked [as seems to be the case in this instance]... Cook corrected it throughout, and signed it at the end with his usual signature... Among the corrections are a number in the margins of the pages describing the Australian coast, giving revised positions for many of its geographical features.

Hence the balance of possibilities favours Flinders’ explanation, but still does not explain why Cook did not record any sighting of today’s Broken Bay on May 10, or why 33.36S was initially recorded in the Journal.

Further pieces of evidence for consideration are the paintings made by Edward Close of both these areas in 1818, a few years after Cook’s visit (Figures 2 and 4). Looking at Figure 2, is easy to see how Cook, from a greater distance than the painter and far enough away for the low land in front of the lagoon not to be visible, concluded that he saw a bay entrance. There is a remarkable similarity between the two views, particularly with regard to the southern entrance, and the inland hills behind the bays. Both bays have the appearance that Cook notes – ‘some broken land that appeared to form a bay’. Given this similarity, could Cook have seen both ‘bays’ and concluded that they were the same feature? This seems unlikely as he shows Cape Three Points a long way from Broken Bay on his chart.

Most of the evidence points to Cook having seen and named the area near Narrabeen Lagoon as Broken Bay. However this conclusion does not explain why Cook initially recorded in the *Endeavour* Journal that Broken Bay was at 33.36, which is very close to the latitude of today’s Broken Bay. Cook was well placed on 10 May...
1770 to see this feature, which bears a remarkable similarity to the view he would have had of his sighting at 33.42. As Cook had passed 33.42 before reaching 33.36 it seems strange that 33.36 appears to have been his first estimate of the position of Broken Bay, later corrected to 33.42. Given these facts there still has to be some uncertainty about what Cook saw and named as Broken Bay.

Trevor Lipscombe

Endnotes


5 Beaglehole, p. 314.


7 Beaglehole, p. ccxiv.

Which Georgiana?

In October 1829 Governor Darling notified the public of the names of Nineteen Counties into which New South Wales was to be divided and which encompassed that portion of the colony within which settlers would be permitted to select land. Prior to Darling's announcement only five counties—Cumberland, Northumberland, Camden, Westmoreland and Argyle—had been proclaimed, while four others—Durham, Roxburgh, Bathurst and St Vincent—were ‘reputed’ counties for the purposes of land allocation, policing and deployment of prisoners.

A hundred and fifty years later John Atchison was the first to offer explanations for the names, not only of the original Nineteen Counties, but of all but one (Gowen) of the 122 counties added after 1829. However, he made the point that the evidence for many of the placenames was ‘circumstantial and speculative’ and invited ‘clarifying/correcting evidence’ on his interpretations.

With regard to the original 19 counties, none of Atchison's interpretations appears to have been challenged and the Geographical Names Board of NSW still specifically references his paper in 14 of them. I now intend to change that by questioning his interpretation for the one original county bearing a woman's name—Georgiana.

Atchison's explanation is that the County of Georgiana was named for Georgiana Cavendish, Duchess of Devonshire, but I believe there are good reasons for doubting this, and that there is at least one far more plausible explanation.

Much has been written about Georgiana Cavendish, both during her lifetime and since, and what follows is a brief digest based on a number of sources. Born in 1757 she was known as Lady Georgiana Spencer until 1774 when, on her 17th birthday, she married 25-year-old William Cavendish, 5th Duke of Devonshire, one of England's richest and most powerful men. Georgiana was a renowned beauty but the marriage was not a happy one, and whereas Cavendish indulged in adulterous behaviour Georgiana was not free to do likewise, at least not until she had fulfilled her duty to her husband by producing a male heir. She was celebrated for her...
fashionable appearance and for her forthright political activity in support of the Whig party, but her first two successful pregnancies resulted in daughters. However, in 1790 she at last gave birth to a son and now had the freedom to pursue her own course, a freedom she willingly grasped by being made pregnant by Charles Grey, later the 2nd Earl Grey. Georgiana moved to France for the birth but returned to England after giving up her new daughter to the Grey family. She again took up fashion, politics and, reputedly, other lovers but also became an inveterate gambler, losing vast amounts of money at the card table and constantly borrowing from her friends. For many years she was the subject of gossip and rumour, not least concerning her close friendship with Lady Elizabeth Foster, her husband's live-in mistress and, later, his second wife.

