

Werk

Titel: A grammar of the Berber language

Autor: Newmann, Francis W.

Ort: Bonn

Jahr: 1845

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?79912558X_0006 | LOG_0021

Kontakt/Contact

Digizeitschriften e.V.
SUB Göttingen
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1
37073 Göttingen

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

IV.

A grammar of the Berber language.

Introduction.

The materials from which the following Grammar has been composed, are, certain MSS in the possession of the British and Foreign Bible Society, which have been lent to me by the kindness of the Rev. Mr. Jowett, superintendent of their Library. They consist of translations of the four Gospels and of the book of Genesis into the Berber language; and I am enabled to give their history in the words of W. B. HODGSON, Esq., from whom they were purchased by the Society. In a communication which he has politely made to me (dated Sept. 10th 1844) he says:

„I superintended the translation, whilst residing at Algiers, from 1826 to 29, in the official capacity of United States Pro-Consul. The errors which you have detected in the published *) chapters of St. Luke, do not surprize me: I had indeed expected them to occur. My correspondence with Lord Teignmouth (or the Secretary of the British and Foreign Bible Society) expressly admits the probability. The Berber *Taleb* whom I employed, is alone responsible for his version. My care was, to see

*) The Bible Society published by way of specimen in the year 1833, the 12 first chapters of Luke; on which I wrote an Essay in the year 1836.

that he understood the Arabic original from which he translated: this, as you may suppose, he sometimes failed to do. It was a work of much patience and time, and it was executed with much secrecy, in the face of Moslem bigotry and Moslem suspicion."

The difficulties to be surmounted were no doubt great; and the need of secrecy perhaps enough to account for any amount of error. I hope it will be manifest that in here repeating that the faults of the MSS are of the most serious kind, I cannot have the most remote wish to lessen Mr. Hodgson's merit, to whom in fact I am indebted for every word which I know of the language. But it is necessary, in order to show the slippery nature of my materials, to say plainly that the Berber translator is often contented to write the grossest nonsense; not only in mystical and difficult passages, but in those of a common and easy character. Out of this in great measure arises the extreme difficulty which I encounter, in getting any fixed judgment concerning the tenses and voices of the Verb; while yet the variety of its forms impresses the mind with a belief that they were intended to express well defined distinctions. The writer is moreover apt to mislead us by his half knowledge as well as by his ignorance. For example; because in Arabic the sound of *l* in the article is often assimilated to a following consonant, (so that *aldunia* is written, with a „Teshdid“ to show that it is sounded *addunia*,) the translator does the same even in Berber verbs, writing *aldinna* for *addinna*, etc. etc. where *l* has no place at all. Only that it would be quite out of place here, far more startling absurdities might be produced out of the MSS than out of the published volume.

In fact, the twelve first Chapters of Luke, which were prepared for the press, and superintended in printing, by Mr. Hattersley, were also often corrected by him, and probably the worst errors removed. It should perhaps be added, that

the MSS which have been lent to me are not the originals, but the transcripts which Mr. Hattersley made. This is no loss to me; for I found upon trial that I could not read a word of the original; and nothing but long experience, or the greatest perseverance, can have enabled Mr. Hattersley to accomplish his task so successfully.

After I had reached a certain preliminary stage of knowledge, I became acquainted with the extracts from *VENTURE* published by L'ANGLÉS in his French translation of Hornemann's travels. They were of great use in confirming the correctness of my analysis, and especially in helping to fix the feminine form of the pronouns and verbs, in regard to which the MSS are very capricious: yet the notice of the verb in *Venture* is surprisingly meagre. Finally, perhaps I may be allowed to add, that it is the active zeal of my respected friend, Dr. J. C. PRICHARD, author of the *Physical History of Man*, which from the beginning incited me to this study. He has since not only supplied me with information and counsel, but by his approbation has encouraged me in a tedious and uncertain enterprise.

Postscript.

After the above was written and the Grammar in substance finished, I received by the kind interest of that well-known philologist M. D'AVÉZAC of Paris, two important books on the same subject. The former is the *Berber Grammar and Dictionary*, lately published by the Parisian Geographical Society; the latter, *Specimens of Berber dialogue, with a native Berber „poem“* or religious legend, published by M. DELAPORTE. I desire to make my public acknowledgments to all the parties concerned, for this unexpected and welcome courtesy. *Venture's* work has furnished me with numerous useful details, which were not to be found in the abstract made by L'anglés: yet so entirely had the latter

picked out the grammatical principles known to Venture, that I have gained no new light from it. It has however enabled me to introduce many additional illustrations, and I put forth the following pages with much more satisfaction for having made acquaintance with Venture's entire work. M. Delaporte's specimens refer, I suppose, to the Mogadore dialect of Berber. They are so diverse from Venture and from the Algiers MSS, that I have scarcely ventured to touch on them except in a short Appendix. *)

General remarks concerning the notation for consonants.

It is in the first instance needful to state, by what artifices the sounds of the language may be conveniently represented in European types: for which, it may be as well to enter into the subject from a more general point of view.

While it is more desirable than feasible, to obtain a practical agreement in this matter, yet any system of notation will be easily understood, if only it be founded on clear and accurate principles. In the languages which have hitherto attracted most attention from Europeans, our common consonants appear to undergo three chief modifications, *aspiration*, *softening*, and *thickening*. Now in order that every reader may quickly understand a new notation, it is essential that three general marks should be used to indicate each of these changes. What shall then be their form,

*) I have very often preferred to translate Berber words and phrases by help of the *Latin*, because that language has so much greater compactness, and allows of transpositions which make English unintelligible.

will remain as a question of some importance to the typesetter; and especially that errors of the press may be avoided: but, supposing the press perfect, the reader will have no difficulty in apprehending the system, provided that the signs used have not been anticipated in some other sense. On the last ground, I object to the use of our apostrophe (') for the Arabic ع, besides that we may often be glad to reserve the apostrophe for its legitimate use. So also, I have experienced the inconvenience of using *q* and Greek γ for the sounds of ق and غ, in that the typesetter constantly mistakes them for *g* and *y*, whatever care the writer may use. In our own tongues, a vicious habit has obtained of employing *h* to denote almost any modification of letters. The German *h* lengthens a preceding vowel; the French *h* softens *c* into a sort of *si* (*sch*); the Italian *h* hardens *c* and *g*; the English *h* gives a twofold aspiration to *t*, but softens *s*, etc. Such anomalies are the more vexatious, since we need the combinations *th*, *kh*, *sh* etc. etc. to express the sounds *t-h*, *k-h*, *s-h*, . . . in which each letter has its own force; combinations exceedingly common in some languages, and existing in very many. Rather than have recourse to so irregular and perplexing a method, I prefer any intelligible temporary substitute, (such as the use of Greek letters,) until suitable types be provided.

The following table may make the above clearer:

Primitive.	Aspirated.	Softened.	Thickened.	Hardened or Deepened.
<i>d</i>	ذ <i>d'</i> δ	ج <i>d'</i> <i>dj</i>	ص	<i>d'</i> or \bar{d}
<i>t</i>	ث <i>t'</i> θ	چ <i>t'</i> <i>tj</i>	ط	<i>t'</i> or \bar{t}
<i>g</i>	غ <i>g'</i> γ	ج <i>g'</i> <i>gj</i>	ق of Eastern Arabs	<i>g'</i> or \bar{g}
<i>k</i>	ك <i>k'</i> χ	ك <i>k'</i> <i>kj</i>	ق	<i>k'</i> or \bar{k}

Primitive.	Aspirated.	Softened.	Thickened.	Hardened or Deepened.
<i>b</i>	<i>b^h v</i>			
<i>p</i>	<i>p^h f</i>		ⲡ and Armenian <i>p</i> ?	
<i>z</i>		ⲓ <i>z̃ zj</i>	ⲓ	<i>z'</i> or <i>z̄</i>
<i>s</i>		ⲑ <i>s̃ sj</i>	ⲑ	<i>s'</i> or <i>s̄</i>
	ⲛ <i>a</i>		ⲛ	
	ⲏ <i>h</i>		ⲏ	<i>h'</i> or <i>h̄</i>

In some languages it may be requisite to make still nicer shades of distinction: the Armenian, for instance, has two kinds of thickened *k*, and the Amharic has a *t* (ⲧⲧ) which is *at once* softened and thickened. In the latter instance it would be easy to combine the two marks appropriate for each modification; and on the whole I believe that three marks would be sufficient for a great majority of languages. The Greek *γ* and *χ* are not so rough as ⲉ and Ⲉ, but I am not aware that in any language this distinction is significant.

I. In many publications the Greek rough breathing (Ⲁ) has been employed to denote aspiration, and as the only objection to it is that it is troublesome to write distinctly, I have here adopted it, except that it seemed useless to eject our own *f* in order to write *p^h*. — II. For the softened sounds I have used the mark (̃), which is borrowed from the Spanish or Portuguese *ñ*. I am forced to leave it to the decision of those who will kindly superintend the press, whether *d̃* (or *g̃*) shall be printed or *dj*, etc. though double letters appear to me very objectionable. Whether the sounds of ⲉ, ⲏ should be regarded as a modification of *d*, *t*, or of *g*, *h*, must depend on etymology; and in unknown languages the orthography will be uncertain.

In Arabic words these sounds are undoubtedly to be referred to *g* and *k*, but in Amharic (as the very alphabet of that language testifies) to *d* and *t*. The principle is seen in the Italian *gia*, *cio*, and in the English vulgar pronunciation of *modulate* and *nature* as *módjulate* and *nátjure*. As the letter *j* is not essential to our alphabet while we possess *y*, the former might be devoted (in defect of better types) to express the softening of other consonants. — III. The best uniform method of marking a thickened or hardened letter, is perhaps that which was proposed by an English clergyman of the last century for writing the Hebrew language; viz. an additional mark like the cross of a *t*. To write $\bar{k} \bar{d} \bar{t} \bar{s}$ is easy enough; and the only inconvenience is the fear lest \bar{h} (a crossed *h*) should be mistaken by the type setter for *tr*.

A type might easily be cut like *c* with a loop below, closely similar to the form of Arabic ε , but more according with the genius of square Roman letters. This appears to me desirable; but at present the mode of printing must be decided by the superintendent of the press.

Finally, let it be borne in mind, that we need not be anxious to distinguish *all* differences of sound, but those only which are significant. The French and English *T* have not precisely the same utterance, for the tongue in the former touches the teeth, in the latter the gums only; yet to distinguish them in writing would be a very superfluous trouble. The same (it would appear) may be said of the Arab ε ε as compared with the Greek γ χ ; of the Amharic Φ and Arab ف .

Respecting vowels nothing perhaps can be said generally, except that it is desirable to adhere to the German and Italian sounds of *a e i o u*, where there is no strong reason to the contrary; and this principle is now generally adopted by the missionaries in Africa and elsewhere.

