

THE
NATIONAL REVIEW.

VOL. VII.

JULY AND OCTOBER 1858.

LONDON:
CHAPMAN AND HALL, 193 PICCADILLY.

MDCCLVIII.

He has powers which, if used with due painstaking conscientiousness, may make him one of the most successful novelists of the day, as they always render him readable and entertaining. But above all, he has the gift of finishing his work to the most minute detail without becoming for an instant tedious or trivial; and this is a gift so rare that it should never be neglected. The author of *Barchester Towers* should never write so as to tempt his readers to "skip;" and though few do so less often, yet there are symptoms in some passages of his later works of a somnolency, which we trust will not be allowed to grow upon him. The popularity which he has already earned should be a sufficient stimulus to induce him steadily and perseveringly to deserve it.

ART. VIII.—ZOUAVE AND KINDRED LANGUAGES.

Essai de Grammaire kabyle, renfermant les Principes du Langage parlé par les Populations du versant nord du Jurjura, et spécialement par les Igaouaouen ou Zouaoua; suivi de Notes et d'une Notice sur quelques Inscriptions en caractères dits Tifinar' et en langage Tamacher't. Par A. Hanoteau, Capitaine de Génie, Chevalier de la Légion d'Honneur, adjoint au Bureau politique des Affaires arabes. Alger, Constantine; et Paris, 1858.

The Tricolor on the Atlas; or, Algeria and the French Conquest. By Francis Pulszky, Esq. T. Nelson and Sons, London, Edinburgh, and New York. 1854.

THE French conquest of Algeria may be called conterminous with the reign of Louis Philippe. The first great success against the city of Algiers emboldened Charles X. to the act of power which cost him his throne. The final system of administration had just been adopted, and the most dangerous adversary of the French made a prisoner, when Louis Philippe was similarly ejected. This system (if France can permanently bear the expense) is likely to be permanent, even without any increase of the scanty European colonisation which year by year settles in that fertile country; for the townspeople alone are subjected to direct French rule, and they are far too unwarlike to resist it. The mountain population is governed by its own freely elected chieftains, who pay a courtier's homage once a year to the imperial rights of France, in order to obtain confirmation of their dignity. The Arabs of the plains are governed by native agents, appointed and paid by the French military authorities, all whose orders pass to the tribes through those who appear their natural

chiefs. Such a rule is probably as inoffensive to the feelings of the natives as was the old rule of the Turks. In return for the humiliation of being subject to a power which is not Mussulman, they receive many substantial advantages. The French have endowed Arab schools in all the cities, and two Mussulman colleges in Algiers and Constantine; all of which have obtained the confidence of the natives. A great net of high roads has been constructed, connecting the different towns and camps. French stage-coaches run in every direction, and even cross the Atlas. "The wild Hajutes and ragged Kabails" have learned to use them. Great works of drainage and of irrigation are carried on. The French army has converted marshes into fertile land, and removed miasma from wide districts. The climate of a large part of even the lower country is regarded as more healthy than that of Italy, while it is certainly more productive.

"Many old Roman aqueducts have been repaired, new ones built; immense works undertaken for the extension and safety of the ports of Algiers and Bona; churches, mosques, fountains, hospitals, orphan-houses, schools, bridges, lighthouses and wharfs raised, and villages constructed. The sums spent in this way amounted, according to the French blue-books, to above 4,600,000l.*"

In consequence, the Arab tribes get richer and richer. We must quote a few more passages from Mr. Pulszky's vigorous and discriminating summary, confining ourselves to the *results* of French conquest, because our limits and the more peculiar destination of this article forbid expatiating on the general history.

"Before 1830, the price of a bull in Algiers was about 16s.; a sheep was sold at 2s.; a hundred of eggs or a hundred of oranges cost 6d., and a quarter of wheat could be had at 26s. To-day the prices are about the same as those of Europe: the income of the tribes has therefore been considerably increased. Many Kabails, Biscaries, and Mozabites have been attracted by the high wages into the cities, and the Arabs throng to the fairs with their agricultural products. They begin to become acquainted little by little with the comforts of European life; and they possess the means of buying them. They have not yet given up the habit of hoarding; but as soon as they shall become aware of the security which they enjoy under French supremacy, they will spend the treasures which they formerly hid. They have already become the wealthiest Mussulman population in the world: moreover, *the wealth has been diffused among them generally*; it is not only the chiefs, but all the members of the tribes, who grow rich. It is impossible that such a change should not engender great results in their social condition."†

These good works have not been performed without sacri-

* Pulszky, p. 395.

† Ibid. p. 397.

five. France has paid to the conquered country about 3,400,000*l.* sterling every year. Under Louis Napoleon, with the increasing content of the Arabs, the expenses have probably lessened. But it is improbable that any French government will hesitate to continue whatever sacrifice may be needed for the security of their great dominion; and however doubtful was the right of conquest, a noble *ex-post-facto* justification seems to be established by the high-minded uses made of imperial power.

Nevertheless it is impossible to deny that the conquest was really a first step in annexation from the Ottoman empire:

“Whatever may have been the conduct of the dey towards the consul of France, the Turkish sultan, as sovereign of the country, offered full reparation to the French, and sent, in November 1829, his plenipotentiary Haji Khalil Effendi, and again, in May 1830, Tahir Pasha, to Algiers, in order to arrange the difficulties peaceably. But the French government gave no answer to the communications of Khalil, and refused to admit Tahir. Besides, Charles X. had previously assured the English government that France had no intention of territorial aggrandisement; and yet the occupation took place, and Louis Philippe kept the country.”*

No moralist can justify the conduct of the French government; yet probably every historian will so excuse and palliate it as to decline grave censure. When the nominal sovereign cannot control his subjects from becoming a nuisance to foreign powers, he certainly forfeits his sovereign rights. To define at what stage of weakness this happens, is impossible; but the power of the sultan to control the deys of Algiers had long been very feeble, as now to control the Mussulman population of Arabia. When a more vigorous master steps in to put a bridle on the violences of those who pay but hypocritical and occasional submission to their nominal chief, he almost inevitably commits an act of usurpation against the law of nations; but, as in the case of Lynch law, we have sometimes more occasion to admire its discriminating energy than to criticise its conventional legitimacy. It was believed at the time that Charles X. was in close understanding with the Emperor Nicholas, whose great successes, consolidated by the treaty of Adrianople, closely preceded the quarrel with Algiers, and were facilitated by the previous occupation of the Morea by the French troops and the battle of Navarino. Ever since 1830, the French have looked on the whole north coast of Africa as theirs in reversion: Tunis, Tripoli, and Egypt are to fall into the lap of the French empire whenever the great Ottoman dismemberment takes place. Hence no sincere support will be given by French statesmen, of whatever complexion, to the sultan's imperial claims.

* Pulszky, p. 387.

To us it appears that *English* statesmen should entirely disembarass themselves of prospective jealousy against France on this head. That nation of the two will in the long-run rule widest which shall rule best; and to improve the quality of our own rule, without intriguing against our great neighbour, is for us a sufficient task, and is by far the surest means of grounding our own imperial power deeply. But we refrain from going further into the political side of this subject; our purpose is, to consider what new light on languages and ethnology is accruing to us from the French possession of Algeria, a country inhabited by numerous and very different classes of population. The main distinction, however, is into Moors, Arabs, and Kabails, concerning whom Mr. Pulszky has a noteworthy comparison with the inhabitants of Syria.

