AN AUSTRALIAN LANGUAGE

AS SPOKEN BY THE

AWABAKAL

THE PEOPLE OF

AWABA OR LAKE MACQUARIE

(NEAR NEWCASTLE, NEW SOUTH WALES)

BEING AN ACCOUNT OF

THEIR LANGUAGE, TRADITIONS, AND CUSTOMS:

BY

L. E. THRELKELD.

Re-arranged, condensed, and edited,

WITH AN APPENDIX,

BY

JOHN FRASER, B.A., LL.D.,

Fellow of the Royal Society of New South Wales;
Associate of the Victoria Institute of Great Britain;
Delégué Général (pour l'Océanie) de l'Alliance Scientifique de Paris;
Hon. Corr. Member of the Celtic Society of Montreal;

Author of

THE ETRUSCANS: WERE THEY CELTS?
THE ABORIGINES OF AUSTRALIA: THEIR ETHNIC POSITION AND RELATIONS.

Sydney:

CHARLES POTTER, GOVERNMENT PRINTER.

1892.

THE EDITOR'S PREFACE.

This volume is issued by the Government of New South Wales, as a record of the language of native tribes that are rapidly disappearing from the coasts of Eastern Australia. Presentation copies will be sent to the chief learned societies at home and abroad. The indigenes of the Sydney district are gone long ago, and some of the inland tribes are represented now only by a few families of wanderers. In all New South Wales, there are only five thousand full-blood blacks; only four or five hundred in Victoria; and in Tasmania the native race became extinct in 1876. They have decayed and are decaying in spite of the fostering care of our Colonial Governments.

A considerable portion of this volume consists of Mr. Threlkeld's acquisitions in the dialect which I have called the Awabakal, from Awaba, the native name for Lake Macquarie—his sphere of labour. But we have now come to know that this dialect was essentially the same as that spoken by the sub-tribes occupying the land where Sydney now stands, and that they all formed parts of one great tribe, the Kúriggai.

In an Appendix I have collected several Grammars and Vocabularies as a contribution to a comparative knowledge of the dialects. The map and other illustrations are new, and were prepared for this work.

The Gospel by St. Luke herein is now of no practical value, except to a linguist; but it is unique, and it shows the structural system of the language.

JOHN FRASER.

Sydney,

May, 1892.

CONTENTS.

ERRATA.

Page 6, line 28. *For* 'sine' *read* 'shine.'
„ 11, „ 25. *For* ġatoa *read* baġ.
„ 17, „ 4. *Let* Nom. 1 and Nom. 2 change places, so that baġ and its line shall be Nom. 1.
„ 18, „ 33. *Let* Nom. 1 and Nom. 2 change places, so that baġ and its line shall be Nom. 1.
„ 19, „ 26. *Let* Nom. 1 and Nom. 2 change places, so that unni and its line shall be Nom. 1.
„ 37, „ 16. *For* bag (*bis*) *read* baġ †(*bis*).
„ 137, „ 29. *The word* ġatun seems to have dropped out of the manuscript at * * *

APPENDIX.

Page 4, *ad finem*, *This*† recurs in the same sense on pp. 13, 14, 16.
„ 30, „ *For* appendix *read* volume.

THE ILLUSTRATIONS.

1. Map of New South Wales as occupied by the native tribes ... ... *Frontispiece*

This map is the issue of ten years' thought and inquiry on the location of our native tribes; nothing of the kind has been attempted before. The basis of the whole is the boundaries of the Kamalarai tribe, which were marked out for me by a friend who knew the tribe well fifty years ago; his information I have tested and extended by answers I got from others, who also knew the tribe about that time. The Walarai dialect differs only a little from the Kamalarai proper; so also the Wailwun, spoken by the Ngaiamba blacks; for this reason, and because they have the classification of the Kamalarai, these are regarded as only subdivisions of the great Kamalarai tribe. The Walarai dialect extends into Queensland.

The next great tribe is the Kuringgai on the sea coast. Their 'taurai' (hunting ground *or* territory) is known to extend north to the Macleay River, and I found that southwards it reached the Hawkesbury. Then, by examining the remains of the language of the natives about Sydney and southwards, and by other tests, I assured myself that the country thereabout was occupied by sub-tribes of the Kurringgai.

In a similar manner, I determined the territory of the Murrinjari on the south-east coast.

The boundaries of the Wiradhari tribe have long been known. Probably they did not extend quite to the Murray, but that river is their natural limit on the south.

From Moulamein westwards, as shown on the map, or from a line drawn from the Murrumbidgee to the Murray somewhat farther east than that, and on both sides of the Murray, there is a patch of associated tribes whose dialects are called Yerry-yerry, Marrawarra, Yuyu, Tataty, Watty-watty, &c., all from the local words for 'no.' Their position in fragments there is curious, and may be the result of some displacement from above by the incoming of stronger tribes, such as the Wiradhari.

The Bakanji is another strong tribe whose locality is well defined on the east by the Wiradhari. A sub-tribe of it is the Berriait, bordering on the Lachlan River and the Wiradhari frontier. A small portion of the north-west of New South Wales and much more of the adjoining territory in Queensland and South Australia has a tribe which some call the Kornu, but I am not sure that that is the correct name for it.

The boundaries of the Paikalyung tribe were given me by the Rev. H. Livingstone, who knows it well. Its territory runs along the coast up nearly to Brisbane.

The next tribe (I have called it Wachigari) has its 'taurai' limited by the Paikalyung on the north and the Kuringgai on the south.

The Yakkajari speak the Pikambal dialect, and extend across our border some distance into Queensland.

The New England tribe, the Yunggai, has caused me much perplexity. There are scarcely any blacks of that territory now surviving; but the tribal language is quite different in its words from those around it; I also know for certain that the table-land of New England did not belong either to the Kamalarai or the Walarai. I have, therefore, called this tribe the Yung-gai, from Yung—the name which the coast tribes give to New England.

The Ngarego tribe belongs rather to Victoria than to New South Wales.

Of these tribes, the Kamalarai, Walarai, Ngaiamba, Bakanji, Wiradhari, the Associated Tribes, the Ngarego, the Kuringgai, are names already established and in use; and most of them are formed from the local word for 'no,' and thus describe more the speech than the people. The names, Murrinjari, Wachigari, Paikalyung, Yakkajari, I have made; for these tribes have no general name for themselves. Wachi-gari and Yakka-jari are legitimate formations from the local words for 'no'; Murrin-jari and Paikal-yung mean the 'men,' which also is the meaning of the native tribe-name Kuringgai—all from their distinctive tribal-words for 'man. Tribes of aborigines, in many parts of the world, call themselves 'the men.

2. PORTRAIT OF BIRABAN ... ... *Page* 88

This is the intelligent aboriginal who was so useful to Mr. Threlkeld. The illustration is reproduced from the pencil sketch which was made by Mr. Agate.

3. PORTRAIT OF "OLD MARGARET"—an 'Awabakalin,' or woman of the Lake Macquarie sub-tribe ... *Page* 196

'Old Margaret' is the last survivor of the Awabakal. She is now living in her slab-hut on a piece of land near Lake Macquarie Heads, and supports herself by her own industry. She had the advantage of early training in an English home in the district; she is respectable and respected.

Her features, as compared with those of other natives, show how much the type varies; and yet she is an Australian of pure origin. She was born at Waiong, near the Hawkesbury River, and is now about 65 years of age.

4. BUNTIMAI—'A MESSENGER' ... ... *Page* 212

This blackfellow is evidently on an errand which requires despatch. The 'possum cloak, the hair, and the general cast of the figure are true to nature, but the calves of the legs are stouter than usual.

INTRODUCTION.

I. The Grammars.

No large effort has yet been made to master the difficulties that present themselves in the study of the comparative grammar of the Australian languages. The only thing in this direction, that is known to me, is a paper on the "Position of the Australian Languages, by W. H. J. Bleek, Esq., Ph.D.," published in 1871. Dr. Bleek was a philologist who, in 1858, assisted in cataloguing the Library of His Excellency Sir Geo. Grey, K.C.B., then Governor of Cape Colony. Twenty years previously, Sir George (then Captain Grey), as leader of an expedition into the interior of our continent, had excellent opportunities of seeing the native tribes in their original condition; and the knowledge thus gained was enlarged by him and matured, while he was Governor of South Australia. The records of the knowledge of so intelligent an observer as Sir George Grey are sure to be valuable. These records are now in the South African Public Library, Cape Town, having been presented to that Library by him, along with his collection of books and other manuscripts.

The catalogue of Sir George Grey's Library was published by Trübner & Co., London, and Dr. Bleek devotes a portion of the second volume to the philology of the Australian languages.*

The earliest of individual efforts to deal with any single language of the Australian group was made by the Rev. L. E. Threlkeld, who, for many years, was engaged as a missionary among the blacks of the Lake Macquarie district, near Newcastle, New South Wales. His Grammar of their language was printed in Sydney in 1834, at the "*Herald* Office, Lower George Street." A few years previously, Mr. Threlkeld had translated the Gospel by St. Luke into the same language. This translation remained in manuscript and had disappeared; recently I discovered that it still exists, and is now in the Public Library of Auckland. This "Grammar" and the "Key" and the "Gospel," and some smaller fruits of Mr. Threlkeld's labours on that language, are now published in a collected form in the present volume. But Threlkeld's Grammar deals with only one dialect, and, for the purposes of comparative grammar, more languages than one are required.

* Throughout this Introduction I say "languages," although, in fact, there is but one Australian language with many dialects; I also use the word "language" instead of dialect, wherever the meaning is clear.

In looking about for another Grammar, I remembered that Mr. Horatio Hale, the philologist of the United States' Exploring Expedition, had, in his volume on the Ethnography and Philology of the Expedition*, made a short synopsis of two of our dialects. When in this colony, he got access to the Rev. William Watson, then missionary to the aborigines at "Wellington Valley," who drew up for him "an account of the most important peculiarities of the Wiraduri language, modelled as nearly as possible on the Grammar of Mr. Threlkeld, for the purpose of comparison." Further search disclosed the fact that, as early as 1835, a Dictionary and a Grammar had been prepared there, and the Gospel by St. Luke had been translated. How valuable these materials would now be, to illustrate the Awabakal of Lake Macquarie! but Mr. Watson had no relatives in this colony, and on his death his manuscripts were sold as waste paper; so I am told. Fortunately, the late Archdeacon Günther, of Mudgee, wrote a Grammar of the Wiradhari and collected a copious Vocabulary about the year 1838. The Vocabulary I found to be in the hands of his son, the present Archdeacon of Camden, and it is here published, along with a short introductory Grammar which forms part of the manuscript Vocabulary. A longer Grammar was, many years ago, sent to the home country, and I fear that it cannot now be recovered.

The next labourers in the field of Australian grammar were the Lutheran Missionaries, Messrs. Teichelmann (E. G.) and Schürmann (C. W.) In 1840 they published a "Grammar, Vocabulary, and Phrase-book" of the aboriginal language of the Adelaide tribe. Then, in 1856, appeared the primer, "Gurre Kamilaroi," by the Rev. W. Ridley. Mr. Ridley, who was a man of rare devotedness and self-denial, went among the aborigines of Liverpool Plains and shared the privations of their wandering life, in order that he might learn their language, and so be able to tell them the message of the Gospel. In 1866 (2nd edition, 1875), our Government Printing Office issued his book on the "Kamilaroi, Dippil, and Turrubul languages."

A Grammar of some of the dialects spoken in South Australia is contained in Taplin's "Folk Lore," which was published in 1879. This Grammar is given here in a condensed form.

II. Mr. Threlkeld.

Lancelot Edward Threlkeld, the pioneer in the field of Australian language, died in Sydney on the morning of the 10th October, 1859, having on the previous day preached twice in his own church—the church of the Bethel Union there.

* *See pp.* 479-531 of "United States' Exploring Expedition during the years 1838-42, under the command of Charles Wilkes, U.S.N.—Vol. VI., Ethnography and Ethnology; By Horatio Hale, philologist of the Expedition. *Philadelphia:* Lea and Blanchard. 1846."

Mr. Threlkeld's birthplace was Hatherleigh, in Devon, but the family belonged originally to the county of Cumberland, and there to the village of Threlkeld, which either had its name from them or gave its name to them. In "Burke's Peerage," we read of Threlkeld of Threlkeld in the time of Edward I. That family became extinct in the male line in the reign of Edward IV, but the name was continued through a younger branch, Threlkeld of Melmerly, in the same county.

A romantic story from the Wars of the Roses connects itself with a Sir Lancelot Threlkeld by his marriage with the widow of Lord Clifford. Clifford had much power in Yorkshire, where his estates were, but, although related to the House of York, he was a keen supporter of the Lancastrians, and with his own hand he killed the youngest son of the Duke of York in cold blood after the battle of Sandal, in revenge for an injury he had received The sanguinary conduct of Lord Clifford on this occasion is commemorated by our poet, Drayton, in his 'Polyolbion,' in the lines beginning:—

> "Where York himself before his castle gate,
> Mangled with wounds, on his own earth lay dead,
> Upon whose body Clifford down him sate,
> Stabbing the corpse, and, cutting off his head,
> Crowned it with paper, and, to wreak his teene,
> Presents it so to his victorious Queene."

Three months after this, Clifford was himself shot through with an arrow in the battle of Towton, and the Yorkists, being now victorious, stripped the Clifford family of all their estates and possessions; this happened in the year 1470. The heir to Lord Clifford's name and fame was a little boy then six years old. His mother feared that the House of York would seek to avenge on him the murder of their own boy, the young Earl of Rutland; she had now no powerful friends to protect her and her son, and she knew that her movements were watched; in these circumstances she resolved, for safety, to commit her boy to the care of her faithful retainers, and have him brought up as a shepherd on his own estates. Meanwhile, the report was spread that he had been sent to Holland and had died there. When he had reached the age of twelve years, his widowed mother married Sir Lancelot Threlkeld. This was a fortunate thing for the lad, for it led to his removal from the neighbourhood of his own home to places of greater security among the mountains of Cumberland; and his new father, being entrusted with the secret, faithfully assisted in watching over the life of the orphan heir. To avert suspicion, it was still found necessary to continue his disguise; but, although he was thus left without education, and could neither read nor write till happier days had come, yet the culture of his race showed itself in his natural intelligence and his personal demeanour. He grew up a tall and handsome youth, with the features and commanding mien of his grandfather, who had been much loved and regretted. While still living in obscurity as a shepherd, he gained such a knowledge of astronomy as made him a wonder to many in later years, and his gentle manners so shone through rustic attire that he secured the affection of a lady of rank, well known at that time as the "nut-brown maid"—the daughter of Sir John St. John; her he married. When the "Wars of the Roses" were ended by the accession of Henry VII., and peace was again come, the young Lord Clifford, now 32 years of age, asserted his right to the Londesborough estates, and, on petition to the King, was restored to his title and his lands. The men of the time called him the "Shepherd Earl." In addition to Londesborough, the place of his birth, he was owner of Brougham and Skipton, but he usually resided near Bolton, and there, after many years, he died, and was buried in the choir of the Abbey. His son was created Earl of Cumberland; and a grandson was a naval commander in Elizabeth's reign. In 1742 the heiress of the Cliffords married an ancestor of the present Duke of Devonshire, and with her the estates in Yorkshire passed over to that family.

This incident has only a remote connection with the Threlkeld family, but I have given it here as an interesting glimpse into the private history of noble families in those troublous times.

Our author was born in 1788 at the village of Hatherleigh, and, while still a boy, he experienced deep religious convictions under the ministry of the vicar of the parish. This ultimately led to his offering himself to the London Missionary Society for work in the foreign field, and so, after several years of instruction and training at Gosport under Mr. Bogue, he was ordained, along with Mr. Ellis, on the 8th November, 1815, and appointed to labour at Raî-atéa, in the 'Society' group of the South Seas. Towards the end of that month he embarked in a government vessel, the "Atlas," which was about to proceed to Sydney. At Rio de Janeiro, his wife fell ill, and for nearly a year he had to remain there, all the while acting as the first Protestant minister whom the English residents at Rio ever had. On 22nd January, 1817, he sailed again, along with Messrs. John Williams, Darling, Bourne, and Platt, all bound for missionary work in the islands of the South Seas.

After a short stay at Hobart, they reached Sydney on the 11th May, 1817, and Mr. Threlkeld proceeded to Raiatea soon after. The death of his wife led him to return to Sydney in 1824. Next year, the London Missionary Society established a mission to our native blacks at Lake Macquarie under the care of Threlkeld, and there, with assistance subsequently from the

Government of the Colony of New South Wales, the mission was maintained till December 31, 1841, when the number of the natives there had so declined that it had to be abandoned. It was during those seventeen years of labour that Mr. Threlkeld acquired so much experience in the use of the native dialect of the tribe, that he was enabled to prepare the works which form the bulk of this volume. The year 1842 and the surrounding years were a time of terrible commercial distress in the colony, and, when the mission station was abandoned, Mr. Threlkeld lost all his property there. But, in 1845, he was appointed minister of the Mariners' Church, Sydney, and in that office he continued till his death. By his first wife he had one son and three daughters; by his second wife—a daughter of Dr. Arndell, the Colonial surgeon of the time—he had two sons and three daughters. Those of his children who still survive occupy honourable positions in this colony.

The following is believed to be a complete list of Mr. Threlkeld's labours in the dialect which I have called the 'Awabakal':—

1827.—"Specimens of the Aboriginal Language"; printed then.

1829.—First draft of the Translation of the Gospel by St. Luke.

1832.—Translation of Prayers for Morning and Evening Service from the Ritual of the Church of England; these were selected by Archdeacon Broughton.

1834.—"The Australian Grammar" published. Mr. Threlkeld's memoranda show that at the beginning of this year the following subjects were occupying his attention:—

1. Specimens of the Language.
2. The Australian Grammar.
3. The Gospel by St. Luke, under revisal.
5. The Gospel by St. Mark, in preparation. The first rough translation was completed in 1837.
5. The Gospel by St. Matthew, just commenced.
6. The instruction of two native youths in writing and reading their own language.
7. Reading lessons selected from the Old Testament.
8. An Australian Spelling Book.

1836.—"The Spelling Book" printed.

1850.—"The Key to the Aboriginal Language" published.

1859.—At the time of his death he was engaged in completing the translation of the four Gospels; and was proceeding with the "Lexicon to the Gospel by St. Luke." Thus our author's life closed in the midst of 'labours many.'

