Introduction

Miscommunication between speakers of Australian Aboriginal English and Australian English has disadvantaged the former in a variety of contexts ranging from the school and hospital to the courtroom (e.g. Christie and Harris, 1985; Eades, 1996, 2000; Kearins, 1985; Lowell and Devlin, 1998; Malcolm, 1979, 1982; Mobbs, 1986; Sharifian, 2001; Sharifian et al., 2004). For example, Aboriginal English is not recognized by many educators as a legitimate variety of English, but is merely treated as an incorrect form of the language. Lack of recognition of Aboriginal English and its conceptual system by the educational institutions often lets intercultural miscommunication between Aboriginal students and non-Aboriginal educators and students go unnoticed. The discomfort this causes for the students leads to a sizeable number dropping out from school.

Cass et al. (2002) also report significant miscommunication between Aboriginal patients and their medical, nursing and allied professional carers, which is seriously detrimental to the provision of health services to Aboriginal people. They report linguistic and cultural distance as one of the main sources of this observed miscommunication. In the area of legal justice, Eades's (2007) analysis has revealed a number of cases of miscommunication, with serious damaging legal consequences for Aboriginal speakers, between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people in the courts. This miscommunication systematically occurs due to differences between the two varieties of English, which vary in terms of their phonological, grammatical, pragmatic and discourse features. Eades (2007, p. 320) maintains that "given that the language of the law is general Australian English, and that many non-Aboriginal Australians are unaware of differences between general Australian English and Aboriginal English, Aboriginal English speakers are clearly linguistically disadvantaged in legal contexts." Research has revealed that even everyday words such as 'home' and 'family' are...
likely to evoke contrasting cultural meanings among Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Australians (e.g. Sharifian, 2005).

This chapter reveals how the differences between Aboriginal English and Australian English can be significantly accounted for using the framework of Cultural Linguistics, in particular the notion of conceptual metaphor. Presenting examples from Aboriginal English the chapter demonstrates that metaphor in Aboriginal English can be viewed on a continuum ranging from fundamental metaphors that reflect Aboriginal worldview to cases where the metaphor appears to be just a figurative use of language. In other words, at one end of the continuum, the conceptual metaphor involved provides a cognitive framework, a frame of thought, and at the other end, it has only a rhetorical function. As a preamble to the analysis of the examples of metaphor in Aboriginal English, the following section presents an overview of the theoretical framework adopted in this study and a discussion of research on metaphor.

Cultural Linguistics and metaphor research

Cultural Linguistics is a sub-branch of Linguistics with a multidisciplinary origin that explores the relationship among language, culture and conceptualization (Palmer, 1996; Sharifian and Palmer, 2007; Sharifian, 2011, 2013, forthcoming). It shares the view with cognitive linguistics that meaning is conceptualization but places emphasis on the cultural construction of conceptualization. Cultural Linguistics employs analytical tools such as ‘cultural schema’, ‘cultural category’ and ‘cultural-conceptual’ metaphor to explore features of language that have a cultural basis. I refer to these notions collectively as cultural conceptualizations (Sharifian, 2003, 2008, 2011).

The meanings of many lexical items of human languages lend themselves best to cognitive schemas that are abstracted from cultural experiences. Also, many lexical items serve as labels for categories that are culturally established. For example, we categorize events, based on their function, associated behaviour and material culture, as ‘wedding’, ‘funeral’, ‘house warming’ and so on. These event categories are usually defined culturally and have prototypes that may differ from one culture to another. But we also have knowledge about various aspects of these events, such as knowledge of the expected procedures, people’s roles and norms about sub-events. This type of knowledge is always culturally constructed and is captured in cognitive schemas that speakers draw on when engaged in or thinking about these events.