“The native inhabitants of this country [Algeria] are—in the plains, Arabs; in the mountains, Kabails; in the cities, Moors. The Arabs of Algeria are in language, character, and habits, like the Bedouins of Mesopotamia. The Moors are in all these respects like the Arab-talking Mussulmans of the Syrian towns and neighbouring villages. Accordingly the Moors are peaceable townspeople and agriculturists; the Arabs nomadic, pastoral, and making war on horseback. *The Kabails are to the Arabs what the Kurds of the Mesopotamian mountains are to the races of the plains*, more ferocious and bloody, differing in language and origin, fairer in complexion and hair, living in huts, tilling the soil, and having little cavalry.”*

In each case, the mountainous region has resisted the intrusion of the language of the conquerors. We must not conceive of the Atlas as a mere *range* of mountains, though it has some lofty peaks. It has long been known to be a series of highlands, which are now estimated to occupy three-fourths of the “regency.” The ground descends rapidly towards the sea-coast, gently towards the desert. The whole plateau of the Atlas is admirably suited for cattle and forests, its valleys for wheat. The inhabitants, according to Wagner (whose letters Pulszky has condensed), marry but one wife (p. 167), though they are Mussulmans. Wagner did not venture on any estimate of their numbers; but Captain Hanoteau gives the French official census as 759,900, or nearly one-third of the entire population: viz. in Constantine, 533,749; in Algiers, 220,178; in Oran, 5,973. The southern slope of the Atlas is also called *Bélad el Jerid* (the country of dates), and is comparatively unfertile, being a commencement of the Great Desert. Europeans use the word *Kabyle* (*Kabail*) for the whole of this interior Algerine population; but it does not appear that they have any sufficient consciousness of unity to call

* Pulszky, p. 386.

themselves by a common name. It has been known for more than half a century that they possess a peculiar language, broken into several dialects; and that a language either substantially or at least primitively the same reaches along Africa to the oasis of Siwah, which is as it were the stepping-stone to Egypt. Southward, the same or a closely kindred language is found both in the mountains of Morocco and across the Great Desert; also at Ghadames, and to the south-east, until the Tibboo tribes are reached. Prichard regarded it as certain (and Dr. Barth entirely confirms him) that the Tibboos are not of this family, with which Adeling in his *Mithridates* classed them. A generic name is wanted for the Kabail and its kindred languages; and the word *berber* (*i. e.* barbarian?) has been widely employed for this service. It is highly inconvenient that a word almost identical in sound (or its plural *barabra*) is used for a people on the Upper Nile whose language is totally alien from the Kabail; and out of this coincidence many misapprehensions arise. It seems much better to call them all *Libyans*, a word which was in ancient times peculiarly used of the population covering this very same area.

Under the name Libyan we include the native barbarians who surrounded the Greek colonies of Cyrene and Barca,—those who were in contact with Carthage on the south; also the greater nations, known as Numidians, Mauritanians, Gætulians. St. Augustin is regarded as testifying the substantial unity of language in all these when he says, “In Africâ barbaras gentes *in unâ lingua* plurimas novimus;” and it is unreasonable to doubt that the modern languages, now gradually rising to our knowledge, substantially represent those of the ancient population. We know that neither Phœnicians nor Romans displaced them; if the Vandals or Arabs had done so, the language now spoken on the Atlas and in the oases of the desert would be Vandal or Arabic. The wide area over which the Kabail family extends, and the impossibility of conceiving the whole Numidian and Mauritanian peoples to have been annihilated, suffice to convince us that the Algerine *Kabail* is the true modern representative of the Numidian, and the Maroquin *Shilha* tongue that of the Mauritanian. Smaller confirmations of this are found in a few ancient names, which admit of partial explanation from the modern tongues. Thus the name of a place mentioned by Sallust (*Thala*) means a *fountain* in Kabail. Hanoteau has made the interesting remark on the names Massinissa, Massiva, &c.,* that the first syllable *Mass* may be explained (not from the Kabail, but) from

* He seems to treat *Micipsa* as an accidental variation of *Messibsa*, and informs us that there are still among the Imushagh such names as *Ibsa*, *Iwa*, *Ezel*, *Egnes*, or *Ignas*; from which he derives the ancient names *Mic-ipsa*, *Mass-iva*, *Masc-izel*, *Mis-agenes*. The name *Inissa* (whence *Mass-inissa*) appears to be no longer in usage.

the language of the Tuaregs of the south-west desert, with whom it means 'lord.' They say *Messi*, 'my lord' (*monseigneur*), indifferently of men or of God.

It is also an interesting fact, that this people has an original alphabet of its own, the explanation of which seems now to be complete. Half a century ago, we believe, most of the popular compendiums taught confidently that all the alphabets of the world sprang from one source—the Phœnician. We now know that the Perso-Assyrian cuneiform alphabet is quite independent, as also the Sanscrit alphabet, whatever its original form; while the Tamil, Burmese, Siamese, have also an aspect wholly primitive. As language is the product of the human mind, and is certain to receive its developments and accretions during the growth of that mind, so an art of writing, which sooner or later becomes alphabetical, is the natural normal result of unconstrained human cultivation. It certainly is not from the wild tribes of the great desert of Africa that we could expect so important an invention as that of the alphabet. It is indeed preserved solely on their rocks and on the ornaments of their women; yet it is obvious to suggest that it may have been first developed in the more civilised part of that race, though long extirpated, whether by the Punic, Roman, or Arabic literature, in the place of its first invention. But some reasons will afterwards appear on the opposite side. These characters are called *Tifinagh* (sing. *Tefaneght*). The first knowledge of them was brought to Europe by our countryman Oudney, in 1822; a fuller alphabet was published by Boissonnet, a French lieutenant-colonel of artillery, which M. de Saulcy, in 1845 and 1847, endeavoured more exactly to define. We have now, in Hanoteau's Grammar, the explanations of these alphabets by two learned natives,—Abd el Kader ben Bou Beker (who gave to M. Boissonnet his first lessons in the language), and Mohammed el Ouzzani; the very discrepancies of which are instructive, as showing where it was impossible to identify their native sounds with those of the Arabs.

Many of these native signs have an aspect entirely original, and cannot be imputed to *direct* Punic teaching. Thus the letter *a* is represented by a single dot; *w* by two dots like a colon; *k* by three dots like a triangle; *gh* by three dots in line; soft *h* by four dots in line; strong *h*, or perhaps *kh*, by four dots in square. But in *kh* and *gh* minor changes seem to be introduced, to adapt the alphabet to Arabic sounds. The deep soft *k* of the Arabs (ק of Hebrew) has no specific representative with Mohammed el Ouzzani, who denotes it by the same symbol as the *gh*, into which it frequently passes; but Ben Bou Beker writes it by a singular assemblage of eight dots placed like the

five of our common die, with a second *five* overlying it at the side, so as to merge the ten dots into eight. So much, we say, of the alphabet seems to be of native invention. Nevertheless a few of the letters (especially, we think, *y*, *t*, *b*, and *d*) may infuse the suspicion that it was *indirectly* originated from the Punic. Leaving, however, the source of this alphabet in its own obscurity, still we find a practical use in it, as testifying how many truly native sounds the Libyan of the desert contains; respecting which we shall presently speak more in detail.