Georgiana Cavendish, undoubtedly a figure of celebrity and influence in England during the latter part of the 18th century, died on 30 March 1806. Despite her having suffered from a 'liver disorder' for a long time the five physicians who attended her and were present at the post mortem were divided as to whether it was the cause of death.

The question for us, however, is why, more than two decades later, and in view of the less praiseworthy side of her life, should she have been honoured in New South Wales by having a county named after her. Although ‘Georgiana’ was on the public record as a placename by May 1827, it seems unlikely that those who bestowed it—the ‘god-fathers’ as The Australian called them—would have accepted the name of a long-dead woman tainted by scandal.

But if not for Georgiana Cavendish then for whom was the county named? ‘Georgiana’ was not an uncommon name at that time, especially among the British aristocracy, and it would be possible to put forward several candidates. However, the one that stands out is Countess Georgiana Bathurst, formerly Lady Georgiana Lennox, daughter of Lord George Lennox and sister of Charles Lennox who would afterwards become the 4th Duke of Richmond. In 1789 she married Henry Bathurst, Lord Apsley, who later succeeded to the title 3rd Earl Bathurst and from 1812 to 1827 was Britain's Secretary of State for War and the Colonies.

Bathurst was a dominant figure during a critical period in the development of New South Wales. It was he who instigated the commission of inquiry into the administration of New South Wales conducted by John Thomas Bigge between 1819 and 1821, and then, following the publication of Bigge's report, issued the instructions for the division of the colony into counties, hundreds and parishes. By 1829 Bathurst's name had been commemorated multiple times—Mount Apsley, Apsley River, Bathurst Plains, Bathurst Falls, Bathurst Lake, the town of Bathurst and the County of Bathurst—so when it came to a new district adjoining that of Bathurst, what better name than that of his wife, the Countess Georgiana.

However, as with Atchison's suggestion of Georgiana Cavendish as the inspiration for the name, evidence that Georgiana Bathurst was the true stimulus is circumstantial and speculative. Nevertheless, I believe that, given the timing, and the associations and reputations of the two women, the latter is much more plausible.

Endnotes

1. The Sydney Gazette and New South Wales Advertiser 17 October 1829 p1
3. Morning Post 31 March 1806 p3
4. Morning Post 2 April 1806 p3
5. The Australian 11 May 1827 p2
6. The Australian 11 October 1826 p2
7. Not to be confused with her niece and namesake, Lady Georgiana Lennox, daughter of the 4th Duke of Richmond, and who, in 1824, married William L. Fitzgerald-de-Roos. It might be noted that both women have been variously shown as ‘Georgiana’ and ‘Georgina’, the former considered to be the correct form.
10. Earl Bathurst to Governor Brisbane. Historical Records of Australia Series 1 vol 11 p434
I am, you are, we are...

… and the answer is, as the song tells us, Australian. We keep it simple: there’s never any doubt about the form of the adjective that tells where we’re from—or in fact the form of our demonym (what you call the people who live in a particular place). And even better, our adjective and our demonym are identical: ‘I am Australian / I am an Australian’. Not every country can make the same claim—try it with ‘English’ or ‘New Zealand’, for instance.

Can we say the same, though, about where we live within Australia? One of our readers, David Nutting, has asked about the adjectival forms and demonyms for Western Australia and NSW. With the former, he found some apparent inconsistencies in use, and with the latter an unusual form. There does not seem to be any consistency in use, he notes—could we offer an explanation?

David is essentially asking: ‘Is there a pattern in the use and formation of state and territory names, adjectives and demonyms?’ The best way to investigate this is to draw up a grid or table of the terms under consideration, and then to mark off how each is used. This method often reveals patterns more readily. The table below itemises the various states’ names, adjectival forms, and demonyms, and indicates the use of each. Examples of each pattern may be found in various online resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Toponym</th>
<th>Demonym</th>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Noun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>West Australia</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>West Australian</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Western Australian</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>North Australia</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>North Australian</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Northern Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Northern Australian</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Territorian</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>South Australian</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Southern Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Southern Australian</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>East Australia</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>East Australian</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Eastern Australia</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Eastern Australian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>New South Welshman</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Victorian</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Queenslander</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Tasmanian</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Taswegian</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unfortunately, the table does not show any immediately discernible patterns, largely because our sample is far too small—we would need a much larger sample of terms to show any clear patterns. Nevertheless, a number of them can be grouped in order to reveal some regularities. For instance, there are five toponyms that take the suffix -an in their adjectival forms and demonyms. These are: Tasmania (> Tasmanian), Victoria (> Victorian), Western Australia (> West(ern) Australian), South Australia (>South Australian), and Northern Territory (> Territorian).

