1

Introduction

Peter Sutton

This book is for people who are interested in the linguistic anthropology and linguistic prehistory of Aboriginal Australia, and in how these bodies of scientific knowledge may play forensic roles in the resolution of Indigenous claims to native title over Australian lands and waters.¹ It is also a reference work that tabulates linguistic and anthropological details of a particular region of western Cape York Peninsula (CYP) (Map 1.1). In that respect it is also meant as a long-term historical and cultural resource for the descendant families of the region.

We focus here on the peoples and languages of the central-western part of Cape York Peninsula (CYP), between the Embley and Edward rivers. CYP is usually defined as the mainland of Far North Queensland north of the sixteenth parallel of latitude (Map 1.2).

Map 1.1: Location of the study area

Source: AIATSIS

¹ An excellent introduction to the role of linguistics in native title cases is Henderson and Nash (2002).

Map 1.2: Cape York Peninsula

Source: Queensland Government

Map 1.3: Australian language density distribution

Source: AIATSIS

At the time of British colonisation, this peninsula of 288,804 square kilometres was the home of 43 distinct Indigenous languages made up of many scores of dialects.² Dialects are mutually intelligible varieties of a single language; distinct languages on the other hand are not mutually intelligible. This was one of the most densely varied linguistic landscapes in Australia (Map 1.3).

Since British imperial conquest, most of these languages have become moribund or are spoken only by very few people, but a small number continue to have fluent speakers. The most strongly surviving CYP language, Wik-Mungkan, comes within the purview of this study. While most of the language-owning groups of the classical (pre-colonial) period still have descendants, their speech has mostly undergone shift to a community-based language such as Wik-Mungkan (of Aurukun) or Guugu-Yimidhirr (of Hope Vale), or, as is the majority case, to English or Cape York Creole or both.

² The figure of 43 is based on data in Dixon (2002:xxxi–xxxiii). By way of comparison with CYP, the United Kingdom has an area of 243,610 square kilometres.

The study area for this book lies between the towns of Weipa in the north, Coen in the east, and Pormpuraaw in the south (Map 1.2). We refer to this as the wider Wik Region. The wider Wik Region includes the traditional countries of peoples owning Northern Paman languages in the north, between Aurukun and Weipa, and those owning the Wik Subgroup languages in the south and inland, between Aurukun, Coen and Pormpuraaw (Wik and Kugu people).³ Many of the Northern Paman languages covered here fall within the geopolitical identity of the Wik-Way people. The Kugu Ngancharra⁴ varieties of the Wik Subgroup are dialects of the southern part of the Wik Region between Kendall River and Edward River. We unpack these various distinctions in some detail later in the book, especially in Chapter 5.

Language owners

Our focus here is on linguistic varieties and their geographical distribution in specific tracts of land, which has its basis in the linguistic identities of traditional clan countries, under sacred cultural traditions. These clan countries are usually called estates. Each estate has an inherent linguistic variety identity, which on the estate maps (Maps A2.1–A2.13) is shown by an abbreviation. The abbreviations are listed in the front matter to this volume. The geographical distribution of linguistic varieties we examine here has nothing to do with the residential locations of speakers of those varieties, as we explain below.

As in Australia generally, in the Wik Region those who own each traditional country (clan estate) own its particular dialect by a rule of descent from ancestors of the same clan. It remains the descendants' dialect whether they speak it or not. And being able to speak a particular variety does not grant one ownership of the dialect nor of its clan estate(s). In short, in the classical system prior to recent post-colonial developments, linguistic identity and traditional rights in country do not arise from behaviour (place of residence, speaking competence) but from descent-based identity (clan membership). The chief flaw in earlier conceptions of 'dialectal tribes', the predominant one being that of Norman Tindale (1974), was that they claimed language group membership was based on speaking

3 We use 'Wik Subgroup' in the same sense as does Dixon (2002:xxi).

4 I spell this dialect cluster cover term Kugu Ngancharra. In Chapters 6 and 7 here Ken Hale follows the Smith and Johnson (e.g. 2000) spelling of Kugu Nganhcara.

a language, and territorial identity was based on residence in or regular occupation of a bounded tract. This behaviour-based model is now in the past.

