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The devastating effects of European foodstuffs and deprivation of traditional food sources on the diet of Aboriginal people in Australia in the nineteenth century are well known and documented. But interactions between early European settlers and Aboriginal people were often about food sources and records show that Aboriginal people were at first prepared to share their knowledge about edible plants and other food-related matters. This article examines early observations about Aboriginal peoples in South Australia written by some of the early European settlers. Looking at the food practices of the German Lutherans in South Australia, it will examine the extent to which the food customs of the Ngadjuri and Peramangk people influenced European food habits. It will offer suggestions about why some food customs were adopted and others ignored.

Looking at minutiae like food in people’s lives can give insights into broader historical themes. Food, of course, is a basic part of history. Over a long period of time a group of people determine and express their culture through their food. Securing food supplies, moreover, has often determined how people behave towards each other and whether these relationships are cordial or hostile. This is a paper about the encounter of two different food cultures. It examines how German-speaking Lutheran settlers in the Barossa Valley and nearby districts in South Australia viewed the food practices of the local Aboriginal inhabitants. Diaries, reminiscences and letters of the settlers reveal an aspect of early contact that has recently aroused some interest, namely, how much the Europeans learned from the Aborigines and how much of their learning transferred to their own food culture.

Laurel Dyson has suggested that some food practices of early settlers were indeed learned from their Aboriginal neighbours.1 Dyson’s book How to Cook a Galah describes different Aboriginal culinary techniques used by Europeans, including the practice of cooking meat and vegetables in a ground oven, ‘one of the world’s great gastronomic experiences’, and the Aboriginal art of making damper.2 If Dyson’s suggestion is true, it alters the historical perspective of the relationship between Aboriginal people and the newly arrived European settlers, for a learner’s perception of someone conveying desired skills or knowledge is not the same as a dominant colonial power’s condescending image of Indigenes.

This paper makes no attempt to launch into the current debate about European power and the treatment of Aboriginal inhabitants. The arguments of Stuart Macintyre, Keith Windschuttle and their supporters have a different focus from mine (although my findings stand in front of a backdrop of violence and denial of this violence in parts of South Australia, described in the book Fatal Collisions).3 Rather, my investigation builds on Black Pioneers, Henry Reynolds’ study of the contribution made by Aboriginal workers in Australia’s development. Reynolds has cited many occasions where the food and water finding skills of Aboriginal people accompanying white farmers
or explorers saved their lives and won their acknowledgement. I am taking this approach a step further by looking into the transfer of culture. Countless anthropologists and sociologists have examined cultural transfer from a dominant culture to one less technologically advanced (in western terms). I want to reverse this process, by exploring how far European settlers were prepared to go in accepting Aboriginal food culture.

To do this, I am going to formulate some stages of cultural acceptance, basing the first set on observations of noted Australian scholar Adolphus Elkin who, in 1951, wrote an article in *American Anthropologist* describing the psychological stages through which Aboriginal people had passed in their encounter with western culture. Although written more than fifty years ago, the article contains analysis of contact behaviour that presaged currently accepted phases of group dynamics. It also gave an advanced perspective at the time by calling for ‘mutual respect for cultural tradition’. Elkin observed among Aboriginal people a pattern of cautiously positive initial response to encounters with settlers. In many cases this response was followed by feelings of hostility, followed in some cases by a form of adjustment. If these stages were a pattern of behaviour for Aboriginal people encountering Europeans for the first time, they might well apply to the early personal reactions of white settlers encountering an alien culture, particularly with regard to the production and use of food. Here it might also be possible to discern the first tentative, non-hostile contacts, followed by clashes over food and social discord, followed by uneasy truce before the economic and technological power of European culture in general finally prevailed.

Early records in South Australia of contact between Europeans and Aboriginal people over food certainly make it clear that members of both cultures experienced the second stage of cultural confrontation. The Europeans seem to have cornered themselves into a habit of handing out food to Aboriginals, often sugar, rice, tea and flour, for which they expected reciprocal work or at least gratitude. When this did not occur, some settlers’ resentment grew. Clashes over food were the basis for reported violent incidents in the colony. Contemporary accounts describe whites administering beatings and poisoning flour in reaction to Aboriginal petty thieving of food. On the other hand, the original occupants of the land, ever diminishing in number, became strident in their demands for food as compensation for being deprived of their hunting grounds and other natural food sources.