Venture, a French dragoman, more than half a century back conceived the idea of extracting a knowledge of the Kabail tongue from a small number of natives. But he far too easily believed that he had mastered his problem, and in fact acquired little grammatical knowledge of the language. Moreover, he unfortunately confounded into one forms of speech which are rather differences of language than of dialect. It would seem that he supposed the Shilha (or Libyan of Morocco) to be identical with the Kabail; so that the value even of his vocabulary is much impaired. His Mss. also long remained unpublished, except a few extracts from them by M. Langles. Meanwhile an American consul, Mr. Hodgson, interested himself in the language; and putting himself into relation with the Bible Society, engaged Sidi Hamet, a learned Kabail of the district of *Buji* (Bougie), to translate the four Gospels and the book of Genesis into his native tongue. The value of this translation proved to be very small, chiefly, we believe, because Hamet did not understand the Arabic version proposed to him for translation. The Bible Society printed only the first twelve chapters of Luke; and from them, in 1836, Mr. F. W. Newman, now a professor in University College, London, made out the rudiments of a grammar, which was published in the *West of England Journal* (Bristol). Having afterwards, by favour of the Bible Society, been permitted to study the rest of the translation in Ms., he published an enlarged grammatical discussion in the *Morgenländische Zeitung*, 1845. No grammar has been published by the French until the ample and excellent one the title of which we place at the head of our article. It is accompanied by numerous and valuable pieces, illustrating the vocabulary of the language in many dialects, poetry as well as prose; and both as to words and as to grammar, adds immensely to what was previously published on the subject. Moreover, it has a character of certainty which could not be possessed by analyses made from translations of doubtful value, nor from the fragmentary information picked up by the ear of European strangers.

Its author, Captain Hanoteau, being attached to the Bureau des Affaires arabes, has, we presume, direct political motives for

extending his acquaintance with the Kabail languages; but he evidently pursues his inquiries with the ardour of science, and with advantages which no one can have but a French officer. He was not only in daily official relations with numerous Kabails, but had at his side in the same *bureau* a Kabail interpreter well acquainted with written Arabic, Si Said ben Ali, of the tribe of Aith Boudrar (sons of the mountain). Hanoteau has selected the Zouave dialect as the basis of his grammar, because the Kabails regard it as the purest and the hardest. It has very sensible though not important differences from the Kabail of Buji: sometimes they merely differ as to the imported Arabic, by which the native verbal roots are superseded and expelled; for, as Hanoteau remarks, the "purity" of these dialects is only relative; all have a large dash of Arabic, more or less corrupted in sound and sense.

On the contrary, the Tuaregs of the desert, who call themselves *Imushagh* or *Imuzagh*, *Imazighen*, although they have received the Mussulman religion, have kept their language remarkably free from Arabic. The largest vocabulary by far which has yet appeared, is in Dr. Barth's new volumes; in which we find a few words that are Arabic, especially the religious ones, as 'prayer' (thanksgiving?), *amud*, apparently from Arabic *hamd*, 'praise;' but their number is easily counted. When, by the zeal of the French officers already at work, a more complete acquaintance is obtained with this language of the desert, we shall be pretty well able to reconstitute the vocables of the ancient Libyan, now broken into *at least* five distinct languages—the Tamasheght (or language of the Imushagh), the Ghadamsi, that of the Beni-Menaser, the Shilha, and the Kabail.

We are already able to judge confidently concerning the ethnological relations of these languages; and, indeed, they serve to enlarge our view of the Syro-Arabian family. At no distant time, while linguists had learned to embrace under the name "Indo-European" languages so unlike as the Russian and the English, the family related to the Hebrew was restricted to a very few members. Hebrew itself stood at the head, as in its literature the most ancient; next Arabic, less ancient, but by far the most widely extended and ample: besides there were the Syriac and Chaldee, mere dialects of Hebrew; and the Gheez, or old Ethiopic, a language extremely similar. This nearly exhausted the enumeration, which scarcely included more than two languages. When Amharic, the principal language of modern Abyssinia, was first studied, there was great perplexity among leading authorities whether it deserved to be coupled with Arabic and Hebrew. The chief prejudice against it, we believe, arose from those peculiarities of its grammar which in-

duce what we call an inverted order of words in the sentence. In Hebrew, and also in Arabic, the ancient standard order was, verb + nom. + accus., "Creavit Deus cœlos ét terram;" to which is incident a certain rigid monotony. But when we consider how various is the power of transposition in the best-known Indo-European tongues,—German having less of this flexibility than Latin, English less than German, French less than English,—it cannot be admitted as any ground for refusing to a language admittance into the Hebrew group that it ever so much receded from Hebrew in this respect. The most superficial acquaintance with the (newer or older) Egyptian shows a tongue strikingly unlike Hebrew in its vocabulary, but singularly like in its first and second pronoun, and in its principles of grammar less different than the languages of Europe. Nearly the same general statement may be made concerning the language of the distant Galla, a people to the south of Abyssinia; and, as now appears beyond dispute, of all the Libyan languages. The Himyaritic tongue also within recent memory has been learned to have a vocabulary widely opposed to Arabic, and yet to be united to that language by close analogies. Such considerations induced that accurate and anxious ethnologist the late Dr. Prichard to invent the term *Hebræo-African*, which (as analogous to Indo-European) should embrace all the most distant languages of this group. Thus, as we say that German, Dutch, and Danish are all Teutonic (a word of far narrower extent than Indo-European), so we say the Pehlevi, the Punic, the Gheez are Syro-Arabian; and as French and Russian are both Indo-European, so the Punic, the Libyan, and the Amharic are all Hebræo-African.

The chief peculiarities, we suppose, in the Hebrew which strike an Englishman acquainted with the leading tongues of Europe, are, (1) the redundance of alphabetic consonants, and deficiency of vowels: (2) the absence of permanent coherence between the consonants of a root, and the systematic grammatical development of the vowels, which so greatly facilitates the omission of the shorter words in writing: (3) the system of "suffix pronouns," or fragmentary pronouns, which follow nouns, prepositions, or verbs, expressing generally what may be in Greek or Latin the oblique cases of the pronoun: (4) the absence of cases to nouns, just as in English and in all the modern representatives of Latin: (5) the singular phenomenon called the *status constructus*, which unites two nouns into a sort of compound, as a substitute for the genitive case, nearly as though a Latin were to say *ventô-mare* for *ventus maris*: (6) the imperfect development of the relative pronoun, whence arise clumsy and obscure constructions, and a prevalent tendency to the *concaten-*

nation of clauses with the least possible *involution*: (7) the system of dependent or derived verbs, which supplies (and far more than supplies) the *voices* (active, passive, &c.) of our grammars: (8) the great deficiency of tense and mood to the verb, and the extreme difficulty of determining the *time* intended by the form which we call a tense: (9) the rare use of participles as such,—since in practice they chiefly seem to supply the defects of tense or of voice; while the absence of the infinitive is compensated by gerunds or nouns of action, sometimes in superfluous abundance: (10) the almost entire inability to produce *compound* words; since not only compound adjectives such as we are apt to call poetical are excluded, but even the union of preposition or adverb with the verb is inadmissible, as in *overstep, make up*: (11) the introduction of gender into the verb is a novelty which strikes the more from the absence of cases and of the neuter gender. Nearly all the same details characterise the Arabic; but in its ancient form certain cases were imperfectly developed in the noun, and its modern dialects have constructed compound tenses and have more closely defined the time to be understood. They also tend perpetually more and more to expel the *status constructus*, having generally invented some (more or less clumsy) substitute for a genitive case, or rather for our particle *of*. Finally, the Arabic in particular distresses a learner by the very strange irregularities in the plurals of nouns; every plural being in strictness a derived *noun of multitude*.