There seems to be a general principal at work here: toponyms ending in a vowel often take the suffix -(a)n for their adjectival forms (Tunisia, Albania, Indonesia, Italy, Fiji, Samoa, South Africa, etc.). So, these Australian States follow a regular linguistic pattern in adjective and demonym formation.

The general adjectival form denoting something from the Northern Territory, and its demonym, is Territorian. You might expect Northern Territorian, but no. Why? Perhaps because it suggests there could be Southern Territorians, thus implying Northern could be interpreted as an adjective and not part of the proper noun Northern Territory. Another reason might be because NT consists of six syllables. Adding another to form an adjective would make it rather unwieldy. This then raises the question of what the demonym and adjectival form for the Australian Capital Territory is. I have not encountered one. Again, it does not lend itself to an elegant adjective or demonym because it consists of three words and ten syllables. Adding yet another syllable would definitely make it a real mouthful: Australian Capital Territorian? ACT-an? No! Besides, since the vast majority of people in the ACT live in Canberra, the adjective and demonym used is Canberran. (We note that the Macquarie Dictionary also cites the rather awkward Canberraite as a possible demonym—one which to my mind sounds rather like a type of mineral or unpleasant chemical!)

This leaves Queensland and New South Wales. The former follows a pattern often applied to toponyms ending in -land—Queenslander (cf. Hollander, Greenlander, New Zealander, etc.). A common alternative is the -ish ending: Ireland > Irish, Poland > Polish, England > English, Scotland > Scottish. And then there are the outliers, the short forms: Switzerland > Swiss and Thailand > Thai. (We note that all of these adjectives, unlike the -er set, also act as the noun for the relevant language.) Finally, there is also an interesting additional sense for Queenslander—a style of highset house found in the tropical State.

As far as New South Wales is concerned, we are dealing with a special case. The demonym for someone from NSW is given in the Macquarie Dictionary as New South Welshman; a somewhat awkward but understandable term. I must admit, though, I cannot think of a better one. New South Wales is a three-word toponym and, like ACT, does not easily produce an elegant demonym or general adjective. *New South Welsh* is not an option.³ As David Blair has commented, New South Welsh ‘[…]

occasionally pops up because people feel there ought to be a distinct adjectival form—and, of course, because there isn’t a good nominal [i.e. demonym].’ And as David Nutting rightly points out: ‘South Welsh can only be an adjective (or noun) referring to features of the Welsh language as spoken in the south of Wales. My guess is that when the Welsh (or British) refer to anything else other than language then they use South Wales as an adjective.’

---

*Eight Queenslanders*

...what kind of ‘Australian’?

continued on page 12
Indigenous toponymy...

In this, the last instalment of Indigenous toponymy, we briefly look at the reinstatement of Indigenous placenames.

Previously I stated that less than one third of placenames in the Australian Introduced toponym system have an Indigenous-derived element (i.e. a specific, generic or both). This compares poorly with New Zealand’s Māori derived toponyms, which amount to 42%.

Since the 1990s the reinstating of Aboriginal placenames has increasingly been practised in Australia. It is not only seen as a mark of respect towards Indigenous peoples but should also be seen as emblematic of the nation’s cultural heritage. In regions where Aboriginal people were largely or totally dispossessed, the passing down of their placename networks has all but disappeared. This can generally be seen in and around Australia’s capital cities, but it is no more true than in Tasmania. Oftentimes, the remnants of those networks and their names are shrouded by the Introduced system.

Reinstating an Indigenous placename amounts to reinstating a way of looking at the land, together with a set of associated responsibilities, and is may only be really possible in regions where Aboriginal people hold title or have a strong presence.

In remote areas, the assignment and reinstatement of Aboriginal placenames is relatively uncontroversial. In areas that have been settled by Europeans for long periods, assignment of Indigenous placenames may have sentimental standing and perhaps even market value. In such areas, while assignment of names (either Introduced or Indigenous) to features without names may be relatively easy, the reinstatement of an Indigenous name in 2002 they were gazetted as Uluru / Ayers Rock and Kata Tjuta / Mount Olga. In non-official contexts it is usual for only one element of the dual name to be used; currently almost everyone simply refers to the features as Uluru and Kata Tjuta.