Each clan's linguistic identity was implanted in their estate by sacred mythical figures at the beginning of the world, in the Wik Region, as in so many others in Australia (Sutton 1997b). This is why, in classical Wik society, one might be a speaker of many linguistic varieties but only one, usually, was spiritually one's 'own language', and it was the dialect that belonged to one's estate-owning clan. In the study region, all clan dialects were named. A few clans had more than one linguistic variety as their own.⁵

The Aboriginal language owner/speaker distinction first entered the academic record in Sutton (1978:17, emphasis original), where I stated:

In Aboriginal Australia, as far as I am aware, there is a *universal* distinction between the language one 'owns' by way of patrilineal descent,⁶ and other languages. Language is ritual property. People can use each others' languages, as indeed they commonly do and on occasions must. A theory of linguistic communities which simply separates language knowers from language users will overlook in the Australian case a whole ideology—of great pragmatic importance—about language owners.

I repeated this distinction between language owners and language speakers in Sutton and Palmer (1980), which was the unrestricted anthropological report for a claim under the *Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1976* (Northern Territory). In that case, the Aboriginal Land Commissioner, Toohey J, accepted the evidence of conjoint succession to traditional ownership of all the estates of the Malak Malak-owning clans, whether unpopulated or extant, by a smallish group of surviving descendants of the same language group. The Malak Malak language group was thus recognised as a descent-based, language-based country group and as the Traditional Owners of the land, and this was published in Toohey J's report (Aboriginal Land Commissioner 1982). This group was not recruited on the basis of who spoke what but on the basis of who could claim filiative descent from owners of clan estates whose intrinsic linguistic identities were Malak Malak.

⁵ See Appendix 1: Clans 1, 2, 3, 13, 21, 28, 96, 140.

⁶ I would now add: 'or other intrinsic bases such as, in the post-classical era, cognatic descent, or, in the Western Desert, conception or birth place for earlier generations, and in many Western Desert post-classical settlements, identification with the local communalect'. On the post-classical shift to cognatic descent of language identities across Aboriginal Australia see Sutton (2003:206–221).

More widely published thereafter were the following. Using Sutton (1978) as her main source, Francesca Merlan came to the same view on the language owner/speaker distinction (Merlan 1981). I once more laid out descent-based factors for language group identity in Sutton (1991:53). In Sutton (1997b:240) I again expressed the view that Aboriginal languages 'are owned, not merely spoken. They are inherited property ... Languages belong to specific places, and the people of those places'. I revisited the language ownership matter in Sutton (2003:76). In the meantime, Alan Rumsey published an identical view citing Sutton (1978) and Sutton and Palmer (1980) and other case material as his sources in his oft-cited paper on the subject (1993:199).

The *Aak* mapping report

Just before the native title era, which began in the legislative sense in 1993,⁷ several colleagues and I put together a 1,000-page report on around 2,000 sites and about 100 clan countries in the Wik Region (Sutton et al. 1990). This volume is often referred to here as the *Aak* (= 'Country') volume after its short title. That database was the outcome of over 20 seasons of intensive field mapping, using specific sites as the starting point for understanding the larger entities they underpinned, namely clan estates, linguistic countries and sub-regional geopolitical groupings such as ceremonial, riverine or drainage-based alliances. The main field workers doing the Wik Region mapping 1969–89 had been, in chronological order, John von Sturmer and John Taylor, Athol Chase, Peter Sutton, David Martin, John Adams, Roger Cribb (plus archaeological sites) and Philip Hunter.⁸ In the course of this work, our Wik instructors took us physically to well over 1,000 sites so that their map coordinates would be accurate, photographs and sketches could be taken, and knowledgeable people could record their stories for each place, usually on audio tape as well as in notes taken by the anthropologists.

⁷ *Native Title Act 1993 (Commonwealth)*.

⁸ Sutton (2016a) provides details of the history of the ethnographic mapping of Cape York Peninsula, including the wider Wik Region. For copies of broad-brush ethnographic maps of the Wik Region drawn up by earlier scholars see Sutton (1978, and in the present volume: Maps A2.5–A2.11). For a film showing a moment in the mapping of Wik countries during the 1977 season see David MacDougall's *Familiar Places* (1980).