*On the dialect of Venture's Dictionary, as compared
with the Algiers MSS.*

The differences to be discerned between these two sources of information are so great as fully to constitute dialectal variety. In Venture, it is true, there is a sedulous exclusion of mere Arabic words; and it may seem little to say that his dialect is less Arabized. In the Algiers MSS there is often a deplorable obtrusion of Arabic, which may be ascribed either to a long disuse of native Berber or to a desire to affect a more polished style. Beside this, the laws of euphony and syllabization are far more delicate and elaborate in the MSS than in Venture. This in part may merely show that the latter picked up his knowledge of the language by the ear, while the native translator has endeavored to represent a polite and correct enunciation. This is something, but not every thing. The letter *d'* which abounds in the MSS, is almost unknown to Venture. Hard *g* and *t* are with him as rare, as they are common in the MSS; but instead, he almost always writes *g'* and *d*. It would indeed appear that the difference of *d t g* from *d' t' g'* is in Berber very seldom significant. In the MSS certain euphonic laws are manifest even on superficial examination; viz. that at the beginning of syllables (and very often at the end also) *d' t'* are preferred to *d t*; while the double letters *dd, tt* uniformly take the place of *d' d', t' t'*.*) The same distinction is to be observed between *g* and *g'*,

*) The translator also with great regularity substitutes *nt* for *nt'*, *nn* for *d'n*. At the end of substantives Venture has sometimes *ts*, which is *t* in the MS; as *Tidits*, truth, = '*Tidal*. So the suffix pronoun for „Her“ is generally *ets* or *tes* in Venture, but *it* in the MS; and *Natta* (= *Nat'ta*) „He“ of the MS, is in Venture *Nit'sa*.

but not so fixedly. This being a Hebrew rule, can be no mere fancy on the part of the Berber translator. Occasionally I find *gḡ* in the MSS: sometimes the spelling is variable, as *Ṭagnaw*, or *Ṭaḡnaw*, heaven; *Agma* or *Aḡma*, a brother. In a few words the distinction of *g* and *ḡ* is significant; as *Igra*, he cast, *Iḡra*, he summoned; *Tamagra*, harvest, *Tamaḡra*, a feast. — Venture heard *b* in cases where the MSS knows only *w*. Thus he writes *Ta-bürt* for *Tawwart* (= ثَعْر?) a door or gate; *Yübi*, as well as *Yüwi*, he brought; and *bü* for *wü* or *awü* as a mark of the genitive in nouns. His native Berber vocabulary is often different from that of the MSS; but in nothing is this more marked than in the prepositions. This will be noticed in detail below. Sometimes the MSS has evidently a truer spelling, and purer forms. Thus Venture has „parle, *Imsiläi*, *Etimsiläi*,“ without *ḥ*; but in the MSS there is *Iluḥi*, effatus est; *Itlaḥi*, sermonem habuit; *Imlaḥi*, (mutuo) disputavit; which are manifestly of the same root, and show their genealogy from the Hebrew בָּרַח, Arab لَحَى; which could not have been discovered in Venture's forms. In the verb his total omission of the participle, (which I have persuaded myself plays so large a part in the Berber of the MSS,) is a very important point of difference; still more marked, as implying diversity of dialect, than his unacquaintance with the tenses formed by *ara*. I am somewhat struck to find this tense-mark in M. Delaporte's specimens, the dialect of which in general is so much more remote from the MSS than Venture's.

On the Sounds of the Berber.

The complete Berber Alphabet requires the three letters *t* *z* *g* to be added to the wellknown Arabic letters; but in the MSS before me the dot of *f* is placed *below* it, and

ف means \bar{k} and not f . Also ث (except now and then through carelessness) expresses g and not t ; while for t a new and rather cumbrous character is employed, which our printer perhaps cannot express. Soft \tilde{g} , \tilde{k} and \tilde{s} are rare in native words; so is ع. Indeed the ط and ص are as unknown to the Berber of the Algiers MSS, as to Hebrew; Venture also pronounces that they are foreign. Yet in M. Delaporte's specimens of Berber several mysterious characters occur, which are either these or express some unknown sounds. The g is found in various words degenerating into w or y , as in European tongues; also k and \tilde{k} into h .

In common with the Syro-Arabian tongues, the Berber disregards the distinction of consonants into *thin* and *full toned*, (as t and d , p and b , etc.) and permits consonants of opposite genius to exist in juxtaposition. Such cases as *Izgāran*, oxen; *Isġāran*, sticks; seem to prove that no assimilation of the adjacent consonants takes place. No linguist need wonder at this, who is aware that the English pronounce „obtain“ with b and t both distinct, saying neither *optain* nor *obdain*.

The language seems disposed to soften or omit several of the Arab aspirates. The following are instances of words in which this will be discerned, though it is by no means asserted that the Berber has in all cases come *recently* or *directly* from Arabic.

Ascendit <i>Yuli</i> على	Exiit <i>Irag</i> خرج	Ivit <i>Iddu</i> عدى (transivit)	Prehendit <i>Ilaf</i> خطف	Dixit <i>Inna</i> عنى (respondit)
Corrupit <i>Irab</i> خرب	Scivit <i>Ilam</i> علم	Profecto <i>Ilak</i> الحق	Porcus <i>Ilf</i> حلوفا according to Venture.	

The Arabic ج is generally retained; but in many words it

is replaced by غ, i. e. soft *g* by *ġ*. Thus *agzâr*, a butcher, becomes *agzâr*; *ligâm*, a bridle, *algâm*; *ġadi*, a kid, *igîd*. Arabic غ also is apt to become غ. Cases appear, which imply a deep and distant connection with Arabic; the more important for not being obvious. For instance:

	Voluit	Rettulit	Clausit
Berb.	<i>Ira</i>	<i>Irra</i>	<i>Irra</i>
Arab.	<i>Râd</i>	<i>Radd</i>	<i>Rudd</i> (according to Venture)

in which the final *d* of the Arabs seems to have been obliterated by the Berbers. — For the Arabic ص and ظ, in numerous words the Algiers MSS has ط, sometimes *t*. Occasional confusion seems to arise from this. There is *'tili*, shade (= ظلة), *'tili*, error, deceit, (compare ضل erravit):

Venture also gives *'tili*, a sheep (Bagdad Arab. ظلي a lamb): besides which, we have the undoubted Berber *tali* or *tili*, but; *'tala*, a spring of water; *'tawla*, a fever (a boiling?). — So there is *Azar*, a sinew, a vein; *Azar*, (= زرع?) a root, a stock, a race; *Azar*, see thou. The last verb is written by Delaporte with a new consonant, viz. ص with three dots above (compare Arab. نظى); so that there may seem to be a purer Berber pronunciation, which would discriminate such words. In the Algiers MSS, duplication of consonants is in the vast majority of instances a matter of mere euphony; yet there is *Uli*, a heart, and *Ulli*, sheep (collectively); and the verbs *Ili*, be thou, *Ini*, say thou, uniformly have a single consonant (*l* or *n*) in the Imperative and Present tense, but double it in the Aorist. The principles of syllabic euphony in the MSS are identical with those of Arabic.

The vowel system being precisely that of Arabic is probably defective in expressing short vowels. Not knowing the true sound of the Fatahh, Kesra and Dhamma in the separate words, I have written *a*, *i*, *u*, for them; and for

uniformity, in quoting Venture's words, (when nothing turned on the vowels) I have followed my own notation rather than his: yet, as he renders the Fatahh sometimes by *a*, sometimes by *e*, we need not doubt that it has two sounds.

The only peculiar diphthong is that which is written *يو* or *iw*, which at first I thought must needs be sounded *iv*; but I perceive that both Venture and Delaporte express it by *iou*, for which reason I now write *yù* for it, as if it were *يو*. In the MSS there is a very strong tendency to shorten *) all the Arabic vowels, and to give Fatahh an immense predominance over Kesrah and *Dhamma*. Whether the diphthongs *أى* and *أو* be written *ai au* or *ay aw* seems of little consequence.

On the vocabulary of the Berber language.

Although a certain number of the native roots have a more or less distant relation to Arabic, Hebrew, or perhaps the Ethiopian languages, there is no question that the great mass of the words is thoroughly peculiar. Moreover, every fresh accession to our knowledge of it shows how copious is the vocabulary, and makes it every way probable that the admixture of Arabic is not only not needful to it, but is hurtful, by displacing the native words and introducing confusion. Even from the Algiers MSS an idea may be gained of the copiousness of the tongue, although it is undoubtedly deficient in the shades of moral distinction, as well as (what might have been predicted) in political and ecclesiastical phraseology. A few examples will suffice.

*) Venture has „*Igil*, bras, '*Igil*, colline“; but I have never observed words with so minute a distinction of vowels.

<i>Inna</i> , dixit	<i>Inaggaz</i> }	culpavit, questus
<i>Ihḏar</i> , locutus est	<i>Irāb</i> }	est etc.
<i>Ihaddar</i> , compellavit	<i>Itrāb</i> }	
<i>Ikkar</i> , appellavit	<i>Isufur</i> , petivit, precatus est	
<i>Iḡra</i> , vocavit, cievit	<i>Izal</i> , a Deo precatus est	
<i>Iluḡi</i> , effatus est	<i>Isak̄si</i> , interrogavit	
<i>Itlaḡi</i> , sermonem habuit	<i>Iḥuf</i> , <i>Ithuf</i> , quaesivit	
<i>Imlaḡi</i> , disputavit	<i>Yūwi</i> , tulit, accepit	
<i>Iwakkid̄</i> , praecepit	<i>Yuḡa</i> , sumsit: <i>Ittaḡ</i> , emit	
<i>Inabbah</i> , { increpavit, fortiter	<i>Itaf</i> , cepit,prehendit	
<i>Ikaddam</i> , { iussit	<i>Ikmiš</i> (Vent.) vi prensavit	
<i>Isawal</i> , clamavit, nuntiavit	<i>Iḡas̄</i> , rapuit, vi corripuit	
<i>Ibarrah̄</i> , { magnā voce ex-		
<i>Itbarrah̄</i> , { clamavit		

Altogether I am very far from receiving the same impression as Venture, that the language is meagre and barbarous. It is, no doubt, in great need of cultivation; but it has materials which would repay the toil, and they seem at present to be in a highly plastic state. How pliable indeed is the language, will appear from one specimen. The familiar Arabic phrase *Dir bālak*, „turn thy attention“, which is vulgarly shortened into *Bālak*, to warn persons of danger, has generated the Berber imperative mood *Bālak*, „cave“, pl. *Balkat̄*, „cavete“, which is used in the translation of the SS. Whenever cultivated natives arise, they will fix the meaning of doubtful and shifting words; and among the first objects of care must be, to develop to the best advantage the secondary or derived forms of verbs, which are now to so great an extent rendered useless by employing each in the sense of the rest: as, when they may say distinctly, *Yuḡa*, sumsit, *Ittaḡa*, emit, *Issaḡa*, sumere fecit (?), all three are apt to be confounded. After this remark it may be needless to add that I do not pretend the translations to be rigidly necessary, in the list which has just been produced: all that can be said, is, that I have

determined the meaning of almost every word by a rather large induction, and have followed either the prevailing meaning or that which seemed to be specific.

The Berber, like Hebrew and Arabic, does not allow of verbs being compounded with prepositions. It is true, that the preposition *following* a verb often modifies the sense of the verb; but as it cannot be incorporated with the derivatives, much inconvenience results from any large use of this method. In fact we find the same verb (*Iḡḡa*) used for *omisit*, *remisit*, *permisit*, *condonavit*, *liquit*, *deseruit*: the same (*Īṣar*) is *secutus est*, *persecutus est*, *prosecutus est* etc.: the same (*Inabbah*) is found, rightly or wrongly, for *iussit*, *increpavit*, *clamavit*, *propheticum oraculum edidit*, and even *accusavit*. 'Tarbaḥ is employed for *secta*, *gens*, *disciplina*, *discipuli*, and even *plebs*, by the Berber translator: and after all allowance for his personal deficiencies, it appears certain that much is needed to give precision to the language, and especially to set up the shades of moral distinction between verbs. To confound *sequor* and *persequor* draws after it the absurdity that the same word is used for „followers“, i. e. approvers, and „persecutors“. In Venture I find the verb, „*Ikùkil*, il a chassé“: this perhaps might be used for „persecute“; and this is the best mode in which a foreigner can adapt the native verbs to moral senses: but all analogy leads to the belief that the derived forms of the verbs would give to a cultivated native ample facility for such purposes.