In regard to the sounds of these tongues, it is strange to a European to find how consonants are estimated. When two vowels are written together, as in *diet, real*, it never occurs to us that we pronounce any consonant between them; but the necessary hiatus which we leave is counted as a consonant, and is written down, by a Hebrew or Arab as though of equal importance with *h* or *w*. This is the *spiritus lenis* of the Greek grammars; though in Greek it is omitted in the middle of a word, where alone it might seem of any significance. It is the *alef, elif, or hamza*. Sound the same much rougher, as a stuttering jerk of the throat superadded to a vowel, and you have the *ain* of these languages. It is most easily imagined between two vowels, as in *Na'omi, Cana'an*. The aspirates *elif, ain*, soft *h*, strong *h*, all degenerated (in the Greek alphabet) into pure vowels. At the same time, the letters *t, k, s* in Hebrew, and besides these, *d, z* in Arabic, have a double pronunciation (thin and thick), constituting pairs of letters which differ as entirely as our *p* and *b*, and do not so easily pass into one another for euphony as the *tenuis* and *media* of our grammars. When to this we add, that the two languages have also (the so-called) aspirates of England, Germany, and Holland, which we write

th (*dh*), *ch*, *gh*, *sh* or *sch*, *j* or *dsch*, the amplitude of their consonantal system will be confessed.

Yet the roughness of sound is certainly lessened by the essential separability of consonants, to which we adverted as a second peculiarity. Three consonants (in pure classical pronunciation) never come together, nor two at the beginning of a word. A full-bred Arab cannot be got to pronounce *Frank* or *Frangi*: with him it becomes either *Afrenge* or *Feringi*; and in every root the consonants are liable to fall apart by grammatical combination, as in this word the *f* and *r*. In Greek or Latin such a root as *arcto-s* is possible, and when it occurs, the *ret*, found together in the root, remain together inseparably in all the derivatives; but the opposite principle prevails in the Syro-Arabian tongues, where vowels are ever intruding to separate the consonants, which are therefore regarded as fulcra from which the vowels hang.

We proceed to state how far the Libyan tongues share the peculiarities we have recited. The sounds of the alphabet agree more closely with Hebrew than with Arabic, and *so do the laws of euphony*. To this interesting circumstance attention was drawn by Mr. Newman, in his article of 1836; but it remained wholly unconfirmed by French writers until now. In Captain Hano-teau's Grammar the facts are now established beyond a doubt; though the Zouave sounds differ a little from those of the Buji dialect, on which Mr. Newman founded his remark. Only one letter is cardinal to the Kabail which is not found in Hebrew, viz. a thick or lisping *t*, which strangers mistake for *ts*. Yet this is a single letter;* the Arabic *t* degenerates into it; and it is remarkable that the Galla has a similar lisping *t*, for which Karl Tutschek has adopted (in Roman characters) a single symbol. (It does not represent the Hebrew *tsaddi*, of which the double *z* of the Libyan is probably the analogue.) But here we alight on the remarkable fact, that this lisping *t* vanishes in the language of the Imushagh, and *also* in their Tifinagh characters. Must we infer that the characters were not invented for the Kabail population, which stood in closer contact with the Carthaginians, but for the sons of the Great Desert peculiarly?

The reader may perhaps take interest in seeing the parallel of the Tifinagh and Hebrew alphabet. We set apart nine letters, as apparently later modifications, for the convenience of writing words introduced from Arabic.

* In the Bible-Society Ms. Sidi Hamet denoted this *t* by a new symbol, which added the two dots of the Arabic *t* to the shape of the Arabic *s*. He also invented a special symbol for the consonant which vacillates from *θ* to our *t*; but his countrymen, it seems, turn away with disdain from these, as if Christian innovations. The French Dictionary of Brosselard, in which Hamet bore an important part, employs Arabic *t* for the lisping *t*, and Arabic *θ* for the *θ-t* sound, which has for analogue the Hebrew *ṯ*, *tau* or *thau*.

Hebrew.	Tifinagh.	Name.	Power.	Hebrew.	Tifinagh.	Name.	Power.
א	•	(alef)		ל		yal	l
ב	θ	yab	b	מ	⌋	yam	m
ג	χ	yeg	j	נ	—	yan	n
ד	⌋⌋⌋	yed	d	ס	⊙	yes	s
ה	⋮ ⋮⋮	yah	h	ע	⋮⋮	(ain)	'
ו	:	yan	w, u	פ	⌋⌋⌋⌋	yaf	f
ז	✕ ✕	yez	z	צ	⌋⌋	yez	z
ח	⋮⋮	yah	h, χ?	ק	⋮⋮	{yah yagh}	{k gh}
ט	⌋⌋	yaf	t	ר	□ ○	yar	r
י	γ	yi?	y, i	ש	⊙	yesh	sh
כ	⋮⋮	yak	k	ת	+	yed	t

Here are three strong letters, which we write *h t z*, answering to צטה; but the fourth, *k*, which corresponds to ק, is written (by El Ouzzani) exactly as the *gh*. And it would seem that the distinction is only euphonic, especially since Hanoteau attests that the doubling of *gh* always produces *kk*. Yet Ben Bou Beker gives a special symbol for ק, which perhaps is added to express Arabic words. M. Schousboe gives that symbol for *ghain* which they appropriate for *ain*. We have to add:

ע	ع	⋮	ain	ح	⋮⋮	yah	ص	⊙	yas
	غ	⋮⋮	ghain	خ	⋮⋮	yakh	ض	⌋	yad
ק	ق	⋮⋮⋮	qof	ك	⋮	(Schousboe) (gaf)	ظ	⌋	


The language of the Imushagh ignores not only the *lisping t*, but the aspirates of *t* and *d*, which in the mountaineer Kabail, as in Hebrew, are so prevalent. A word more on this may be in place. The Hebrew grammars teach that ט and ת, that is, *d* and *t* (for we will not speak of the other mutes), are ordinarily

aspirates (*dh*, *th*), as modern Greek δ , θ ; but the moment they are doubled, they necessarily drop the aspiration. The same law of euphony is found in Kabail, but not in Arabic. In close analogy to this is the Kabail practice of changing double *ghain* into double *qof*.* These laws of euphony denote in very early times (as also does the alphabet) a nearer relation of the Libyan to the Hebrew than to the Arabic.

From the consonantal sounds we proceed to the character of the roots. It is known that the mass of the roots in the Syro-Arabian tongues are *trilateral*, or marked by three strong consonants, which never permanently cohere. Yet it was early remarked, that a large part of these was formed out of simpler *biliteral* roots, which pointed at a more primitive state of the languages. The Libyan roots, like those of Coptic, are prevailing *biliteral*, often monosyllabic. Examples are—*af*, 'find;' *as*, 'come;' *sel*, 'hear;' *mel*, 'tell;' *etsh* (*etk* in Imushagh), 'eat;' *inig*, 'travel;' *afeg*, 'fly;' *azzel*, 'run;' *ughal*, 'return,' &c. It will be seen that in these imperatives the vowels have no one law. The consonants are liable to fall apart (as from *emger* comes *megger*; from *eflu*, *fellu*) by the processes of conjugating.

The method of suffix pronouns is as systematic in the Libyan as in the Syro-Arabian. The chief pronouns are still more like to the Coptic than to the Arabic; and some of the suffixes are *less* mutilated, and evidently older, in the Libyan than in Hebrew or Arabic. Thus the suffix pronoun *us* is in the two last expressed by *na*, in Libyan by *nagh*, which comes nearer to the isolated pronoun *we*, which is *nahne* in Arabic, *nukni* in Libyan; the oldest forms probably being *nakhni*, and suffix *nakh*. Gender is marked by the Libyan in the pronouns of all three persons; by the Syro-Arabian only in the second and third persons. Nor is this all. Instead of a single set of suffix pronouns, as in the Syro-Arabian, we find in the Libyan more than two sets, nearly expressing the distinction of our accusative and dative; and altogether, in the whole pronominal system (taking that phrase in its widest conventional sense) the language is more delicately and fully developed than the Arabic, of which nevertheless it perpetually reminds us.