The construction of the *Aak* volume during 1989–90 was in response to the request by the Wik people of Aurukun for support in their application for an emergency declaration by the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs under the *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage Protection Act 1984*. They were seeking this declaration in order to protect their landscape from the proposed 1989 seismic survey program of the mining company Comalco. After copies of our report were submitted, Comalco deferred its proposed field program indefinitely.⁹

Within a few years the report had acquired a new purpose. It formed part of the detailed evidentiary base for the Wik native title case expert reports of 1997.¹⁰ We carried out a substantial amount of further mapping field work 1989–97, and this resulted in a further site and estate record of over 230 pages, which supplemented the 1990 report.¹¹

The Wik native title case

The *Wik* native title case, which ran for 20 years (1992–2012), was one of a small number of Indigenous land claims that played pivotal roles in the history of Australian property law.¹² Before *Wik* were the 1971 Gove case (*Milirrpum*), where a doctrine of native title was rejected, and *Mabo* (1992), where it was accepted.¹³

During the *Wik* saga, in 1996 the High Court of Australia found in favour of the Wik peoples' claim that native title rights could survive on pastoral leases,¹⁴ titles that cover the vast area of 44 per cent of Australia.¹⁵ (While most of the Wik claim area lay outside the pastoral lease zone, significant tracts in the eastern sector lay inside the zone.) This was the biggest legal break-through in favour of Australia's Indigenous peoples' rights in land and waters since *Mabo*.

9 More detail on these events is provided at Sutton et al. (1990:1).

10 Sutton (1997a).

11 Sutton et al. (1997).

12 The documentary film *Wik vs Queensland* (2018) gives an authoritative account of this saga.

13 *Milirrpum v Nabalco* (1971) 17 FLR 141; *Mabo v Queensland (No 2)* [1992] HCA 23, (1992) 175 CLR 1 (3 June 1992), High Court.

14 *Wik Peoples v The State of Queensland* [1996] HCA 40, (1996) 187 CLR 1 (23 December 1996), High Court.

15 www.austrade.gov.au/land-tenure/Land-tenure/pastoral-leases, accessed 27 September 2018.

The Wik peoples' claims finally came to an end in a series of five consent determinations, reached in 2000, 2004, 2009 and 2012, under which the Australian Federal Court accepted the Wik peoples' case for native title on the basis of the expert reports their counsel had submitted. This meant that litigation, and the stresses and huge expenses of adversarial legal action, were avoided. It also meant that examination and cross-examination of lay claimant witnesses and expert witnesses were rendered unnecessary. This book is in part based on the anthropological and linguistic evidence that was foundational to that case. Most of that evidence had been recorded before the native title era.

In the process of reaching these post-Gove landmark stages, and during the flood of native title applications, negotiations and litigations that flowed from them, Australian society itself changed. In particular, large numbers of Indigenous people gained at least partial recognition for what remained of their ancient pre-conquest property rights, and they increasingly became participants at the table rather than people who, if they were lucky, got to be consulted about land use from time to time.

The majority of Australian native title claims lodged since 1993 have been made by people identifying with particular named language groups and their language countries. The corporate bodies set up to manage the affairs of native title holders are typically identified as having as their members people from the same linguistic countries. In this sense, a large proportion of the ancient language groups of Australia, often called tribes, live on permanently—albeit transformed—as part of the fabric of contemporary Australian society.

Ken Hale

My co-author in this volume, American linguist Kenneth Locke Hale (1934–2001), who preferred to be called Ken, carried out field work on a very large number of languages, not just in Australia but internationally. He was a supremely gifted polyglot and also an academic linguist of distinction, who taught in the Linguistics Department of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology from 1967 to 1999.¹⁶

16 For book tributes to Ken's life work see Carnie (et al.) (2000), Kenstowicz (2001), and Simpson et al. (2001).

In 1960 Ken did a linguistic survey of Cape York Peninsula, Queensland, and much of the comparative contents of his chapters in this book come from those recordings. In that time, he spent 1–17 August at Aurukun Presbyterian Mission, where he worked on five different Wik Subgroup and Northern Paman languages.¹⁷

After I was appointed principal expert witness for the Wik native title case by the Cape York Land Council (CYLC), I suggested to lawyer James Fitzgerald of the CYLC that he request from Ken a report on Wik linguistic prehistory. Amidst his manifold commitments, Ken found time to write a two-part report interrogating Wik linguistic history for evidence as to the length of time the Wik peoples had been territorially at their present locations.¹⁸

We needed something on this because, at that time in the evolution of native title case law, it was still considered necessary to provide evidence of continuity of traditional tenure by the same people in the same country since the establishment of British sovereignty, which in this case was understood to be 1788. Later it came to be accepted that continuity of law and custom from the period when *effective* sovereignty was established, until the present, would be all that could be and needed to be proven. This date varied widely from region to region because the control of the colonists expanded into different places at different times over more than a century after 1788.