To flee to the Arabic for help is the refuge of idleness, and is very destructive to the language. In fact, it very often happens that the Arabic roots already exist in Berber; *but with a different sense*; hence to import them produces great confusion: not to speak of the necessary obliteration of the differences of ط ظ or ز, or again, in adapting the Arabic root to Berber use, two Arabic forms are perhaps inevitably confused; as *Salàm*, peace; *Sallam*,

he consigned. The following are instances of words actually found in the same MS; which will show how annoying is the intrusion of the Arabic.

Root	Arabic	Berber
سلم	Peace	Fish
سكن	Dwell	Show
شط	River	Abundance
حب	a Grain	Fruit
سهر	Nail	Pour
عبر	Cross over	Measure
صبح	Morning	It chanced
زيد	Surplus	Sin
برك	Bless	Black
اما	A maid-servant	A mother
(imma)		
صفا	Clear	Kinsfolk
جوز	Lawful	Pass, Enter etc.
خلق	Create	Grow
برا	Outside	Hide, Clothe
امن	Believe	Soul, Self
مرآ	A time	Entirely
ربع	Four	Division
طول	Length	Affinity
بدل	Change	Split

The want of the conjunction „And“ is in the Algiers MS the more annoying, since its substitute *Ad* or *D* not only means „With“, but is a sign of the Absolute case. I am however surprised to find in Venture how easily this is obviated by the use of *Ak*, *Akka*, *Uk* (so, also) for „and“, when occasion requires. Moreover, although the particles *Ma*, *Mad'a*, *Mad'ayalla*, *Mayalla*, have a most inconve-

nient latitude in the MS, (like the Hebrew כִּי,) there appears to be a great variety of words by which ambiguity may be avoided. Indeed the abundance of conjunctions indicates a state of language by no means barbarous; and a skilful use of them seems the chief desideratum.

In adjectives the language seems to be defective; but if I take a correct view of the participle, it may be so used as to compensate pretty well. Abstract nouns, which Venture declares to be wholly wanting, are found in such moderate plenty, as to inspire the belief that natives would find no difficulty in forming as many as they chose.

Pronouns.

The separable Pronouns of the Berber are as follows:

<i>Nakki</i> , I;	<i>Kat̃t̃i</i> , thou (m);	<i>Kammi</i> , thou (f);
<i>Nakni</i> , we;	<i>Kunwi</i> , ye (m);	<i>Kunamti</i> , ye (f);
<i>Natta</i> , he;	<i>Nattaf</i> , she;	
<i>Nuf̃ni</i> , they (m);	<i>Nuf̃anti</i> , they (f).	

Venture and Delaporte write *Nukni* (not *Nakni*) we; which is more analogical.

The MS shows great laxity in the use of feminine pronouns, and very often employs the masculines instead. Venture gives *Nukunti*, for „We“ in the feminine.

The separable Pronouns form a Dative and an Absolute case like common nouns, by prefixing *I* and *Ad̃*. Thus:

Inakki, to me: *Inakni*, to us: *Inatta*, to him: etc. etc.

Ad̃nakki, as for me, I — etc.: *Ad̃kunwi*, as for you, ye — etc.

In such expressions as, „It is I“, the Berber translator generally, but not always, adopts the formula „I am I“: and *ayad̃* then is the practical equivalent for the logical copula, as: *Nakki ayad̃nakki*.

It is impossible to overlook the likeness of *Nakki* to the Hebrew *Anoki* and of *Nakni* to the Arabic *Nahani*; but these forms are as much Egyptian as Syro-Arabian.

The Coptic has not only *Anok* or *Anôg* (I), but in the third person, *Nefof*, he, *Nefos*, she, *Nefôû*, they; which appear too similar to the Berber to be accidental. *Natta* itself is probably a euphonic softening of *Nat'fa*, whence pl. *Nufni*.

Instead of *Nakki*, we often find *Nakkini*, where much emphasis is sought after: so also in Venture, *Kat'tini* and *Kammini*.

As in Hebrew and Arabic, so in Berber, the prepositions, when unemphatic, often coalesce with some other word; in which case we call them *Affixed*. But in two respects the Berber has more variety than the other languages; *first*, in having distinctions closely resembling those of Dative and Accusative in common nouns; *secondly*, in prefixing as well as suffixing the fragmentary pronouns.

A table of the various forms will be of use.

Affixed Pronouns.

	1 st p. sing.	1 st p. pl.	2 nd p. s. m.	2 nd p. s. f.	2 nd p. pl. m.	2 nd p. pl. f.
Gen.	-yù -u	-nag ^ç -g ^ç ?	-ik -k	-im -m	-awan -wan	-awant -want
Dat.	-i -i	-ag ^ç -nag ^ç	-ak -k	-am -m	-awan -wan	-awant -kunt
Ac.	-i -i	-ag ^ç	-ik -k	-àm -kkam	-kun	
Pref.	Aya-		Akk-	Amm-	Awan-	
Dat.	Ay-	Ag-	Ak-	Am-	Awn-	
Pref.				Akim-	Akkun-	
Ac.	Ay-	Ag-		Akm-		

	3 rd p. s. m.	3 rd p. s. f.	3 rd p. pl. m.	3 rd p. pl. f.
Gen.	-is -s	-is -s	-san	-sant
Dat.	-as -s	-etset -as -s	-san	-sant
Ac.	-if -f	-it -ets -t -tes	-if an -f an	
Pref.			Asan-	Asant-
Dat.	As-		Asn-	
Pref.	Af-	At-?	Afan-	
Ac.	T-	Ats-	Afn-	

The Genitive is suffixed to *Nouns* in order to supply the possessive pronouns. If the noun ends in a vowel, the vowel of union (*i*) is not needed with the suffix.

Examples of the Genitive (or Possessive) Pronoun.

<i>Lahd'ir-yù</i> , sermo meus	<i>Ammi-k</i> , filius tuus
<i>Ass-yù</i> , dies meus	<i>Agma-k</i> , frater tuus
<i>Izamarn-yù</i> , oves meae	<i>Amdukkal-ik</i> , socius tuus
<i>Almut-yù</i> , mors mea	<i>Titt-ik</i> , oculus tuus
<i>Alnaema-u</i> , cibus meus	<i>Aabbut-im</i> , uterus tuus
<i>Agfa-sabba-u</i> , super causam mei, = propter me	<i>Aśfa-m</i> , affines tui
<i>Imanan-nag</i> , animae nostrae	<i>Bābat-wan</i> , pater vester
<i>Ammif-nag</i> , filius noster	<i>Ammif-wan</i> , filius vester
<i>Dalēali-g</i> , bonitas nostra	<i>Yils-is</i> , lingua eius
	<i>Bāba-s</i> , pater eius

<i>Ilkall-is</i> , (all of it)	<i>Imanan-san</i> , animae eorum
<i>Īarn-is</i> , pedes eius	<i>Bābat-san</i> , pater eorum
<i>Agma-s</i> , frater eius	<i>Allan-s</i> , oculi eius

The reflective pronoun is supplied by help of the word *Iman*, soul or self. Thus:

<i>Iman-yū</i> , myself	<i>Imanannag</i> , ourselves
<i>Iman-ik</i> , thyself (m)	<i>Imanansan</i> , themselves
etc.	etc.

A few nouns, when thus united to the heavier suffixes *nag*, *wan*, (*want*), *san*, (*sant*), assume *t* at their end. Especially *Bāba*, father, *Yamma*, *Imma*, mother, *Ammi*, son, *Agma*, brother, *Sid'i*, master (Lat. *herus*) become *Bābat*, *Yammāt*, *Ammit*, *Agmat*, *Sid'it*.

So also *Yalli*, daughter, must probably be changed to *Yallit*. This is (what is called in Hebrew) the Construct Form of the noun; yet if we judge by the words *Bāba* and *Sid'i*, it is not the original and purer form: for *Sid'i* is nothing but the Arabic for „My master“. We however probably infer that these heavier suffixes take the accent on the penultima, as, *Bābatnag*, *Yammāwan*.

The plural suffixes, to form the possessive pronoun, are very rare in direct conjunction with nouns. This has made it impossible to obtain an induction wide enough to account for the variety. *Dal'ali-g*, bonitas nostra; not *Dal'ali-nag*, nor *Dal'alitnag*. It may be conjectured that the difference is euphonic, and depends on the accented *à* in *Dal'ali*. In numerous other instances it is clear that the principle of euphony exerts great influence on the forms of words in the MSS.

For the plural possessives it is much commoner to use the Preposition *An* (of) with a suffix pronoun. Most Prepositions take the *dative* pronoun, but there is in this one a slight irregularity with the singulars.

<i>Anaw</i> , oftener <i>Inu</i> or <i>-nu</i> , mei	<i>Annag</i> , nostrum
---	------------------------

<i>Anak</i> , oftener <i>Inak</i> or <i>-nak</i> ,	<i>Anwan</i> , <i>vestrûm</i> (m)
tui (m)	
<i>Inam</i> , tui (f)	<i>Ankunt</i> *), <i>vestrûm</i> (f)
<i>Anas</i> , . . . <i>Inas</i> or <i>-nas</i> ,	<i>Ansan</i> , eorum
eius	<i>Ansant</i> , earum

Thus we find:

<i>Tafat' anwan</i> , lux <i>vestrûm</i>	<i>Battu anwan</i> , rectitudo <i>vestrûm</i>
<i>Wallan ansan</i> , oculi eorum	<i>Agrum annag'</i> , panis <i>nostrûm</i>
<i>Labg'i-nak</i> , voluntas tua	<i>Akli-nu</i> , servus meus.

Even with the singular pronouns the same mode of speech is probably destined finally to prevail. Venture represents it as the standard method. Thus (says he)

<i>Kitab inu</i> , liber meus	<i>Kitab inam</i> , liber tuus (f)
<i>Kitab inak</i> , liber tuus	<i>Kitab inas</i> , liber eius

The vowel of the preposition seems to have been shortened into *i* by quickness of pronunciation.

Against this may however be quoted the isolated use of *Inu* for *Mei*, *Meum*. Thus John 16, 15. *Ayanni illan am Bâba, natta inu*: Quodcunque est Patris, illud *meum*. Indeed Venture sometimes gives *In* for *An* before a common noun.

It may be suspected that nouns of recent introduction have less pliability in moulding their form into euphony with pronouns suffix; and that there is a class of words which refuse to part with any of their vowels or to shift their accent with a view to the union. Among the commonest of these are

<i>Labg'i</i> , voluntas,	<i>Wulli</i> , grex, pecus
<i>Azyad'a</i> , peccatum,	<i>Alçali</i> , bonum, bonitas;
<i>Algãsi</i> , plebs,	

which last however sometimes takes suffixes. Observe, that *Azyada* probably is accented on the antepenultima; while the rest end in *i* short.

*) *Annawant* (Vent.)

Occasionally the suffix *-i* is found instead of *-yù*; as, *Ammi*, filius meus, *Sayaltì*, postulatio mea: but this may be suspected as an inadvertent Arabism, many glaring cases of which appear in the MS. The same may be said of *kum* for *kun*.

Plural nouns often drop their last vowel, when they suffix a pronoun; as *Izamaran*, oves; *Izamarn-is*, oves eius, and the accent doubtless shifts to the penultima of the compound. But all depends on the form of the plural.

To give emphasis to the Genitive Pronoun, the isolated Pronoun is superadded. Thus *Annaçma-u nakki*, cibus-mei ego, for, meus cibus; John 4, 34. Whether this is an overslavish imitating of Arabic idiom by the translator, there are no means of determining.