An important class of conceptualization, which is central to both cognitive linguistics and Cultural Linguistics, is conceptual metaphor. The seminal work on conceptual metaphor within cognitive linguistics by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) characterized metaphor as fundamental to human thought and action, rather than simply a figure of speech. Lakoff and Johnson argue that our ‘ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature’ (p. 545). They also argue that since our conceptual system structures how we perceive the world, ‘the way we think, what we experience, and what we do every day is very much a matter of metaphor’ (p. 545).
If language is closely linked to our conceptual system, it serves as a laboratory for exploring our conceptualizations including conceptual metaphors. One of the examples that Lakoff and Johnson (1980, p. 456) give is the conceptual metaphor of TIME IS MONEY, reflected in expressions such as ‘You’re wasting my time’, ‘You need to budget your time’ and ‘Do you have much time left?’ In recent years, many studies have shown how a close analysis of language use can highlight underlying conceptual metaphors (e.g. Cameron and Low, 1999; Cameron and Maslen, 2010; Yu, 2009a,b). The theoretical framework of conceptual metaphor has been productively used in several areas, including the analysis of political discourse (e.g. Musolff, 2004, 2010).

Conceptual metaphor is also central to Cultural Linguistics, in that it focuses on exploring the cultural basis of conceptual metaphor, and its important implications for the cognitive nature of conceptual metaphor (e.g. Kovecses, 2005; Sharifian et al., 2008; Yu, 2009a,b; see also Quinn, 1991, for a similar interest in cognitive anthropology). As Yu (2003, p. 14) maintains, ‘the relation between metaphor, body, and culture is extremely intricate, with all of them mingled together, and each of them penetrating the others, giving rise to a colourful spectrum of cognition’. Chapters in Sharifian et al. (2008) explore cultural traditions that have given rise to conceptual metaphors of internal body organs, such as that of the heart as the seat of emotions, showing that the links between particular organs and their associated emotions are not universal. In Indonesian, for instance, it is hati (the liver) that is associated with love (Siahaan, 2008). Siahaan traces back such conceptualizations to the ritual of animal sacrifice, especially the interpretation of the liver organ, known as ‘liver divination’, which was practised in ancient Indonesia. Ning Yu (2009b) explores the origin of the conceptualization of xin (heart) in ancient Chinese philosophy and traditional Chinese medicine. According to the Chinese conceptualization, the heart is traditionally believed to be the central faculty of cognition as well as being the physiological centre of the human being, and even, in a cosmic view, the ‘mirror of the universe’. In other words, the heart is seen as governing the body, including the brain. Yu reveals how this conceptualization is still widely manifested in the Chinese language today.

The approach of Cultural Linguistics has also been applied to explore the conceptual basis of Aboriginal English (e.g. Malcolm and Rochecouste, 2000; Malcolm and Sharifian, 2005; Sharifian, 2006). In this chapter, I focus on the exploration of conceptual metaphor in Aboriginal English and discuss how unfamiliarity with culturally constructed metaphor in Aboriginal English often leads to miscommunication between speakers of Aboriginal English and speakers of non-Aboriginal English. But first, a description of Aboriginal English is in order.

Aboriginal English

‘Aboriginal English’ collectively refers to the indigenized varieties of English spoken by Aboriginal people in Australia (e.g. Arthur, 1996; Eades, 1991, 1995; Harkins, 1990, 2000; Kaldor and Malcolm, 1991; Malcolm, 1994a,b). Although Aboriginal people come from a variety of cultural-linguistic backgrounds, with a fair level of generalization it
is possible to refer collectively to the varieties of English that they speak as ‘Aboriginal English’. This is apparent, in particular, in the similarities in the conceptual systems and the worldviews that characterize most varieties of English spoken by Aboriginal people. These varieties came into existence as a result of various contact-induced linguistic processes such as pidginization, depidginization, creolization and decreolization based on the interaction between English and Aboriginal languages. However, varieties of Aboriginal English did not develop solely due to the need for a lingua franca between Aboriginal people and European settlers. Aboriginal people who were displaced by Europeans from their original settlement areas, and who collectively spoke more than 250 different languages, needed a lingua franca to communicate with each other. Thus, Aboriginal English is not a Western variety, but as Eades (1991, p. 57) notes, it ‘is a distinctive dialect of English which reflects, maintains and continually creates Aboriginal culture and identity’. Malcolm (2001, p. 217) also observes that ‘AbE [Aboriginal English] is a symbol of cultural maintenance; it is the adopted code of a surviving culture.’