Ken's reports played a key role in removing doubt about the since-sovereignty question from the negotiation agendas of the two main parties. These parties were the Wik peoples as represented by the Cape York Land Council, led by Noel Pearson, and Ebsworth Lawyers, and the Queensland Government's Crown Law department. The vital role of Ken's reports in the negotiations was facilitated by their assessment by a Queensland Government employee, Colin Sheehan, who had academic linguistic training. In fact, he was an ex-student of Dr Luise Hercus of The Australian National University, an eminent specialist in Aboriginal languages. In the early 1990s, Colin and I were in the same room in Brisbane when the parties' legal representatives discussed Ken's work. As Colin explained the significance of Ken's reports, one of the

17 See further Chapter 2.

18 Hale (1997b), here Chapters 6 and 7.

State's planks of resistance suddenly fell away.¹⁹ Ken's work had shown that, in the case of the Wik Subgroup area, which was the lion's share of the claim area, territorial stability was essentially centuries old. This technical demonstration, following on the other evidence of Wik peoples' continuity of connection to their countries, was the beginning of the long road to a final consent determination of native title.

This book in part acknowledges Ken Hale's key role in that historic chain of events, but it also adds a further tribute to his life and work in its Australian phase.

In 1997, I wrote to Ken to suggest we combine our various Wik expert reports as a book and get it published.²⁰ Ken's reply was swift: 'I really like the idea!'²¹ Sadly Ken passed away before we could weld the book together between us, and the present volume has had to be constructed by myself. I have left Ken's two chapters as they were in 1997, apart from correcting typos, renumbering tables, and adding a few footnotes. No doubt there have been many new developments in the world literature on linguistic generalisations since 1997. There have also been advancements in scholarship on Paman and Pama-Nyungan languages since 1997. However, the historical importance and enduring value of Ken's chapters justifies their being published at the present time.

I first met Ken Hale when he took part in a conference at The Australian National University in 1974, organised by the then Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies (AIAS, now AIATSIS). Ken gave several papers, some of them in a symposium I convened on languages of Cape York Peninsula. These papers were published as *Languages of Cape York* (Sutton 1976) and four of the papers published there were by Ken (Hale 1976a, b, c, d).

Later that year we travelled to Darwin with fellow linguist Geoffrey O'Grady to attend a meeting with the Northern Territory Education Department for the purpose of discussing the introduction of a bilingual education program for Aboriginal school students. I was sent along by my

19 Sheehan later wrote a report where the role of the linguistic evidence, and Ken's submissions in particular, were described as clinching the question of Wik occupation of the claim area since before the establishment of British sovereignty (Sheehan 2002:24–25).

20 Sutton email to Hale, 10 October 1997.

21 Hale email to Sutton, 10 October 1997.

employer, the AIAS, and as a novice linguist I was fascinated to sit and listen to the two veterans and old colleagues during their exchanges over dinner at the Hotel Darwin.

Ken and I kept in touch over the years that followed, including when I sent Ken a copy of my PhD thesis (Sutton 1978). His response was encouraging:

Dear Peter: Thank you so much for sending me your dissertation. It is excellent—I read the whole thing last night, and will probably read it again soon. I’m also pleased you mentioned my work—I really like to get mentioned.²²

Peter Sutton

I began decades of working with Wik people in a short mapping trip in January 1976, with Athol Chase and John von Sturmer, while we were mapping sites and estates north of Aurukun. I had by then already spent cumulatively about 12 months doing linguistic field work elsewhere in Cape York Peninsula and Far North Queensland in the years 1970–75.

From 1976 I began living at times in Aurukun Presbyterian Mission, as it then was, but for most of my field work time, in the late 1970s, I was residing out in the bush based at Peret Outstation 60 kilometres to the south in the great wetlands of the Cape Keerweer²³ region, or in temporary bush camps. From those bases I worked with local people to develop an in-depth study of the roles played by language variation and political action in people’s systems of relationships with their tribal countries, including land tenure and succession. The outcome of that work was Sutton (1978).