Certain nouns of family relationship habitually superadd *-is* or *-s* by redundance, as, *Bâbas*, pater eius, *Ammis*, filius eius, before another genitive, where *Bâba*, *Ammi* would suffice. As this is no general law pervading the language, it may easily be exploded. It often produces ambiguity; and sometimes indeed is highly vexatious, since *Ammis Yuhana* may mean „Filius eius (et) Iohannes“, the connective being very often omitted.

Pronouns are often suffixed to particular adverbs or conjunctions, and to (what are called) pronoun adjectives under certain circumstances. The commonest cases are closely imitative of Arabic idiom. Especially the conjunction or adverb *Akla*, which is habitually used in the apodosis of a sentence, and which we are prone to render *Lo!* but which seems on the whole rather to be identified with the Arabic *Enna*, meaning That, Because, although it is used redundantly to mark the beginning of the apodosis. Thus we have:

<i>Akli</i> , quòd ego	as in Arabic, <i>Enni</i>
<i>Aklak</i> , quòd tu	<i>Ennak</i>
<i>Aklag</i> , quòd nos etc.	<i>Ennena</i> etc.

So from *Ulaš*, nihil, non, *Ulaš*i, *Ulaš*ak etc. as in Arabic *Māni*, *Mānak* etc. Again; the word *Wahad* is borrowed from Arabic to bear the sense of Alone*), and takes a suffix pronoun; as, *Wahadwan*, „yourselves apart“, as in Arabic, *Wāhadi*, I apart, *Wāhadak*, thou apart etc. It is worthy of remark that the modern Greeks use *μόνοι* *μας*, *μόνοι των*, etc. with the same idiom.

It is difficult to set the limits to this application of the suffixes. For instance, we find (Gen. 24, 23) *Takšif ansi-kkam*, *Filia cuius-tu?* (Or rather; *O puella, unde-tu?*) Here the termination *-kam* is slightly different in form from those given in the table; and the double *k* seems to show that *ansikkam* for *ānsi kāmī* is a mere result of quick pronunciation, when the accent shifts through the pronoun losing emphasis. In John 19, 9 we find the suffix followed by the emphatic pronoun: *Ansi-k kat'ti?* Unde (es) tu?

Pronouns with Prepositions.

As a general rule, the prepositions annex to themselves what in the Table is called the *dative* of the pronouns. Regular examples are the following. *Gur*, for: *Falla*, upon, against.

<i>Guri</i> , for me	<i>Falli</i> , upon me
<i>Gurak</i> , for thee (m)	<i>Fallak</i> , upon thee (m)
<i>Guram</i> , (f)	<i>Fallam</i> , (<i>Fallakim</i> , V) . . (f)
<i>Guras</i> , for him, her, it	<i>Fallas</i> , upon him, her, it
<i>Gurnag</i> , for us	<i>Fallanag</i> (once <i>Fallag</i>) upon us
<i>Gurwan</i> , for you (m)	<i>Fallawan</i> , upon you (m)

*) There is an obscurity about *Wahad* which illustrates the danger of importing Arabic words. It sometimes means *alone* and sometimes *in company*! Compare Latin „*unus*“ and „*unā*“.

<i>Gurkunt</i> , for you (f)	<i>Fallakunt</i> , upon you (f)
<i>Gursan</i> , for them (m)	<i>Fallasan</i> , upon them (m)
<i>Gursant</i> , *) (f)	<i>Fallasant</i> , (f).

It can hardly be doubted that the forms *wan*, *want* are mere degenerate sounds of *kun*, *kunt*. It will soon appear that *Winna*, *Tinna* (ille, illa) are *Kuni*, *Tuni* in the Galla tongue.

A slight irregularity in the preposition *An* (of) has been noticed. The preposition *Dag*, of or from, (Latin *de*) is also irregular, as follows.

<i>Adgi</i> , <i>Adzi</i> , de me	<i>Dagnag</i> , de nobis
<i>Dak</i> (for <i>Dagk</i>), de te (m)	<i>Dagwan</i> , de vobis (m)
<i>Adzam</i> , de te (f)	
<i>Dags</i> , de eo, eà	<i>Dagsan</i> , de iis (m).

In this place it may be convenient to give a list of the prepositions.

An, *N*, of. (Before Suffix, *In*, *An*).

Ad, *D*, with, together with. (. . . . *Did*). Venture says *Akid*.

As, *S*, in, with, by. (On Suffixes, see below.) In several adverbial demonstratives, *As* means „from“.

Ag, *G*, **) from, in, at. (Venture: *Ig*, *Gi*, in. On Suffixes, see below.)

Dag, *Dag*, **) from, through, in, concerning. (Venture: *Dig*, in.)

*) This preposition supplies the want of the verb *to Have*, even in constructions where this involves harshness. Thus:

<i>Winna guras t'imagriwin</i> ,	<i>natta d'isli</i> :
<i>Qui habet nuptias</i> ,	ille (est) sponsus.

**) To decide on the primitive meaning of these prepositions is very difficult: and the prevailing sense of *Ag* by no means seems so distinctly „in“, as Venture makes it. The extreme obscurity of the prepositions in Hausa is complained of by Mr. SCHÖN.

<i>Azzag</i> , out of, after. (Venture: <i>Zig</i> , from.)	
<i>Ar</i> , until, as far as. <i>Alamma</i> , until (not in Venture).	
<i>Gar</i> , <i>Gara</i> , between, among. <i>Aggaigar</i> , <i>Agguigar</i> , d°.	
<i>Gar</i> , for, to. (Before Suffix, <i>Gur</i> .) <i>Ag^{ra}</i> , into, unto.	
<i>Ag^{fa}</i> , <i>Gaf</i> , over, upon, because of.	
<i>As^gur</i> , from	<i>Amma</i> , according to, like
<i>Falla</i> , upon, against	<i>Azzat</i> , in front, before
<i>Annig</i> , above, more than	<i>Daffir</i> , after, behind
<i>Addaw</i> , under	<i>Ankal</i> , on account of (John
<i>Ad^{ur}</i> , around (Arabic?)	11, 51. 52)
<i>Ubdⁱⁿ</i> , instead of (Mat. 2, 22)	<i>Afla</i> , <i>Ambala</i> , without
<i>Az</i> (in compounds, seems to mean) at, or, in: a rare particle.	<i>Fihal</i> , <i>Atfihal</i> , without, besides
	<i>Ala</i> , <i>Alamayal</i> , except
	<i>Ifk</i> , (in Gen. 4, 25) instead of.

In the MSS *Azzat* and *Daffir* are used of time as well as place, though more rarely. In Venture (more correctly, as it may seem) *Azzat* is coram; *Daffir*, pone; *Nef* and *Tigurdin*, post, (words seemingly not used in the MSS) and for Ante, *Ig^zuwarnin* (= in antecedentibus?) from *Izwar*, antecessit. The word *Amazwar*, prior, primus, and *Tazwara*, initium, are sometimes used in the Algiers MSS for „Ante“. — Venture also has *Dar* or *Der*, apud.

I have recently discovered from a small work by the Rev. J. F. SchöN, on the *Haussa* language, that it has the prepositions *Na*, of; *Da*, with, and; *Ga*, in, by, at, to; *Daga*, from, by, through; *Gara*, to, for: which are evidently Berber.

The preposition *As* in Venture forms *Yasik*, in te (m), *Yasem*, in te (f), from which we may infer that with him it becomes *Yas* before all suffixes. In the Algiers MSS however it is *Ayyas*, as follows:

1	2	3
<i>Ayyassi</i>	<i>ayyassak</i>	<i>ayyas</i> :
1	2	3
<i>Ayyasnag</i>	<i>ayyaswan</i>	<i>ayyassan</i> :

in which *Ayyas* *) seems to be for *Ayassis*, (perhaps because the last word might seem to mean „His daughter“?) Sometimes *Ayyas* stands for „him“ without a preposition, as *Iḡḡa ayyas*, reliquit eum, etc.; in which the word may be composed of the pronoun suffix -s and the Arab fulcrum *Ayyā*.

The preposition *As* has close analogies to the Arabic *Bi*, in or by; and among others, it gives to intransitive verbs a transitive meaning; as, *Ulin*, ascenderunt; *Ayyas*, in eo; but *Ulin ayyas*, fecerunt eum ascendere. — *Gar*, between, makes *Agri* as well as *Gari*, „between me“.

The forms assumed bey *Ad* with a suffix are

1 2 3
'*Did'i*, | *d'id'ak*, *d'id'am* | *d'id'as*:

1 2 3
'*Did'nag* | *d'id'wam* | *d'id'san*.

These however are unknown to Venture; and what he seems to have instead, viz.

Ad'i | *ad'ak*, *ad'am* | *ad'as* | etc.

are interpreted by him *à moi*, *à toi* etc. not *avec moi* etc.: and as I shall afterwards say, I suspect that this *Ad* is really part of the present tense of the verb. For *avec moi* etc. he has *Akidi* etc.

I have never found *Ag* with suffixes, nor *Ar*; but this may depend on the meaning of those prepositions, of which the former perhaps essentially refers to place, the latter generally to time. „From me“ „From you“ etc. is expressed by *Asgur*. Yet many other prepositions seem to be averse from pronouns suffix: as *Amma*, *Ala* (= Amharic *Yala*, without?) *Annig*, *Addaw*, *Fihal*, *Afla* (or *Abla*? = Arab. *Bela*). In John 15, 3 we read *Fihal nakki*, without

*) Delaporte has *Guyis*, for „in it“, which may suggest that *Ayyas* is a corruption of *Ag-is*, and has nothing to do with the preposition *As*.

me; in J. 1, 3, *Afla natta*, without him. Perhaps *Fihāl* = Arabic *Fihl*, extra; and such foreign words would naturally be less easy of assuming the genuine idiom; yet we read *Adūras* „around him“.

As in our own languages complex phrases are used by the Berbers as a substitute for prepositions, to obtain greater accuracy. Thus *Ag sura*, for „After“ (in time): *Agfama*, on the part of: *Agfasabba*, because of. The last seems to be from the Arabic *sebab*, „caussa“.

Pronouns governed by Verbs.

Some verbs, with no apparent reason, take a dative case of the pronouns; with an apparent caprice like that of the Latins who say, *Nocuit ei*, *Laesit eum*; *Imperavit ei*, *Iussit eum*. *Akkarn-as*, appellaverunt *ei* (nomen aliquod), may be understood from the Hebrew. But equally there is, *Ibrayas*, dimisit *ei*; *Ifsiyas*, solvit *ei*; — in both, for *eum*. In other verbs the distinction is clearly marked; as:

<i>Akkun-agġag</i> , vos remitto	<i>Ifkayat an</i> , dedit eos
<i>Awan-agġag</i> , vobis remitto.	<i>Ifkayakan</i> , dedit iis.

By help of this distinction the Berbers can add simultaneously two affixes to a verb; a complexity which satisfies me that the pronominal system is not borrowed from Arabic etc.

Thus from *Afkiġ*, dedi, *Ikādman*, faciens, *Isaknan*, monstrans, *Arayisaknan*, monstraturus, we get:

Afkiġ-ak-it, (or *Afkiġakt*.) Dedi-tibi-eam (= id)

Winna awan-t-ikādman, ō vobis-id-faciens

Ar-ag-t-isaknan, nobis-id-monstraturus.