Cases to nouns cannot be said to exist in the Libyan. They have some very short and elegant prepositions; but these are in every grammatical sense still prepositions even when incorporated with a noun, and are not case-inflexions. As to the geni-

* The Zouave also supersedes *dd* by *tt*. This cannot be called a Kabail law, for the letter *d* seems to have no existence in Buji. The distinction is probably in all cases merely euphonic (as that of *n* and *ṣ* in Hebrew), and would be better denoted in Roman text by a single consonant variously marked than by types essentially different. In fact, *d* alone seems to suffice. That in Kabail *ḥ* and *d* are sometimes different in *meaning*, is carefully noticed by Hanoteau. 

tive, they have two modes, of which one allies them to the Hebrew, the other to the Coptic. The former consists in using the oldest and simplest* demonstrative (comparable to Homer's $\acute{o} \eta \tau\acute{o}$) as the instrument or copula of the *status constructus*; by the effect of which the definite article degenerates into the particle *of*, and makes an equivalent to our genitive. We stated above, that the modern Arabic dialects develop clumsy substitutes of another kind for *of*. But here the remarkable thing is, that the proper Libyan element for the same (viz. *n* or *en*) is not newly invented, but is of extreme antiquity, being not only Coptic, but also found in Haussa, a negro language, which has nothing in common with the Libyan but certain pronouns and prepositions.

The relative and interrogative pronouns have all a perfect development in Libyan, and are susceptible of taking prepositions, which then become postpositions, in a very elegant way. Thus in Shilha, from *elli*, 'which,' *ellif*, 'upon which,' *ellis*, 'by which;' *ma*, 'what?' *mas*, 'by what?' And the principle holds in Zouave, as may be seen in *ais*, 'by what?' *aghef*, 'upon what?' *wi*, 'who?' *wighour*, 'to whom?' (*apud quem?*) Also in Tama-sheght. There is likewise a great abundance of those relative adverbs which we often name conjunctions.

Hence one might perhaps expect somewhat more of *involution* in the sentences than in Hebrew. In fact, the relative has a peculiar tendency to attach itself to the participle; nearly, if we rightly remember, as in Amharic, and in Sir H. Rawlinson's translations of the old Persian, which remind one of German or even of Greek. If we merge the distinction of article and relative, the order of the Greek words $\acute{o} \upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o} \pi\omicron\iota\acute{\omega}\nu$ is the standard one with all the Libyan languages. The relative, and the interrogative also, has an inverting power on all the suffix pronouns, causing them to precede instead of following the verb. Nevertheless (perhaps because their style and taste is formed on the Arabic) the structure of sentences is the concatenated and stiff.

There is a system of derived verbs in close analogy with, though differing from, the forms of the Syro-Arabian. When the sound is nearly the same, the sense is nevertheless different. A set of forms, which in Brosselard's Dictionary† is treated as equivalent to our *present* tense, is in Hanoteau explained to mean

* It is *wa*, δ ; *tha*, *ta*, η ; or *awwa*, *etta*. The *w* is liable to pass euphonicly into *g* or *b*. The *th* or *t*, as marking the feminine, is alike Coptic and Syro-Arabian.

† To an ethnologist or etymologist this beautifully printed empty-paged volume is very disappointing. By far the greater number of words given as Kabail are mere Arabic under slight disguise. Even as to vocabulary, a page of Hanoteau's grammar is worth ten of the dictionary.

habitual action, expressing what is called imperfect in Latin and Greek, but being indifferently (it seems) present imperfect, præter imperfect, or future imperfect. This set of forms sometimes imitates the *second* of the Arabs (especially in conjugating triliteral Arabic verbs), sometimes is like the *fifth*; yet in both cases with a new sense. The passive voice is, as in Syro-Arabian, one or two of these derived forms, and the causative is in great use. This is like other Hebræo-African tongues.

The primitive tense is used as vaguely as in Hebrew and Arabic; and the mode of conjugating it is so close in sound to modern Arabic, as to seem but a dialect of it. The participles have little use as such; they generally supply verbal tenses; yet they are rather numerous, especially (it would seem) in the Ghadamsi. Gerunds, or nouns of action, are as profuse as in the Syro-Arabian, and very like in form. The plurals of nouns are almost as irregular as in Arabic. There is also the same inability to compound words, and the same introduction of gender into the verb. In consequence of these close and numerous analogies, it is extremely easy to translate (as we have read somewhere, perhaps in the Baron de Slane) from Arabic into Kabail, and conversely.

We are now necessarily led to contemplate a time at which the Hebræo-African family was already separated by a wide chasm from the Indo-Persian and Indo-Tartar, but had not yet developed the peculiarities which so deeply separate Arabic, Libyan, Amharic, and (we suppose we may add) Assyrian, Egyptian. This carries us back to a time when the now existing vocabularies were unformed or in mere embryo, only the *pronouns* and the *principles* and a sprinkling of elementary words having withstood the wear and tear of time. At that period, what are we to say of the relation of the Libyan to the central negro languages? Without getting out of our depth in a vast and new inquiry, we may remark, that though the Haussa language is emphatically negro, and has been selected by Mr. Schön and other missionaries as the best suited for wide currency among the negro nations, yet its whole system of (demonstrative and relative) pronouns is so strikingly Libyan, as to mark some early historical union. Not only all the material of the tongue, but all the principles, have been recast since the time when Libyans and negroes learned their pronouns in a common school. Such is the vast sweep of past existence for the human race, through which we are taught by linguistic studies to look.

The inquiry has been started, whether Africa or Asia ought to be regarded as the centre out of which the Hebræo-African family developed itself. The popular assumption is, that as of *course* every thing human has come out of Asia, therefore all

early movements of population were from Asia. But this is no valid presumption at all, except on the very superficial hypothesis that human nations all sprang from three men and three women less than four thousand years ago; an hypothesis opposed to every known fact of extreme antiquity and to all the evidence of language. We now see Europe pouring itself into Asia. Tartary has, ten times over, flowed into Persia, India, and China; yet Europeans and Tartars came (we suppose) out of Persia, and Mongolians out of China. If we are to believe (what is far less evident) that the primitive Hebræo-African family is an offshoot from Persia, the *primâ-facie* evidence would be that the Syro-Arabians are the rear of the emigration left behind after its peculiarities had fixed themselves unchangeably in the race. But those to whom a manifold local origin of human races appears more reasonable, and who believe Creative Power to have displayed itself independently in the man of China, the man of Persia, and the man of Africa, will perhaps of necessity regard the Syro-Arabians as an early efflux from Africa. The chief embarrassment of every such hypothesis is the impossibility of determining (in our present knowledge, if ever at all) how many primitive centres of population are recognisable. But the advocates of a single centre must not triumph in that embarrassment; for it is equally felt in regard to many other widely diffused creatures,—dogs, poultry, horses, cows, parrots,—which no one supposes to have sprung from a single centre.

We return to Captain Hanoteau's Grammar for remarks in detail. His direct object being exclusively practical, he declines assisting us in etymologies of merely speculative interest; although much evidence of learning and insight underlies his remarks. His belief is, that each separate language must be practically won in its details before we can embrace the whole; and this is true as to complete and irreversible knowledge. Yet meanwhile, if glimpses of general views open upon us, they are the fit solace for the toil of learning, and are not to be despised for incompleteness.