In terms of syntax, Aboriginal English is more variable than Australian English (Malcolm, 2001, 2004). It has been noted that less structured varieties of Aboriginal English share many features with creoles and substrate languages (Dixon, 1980; Harkins, 1990). Aboriginal English has certain distinctive pragmatic norms which reflect Aboriginal cultural systems. Eades (e.g. 1982, 1988, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, 2000) has observed that Aboriginal speakers rely on rather indirect strategies for seeking information whereas Anglo-Australians usually try to elicit information in a direct and repeated manner. Eades has also observed that silence achieves certain functions for Aboriginal speakers, which are unfamiliar to non-Aboriginal speakers, who can easily interpret silence as non-compliance. Such cultural differences in communication style have had serious implications for legal cases involving allegations of murder and of deprivation of liberty by police officers (Eades, 1995, 1996, 2000).

Recent research on semantic aspects of Aboriginal English has adopted a cultural-conceptual approach that largely draws on Cultural Linguistics. It has, for example, been observed that even everyday words such as ‘family’, ‘home’ and ‘sorry’ evoke cultural schemas and categories among Aboriginal English speakers that generally characterize Aboriginal cultural experiences (Malcolm and Sharifian, 2002; Sharifian, 2005). The word ‘family’, for instance, is associated with categories in Aboriginal English that move far beyond what is described as the ‘nuclear’ family in Anglo-Australian culture. A person who comes into frequent contact with an Aboriginal person may be referred to using a kinship term such as ‘brother’ or ‘cousin’ or ‘cousin brother’ (Malcolm and Sharifian, 2007, p. 381). The word ‘mum’ may also be used to refer to people who are referred to as ‘aunt’ in Anglo-Australian culture. Such usage of kin terms does not stop at the level of categorization but usually evokes schemas associated with certain rights and obligations between those involved. The word ‘home’ in Aboriginal English evokes categories that are usually based far more on family relationships than the possession of a building by the nuclear family. For instance, Aboriginal English speakers may refer to their grandparents’ place as ‘home’. Unfamiliarity with the schemas that inform Aboriginal English discourse has often led to miscommunication
that has disadvantaged Aboriginal speakers (e.g. Sharifian, 2001; Sharifian et al., 2004; Sharifian et al., 2005).

**Metaphor in Aboriginal English**

**Aboriginal conceptualizations of the land**

In this section, I use examples from Aboriginal English to show how conceptual metaphor may be viewed along a continuum in terms of its cognitive and linguistic status/processing. At one end of the continuum what appears to be rhetorical from the perspective of an outsider to Aboriginal English is actually culturally constructed conceptualization originating from the Aboriginal worldview. Thus, to the speaker, such conceptualizations are real beliefs about the world and life and as such are understood by speakers as literal, although from the perspective of an outsider the culture they are likely to be viewed as cases of conceptual metaphor. That is, from the *etic* perspective, such conceptualizations appear as conceptual metaphor, while from the *emic* perspective, they are part of the speaker’s real worldview, with no element of figure of speech. This class of conceptualizations, which may be termed *fundamental metaphors*, includes religious metaphors (e.g. Feyaerts, 2003). A more neutral, and therefore more appropriate, term to use in such cases is the umbrella term of Cultural Linguistics: *cultural conceptualization* (Sharifian, 2011).

As an example of fundamental metaphors, in Aboriginal English a speaker may state that ‘This land is me’. This seemingly rhetorical statement, particularly from a non-Aboriginal perspective, in fact dwells in the Aboriginal conceptualization of ancestor beings are part of the land and I AM PART OF ANCESTOR BEINGS, with the resulting conceptualization of I AM PART OF THE LAND. According to the worldview of the Dreamtime, Ancestor Beings returned to the land in the form of stones, trees and the like after the Creation. Therefore they are now considered to be part of the land, and since according to the same worldview, an Aboriginal person is an extension of his/her Ancestor Beings, the land itself is conceptualized as embodying the person. The following excerpt from an Aboriginal English speaker further elaborates on Aboriginal conceptualizations of the land:

(1) You see my people see land ownership as being totally different to the English way of ownership because we, ours used to be really the land owns us and it still is that to us. You know the land ah, grows all of us up and it really does, no human is older than the land itself it just isn’t and no living marsupial is as old as the land itself. Everything that’s been and gone with life in the flesh has died but the land is still here. (Rob Randall, a Yankunytjatjara Elder, 2012)