But it is the very first stage of cautious acceptance and exchange that is pertinent to early German-speaking settlers in South Australia, including those settling in the Barossa Valley before Aboriginal groups left these areas. Accounts of what people ate, both in the early days of the colony of South Australia and at later dates, do suggest that in the initial confrontation of the two cultures new food ideas did not only flow in one direction, and that the settlers did learn about food from the Aboriginal inhabitants. The way the European food of the German-speaking Lutheran settlers evolved when transplanted to a new land owes some of its development to encounters with Aboriginal culture.

Transfer of food practices from an incumbent culture to a newly imported one can take several different forms. At the most fundamental level the incoming culture can use indigenous ingredients, so that the immigrants try new foods and adopt new tastes, applying them to their own recipes. Lowering cultural barriers a little more, the immigrants may eat indigenous foods prepared and offered by indigenous hosts, in an act of cultural sharing. But a characteristic food culture is usually described in terms of certain dishes prepared according to a recipe, which epitomises that culture. The actual transfer of culture from one set of food practices to another would occur when the newly arrived culture adopted methods of food preparation from the other culture and used them as their own.

These three levels are apparent in descriptions of three different drinks in the writings of Clamor Schürmann and of Samuel Klose, German missionaries to the Aboriginal children at their Piltawodli School in Adelaide. The example of the first kind of cultural exploration concerns Klose, who, in 1840, with only nine pence at his disposal to give his students a Christmas treat, prepared a tea from wild mint that he gathered on the banks of the Torrens. He was using an indigenous ingredient but adapting it to a hot infused drink belonging to his European culture. To illustrate the second level
of food experience, a reading of Schürmann’s early letters reveals that, in dire thirst when travelling south with Kaurna friends, the missionary had shared their brackish water filtered through dry grass, drunk, as was the custom, from a receptacle made of a human skull. This was cultural sharing but appears not to be cultural transfer, for Schürmann’s journals and letters make no later mention of his trying this technique for himself. The third kind of food encounter had occurred two years earlier, when Schürmann had made a journey to the River Murray, accompanied by the German geologist, Johannes Menge. The two travellers had relied for their drink on bottles of ‘resinous soup’ that Menge had made from the sweet gum of the Adelaide Plains eucalypts. Years later, Schürmann wrote that this gum was a summer staple for the Kaurna in Adelaide. It was also the Aboriginal custom to soak sugary plants in cold water and obtain a sweet drink. Menge’s resinous soup was made, by all indications, using an Aboriginal method as well as an indigenous ingredient. This last example is the true cultural transfer.

Each of these three stages of culinary sharing requires an increasing degree of open acceptance of the untried, the new and the wild. The predisposition of the settlers was an important factor in shaping their acceptance of another culinary culture. Indeed, cultural ecologists writing of transfer and migration single out preadaptation as a requirement of successful settlement. The concept of preadaptation involves traits possessed by groups of people before they migrate that give them an adaptive advantage. Most German-speaking immigrants who came to South Australia before 1850 had an attitude towards food supplies that made them receptive to new ingredients collected from the wild. They were country people and about half of them had led simple lives in Brandenburg, Posen, Silesia and Mecklenburg. They were habituated to foraging in European forests, fields and ditches to supplement a limited diet. Thus they would consider eating newly encountered indigenous ingredients and would not refuse to do so out of a sense of social superiority and attendant expectations of refined foods, many having belonged in Europe to peasant ranks themselves. Even the better-educated pastors and missionaries had often come from farming families, were familiar with food obtained at its source and continued to dig their vegetable gardens in South Australia, planting — in the case of the erudite missionary Clamor Schürmann — potatoes, lettuce, cabbages, onions and beet. From these culinary-minded missionaries come detailed observations of indigenous food and its preparation, for they had instructions from the Dresden Mission Society to live among the Aboriginal people as part of their community, learn their way of life and record their speech so that they, the missionaries, could communicate their God’s message in the local language. Notwithstanding their religion, they had to drop their cultural defences and become receptive to another food-oriented way of life.