The pronominal systems of the Libyan languages are the centre of their chief interest; for it is here that they are in contact with Hebrew, with Egyptian, and with Haussa: here it is that they are most strongly contrasted with one another; for it is chiefly the difference as to demonstratives and relatives and all the particles thence originated which makes the speech of the Tuareg, of Ghadames, of the Beni-Menasser, of the Shilha, of the Kabails mutually unintelligible: and finally, it is in the pronominal systems that these languages show so great richness and flexibility, and have the means of becoming fluent, various, and clear, whenever they receive cultivation. We have already

observed, that the pronouns suffix have a double development of case (for dative and accusative) where the Syro-Arabian has but one set of forms. The threefold demonstrative may now be suspected, from Hanoteau's statements, to have primitively referred, as the *hic, iste, ille* of the Latins, to the three personal pronouns, viz. (if we extract the elements) *agi* (*adi*, fem. *ati*), 'hic,' this of mine; *enni*, 'iste,' this of thine; *ahi*, 'ille,' that of his. Hanoteau does not lay this down; only of the adverbial additions *d* and *n* he informs us that *d* means *ici, là*, as in *celui-ci, là-bas*; and that *n* differs from it in pointing always to the second person.

"Le *n* séparable offre beaucoup d'analogie de signification avec le *d*. Il présente cette différence toutefois, qu'il ne s'applique qu'à la personne à qui l'on parle, et indique une idée de lieu attribuée exclusivement à cette personne.

L'emploi de cet *n* est beaucoup moins général que celui de *d*, qu'on retrouve dans tous les dialectes berbères. Le *n*, au contraire, paraît restreint à celui des Zouaoua. Peut-être est-il l'abréviation des adverbes *in, inna, dinna, 'là, là-bas'*" (p. 192; see also pp. 167, 168).

Hanoteau's own examples are not always perfectly consistent with this law; but this was only to be expected, when the law itself is confined to the Zouave dialect, and when we remember how often the *iste* of Latin drops its peculiarity. Yet when we observe that the French *voici* and *voilà* have also in the Zouave a threefold representation (*aθaia*, 'eccum!' *aθaien*, 'en istum!' *aθaθ*, 'ellum!'), we cannot doubt that there was once a triple demonstrative principle pervading the formations; and this is a new illustration that in these pronouns we have original materials of great antiquity, however much recast in more modern times. Hence, even when in sound they are most like Arabic, it becomes doubtful whether they are imported from that language.

The fundamental demonstrative (or article?), answering to *ὁ, ἡ, τὸ*, makes its plural by the simple change from *a* to *i*; sing. *wa, θa, ó, ἡ*, pl. *wi, θi, oi, ai*. On this Hanoteau has founded the interesting remark, that it explains the general tendency of nouns also to mark their singular by *a*, and especially their plural by *i*.

The two demonstratives, (*w*)*agi*, 'hic,' (*w*)*ahi*, 'ille,' of the Zouave appear in the Buji to be confounded into (*w*)*ayyi*, or (*w*)*aghi*; and Hanoteau himself often has *aia* where we expect *agi* or *ahi*. Perhaps, therefore, we do not yet know the number of separate forms. Besides these, we have *ad*, 'this;' *netta*, 'that.'

From *ad*, 'this' (which is common in Shilha), the Kabail has developed an *emphatic* case of the noun by a noteworthy process.

First, as in Hebrew and Arabic, the word *this* is used to supply the logical copula; as (1 Kings xviii. 39), "Jehovah, *hic* Deus," for "Jehovah *est* Deus." From the great familiarity of this, the particle *ad* (in Kabail *ad*) becomes the mark of the predicate, and consequently subserves also apposition, which is only indirect predication. Confusion arises from the fact, that the same particle (*ad*, δ) is also used for the preposition 'with' (which in Hanoteau is *id*), and indeed for the conjunction 'and.' Mr. Newman called attention to the strange analogy which this bears to the manifold use of the Hebrew אֶת (*eth*), not of very dissimilar sound. But Captain Hanoteau develops very new and singular limitations as to the use of *ad* or δ . First, as we have said, it marks the direct predicate. Next, if a noun is in apposition to another noun "which is *indeterminate* and is not in the genitive, dative, or ablative" (Hanoteau, p. 84), then, and then only, the second noun takes the sign *ad* or δ . Thus (in exact reverse of what might have been expected): "Vous avez *des* bœufs blancs; *Ghurëwen izgaren ðimellalen.*" [Strictly, "Apud vos boves albi."] But, "Vous avez *les* bœufs blancs; *Ghurewen izgaren imellalen.*" Perhaps so minute and arbitrary a distinction was not likely to exist in all the dialects. We observe on the surface of Hamet's version of Luke opposite phenomena: as, Luke iii. 1, "Philip his brother," is, *Failebis ðagmas*; and Luke iii. 19, "Herod the king," *Hairidus ðamaqrân*; where (since Philip and Herod are determinate) the δ is superfluous after them. But this is *Buji* dialect, not *Zouave*.

On another remarkable demonstrative particle Hanoteau has thrown light. It is *ayyi*, or *aia*, *ai* (this), which is used for strongly defined emphasis, which he renders by "*c'est . . . que.*" This pervades the *Buji* quite to redundancy. Thus "I am well pleased in thee" is (we suppose) "*farhagh s-ek*;" but "In thee am I well pleased" is not "*S-ek farhagh*," as might have been expected, but (Luke iii. 21) "*Ayya-ssek ay-farhagh*," where the reduplication of *ay* almost implies a response of relative to demonstrative ("It is in thee that I am well pleased"), which seems to be Hanoteau's view. From "*Yusa-d idelli*, Il est venu (ici) hier," comes *Idelli ai-d yusa*, (rendered by him) "*C'est hier qu'il est venu.*" But we hesitate to assent when Hanoteau adds to "the confirmative particles" *ai* and δ a third, viz. *r'a* (as he writes it), intending the sound *gha*. His own examples appear to show that his *r'a* ("quelque fois par euphonie *ar'a*"), which he says confirms the future tense, is (as the *ar* of the *Buji*) only the peculiar future, which the Latins render by *-urus est* or *debet*. Thus from *azekka*, 'to-morrow,' and root *as*, 'come' (*as-ad*, 'come hither'), we have *yusa-d*, 'he came (comes) hither,' and *azekka ara-d-yas*, 'Cras huc venturus est,' Hanoteau trans-

lates this "*C'est demain qu'il viendra;*" but there is no particle to confirm *azekka*. When he adds, "*r'a s'emploie exclusivement avec les verbes,*" he almost confesses what is to us clear, that it is a mere tense-mark. In p. 83, he translates "*Nek r'a θen in'r'en,*" "*C'est moi devant tuer eux;*" his *devant* gives the clue to the true translation, "*Ego eos occisurus (sum).*" To this indeed he himself gives clear assent in p. 159, where he has "*r'a in'r'en, devant tuer, de r'a iner', il tuera.*"

· Touching these participles (formed by adding *-en* or *-in* to the root, and generally prefixing *i* or *y*), we must not omit to add a singular circumstance, now for the first time confirmed. Mr. Newman, in alleging it on the evidence of Hamet's version of the gospels, expressed himself as hardly able to believe his own analysis: namely, when the participle is preceded by the particle *ur* (not), the termination *-en* changes into a prefix *n*. This is distinctly laid down as the law by Hanoteau, who exemplifies it by: "*Anwa ikshemen? quis intrans?*" (i. e. "who has gone in?") "*Anwa ur nekshim? quis non intrans?*" where the participle abruptly changes its form from *ikshemen* to *nekshim*, by the influence of the negative particle *ur*.