There are numerous examples of the reinstatement of Indigenous placenames over the last four decades or so. A few noteworthy examples will suffice as representative examples here.

- In 2001 the River Torrens was given the dual name River Torrens / Karrawirra Parri by the South Australian government. More recently the name of Lake Eyre (named in honour of Edward John Eyre, who was the first European to see it, in 1840) was extended by its Arabana name Kati Thanda. Lake Eyre / Kati Thanda now refers to both the North and South sections of the lake.

Essentially the issue is this: if Indigenous names are brought into the official Introduced toponymic system, they are in the public domain. This will afford public recognition of the names, and thus of prior occupation of the country by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. But once the names are in this public domain they become a commodity. They can be used, say, in business names, without permission being granted by the Indigenous owners of the placenames. This is problematic, and proper legislation needs to be drafted, enacted and promulgated to ensure this does not occur.

As an interim step to reinstalling Indigenous names by the replacement of Introduced ones, dual naming is now regularly being adopted. The process normally follows the pattern of in initially maintaining the Introduced whilst concurrently (re)introducing the Indigenous name. The two toponyms are initially represented as Introduced name/ Indigenous name. After a period of time the two names are interchanged, after which the Introduced name may be eliminated. The most well-known examples of this are Ayers Rock and Mount Olga which in 1993 were gazetted as Ayers Rock / Uluru and Mount Olga / Kata Tjuta. Then

22 February, 1846. We had reached the united channel of the Macquarie and Morissett’s Ponds, and were at an easy day’s journey only distant from the junction with the Bārwan or “Darling.” The use of the aboriginal name of this river is indispensable amongst the squatters along its banks, who do not appear to know it to be the “Darling.” It is most desirable to restore to such rivers their proper names as early as possible after they have been ascertained, were it only to enable strangers thereby to avail themselves of the intelligence and assistance of the natives, in identifying the country by means of the published maps.

Thomas Mitchell (1848) Journal of an Expedition into the Interior...
The mountain range *The Grampians* was named by Thomas Mitchell in 1836 after the Grampian Mountains in his native Scotland. In 1991, after a two-year consultation process, the national park in which the mountain range is situated was renamed and is now *Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park*. The Indigenous name comes from the local languages, Jardwadjali and Djabwurrung.¹

In 2015 the hill at Bathurst (NSW) which is the site of a well-known car-racing circuit was dual-named as *Mount Panorama / Wahluu*. The Indigenous element is from Wiradjuri ‘young man’s initiation place’.

In 2008 the Victorian Government announced it would be renaming *Mt Niggerhead* (a mountain in the Alpine National Park) as *The Jaithmathangs*, purportedly after one of the traditional languages of the Bogong High Plains. In many respects this renaming was commendable; however, it prompted loud objections from another Aboriginal nation, the Dhudhuroa people, who claimed that the peak is part of their country and the proposed new name was just as offensive to them as *Mt Niggerhead*. According to the Dhudhuroa people, the Jaithmathang people are from the other side of Omeo, nowhere near Mount Niggerhead, and therefore they believed the name to be linguistically and culturally inappropriate.

This last example serves to illustrate the complexities and sensitivities involved in reinstating placenames. It highlights the need for governments to ensure all Indigenous communities and traditional owners who have a legitimate claim to the naming of a feature to be consulted on how their language should be used to name sites and places. This will help ensure that the context and suitability of a name can be deliberated. In addition, authorisation needs be obtained for the use of an Indigenous name or word, and issues regarding copyright and ownership of the name be agreed upon.

The restoration of original Indigenous placenames is often extremely difficult, if not impossible, given there may be no known or accurate records of what the original feature name was. In such cases, a new name which honours the Aboriginal heritage of the place may be devised. Such was the case of *Barangaroo*, an urban place near Sydney’s CBD: the name honours the Gamaraygal woman of that name who was the second wife of Bennelong, and who acted as an intermediary between the Aboriginal people and the early British occupiers of the region.

It is impossible to do justice to the vast and complex topic of Indigenous toponymy in three short newsletter articles. However, there is a wealth of literature available to the reader who is inspired to discover more.