Several ingredients used by Aboriginal cooks were indeed adopted by the German-speaking settlers. Clamor Schürmann, who founded the Piltawodli school for Aboriginal children on the banks of the River Torrens in Adelaide and co-compiled a dictionary and grammar of the local Kaurna language, wrote that Aboriginal people divided their food into two general classes: paru, or animal food and mai, ‘comprising all vegetable nutriments’. In the very early stages of settlement the Aboriginal people were happy to share both with the colonists (as long as the colonists shared in return). For example, the missionary, C. G. Teichelmann, wrote in 1840 that on his recent return journey from Lake Alexandrina several Narrindjeri inhabitants had presented him with a fish. The settler Johann Christian Liebelt, describing survival in the new village of Hahndorf, wrote:

At first our principal means of subsistence were buttercup roots, which we had to grub out with our hands, and opossums, the catching of which we learned from the blacks.

It is most probable that the settlers learned that the root vegetables were edible by being shown how to dig for them, or by observing the Aboriginal people procuring them for themselves. That information might also have come via the Lutheran clergy, who looked out for the physical welfare of their congregations as well as for their souls. The pastors might have passed on the observations from missionaries like Schürmann and Teichelmann. These two men, who later became parish
ministers themselves, and who were regular visitors to the Barossa, both documented several root vegetables in early South Australia. This is Schürmann’s account:

To the [mai] class [of food] belong a variety of roots, such as nganla, ngarruru, nilai, winnu and other kinds, which are nearly all the size and shape of a small carrot or radish. These are all roasted in the hot ashes and peeled before they are eaten and have a more or less bitter taste.25

Word about some of these root vegetables, particularly the yam daisy, microseris scapigera, called murnong by some Aboriginal groups, spread quickly among settlers, for the latter became a popular vegetable for South Australian colonists. Microseris scapigera grew prolifically in southern Australia and in spring had such a sweet, nutty flavour when roasted that colonial botanist Ferdinand von Mueller suggested cultivating it as a vegetable in Europe.26 Having fallen into oblivion for several generations, these tuberous plants are once again arousing the interest of botanists and gardeners. Intensive farming in the settled areas of southern Australia had caused the plant to become scarce, since it was no match for European farm animals herded onto the virgin land. William Nott wrote in the 1860s of pigs being put to graze on the yam daisies and uprooting the whole crop.27 Feral agents were already destroying the delicate indigenous environment, a situation not likely to encourage the continued use of indigenous plant foods.

Further mai foods adopted by early South Australian settlers were fruits and berries, and again the Lutheran missionaries identified, tasted and documented these in the company of Aboriginal guides. Teichelmann wrote enthusiastically about tasting the pig-face fruits when travelling with Aboriginal companions at Lake Alexandrina, and so did Schürmann and his colleague Carl Wilhelmi when arriving at Port Lincoln in 1840. Later, in a publication about the Aboriginal people of South Australia, Schürmann described the experience of eating this fruit:

[This is a] fruit of a species of cactus, very elegantly styled pigs-faces by the white people, but by the natives called karkalla. The size of the fruit is rather less than that of a walnut and it has a thick skin of a pale reddish colour by compressing which the glutinous sweet substance inside slips into the mouth.28

Other indigenous fruits documented and named by early missionaries, pioneer botanists and by the explorer Edward John Eyre, later found their way into the mouths of German-speaking settlers. These included desert quandongs29 or native peaches, santulum acuminatum, tart-tasting bright red berries from an attractive small tree. More than one Barossa family can trace their family custom of gathering quandongs or ketango from the areas east and west of the Barossa ranges back through three or four generations.30 Cooks in these Barossa families served them with the same crumbly Streusel topping used for their traditional German cake.31

When attractive fruits such as these grow above ground, it is not always certain whether Europeans learned to eat them from contact with Aboriginal people or from observing which fruits were edible for birds and animals. If the fruits have been identified in European documentation by an Aboriginal name, however, settlers must have learned about them from Aboriginal people. This is the case with the native cherry, which Schürmann learned from the Kaurna group was called tili.32 The plant, resembling a native pine, has small red fruits in spring, summer and autumn, each with its seed growing outside the flesh. The earliest record of Europeans tasting them in the Barossa describes an incident in 1845, when the Matthews children on their four-and-a-half-mile walk to school in Angaston ‘saw a tree of native cherries, lovely red ones, and so ripe that they could not resist the temptation to halt a few minutes to pick some’. They stopped to feed and were startled when a spear came flying out of the bushes, rapidly followed by three Aboriginal adults who assured the children that they had not been intending to hurt them.33