Authors of Appendices 1 and 2

Sutton (2016a) includes a history of the cultural mapping roles played by the authors of the two appendices here, namely Sutton, Martin, von Sturmer, Cribb, Chase, Taylor and McConnel, to which the reader is referred.

22 Hale letter to Sutton, 19 June 1979.

23 Cape Keerweer was mapped geographically and named by Willem Janszoon in 1606, during the earliest known European exploration of an Australian coast (Heeres 1899). See Figures A1.21 and A1.22.

Acknowledgements

Our first debt, as always, is to our Aboriginal mentors, whose energetic engagement with researchers over generations has resulted in the rich record that is partially reflected in this book. They are too many to name here in full—however, they are in Sutton et al. (1990) and Sutton et al. (1997)—but the following were key instructors for the site and country mapping, and the extensive genealogies and totemic information, that underpin Appendices 1 and 2 and Maps A2.1–A2.13:

Sam Kerindun, Fred Kerindun, Uki Pamulkan, Mabel Taisman, Myrtle Chevathun, Jean George, Alice Mark, Ronnie John, Lenford Matthew, Violet Yunkaporta, Nellie Taisman, Cyril Owokran, Isobel Wolmby, George Sydney Yunkaporta, Clive Yunkaporta, Paulina Peemuggina, Francis Yunkaporta, Alan Wolmby, Morrison Wolmby, Ron Yunkaporta, Archiewald Otomorathin, Lomai Woolla, Rex Walmbeng, Cecil Walmbeng, Jack Spear Karntin, Johnny Lak Lak Ampeybegan, Denny Bowenda, Charles Taisman, Alfred Taisman, Arthur Pambegan, Geraldine Kawangka, Maud Yunkaporta, Noel Peemuggina, Mikompa Peemuggina, Peter Peemuggina, Jack Sleep Yunkaporta, Paddy Yantumba, Dan Gothachalkenin, Yukwainten Gothachalkenin, Koppa Yunkaporta, Bob Massey Pootchemunka, Small Eric Pootchemunka, Nigel Pootchemunka, John Kelly Pootchemunka, Marybelle Pamtoonda, Mary Walmbeng, Mulloch Wolmby, Stewart Korkaktain, Jackson Woolla, Roddy Shortjoe, Dawn Koondumbin, Wompey Keppel, Rosie Ahlers, Peret Arkwookerum, James Kalkeeyorta, Rodney Karyuka, Tommy Eileen, Abiu Holroyd, Duncan Holroyd, Jimmy Kendall, Dugal Tarpencha, Stingaree Barney, Mickey Edward, Ned Edward, Joe Ngallametta.

Ken Hale's main language teachers for this part of CYP were Sam Kerindun, Joe Marbendinar, Jim Henry, and Billy Ngakapoorgum (Aurukun), and Tictic, Frank Moreton, Andrew Mark, Willie, Robert Hall, Monty Motton, Arthur Dick, Hector, and Keepas (Weipa).

Specific factual data on Wik Region clans and estates, here listed in Appendices 1 and 2, have been drawn from the limited publication of Sutton et al. (1990) with additions from the follow-up report (Sutton et al. 1997). A draft of the 1990 report was taken to Aurukun in November 1989 where John von Sturmer and I conducted fact-checking and permissions discussions with 14 sets of families whose countries and

clans were represented in the volume. Those consents are reflected here, although the great bulk of Sutton et al. (1990, 1997), namely the data on around 2,000 specific sites recorded in the field and elsewhere, is not contained in this book.

I must also acknowledge in particular Victor Wolmby (1905–76, Figure A1.1) who took me as a son in the months before his passing, and who was my first instructor in learning his clan dialect Wik-Ngathan, at Aurukun Presbyterian Mission in the 1975–76 wet season. He passed away in March 1976 before I began mapping field work a few months later, and his role as mentoring father was assumed by his clan brother Noel Peemuggina (1910–82, Figure A1.18). My principal Wik-Ngathan language teacher, and most indefatigable site and estate mapping instructor, was Victor's widow Isobel Wolmby née Gothachalkenin (1917–89, Figure A1.7).