III. Influences affecting the Language.

The position of our Australian dialects in their relation to the great families of language has not yet been determined. That task demands leisure, labour, and skill. A collection of carefully prepared Grammars and Vocabularies would make the task much easier; but where are these to be had? With the exception of those that I have named, I know of none. Australian Vocabularies have been collected in abundance, but, for the most part, these are quite useless to the philologist; they consist of dialect-names for native customs and weapons, for the birds of the air, the beasts of the field, and the trees of the forest. All this is mistaken labour which yields no fruit. What we want is to get from each dialect a sufficient number of words expressing the ideas essential to a language, in the form of substantive, adjective or verb, and a sufficient number of simple sentences; this would enable the philologist to ascertain what is the structure of its grammar and its vocables.

The Australian languages are subject to a principle of change which it is worth our pains to consider here. The native tribes name their children from any ordinary occurrence, which may have taken place at the birth or soon after it. For instance, if a kangaroo-rat were seen to run into a hollow log at that time, the child would be named by some modification of the word for kangaroo-rat. At a later period of the boy's life, that name might be changed for another, taken from some trivial circumstance in his experience; just as our own boys get by-names at school. When a man or woman dies, his family and the other members of the tribe, as far as possible, never mention his name again, and discontinue the use of those ordinary words which formed part of his name; other words are substituted for those common ones, and become permanently established in the daily language of the clan or sub-tribe to which the deceased belonged.* In this way new words arise to designate those familiar objects, the previous names for which have been cast aside; and these new words are formed regularly from other root-words, that describe probably another quality inherent in the thing in question. Let me illustrate this matter by examples. A man or a woman may get a name from some peculiar physical feature, such as a large mouth, or chin, or head; or a name taken from an animal or tree, or any similar object, animate or inanimate, which had some relation to his birth. A Tasmanian woman was called Ramanalu, 'little gull,' because a gull flew by at the time of the child's birth. After her death, the word rama would never be used again for 'a gull'; a new name for 'gull' would be invented, formed, it

* It is possible that the discarded word resumes its place in the language after a while; this point I have not ascertained; at all events, the adopted word remains.

may be, from a root-word meaning 'white,' because of the whiteness of the bird. This new word would be used by all the kindred and acquaintances of the deceased, and would ere long establish itself in the language of that portion of the tribe as the right name for 'gull.' Again, a boy of the Dungog tribe of blacks, in our own colony, was receiving instruction from the old men of the tribe; he was required to make a spear, and was sent into the bush to select a suitable piece of wood; he cut off and brought to them a piece of the 'cockspur' tree; this choice was so absurd, that forthwith his instructors dubbed him Bobin-kat, and that was his name ever after. When he died, the word bobin would disappear, and some other name be found for the cockspur tree. And the operation of this principle is not confined to Australia; it is found also in Polynesia; but there it has respect to the living, not the dead. High chiefs there are regarded as so exalted personages, that common people must not make use of any portion of their names in ordinary talk, for fear of giving offence. If, for example, a chief's name contains the word pe'a, 'bat,' the tribe calls the 'bat,' not pe'a, but manu-o-le-lagi, 'bird of the sky.' In languages which are not subject to these influences, the derivation of such a word is usually very plain; the Latin vespertilio, 'bat,' for instance, bears its origin on its very face; but if a philologist, not knowing the history of the word manu-o-le-lagi, were to find it to mean a 'bat' in a Polynesian tongue, he would be puzzled to explain how it is that a creature so peculiar as the 'bat,' should have been named by a word having so indefinite a meaning as the 'bird of the sky.' Any one who may have had the curiosity to look into lists of names for common things in Australian vocabularies, must have been surprised to see how diverse are these names in the various tribes, but your wonder ceases to be wonder when the cause is known. In fact, we do find that among conterminous tribes, and even in the sub-sections of the same tribe, these words vary greatly; for the presence of death from time to time in the encampments kept up a frequent lapse of words.

To show how much a native language may be effected by this cause of change, I quote here a few sentences from Taplin, who, for many years, was in daily contact with the black natives of South Australia. In his Vocabulary he says:—

"Therto, 'head'; obsolete on account of death. Koninto, 'stomach'; obsolete on account of death. Muna, 'hand'; not used on account of the death of a native of that name. When any one dies, named after anything, the name of that thing is at once changed. For instance, the name for 'water' was changed *nine times* in about five years on account of the death of eight men who bore the name of 'water.' The reason of this is that the name of the departed is never mentioned because of a superstitious notion that his spirit would immediately appear, if mentioned in any way."

It may possibly be asked why our blackfellows had so strong a disinclination to mention the name of a friend who had died. We ourselves have a feeling of the same kind. We speak of our friend as 'the deceased,' 'the departed,' 'him who has gone'; and if we must mention his name, we apologise for it by saying 'poor' Mr. So-and-so, and seem afraid to use the simple word 'dead.' But our indigenes have a stronger reason than that. They believe that the spirit of a man, especially if he is killed by violence, is excessively uncomfortable after death, and malicious, and in its fretfulness ready to take offence at anything, and so pour out its wrath on the living. Even the mention of the dead man's name would offend, and bring vengeance on them in the night time. Our blacks seem also to have the idea that the deceased, for a certain number of days after death, has not yet got his spiritual body, which slowly grows upon him, and that, while in this undeveloped state, he is like a child, and is specially querulous and vengeful.

IV. Tests in Examining Languages.

I now proceed to show some results which may be obtained even from our Australian words, by comparing them with others elsewhere. It is agreed among philologists, that there is no surer test of the affinity of different languages than that which comes through the identification of their pronouns, numerals*, and, to a less extent, their prepositions. To this I would add, in our present inquiry, the identity of such common words as 'eye, foot, hand, fire, sun, moon,' and the like; for these words cannot have been used much in the names of individuals, and are therefore not likely to have suffered from the fluctuations which I have already explained. It is true that, in all languages, the pronouns and the numerals are subject to abrasion and decay, from the frequency and rapidity with which they are pronounced, and from a natural tendency everywhere to shorten the words which are most in use. But it is the function of the philologist, not only to understand these causes of decay, but to show the process by which the words fell away, and to restore them to their original forms for the purpose of identification.

It is agreed, then, that the numerals, the pronouns, and, to some extent, the prepositions, are a strong test of the affinity of languages. On this principle, such languages as the Sanskrit, the Greek, the Latin, the German and Gothic, the Lithuanian, the Keltic, have been tested and proved to be so much akin that they are grouped as a well-defined family of languages—the Aryan. Some anthropologists, especially when they are not linguists themselves, sneer at the labours of philology as deceptive and liable to serious error; so are all sciences, if not managed with care and ability. A student in chemical analysis and synthesis may get results which are clearly erroneous; instead of declaring the prescribed methods to be faulty or his materials to be bad, he ought to blame only his own want of skill in manipulation. As to the utility of philology, I would only remark that it was by the study of languages that the place of Sanskrit (and consequently of the Hindu race) was determined in its relation to the other members of the family I have named, and it was philology alone that settled the claim of the Keltic, and consequently of the Kelts, to be regarded as one of the most ancient members of the Aryan family. In the case of the cuneiform inscriptions, the services which philology has rendered are inestimable. And it is quite possible that, amid the conflicting opinions as to the origin of our Australian race, the *via prima salutis*, the first dawn of a sure daylight, may in the future arise from a careful examination of their language.

* Bopp says that the lowest numerals can never be introduced into any country by foreigners.

As is well known, the Australian numeral system is very limited in its range; our natives say 'one,' 'two'; sometimes 'three'; occasionally 'hand' for 'five'; all else is 'many,' 'a great number.' It was alleged by Sir John Lubbock, and has since been repeated by everybody, that their having separate words only for 'one' and 'two' is a proof that Australians possess very limited mental powers, since they cannot count higher than 'two.' Every colonist, who has been much in contact with the blacks, can adduce proofs to show that their mental powers are not so limited, and that, when our indigenes are taken out of their adverse environment and encouraged to cultivate their intellectual faculties, they readily develope a decided capacity for improvement. A friend of mine, fifty years ago, taught two young black boys to play chess; they soon acquired a liking for the game, and learned to play with caution and skill, and even with success. If it were possible to surround the blacks with favourable influences continued from generation to generation, I have no doubt that their whole position would be altered; but any final separation from their ancestral habits would lead to their speedy extinction as a race; this was the issue that was rapidly approaching after the last remnants of the Tasmanians were removed to Flinders' Island. But, for many hundreds of years, no one can tell how many, the Australian race has lived in the midst of adverse surroundings, tribe warring against tribe, each tribe restricted to its own boundaries, the supply of food in our precarious climate often scanty, the paralysing terror produced by their strong belief in the supernatural power of demons and of their own wizards, the ravages of waves of disease and death sweeping over them from time to time; all these and other causes compelled them to think only of their daily subsistence and the preservation of their lives, fixed and deepened their degradation, and prevented even the possibility of amelioration and elevation. The natives of the South Sea islands, whose lot has been a fairer one, have had many yams and cocoa-nuts and bananas and other things to count, and so have developed a wide system of numbers; but our poor blackfellows, whose only personal property is a few spears or so, have not felt it necessary to speak of more than 'one,' 'two,' or 'three' objects at once. Then, as to the linguistic question on which Sir John Lubbock builds his charge, I think it could be shown that even the Aryan system of numbers—the most highly developed system of any—is founded on the words for 'one,' 'two,' 'three,' and no more, all the rest being combinations of these by addition or by multiplication. Further, the Aryans have singular and dual forms for nouns and pronouns, that is, they have number-forms for 'one' and 'two,' but all the rest beyond that is included in the general name of plural, that is 'more'; indeed the Sanskrit uses its word for 'four' in a general way to mean a considerable number, exactly as to our blackfellows all else beyond two or three is bula, 'many.' For these reasons I think that this charge against our blackfellows ought to be laid on better ground than that afforded by their numerals.

V. The Australian Numerals.

If Bopp's dictum is well founded, the numerals 'one,' 'two,' 'three,' when tested, may tell us something about the origin of our Australian blacks. I, therefore, now proceed to examine these numerals. And here I may be permitted to say that I alone am responsible for the arguments drawn from the evidence produced in this inquiry. So far as I know, these arguments have never been advanced previously; indeed, I am convinced that no one has ever discussed these numerals before, for it is commonly alleged that it is impossible to give any account of them.

1. *The Numeral 'One.'*

(*a*.) Of the words for 'one,' I take up first that which is least common, pir, 'one.' It is used in the Walarai country (see map). It must be an old and genuine word, for I know that, in another dialect, the word piriwal means 'chief,' and pir seems to me to bear the same relation to piriwal that the Latin primus, 'first,' bears to princeps, 'chief,' 'first,' or the Latin preposition pro, 'before,' to proceres, 'chiefs,' or our English word 'first' to the German fürst, 'a prince.' In fact, I regard pro and pir as the same word originally.

Now, do not mistake me here; for I do not assert that the languages spoken by our Australians are uterine brothers to the Latin and the Greek; but I do assert that all languages have

one common, although ancient, origin, and that, in the essential words of these languages, there are proofs of that common origin. Pir, then, as allied to pro, means the number which comes 'before' all others in the row, the one that comes 'first.' The Latin primus is for pri-imus (*cf.* Sk. pra-thamas, 'first'), in which the root pri, not unlike pir, is the same as the Latin pro and prae. In the Aryan family, the nearest approach to the Australian pir is the Lithuanian pir-mas, 'first,' and pir-m (a preposition), 'before'; other remote kinsmen are the Greek pro-tos, 'first,' pru-tanis, 'a prince,' 'a president' (*cf.* piriwal), prin, 'before'; the Gothic fru-ma, 'first'; the Aryan prefixes pra, fra, pro, pru, prae, pre, and fore as in our English 'fore-ordain.' The Keltic languages drop the initial *p* or *f*, and say ro, ru, air, ari, to mean 'before.' In the Malay region ar-ung is a 'chief,' and in Polynesia ari-ki is 'a chief,' which the Samoans change into ali'i; these words, I would say, come from eastern forms corresponding to the Keltic ro, air, 'before.' In Samoan i lu-ma means 'in front,' and in Malay de-alu-wan; these are like ru; in Aneityum, a Papuan island of the New Hebrides, a 'chief' is called natimi arid, where natimi means 'man,' and arid is 'high,' 'exalted,' doubtless from the same root as ariki; and arid is to ariki as the Latin procĕrus, 'tall,' to procĕres, 'chiefs.' From the abraded from ru I take the New Britain* word lūa (Samoan lua'i), 'first.'

In the Dravidian languages of India, from which quarter, as I suppose, our Australian languages have come, there is a close parallel to our word pir, for pira means 'before,' and piran is 'a lord.' Dravidian scholars themselves acknowledge that piran comes from the Sanskrit preposition pra, 'before'; this corroborates my derivation of the Australian word piriwal and the Maori ariki. The Aroma dialect of New Guinea says pirana, 'face'; and in my opinion this pirana bears the same relation to the Dravidian pira that the Latin frons has to the preposition pro, the Samoan mua-ulu to mua, 'first,' and the English fore-head, to be-fore. The Motu dialect says vaira for 'face, front'; I take this to be a metathesis of pira, for the Motu also says vaira-nai, 'before'; another dialect says vari; with this compare pro, para, and frons. The negroes, to the west of Khartoum, also say ber, bera, for 'one.'

The Australian postposition bir-ung, 'away from,' seems to be connected with this root in the same way as the Greek para. The dictionary meanings of the Sanskrit preposition pra are 'before,' 'away,' 'beginning'; now, if these three meanings were

* New Britain and New Ireland are two tolerably large islands lying to the east of New Guinea, and Duke of York Island—a name corrupted by the natives into Tukiok—is a small island in the straits between these two. The natives of all these are Papuans.

carried to Australia through the Dravidian form pira, they abundantly justify my arguments as to the origin of the Australian word pir, 'one,' and birung, 'away from.' In New Britain pirai means 'odd,' 'not a "round" number' (*cf.* the game of 'odds and evens'), and this sense must be from a numeral meaning 'one.' In the Ebudan* language of Efate, 'a voice came from heaven' is nafisan sikei i milu elagi mai, in which milu elagi signifies 'away from (direction from) the sky.' Here milu is identical in form and meaning with the Awabakal birung. Further, in New Britain and in the Duke of York Is. (Melanesian), ka, kan mean 'from,' kapi, with verbs of motion, implies 'motion from,' and kabira means 'on account of.' These correspond very well with the forms and uses of the Awabakal postpositions kai, ka-birung, kin-birung. The simple form biru is therefore cognate to the Sanskrit para, *Gr.*, para, 'from.'

Some further light on this point may be got from another quarter. The Hebrew preposition corresponding to birung is min, or, without the *n*, mi, mä; in form this is not far removed from the bi of birung. Min, originally, is a noun meaning a 'part,' and, in its use as a preposition, it answers first to the partitive genitive or the preposition ex in the classic languages; then, from this primary notion, it is used to signify a 'departing from' any place, 'distance from,' 'proceeding *or* 'receding from'; in these respects it corresponds exactly with the Australian birung. Now, män, (min), 'a part,' comes from the *Heb.* root mânâh, 'to divide.' But, in Dravidian, the verb 'to divide' is per, piri, and that also is a close approximation to our Australian birung. In the chief Dravidian dialects, 'a part', 'a portion' is pâl; this again brings us to the Shemitic pâlâ, pârash, and many other forms of that verb, meaning 'to share,' 'to separate,' &c., and to the Sanskrit phâl, 'to divide,' *Gr.* meiromai, 'I share,' meros, 'a part,' *Lat.* pars, and a host of words from these. Now, if birung be the Dravidian piri, per, and if piri, per be the same word as the Sanskrit pâl and the *Heb.* pâlâ, and if these are all original root-words belonging to a common stock, I cannot see how it is possible for anyone to avoid the force of the argument from this that our Australian indigenes have a share in a common ancestry, and that, in language, their immediate ancestors are the Dravidians of India.

Results in this Section are:—Preposition forms to mean 'before' are, in the primitive languages, *pro*, *pri*, *pro*, *prae*, *pru*; other forms are *par-a*, *par-os*, *pur-as*; modes of all these are, *fra*, *fru*, *vor*, *fore*, and, without the initial letter, *ro*, *ru*, *air*; the Lithuanian has *pir*, and with this correspond the Dravidian *pir-a*, 'before,' the Australian *pir*, 'one,' and the Turkic, *bir*, 'one.' In Sanskrit, the old ablative form *purâ* means 'formerly,' 'first'; cognates are the Gr. *paros*, 'before,' and the Zend *para*, 'before.'

(*b*). But the most common word for 'one' in New South Wales is wākul. In fact, it is our Sydney word for 'one,' and there can be no doubt of its genuineness, for it is noted by Lieut.-Colonel Collins as a Port Jackson word in his book on the Colony, published 1802; he spells it wogul. At Newcastle it was wākōl; in the Williams River district, wakul-bo, and on the Manning, wakul. From my manuscript notes I write down the various forms which this word assumes, beginning with Tasmania and passing northwards to the Timor Sea:—Tasmania, mara-i, mara-wa; in Victoria, bur; on the Murray River near Wentworth and Euston, mo, mata, máda, meta-ta; on the middle course of the Darling, waichola; on the Upper Murray, mala; on Monero Plains, yalla; at Moruya, medendal; in the Murrumbidgee district, mit-ong; at Jervis Bay, met-ann; on Goulburn Plains, met-ong; in the Illawarra district, mit-ung; at Appin, wôgul; at Sydney and northwards to the Manning River and the Hastings, wakul; on Liverpool Plains, mal; at Wellington, mal-anda; in southern Queensland, byáda, muray, baja, byáya; in the Northern Territory of South Australia, mo-tu, wa-rat, wa-dat.