Schürmann learned from the Aboriginals about berries named kangatta.34 These were most likely the fruits later called native currants, acrotriche depressa (growing on thorny bushes only in the Barossa area of Australia and on Kangaroo Island off the South Australian coast). They made excellent jelly. Once German-speaking settlers learned about them, they developed a tradition of annual picnics
when families would spend a day in the wilderness, gathering the berries to make preserves and cordials. This widespread custom dates back to at least 1856, according to South Australian botanist, Johann Gottlieb Otto Tepper, who was living at Lyndoch in the Barossa at that time. Some of the berry-pickers over the years grew impatient with the painful process of extracting the berries from the prickly lower branches and with shameful disregard of the environment pulled up the bushes roots and all, in order to harvest the crop more easily.

Native currants were not the only wild foods adopted by Europeans in the Barossa. As recently as the 1920s people were gathering wild cress (*Lepidium ruderake*) in the creeks up in the ranges and native cranberries (*Astroloma humifusum*) in the sandy foothills of the Barossa. They also cooked with the bitter quandong (*Santalum murrayanum*), made apple-flavoured puddings from *muntari* (*Kunzea pomifera*) and lemon-flavoured cordial from the sourbush (*Leptomeria aphylla*) gathered in the Moppa Scrub near Nuriootpa. Possibly these plants were first identified for them by the German botanist Hans Herman Behr, who gave detailed accounts of food plants in the Adelaide hills and Barossa Ranges, and who preferred to travel with an Aboriginal companion.

The *paru* or animal foods of Aboriginal people came more readily than *mai* to the notice of the European settlers. They already had names for them, like kangaroo and opossum and needed little further Aboriginal interpretation. One of the most exhaustive lists of paru was compiled by the explorer Edward John Eyre. Eyre was, incidentally, a good friend of Schürmann, and stayed with him for some weeks at Port Lincoln before beginning his journey across the Nullarbor. Eyre’s list contained crayfish and other crustaceans, fish such as mallowe caught on the Coorong waterway near the mouth of the River Murray, frogs, small marsupials, snakes, lizards, turtles, grubs, the *bouguon* moth, termites, possums, swans, geese, ducks and other birds, wallabies, eggs, honey from wild bees, emus and of course kangaroos. Europeans adopted these animal foods with varying enthusiasm, preferring the larger mammals to such a point that kangaroos had been hunted out of the areas around Adelaide before 1842. Daniel Thiermann, living in Tanunda in the Barossa in 1848, claimed not to have seen a kangaroo, let alone taste one, since his arrival in Australia in 1847 (only eleven years after the founding of the colony). The settlers caught fish; the rainbow-spotted gudgeon was a delicacy both to Europeans and to the Aboriginal coastal groups, who later brought them in to sell at the Adelaide markets. The Europeans enjoyed crustaceans including oysters, which were abundant on the coasts near Adelaide at the time of first settlement but which are no longer found in those areas. Alfred Brauer, in his history of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Australia, seemed to have evidence that the first settlers at Hahndorf, ‘following the example of the Aborigines,’ ate baked snake and lizard and ‘declared it to be a very agreeable dish to the palate’. Europeans shot birds and mammals although grubs and moths seem to have met general consumer resistance. Nevertheless, many indigenous plants and animals were acceptable new foods for the European arrivals and it was Aboriginal people who demonstrated their use.