As reflected earlier, the Aboriginal conceptualization of the relationship between people and the land is that of ‘the land owns us’ and ‘the land grows us up’. The general underlying conceptualization here is that of LAND AS PROGENITOR, whereas the dominant understanding from the perspective of Anglo-Australian is rather ‘land is a possession that can be bought and sold’. Another closely related Aboriginal
conceptualization of the land is that of land as a human being, which is reflected in the following excerpt from an Aboriginal Elder:

(2) If you look at the land and you watch the land talk to you boy you know you won’t starve, you won’t go thirsty, you know it’s there to show you. It’s talking to you all the time, every time a blossom blooms, every time different coloration and that come on your plants and your trees and that you look at it and you start to understand it and you say ‘now what’s it doing that for’ ‘why is it goin’ like that’ and then you watch it next time it comes around and then and then the penny drops you know then ‘oh so that’s what that’s happened’ there with that see so it’s things like this that people have got to start to understand about, um about our people and their lifestyle. (Max ‘Duramunmun’ Harrison, 2009)

It can be seen that in this example the speaker characterizes the land as being able to talk to people and care for them and provide for them. The land does this, for example, by giving people clues using signals through natural events, such as blooming blossoms and colour changes in plants. This kind of characterization of the land is consistent with the conceptualization of land as close kin, in particular as a mother or father.

In the Aboriginal worldview, land also enjoys a sacred position and is strongly associated with Aboriginal spirituality, a topic that has long been a matter of significant debate and conflict between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal speakers. This is best reflected in the following excerpt from the same interview by the aforementioned Elder:

(3) Um if we said that that place was sacred over there you know across Uluru. If I sat down I was tellin’ a lot of politicians or someone you can’t develop over there because that place is sacred over there and the first thing that they would do, then they would go and they would look to see what was sacred about it or they would try and bring the sacredness down, and you know they’d say ‘well so what’s sacred about it?’ ‘You know but they can’t understand the energy or the ceremonies that went into the land and the singing that went into the land, into the rocks ah into the trees ah they cannot understand that and ah and so they’ve got to look to find some to identify something there. They’re trying to look for that sacredness thing, you can’t see sacredness. (Max ‘Duramunmun’ Harrison, 2009, ibid.)

This excerpt clearly reflects miscommunication between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal speakers regarding ‘the sacredness of the land’. The sacredness that is referred to in this excerpt is associated with many aspects of the environment, such as rocks, hills, lakes, trees and the like, for Aboriginal people. This spirituality is rooted in the worldview of Aboriginal people, according to which, as mentioned before, Ancestor Beings during the Dreamtime created the land, the people and the animals and at the end of their journey themselves turned into topographical features (Charlesworth et al., 1990). Thus the underlying cultural conceptualization here is that Ancestor Spirits are part of the land, which is why the land is so sacred to Aboriginal people.
Aboriginal conceptualizations of rain

The spirituality that characterizes Aboriginal English, and is often the source of miscommunication between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal speakers, is not limited to the domain of land, but influences many other aspects of the speaker’s language. Words such as ‘sing’, ‘smoke’, ‘medicine’, ‘rain’ and so on may be used to refer to Aboriginal spiritual experiences that are part of their cultural conceptualizations and are largely unfamiliar to non-Aboriginal speakers (Sharifian, 2010). The following is an excerpt from a conversation between the author and an Aboriginal English speaker where the word ‘rain’ is used to refer to an Aboriginal conceptualization:

(4)     C: same like when it’s death or funeral times when it’s burial, might not, might be good, and then this cloud comes and it’s the rain it's called the midjal, it rain, it's a sad rain, it's crying rain, . . . the old fallas crying for umm not crying for the falla who's gone cause they're with them, they're crying for the fallas that're there, they're cryin' sad for watchin' all the people mob cryin', you know, and it's a soft rain, a different rain.

It can be seen that the speaker describes the rain as ‘the old fallas crying’ for survivors of the person who is deceased. Here ‘the old fallas’ refers to the spirits of the ancestors and, as reflected in the text, the deceased person is now believed to be with the ancestors. According to the speaker, the spirits of her ancestors are crying because they are sad, watching people mourning and crying for the deceased. It is to be noted that although from the outsider perspective conceptualization of ancestor spirits’ tears as rain appears metaphoric, for the speaker it is an indisputable reality that is part of her worldview. Another use of the word ‘rain’ by the same speaker to refer to an Aboriginal conceptualization is as follows:

(5)     that, that rain, the rain ‘ere, the angry rain, das when some, you done somethin’ or someone’s done somethin’, that did bad an it’s like it’s not rainin’ and it comes and it’s like bangin’, loud, sort of lashin’, makes the trees go shshsht, you know, hitti’ out that sort of rain an’ it can come out like that but then you find out after someone doin’ somethin’, and you go th’as what it was . . .