Finally, I cannot find a more appropriate way to conclude this last installment on Indigenous toponymy other than to cite a rather remarkable statement by the Rev. Dr John Dunmore Lang on indigenous place-naming. In a letter (dated 15 November, 1840) to Dr. Hodgkin, a passionate advocate for Aboriginal people, Lang writes:

> Indeed, the infinity of the native names of places, all of which are descriptive and appropriate, is of itself a *prima facie* evidence of their having strong ideas of property in the soil; for it is only where such ideas are entertained and acted on, that we find, as is certainly the case in Australia, *nullum sine nomine saxum* ['no stone (is) without a name/without a tale to tell'].
> (Eyre, 1845)

Jan Tent

Endnote

¹ For an insightful article on the restoration of Djabwurrung and Jardwadjali names to Gariwerd see Wilkie (2018).
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Indeed, the adjective used to denote anything from NSW is *New South Wales*. Compare: ‘New South Wales bushfires’ with ‘*New South Welsh* bushfires’. Another indication that *New South Welsh* is generally considered to be an anomalous expression is Google’s response when ‘New South Welsh’ is typed into the search window: Did you mean: *new south wales*. However, if you persist with the search, many thousands of hits are shown, not all of them jocular.

Where the seeming irregularity in adjectival forms and use occurs is with those three jurisdictions that have a cardinal compass point (CCP) as the first element in their names: *Western Australia*, *South Australia*, and *Northern Territory*. It is interesting that the two States have different forms of CCP. Why is this so? A stylistic quirk of language? What name, then, will the NT choose if and when it ever achieves statehood: *Northern Australia* or *North Australia*? Either way, *northern Australia* will continue to be the term used to refer to the northern region of the continent, just as *western Australia* is for the western region (even though this is the official toponym for that State), *southern Australia* for the southern region (cf. *South Africa* v *southern Africa*), and *eastern Australia* for the eastern region. Note that a lower-case spelling indicates that the term is not an official toponym, with the CCP merely functioning as an adjective. So, there is a pattern here too.

An interesting historical fact is that from 1846 to 1847, the colony of North Australia existed. It comprised all land in what is now the Northern Territory and that part of Queensland lying north of the 26th parallel. The capital was at Port Curtis, now Gladstone (see Cumbrae-Stewart 1919). North Australia re-emerged in the late-1920s because the NT was thought to be too large to be governed effectively. The NT was split into two territories, North Australia and Central Australia. The split only lasted for four years, when in 1931, the two were reunited as the Northern Territory.\(^2\)

As for the variable use of the adjectival forms *Western Australia* and *West Australian*, the *Macquarie Dictionary* provides the following usage note in its entry for *Western Australian*:

> Both *West Australian* and *Western Australian* can be used to refer to someone from Western Australia or as the adjectival form. Some people consider *Western Australian* the correct form (the name of the state is *Western Australia*), but there is a long tradition of using the shorter form, as, for example in the name of the newspaper *The West Australian* and the West Australian Opera. These alternatives are simply indicative of stylistic variation.

There is another form of *Western Australia(n)*, namely the contraction *Westralia(n)*. The term has been used by secessionists during campaigns involved with Secessionism (*Republic of Westralia*). It has also been used as the name of two Royal Australian Navy vessels, in the name of a Perth office block (*Westralia Square*), in the name of the company that operates Perth Airport (*Westralia Airports Corporation*), in other business names, and in the name of a former newspaper published in Kalgoorlie (*The Westralian Worker*). It will be interesting to see whether or not the term catches on in general language use. It certainly is an efficient expression. Both *Westralia* and *Westralian* rate entries in the *Macquarie Dictionary*, which notes that they are colloquial forms.

So, in conclusion, I would say that although there appears to be some random variation in the use of state/territory toponymy and their adjectival forms, there are nevertheless underlying patterns to be discerned, if you look hard enough.

---

**Endnotes**

1. An asterisk above and before a word or sentence is used in linguistics to indicate an anomalous or ungrammatical form.
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A surprising suggestion about Canowindra

As the March 2019 issue of Placenames Australia noted, the name of the NSW town Canowindra is clearly of Aboriginal origin, and was first recorded as the name of a pastoral property ‘Canoundra’ in 1829. The conventional view, commonly expressed in popular ‘name books’ and websites, is that it comes from a Wiradjuri word meaning ‘home’ or ‘camping place’.

The standard way to pronounce the name of the town is <kuh-'nown-druh>; if you are ‘misled’ by the current spelling and say <kan-uh-'win-druh>, you’ll be promptly corrected! But what if that pronunciation is right after all?