The euphonic law which changes *nt* into *nt* is inconvenient, since it obscures the distinction between *it*, *eum*, and *it*, *eam*. Venture does not acknowledge any such distinction, but *its*, *ets* or *tes* is his only peculiar feminine. (See under *LA*.) Only late in time was I led to perceive that in the Algiers MS *it* is used, and not *it*, for the accus.

fem. while in the dative the genders are not distinguished. Hence, though I have verified it in too many instances for it to be result of accident, I do not speak from a full survey of the MS. The termination *-nt* is often awkwardly ambiguous. Thus *azrant* means, either, *eac viderunt*, or, *ii viderunt eum* (vel *eam*). By Venture's pronoun *its*, we can perspicuously say, *azranits*, *ii viderunt eam*.

The Greek or indeed the German language will in part explain the case in which the Berbers prefix their pronouns to a verb or participle. In the direct member of a sentence, the pronouns follow the verb, as in ἔδωκά σοι αὐτό, *Afkiḡakt*: but after a relative (or article equivalent in thought) it is inverted, as ὁ ἑμὶν αὐτὸ ποιεῖν, *Winna awant-ikadman*. — A result of this principle, when once become stereotype, is, that when the verb is in the Subjunctive Mood, the pronouns are prefixed, even though no particle, such as „Ut“ etc. precede it: as:

- { *Ulaṣṣ ḡuri argaz, ay-igar agfanda:*
- { Non mihi homo, (qui) me iaciat in stagnum.
- { *Anwa argaz d'agwan, as-fili fiksi yiwaṣ — ?*
- { Quis vir de vobis, (si) ei-sit ovis una — (= *cui sit*).

Also in the elongated tenses which take a prefix, (*ad* or *ara*,) the affixed pronoun follows this prefix; as, *Ar-ay-azran*, me videbunt.

It is a very common practice of the MS to redouble a pronoun, by adding it in full *after* the verb, when it has already gone before: as, *Akkanni ag-inna inakni*, Ut nobis-dixit nobis: *Ad-awn-iniḡ ikunwi*, Vobis-dico vobis. This seems quite appropriate, where emphasis on the pronoun is needed: otherwise, it is probably the mere unmeaning redundancy, into which the vulgar are every where apt to fall. It is by no means universal, and therefore cannot have become the fixed method of the language.

Instead of *Awan* and *Asan*, prefixed to a verb, we

sometimes meet *Awand* and *Asand*, with no difference of sense that is apparent.

For the accus. pron. 2. pl. masc. the Algiers MS with marvellous uniformity gives *kum*, (sometimes *kam*), but not *kun*. This is so opposed to analogy, that I had convinced myself it was an Arabism improperly foisted in; and so had written, when Venture's Dictionary came, to prove this beyond a doubt.

It must not be concealed that Venture is unacquainted with any distinction but that of euphony, between the forms which I have called Dative and Accusative. Yet it appears to me that his own examples are opposed to his rule of euphony: and most of them, though not all, agree with the view which I have given. Under *Vous* (with verbs) he gives the following:

<i>Ad- awan -afkag</i> }	<i>Sinag- kun</i> }
<i>vobis do</i> }	<i>Novi vos</i> }
<i>Ad- awan -sakran</i> }	<i>~Gan - kun</i> }
<i>vobis fecerunt</i> }	<i>Reliquerunt vos</i> }
<i>Ad- awant -annig</i> }	<i>Ikat- kunt</i> }
<i>Vobis (f) dixi</i> }	<i>Ferit vos (f)</i> }
<i>Ad- akunt ur hammelag</i> }	<i>Ur - kunt zarig'd</i> }
<i>Vos (f) non amo</i> }	<i>Non vos (f) vidi</i> }

Ad- akunt, according to him, must mean *Vobis*, not *Vos*. In fact, all of these confirm my rule, if at least I have rightly translated „*Ils vous ont fait*“ in the third example.

Under *Lui*, *Eux*, *Leur* all his examples give *-as*, *-asan*, *-asant* for datives; under *Le*, *La*, *Les*, he exhibits *-f*, *-fan* thirteen times as accusatives; but he likewise has the following, which violate my distinction:

<i>Ur- as -azrig'd</i> }	<i>Ur- san -sinag' ara</i> }
<i>Non eum vidi</i> }	<i>Non eos novi omnino</i> }
<i>Ur- san -nahammil</i> }	<i>Ur- as askar</i> }
<i>Non eos amamus</i> }	<i>Ne id fac</i> }

beside others of anomalous form. Under *La*, he lays down

distinctly that *-t*, *-fan* are feminine as well as masculine. The analogy of *-san*, *-sant* and the form *Nufanti* (illae) seems to make it certain that the feminine *-fant* must once have been used; and it appears probable that if this distinction does not now exist, it has been obliterated. — In Mat. 10, 17. I find the expressions *Akkun-afkan* and *Awn-afkan*, in consecutive clauses; the former meaning, Vos dabunt, the latter, Vobis dabunt. This, and similar phenomena, cannot be ascribed to accident.

Etymological remarks on the fragmentary Pronouns.

That *nag* and *ag*, the suffixes for the 1st person plural, are derived from *Nakni* or *Nukni* (we), can scarcely be doubted. We have compared *Nakki* to the Coptic *Anok* and *Anog*: we now see reason to think *Naggi* to have been the oldest form, although, from the aversion frequently displayed to a double *g*, it has been superseded in the present language. It may excite surprize that the prefix is *Ag* and not *Nag*. Venture treats what we call a prefix, as a *suffix* to the word preceding: as, after the negative particle *Ur*. But it is hard to allege this in such cases as *Anwa ak-ilsan*? (who touches thee?) for we should expect *Anwak*, if there were an intimate union between the two first words. It remains to ask, *why* a Berber says *Anwa agizran*? (who sees us?) and not *Anwa nagizran*? If the fact is correct (as I believe) that they do *not* use the latter phraseology, it goes to prove that the system of Prefixes is later in time than that of Suffixes; that the Pronouns were first broken up into use for Suffixes, and only after these forms had already become familiar, were employed as Prefixes.

The feminine suffix *kam* seems to imply that its equivalent *am* is derived from the nominative *Kammi*; and this makes it more probable that *-ak* of the masculine is derived

from *Kat̃ti*, than that *Kat̃ti* is a new formation, generated out of *-ak*. If this be admitted, we have in *Kat̃ti*, *Kammi*, the old pronouns, from which the Hebrews, Arabs, Copts and others obtained their *-k*. Nor need this be thought paradoxical, when it is observed that in the first person, the Berber *nag̃* is less degenerate from the original pronoun than the *na* and *nu* of the other languages.

In the 3rd person the Berber deviates from the languages to which we have generally compared it, and becomes thoroughly African. The *Galla* language (of which I know only a few elements, communicated in some small works by the Rev. Mr. KRAPE,) says *Isa*, he; *Isan*, they; and suffixes *-sa* for „his“: these are too similar to the Berber datives and genitives *As*, *Asan*, to be overlooked. More especially, since we find that in other demonstratives the Galla agrees with the Berber, as will be noticed below. As for the Berber accusatives, *Af*, *Afan*, these may possibly come direct from the native nominatives *Natta* (*Nat̃a*) and *Nufñ*, the initial *n* being obliterated as in *ag̃* from *Nakki* (*Nag̃gi*). Why the feminine (her) should be expressed by *it* rather than *it̃*, remains unexplained. In the Coptic, „her“ is rendered by *-ες*, which appears identical with the Berber dative. Venture's feminine *ets* is equally inexplicable as a feminine by etymology, although there seems no reason to doubt that it is connected with *Nifsa*, he, *Nifsat*, she; — which is his orthography for *Natta*, *Nattaf*.

The distinction of Dative and Accusative in the pronouns, (if I have duly verified it,) is of much etymological importance; as establishing that the system of suffixes is not borrowed from the Arabic or (we may probably add) from the Punic.

On the Definite Article.

Berber nouns are found under several variations of form. As a general rule, native nouns, when masculine,

appear to begin with a vowel; when feminine, to begin with 'T (or T) and often to end likewise with *t*. But the masculine nouns often have *W* prefixed, and sometimes *Aww*; and the feminines instead of 'T or T begin with *Att*. Thus *Ak̄s̄is̄*, a boy, becomes *Wak̄s̄is̄* and *Awwak̄s̄is̄*; the demonstrative *Ayyi*, this, becomes *Wayyi*, *Awwayyi*; and 'Tid̄at, truth, becomes *Attidat*. Again, masculine nouns, especially of three or more syllables, are apt to change their initial *A* into *U*; where apparently *U* is = *Wa*. These are phenomena to be accounted for.

Venture (*Grammaire*, p. 11) positively denies that the nouns have any article corresponding to the French *le*, *la*. On the contrary in the *Penny Cyclopædia*, (Article Berber) it is stated that initial *T* is the article of both genders. This appears certainly an error: in all the Berber at least which I have seen, the initial *T* is confined to feminine nouns. But it remains to inquire whether the truth is not midway between these authorities.

The syllable *Wa* is given by Venture as meaning One; and this is no doubt true in the phrase *Wa defirwa*, (which he quotes under *UN*) „one after another“ = *Wan d'affirwan*, = *Yiwan d'affir yiwan*: (unless indeed *Wa* is a syncope of *Wad* = Arabic *Wahad*.) But although this shows an etymological possibility that *Wak̄s̄is̄* may mean „a boy“, it is certain that this explanation is opposed to many of the passages in which the form is found. Moreover it leaves 'T without any relation to *W*.

That *Wa* and 'Ta are somehow related as masculine and feminine, appears clearly in the demonstratives, *Wayyi*, hic, 'Tayyi, haec; *Winna*, ille, 'Tinna, illa; *Wid̄ak*, ille, 'Tid̄ak, illa. It appears also in the interrogative *Anwa*, quis? *Anta*, quae? — where the particle *An* no doubt must express the interrogation, being = Arabic *Ayna*, quis? or *Ayn*, ubi? In Egypt, *Ana*, (who?) is said for *Ayna*, (DE PERCEVAL'S *Dict.* under Qui.) The Galla also has *Eniu?*

for Who? Which? No explanation therefore of the *W* seems satisfactory, which does not embrace '*T*' as its feminine.

Instead of *Winna*, '*Tinna*', the Galla has *Kuni*, *Tuni*, hic, haec; which shows a *K* corresponding to our *W*, and will presently lead to a remark. On the other hand I find in Berber various clear instances in which *Wa*, *Wi* and their absolute case *Adwa* stand for the demonstrative, 'That', and Venture gives *Âti* for the feminine 'Celle-la', or 'Cette', — a word which I have not found. *Wa* is not acknowledged in his Dictionary under its natural place; but under *TOURNE* he gives:

Wa itezzi, cela tourne.

In the Algiers MS I had already observed the following:

{ *Ur-illi adwa, ašal ad Barabbàn*:

{ Non erit hicce, verum Barabbas.

{ *Ur-illi adwa adnaggar?*

{ Nonne est hicce faber?

{ *Uwwi illan itkima nātlam* —

{ (Et) οἱ ὄντες sessores caliginis —

{ *Labgi awwi ay-addišayḥan* —

{ Voluntas τοῦ me-mittentis —

{ *Ur-illi w-aragfisaknan* —

{ Non est ὁ-nobis-id-explicaturus —

{ *Ur-illi w-araykišman akkamūš* —

{ Non est τὸ intrans τὸ os —.

In M. DELAPORTE (*Tale of Sabi*, p. 12, l. 8) I find:

{ *Konni k-ayyidifkan* —

{ (C'est) vous qui moi a apporté — (Vos τὸ mihi dans,)

in which *k* initial corresponds to *w* initial of the Algiers MS and forms a union with the Galla *K*, *T* observed above.