Besides these, some other words for the number 'one' are used in various parts of Australia, but those that I have given all proceed from the original root, which it will be our duty now to discover. And I notice, first of all, that one word in the list stretches along the whole extent of seaboard from the Illawarra district to the Hastings—the word wakul—and this fact affords the presumption that all that coast line was occupied by the same tribe, or by tribes closely akin; for the tribes a little inland say mal and mal-anda for 'one.' Wakul, then, was the word used by the Sydney blacks, as Collins testifies. If a chemist has a compound substance handed to him for analysis, he experiments on it, and tests it in order to discover its elements. Let us do so with wakul; it is a compound, for simple roots are usually monosyllables; but are its parts wa+kul or wak+ul? Here I remember that, in the same region where wakul exists, there is a word kará-kal, 'a wizard,' 'a doctor *or* medicine-man,' but inland he is called kará-ji. This satisfies me as proof that the -kul is merely a formative syllable, and that the root is wa. And this conviction is strengthened when I cast my eye over the above list of words; for they all begin with the syllable ma or some modification of it, the rest of each word consisting of various formative syllables. As I have now got hold of a clue to a solution, I reflect that the initial labial of a root-word may

* I have made the word 'Ebudan' (*Lat.* Ebudes *insulae*), and use it as more convenient to handle than 'New Hebridean.' The languages spoken on New Britain, New Ireland, Duke of York Island, Solomon Islands, Santa Cruz, and Banks Islands I call 'Albannic' (*cf. Lat.* Albion), and any root-words which are found in the Malay, Melanesian, and Polynesian languages I call 'Sporadic.'

assume various forms; thus, *p*, *b*, *m* may interchange, and may easily become *f*, *wh*, *v*, *w*. There can be no doubt, for instance, that the Latin pater, the German vater, and the English father are the same word; there $p=f=v$; and in one district in Scotland the people always say fat for what and far for where; so also the Maori whatu is the Samoan fatu; that is $f=wh$; *b* and *m* also are interchangeable, in Oriental languages especially, for *m* is only the sound of the letter *b* modified by the emission of a breathing through the nose; *m* is therefore regarded as a *b* nasalized. I note also that the words under consideration all begin with the cognate sound of *m*, *b*, or *w*, except yalla; and this example I think must have been at one time walla, that is, uala, of which the *u* has obtained the sound of *i* (y); or wa-la may come from the same root as wa-kul, the difference lying only in the termination. The other vowels of root word are *o*, *u*, *e*, *i*, *ai*, all of which in Australian are modifications of the original sound *a*.

Having now discovered the root-germ from which our Sydney friend wakul proceeded, and having noted the various guises which he has assumed in these colonies, we must next ask where he came from, and see if he has any kinsmen in other lands; for, when by searching we find that out, we may perhaps be justified in saying that the Australians brought the root-word with them from those lands. Before setting out on this quest, I observe that when a number of men are arranged in a row, he who is number one is (1) 'before' all the others, and 'in front' of them; he is thereby (2) 'first or foremost'; he has (3) the 'pre-eminence' in honour or authority, and (4) he may be regarded as the 'beginning or origin' of all the others.* We may therefore reasonably expect that words for 'one' will be akin to other words, bearing some one or other of these four meanings. I have already shown that the Kamalarai numeral pir, 'one,' is related to Aryan prepositions meaning 'before,' and to the Maori word ariki (Samoan ali'i), 'a chief,' as one having authority and eminence†; I shall now show that the kindred of wakul have the other meanings as well. And, first, I note that the word bokol is used for 'one' in the island of Santo, one of the New Hebrides. Bokol is so like wogul, the Port Jackson word, that I cannot doubt their identity; and yet it is impossible to suppose that the one word can be borrowed from the other. The islanders of Santo can never have had any intercourse with the blacks of Sydney; nor, if they had in any past time, can we believe that either language was so

* *Cf.* the *Heb.* âhādh, kedam, rôsh, aûl or yaāl, for these meanings.

† The Insular-Keltic words for 'chief,' 'principal,' are priomh, ard, araid; and roimh is 'before.' It is evident that these are only corruptions of the root pri, pro, prae, pra, 'before.' In Ku, a Dravidian dialect, 'one' or 'first' is ra (*cf.* Sk. pra) and in Duke of York Island (New Britain Group), 'one' is ra, re.

miserably poor as to be without a word of its own for 'one.' The blacks of Santo are a frizzly-haired negroid race; I therefore argue, from the evidence of this word, that these blacks and our blacks have, in some way, one common origin.

I next take you to another Papuan region having a negroid population—a group of islands off the east end of New Guinea and consisting of New Britain, New Ireland, and some others. In the Duke of York Island there, I find the following words, all akin to wakul, viz., makala, 'for the 'first' time' mara, mara-kam, 'for the 'first' time,' marua, 'to bear fruit for the 'first' time, to enter on a new course, to begin,' mara, 100 (= the 'beginning' of a new reckoning), muka, 'first,' muka-na, 'first-born son,' muka-tai, 'first,' mun, 'to go first.'* In all these, the root is ma, mu, as in Australia, and the abundance of these derived forms in this Tukiok language proves that the root is indigenous, not borrowed. Among them I observe mara, 'for the 'first' time,' and mara, 100, and this is exactly the Tasmanian word (marawa) for 'one'; another of them is muka, 'first,' and this word, by dropping the k, which is never† sounded in Samoan, becomes the Samoan mua, 'first,' and mua-ulu, 'the fore-head.'‡ Mua also is very common in Samoan (as in foe-mua, 'the 'first' *or* stroke oar,' a-fua, 'to begin'), and thus proves itself to be native to the language. Further, you may have observed that some of the Australian words for 'one' are mo, mata. With mo compare the Santo word mo-ig, 'to begin,'—another proof that the Santoans and the Australians are kinsmen; with mata compare the Motu word mata-ma, 'a beginning,' and mata-mata, 'new,' 'fresh'; the Fijian matai, 'first,' and tau-mada 'before-hand'; the Maori ti-mata, 'to begin'; the Samoan a-mata, 'to begin'; the New Britain a-ma-na, 'before, in front,' mata-na, 'the front,' biti-na 'the commencement'; the Motu badi-na, 'origin,' and the Aneityumese ni-mti-din, 'the front'; with mu compare the Fijian vuna, 'to begin,' and the New Britain wa-vuna, 'to begin,' and the Santo mul, 'a chief,' as being the 'first' man. All these I

* Compare with this the Tamil postposition mun, 'before.'

† The one solitary exception is puke, 'catch you'!—a child's play-word.

‡ An uncommon form of the root ba is va; and from it the Mangaians (Hervey Islands) say va-ri, 'a beginning'; but in the Koiari dialect of New Guinea this same word means 'the forehead,' 'the face.' This word thus illustrates the procession of meanings from the root pra (para), pro, 'before'; for vari is equivalent to 'that which is before,' hence 'a beginning,' 'the forehead' as the 'front' part of the human body, 'the face'; it also throws some light on the derivation of frons, which has so puzzled Latin etymologists that some of them derive it from the Greek ophrus, 'the eyebrow'! The Motumotu dialect of New Guinea says hali, instead of vari, for 'forehead'; several other dialects there say i-piri-ti, paru, para-na, pira-na, for 'face'; these are all connected with the Dravidian pira, 'before.' The Brahui of Afghanistan says mun, 'the face,' which is the same word as the Tamil, mun, 'before.'

have noticed in the course of my reading, but I believe there are many other words in these islands which are of the same origin as our Australian word wakul.* I pray you to remember that, with the exception of Samoa and New Zealand, these words all come from Papuan regions and afford indirect evidence that our Australians are allied to the Papuans.

As to the Maori and Samoan congeners that I have quoted, it is commonly alleged that these races are Malayo-Polynesians, on the theory that their languages are of Malay origin †; but let us look at this theory in the light of our present inquiry. It is said that the Polynesians are Malays. Well, let us see. If the Samoans are Malays, then the Duke of York Islanders are Malays; for the word mua, which is essential to the Samoan language, is the same word as the Tukiok muka; therefore the Papuans of that island also are Malays! But the corresponding Malay word is mūla, 'in front,' 'foremost,' 'at first,' and it is certain that muka can never be formed from mula; for, while *k* may become *l*, the letter *l*, when once established in a word, cannot revert to *k*. Thus the Malay language might be said to have come from the Duke of York Island, as least so far as the evidence of this word goes! But I acknowledge that they may both be taken from one common source, and this, I believe, is the true solution of the question. Where shall we find that common source? The root-form of mula, muka, mua, and of all the others, is ma, mu, and if we can find that root, it will be easy to understand how all these words have been formed independently from that original root; and it will then be unnecessary to say that the Samoan language is of Malay origin, or that the Papuans of the New Britain isles are using a Malay language. I now take you to Southern India, to a group of languages called the Dravidian, occupying the mountains of the Dekkan, and the coasts both to the east and the west of that. Some of these Dravidian tribes are considered by the best authorities to be certainly negroid, and, in England, Prof. Flower, from an examination of their crania, has classed them as kinsmen of the Australians. One of the most cultivated languages of the group is the Tamil, and the Tamilians are known to have class-marriage laws similar to those in Fiji and Australia. Now for 'first' the Tamil says mudal, and this mudal is a verbal noun meaning 'a beginning,' 'priority' in time or place. The root is mu, and dal is a formative syllable. The mu is, without doubt, our Australian

* These and all other words from the New Britain and Duke of York Islands I quote from manuscript dictionaries of these languages, prepared by the missionaries there.

† The name and authority of K. Wilhelm von Humboldt first gave this theory a standing; but we have now much fuller materials on which to form an independent judgment.

root ma, mo, mu. The late Bishop Caldwell says*—"Mudal is connected with the Tamil postposition mun, 'before'; mudal is used as the root of a new verb 'to begin.' Mu evidently signifies 'priority,' and may be the same as the Tamil mu, 'to be old,' mudu, 'antiquity.'" I think there is a better derivation than that. The Sanskrit mûla means 'origin, cause, commencement,' and is the same word as the Malay mula already referred to, and both of these I take from the Sanskrit root-word bhû, 'to begin to be, to become, to be,' with which is connected the Latin fore (fuere), 'to be about to be,' fui, &c. From bhû come such Sanskrit words as bhava, 'birth, origin,' bhâvana, 'causing to be,' bhuvanyu, 'a master or lord' (*cf.* piran, &c.), and many other words in the Aryan languages. At all events, wakul and these other Australian words for 'one' are assuredly from the same root as the Dravidian mu-dal, 'first,' 'a beginnig.' I, for one, cannot believe that words so much alike both in root and meaning should have sprung up by accident over so vast an area as India, Malaya, New Guinea, Fiji, Samoa, and back again to the New Hebrides and Australia. The only rational explanation seems to me to be that these races were all at one time part of a common stock, that in their dispersion they carried with them the root-words of the parent languages, and that in their new habitations they dressed out these root-words with prefixes and affixes by a process of development, just as circumstances required.

Results.—The root in its simplest form is *ba*, 'to begin to be,' 'to begin'; other forms are *bo*, *bu*, *bi*; *ma*, *mo*, *mu*; *fa*, *fu*, *vu*; *wa*. The nearest approach to the Australian *wakul*, 'one,' is the Ebudan *bokol*, 'one,' and the Tukiok *makal-a*, 'for the first time,' but many other cognate words are found all over the South Seas in the sense of 'first,' 'begin.' The Tasmanian *mara-wa*, 'one,' is the same as the Tukiok *mara*, 'for the first time,' and *mara*, 100; and in New South Wales, *mara-gai* means 'first' in the Mudgee dialect.

2. *The Numeral Two.*

Almost the only other Australian numeral is bula, 'two.' It is true that several tribes have a distinct word for 'three,' and a few have a word for 'five' taken from the word 'hand,' but in most parts of Australia the number 'three' is expressed by 'two-one,' four' by 'two-two,' 'five' by 'two-two-one' and so on. But the wore bula is universal; with various changes of termination, it exists from Tasmania in the extreme south, right on to the Gulf

*All my knowledge of the Dravidian race and language comes from Dr. Caldwell's "Comparative Dictionary of the Dravidian or South Indian Family of Languages; second edition; London: Trübner and Co., 1875." In this Introduction, I quote from the notes which I made when I read the book some years ago, and now I cannot always tell whether I am quoting his words or only my own statement of them.

of Carpentaria. If you ask me why there is only one word for 'two,' while the words for 'one' are so numerous and different, I reply that, in other languages, and especially in those of the Turanian family, there is a similar diversity in the words for 'one'; and the reason is this, that, wherever there is a considerable number of words for 'origin,' 'commencement,' 'before,' &c., there will be a similar variety in the words for 'one,' which are formed from them. But the range of ideas for 'two' is somewhat limited; the only ideas possible are 'repetition,' or 'following,' or something similar. Let me show you this by a few examples. The Hebrew shenāim, 'two,' is a dual form, and is connected with the verb shânâh, 'to repeat;' the Latins also say 'vigesimo altero anno' to mean in the 'twenty second year;' but alter is 'the other of two,' and in French and English it means to 'change;' and secundus in Latin comes from sequor, 'I follow.' Thus we shall find that words for 'two' are the same as words for 'follow,' 'repeat,' 'another,' 'again,' 'also,' 'and,' and the like; and most of these ideas are usually expressed by forms of the same root-word.

As to the form of the word bula*, we have here no friendly karáji to tell us whether the -la is radical or not. I think that the -la is formative. The Tasmanian bu-ali (Milligan writes it pooalih) is probably the nearest approach to the original form, the bu being the root and the -ali the affix. In the Tasmanian pia-wa, the pia seems to me to be only a dialect form of bula, for the liquid *l* easily drops out, and in the Aryan languages a modified *u* approaches very nearly to the sound of *i* (*cf.* Eng., sir); in the Polynesian, *i* often takes the place of *u*. Thus bula would become bu-a, bi-a, pia. The syllable *wa* in pia-wa, as in marawa, 'one,' is only a suffix, the same as ba in our colony. All the other words for 'two' are only lengthened forms of bula.

As to the kindred of bula, I find that, in the Papuan island of Aneityum (New Hebrides), the word in-mul is 'twins'; there, *in* is the common prefix used to form nouns; the mul that

* In my manuscript notes I have the following forms :—From Tasmania, bura, pooali, piawah; Victoria, būlum, pollit; South Australia, bulait, purlaitye; New South Wales, blula, buloara, bul'oara-bo; Southern Queensland, bular, pūbul, bularre, bulae; Northern Queensland, bularoo. It is evident that some of these words have been written down by men who were not acquainted with the phonology of languages, and that the spelling does not adequately represent the real sounds. This is generally the case in vocabularies of Australian words, and is a source of much perplexity to linguists. One of the commonest mistakes is bular for bula. In pronouncing that word, our blackfellows let the voice dwell on the final *a*, and an observer is apt to think that this is the sound of *ar*; just as a Cockney will say 'idear' for 'idea,' 'mar' for 'ma,' or 'pianer' for 'piano.' In one vocabulary that I have seen almost every word terminates with *r* on this principle !

remains is bul, 'two'; there also um, for mu, is 'and'; in the other islands it is ma, mo. In New Britain, bal-et is 'again,' bul-ug, 'again,' 'also,' 'another,' mule, 'again,' bula, 'another,' 'an additional one' (*cf.* ma, 'and'), bula, ka-bila, 'also' (with -bila *cf.* Tasm. pia), muru, 'to follow.' In Samoan, muli is 'to follow,' fo is 'also,' ulu-ga (for fulu-) is a 'couple.' The Fijian has tau-muri, 'behind' in the sense of 'following,' just as tau-mada in Fijian means 'first' or 'before.' The Malay has ulang, 'to repeat,' and pula, 'again, too, likewise.' In some of the Himalayan regions, to which a portion of the aboriginal inhabitants of India was driven by the Aryan invasion, buli, pli, bli means 'four,' that is, as I suppose, 'two-twos,'—a dual form of 'two.'

It seems to me that the Dravidian words maru, 'to change,' muru, 'to turn,' muri, 'to break in two,' are from the same root as bula, and that root is to be found in Aryan words also, such as Lat. mu-to, mu-tu-us; for there is a Sk. root ma, 'to change.' It is known that the Sanskrit dvi, dva, 'two,' gives the Greek dis (for dvis), 'twice,' and the adjective dissos, 'double,' and that dvis gives the Latin bis; but the Sk. dva also gives the Gothic twa, 'other,' 'different,' and the Eng. twain, 'two,' as well as words for 'two' in many languages. Hence I think that our root bu, ba, gives the Samoan vae-ga 'a division,' vaega-lemu, 'the half,' and other words; because when people are 'at one' on any subject they are agreed, but when they are at 'twos and threes' they are divided in opinion; and in the same sense sense I would connect the Lat. divido with the Sk. root dvi. Probably the Latin varius and the English variance are connected with the root ba in that same sense.

I would only add a line to say that our blackfellows use the word bula also to mean 'many.' I do not believe that this is the same word as bula, 'two.' I consider it to come from the same root as the Sanskrit pulu, puru, 'many,' and that root, under the form of par, pla, ple, plu, has ramifications all through the Aryan languages in the sense of 'fill, full, much, more,' &c. The eastern form of this root gives, in New Britain, bula, 'more,' mag, 'many,' buka, 'full'; in Motu, bada is 'much,' and hutu-ma, 'many,' 'multitude'; in Aneityum, a-lup-as (lup=plu), 'much'; in Fiji, vu-ga, 'many'; in Duke of York Island, bu-nui, 'to increase.' In Dravidian, pal is 'many,' pal-gu, 'to become many, to multiply, to increase.' It thus appears that the Australian bula, 'many,' has kindred, not only in Melanesia and the Dekkan, but also all through the Aryan region.

Results.—The root is *bu*, which denotes 'repetition,' 'change,' and this is the idea which resides in the Hebrew numeral 'two,' and in the Latin *alter*, 'second'; another, but cognate, idea for 'two' or 'second' is 'that which *follows*'; of the root *bu* other forms are *bu*, *bi*, *pi*, *ma*, *mo*, *mu*, *fu*, *fo*, and *u*; from *ma*, *mu*, come Dravidian words meaning 'to turn,' 'to change'; and from the same root-forms there are, in the New Hebrides, New Britain, and Polynesia, numerous words in the sense of 'follow,' 'again,' 'another,' 'a couple,' 'also.' The Melanesian word *mu-le*, 'again,' and the Malay *pu-la*, 'again,' connect themselves, not only with the Dravidian *ma-ru*, *mu-ru*, but also with the Sanskrit word *pu-nar*, 'back,' 'again,' and also with the Greek *pa-lin*, 'again.'

VI. Other Test-words.

Words for 'Water,' 'Blind,' 'Eye.'

(*a*). In dealing with the Australian words for 'water,' 'fire,' 'sun,' 'eye,' &c., I must use brevity. All these can be proved to have their roots in India, and to have stems and branches from these roots in Aryan Europe, in Malay lands, and in the islands of the South Seas. First, let us take up the word for 'water.'