This does not mean, however, that a genuine transfer of food culture from Aboriginal people to European settlers was taking for any kind of cultural exchange requires both resources and people in a dynamic mix. In that regard the early German-speaking settlers in the Adelaide Hills and the Barossa had relatively small opportunity for meaningful contact with the original occupants of the land. The Aboriginal people in their area were few, a phenomenon observed by several contemporary writers. Many had died from the smallpox that had travelled along rivers from Sydney before the colony of South Australia had begun in 1836. After the 1860s their appearance in the Barossa were rare. Yet the diary of Daniel Thiermann, written in Tanunda in 1848, mentions that Aboriginal people often visited neighbouring Germans and could speak English as well as a few words of German. Other early accounts describe in some detail visits by large groups of Aboriginal people to German farmhouses in the Adelaide Hills. Between 1860 and 1870, young Emilie Wurst, living at Nuriootpa in the Barossa with her parents, was delighted when Aboriginal families camped behind the house for several weeks, and wanted to take them food so that she could ask them for a corroboree.
These reports of social interaction between settlers and the original inhabitants are supported by the contemporary painting, *A Scene in South Australia*, created around 1850 by the German artist, Alexander Schramm, who arrived in Adelaide in 1849 and lived there until his death in 1864. The painting depicts an Aboriginal visit to a family of settlers. The expressions on the faces of the Europeans are relaxed and benign. The woman of the house continues to do the washing as she talks to the leading Aboriginal who is carrying a baby. Only the dog is growling at an Aboriginal woman stealing a log from the fire, a deed arousing mildly amused interest among the other white onlookers. If this scene was typical for any settlers in country settings, opportunities for social interaction with Aboriginal inhabitants, and thus for cultural transfer, did exist.

Unfortunately, whether these opportunities gave rise to reciprocal sharing of cooking methods or recipes with settler families has not appeared in any contemporary documents available at the present time. The writings of the early Lutheran missionaries are a different matter. Once again, the missionaries had been instructed by the Dresden Committee of the Evangelical Lutheran Mission Society to immerse themselves in Aboriginal culture and gain an understanding of all aspects of Aboriginal life, so that they could compile a dictionary of their language. Because documented description was part of their written reports, the missionaries have provided detailed accounts of cooking kangaroo, shellfish and vegetables, using techniques of slow cooking in a pit, or grilling on a bed of fragrant branches over the coals. In his notebooks the missionary C.G. Teichelmann wrote:

> Since wood is scarce in this region, a kind of dense, low growing shrub serves as pot, heath and fuel. Onto this the crayfish are thrown, the bush shoved into the fire and the crayfish are cooked.

Clamor Schürmann’s description of cooking kangaroo in a ground oven, which he ate on a five-day hunting trip with Kaurna people south of Adelaide shows not only detailed observation but evident pleasure in cultural learning as well:

> The way in which the Aborigines make a kangaroo palatable is worthy of note ... as soon as the prey is killed a suitable spot for cooking is sought out nearby ... Then the animal is carried to this site and the most practised one sets himself to skinning it as far as the head and the greater part of the tail, which latter is cut off and singed in the fire, while another digs a hole in the earth about one and a half feet deep, a third gathers small stones and a fourth wood and lights a fire in the hole in which the stones are heated until they glow. By the time the fire has burned down, the butcher has already gutted the animal, cut off the legs and thighs and cut three slits in the thick flesh of the rump; meanwhile another has cleared the large intestines and with them made a sausage with the blood accumulated in the chest cavity. Now the stones are drawn out by the fire and the smaller ones inserted partly in the breast and bowel cavities and partly in the slitted rump, mixed with the foliage of a small gum tree as spice. Next the kangaroo is laid on the coals in the hole while twigs of the above-named tree are spread underneath as well as over it; in those on top of it, the legs, the tail, the sausage together with the vital organs are placed, and the whole lot covered with the remaining glowing stones. In the meantime a man has removed a piece of bark from a nearby tree, big enough to cover the kangaroo from its head to its tail; the gaps between the bark and the sides of the hole are then sealed with earth so that no air can penetrate. After a comfortable rest of an hour, the pit is opened and a clean, delicious tasting grilled meat drawn out.

The flavours, the efficiency of the group effort, and the cleanliness of this operation, might conceivably have encouraged other members of the Lutheran congregations to try this unfamiliar technique for cooking meat as well. Procedures for using ground ovens or fragrant barbecuing on foliage were certainly within the capability of the farming families, who were used to cooking outdoors on an open fire. Most Barossa families cooked in the open for at least a year when they first settled on their farming lands, and a strong tradition has continued over generations of camping and living off the land Moreover, the Barossa settlers were no strangers to the earthy skills of preparing animals for cooking. The description of the kangaroo blood sausage, indeed, is reminiscent of European pig processing. All of these habits would have created a condition of preadaptation and
made it easy for the Europeans to adopt aspects of Aboriginal cooking. Yet, had the settlers placed food in a pit or ground oven or exposed food to the direct heat of an open fire because they had learned from Aboriginal people to cook this way, the evidence would have been there in pictures of cooking in the early settlement, or in documents or later oral reminiscences of local people. To date such evidence has not appeared. Indeed, from early documents it is possible to infer the reason that European settlers did not adopt the Aboriginal method of cooking in a ground oven. The diary of Daniel Thiermann, talking about baking bread for a shop, says:

Here almost everyone does their own baking in pots. ... we also sell some although the madame does not like doing it. It is baked in pots, although we do have a small oven.  