The Kabail participle, according to Hanoteau, has no variation with gender or number; and in this he finds a most cardinal contrast to the Tamasheght, which has a participle declinable in these respects. We cannot doubt that, as a general fact concerning the Kabail, his statement is correct; but we find nothing cardinally distinctive here, for the Kabail *exceptionally* does vary the participle with gender. Thus, in Luke i. 7, "(Elizabeth) was barren," is rendered by Hamet, "*ur ettarawant*" (from *irwa*, 'genuit,' *irwan*, 'gignens'), where *ur nirwa*, 'non gignens,' might have been expected. Again, Luke i. 27, "Ghur 'adra *θughat* iwegaz," stands for "ad virginem sumtam viro" (to a virgin betrothed unto a man); where *θughat*, 'sumta,' from *yugha* 'sumsit,' has exactly the form of the feminine participle defined by Hanoteau for the Tamasheght.

Hanoteau also makes the curious revelation of a class of defective verbs (chiefly verbs of colour and of state) which seem scarcely to pass beyond the character of adjectives. They are without prefixes, and look as if always of the third person. Verbs of colour are also a class by themselves in Arabic; so indeed are the adjectives of colour; but with no further analogy to these Libyan defectives.

In general, every derived form of the verb has its own tenses and its own participles, formed by the very same law. Hanoteau recognises two participles only, which he names present and future; as, from the verb *illa* (it was), *illan* (being), *r'a yilin*, or *arayilin* in Buji (about to be). We seem to find other parti-

ciples besides in Buji; for Hamet has *adlalen*, Luke i. 31 (paritura); *addihulan*, Luke i. 35 (pariendum), from *ilul*, Matt. ii. 4 (natum est): also *ilulan*, Matt. ii. 2, Gen. xvii. 27 (natus); *ar nattil*, John iii. 5 (non natus); *araddihulan*, Matt. i. 20 (debens nasci). That form of the verb which Hanoteau calls "forme d'habitude," but which is regarded as a present tense in Brosse-lard's Dictionary, nevertheless does *not* seem (in Hanoteau) to form a participle, nor yet any future by prefix *ad* or *ara* (*ar'a*). This seems to us a reason for treating it as a peculiar *tense* of each verb (whether we are to call it present, or imperfect, or tense of habitude, is a separate question); and we incline to say, that the distinctive "conjugation" (in the sense of the Latin grammar) ought here to be estimated by the mode of forming this particular tense. Then the derived forms will remain, as in Syro-Arabian, analogous to the 'voices' of Greek and Latin.

Hanoteau writes positively of these derived forms: "Toutes ces formes dérivées se retrouvent chez les Touareg avec de légères modifications dans les signes. . . . J'ai de plus constaté dans ce dialecte une forme qui ne paraît plus exister en Kabyle: elle a pour signe *t* affixé, et indique l'idée de devenir: par exemple, *erzer*', 'être riche; *erzer'et*, 'devenir riche.' The identity of the derived forms in general is a strong mark how late (comparatively) must have been the divergence of the Libyan dialects into distinct languages.

We have said that Captain Hanoteau's plan forbade his dealing with any etymology that went beyond the language itself; but we cannot refrain from a few remarks which have an ethnological direction. The celebrated laws of Grimm concerning the changes of consonants in passing from one Indo-European tongue to another, give us to expect some analogous changes between every group of languages similarly related. Dr. Schott discovered fixed laws of mutation between the consonants of the languages of High Asia,—the Turkish, the Mongolian, the Tungusian. We are therefore prepared to expect that the Libyan tongues shall have a part of their old vocabulary in common with Arabic or Hebrew, but that in this common part certain tendencies of change will be discovered. We dare not pretend yet to have the means of distinguishing with certainty *old* imported Arabic from primitive Libyan; yet it is possible that this very study of the laws of mutation may aid to the distinction. Thus, sometimes we see the double *h* of the Arabs retained in Kabail, as in *yakma*, 'it is hot,' from Arabic root *ham*. This is undoubtedly imported, and is not used by the Tuaregs. On the other hand, in many roots the Arabic *h* is replaced by *w*, *k*, or *g*. Thus, to the Arabic root *hanu* corresponds Kab. *eknu* (ployer); to the Arabic *rahel*

corresponds *erwel* (fuir), *reggul* (fuir habituellement); where the *h* is evaded by change first into *w*, and next into *g*. In the first instance, we may see in such changes the indications of older and newer importations from Arabic (as in English we have *comply* and *complicate*, older and newer from Latin, and a hundred others); but what at first appears an old importation, may prove to be the primitive Libyan. Examine the relation of the word *ergigi* (trembler) to the Hebrew root *רע* (which is discerned by analysis of several Hebrew trilateral verbs); evidently the Libyan pure *g* here supplants the Hebrew *ain*. Yet Hanoteau gives us simultaneously the verb *ra'ia'sh* (trembler), or *רעעש*, which is more like to an imported root.

But, in truth, hitherto the spellings presented to us are very wayward. In many words the Arabic *b* is changed into *w* or *u* (which perhaps is what led Venture to think *b* was not a native sound); and, on the other side, the Arabic *w* is changed into *b*, as in *kebbi*, 'to be stout;' evidently Ar. *kawwi*. We may here throw together a few examples of the Libyan and Arabic or Hebrew, where they are alike but not identical.

ARABIC.	KABAIL.
ḥarek (burn)	ergh, <i>pres.</i> rekk.
ḥaṭaf (seize)	eṭṭef.
ḥareṭ, &c. (plough)	ekrez, <i>pres.</i> kerrez (Greek χαράγ).
beket (strike: Goliath)	aweṭ, <i>pres.</i> ekkaṭ.
kari, קר (read, call)	ghar, <i>pres.</i> ekkar.
Heb. נק נכה (smite)	ingha (he killed).
'ajel (hurry)	azzel (run, hasten).
beda' (split, divide)	ebdu.
lebes (dress, clothe)	els.
rebb, רבב (increase, &c.)	erwu, <i>pres.</i> rebbu (satiare), reggu [in Bross].
'aṭas (sneeze)	eḡs, eṭs (laugh).
kharej (come out)	irej, ireg [Buji].
jedd (value)	{ agla, aila, ila (property); sometimes agda, ajda in Buji, if the Bible-Society Ms. is right.
Heb. טדד—Tamash. <i>gudei</i> —('praise [God]')	

Sometimes the deep *k* passes into *w*. 'The heart' in Arabic is *ḥalb*, in Heb. *lib* (the *k* vanishing?), in Libyan *uli*, pl. *ulawen*, which seems to give *ulaw* or *uliv* for the radicals. It is not too much to believe *uliv* identical with *lib* and *ḥalb*. The Libyan *awal* (a word, a discourse) seems to represent the קול (*kul*) of Hebrew and Arabic. Barth, indeed, gives as Tamashegt *takalt*, 'talk,' *assokel*, 'speech, idiom.' 'The face' in Libyan is *udem*, which must surely be identical with *hedem* (the front) of Hebrew

and Arabic. Indeed the Shilha (?) *akādīm* of Venture seems a mere adaptation of Arabic to the genius of Libyan grammar.