Collins quotes bado as the Port Jackson word for 'water'; others write it badu; it is found in various parts of our colony and in Western Australia. The root is ba, ma, and the du is a suffix; du is also in Dravidian a formative to neuter nouns. The root ma means 'to be liquid,' 'to flow.' It is a very old word; for the Assyrian cuneiform inscriptions have mami, 'waters,' and this is a plural by reduplication; the Hebrew has mo, ma(i), 'water,' moa, 'to flow'; the ancient Egyptian has mo, 'water,' whence, according to some, the name Moses; the Sanskrit has ambu (am *for* ma, by metathesis), 'water;' the Keltic has amhainn, abhuinn, 'a river,' whence comes the river-name, 'Avon.' From ma come the words wai and vai which are so common for 'water' in the New Hebrides and in the Polynesian islands, and from the same root, in a sense known to the Arabs, by an appropriate euphemism, as 'the water of the feet,' come the Melanesian and Polynesian words mi, mim, mimi, miaga, &c., the Sanskrit mih and the Keltic mùn. From am (=ab=ap) comes the Sanskrit plural form âpas, 'water,' while from ma may come the Latin mad-idus, 'wet.' We found that wa-kul, 'one,' comes from root ba, ma; so, from the root of ba-du, comes the Australian word wa-la, which means 'rain,' and in some places, 'water.'

As to the kindred of our Sydney badu, I would remind you that 'water,' 'rain,' 'sea,' and 'wave,' are cognate ideas; hence the Samangs, who are the Negritos of the peninsula of Malacca, say bat-eao for 'water'; the Motu of New Guinea say medu, 'rain,' batu-gu, 'shower'; the Aneityumese in-cau-pda,* 'rain'; New Britain says bata, 'to rain,' ta-va, 'sea,' and the Maori say awa, 'water.' As a coincidence, it is remarkable that the old high German word awa (*cf.* the Ger. wasser, Eng. water) means 'water,' and bedu is quoted as an old Phrygio-Macedonian word meaning 'water.'

* Cau is the Fijian tau, 'to fall as rain,' and -pda is the same as the New Britain word bata, 'rain'; au in Samoan is 'a current.'

Some observers have remarked that our blacks soon master the dialects spoken by other tribes, and have ascribed this to a natural readiness in learning languages. But the present inquiry shows that there is another cause for this. A man or woman of the Sydney tribe, which said ba-du for 'water,' would easily recognize ba-na in an adjacent tribe as the same word, the termination only being different, just as it is not hard for Englishmen to remember that the German wasser is water, and that brennen means burn. So also, a Kamalarai black, who says mu-ga, would soon know the Wiradhari mu-pai; and elsewhere mata, 'one,' is not much different from meta and matata for 'one,' or even from the Tasmanian mara.

Results.—*Ba*, *ma*, *mo*, *am*, *ap* are forms of an original root meaning 'water,' 'that which is liquid and flows'; derived forms are *mi*, *me*, *wa;* from *ba* comes the Sydney word *ba-du*, 'water'; the *du* here is a suffix in Dravidian also, and exists in the New Guinea word *ba-tu*, elsewhere *ba-ta;* the Samang Negritos say *bat-eao;* the old language of Java has *banu*, 'water,' where the *n* has the liquid sound of *gn*, and takes the place of *d* in the suffix *du*. From all this it is clear that our Australian *badu* is of good and ancient lineage.

(*b*.) In the Maitland district of New South Wales a 'blind' man is called boko; in Polynesia poko is 'blind,' or, more fully, mata-poko, mata-po, 'eyes-blind.' As there can be no suspicion of borrowing here, how is so striking a resemblance to be accounted for? Do you say that it is a mere coincidence? Well, if so, let us examine the matter. In the Kamalarai region, (see map) mu-ga means 'blind,' and in the Mudgee district, mu-pai is 'dumb'; in Santo (New Hebrides), mog-moga is 'deaf'; in Erromanga, another island of that group, busa is 'dumb'; in Fiji, bo-bo is 'blind'; in Duke of York Island, ba-ba is 'deaf'; in Sanskrit, mu-ka is 'dumb'; in Greek, mu-dos, mu-tis is 'dumb,' Lat. mut-us. In Keltic, bann is 'to bind, tie,' balbh is 'dumb,' and bodhar is 'deaf.' Now, there can be little doubt that in all these words the root is the same (mu, mo; ba, bo, bu; po), and yet these words extend over a very wide area indeed, from Tahiti right across through India to Greece, Italy, and even to John o' Groat's. The meanings are 'blind,' 'deaf,' 'dumb,' and yet the root is the same. The general root-meaning which suits them all is 'to close,' 'to bind'; this meaning shows itself in the Greek verb mu-ō—from which mudos comes—'to close the eyes or mouth,' and in the Sanskrit mu, 'to bind';

similarly the Hebrew (a) illăm, 'dumb,' comes from the verb âlăm, 'to bind,' 'to be silent'; in the Gospels, the blind man's eyes were 'opened,' and Zacharias, who had been for a time dumb, had 'his mouth opened and his tongue loosed.' The root of our Australian words boko, muga, is therefore the same as the Sanskrit mu, 'to bind.' From the same source come the Samoan pu-puni, 'to shut,' po, 'night'; the Aneityumese at-apn-es (apn=pan), 'to shut,' nā-poi, 'dark clouds'; the New Britain bog, 'clouded,' and the Tukiok bog, 'to cover up'; *cf.* the Sanskrit bhuka, 'darkness.' In Aneityum, a-pat is 'dark,' 'deaf,' and po-p is 'dumb.' In Malay, puk-kah (*cf.* mu-ga) is 'deaf,' and bu-ta is 'blind'; ba-bat (*cf.* ba-ba, bo-bo) is to 'bind'; Fiji has bu-ki-a, 'to tie,' 'to fasten'; New Zealand has pu-pu, 'to tie in bundles,' pu, 'a tribe,' 'bunch,' 'bundle.' It is even possible that our English words bind, bunch, bundle, come, through the Anglo-Saxon, from this same root, ba, bu, mu.

I suppose that these examples will suffice to prove that the similarity between the Australian boko and the Polynesian poko is not a mere coincidence. Where have we room now for the theory that the natives of the South Sea Islands are of Malay origin? I might, with equal justice, say that they came from the Hunter River district in Australia, if I were to look only at the words boko and poko!

Results.—The ideas 'blind,' 'deaf,' 'dumb,' may be reduced to the simple idea 'bound'—the eyes, ears, mouth, or tongue 'closed, bound, tied.' This idea is, in the Aryan languages, expressed mostly by *mu*, but, in our Eastern languages, by *ba, bo; mu, mo; pu, po;* all these root-forms are identical, and are the basis of cognate words spreading from the region of '*ultima Thule*' across the world to Tahiti. Can this be the result of accident, or of the spontaneous creation of language in several different centres? Is it not rather proof of a common origin? Even in the development of the root, there is a singular correspondence; for the Sanskrit adds -ka, and so do the Malay, the Kamalarai, the Santoan, and the Polynesian; others use *t* for *k*.

(*c.*) The word for 'eye' also may be useful as a sample test-word, for it is not likely to be subject to the influences of change to which I have already referred. In Tasmania a word for 'eye' is mongtena, and the common word in all Australia is mi *or* mil, or some other simple derived form from the root mi. Mongtena is in Milligan's "Vocabulary of the Dialects of the Aboriginal Tribes of Tasmania," but I have never found that Vocabulary to be satisfactory either as to its phonetics or its critical sagacity. I therefore suppose that the real form is ma-aġ-ta-na; for mong-ta-linna is there the word for 'eyelash,' and mong-to-ne is 'to see'; at all events, I consider ma to be its original stem, while the

Australian stem is mi, although there are, in various parts of the continent, words with the ma stem. The Australian words for 'eye,' then, are mi, mia, mikal, miki, mir, mil, mial, mina, minúk, miko, mirang; maal, mail; meur, mobara. These words extend from Port Darwin right across to Bass's Straits. Several words formed from the same root mean the 'face,' and compound words are:—wirtin-mirnu, 'eyelid,' turna-mirnu, 'lower eyelid,' wićin-mir, 'eye-lash,' genin-mir, 'eye-brow,' kráji-mring, 'white of the eye,' daami-mir, 'the temples,' katen-mirnu, 'a tear.'

Now, it is evident that all these words for 'eye' come from the root ma, mi, me, mo, and that those formed from mi are the most common. This ma is quite sporadic; for, in Samoan, which I take to be original and typical Polynesian, ma means 'clean,' 'pure,' 'bright-red,' maina is 'to shine,' said of fire; mā-lama means either 'the moon' or 'a light'; va-ai is 'to see,' and so on; the Ebudan ma is 'to see'; in New Britain me-me is 'scarlet,' 'bright-red,' and with the meaning of 'red' the Ebudan has me-me-a, miel, miala; in Samoan, mu-mu is 'to burn brightly,' and mú-mú is 'red,' and the Aneityumese ama-mud is 'to burn' transitively; the Maori has ma-hana, 'warm'; Papuan for 'eye' is mata, mara, maka, mana; the Malay has mata, 'eye,' and this is the sporadic word used everywhere for 'eye.'

From all these words, it appears that 'see,' 'clear,' 'shine,' 'eye,' 'burn,' 'fire,' 'red,' are allied terms, and that the root-idea from which they all proceed is that of 'shining brightly.' Now, so far as the eye is concerned, that is an appropriate designation for it; and this appropriateness is elsewhere confirmed by language; for the Sanskrit akshi, 'eye,' Latin oculus, and the Latin acer, 'sharp,' are founded on the root ak, meaning 'keenly bright' or 'sharp,' and the English word 'sheen' is, in Lowland Scotch, applied to the 'bright' part of the eye. Now, I find that meaning in the Sanskrit bhâ, 'to shine,' which is just our root ma. Sanskrit derivatives from this bhâ are bha, 'a star' (with which compare the Australian mirri, 'the stars'), bhaga, 'the sun,' and bhâ, 'light,' bhânu, bhâma, 'light,' 'the sun,' 'passion.' The Greek phai-no is from the same root.

The Dravidian language, like the Australian, seems to prefer the form mi; it has min, 'to glitter,' and hence mina is 'a fish,' so called from its phosphorescent scales.

A Samoan word 'to glisten,' 'to shine,' is ila-ila, applied to the eyes, and in the Papuan of Tagula (south-east cost of New Guinea) ira is 'bright'; at Port Essington (north coast of Australia) ira is the 'eye,' and, in some parts of New South Wales ire, yir-oka is the 'sun.' In the Wiradhari dialect, iradu is 'day,' and the Ebudan of Erromanga has ire, 'to-day.' Further, a common word for 'eye' in Queensland is dilli; and

I have no doubt that this is the same Dravidian termination -illi which we shall find in ta-killi-ko and in many other Awabakal words, but here added on to the same root which we find in the Sanskrit di(p), 'to shine.'

The Ebudan of Baki has sembi to mean 'fire'; now sembu in Dravidian means 'red.' In Australia, a very general word for 'fire' is wi, win; in the north-west of Tasmania it is win-alia; these I take to be from the same root as our mil, 'the eye,' and the Dravidian min. In Tasmania also, tintya means 'red'; to which cognates are the Sanskrit damh, dah, 'to burn,' dams, damç, 'to bite,' 'to see'; in Tamil tind-u, is 'to kindle,' tittu, 'to whet'; *cf.* Anglo-Saxon tendan, 'to kindle,' English tinder.

Besides mata, the Maoris have another word for 'eye,' kanohi, which much resembles the Dravidian kan, 'the eye,' kân, 'to see'; and the root of kan may be the same syllable as in Sanskrit ak-shi, 'eye,' the ak being by metathesis changed into ka. At all events, the root kan is abundantly prevalent in the sporadic languages; for the Maori itself has kana, 'to stare wildly,' that is, 'to look keenly'; ka, 'to burn'; ka-ka, 'red-hot'; kana-pa, 'bright,' 'shining'; kana-ku, 'fire'; and cognate Polynesian dialects have kano-i-mata, 'the pupil (*i.e.*, 'the sheen') of the eye'; 'a'ano, certain 'red berries,' 'the flesh of animals,' from its redness; ka-napa-napa, 'to glitter'; ka-napa, 'lightning.' The simple root ka gives la, ra, 'the sun,' and all the Polynesian words connected with these forms.

Nor is this root-word ka, kan confined to Polynesian dialects; in Ebudan, 'fire' is in-cap, kapi, kapu, gapu, av, avi; and the Papuan dialects have for 'fire,' kova, kai-wa; for 'burn,' ogabu, igabi. And kai-o in Greek is 'I burn.'

It is interesting to know, also, that in the states which form the Himalayan boundary of India the words for 'eye' are mi, mik, mighi, mak, mo, mak, mo; and, farther east, in Cochin-China and Tonkin, mot, mok, mu. It thus appears that, on the whole our common word mil, 'the eye,' is more akin to the non-Aryan races of India—the representatives of its earlier population.

In closing this section of my subject, I presume I need scarcely say that the evidence before us drawn from the words for 'water,' 'blind,' and 'eye,' fully justifies the opinion that the Australian languages are not isolated, but that, in their essential root-words, they have a close relation to the languages of the Southern Seas and to similar root-words in the languages of the great peninsula of India. I cannot conceive it to be possible that our blackfellows should have, by chance, invented words which, when analysed, show the underlying ideas expressed by them to be the same as those root-words spread overso vast an area elsewhere.

VII. Miscellaneous Test Words.

(*a.*) There are just two or three other words which I would glance at very rapidly. The Malay kutu means 'louse'; in all Polynesia also that word means 'louse'; therefore, as some persons say, the South Sea Islanders must be Malay-Polynesians. But I find that in Aneityum also, a Papuan region, in-ket is 'louse,' and in South Australia kŭta, and in other parts of Australia, kŭ-lo, gullun. To complete the analogy, these persons should now say that the Papuans of the New Hebrides and the blacks of South Australia are Malay. This looks like a *reductio ad absurdum.*

(*b.*) The word kutu reminds me that there are some very unsavoury words, which are a strong proof of identity of origin among races; for, if these words have not come from one common source, it is scarcely possible to imagine how they are so much alike. For instance, gū-nung here means *stercus hominis aut bestiae;* in Sanskrit the root-verb is gu. In Samoan, (k)i-no is 'excrement,' the same word as gū-nung. Among our Port Stephens blacks, the worst of the evil spirits is called gūnung-dhakia='*stercus edens.*' In Hebrew, a variant for the name Beelzebub is Beelzebūl, which means *dominus stercoris.* Again, kak is an Aryan root-verb; in New Guinea it becomes tage (*t* for *k*, as is common); in New Britain, tak; in Samoa, ta'e; in Aneityum, no-hok and na-heh. The Sanskrit bhaga, which I need not translate, is in Fiji maga; and in Tasmania maga; and pi, mi, as I have already shown, is as old as the Assyrians.

(*c.*) The Tasmanian word for 'sun' is pugganubrana or pukkanebrena *or* pallanubrana *or* panubrana, according to Milligan's list. Of these, the first is clearly the original form, for the last is merely a contraction of it, and the third substitutes *l* for *g*. The last syllable -na is formative, and is exceedingly common in Tasmanian words; it is, I may observe in passing, exactly the same syllable which is used as a common suffix to form nouns in New Guinea and in the Albannic group, and in a slightly different way also in Aneityum. The remainder of the Tasmanian word is pugga and nubra. Now, nubra or nubré in Tasmanian is 'the eye,' but the vocabularies of that language do not enlighten me as to the meaning of pugga. I would write it bŭg-a, and connect it with the New Britain word bŭg (pronounced bŭng), which means 'day'; thus bŭganubra would mean 'the eye of day,' that is, 'the sun'; and that is exactly the meaning of mata-ari, the Malay word for the 'sun.' The Ebudan of Santo has bọg, 'day,' and the Fijian for 'sun' is mata-ni-senga. Bug is allied to the Dravidian pag-al, 'day.' Bŭg I take from the Sk. bhâ, 'to shine'; with this compare the derivation of the English word 'day.'

(*d.*) In the Kamalarai dialect (N.S.W.), kagal means 'bad,' 'no good'; the -gal here, as elsewhere, is formative, and ka is the root. Now kâ is a Sk. prefix meaning 'bad'; in Fiji, 'bad' is ca, and in the New Hebrides, sa; in New Britain it is a-ka-ina.

(*e.*) The Awabakal word for 'good' is murràràġ; in Wiradhari, it is marang; in Kamalarai, it is murraba; the Port Jackson tribe at Sydney called it bujàri. The root is ma, mu, bu; Mr. Threlkeld's spelling should thus have been ma-ra-raġ, that is, ma-ra with the last syllable reduplicated and -aġ added; and murraba should be ma-ra-ba; in bu-jari, the -jari is a very common formative. Analogues to these are:—Albannic, bo-ina, 'good'; Ebudan (Aneityum), up-ene (up *for* bu); Malay, bā-ik; Papuan, māgē, bo-ēna, na-mo, na-ma. The Sanskrit bha-dra means 'best,' 'happy,' 'well'; and the insular Keltic ma-th is 'good,' 'wholesome,' 'happy.' I believe that the Latin bonus (of which Latin etymologists cannot trace the origin) is connected with these ancient roots; for the Keltic ma-th, *i.e.*, mad, would easily give bon-us.

(*f.*) The Wiradhari balun, 'dead,' seems to be the same word as the Dravidian mâ-l, 'to die,' and of the same origin as the Polynesian ma-te, 'dead,' and the Malay ma-ti, mang-kat, 'dead.' The old Assyrian has maatu, 'to die,' and the Sanskrit mri (mar), the Malay mi-ta, the Hebrew múth, mäth, are all cognate verbs. The Keltic has bath, bas, 'death.'

(*g.*) Korien is an Awabakal negative. If it were an Ebudan word, its form in -en would make it a verbal noun equivalent to 'the denying.' Now, it happens that, in the Motu dialect of New Guinea, gorea means 'to deny,' and the Maori ha-hore *or* hore means 'no' (*h* for *k*), and whaka-kore-kore, 'to deny.' The Ebudan of Efate has koro, 'to deny.' Another Awabakal negative is kya-wai, where the kya is for ka. The Maori ka-ua (imperative or optative) also means 'not.'