Edward John Eyre, too, emphasized difference between the two cooking cultures when he wrote that the Aboriginal people had no vessels ‘capable of resisting the action of fire’. The Europeans had a cooking-pot culture; the Aborigines did not. As Elkin explains, for food gathering people possessions (like cooking pots) were ‘needless impedimenta’. In early pictures, pots enclose the European food to protect it from the external environment. The German-speaking settlers heated water and baked bread in pots. They cooked their meat, soup and porridge in pots. Even decades later, they preferred to pot-roast and simmer their meat rather than to dry-roast in the oven. When cooks acquired a bread oven, it was never used for the open roasting of meat and the majority cooked bread in iron pans rather than on the oven floor.

Such a cultural predisposition would not be easily replaced by an approach to cooking that did not create a barrier between the food and its source of heat. To encase their food and place a metal barrier between it and the outside world is a cultural behaviour that had been learned more than two centuries before emigration to Australia, an evolution described by Norbert Elias in *The Civilizing Process*. As Claude Lévi-Strauss explained in his writing on the culinary triangle, boiled food is doubly mediated. One can say that the roasted is on the side of nature, the boiled on the side of culture; literally because boiling requires the use of a receptacle, a cultural object. Mid-nineteenth-century philosophers of cuisine, said Lévi-Strauss, had a consciousness of the same contrast between knowledge and inspiration, serenity and violence, measure and lack of measure, symbolized by the boiled and the roasted. With a cultural and historical foundation like that, the nineteenth-century European cook was certainly not going to abandon the pot or the implements that went with it and adopt another way of cooking.

It would be simplistic to assert that this cultural attitude alone was responsible for preventing the early settlers from adopting methods of cooking meats and vegetables in contact with direct heat in the coals or in ground ovens. Other reasons came into play: the time they needed to establish farms with a more regular source of food would have deprived them of the luxury of time to experiment; the disappearance of foods from the natural environment would have removed the rational underpinnings of a certain type of cooking; changing expectations and aspirations as the settlers’ material fortune increased would have given them a taste for greater artifice. But the important custom of cooking in a pot, with all the assumptions about material culture that accompanied it, was fundamental in maintaining the European settlers’ cohesive identity in an uncertain situation, and therefore closed their minds against aspects of another culinary culture. It is an indication of where the German settlers drew the line between themselves and the indigenous inhabitants. Only individuals who were more highly educated like Menge, Baer and the ordained Lutheran missionaries had a greater appreciation of the finer culinary points of another food culture. New encounters made them receptive to new ideas.

Early confrontations in South Australia were often a struggle for food supplies, but before these struggles began in earnest, some aspects of Aboriginal food practices transferred to the Europeans’ culture. Documentary evidence of Aboriginal influence on the food of the early German-speaking settlers shows that ordinary settlers as well as clergy running the missions did, in fact, learn about ingredients directly or indirectly from the Aboriginal occupants and that they shared meals of, for example, snake and lizard, cooked by those people. Such learning seems to have occurred.
within the first ten years of contact, in that first receptive phase described in Elkin’s analysis of patterns in indigenous and European contact. As for cooking methods like baking meat in ground ovens, no evidence has come to light that Barossa people ever adopted them although the more educated missionaries were familiar with them. Culinary contacts between the two cultures are another dimension in the relationship between Aboriginals and Europeans. When we examine that relationship, it is important to assess European treatment of Aboriginal people, and to look at the contribution made by Aboriginals in the development of the land. Important, too, is a search for instances of learning, for with learning comes a different regard for the person transmitting skills and knowledge. Specifically, learning about food was one way that colonial Europeans partially lowered their defences when encountering indigenous culture.
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