Sometimes the Libyan *k* itself changes into *w*, as in the root *ikhāl*, 'he turned' (returned), which is hard to separate from another root *iwalla*, 'he returned,' and perhaps is comparable to Heb. לו. On the other hand, in Shilha *wel* (a time or turn) represents the root *kel*, hidden in the Kabail *thikkelt*, of the same sense. We cannot doubt that there is a curious harvest* of etymology to be gathered in these realms.

Our limits warn us not to enlarge on this subject; and we must finally make some remarks on Captain Hanoteau's mode of writing the Libyan sounds in modified Roman characters.

In the abstract we warmly applaud the idea; but we cannot praise the details of his scheme. They rest on no general principle, nor yet can they lay claim to any practical convenience. In the above we have not followed his notation, except that we have (in quoting from him) written *r'a* (not *gha*) where the Tamashght and Buji and Shilha agree in *ra* or *ara*, which makes the sound *gha* appear to be a mere Zouave corruption. M. Hanoteau, in justifying his notation *r'* for *gh* (which would lead to a troublesome remodelling of proper names), with great simplicity assures us that the sound of the letter "est celui d'un *r* fortement grasseyé, et non celui du *g*." But who ever said it was a *g*? Of course, it is no more a *g* than the roughest German or Swiss *ch* in *auch* is a *k*. Each sound (like *r*) is vibratory; in consequence, many Northumbrians, Germans, and French corrupt *r* into an Arabic *ghain*. But the fact remains, that *ghain* is to *kha* precisely as *g* to *k*, as every *media* to its *tenuis*; and there is the same reason for writing the one by *gh*, as the other by *kh* or *ch*. M. Hanoteau retains *kh*; what does he gain by exploding *gh*? In fact, we doubt whether *r* is nearer to *gh* than to *kh*.

Then we object to his using the apostrophe to express very different modifications with *d*, *t*, *k*; for it aspirates *d*, but strengthens *t* and *k*: also, the addition of *h* with him aspirates *k* and *t*, but thickens *d*; hence it is difficult to remember his system. His *dh* is not in analogy to his *th*, nor his *d'* to his *t'* nor to his *r'*. Also the *ain*, which is very well expressed by an apostrophe, he renders by *á*, as if it could not be joined to other vowels than *a*. The letters which differ only by euphony are by him made wholly unlike in form; and the characteristic lisping *t* is written *ts*, as though it were two elements.

His preference of *ou* to *u* cannot be censured in a Frenchman, though we would rather adhere to Italian simplicity. So

* Some of the analogies try to seduce us beyond sobriety. Thus we have in Greek two roots for 'head,' viz. *kap* and *keph* (seen in *καπα*, *κεφαλη*); also in Libyan 'head' is either *akarrui* or *ikhf*, *ikhf*.

also we see no reason, with him, to explode the highly useful letters *y w*, especially the latter, which is often a radical consonant. In general, we desire (1) some *single* method to express the *strengthening* of a consonant; and know nothing better than the mathematical types $\dot{h} \dot{k} \dot{l} \dot{q} \dot{s} \dot{z}$,* for the zeros are not so easily mistaken for blots or unobserved as mere dots would be; and if dots are large enough to be seen clearly, they disgust every printer by the spotty effect. Accents, apostrophes, and italics are needed for widely different service. (2) We *acquiesce*, but unwillingly, in the use of *th, dh, kh, gh*, to express the aspirates $\theta \delta \chi \gamma$ of the modern Greeks; the Greek types would seem *far* better, if only the γ were not too like the Roman *y*. But we might use the old-fashioned type ζ for it. The Greek $\theta \delta \chi \zeta$, added to our alphabet, would be of great utility. *Ghain* is so common a sound, and so characteristic of the Libyan, that it demands a simple form. (3) There remains *sh* (French *ch*) to be provided for. Why not write *c* (a letter at present useless) for this sound? Lastly, *j* may be used either with its English or with its French force, as occasion may require.

It seems to be as yet undecided what place hard *g* bears in the Libyan languages. We do not yet believe that they have three independent sounds, *j* (English), *g* (hard), *gh*. The hard *g* appears to be euphonicly exchangeable sometimes with *j*, sometimes with *gh*. In the Tifinagh letters hard *g* is not acknowledged by either of the learned natives: it is only given by M. Schousboe, and its form seems to be a mere modification of *k*.

With regard to the lipping *t*, we think that Brosselard's Dictionary, in its adaptation of the Arabic alphabet, has shown the right use of the Roman. We ought to denote this characteristic letter by our simple *t*, and employ θ for the τ sound. That it is more essential, in Roman than in Arabic type, to distinguish the latter twofold sound, cannot be imagined; but if requisite, θ should receive some modifying mark, and our alphabet would be complete. But it would be understood, without any mark, that $\theta\theta$ is to be pronounced as our *tt*, and $n\theta$ as our *nt*.

To adapt systematically a Roman type for extra-European languages would not only add great facilities to comparative grammar and ethnological linguistry, but would be of service to

* Hanoteau and De Slane give us in some purely Libyan words the mysterious combination $z\zeta$ (as $ez\zeta u$, 'to plant'). The ζ is meant for Arabic *ssad*. Hanoteau has also $ezzu$, 'griller'; so that $z\zeta$ is essentially different from zz . We presume that $z\zeta$ is the \ddot{z} of the Tifinagh, and is the Libyan representative of \mathfrak{Z} and of *ssad*. We should propose to denote it by ζ . Hamet, in the Gospels, uses the soft zz of the Arabs, and not any of their thick sounds, for this peculiar consonant.

Ambiguities so strange as *hammil* (to love) and *hammû* (to pour in torrents) ought not to make us suspect that there remain still more sounds than we know; but rather, that in one or other word the \dot{h} is corruptly written for *h* or for *kh* or for *ain*.

us politically in India, religiously in every missionary station. The missionaries have already done much in this direction; politicians have done nothing. May we think it possible that France will effect in Algeria what England has so long failed to do in India? If Captain Hanoteau's Roman notation were on a par with the substantial merit of his grammar, we should hope for this result; but as it is, we do not know how to expect or to wish that his mode of writing should be generally adopted.

If our Indian authorities would earnestly take in hand this matter, we believe they would find great advantage, and need encounter no difficulty. Let them appoint a committee of three to report on the best mode of adapting the Roman alphabet to the Indian languages. Let the committee consist of one printer, one person acquainted with several Indian languages, and one English man of letters. Having settled the alphabet, let them request every Indian railway-board to set up every notice at every station in a twofold type, *first* in the Indian, *next* in the Roman. Let them set the example in all government proclamations, using one method from end to end of India. This would not only facilitate the learning of the Indian languages to every soldier and every railway-official, but it would facilitate to the natives the reading of English. And small as this matter seems, its results may be great. Whoever learns by the Arabic type, is thrown into the channels of Arabic literature and religion. Whoever learns by a pure Indian type, is similarly in connection with Hindoo literature and religion. But to learn the Roman type is a first and great step towards the imbibing of European influences. And how small a fraction of the Indian population as yet have any knowledge of letters at all!

ART. IX.—CHARLES DICKENS.

Cheap Edition of the Works of Mr. Charles Dickens. The Pickwick Papers, Nicholas Nickleby, &c. London, 1857-8. Chapman and Hall.

It must give Mr. Dickens much pleasure to look at the collected series of his writings. He has told us of the beginnings of *Pickwick*. "I was," he relates in what is now the preface to that work, "a young man of three-and-twenty, when the present publishers, attracted by some pieces I was at that time writing in the *Morning Chronicle* newspaper (of which one series had lately been collected and published in two volumes, illustrated by my