(*h.*) Wiyalli is to 'speak.' The Sanskrit vad, vaç, 'to speak,' would give the wiya, and the -alli is the usual verbal form. The Albannic has veti, 'speak.' Fiji has va-ka, 'to say,' and vei wali, 'to joke,' where vei is a reciprocal. The Awabakal wi-ya means 'say,' 'tell'; New Britain has wi, 'to tell, to inform.'

(*k.*) The Awabakal bún means 'to strike,' 'to beat,' 'to kill.' With this compare the Malay bunoh, 'to kill'; the Albannic bua-tari, 'to destroy,' and we-umi, 'to fight,' 'to kill,' of which the we is reciprocal.

(*l.*) For an adult 'woman,' the Wiradhari says inar; the Port Jackson (Sydney) sub-tribe said din or dhin*; other localities say yinan, ina; thus the *d* is radical. Several districts, far apart, in

*Hence comes the word jin—so commonly used in Australia to mean the 'wife' of a black man (kuri).

British New Guinea say ina-gu, 'my mother,' ia ina-na, 'his mother,' ine, 'mother,' where the ina is our Australian word; and, in Samoa, tinā is 'mother.' Are these languages not akin? Is it possible that the Papuans, the Polynesians, and the Australians could have borrowed from one another so essential a word as 'woman,' 'mother'? Moreover, in Tamil, înu means 'to bring forth young' (*cf.* Eng. yean), and in Malay īndūis a word for 'mother.' Are these, too, not akin to our Australian word?

VIII. The Pronouns as Test Words.

There are few languages in which the pronouns of the first and the second persons are declined throughout by the inflexion of the same base-stem. In the Aryan family, there are at least two bases for each of them, and these are often so disguised by the inflexions that it is difficult to detect them. In English, for instance, there does not seem to be any etymological connection between *I* and *me* and *we*, and a similar diversity exists in the Latin *ego*, *mihi* and *nos*, *tu* and *vos*; in the Greek *ego*, *mou*, *nōi*, *hēmeis*; in the Sanskrit *aham*, *mam*, *vayam*, or *tvad* and *yushmad.* In Melanesian regions, the corresponding Papuan, Albannic and Ebudan pronouns are apparently considered so volatile and evanescent that a strong demonstrative is added as a backbone for their support, and thus the pronoun itself almost disappears from view. But many of these Melanesian pronouns usually have two forms—a longer and a shorter; the longer and stronger is used for emphasis and can stand alone; the shorter is suffixed to verbs and nouns, and it commonly shows the stem of the pronoun in its primary state. In Latin and Greek, we are already familiar with the strengthening use of demonstratives as regards these two personal pronouns, for we know that *ego-ipse*, *ego-met*, *vos-met-ipsi*, *ego-ge*, and the like, are used. As examples of the shorter Melanesian forms, I cite the Aneityumese etma-k, 'my father,' etma-m, 'thy father,' etma-n, 'his father,' where the *k*, *m*, and *n* represent the three pronouns of which the longer possessives are unyak, unyum, o un; corresponding suffixes are seen in the Papuan (Murua Is.) nima-gu 'my hand,' nima-mu, 'thy hand,' nima-na, 'his hand.' In Melanesian languages generally, either the separable possessive or its suffix form is used with nouns, although the one and the other use convey a slightly different shade of meaning; thus, the Tukiok dialect says either a nug ruma *or* a ruma-ig, 'my house,' and the Fijian something similar; but the Papuans say ia nima-na, 'his hand,' ina-gu, 'my mother.'

Each dialect in this volume has some peculiarity; for the Wiradhari has something which looks like suffixed pronouns,*

* See girugal-*du* on page 111 of this Appendix, gaddal-*di* on page 112, and other instances in the same section.

and the Awabakal has a 'conjoined dual'; yet they all have long forms of the first and the second pronouns to be used alone or for the sake of emphasis, while other short forms always go with a verb as its subject. I add a list of the pronouns found in the whole of the Australian, Papuan, and Melanesian regions, so far as they are as yet known to linguists; for, although I shall make only a limited use of this list at present, yet it may be useful to students of language in Britain and elsewhere, especially as the sources from which I have compiled it are not generally accessible.

Australian Pronouns.

The *Awabakal* pronouns are :—

Singular.	*Dual.*	*Plural.*
1st.—Gatoa, baġ, emmo-uġ, tia	Bali, ġali	Geen, ġear-un
2nd.—Ginto, bi, ġiro-ug	Bula	Nura
3rd. Masc.—Niuwoa, noa, ġi-ko-uġ, bón 3rd. Fem.—Boun-toa, boun-noun	Buloara	Bara

For the purpose of comparison, I give the forms of these two pronouns as found in other parts of Australia :—

New South Wales.

1st Pronoun.

Sing.—Gaiya, ġa, ġaan, ġai, iya, ġata, ġaiaguġ; ġadthu, nathu, nathuna, athu, addu, thu, athol; mi, mina, mitua, motto; imiġdu, ġanna, nanna; ġera; maiyai; iaka; ġiamba; ġulaġi.

2nd Pronoun.

Sing.—Gind-a, (-u), yind-a, (-u), ind-a, (-e, -o, -u), nind-a, (-u); idno; numba; wonda; nindrua, natrua; yindigi, indiga; youra; beai, búbla; wiya, walbo; ġín; imiba; ġindiguġ; nagdu; gulaġa.

3rd Pro.; *Sing.*—Genna, noa, niuoa; *Plu.*—Garma, bara.

Victoria.

1st Pronoun.

Sing.—Gaddo, nadtha, gio, ġaiu, ġatúk; waan, aan, winnak; yatti, yanga, yandoġ, nitte; naik, naić, niak, ġe, ġén; wokok, yerrowik, wolúnyek, tiarmek; búrdop.

2nd Pronoun.

Sing.—Gind-a, (-e, -i,- o, -u), ġindúk; nind-i, (-e); ġinna, ġinya; nin, nindo, ninan, niam, winnin; yerrowin; tiarmin; waar, waanyen; wolaniġ; nutúk, utúk; mirambina; ġulum; yerally.

3rd Pro.; *Sing.*—Nunthi, munniger, kiġa; *Plu.* Murra-milla, kinyet.

Tasmania.

1st Pro.; *Sing.*—Mina, mana, mena. 2nd Pro.; *Sing.*—Nina.

Central and South Australia.

1st Pronoun.

Sing.—Gai, ġann-a, (-i), ġinyi, onye, yiġa, yinna, ini, unnyi; ġapp-a, (-u), ġaap, appa, aupa; ġatto, attho, attu, autu, althu; ġúća; ti; iyie.

2nd Pronoun.

Sing.—Gina, nia, nini, nina, yina; ġimba, imba, umpu, unga, unni, yinyi; nindo, yundo; tidni, yidni, yundru, andru, gundru; wuru, nuru, nuni; ćanna.

3rd Pro.; *Sing.*—Nulia, kitye, pa, panna, ninni; *Plu.*—Kinna(r), ka(r), pa(r)na, nana, ya(r)dna.

Western Australia.

1st Pronoun.

Sing.—Gatha, ġatuko, natto, ġadjo, ajjo, ġanya, ġuanga, ġanga, ġana, ġonya, nanya, nunna; ġarni, ġeit; ġi, ġida, ġika, ġiġ.

2nd Pronoun.

Sing.—Ginda, ġinna, yinda, yinna, nini, ninya, niya; ġinduk, yinnuk, nonduk, nundu, núnda, nunak; janna. *Plural*—Nural.

3rd Pro.; *Sing.*—Bal; *Plu.*—Balgun, bullalel.

Queensland.

1st Pronoun.

Sing.—Gaia, ġia, ġio, nigo; ġanga, ongya, unća; nutta, utthu, uda; yundu, ġiba, ipa; nia, ia, niu, iu, iuwa, yo; búrko; kuronya; ġúnġúl.

2nd Pronoun.

Sing.—Ninda, inda, imba; yinda, (-i), ind-a, (-i); yindua, yúndu, indu; innu, iu; inknu, ingowa, enowa, nowa; nino; nayon; nomún; yunúr; tini; wologa.

3rd Pro.; *Sing.*—Uġda, unda; *Plu.*—Ganna.

With these Australian Pronouns, compare the

Dravidian Pronouns.

1st Pronoun.

Sing.—Tamil—Nân, yân, ên, en; Canarese—ân, yân, nâ, nânu, en, êne; Tulu—yân, yen, e; Malayâlam—âlam, ñân, ên, en, ena, eni, ini; Telugu—nênu, nê, ēnu, é, nâ, nu, ni; Tuda—ân, en, eni, ini; Kôta—âne, en, eni, ini; Gônd—annâ, nâ, ân, na; Ku—ânu, na, in, e; Râjmahâl—en; Orâon—enan.

Plu.—Mêmu, amât, yâm, âm, âmu, nâm, nângal, nâvu, âvu.

2nd Pronoun.

Sing.—Tamil—Nî, nin, nun, ei, i, ay, oy; Canarese—nîn, nî, nînu, nin, ay, e, iye, î, i; Tulu, î, nin, ni; Malayâlam—nî, nin; Telugu—nîvu, îvu, nî, nin, vu, vi; Tuda—nî, nin, i; Kôta—nî, nin, i; Gônd—imma, nî, î; Ku—înu, nî, i; Orâon—nien; Râjmahâl—nîn. The Scythic of the Behistun tables has nî; the Brahui of Affghanistan has ni, na. *Plu.*—Mîru, imat, nîr, nîvu, îru.

With these compare corresponding pronouns from several places in British New Guinea, thus:—

Papuan Pronouns.

1st.

Sing.—Gai, mōu, da, yau, ye-gu, náu, nana, ara; *Dual*—Gabaġaba, ni-mo-to, noni, kaditei, vagewu; *Plu.*—Ga-l-pa-ġa-l-pa, 'we three,' ni-mo, 'we,' no-kaki, kita, ya-kaimi, ita.

2nd.

Sing.—Gido, ġi, rōu, koa, ya-kom, oa, goi, oi; *Dual*—Gipel, ni-go-to, ka-mitei; *Plu.*—Gita, nigo, yana, komiu, ya-kamiyi, um-ui, omi.

3rd.

Sing.—Ia, ġoi, nōu, aū-kaki, tenem; *Plu.*—Iamo, tana, nēī, ya-buia, sia, idia, ila, ira, isi.

Possessive forms are:—

1st.

Sing.—Lau-apu, ġau, moro, dai-ero, yo-gu, ge-gu, egu; *Plu.*—Lai emai-apumai, ġa-l-pan, yo-da, la-nambo.

2nd.

Sing.—Ia-apuġa, eke-ero, apui-ero, li-nambo, gninu, oi-amu; *Plu.*—Komiai, ġita-munu, yai-ero, amui, ami, gami.

Ebudan Pronouns.

Corresponding Ebudan pronouns are:—

1st.

Sing.—E-nau, iau, na-gku, avau, ain-yak; *short forms*, na, a, ku, ne, iya, k; *Plu.*—Endra, hida, riti, kito, a-kity, a-kaija,

2nd.

Sing.—Eg-ko, e-nico, jau, aiko, yik, aiek; *Plu.*—Kamim, hamdi, ituma, akaua, aijaua.

Possessive forms are—

1st.

Sing.—No-ku, his-ug, kana-ku, kona-gku, rahak, tio-ku, unyak; *Plu.*—No-ra, isa-riti, kana-dro, kona-ra, otea, uja.

2nd.

Sing.—No-m, hisa-m, kana-mo, kona-mi, raha-m, o un; *Plu.*—No-nim, isa-hamdi, kana-miu, kona-munu, aua, un-yimia.

Fijian Pronouns.

Fijian pronouns are:—

Singular.		*Binal.*	*Ternal.*	*Plural.*
		First.		
Nom.—*Koi-a*-u†	*inclu.*	*Koi-k-e*-daru	*Koi-k-e*-datou	*Koi-ke*-da
	exclu.	*Koi*-keirau	*Koi*-keitou	*Koi*-keimami
Poss.— -nku	*inclu.*	*I-ke*-daru	*I-ke*-datou	*I-ke*-da
	exclu.	*I*-keirau	*I*-keitou	*I*-keimami
Obj. —Au	*inclu.*	Kedaru	Kedatou	Keda
	exclu.	Keirau	Keitou	Keimami
		Second.		
Nom.—*Ko-i*-ko		*Koi-ke-mu*-drau	*Koi-ke-mu*-dou	*Koi*-kemuni
Poss. — -mu		*I-ke*-mudrau	*I-ke*-mudou	*I-ke*-muni
Obj. —Iko		Kemudrau	Kemudou	Kemuni
		Third.		
Nom. —Ko-koya		*Koi*-rau	*Ko*-iratou	*Ko-i*-ra
Poss. —I-keya; -na		I-rau; drau	I-ratou; dratou	I-ra; dra
Obj. —Koya.		Rau	I-ratou	I-ra.

† Those syllables which are printed in italics may be dropped off in succession for various uses of the pronouns.

Demonstratives are:—

O ġuo, 'this, these'; o koya o ġuo, (*sing.*) 'this'; o ira o ġuo, 'these.' O ġori, 'that, those'; o koya o ġori (*sing.*), 'that'; o ira o ġori (*plu.*), 'those.'

Albannic Pronouns.

In the Albannic (Tukiok) dialect, the pronouns are:—

Singular.		*Binal.**	*Ternal.*	*Plural.*
1st —Iau, io, yo	*inclu.*	da-ra	da-tul	dat
	exclu.	mi-ra	mi-tul	me-at
2nd—U *or* ui		mu-ru	mu-tul	mu-at
3rd—Ia *or* i		dia-ra	di-tul	di-at

This is a long list, and yet it may be useful, as showing how great a variety there is in the pronominal forms of the Australian and Melanesian languages. But these forms, if subjected to analysis and comparison, will be found to resolve themselves into a few simple elements. In examining the Australian pronouns now given, we must bear in mind that they are subject to some

* I prefer *Binal* and *Ternal*, because they signify 'two (three) each time.'

degree of error, which affects also many other lists of Australian words. Australian vocabularies are made often by Englishmen, who, in writing the words, follow the sounds of the vowels as used in English, and sometimes even their own vices of pronunciation; for instance, kinner is written down for kinna, and i-ya for ai-ya. Again, a blackfellow, when asked to give the equivalents for English words, sometimes fails to understand, and so puts one word for another; thus, in some lists that I have seen, the word for 'I' is set down as meaning 'thou'; and even in printing mistakes occur; for, in Mr. Taplin's list of South Australian dialects 'we' is ġun, and 'you' is ġun also; the former should probably be ġén; and kambiyanna is made to mean both 'your father' and 'his father.'

The First Pronoun.—Making all due allowance for such defects, I proceed to examine the Australian pronouns, and I find that, notwithstanding the multitude of their dialect-forms, they have only a very few bases. These are, for the first pronoun—Ġa-ad, ġá-ta, ġa-ad-du, ba, mi, mo; and, for the second pronoun—Ġin, ġin-da, ġin-du, bi, bu, gula. I leave the demonstrative or third pronoun out of account, as it is not of so much importance to our inquiry. Now, the existence of the base ġa-ad is proved by the forms (given above), ġa-an, ġá-na; the base ġa-ta recurs in ġatha, ġa-ya, ni-te; ġa-ad-du, in ġád-thu, na-thu, a-thu, ġa-tu-ko, &c.; ba gives wa-an, a-an, and, in South Australia, ġa-pa, ġa-ap, a-pa; mo and mi are merely softened forms of ba, and are found in mo-to, wo-kok, mi-na, wi-nak, ġa-mi. Even so unpromising a form as ún-ća (Queensland) connects itself with the base ġa-ta through ġú-ća (South Australia); for some Melanesian dialects prefer to begin words with a vowel, and so transpose the letters of an initial dissyllable; thus, ún-ća is for úġ-ća=ġú-ća=ġá-ta.* Most of the dialect forms of this pronoun given above arise from the interchange of ng, n, and y; the Wiradhari dialect, for example, has ġaddu, naddu, yaddu, 'I,' and these become more liquid still in yallu, -ladu.† Let us observe here, also, that the Tasmanian forms ma-na, mi-na, 'I,' come from the base ma, mi. I have above given six bases for the first pronoun in Australian, and yet there are only two—ad *or* ta and ba; for mi and mo are only ba differently vocalised, and, in the other three, ġa- is a prefix, as will be shown further on, while the -du of ġa-ad-du is an emphatic suffix.

* The Aneityumese (Ebudan) language is so fond of an initial vowel that it constantly dislocates a consonant in favour of a vowel. Our Australian Vocabularies in this volume have very few words beginning with vowels.

† See Appendix, page 60. Dr. Caldwell was led into error by the form gadlu, which an authority told him meant 'we' in South Australia. Used alone, it is only 'I,' for gaddu.

Here comes in a most important question. Are these bases ta and ba exclusively Australian? Emphatically I say, No; for I know that, in Samoan, ta is the pronoun 'I,' and tā (for tā-ua) is 'we two,' 'ita is 'me,' and ta-tou is 'we'; la'u (*i.e.*, ta-ku, *l* for *d*) is 'my.' I quote the Samoan as the representative of the Polynesian dialects. And yet the Maori pronouns of the first and second pronouns present some interesting features. They are:—

'I,' 'me'—Ahau, au, awau.
'We two'—Taua, maua.
'We'—Tatou, matou, matau.
'My'—Taku, toku, aku, oku, ahaku.
'Thou'—Koe; *dual*, korua, *plu.*, koutou.
'Your'—Tau, tou, au, ou, takorua, takoutou.

Here in 'we two,' 'we,' and 'my,' I see both of our Australian base-forms ta and ma; in 'my' I find the Australian possessive genitive suffix ku, gu*; and in 'we' I take the -tou to be for tolu the Polynesian for 'three,' three being used in an indefinite way to mean any number beyond two.† Then, in Fiji, I find that 'I,' 'me' is au, which may be for ta-u, for the binal form of it is -da-ru (*i.e.*, da+rua, 'two'), the ternal is -da-tou (*i.e.*, da+tolu, 'three'), and the plural is da. In the Motu dialect of New Guinea, 'I' is la-u, of which the plural is (*inclusive*) ai (for ta-i?) and (*exclusive*) i-ta. In other parts of New Guinea, 'I' is da, ya-u, ná-u, na-na, la-u, and, for the plural, ki-ta, i-ta (*cf.* Samoan). Ebudan parallels are—'I,' e-nau, iau, ain-ya-k; for the plural, hi-da, ki-to, a-kity; possessive forms are tio-ku, otea, u-ja. The Tukiok forms iau, io, yo; da-ra, da-tul, dat, correspond mainly with the Fijian, and are all from the root da, ta.