In five places I have noticed *Wi* before the preposition '*Gur*', to denote the relative Qui; as:

Winna, wigur allan imazzugan — {
Ille, cui sunt aures — }

Winna wigur illa, ad-as-ifk — {
Ille cui est, ei dabitur — }

Also: Gen. 5, 29. *Wi ikza Rabbi —* {
Quem execravit Deus —. }

I have carefully enumerated these, to let the reader see that it is no mere fancy to believe that *Wa* originally was the demonstrative and degenerated into the article. Yet (I imagine) this belongs to a past stage of the language; for it is generally superseded by the longer forms *Winna*, *Widak* etc. and in many of its uses before nouns it seems utterly to have lost (if, as I believe, it once had) the sense of the article.

The concise formulas, such as *w-aragfisaknan* (ô nobis id explicaturus) are very rare. Instead of *w*, the MS generally gives *winna*, and as its genitive *awwinna*; and with this modification the idiom is a standard one. This leads to the inference that *awwi* (quoted above) is the genitive of *Wi* or *Wa*; while I take *uwwi* to be the Arabic *u* („and“) prefixed to the Berber root *Wi*; as not seldom happens.

Mr. SCHÖN (on the *Haussa* language) assigns to *Wa* in one sentence the meaning of „What?“ and it will appear that the demonstratives in that language are very similar to those of Berber. Again; he gives *Kômi*, *Kôwa* for Whatsoever, Whosoever; which I do not doubt are softened from *Kûl mi* (omne quod,) *Kûl wa* (omnis qui); just as in Delaporte, *Kûyan* (unusquisque) for *Kul yan*. This gives *Wa* in *Haussa* = *Qui*.

The evidence concerning ‘*T*’ is less distinct from the Algiers MS; but here we have in Venture the important fact that *Âti* means „cette“. It is impossible to enable my reader to know, what weight is to be given to analogies

drawn from other tongues; yet I venture here to set down as parallel facts, that „She“ in the Hausa is expressed by *Ta, Ita, Tai* (Schön); while it is well known, that, as in the Arab verb initial *T* is the feminine mark, so is it the Coptic feminine article. In fact, I cannot help suspecting that the Coptic π or φ (= *le*) and τ or ϑ (= *la*) are at bottom identical with the Berber *Wa* and *Ta*.

The Berbers have imported the Arab article *Al* with Arab nouns, but (as most European nations) they are apt to neglect its sense, and confound it with the noun, exactly as we say, „The Alcoran“, „An Almanac“. Moreover, it constantly serves (in practice) as the sign of the genitive case, the initial vowel being then retained, which is else apt to vanish. Thus *Lag̃ma*ε, temple, *Allag̃ma*ε, of the temple. Owing to the familiar use of *Al* between two nouns „in regimen“ (as the Hebraists speak) *Al* practically comes to mean „of“.

Now the corruption which has past on the Arab article in Berber, is (in appearance) precisely that which has past also on (what I conceive to have been) the old Berber article, *Wa, Ta*. It is apt to lose its sense, or to be a mere mark of gender, when joined to a noun in the form *Wa, Ta*; or to become a genitive case in the forms *Aw, Aww, At, Att*. I cannot think that *Aww, Att* are compounded of a preposition that means „of“, superadded to the particles *Wa, Ta*; for cases occur, especially with demonstratives, in which the longer forms mean no more than a pure nominative. Thus:

<i>Winna aww-as:</i>	} Literally, as Arabic: <i>Had̃ak al -yòm:</i>	
Ille dies;		} Greek: <i>ἐκείνη ἡ ἡμέρα.</i>
also <i>Was anni:</i>		

and before the demonstratives themselves:

<i>Maryama at -fayyini</i>	} <i>Nuf̃nat it -tid̃ak it̃afran Yùsuεa</i>
<i>Μαριαμ ἡ αὐτῆ</i>	

Whatever difficulty attends the explanation of these femi-

nines, the forms seem to prove that *aww*, *att*, are no proper genitives. From such considerations I had persuaded myself that in *Wa*, *Ta*, *Aww*, *Att* we see the Berber article in a degeneracy similar to that of *L*, *Al* of the Arabs; when I fell in with a letter written to Paris by the learned M. ABBADIE, concerning the *Saho*, a language of Ethiopic family, in which he details a perfectly analogous degeneration of the *Saho* article. I do not know whether it will seem overhasty to say that the analogy has persuaded me that my conclusion was true. *)

There remain some other facts, which assimilate the Berber masculine article to Hebrew forms. Namely, when the noun begins with *Y*, or with a consonant, (the latter happening with foreign proper names, and a few Berber nouns, apparently either very ancient, or of foreign origin,) instead of *Aww* prefixed we find the consonant doubled and *A* placed before it. Thus:

{ <i>Tala aww-amàn ay -Yakùba:</i>	{ <i>Aḡakka ay -yiraḏ:</i>
{ <i>Fons aquae Iacobi.</i>	{ <i>Granum tritici.</i>
{ <i>Agg-ussan ah -Hayridùs:</i>	{ <i>Tafaf am -maddan:</i>
{ <i>Diebus Herodis.</i>	{ <i>Lux hominum.</i>

Now this is exactly like the Arabic, except that *Y*, *H*, *M*, do not belong to the consonants called Solar: and in this respect the language exhibits an article more like that of the Hebrews, who know no distinction of Solar and Lunar letters. Perhaps, until something more certain is discovered, we may rest in the belief that *Aw*, *Wa*, (*m*), *Aḡ*, *Ta* (*f*), are to the Berbers what *Al* and *Hal* are to the Arabs and Hebrews, understanding that *Aw* assimilates its *w* to the sounds of any consonant which may follow.

*) To make due allowance for mere euphony, is very difficult. For instance, „How“ is expressed very constantly by *Amak*; yet I read, „*Ur-illi wamak*“, in which *W* seems to be inserted to spare a hiatus.

The double form *Aw*, *Wa*, and similarly *Af*, *Ta*, is in strict conformity with the genius of the Berber; as may appear even from the prepositions, in which we have the double forms *An*, *Na*; *Ag*, *Ga*; *As*, *Sa* etc. At the same time even in modern Arabic the pronunciation is very vacillating as to *Nabid* or *Anbid*, *Amra* or *Mara*, etc.; so that it is doubtful whether in Berber such differences as *Tamattuf* and *Afmatuf* deserve notice.

The form *U* for *Wa* is commonest in trisyllables:

{ *Natta ad'yili d'-amakràn azzaf Umakràn* :

{ Ille erit magnus coram τῷ Magno.

{ *Amaksa* : { *Izamaran umaksa* :

{ Pastor ; { Oves pastoris.

In dissyllables, I notice it oftenest after prepositions, whether by accident or euphony, is hard to say; but *agra*, *ag*, *s* and others very often seem to require it. We can generally render these by the article:

{ *S-ufus- is* : but: { *Afsuk* :
{ Per τῆν manum eius; { manum tuam.

{ *Adrar uzammur* :

{ Mons τῶν Olivarum.

Farther: we may quote *Wuyanni*, illi, *Kiralla aw-Wud'ayan*, multi τῶν Iudaeorum; to show that *W*, *Aw* is not restricted to the singular number. Still, for whatever reason, I think it is less common with the plural.

Demonstratives and Relatives.

The pronoun *Natta* (he) is occasionally used as an adjective; as, *Natta d'alg'as'i* *), illa plebs. But other

*) Elsewhere I remark that *Natta* so used takes the absolute case after it, of which initial *ad* or *d* is the sign. But this remark comes too late to allow of my searching to see whether the rule is general.

demonstratives are far more usual: viz. *Ayyi*, this, (in Venture, *Ag'i*.) *Anni*, that, *Id'ak*, that. These words appear to be properly masculine, but may be used *after* a feminine noun, as, '*Tamattut' ayyi*, femina haec; perhaps only because the *t* with which the noun ends is heard sufficiently at the beginning of the demonstrative. If the noun is omitted, the mark of gender (or the article) *W* or '*T*' must be prefixed to the demonstrative.

To give point, *Ayyini* is said for *Ayyi*, as in the Personal Pronouns, *Nakkini*, *Kat'tini*, etc.

Some uncertainty rests on the purely plural forms, yet I believe the words are declined as follows:

<i>Wayyi</i> , hic;	<i>Tayyi</i> , haec;	{	<i>Ayyàn</i> , hi, hae.
(<i>Wayyini</i>)	(<i>Tayyini</i>)		
<i>Winna</i> , ille;	<i>Tinna</i> , illa;	{	<i>Wuyanni</i> , illi; <i>Tayanni</i> , illae.
<i>Wid'ak</i> , ille,	<i>Tid'ak</i> , illa,		
	{illi;		{illae.

Yet, as a relative, *Anni* is indeclinable; or at least used as plural and of both genders. Also I have seemed to observe that *Ayyàn* is usually said of persons, *Wuyanni* of things; and this distinction is far more prominent in the words than that of *hi* and *illi*. In *Agg-ussan anni* (diebus illis) we see *anni* as a masc. pl. after its noun; = *wuyanni*. More accurate detail must be waited for.

A dative and absolute case is made, just as in common nouns, by prefixing *I* and *Ad'*:

{	<i>Iwayyi</i> , <i>Iwinna</i> , <i>Iyyàn</i> ; <i>Ifinna</i> , —
{	<i>Ad'wayyi</i> , <i>Ad'winna</i> , etc.

The Genitives are *Awayyi*, *Awinna*; *Awid'ak*; also *Awwi*, *Awayyini*; as: *Ag'fassabba awayyini*, ob causam huius.

'*Dayyi* occasionally means „ipse“, and hence „solus“, just as *av'ròs* in Greek. Thus Mark 6, 8. *Wasgar d'ayyi*, baculum solum. In Mark 12, 13. *Wayyini ad' Dawud*, David ipse: in which it is remarkable that *d'-D* are left in

juxtaposition. Oftener, the idea of „Self“ is expressed by *Iman*, „Soul“, exactly as by *Nefs* in Arabic. Venture says, Sing. *Edwin*, pl. *Edwîn*, pl. f. *Tinna*. This *Ed* merely marks the absolute case. — I have once or twice found *In* or *An*, for *Anni*, *Winna*, in the Algiers MS.

Occasionally *wid'a* is found for *wid'ak*; and the relation of the two can hardly fail to be the same as that of the Arabic *Hād'a*, this, *Had'āk*, that. Indeed the prefix *Hā* is omitted in the Egyptian Arabic; so that we see the entire composition of *Wid'a*, *Wid'ak*, from *Wa* or *Wi*, and *d'a*, *d'āk*. The *k* is a wellknown addition, and *d'a* is Arabic دَا, Hebr. דָּא.

This element is found again in *Ma*, *Mad'a*; see the Conjunctions. *Da* in Hausa means „that; which“. — The word *wid'ak* is much oftener used as a relative than as a demonstrative.

The triple pronoun-system, *Natta*, *Wid'ak*, *Winna*, each meaning „Ille“, may cause surprize. But it may be remarked that the first is connected with Coptic, the second with Arabic, the third with Hausa. We have not the means of deciding on the age of the two last within the Berber. They may possibly be importations; as *Aš'u*, „Quid“? undoubtedly is, being a recent Arabic conflation from three words, *Ay š'i hu?* Quae res illud?

The demonstratives of Berber are so important, that it may be worth while to give various examples.

Winna argaz, Ille vir: *Ass-ayyi*, Die hōc:

Winna awwas, or *Was anni*, Ille dies.

Agg-ass-an, Die illo: *Agg-ussan anni*, Diebus illis.

{ *Ur-illi galkarni ayyi*, *ur-illi agg-in*:

{ Non erit in seculo hōc, non erit in illo.