Here the speaker identifies a particular type of rain as ‘angry rain’ and states that it falls when someone has done something wrong, described as ‘someone doin’ something’. When asked to elaborate on this expression the speaker continued as follows:

(6)     someone, if it’s not me, someone done something shouldna, something, somethin’, could be went out somewhere where they should’ve not went, might have went out to [name of a place] might’ve went to [name of a place], and coming back an then next minute it’s starts rainin’ but it’s a wind an it’s got the wind with it, that’s Warra rain that is, tha’s Warra baad rain you know, that’s bad thing, someone savage stirred up them all them fallas now.

The underlying cultural conceptualization here is the ancestor spirits’ anger as rain. This anger is explained in the excerpt here as the result of breaking a cultural
taboo, such as someone visiting a forbidden place, for example, the ‘country’ or
the sacred place of another cultural group, without their permission. Again, such
conceptualizations would appear to be rhetorical to non-Aboriginal speakers, but they
are intended literally by the speaker and form part of the Aboriginal worldview. From
a technical perspective, the expressions discussed so far involve conceptual mapping
from the domains of land and rain to the domains of ancestors and ancestors’ emotions.
However, these mappings are part of the Aboriginal worldview and spirituality, which
are unfamiliar to many non-Aboriginal speakers, leading to miscommunication with
Aboriginal speakers.

Aboriginal conceptualizations of medicine

A set of Aboriginal conceptualizations that reveal mapping from a Western domain to
an Aboriginal domain is that of healing as medicine. The word ‘medicine’ can be used
in Aboriginal English to mean ‘spiritual power’ (Arthur, 1996, p. 46). The following is
an example of the use of the ‘medicine’ in this sense in Aboriginal English:

(7) That when . . . my mum was real crook and she . . ., she said, ‘I woke up an it
was still in my mouth . . . the taste of all the medicine cause they come an’ give
me some medicine last night an’ she always tells us that you can’t move . . . an’
you wanna sing out an say just . . . sorta try an’ relax. That happened to me lotta
times I was about twelve.’

In this recount the speaker remembers that once her mother was ill and she told them the
next morning that ‘they’ went to her and gave her some ‘medicine’ she could still taste.
She also describes the feeling that results from the medicine as wanting to shout and
then forcing oneself to relax. Without having the requisite schema, the audience of the
recount given earlier would be likely to think that ‘they’ refers to medical professionals
who visited the mother after hours and gave her syrup or a tablet. However, further
discussion with the speaker made it clear that her mother was referring to ancestor
beings using their healing power to treat her illness. Again, unfamiliarity with cultural
schemas that underlie the use of instances of discourse such as the one given here often
causes miscommunication between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal speakers.

Associated with this conceptual metaphor is the use of ‘doctor’ or ‘doctor man’
or ‘medicine man’ to refer to ‘a spiritually powerful person whose powers include
healing’ (Arthur, 1996, p. 25). Elkin (1977, p. xx) observes that medicine men are
‘magical practitioners, for they cure some sicknesses by magical rituals and spells. In
many parts they are sorcerers as well; they know how to, and may, insert evil magic,
extract “human fat”, or cause the soul to leave the victim’s body, bringing about sickness
and death.’ The following excerpt reveals how the use of the word ‘doctor’ can lead
to miscommunication between an Aboriginal English speaker and a non-Aboriginal
English one.

(8) Aboriginal English speaker: There’s no doctor man ’round ’ere anymore.
Non-Aboriginal English speaker: Not even a clinic or something?
It is to be noted here that while the domain of healing for Aboriginal speakers is associated with their worldview, the mapping from the domain of ‘medicine’ to ‘healing’ appears to be less of an unalienable tenet of the speaker’s worldview than the connections of the domain of kinship and the domain of land. In other words, the speaker is likely to be aware of the culturally relative nature of such usage, as they would be familiar with the Western domain and the Aboriginal domain.