I think that I have thus proved that our Australian base ta is not local, but sporadic, and that, so far as this evidence has any weight, the brown Polynesians have something in common with the Melanesian race.

My next inquiry is this—Has this base, ta, da, ad, any connection with the other race-languages? And at once I remember that the old Persian for 'I' is ad-am, and this corresponds with the Sanskrit ah-am, of which the stem is agh-, as seen in the Græco-Latin ego and the Germanic ich. I assume an earlier form of this base to have been ak-, but, whether this Indian ak- or the Iranian ad- is the older, I cannot say. At all events, the change of ak into at and then into ad, and conversely, is a common phonetic change, and is at this moment going on copiously in Polynesia. The ak is now in present use in the Malay aku, 'I.'

*The possessive termination for persons in Awabakal is -umba; this I take to be for gu-mba, the gu being the possessive formative in Wiradhari; it corresponds to the Ebudan ki, which is used in the same way.

†*Cf.* Singular, Dual, and (all else) Plural.

The other Australian base-form of the first pronoun is ba, and this, in the forms of ma, me, mi, mo, is so common in all languages that I need scarcely quote more than Sanskrit mad (the base), 'I'; the Græco-Latin emou, mou; mihi, me; and the English, 'we.' This base, ba, gives us the Awabakal simple nominative báġ (for ba-aġ), -aġ being one of the most common of Australian formatives. Then, of the possessive form, emmo-úġ, which I would write emo-uġ, I take the *e* to be merely enunciative, the -úġ being a possessive formation; the mo that remains is the same as in the Australian mo-to, wo-kok, 'I,' the Papuan, mōu, 'I.' The Awabakal ba-li, 'we two' (both being present), is ba + li, where the -li is probably a dual form.

The Awabakal accusative of the first pronoun is tia, or, as I would write it, tya *or* ća; *cf.* ġuća and úncá. This tia appears again in the vocative ka-tio-u, and is, I think, only a phonetic form of the ta which I have already examined.

I think, also, that the Hebrew pronoun an-oki, 'I,' is connected with our root ak, at, ta; for it seems to be pretty well assured that the an- there is merely a demonstrative particle placed before the real root-form -ok-i; for the Egyptian pronouns of the first and second persons have it (-an, -ant, -ent) also. And this quite corresponds with our Awabakal pronouns of the first and second persons, ġa-toa and ġin-toa; for, in my view, they both begin with a demonstrative ġa, which exists also in Polynesian as a prothetic nga, nge.* In Awabakal, I see it in ġa-li, 'this,' ġa-la, 'that,' and in the interrogative ġan, 'who'? for interrogatives come from a demonstrative or indefinite base (*cf.* the word minyuġ on page 3 of the Appendix). Here again, in the Awabakal word ġan, 'who'? we are brought into contact with Aryan equivalents; for, if ġán is for ká-an, as seems likely, then it leads us to the Sanskrit ka-s, 'who'? Zend, cvañt = Latin quan-tus? Latin, quod, ubi, &c., Gothic, hvan = English, 'when'? Lithuanian, kà-s, 'who'? Irish, can, 'whence'? Kymric, pa, 'who'? Greek, pōs, 'how'? po-then, 'whence'?

In the Australian plural forms ġéanni, ġéen, we have again the prefix demonstrative ġa, but now softened into ġe (*cf.* the Maori prefix nge) because of the short vowel that follows. The next syllable, an, is a liquid form of ad, ta, 'I,' and the ni may be a pluralising addition—the same as in the Papuan ni-mo. It should here be remembered, however, that the Australian languages seldom have special forms for the plural; for ta may mean either 'I' *or* 'we'; to indicate the plural number some pluralising word must be added to ta; thus in Western Australia 'we' is ġala-ta, literally 'all-I.' Some pronouns, however, seem to have absorbed these suffix pluralising words, whatever they were, and thus to have acquired plural terminations; of this our ġéanni is an instance; in western Victoria, 'we' is expressed by ġa-ta-en, that is, ġata, 'I,' with the suffix -en—the same as the -ni of ġéanni. The Awabakal 'we' is ġéen. Such plurals are very old, for they are found in the Babylonian syllabaries; there the second pronoun is zu; its plural is zu enan, that is, 'thou-they' = ye; there also, 'I' is mu; with which compare ba, ma.

*In Maori, this nge is used as a prefix to the pronouns au and ona; thus, nge-au is exactly equivalent to the Australian ngatoa.

The Second Pronoun.—There are only two base-forms for the second pronoun, bi *or* bu and ġin. The latter is strengthened by the addition of -da, which may also be -de, -di, -do, -du, and these vocalic changes support my contention, that this syllable proceeds from the demonstrative ta, for if the original is da *or* ta, all the others may proceed from that, but it is not likely that, conversely, any one of them would change into -da. The -toa in the Awabakal ġin-toa is the same as in ġát-toa, and the initial ġ is the same as ġa, ġe. But what is the body of the word—the -in? I can only say with certainty that it is the base-form of the second pronoun, for I can give no further account of it. Possibly, it is for bin with the *b* (*v*) abraded; for the other base-form, although it now appears as bi, may have been originally bin—the same as the accusative; and yet, in the accusative dual, we have ġali-n and bulu-n, and in the singular bón for bo-un, where the *n* seems to be a case-sign. If the -in of ġintoa is for bin, then we get back to bi as the only base-form of the second Australian pronoun, and bi gives the forms wi-ye, wé, i-mi-ba, win-in, *q.v.* The other base-form of bi is bu, and this is attested in Australian by búbla, wuru, nuro, nuni, *q.v.*; the n'yuraġ in South Australia shows how the initial *n* has come in, for that plural is equivalent to ġvurag, from bu; it also shows the origin of the Awabakal plural nu-ra. The -ra there is certainly a plural form; for we have it in ta-ra, 'those,' from the singular demonstrative ta, and in ba-ra, 'they,' from ba. In the genitive ġear-unba, 'of us,' the -ar may be this -ra, but it may also be simply the -an of the nominative. This same -ra is a pluralising suffix in Melanesia. In many parts of Melanesia, likewise, this mu—often when used as a verbal suffix—is the pronoun 'thou.'

I may here venture the conjecture, without adding any weight to it, that, as the Sanskrit dva, 'two,' gives the Latin bis, bi, so, on the same principle, the Sanskrit tva, 'thou,' may be the old form to which our bi, bu is allied.

As to the prefix ġa, I know that, in New Britain, ngo is 'this,' in Aneityum, nai, naico, i-naico is 'that.' This nga, also, as a prefix, occurs in a considerable number of words in Samoan; for instance, tasi is 'one,' and tusa is 'alike,' solo is 'swift'; an intensive meaning of each is expressed by ġa-tasi, ġa-tusa, ġa-solo;

the numeral 'ten' is ġa-fulu which I take to mean 'the whole' (*sc.* fingers). In Teutonic, it seems to have sometimes a collective force, as in ge-birge, 'mountains,' and sometimes an intensive, as in Gothic, ga-bigs, from Sanskrit bhaga, the 'sun.' In Latin the suffix *c* in sic is supposed to be the remains of a demonstrative.

Gátoa, then, is to me made up of ġa+ad+do, the -do being the same suffix particle of emphasis which is elsewhere in Australia written -du, and the -do is extended into -toa, also for emphasis, as in the Wiradhari yama, yamoa, and other Australian words. It is quite possible that this -do also is only the demonstrative ta —so often used in composition in Awabakal—changed into -to, -do, according to the rules on pages 10 and 11 of this volume.

From the lists of pronouns given above, it will be seen that Fijian also prefixes a demonstrative ko, ko-i to its first and second pronouns. This same particle, ko, o is also prefixed to nouns, and especially to proper names. In Samoan, 'o, that is, ko, is placed before nouns and pronouns when they are used as the subject of a proposition—this, also, for emphasis, to direct attention to the agent, like the agent-nominative case in Awabakal.

In the Ebudan and Papuan pronouns, a similar prothetic demonstrative is found; there it has the forms of na, ain, en, a, ka, ha, ya, ye; in many of the Ebudan dialects,—the Aneityumese, for instance—the demonstrative in, ni, elsewhere na, is prefixed to almost every word that is used as a noun. In other parts of Melanesia, the na is a suffix.

Finally, I placed the Dravidian pronouns in my list in order to compare them with the Australian. And the comparison is instructive. They are, chiefly, nân, yân, for the first person, and nin, nî for the second. Dr. Caldwell himself considers the initial *n* in each case to be not radical, and the base forms to be ân and în. This is a close approximation to our Australian bases; for we have the three forms, ġád-du, nád-du, yád-du, in which the *n* and the *y* proceed from the original nasal-guttural ġ, and that ġ, as I have shown, is only a demonstrative prefix. The *d* of nád and yád may easily pass into its liquid *n*, thereby giving the Dravidian nân and yân; and the Australian forms are older, for while *d* will give *n*, *n*, when established in a word, will not revert to *d*. So also, the Dravidian nîn will come from the earlier ġin, which we find in the Australian ġinda.

IX. The Formation of Words.

Any one who examines the Vocabularies of the Awabakal and the Wiradhari dialects will see how readily the Australian language can form derivative words from simple roots, and how expressive those words may become. The language is specially rich in verb-forms. As an illustration of this, let us take from the Wiradhari dialect the root verb banga, of which the original meaning is that of 'breaking,' 'dividing,' 'separating.' From that root are formed—bang-ána, 'to break' (*intrans.*), bang-ára, 'to break' (*trans.*), banga-mára, 'to (make to) break,' and, with various other adaptations of the root-meaning, banga-bira, banga-dira, banga-nira, banga-naringa, banga-dara, banga-gambira, banga-dambira, banga-durmanbira, bang-al-gára. It is true that these varying formatives resolve themselves into a few simple elements, but they certainly convey different shades of meaning; else, why should they exist in the language? Nor is the root banga the only one on which such changes are made; for the Wiradhari vocabulary contains numerous instances of similar formations.

Then the modes of a verb are also usually abundant and precise. In the Indicative mood, the Awabakal dialect has *nine* different tenses, and the Wiradhari has one more, the future perfect. Our Australian verb thus rivals and excels the Greek and the Sanskrit, for it thus has four futures, and, for time past, it has three forms, marking the past time as instant, proximate, and remote. Corresponding to these tenses, there are nine participles, each of which may be used as a finite verb. Besides an Imperative mood and a Subjunctive mood, there are reflexive and reciprocal forms, forms of negation, forms to express continuance, iteration, imminence, and contemporary circumstances. Now, as the Australian language is agglutinative, not inflexional, the verb acquires all these modifications by adding on to its root-form various independent particles, which, if we could trace them to their source, would be found to be nouns or verbs originally, and to contain the various shades of meaning expressed by these modes of the verb. The Fijian verb—in a Melanesian region—is also rich in forms; for it has verbs intransitive, transitive, passive, and, with prefixes, intensive, causative, reciprocal, and reciprocal-causative. And among the mountains of the Dekkan of India—also a black region —the verb, as used by the Tudas and Gonds, is much richer than that of the Tamil, the most cultivated dialect of the same race.

And, in Australian, this copiousness of diction is not confined to the verbs; it shows itself also in the building up of other words. On page 102 of this volume, a sample is given of the manner in which common nouns may be formed by the adding on of particles. Mr. Hale, whom I have already named, gives other instances, doubtless derived from his converse with Mr. Threlkeld at Lake Macquarie, and, although some of the words he quotes are used for ideas quite unknown to a blackfellow in his native state, yet they are a proof of the facility of expression which is inherent in the language. I quote Mr. Hale's examples:—

EXAMPLES *of the* FORMATION *of* VERBAL NOUNS *in* AWABAKAL.

1. *The agent.*	2. *The actor.*	3. *The instrument.*	4. *The action as subject.*	5. *The action.*	6. *The place.*
Bún-ki-lli-kan	Bún-ki-ye	Bun-ki-lli-kanné	Bun-ki-lli-to	Bun-ki-lli-ta	Bunki-lli-ġeil
Gakuya-lli-kan	Gakuya-i-ye	Gakuya-lli-kanne	Gakuya-lli-to	Gakuya-lli-ta	Gakuya-lli-ġeil
Goloma-lli-kan	Goloma-i-ye	Goloma-lli-kanne	Goloma-lli-to	Goloma-lli-ta	Goloma-lli-ġeil
Gu-ki-lli-kan	Gu-ki-ye	Gu-ki-lli-kanne	Gu-ki-lli-to	Gu-ki-lli-ta	Gu-ki-lli-ġeil
Gura-lli-kan	Gura-i-ye	Gura-lli-kanne	Gurra-lli-to	Gurra-lli-ta	Gurra-lli-ġeil
Kor-ri-lli-kan	Kor-ri-ye	Kor-ri-lli-kanne	Kor-ri-lli-to	Kor-ri-lli-ta	Kor-ri-lli-ġeil
Man-ki-lli-kan	Man-ki-ye	Man-ki-lli-kanne	Man-ki-lli-to	Man-ki-lli-ta	Man-ki-lli-ġeil
Pirri-ki-lli-kan	Pirri-ki-ye	Pirri-ki-lli-kanne	Pirri-ki-lli-to	Pirri-ki-lli-ta	Pirri-ki-lli-ġeil
Tiwa-lli-kan	Tiwa-i-ye	Tiwa-lli-kanne	Tiwa-lli-to.	Tiwa-lli-ta	Tiwa-lli-ġeil
Uma-lli-kan	Uma-i-ye	Uma-lli-kanne	Uma-lli-to	Uma-lli-ta	Uma-lli-ġeil
Upa-lli-kan	Upa-i-ye	Upa-lli-kanne	Upa-lli-to	Upa-lli-ta	Upa-lli-ġeil
Uwa-lli-kan	Uwa-i-ye	Uwa-lli-kanne	Uwa-lli-to	Uwa-lli-ta	Uwa-lli-ġeil
Wiroba-lli-kan	Wiroba-i-ye	Wiroba-lli-kanne	Wiroba-lli-to	Wiroba-lli-ta	Wiroba-lli-ġeil
Wiya-lli-kan	Wiya-i-ye	Wiya-lli-kanne	Wiya-lli-to	Wiya-lli-ta	Wiya-lli-ġeil
Wún-ki-lli-kan	Wún-ki-yo	Wún-ki-lli-kanne	Wún-ki-lli-to	Wún-ki-lli-ta	Wún-ki-lli-ġeil
Yallawa-lli-kan	Yallawa-i-ye	Yallawa-lli-kanne	Yallawa-lli-to	Yallawa-lli-ta	Yallawa-lli-ġeil

If we follow the numbers on the columns, and remember that the word in column No. 1 always denotes the person who does the action of the verb, the meanings which these words bear—all springing from the verbal root-form and meaning—may be shown thus :—

From

Bún-ki-lli —2. a boxer ; 3. a cudgel ; 4. a blow ; 5. the smiting ; 6. a pugilistic ring ; *root-meaning*, 'smite.'

Gakuya-lli —2. a liar ; 3. a pretence ; 4. deceit ; 5. the deceiving ; 6. a gambling-house ; *rt.m.*, 'deceive.'

Goloma-lli —2. a saviour ; 3. a safeguard ; 4. protection ; 5. the protecting ; 6. a fortress ; *rt.m.*, 'protect.'

Gu-ki-lli —2. an almoner ; 3. a shop ; 4. liberality ; 5. the giving of a thing ; 6. a market ; *rt.m.*, 'give.'

Gura-lli —2. a listener ; 3. an ear-trumpet ; 4. attention ; 5. the act of hearing ; 6. a news-room ; *rt.m.*, 'hear.'

Ko-ri-lli —2. a porter ; 3. a yoke ; 4. a carriage ; 5. the carrying ; 6. a wharf ; *rt.m.*, 'carry.'

Man-ki-lli —2. a thief ; 3. a trap ; 4. a grasp ; 5. the taking ; 6. a bank ; *rt.m.*, 'take.'

Pirri-ki-lli —2. a sluggard ; 3. a couch ; 4. rest ; 5. the reclining ; 6. a bedroom ; *rt.m.*, 'recline.'

Tiwa-lli —2. a searcher ; 3. a drag ; 4. search ; 5. the seeking ; 6. the woods ; *rt.m.*, 'seek.'

Uma-lli —2. an artisan ; 3. a tool ; 4. work ; 5. the doing ; 6. a manufactory ; *rt.m.*, 'do.'

Upa-lli —2. a writer ; 3. a pen ; 4. performance ; 5. the performing ; 6. a desk ; *rt.m.*, 'perform.'

Uwa-lli —2. a wanderer ; 3. a coach ; 4. a journey ; 5. the walking ; 6. a parade ground ; *rt.m.*, 'walk.'

Wiroba-lli —2. a disciple ; 3. a portmanteau ; 4. pursuit ; 5. the act of following ; 6. the barracks ; *rt.m.*, 'follow.'

Wiya-lli —2. a commander ; 3. a book ; 4. speech ; 5. the speaking ; 6. a pulpit ; *rt.m.*, 'speak.'

Wún-ki-lli—2. a magistrate ; 3. a watch-house ; 4. resignation ; 5. the leaving ; 6. the jail ; *rt.m.*, 'leave.'

Yallawa-lli—2. an idler ; 3. a seat ; 4. a session ; 5. the act of sitting ; 6. a pew ; *rt.m.*, 'sit.'

As to the origin of these formatives, I think that kan equals k + an, the -an being a personal suffix from the same source as the demonstrative un-ni, 'this' ; in Wiradhari it is -dain, that is d + ain, the -ain being the same as -an. We shall find further on that *k*, *d*, *t*, *g* and other consonants are used in this language merely to tack on the suffix. Similarly, in Fijian and Samoan, there is a great variety of consonants in use for this purpose. The -kanne seems to be a softer form of -kannai *or* -kanmai, the -mai being a common formative. The -ta of number 5 is a demonstrative which is used abundantly in the language as a strengthening particle; and the -to is the agent-nominative form (see pp. 10, 11) of -ta. The -ġeil of number 6, or, as I write it, -ġél, seems to me to be of the same origin as the suffix -kàl (see page 18); a corresponding word in Dravidian is kâl, 'a place.' The -yé of number 2 denotes a continued action, and may be the same as the imperative form -ía, that is -iya.

