BC 151 C14.4

Grey Library, Cape Town
16 March 1870

Dear Sir,

I must apologize for answering your letter of 15 October at so late a date. But when it arrived, I had only just returned from a visit to Europe, and until lately I have not found any time to attend to the matters to which your letter refers.

I am very glad to hear that some one is occupied with the

4

languages. I am about to send a copy of this treatise to Professor Huxley for publication, according to a promise made to him last September in England. I shall ask Professor Huxley to send you a copy when published. — I have looked at the specimens of the "Glotte" you furnished me with. Unfortunately they are too few in number to enable me to form a decided judgment regarding them. The presence of the letter ⊏ is against their belonging to

with the comparative study of the Australian languages, and I shall be much interested to see the work which you are preparing. My treatise to which you allude does not adduce any proofs of the relationship of the Australian languages to the Dravidian, but assumes this as a fact, or at least as a strong probability. On this subject I must particularly refer you to Caldwell's Comparative Grammar of

of the Dravidian or South Indian Family of Languages, who on pp. 51–53 points out the ~~general~~ remarkable general resemblance in the pronouns and the general agreement in the structure between Australian and Dravidian languages. What I mainly discussed in my treatise, are the traces of an original sexdenoting form in the structure of the Australian language — whereby it is rendered probable that this whole Class of languages may only have branched off from the Sexdenoting Family of language

BC151.C14.4

de Vetralla, Rome 1650, in four languages on distinct columns, the first giving the Congo translation, the second the Portuguese, the third the Latin, & the fourth column the Italian translation.

Is either of these editions to be met with at the Propaganda? and if so what would be the cost of a transcript? I suppose no copies can be purchased at Maynooth!

The Congo Language.

345. A translation of "Doctrina Christã, ordenada a maneira de Diálogo os mínimos, pelo Padre Marcos Jorge da Companhia de Jesu, Doctor em Theologia, - 1600," translated by interpreters of the Court of Congo, with the assistance of the Jesuit Matthew Cardoso, published probably the first time at Lisbon.

345 a. Second edition of the preceding Catechism, by the Capuchin Jacinto Brunetto de

BC 151 C14.4

with anything in my power. In return I venture to be troublesome myself. Should it be easy for you to ascertain at Rome whether in the Library of the Propaganda there is a copy of the book of which I here enclose the title, I shall thank you much for trying to find this out, and also for enquiring for me, what it would cost to have an accurate copy made of it. I have in vain as yet hunted after this book. – Again apologising for my late answer,

believe me, my Dear Sir
yours very truly
W. H. I. Bleek

to an Australian language, as this letter is generally not found in these languages. Amongst the nouns I have remarked only one which is identical with one in an Australian dialect, viz: Kabi "water" which is also met with at Mudgee in the Interior of New South Wales. The forms of the pronouns do not well agree with those of any Australian language known to me, – I mean such form as Kame and Kata for "we", and Dukii for "thou". The pronoun of the 3rd person being

Bak

bah might indeed be
Australian, and so might
Kalik "we two", — but they
do not suffice to fix the
character of the tongue
in which the "Glotte" is written.
As regards the character
of the Tasmanian language,
it appears to me that
the materials existing
for its knowledge are of
too scanty a nature to
render it more than guess-
work to say to what
class of languages they
belong, or belonged. On
the whole I am inclined
to

to think that they can
not properly be separated
from the Australian, and
are at least nearer akin
to them than to the
Papuan languages. But
one more intimately ac-
quainted with this domain
of philology will be in
a better position to decide
this question than I who
have merely thrown occasional
glances at it. I am
sorry that I have not been
able to answer your letter
in a more satisfactory
manner, but I shall be glad
to help you and your researches
with