Winna and *Wid'ak* are sometimes used as Nouns, with suffixed pronouns of the genitive case:

Mark 5, 7: *Winnik*, τὸ σοῦ, Quod tuum est:

John 15, 19: *Wid'akis*, τὸ αὐτοῦ, Quod ipsius est.

In this instance the Greek article exactly expresses them; so does it express their use before a participle, which however is quite absent in Venture. Occasionally I find both in the sense of a pure relative. The instances in which *Ayyi* fulfils these functions are so rare, as to raise the suspicion of error. But *Ayyān* is very frequently so employed.

John 6, 11: *Ayyi abġan*, Id-quod voluerunt.

— 12: *Ayyi irzan*, τὸ fractum; Quod fractum est.

{ *Dalġali aġf-ayyān ittarun*: { *Dalġali iyyān ilzan*:
 { Beatitudo super τοὺς flentes. { Beatitudo τοῖς esurientibus.

{ *Labġi awwi* (or, *awwinna*) *ay-addiṣayġan*:

{ Voluntas τοῦ me mittentis.

{ *Aṣbah awwiḍak af-isayġan*:

{ Gloriam τοῦ eum mittentis.

{ *Adwiḍa isallan adadran*: { *Winna iwinna lahdiryū*:

{ Et oī audientes vivent. { Ille cui (est) sermo meus.

{ *Iwiḍak an-Wuḍayan, wiḍak yumnan ayyas*:

{ Illis Iudaeorum, oī credentes in eum.

{ *Ur-illi adwayyi adwinna, wiḍak ibġan alwuf-is?*

{ Nonne est hicce ille, ō volens mortem eius?

(This does not duly express the Greek of John 7, 25.)

{ *Wayyi natta d'almaṣbah iṣaġlan*:

{ Hic (est) ille lychnus ardens.

Natta, *Nattaf*, *Nuṣni*, etc. are used in a complex sense for Quia is, Quia ea, Quia ii etc., not unlike ὅστις of the Greek classics. Thus:

{ *Dalġali iyyān izadġan*; nuṣni *adazran Rabbi*:

{ Beatitudo τοῖς purgatis; quippe qui videbunt Deum.

Besides the demonstratives already named, there is another, *Akka* or *Wakka*, which is generally adverbial, but not always. At first sight it may appear that *Akka* is only another form of *Aġi*, (as Venture writes *Ayyi*;) but the forms *Akkayyi*, sic, *Akkanni*, ut (or, sic), seem to refute this. Perhaps rather *Wakka* is to *Wa*, as *Wiḍak* to

Wid'a. Be this as it may, we find even as Genitives the words *Awwakka* and *Awwakkanni*. Thus:

{ <i>Agf-akka allahd'ir</i> :	{ <i>Agf-assabba awwakka</i> :
{ Super eam rem.	{ Ob causam eius.

Also, *Agfassabba awwakkanni*, exactly as the last.

Adverbially, *Akka*, „thus“, *As-wakka*, „herein, hereby“; and other derivatives. To the same class may seem to belong *As-wayas*, (see Conjunctions etc.) but the derivation is doubtful. *Akka* (in Venture *Ak*) may be itself the element, which, added to *Wid'a* makes *Wid'ak*.

In Gen. 7, 13, *As-akkanni*, stands for „The self same day“, which suggests that *Akkanni* may contain a more emphatic idea than the shorter form *Anni*. Yet it does not appear to be used in combination with adjectives in general. *Assakkanni*, like *Assanni*, *Assayyi* or *Assa*, appear to be practically adverbial, as „Hodie“ in Latin.

There is nothing in the form of *Akkayyi* and *Akkanni* to give them the specific senses of Antecedent and Relative; no wonder then that *Akkanni* may mean either „as“ or „thus“.

{ *Ad'yili labgi-nak, akkanni agfagnaw, akkanni agfalka'a* :
 { Sit voluntas tua, ut in caelo, sic super terrâ.

But *Akkayyi* is never (that I have found) used for „as“: it is then better to distinguish them; as we read:

{ *Akkanni aslag, akkayyi had'rag* :
 { Ut audivi, sic locutus sum.

It has appeared that the use of Relatives proper is very generally evaded, by employing the Demonstrative with the Participle, as the German and Greeks use the Article. This idiom is quite out of harmony with the Syro-Arabian tongues, but it is closely akin to that of the Amharic (See ISENBERG'S *Amharic Grammar*) a language which is now shown to be related to the Ghÿz, the Hebrew and the Arabic by

a bond at least as close as unites the principal members of the Indo-European group to one another.

Yet the Berber not only occasionally uses *winna* (or rather *anni*) and *wid'ak* as true relatives, but has a peculiar relative of its own, *uyawmi*, which in sound and sense may be fairly compared with the Amharic *yam*: closer still is *yawme* (when) of the Gallas. There is also a relative particle *ma*, (in the Algiers MS always adverbial) which in many usages is identical with *ma* of the Arabs. We have already seen: „Winna, *iwinna lahd'iryü*“: this is the standard method with Venture.

{ *Dalkad'ma anni ik'd'am Bāba*,
 } Opus quod facit Pater,
 { *fayyini d'ag'anni ik'd'amt Mammis*.
 } *illud* etiam facit id Filius eius.

Here the Hebrew idiom is reversed, if the translation is correct; for the redundant accus. pronoun (*ik'd'am*-it) should be in the other clause. It will be observed that *anni* is here left indeclinable, while *fayyini* is feminine.

Uyawmi is used interrogatively for „Why?“ „What?“ „How?“ and „Whose?“ As a relative, it is oftenest in the Genitive or Dative case, sometimes perhaps in the Accusative. The Interrogatives (*Anwa*!, quis? *Anta*, quae?) are also sometimes relative.

{ *Alamayal uyawmi inna Bābas*:
 } Praeter quem (?) dixit Pater eius.
 { *Dalç'ali iwid'ak, uyawmi ašfan wulawan ansan*:
 } Beatitudo illis, quorum pura - sunt corda eorum.
 { — *amm-inna, uyawmi illa array*:
 } — ut ille, cuius (or cui) erat potestas.
 { — *'tima, uyawmi akkaran Bayt'laham*:
 } — ea, cui *) appellarunt Bethlehem.

*) The verbs *Ikkar*, *Ifsi*, govern a dative of the pronoun affix.

- { *Akra awinna, yawmi fāfsam agfalkāḡa, adili* etc.
 { *Omne illius, cui solvistis super-terram, erit* etc.
 { *Agfidak awwakli, winna yawmi aradyas sidis* —
 { *Super illum τὸν servum, qui cuius venturus sit herus eius* —.

In the formula *wigur* (quem - ad) it has appeared that the relative, contrary to Syro-Arabian idiom, is followed by a preposition. It seems unlikely that this should be a phenomenon wholly isolated, but I have not been able to find similar instances except with the prepositions *agaf* and *adag*, which appear, in this use, identical with *gaf* and *dag*. It may be proper to illustrate this, premising that *dag* must be rendered *de* or *in* according to the connection, and that *adag* has the same ambiguity.

- { *Akrayallan dālḡāḡa, winna agaf ifwakkal* —
 { *Omnem supellectilem, quem super fretus est* —
 { *Isalman, ayyān agaf afḡaddam fura* —
 { *Pisces, quos super praeteristis (?) nunc* —
 { *Issufar dāḡs argaz, anni adag asḡan asūtān* —
 { *Petiit de eo vir, quo de exiere Diaboli* —
 { *Widak adag illa asšaytān* —
 { *Is quo in erat ō Diabolus* —
 { *Tamdinin, anta adag illa bazzāf alḡasī* —
 { *Urbes, quibus in erat multum plebis.*

It is nevertheless perplexing (and casts doubt on these translations of *adag*) that *adag* or *adaj* is often a relative adverb, meaning „ubi“ or „quando“, and even stands for *Quem* and *Quos*.

The relative is sometimes omitted, as in Hebrew and English; sometimes also the mere pronoun suffix supplies its loss.

- { *Siggat ḡar dāyyini, anid'a yalla wamkān,*
 { *Aspicite ad ibi, ubi erat locus,*
 { *dāḡs Rabbi adazlan.*
 { *in eo Deus trucidant.*

(The last word *adazlan* is wrong, Mat. 28, 5: per-

haps it should be *adīrsan*, iacens; or *adīzāwan*, recumbens.)

In M. Delaporte's specimens, I find the Interrogative particle (*Man*, who? what?) followed by prepositions; as: *Manizig*, (also *Zigmani*) from what? Whence? *Maneg*, In what? Wherein? — This, with the corresponding phenomenon of the relative having oblique cases, or being followed by prepositions, (as in *Iwinna*, cui, *Wigur*, ad quem, cui) elevates the organization of the language above that of the Arabs and Hebrews in this respect. Nevertheless, the Berber often imitates the Arab idiom, unless the translator has been too slavish.

Interrogatives and other kindred words.

Anwa (m), *Anta* (f), Who? What? — Whoso, Whatsoever.

Uyawmi, whose, what?

Ašu, what? (followed by nouns), fem. *Ašuf*.

Ašu, as the derivation requires, is confined to *things*, and in consequence it is comparatively rare to use *Anwa* except of persons. For *Anwa* and *Anta* when adjectives, Venture has the Arabic *Man*, Quis? quae? as also *Ensi*; which means only „Unde“ in the Algiers MS; a sense recognized also by Venture.

Anwa argaz? } *Anta tiramt?* } *Anwa tathufam?* }

Quis homo? } Quae hora? } Quem quaeritis? }

Uyawmi tassufaram? } *Uyawmi arafili at mattuf?* }

Cui (sc. quem) petitis? } Cuius erit mulier? }

Anwa arayat t'an— } *Anwa, uyawmi t'aldi t'ittis?* }

Quisquis comedet — } Quis (est) cuius apertus est oculus eius? }

Ur-asnam ašu asn-inna: }

Non intellexere quid iis-diceret. }

Adag is used for *Quid* in Mar. 6, 24. *Winna* (or *Anni*) is sometimes found interrogatively for *Anwa*; but these may be suspected of error.

A relative or interrogative begins its own clause, and appears to force the verb apart from it, so as to take up the affixed pronouns *between* them. Thus just now, *Aṣu asn-inna*, not, *Aṣu innay-asan*.

Occasionally the interrogative (imitating the construction of the demonstrative) is followed by the participle instead of the verb:

{ *Anwa ak-yufan?*
 { *Quis tē feriens?*

in which the position of the pronoun might seem to be necessitated even by the general law of the participle.

The particle *yallan* (or sometimes *ara*) appears similar in force to the English „soever“ or „in the world“: as, *Anwa yallan?* who in the world? *Quis tandem?* and *Aniḏa yallan*, wheresoever. It is however oftenest found after the word *Akra*, which means either „All“ or „Some“, „Any“: — being a general representative of *Quisque*, *Quispiam*, *Quisquam*, etc. Venture has *Ak*, „all“; but I have not met this form.

Akra — *akra*, repeated, stands for „Some“ and „Other“.

Akra after a negative, is, „(Not) any“; and in reply to a question, *Akra* standing alone, by an idiom common to many languages, means „None“, „Not at all“. The ambiguity of this appears sometimes unbearable.

Akra awwinna, = Whosoever, all of those who — (*πάντες τῶν?* or it may be, *πᾶς ὁ*). *Akra* followed by a noun, „All, every“; but in this sense *Akayallan* is commoner.

Mat. 20, 6: *Wayat̄ akra*, some others. (*Wayat̄* = other.)

— 11, 5: *Akrat̄*, some (aliquot): a rare form.

— 9, 15: *Akayallan* adverbially, As long as.