In the list given above, 'a magistrate' is called wúnkiye because he 'commits' the culprit to jail, and 'the watch-house' or jail is therefore wúnkilliġél. The wirrobàllikan are the 'light-horse,' who act as an escort to the Governor of the colony, and the place where they are housed is therefore wirrobàlliġél. In the Gospel, the disciples of Christ are called wirrobàllikan, and their following of Him for instruction—their discipleship—is wirrobàlli-kanne-ta. Búnkillikanne may be a 'musket,' because it 'strikes' with a ball, or it may be a 'hammer,' a 'mallet,' which gives 'blows.'

The reader has observed that all the verbals in the first column above contain the syllable -illi, and, as that table has given us examples of synthesis, it may be profitable now to examine the formation of Australian words by employing etymological analysis. With this view, I take up the Awabakal verb takilliko, 'to eat,' and I take this word, because the idea expressed by it is so essential to a language, that it is impossible that the word should be a loan-word. Now, the verb 'to eat' has, in Australian, many forms, such as thalli, dalli, thaldinna, thilala, dira, chakol, taka, tala, and, in Tasmania, tuggara, tughli, te-ganna. Of all these, the simplest is taka, which is used by the northern portion of the Kuriġgai tribe (see map) in N. S. Wales. On comparing taka and tala, it is evident that the simple root is ta, and all the others come from this; chakol, for instance, is ta palatalized into ĉa, with -kàl added; di-ra has the suffix -ra added on to the root ta, vocalized into di; and díra gives the universal Australian word for the 'teeth,' just as the Sanskrit dant, 'a tooth' (*cf. Lat.* dens), is a participial form of the verb ad, 'to eat.' The Tasmanian words, which I have here restored to something like a rational mode of spelling, are clearly the same as the Australian. Nor is the root ta confined to Australia; it is spread all over the East as ta *or* ka. In Samoa (Polynesian), it is *tau*-te, *tau*-mafa, and 'ai, that is (k)ai; in Aneityum (Melanesian), it is caig; in Efate, kani; in Duke of York Island, ani, wa-gan; in Motu (New Guinea), ania; in New Britain, an, yan. The Dravidian is un, and the Sanskrit is ad and khâd. Our English word

eat, Gothic ita, Latin edo, are from the same root. The Malay is ma-kan, of which the ma is also pa, ba, and with this corresponds the Melanesian (Efate) ba-mi, 'to eat.' Now, it seems to me likely that in primitive speech there were, alongside of each other, three root-forms, ba, ad, and kad, of which ba and ad passed to the West and produced the Greek pha-go, and e(s)thio, the Latin edo, the English eat, while kad spread to the East and is the source of all the other words; ba in a less degree accompanied it, and gives bami (Efate), -ma-fa (Samoa), and the Malay ma-kan. This root ba seems also to exist in Australia, for one dialect has has a-balli, 'to eat.'

In the Samoan tau-te (a chief's word), the tau is an intensive and therefore, in this case, honorific, prefix, and the tē is our root ta; it thus corresponds with the Tasmanian tē-ganna.

In various parts of British New Guinea, words for 'eat' are bai, uai, mo-ana, kani-kani, an-an, ye-kai; and for 'food,' kai, kān, ani-ani, ai-ai, mala-m, ala, wa-la. All these come from the roots ba and ka, kan; with an-an (an for kan) compare the Dravidian un, 'to eat.'

Thus I dispose of the Awabakal root ta, 'to eat'; and, if the analogies given above are well founded, then I am sure that our Australian blacks have a share with the rest of the world in a common heritage of language.

When the radical syllable, ta, is removed, the remainder of our sample word is -killi-ko, and both of these are formative. On comparing ta-killi-ko with other Awabakal verbs, such as umulli-ko, wi-yelli-ko, um-olli-ko, and with the Wiradhari verbs and verbals da-alli, d-illi-ġa, b-illi-ġa, it is obvious that the essential portion of the affix is -illi *or* -àlli, the consonants before it being merely euphonic. In the Dravidian languages, similar consonants, *v*, *y*, *m*, *n*, *d*, *t*, *g*, are inserted to prevent hiatus, and in Fiji and Samoa there is also a great variety of consonants used to introduce suffixes. Then, as to the -illi *or* -àlli, I find exactly the same formative in Gond—an uncultured dialect of the Dravidian; there the infinitive of a verb has -âlê *or* -îlê; and in Tamil, the verbal noun in -al, with the dative sign -ku added, is used as an infinitive; in Canarese the -al is an infinitive without the -ku. In all this we have a close parallel to the Awabakal infinitive in -àlli-ko, -illi-ko, for some of our dialects have the dative in -ol, -àl.* Our formative, when attached to a verb-root, makes it a verbal noun, as bún-killi, 'the act of smiting'; hence the appropriateness of the suffix -ku, 'to,' a post-position.

The -ko in ta-killi-ko is equivalent to the English 'to' with verbs, except that it is used as a post-position in Awabakal, where it is the common dative sign. It also resembles, both in form and

*See page 49 of Appendix.

use, the Latin supine in -tum. This Sanskrit -tum is the accusative of the suffix -tu to express agency, and may thus correspond with our Australian suffix -to, -du, which is used in a similar manner. In the Diyeri dialect*, the infinitive ends in mi, which means 'to'; in Aneityumese imi means 'to.' Now, in all the Dravidian dialects, the sign of the dative case is ku, ki, ge; in Hindi it is ko, in Bengali kê; other forms in India are khê, -ghai, -gai; with this -gai compare the Minyung dative in -gai*. In the Kôta dialect of the Dravidian, the dative sign is ke, and the locative is -ol-ge; the infinitive ends in -alik, probably a compound of ali and ke; the Aneityumese infinitive in -aliek is very like that. A close parallel to our Awabakal infinitive in -ko is the Dravidian infinitive in -gu; as, kuru, 'short,' kuru-gu, 'to diminish.' In the Malay languages, transitive verbs are formed by prefixes and affixes; of the latter, the most common is kan, which may be the preposition ka, 'to.'

In the Ebudan languages, ki is a genitive and a dative sign, and in one of them, Malekúlan, bi, 'to,' makes an infinitive (*cf.* the South Australian mi), and this same bi is used like the Latin ut, 'in order that'; with this compare the Awabakal koa (page 75, *et al.*)—a lengthened form of -ko. In Fijian, some transitive verbs take ki, 'to,' after them, but a common termination for the infinitive is -ka, and the 'i (sometimes 'o) of many verbs in Samoan may be the same termination.

Our infinitive denotes the 'end' or 'purpose' for which anything is done; hence the dative sign; so also in Sanskrit, it would be correct to use the dative in -ana of the verbal noun. In the Wiradhari dialect, -ana is a very common termination for infinitives; but I do not know that it has any relation to the Sanskrit -ana.

I have taken this verb takilliko as an example of the formation of an infinitive in Awabakal; all other infinitives in that dialect are formed in the same way; the variations -ulli-ko, olli-ko, elli-ko proceed from -alli, which I would write -àlli, so as to include the vowel changes all in one sign. In other dialects, there are many other forms for the infinitive, but this one in -illi is not confined to the Kuriġgai tribe, but is found also in Victoria.

Another similar and very important verb in the Awabakal is kakilliko, the verb 'to be.' On the same principles, as shown above, the -killiko here is terminational and the root is ka. Here again the Dravidian dialects assist us to trace the word; for the Tamil has â-gu, 'to become,' the Telugu has kâ, the Canarese âgal, and the Gond ay-âlê. Our Wiradhari dialect says ġinya (for ġi-ġa), 'to become.' It is possible that these forms have a parallel, but independent, relation to the Sanskrit roots gan and ga, 'to come into being,' Greek gigno-mai, gino-mai.

*See pp. 13 and 45 of Appendix.

X. Grammatical Forms and Syntax.

The consideration of the grammatical forms and the syntax of a language is a very important part of comparative grammar, and is a more potent proof of identity of origin than mere words can be; for, while words may be abundantly introduced from abroad, as the history of our English language testifies, yet the essential structure of allied languages is as little liable to change as the cranial character of a race. As none of the dialects spoken in Australia has had the chance of becoming fixed by being reduced to writing, the materials available for comparing them with themselves and with other languages are in a state of flux and decay, and any effort to determine their grammar will be only provisional at present, and subject to errors arising from the imperfect state of our information about them. Nevertheless, allowance being made for this source of imperfection and error, several of their features may be regarded as well-determined; and it will here be convenient to arrange these in numbered paragraphs.

1. The Australian languages are in the agglutinative stage; the relations which words and ideas bear to each other in a sentence are shown by independent words, often monosyllables, which do not lose their identity when attached to the word which they thus qualify. For example, 'he is the son of a good (native) man,' in Awabakal, is noa yinál mararàġ ko ba kùri ko ba, where the monosyllables ko and ba express the relation of yinál to kùri, and are otherwise in common use as distinct words; they can be combined and fastened on to kùri so that the whole may be pronounced as one word, kùrikoba, but they do not thus become lost as case-endings. These particles ko-ba, when thus united, may be also treated as an independent word, even as a verb, for koba-toara is a verbal form, meaning 'a thing that is in possession, gotten, acquired.'

Similarly, the tenses of the verb are indicated by particles added on to the stem; as, búm-mara-bùn-bill-ai-koa baġ, 'that I may permit the one to be struck by the other'; here bún is the root-form, 'strike,' which may be almost any part of speech; mara is an independent stem meaning 'make' (ma); bùn is another verb conveying the idea of 'permission'; it is not used as a separate word, but it appears to be only a derived form of the verb ba, (ma), 'to make,' 'to let'; the rest of our sample word is bill-ai-koa; of these, koa is a lengthened form of the preposition ko, 'to,' and is equivalent to the Latin conjunction ut; the -ai has a reciprocal force, and b-illi is the same formative which we found in ta-killi-ko, *q.v.* Thus our sample-word is made up of three verbs, a formative (illi), which, perhaps, is of the nature of a demonstrative, a particle, and the infinitive post-position, which, as to its origin, may have been a verb.

2. Nevertheless, several dialects have forms which show the agglutinative words on the way to become inflexional. In the dialect of Western Australia, 'the woman's staff' is yago-àk wanna, in which the -àk has lost its independence, and is as much a case-ending as the *æ*, *i*, or *is* of the Latin genitive. So also in Awabakal; the -úmba of kokara emoúmba, 'my house,' may be regarded as inflexional; for, although the -ba can be detached and used as a separate word, not so the -úm. I believe the -úmba to be a weathering for gu-mba, the gu being a dialect form of the post-position ko, as in Wiradhari; yet the -ú cannot stand alone; the *m* belongs to the ba.

3. As to the *Cases* of nouns and pronouns, they are shown by separable post-positions which are themselves nouns, adjectives, or verbs. The post-position birung, for example, meaning 'away from,' is an adjective in the Wiradhari dialect, and means 'far distant,' while birandi, another form from the same root, is the post-position, 'from.' The other post-positions in the paradigm on page 16 are all taken from the monosyllables ka and ko. Of these, I take ko to be a root-verb, implying 'motion to,' and ka another, meaning 'to be' in a certain state or place; but of their origin I can give no account, unless ka be related to the Dravidian verb âgu, already noticed, and ko be a modified form of ka. These two roots, variously combined, become the post-positions kai, kin-ko, ka-ko, kin-ba, ka-ba, ka-birung, kin-birung on page 16; by the influence of the final consonant of the words to which they are joined, the initial *k* of these becomes *t*, *l*, or *r*.

A similar account of the post-positions in the Narrinyéri, the Diyéri, and other distant dialects could, no doubt, be given, but from the scantiness of our knowledge, that is at present impossible.

4. As to the *Gender* of nouns, that is either implied in the meaning of the word or to be guessed from the context. In Fijian, a word is added to mark the gender; for example, gone is 'child,' and, from it, a gone tagane is 'a boy,' but a gone alewa is 'a girl.' The Samoans say ulī po'a and ulī fafine to mean a 'male dog' and a 'female dog,' and the Ebudans something similar. Our Australians have no such devices, but they have some words in which the gender is clearly distinguished by an ending added on, or by a change of the vowel sound of the final syllable of the word. The most common feminine suffix is -gun; as, mobi, 'a blind man,' mobi-gun, 'a blind woman'; yinál, 'a son,' yinal-kun, 'a daughter'; another suffix is -ín; as, Awabakal, 'a man of Awaba,' Awaba-kal-ín, 'a woman of Awaba'; makoro-ban, makoro-bin, 'a fisher-man,' 'a fisher-woman,' show a change in the vowel sound. I think that, in proportion to the extent of the language, instances of this kind—the expression of gender by change of termination—are quite as common in Australian as they are in English. To this extent, therefore, the Australian dialects are sex-denoting.

The -ban in makoro-ban seems to be a masculine suffix; in the Minyung dialect, yerrubil is 'a song,' yerrubil-gin, 'a singer,' and yerrubil-gin-gun is a 'songstress.' The Wiradhari -dain in birbal-dain, 'a baker,' from birbára, 'to bake,' and in many other words, is also a masculine termination.

5. As to *Number* of nouns and pronouns, the same word, and the same form of it, does duty both as singular and plural; the context shows which is meant; *e.g.*, kùri is 'a (native) man,' but kùri is also 'men'; if the speaker wishes to say, '*a* man came home,' that would be wakàl kùri, 'one man'—the numeral being used just in the same way as our Saxon 'an,' 'ane'—but '*the* men' would be bara kùri, 'they-man,' not kùri bara, as the Aryan arrangement of the words would be. Hence the pronoun ngaddu, ngadlu may mean either 'I' or 'we'; to mark the number some pluralising word must be added to nouns and pronouns, such as in the gala-ta, 'we,' of Western Australia, where the gala is equivalent to 'they,' or perhaps 'all.' In Wiradhari, ġalang is added on to form plurals. Nevertheless, there are, among the pronouns, terminations which appear to be plural forms, as, nge-an-ni, 'we,' nu-ra, 'you,' which I have already considered in the section on the Australian pronouns.

The declension of yago, 'a woman' (page 49 of Appendix), is an example of a termination *added on* to form the plural of a noun, and shows how much akin our Australian language is to the Dravidian and other branches of the Turanian family. Yago takes -màn as a plural ending, and to that affixes the signs of case which are used for the singular number. As a parallel, I cite the Turanian of Hungary; there, ur is 'master,' ur-am is 'my master,' ur-aim, 'my masters,' ur-am-nak, 'to my master,' ur-aim-nak, 'to my masters.' The Dravidian has not, in general, post-fixed possessives, but our Narrinyeri dialect has them, and they are quite common in the Papuan and Ebudan languages. In Fijian, the possessives, with nouns of relationship or members of the body or parts of a thing, are always post-fixed. And in Dravidian, when a noun denotes a rational being, the pronominal termination is suffixed.

6. The Minyung dialect (page 4, Appendix) makes a distinction between life-nouns and non-life nouns, and varies the endings of its adjectives accordingly. Something similar exists in Dravidian; for it has special forms for epicene plurals and for rational plurals and for neuter plurals; and, of course, in the classic languages the *a* of the neuter plural is distinctive. But in Fijian, the Minyung principle is carried out more fully, for possessives vary their radical form according as the nouns to

which they are joined denote things to be held merely in possession, or to be eaten, or to be drunk. In Samoan there is a somewhat similar use of lona and lana, 'his.'

7. In the Awabakal dialect (see the Gospel *passim*), a main feature is the use of the demonstrative ta as a suffix; it is added to nouns, adjectives, pronouns, and adverbs, and always has the effect of strengthening the word to which it is joined; as, unni ta kuri, 'this man,' wakàl-la purreàng, 'one day'; its plural is ta-ra; another form, apparently a plural, is tai, as in mararàng-tai, 'the good'; the singular form tarai means 'some one,' 'another.' Ta is simply a demonstrative particle, and may be related to the Sanskrit tad, 'this,' 'that.' Ta is always a suffix, and I consider it the same word as the demonstrative -na, which is so common as a suffix to nouns in all Melanesia, and sometimes in Polynesia. Some Ebudan dialects use it as a prefix, na, ni, in. In Telugu, ni and na are attached to certain classes of nouns before adding the case signs, as da-ni-ki, 'to that.' This ta is probably the same as the Dravidian da of inda, 'this,' anda, 'that.'

8. In Awabakal, a noun or adjective, when used as the subject of a proposition, takes ko (to, lo) as a suffix; so also in Fijian and Samoan, ko, 'o as a prefix. In Awabakal, this ko must be attached to all the words that are leading parts of the subject; as, tarai-to bulun kinbiruǵ-ko, 'some one from among them.'

In Awabakal, there seems to be no definite arrangement of words in a simple sentence except that required by expression and emphasis; but an adjective precedes its noun and a pronoun in the possessive may either follow its noun or go before it. In Dravidian also, the adjective precedes its substantive; but the possessive pronouns are prefixed to the nouns.

These comparisons are general; those that now follow compare the Australian with the Dravidian.

9. In Gond and Tamil, the instrumental case-ending is -al. With this compare the Narrinyeri ablative in -il, and the -àl of Western Australia (pp. 29, 32, 49 of Appendix).

10. The Tuda dialect alone in the Dekkan has the sound of *f* and the hard *th* of the English 'thin'; in Australia the Narrinyeri has the *th* of 'thin,' but there is no *f* anywhere.

11. The Tamil inserts a euphonic *m* before *b*; this is also exceedingly common in Australia. The Canarese dialect hardens mûru, 'three,' into mundru. Some of the dialects of Australia have a similar practice, and the Fijians do the same.

12. In Tamil, the conjunctive-ablative case has ôdu, dialect tôda, 'together with,' supposed to come from the verb to-dar, 'to join on.' The corresponding Awabakal word is katoa for kata (page 16).

13. In Dravidian, the 2nd singular of the Imperative is the crude form of the verb; so also in Australian.

14. In Tamil, the accusative case is the same as the nominative; so also with common nouns in Australian.

15. In Dravidian, there is no case ending for the vocative; some sign of emphasis is used to call attention; in Tamil, this is ê. In Awabakal, ela is used for the same purpose, and in Wiradhari ya. In Samoan e is used, but it usually comes after its noun.