Especially in those days, traditionally oriented remote Aboriginal people like the Wik peoples were most at home in dealing with people they classed as kin. Non-Aboriginal people were thus at times taken into their world and made relatives. In 1976 I was suddenly thrown into a network of what was then over 600 people, to each of whom I was then related as a specific kind of relative, and each of them to me. Victor's patrilineal clan estate (number 6 Aayk, near Cape Keerweer), his clan dialect (Wik-Ngathan), and his totems (Chiiyn-chiiyn 'Bush Rat', and many others, see Clan 6 Appendix 1), were spoken of as mine, as they were also of the rest of the Wolmby and Peemuggina descent group from the Aayk estate. Happily, this inclusion of one of the Wik native title case experts in one of the Wik claimant families was never raised as a problem during the long and strenuous legal negotiations.

By and large, the field records on which this book is based were made before and outside of the native title legal process, principally between 1969 and 1990, although some were generated in the period 1991–97. Earlier cultural and linguistic mapping from the period 1927–34, recorded by anthropologist Ursula McConnel (1886–1957), has also been included here, along with smaller contributions from other sources as acknowledged.

The fact that the Wik Region was already well-researched in terms of traditional country ownership was one of the main reasons it was chosen by Noel Pearson and the Cape York Land Council as the first Queensland mainland native title case in 1992.²⁴

Specific consultations about publishing Appendices 1 and 2 were carried out in Aurukun by David Martin in 2019. Collective support for the publication of the Appendices was passed as a formal motion of the Wik, Wik Way²⁵ and Kugu traditional land owners body Aak Puul Ngantam ('Our Fathers' Fathers' Country') on 24 September 2019. In 1995 Napranum Aboriginal Corporation gave me access to Co-ordata (1994). All are to be thanked for their collaboration.

Where scholars have contributed to the contents, they are specifically acknowledged. However, in particular, I acknowledge the special contributions of David Fernandes Martin, John Richard von Sturmer, Roger Llewellyn Dunmore Cribb, Athol Kennedy Chase, John Charles Taylor and Ursula Hope McConnel. I also thank two anonymous manuscript referees for their most helpful suggestions, most of which have been adopted here.

The information on clans and estates of the Kugu Ngancharra region that has been compiled here has been extracted from von Sturmer's PhD thesis (1978), which is openly available electronically from the Library of the University of Queensland. Early clan estate maps for the area between the Archer and Kendall rivers appear in my own PhD thesis (Sutton 1978), which is also publicly downloadable from the same site.

On some of my mapping trips I worked collaboratively with anthropologists John von Sturmer, David Martin, Roger Cribb, Athol Chase and Marcia Langton. I also had the fine company and assistance of John Adams (Aurukun Mission staffer), Dermot Smyth (ecologist) and Philip Hunter (solicitor for the Wik case) on a series of mapping expeditions, and I thank them all here.

24 It was lodged in 1992 as a common law claim. It went on under the Native Title Act after that act was passed in 1993.

25 Note that we spell this in linguistic-anthropological contexts with a hyphen (Wik-Way), but the legal reports have Wik Way. The meanings are the same. We retain both depending on context.

Although Ken Hale gave his permission in 1997 for his *Wik* case reports to be published here (as Chapters 6 and 7), I also thank Ken's son Caleb Hale for his approval of the present publication.²⁶

Funding for the field work and other research behind this book came from the Australian National Research Council (McConnel), The National Science Foundation (USA) and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (USA) (Hale); and for the more recent scholars: the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, the Australian Commonwealth Department of Education, University of Queensland Department of Anthropology and Sociology, Aurukun Shire Council, Aurukun Community Incorporated, Australian Department of Aboriginal Affairs, the Australian Heritage Commission, the South Australian Museum, the Australian Research Council, and the Cape York Land Council.

The clan estate maps (Maps A2.1–A2.13) were kindly prepared by Joyce Gehr for the Cape York Land Council and this publication.

Financial support for copyediting and indexing this book by Angela Terrill was provided by the Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for the Dynamics of Language at The Australian National University.

This book was put together because of a suggestion by Nicholas Evans that I publish my 1978 PhD thesis on *Wik* linguistic anthropology. I thank him for this encouragement.

Peter Sutton
School of Biological Sciences, University of Adelaide
Division of Humanities, South Australian Museum
30 June 2021

²⁶ Caleb Hale email to Peter Sutton, 8 March 2018.

This text is taken from *Linguistic Organisation and Native Title:
The Wik Case, Australia*, by Peter Sutton and Ken Hale, published 2021 by
ANU Press, The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.

doi.org/10.22459/LONT.2021.01