The most curious or notable feature of the current name is the syllable -win-. Now win or wi is a common Aboriginal inland word for ‘fire’. The table below shows a selection from a large number of examples in early texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original text</th>
<th>Respelt</th>
<th>Translation in text</th>
<th>Engl: JS</th>
<th>Source of text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weein</td>
<td>wi</td>
<td>fire</td>
<td>fire</td>
<td>Mitchell, T.L.: 4: Wellington Valley [:380.4:20] [Wira]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Win</td>
<td>wi</td>
<td>fire, fuel, wood</td>
<td>fire</td>
<td>Günther (Fraser) [:106:4] [Wira]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wi</td>
<td>wi</td>
<td>fire</td>
<td>fire</td>
<td>KAOL Ridley [45 Wlwn] [:49.2:4] [Wlwn]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wi</td>
<td>wi</td>
<td>fire</td>
<td>fire</td>
<td>AL&amp;T Greenway (Ridley) [KML] [:236:27] [Kml]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This being so, it provides a hint as to the possible meaning of the first part of Canowindra, ‘Cano-’, which might be repelt by linguists as ganu- or gan-. Now gan- is the stem of many inland words (dislike, all, kangaroo, tuber, beach, belly, excrement, fib, liver, shoulder), but one that really jumps out is ‘burn’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original text</th>
<th>Respelt</th>
<th>Translation in text</th>
<th>Engl: JS</th>
<th>Source of text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gannarra</td>
<td>gana-ra</td>
<td>to burn</td>
<td>burn</td>
<td>Günther (Fraser) [:63:46.1] [Wira]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gannal-birra</td>
<td>gana-l-bi-ra</td>
<td>to burn</td>
<td>burn</td>
<td>Günther (Fraser) [:63:46.1] [Wira]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gannanna</td>
<td>gana-ra</td>
<td>to burn</td>
<td>burn</td>
<td>Günther (Fraser) [:63:46.1] [Wira]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for the final portion, -dra or -dara, this is a form of the proprietary suffix ‘having’ in several Aboriginal languages of New South Wales, and can be seen in placenames such as Bulgandramine, Gilgandra and Cootamundra, and in the form -bara(yi) in Narrabri and Boggabri and many others.

The above speculative analysis would suggest that Canowindra, properly pronounced in Aboriginal terms as ganawin-dara, might mean ‘burn-fire-having’, or ‘the place where there is/was a fire burning’.

Jeremy Steele

A university course in toponymy

ANPS is offering an online unit in toponymy this year, through Open Universities Australia and with the cooperation of Macquarie University.

Placenames in the Modern World

This short course will be the equivalent of an undergraduate unit and will not require any previous university study. It is designed to cater both for those who wish to increase their general knowledge of placenames and for those who need professional development in toponymy. There will be a practical component that will involve some data collection and the analysis of that data to help answer the five standard questions—the what, the where, the who, the when and the why of the placename.

This fully online unit runs for 15 weeks from the end of July. Check the details here:


Email Jan Tent <director@anps.org.au> or Helen Slatyer <secretary@anps.org.au> if you’d like to know more.
Become a Supporting Member!

We realise that not everyone who wishes to support the Australian National Placenames Survey can do so by carrying out toponymic research and supplying information for our database. There is another way — become a supporting member of Placenames Australia! In doing so, you’ll help the Survey and its volunteer researchers by providing infrastructure support. In return, you’ll have the assurance that you’ll be helping ensure the continued existence of this prestige national project, and we’ll guarantee to keep you in touch with our progress.

Please consider carefully this invitation. If you wish to become a Member

- send a cheque for $25 to Placenames Australia Inc.
- or arrange a bank transfer for $25 to bsb 032089 a/c 275989

Please advise our Treasurer of the transfer by one of the following methods:

Email: treasurer@anps.org.au
Mail: PO Box 5160, SOUTH TURRAMURRA NSW 2074
Website: www.anps.org.au

Articles for Placenames Australia

Material for publication in Placenames Australia is always welcome. Please send all contributions to the Editor, David Blair, by email:

<editor@anps.org.au>

Supporting photographs or other illustrations are greatly appreciated.

Closing dates for submissions are:
March Issue: 15 January  September Issue: 15 July  June Issue: 15 April  December Issue: 15 October