16. In Dravidian, there are compound case-signs. So also in Australian (see pages 16, 17, and of Appendix, pages 30, 33, 58).

17. In Dravidian, comparison is expressed by using some adverb with the adjective; as, 'this indeed is good,' for 'this is very good.' There are no adjective terminations there to show comparison, but some Australian dialects seem to have them (see pages 45 and 51 of Appendix). Usually the Australian and the Melanesian languages are like the Dravidian in this matter.

18. In Turanian, the ma of the first pronoun often adds an obscure nasal making it something like máng. With this compare the Awabakal báng.

19. For the second pronoun, the Tamil has ây, ôy, er. With these compare the Papuan second pronoun on page xl. of this Introduction.

20. In the Dravidian pronoun nin, 'thou,' the initial *n* is merely a nasalisation, for it disappears in the verbal forms. With this compare my analysis of the Awabakal pronoun ǵintoa.

21. In Dravidian generally, the pluralising particles are added on to the pronouns; but in Telugu these signs are prefixed, as in mi-ru. With this compare the Papuan ni-mo (page xl. of this Introduction), and the Awabakal ba-ra, nu-ra, and the like.

22. In almost all the Dravidian dialects, the first pronoun plural has both an inclusive and an exclusive form. This is so also in the Melanesian languages, especially those of the New Hebrides and Fiji.

23. The Canarese formative of adverbs is *l*, as in illi, alli, elli, 'here,' 'there,' 'where'; in Gond, âlê, îlê are the verb-endings. In Awabakal, these are the formatives of verbal nouns, as I have shown in another section. Now, it is an easy thing in language for a noun to be used adverbially, and hence the Canarese and Gond formatives may really be nouns. This would bring them closer to the Awabakal.

24. In the chief Dravidian dialects, the infinitive ends in -ku, a post-preposition, 'to.' So also in Awabakal, as has been already shown. I may add here that the Zulu infinitive ends -ku.

25. The Dravidian verb may be compounded with a noun, but never with a preposition. So also the Australian verb.

26. The Dravidian verb is agglutinative; particles are added on to the stem in order to express mood, tense, causation, negation, &c., no change being made on the stem. Tulu and Gond—both uncultured dialects—are exceptionally rich in moods and tenses. All this applies to the Australian, the Ebudan, and the Fijian verbs.

27. In Dravidian, there are no relative pronouns. So in Australian; for 'this is the book which you gave me,' a native would say 'this is the book; you gave it me.'

28. In Canarese, kọdu, 'to give,' is used as a permissive. In Awabakal, bùn is the permissive, and appears to be formed from ba, a root-form meaning 'to make.' In English, the conditional conjunction 'if' is for 'gif,' 'give.'

29. The Dravidian verb has no passive, nor has the Australian. For 'it was broken,' our natives would say 'broken by me (you, &c.)'; a Dravida would say, 'it became broken through me.'

30. In Dravidian there are two futures—(1) a conditional future, and (2) a sort of indeterminate aorist future. For the latter, the Malayâlam adds -um to the verbal noun which is the base of the future. In Awabakal there are three futures; the third is an aorist future and adds -nùn to the verbal stem in -illi (see pages 25, 28 *ad finem*). This -nùn is probably equivalent to a formative -ùn with *n* interposed between the vowels to prevent hiatus. In Tamil also *n* (for *d*) is similarly inserted in verbs; as, padi(*n*)an, 'I sang.'

XI. The Origin of the Australian Race.

From these analogies and from the general scope of my argument in this Introduction, the reader perceives that I wish to prove a kinship between the Dravidian race and the Australian. This opinion I expressed in print more than ten years ago when it was not so generally held as it is now. Some of the very highest authorities have formed the same opinion from evidence other than that of language. But a theory and arguments thereon must be shown to be antecedently possible or even probable before it can be accepted; and to furnish such a basis of acceptance, one must go to the domain of history. This I now do.

In my opinion the ultimate home of origin of the negroid population of Australia is Babylonia. There, as history tells us, mankind first began to congregate in great numbers, and among them the Hamites, the progenitors of the negro races. It seems to have been those Hamites who were the first to try to break down the love-law of universal brotherhood and equality; for Nimrod was of their race, and wished to establish dominion over his fellows, and to raise an everlasting memorial of his power, like those which his kindred afterwards reared in Egypt. This attempt was frustrated by the 'Confusion of tongues,' at Babel; and here begins, as I think, the first movement of the negro race towards India and consequently towards Australia. Here comes in also the 'Tôldoth Benê Noah' of Genesis x.

Accordingly, the position of the Hamite or black races at the opening of history is, in Genesis x. 6, indicated ethnically by the names Kush and Mizraim and Phut and Canaan, which geographically are the countries we call Ethiopia and Egypt and Nubia and Palestine. The Kushites, however, were not confined to Africa, but were spread in force along the whole northern shores of the Arabian sea; they were specially numerous on the lower courses of the Euphrates and Tigris, their original seats, and there formed the first germ whence came the great empire of Babylonia. The Akkadians were Turanian in speech, and, it may be, black in 'colour.' In this sense, the later Greek tradition (Odyssey I-23-24) speaks of both an eastern and a western nation of Ethiopians. And Herodotus tells us (VII-70) that in the army of Xerxes, when he invaded Greece, "the Ethiopians from the sun-rise (for two kinds served in the expedition) were marshalled with the Indians, and did not at all differ from the others in appearance, but only in their language and their hair. For the eastern Ethopians are straight-haired, but those of Libya have hair more curly than that of any other people."

It is clear, therefore, that the black races, many centuries before the Trojan war, had spread themselves from the banks of the Indus on the east right across to the shores of the Mediterranean, while towards the south-west they occupied the whole of Egypt and the Abyssinian highlands. Thus they held two noble coigns of vantage, likely to give them a commanding influence in the making of the history of mankind—the valley of the Nile, which, through all these ages to the present hour, has never lost its importance—and the luxuriant flat lands of Mesopotamia. A mighty destiny seemed to await them, and already it had begun to show itself; for the Kushites not only made the earliest advances towards civilisation, but under Nimrod, 'that mighty hunter,' smitten with the love of dominion, they threatened at one time to establish a universal empire with Babel as its chief seat. And not without reason; for the Kushite tribes were stalwart in stature and physique, in disposition vigorous and energetic, eager for war and conquest, and with a capacity and lust for great things both in peace and war. But a time of disaster came which carried them into the remotest parts of the earth—into Central Africa, into the mountains of Southern India, whence, after a while, another impulse sent them onwards towards our own island-continent; hither they came, as I think, many centuries before the Christian era, pressed on and on from their original seats by the waves of tribal migration which were so common in those early days. Similar was the experience of the Kelts, a very ancient tribe; soon after their first arrival in Europe, we find them occupying Thrace and the countries about the mouth of the Danube; but fresh immigration from the Caucasus plateau pushed them up the Danube, then into Belgium and France, thence into Britain, and last of all the invading Saxons drove them westwards into Ireland, and into the mountains of Wales and Scotland. So the successive steps of the Kushite displacement, in my opinion, were these:—first into the valley of the Ganges, where they were the original inhabitants, then into the Dekkan and into Further India, then into Ceylon, the Andaman Islands, and the Sunda Islands, and thence into Australia. These stages I will examine presently more in detail.

But, meanwhile, let us look at the old Babylonian kingdom. Its ethnic basis was Kushite; its ruling dynasty continued to be Kushite probably down to the time of the birth of Abraham, about 2000 B.C. But before that date, the Babylonian population had been materially changed. Nimrod had conquered Erech and Accad and Calneh in the land of Shinar; an Akkadian or Turanian element was thus incorporated with his empire; he had built Nineveh and Rehoboth and Calah and Resen (Genesis x. 11); a Shemite element was thus or in some other way superadded; other Turanians and Shemites and Japhetian Aryans too, perhaps attracted by the easy luxuriance of life on these fertile plains, had all assembled in Chaldæa and Babylonia. In consequence, we find that, about twenty centuries B.C., the Kushite kingdom had become a mixed conglomerate of four essentially different races—Hamite, Turanian, Shemite, and Japhetian—which on the inscriptions are called *Kiprat-arbat*, 'the four quarters.' Then, as the Babylonian worship of Mulitta demanded free intercourse as a religious duty, a strange mixture of physical types must have been developed among the children of these races, the Ethiopian, Scythic, Shemitic, and Iranian all blending—a rare study to the eye of a physiologist, who would have seen sometimes the one type sometimes the other predominating in the child. This Chaldæan monarchy—the first of the five great monarchies of ancient history—was overthrown by an irruption of Arab (Shemitic) tribes about the year 1500 B.C. And now, as I think, another wave of population began to move towards our shores; for these Arabs were pure monotheists, and in their religious zeal must have dashed to pieces the polytheistic and sensual fabric which the Babylonian conquests had extended from the confines of India westwards to the Mediterranean (*cf.* Chedorlaomer's expedition, Genesis xiv. 9). Those portions of the Chaldæo-Babylonian people that were unable to escape from the dominion of the Arabs were absorbed in the new empire, just as many of the Keltic Britons were in the sixth and seventh centuries merged in the newly-formed Saxon kingdoms. But the rupture of the Babylonian State and the proscription of its worship must have been so complete as to drive forth from their native seats thousands of the people of the four tongues and force them westwards into Africa, or eastwards through the mountain passes into the tableland of Pánjâb, and thence into the Gangetic Plain. Here, I imagine, were already located the pure Hamites of the Dispersion; but finding these to be guilty of a skin not exactly coloured like their own, and not understanding their language, these latter Kushites of mixed extraction regarded them as enemies and drove them before them into the mountains of the Dekkan, where, to this hour, the Dravidians and Kolarians are black-skinned and savage races. Ere long, these Babylonian Kushites were themselves displaced and ejected from the Ganges valley by a fair-skinned race, the Aryans, another and the last ethnic stream of invaders from the north-west. These Aryans, in religion and habits irreconcilably opposed to the earlier races of India, waged on them a relentless war. Hemmed up in the triangle of southern India, the earlier Hamites could escape only by sea; the Babylonian Kushites, on the other hand, could not seek safety in the mountains of the Dekkan, as these were already occupied; they must therefore have been pushed down the Ganges into Further India and the Malayan peninsula; thence they passed at a later time into Borneo, and the Sunda Islands, and Papua, and afterwards across the sea of Timor into Australia, or eastwards into Melanesia, driven onwards now by the Turanian tribes, which had come down from Central Asia into China and the Peninsula and islands of the East Indies.

Many arguments could be advanced in favour of this view of the origin of the Australian race, but the discussion would be a lengthy one, and this is scarcely the place for it. I may, however, be permitted to add here a simple incident in my own experience. A few months ago, I was staying for a while with a friend in the bush, far from the main roads of the colony and from towns and villages. One day, when out of doors and alone, I saw a black man approaching; his curly hair, his features, his colour, and his general physique, all said that he was an Australian, but his gait did not correspond. I was on the point of addressing him as he drew near, but he anticipated me and spoke first; the tones of his voice showed me that I was mistaken. I at once suspected him to be a Kalinga from the Presidency of Madras. And he was a Kalinga. This incident tells its own tale. In short, it appears to me that the Dravidians and some tribes among the Himalayas are the representatives of the ancient Dasyus, who resisted the Aryan invasion of India, and whom the Puranas describe as akin to beasts. The existence, also, of cyclopean remains in Ponape of the Caroline Islands, and elsewhere onward through the Pacific Ocean, even as far as Easter

Island in the extreme east—all these acknowledged by Polynesians to be the work of a previous race, which tradition, in various parts, declares to have been black—points out one of the routes by which the black race spread itself abroad into the eastern isles; while the presence of Negrillo tribes in detached portions nearer to India—like islands left uncovered by the floods of stronger races pouring in—the Mincopies in the Andaman Islands, the Samangs in the Malay Peninsula, and the Aëtas in the interior of Borneo, with the wild remnants of a black race in the heart of many of the larger islands of the Malay Archipelago—all this seems to me to show that the primitive Dasyus, driven from India, passed into Further India and thence—being still impelled by race movements—into our own continent and into the islands to the north and east of it. But this question must be left for separate investigation.

Thus, in my view, our island first received its native population, in two different streams, the one from the north, and the other from the north-west. Many known facts favour this view :—

(1.) Ethnologists recognise *two* pre-Aryan races in India. The earlier had not attained to the use of metals and used only polished flint axes and implements of stone; the later had no written records, and made grave mounds over their dead. The Vedas call them 'noseless,' 'gross feeders on flesh,' 'raw eaters,' 'not sacrificing,' 'without gods,' 'without rites'; they adorned the bodies of the dead with gifts and raiment and ornaments. All this suits our aboriginals; they are noseless, for they have very flat and depressed noses, as contrasted with the straight and prominent noses of the Vedic Aryans; they have no gods and no religious rites such as the Vedas demand.

(2.) The Kolarian and Dravidian languages have inclusive and exclusive forms for the plural of the first person. So also have many of the languages of Melanesia and Polynesia.

(3.) The native boomerang of Australia is used on the south-east of India, and can be traced to Egypt—both of them Hamite regions.

(4.) In the Kamalarai dialect, the four class-names form their feminines in *-tha*; as, Kubbi (*masc.*), Kubbi-tha (*fem.*); and that is a Shemitic formative. So also in the Hamitic Babylonian, Mul (*masc.*) gives Muli-tta (*fem.*), and Enu (*masc.*), Enu-ta (*fem.*). Although this formative is not common in the Australian languages, yet its unmistakable presence in Kamalarai may mean that our native population has in it the same mixed elements as existed in the old Babylonian empire. To the same effect is the fact that some tribes practise circumcision, while contiguous tribes do not; in many places the natives, in considerable numbers, have distinctly Shemite features; some have as regular Caucasian features as any of us; others, again, are purely negroid.

(5.) In Chaldæa, the dead were not interred; they were laid on mats in a brick vault or on a platform of sun-dried bricks, and over this a huge earthenware dish-cover, or in a long earthen jar in two pieces fitting into each other. Our blackfellows also, even when they do inter, are careful not to let the body touch the earth; in some places, they erect stages for the dead—the Parsee "towers of silence"; elsewhere, they place the dead body in a hollow tree; in South Australia, the corpse is desiccated by fire and smoke, then carried about for a while, and finally exposed on a stage. All this corresponds with the Persian religious belief in the sacredness of the earth, which must not be contaminated by so foul a thing as a putrifying human body. And it shows also how diverse are our tribal customs in important matters.

(6.) The Dravidian tribes, though homogeneous, have twelve varying dialects. The Australian dialects are a parallel to that.

(7.) There is nothing improbable in the supposition that the first inhabitants of Australia came from the north-west, that is, from Hindostan or from Further India. For the native traditions of the Polynesians all point to the west or north-west as the quarter from which their ancestors first came. So also the Indias are to the north-west of our island.

(8.) I now quote Dr. Caldwell; in diverse places, he says :—

"The Puranas speak of the Nishadas as 'beings of the complexion of a charred stick, with flattened features, and of dwarfish tature'; 'as black as a crow'; 'having projecting chin, broad ands flat nose, red eyes, and tawny hair, wide mouth, large ears, and a protuberant belly.' These Nishadas are the Kolarian tribes, such as the Kols and the Santals. But the Dravidians of the South have always been called Kalingas and Pandyas, not Nishadas."

"The Tudas of the Dekkan are a fine, manly, athletic race, with European features, Roman noses, hazel eyes, and great physical strength; they have wavy or curly hair, while the people of the plains are straight haired, have black eyes, and aquiline noses. The skin of the Tudas, although they are mountaineers, is darker than that of the natives of the Malabar coast. The physical type of the Gonds is Mongolian, that of the other Dravidians is Aryan."

"In Shamanism, there is no regular priesthood. The father of the family is the priest and magician; but the office can be taken by any one who pleases, and laid aside; so also in Southern India. The Shamanites acknowledge a Supreme God, but offer him no worship, for he is too good to do them harm. So also the Dravidian demonolators. Neither the Shamanites nor the Dravidians believe in metempsychosis. The Shamanites worship only cruel demons, with bloody sacrifices and wild dances. The Tudas exclude women from worship, even from the temples; they perform their rites in the deep gloom of groves. They have a supreme god, *Usuru Swâmi*; his manifestation is 'light,' not 'fire.' They have no circumcision. They have no forms of prayer. They believe in witchcraft and the work of demons. After the death of the body, the soul still likes and requires food."

"Dr. Logan thought that the Dravidians have a strong Melanesian or Indo-Afric element, and says that a negro race overspread India before both the Scythians and the Aryans. De Quatrefages agrees with him, and says that, long before the historical period, India was inhabited by a black race resembling the Australians, and also, before history began, a yellow race came from the north-east. Of the Tamilians Dr. Logan says :—'Some are exceedingly Iranian, more are Semitico-Iranian; some are Semitic, others Australian; some remind us of Egyptians, while others again have Malayo-Polynesian and even Semang and Papuan features.' Professor Max Müller found in the Gonds and other non-Aryan Dravidians traces of a race closely resembling the negro. Sir George Campbell thinks that the race in occupation of India before the Aryans was Negrito. Even in the seventh century of our era, a Brahman grammarian calls the Tamil and Telugu people Mlêchchas, that is, aboriginals. Dr. Muir thinks that the Aryan wave of conquest must have been broken on the Vindhya mountains, the northern barrier of the Dekkan."

Conclusion.

In this discussion, I have endeavoured to show the origin of our Australian numerals, the composition and derivation of the chief personal pronouns, and of a number of typical words for common things, and of these many more could be cited and examined in the same way. I have shown, so far as I can, that these pronouns, and numerals, and test-words, and, incidentally, one of the postpositions, are connected with root-words, which must be as old as the origin of the language; for such ideas as 'before,' 'begin,' 'first,' 'another,' 'follow,' 'change,' 'many,' seem to be essential to the existence of any language. I think I may safely say the same thing about the root-words for 'water,' 'dumb,' and 'eye.' It thus appears, from the present investigation, that our Australians have a common heritage, along with the rest of the world, in these root-words; for, if these blacks are a separate creation and so have no kindred elsewhere, or were never in contact with the other races of mankind, I cannot conceive how they have come to possess primitive words so like those in use over a very wide area of the globe. I therefore argue that they are an integral portion of the human race. If so, what is their origin? On this point, our present discussion may have thrown some light.

J.F.

PART I.

THE GRAMMAR AND THE KEY.