Nature metaphor and creative metaphor in Aboriginal English

Moving along the continuum, there are expressions in Aboriginal English that reflect mappings based on Aboriginal conceptualizations of certain aspects of nature, such as that of the moon as a living being, reflected in expressions such as ‘when the moon jumps up’. At the most rhetorical end of the spectrum Aboriginal English includes expressions that reveal creative conceptual mappings that are understood as metaphorical by the speaker, such as using ‘riding the white horse’ to refer to kneading dough when making damper.

Another example of this kind of metaphor is the use of the expression ‘foot Falcon’ to mean ‘travelling on foot, especially long distances’. The following is an example of the use of this expression:

(9) Aboriginal English speaker: We footfalcon to Carnarvon.
    Non-Aboriginal speaker: Do you have a falcon?
    Aboriginal English speaker: (laughing) You got one too.
    Non-Aboriginal speaker: me? (puzzled)
    Aboriginal English speaker: Yeah.

The use of the word ‘Falcon’, to refer to the make of a car, here implies a long distance trip. As such distances are usually travelled by car, especially by non-Aboriginal people, it also ironically reflects the fact that the speaker(s) cannot afford any other kind of Falcon. This sort of playful expression can, as this interaction shows, also lead to miscommunication between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal speakers.

Concluding remarks

Analysing a number of examples, this chapter shows how unfamiliarity with Aboriginal English, in particular its conceptual system, has led to miscommunication between speakers of Aboriginal English and other non-Aboriginal Australians. This continues to disadvantage Aboriginal English speakers in various contexts in which they have to communicate with non-Aboriginal people, from the classroom to the courtroom. It is hoped that the analysis of data from Aboriginal English from the perspective of Cultural Linguistics will provide awareness and recognition of the conceptual basis of Aboriginal English, leading to a reduction in the disadvantage that Aboriginal English speakers are likely to experience in various contexts.
We now return to the observation made at the beginning of this chapter – that metaphor can be viewed along a continuum, with fundamental metaphors that reflect Aboriginal worldview at one end to cases where the metaphor appears to be a figure of speech at the other. In summary, conceptualizations such as ANCESTOR SPIRITS AS BEING PART OF THE LAND and ANCESTOR SPIRITS’ EMOTIONS AS RAIN do not appear metaphoric from the emic perspective, but rather from the worldview of the speakers. As mentioned before, in such cases the conceptualization provides a cognitive frame for making sense and organizing their cultural experiences. Thus, the function of the observed conceptualization is schematic rather than metaphoric. It provides the speaker with a cultural schema that can constitute the speaker’s world. There are also metaphors in Aboriginal English that reflect cross-cultural mapping from Western domains of experience, such as that of medicine, to Aboriginal cultural domains, such as that of healing. It is likely that in such cases the speaker here is more conscious of the mapping across the two domains, since they have access to both in the normal course of their life. At the other end of the continuum, there are expressions in Aboriginal English that reflect creative conceptual mappings that are rather playfully constructed.

In general, the observations made in this chapter suggest that explorations of the cultural basis of conceptual metaphor have significant implications for conceptual metaphor theory. For example, such explorations reveal that there are several dimensions to conceptual metaphors. They include the degree to which what appears to be metaphorical/rhetorical is based on cultural conceptualizations that constitute the speaker’s worldview, the degree to which a conceptual mapping is the result of cross-cultural mapping (HEALING AS MEDICINE) and the degree to which speakers are conscious of the cross-domain mapping involved in an expression. Explorations of these questions using data from different languages and language varieties can contribute to a deeper understanding of the interplay among culture, conceptualization and human cognitive processing.

Notes

1 The author received financial support from Australian Research Council twice throughout the conduct of the research that forms part of this chapter (ARC DP and Australian Postdoctoral Fellowship [project number DP0343282], and ARC DP [project number DP0877310]).
2 <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w0sWIVRIhXw&feature=relmfu>
3 <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=06UpQQQ7cBM>
4 This excerpt and the next three formed part of the data collected for Sharifian (2010). The data were collected in the form of naturalistic conversations between the author and an Aboriginal English speaker.
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