It seems evident that the language needs much improvement as to the use of this word.

Akayallan takes nouns of either number after it, sometimes with the article prefixed.

Akrayallan at-tiram̄t or *tiram̄t*, omnis hora = semper.

Akrayallan imir, omne tempus (tous les fois?)

Wayat, alius, sometimes *Yat*, is rather irregular. There seem to be two roots, *Yat* and *Yatan*. Hence:

Yat, *Wayat* } alius: *Tayat* } alia: *Itnin*, alii; }
Yatan, *Itan* } *Tattin* } *Itnint*, aliae. }

But also,

{ *Wiyati*, alii
 { *Itan*, f. alia
 { *Dat* (abs. case,) alius.

Venture writes *niden* for „d'un autre“, which implies that *Nitan* would be the genitive singular in our notation.

From Arabic *Wahad*, *Ahad*, One, Any, the Berbers have adopted *Had*, any, (dative *Ihad*,) after a negative: as, *Ur-illi had*, *ala natta*, Non est quisquam, praeter hunc. If this word has been widely spread among the different dialects of the language, it will usefully supply the word *Akra*. They often say *Ur — yiwan*, for „Not — any“.

Azgan, some, will also supply another meaning of *Akra*. *Wazgan iwayat*, one to another.

Kiralla, much,
 many

Adrus, little,
 a few

Azgan, } some: half.
Wazgan }

Annig, more

Akfar (Arab) d°.

Bazzaf } much, in

Bahra (V) } abundance

Nazzah, very,
 greatly.

Adverbs, etc.

Since the most important adverbs are connected with the demonstratives and relatives, this is the most natural place for adducing them. To keep the distinction sharp between Adverbs, Prepositions and Conjunctions is impossible, and only practical convenience is here aimed at. Certain

adverbs govern a genitive case, and as such, become virtually Prepositions: all such come under this head, *when they cannot take suffix pronouns.*

<i>Afaya</i> , behold *)	<i>Akka</i> , { so
<i>'Dayyi</i> , here	<i>Akkayyi</i> , {
<i>'Dayyini</i> , here: there	<i>Akkanni</i> , as: so: in order
<i>'Dinna</i> , <i>'Dahinna</i> , there (Cf.	that (before Future)
Ar. <i>Honā</i> , there)	<i>Aswakka</i> , { therein, thereby
<i>'Dinna gar</i> , near to	<i>Aswakkayyi</i> , {
<i>Anid'a</i> , where?	<i>Aswakkan</i> , therein
<i>Anid'allan</i> , wherever	<i>Siwak</i> , { therefore
<i>'Gard'a</i> , <i>'Gurid'a</i> , { hither	<i>Agfakkan</i> , {
<i>'Gard'ayyi</i> , {	<i>Aṣag'af</i> , wherefore?
<i>'Gar d'ahinna</i> , thither	<i>Amak</i> , how? even as: = quem-
<i>'Gar wanid'a</i> , whither?	admodum
<i>Ar d'inna</i> , so far — till then	<i>Iwakkanni</i> , { therefore
— until (that)	<i>Aswakkanni</i> , {
<i>Asyi</i> , <i>Asyayyi</i> , { hence	<i>Agg akka</i> , hereupon, forthwith
<i>Aggayyi</i> , {	<i>'Gafakkan</i> , (with gen.) in re-
<i>Asyinni</i> , <i>Assinna</i> , { thence	gard to
<i>Gassinna</i> , {	<i>Awakkanni</i> , of-that, (τοῦ ὅτου)
<i>Ansi</i> , whence?	<i>Agg akkan</i> , thereupon, thereat
<i>Aswayyi</i> , hereby	<i>Agg akkanni</i> , forasmuch as
<i>Aswayas</i> , forasmuch as —	<i>Azzakki</i> , (Mark 12, 24 <i>ex</i>
in-that — For, since. (Also)	<i>eo quod</i> ; perhaps = <i>Siwak</i> .)
How?	<i>Akkin</i> , afar (See <i>'Dinna</i> ,
<i>Aswuyanni</i> , herein, therein	near;) yonder (?)
— in that (which) —	(In Venture) in order that.
<i>Aswinna</i> , wherewith?	<i>Sura</i> , (with dative) near, af-
<i>'Dag'anni</i> , also, likewise —	terwards
Again.	<i>Agsura</i> , at the distance (of):
	afterwards

*) Modifications are *Afayan*, *Afayanni*, *Afnayan*. I suspect that the two first mean, *Ecce ille*, (or, *Ecce illa*) the last, *Ecce illi*.

<i>Ur</i> <i>sura</i> , not yet, no longer.	<i>Agfiramt</i> , } instantly.
<i>Azd'assir</i> , behind, afterwards.	<i>Ifiramt</i> , }
<i>Azzags</i> , afterwards.	<i>Kul firamt</i> , }
<i>Azaggaġ</i> , do. Mat. 27, 31.	<i>Akrayallan firamt</i> , } always.
<i>Lamfid'ar</i> , near, Mark 5, 21.	<i>Akrayallan imir</i> , *) }
<i>Antarga</i> , outside, Mark 7, 33.	<i>Aggassanni</i> , thenceforth (ex illo die).
<i>Azd'ak'al</i> , inside (Arab).	<i>Amzun</i> , like as.
<i>Azzazgan</i> , in the middle.	<i>Tura</i> , now.
<i>Arrif</i> , on the side (of).	<i>Alamma attura</i> , until now.
<i>Ag'razzaġ</i> , to the front.	<i>Agfura</i> , henceforth.
<i>Agfama nazzaf</i> , on the front.	<i>Agginna sura</i> , hereafter (soon after?)
<i>Akt'ul</i> , across.	<i>Imir</i> , <i>Imiranni</i> , then.
<i>Imayyaz</i> , Mark 3, 8, } beyond?	<i>Aywak</i> (Arab), when?
<i>Iz'arrab</i> , Mark 10, 1, } across?	<i>Araywak</i> , until when?
<i>Tallit ad'rus</i> , a little while.	<i>Ur</i> , not (before a verb).
<i>Tikkal kiralla</i> , oftentimes.	<i>Ula</i> , (Arab) nor, not even.
<i>Aš'ihal?</i> how much? how many?	<i>Ulaš</i> , (Arab) not.
<i>Kaddaš?</i> how much? (Arab.)	<i>Ulaħad</i> , not yet.
<i>Tikkalt attisnaġ</i> , the second time.	<i>Akra!</i> { not at all!
<i>Asfizli</i> , quickly.	<i>Artama!</i> }
<i>Ag'fassabba</i> , because.	<i>Ur</i> <i>ara</i> , not at all.
<i>Sadda</i> , { beneath (adverb).	<i>Ur</i> <i>aš'amma</i> , nothing at all.
<i>Assadda</i> , }	<i>Ur</i> <i>ġaganni</i> , no longer.
<i>Sufalla</i> , { aloft, above.	<i>Ur</i> <i>naġ'jiwan</i> , not even one.
<i>Asufal</i> , }	<i>Ayyāh</i> , yea: yes (Arab. <i>aywa</i> .)
<i>Yūsawan</i> , upwards.	<i>Ašal ayyāh</i> , nay but — (immo vero.)
<i>Ag'fyūsawan</i> , on the surface, top.	<i>Ilak</i> , verily, surely.

*) *Imir* seems to mean „time“ (fois), like the Arab *marra*, which is sometimes found in the MS. *Tirant* means „instant“, and perhaps „hour“, „season“.

Conjunctions.

Wa, *) (Arabic), and.*Ad*, and.*Awa*, *) also.*Tali*, but.*Maēna*, but.*Umma*, but.*Asal*, but (contra autem) —

Nay but! God forbid!

Adḡa, whereas.*Nag*, or; (after negative) nor.*Dag'anni*, even (etiam).*Ahha*, but (at vero).*Akkanni*... (with Future) in order that.*Sag'a*, lest.*Wissan*, whether; (lest? if haply?) (Vent. Perhaps.)*Akkanni*..., *imir* — When... then.*Imir ma*,
Imir anni ma, { When —*Ma*, that — when — (after adverbs).*Ma*, *Mad'a*, *Mad'ay*, if.*Mad'ayalla*, { that — because
Mayalla, { — if — when —
although?*Madayalli* —, *akkayyi* —, If —, then —.*Mayalla*, whereas, since.*Lukàn*, were it that — (Ar).*Mawr*, unless, if not.*Mulas*, but otherwise: but if (it be) not (so) —*Alama*,
Alamayal, { unless, only that.*Alama*, Mark 6, 31, not even (so) that. (qu. *Ulama*?)*Alamma*, until; so that. Not yet! — (negat. suppressed).*Agfalkhad*, so far as that — (Ar. حد).*Alamma immuf*, until when: until when? Mat. 5, 6: John 10, 24. (Cf. Arab.*Metta*, *Emti*, when: so Heb.)*Agsura ma*,
Aggimir ma, { after that —
Daffir ma, { ever since.*Tiramt ma*, as soon as — (the instant that).*Akrara*, Mark 2, 19, as long as.*Tul ma*, (Arab.?) as long as.*Aggazgan*, John 9, 4, as long as — (?)

*) *Wa* cannot be used in this sense without confusion. *Ad* is equally objectionable. Venture has *uk*, also, likewise, equally; (= *oka*, so; of the Gallas.) He sometimes uses this word for And: it seems akin to *Akka* or *Ak*, so. Of these, I suppose, his words *Akid*, *Ukid*, With, are compounded.

<i>Agmi</i> , ever since (Luke 2, 36 and Mark 9, 21). <i>Azzaḥ ma</i> , before (that) —	antequàm. <i>Urilli wamak</i> , it cannot be that — οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως —.
---	---

Certain phrases have great ambiguity, which would soon be corrected if the language were at all cultivated. Thus *Agfakkanni* and words equivalent to it are used for, Therefore, Because, or, In order that. *Akkanni ar-ak-nini* in Mark 10, 35, means, „According as we shall say to thee“, which appears to be the strictest sense of the words: yet the phrase, interpreted by the more frequent use of the idiom, would denote, „In order that we may say to thee“.

Considering that *ma* exhibits so many marks of native origin, it appears probable that we should be at once perspicuous and idiomatic by a freer use of it after prepositions, to form conjunctions: as:

Gaf ma, (before Future) in order that; *Ar ma*, until (that) —; etc. *Agmi* (ever since) has been observed twice, and must surely = *Ag ma*, „from that“, ex quò. (Under PAIN, Venture has *Armi*, which seems to mean „Until“. Yet he gives *Armi* as a rendering of QUAND.)

The particle *ma* is generally incorporated in the MS with the following verb: as, *Ma-ninna*, Si dixerimus; *Mawr-illi*, (= *ma ur illi*) si non sit, nisi sit: *Ma-yusad*, Quando venerit. *Maḍa*, like *Ma*, is pure Arabic, and exhibits the particle *ḍa* again.

The termination *yalla* in *Mayalla*, *Maḍayalla* can hardly be anything else than the verb *Yalla* or *Illa*, He was: for this is exactly analogous to Arabic, in which the old particle *In* (if) has been extensively supplanted by *In-kàn* (if it was, if so be) and *Là* by *Lùkàn*. In fact the Berbers employ *Illa* and its plural *Allan* with idioms in the verbs closely similar to the Arabic use of *Kàn* (he was): and we have already seen that *Akra* is elongated into *Akrayallan*, probably by adding the Participle of the same

verb. In the same sense the Arabs add *kàn* after *Ay man* or *Ays̃ ma*.

The particles *Mayalla*, *Mad̃ayalla* have meanings so diverse, as often to make sentences exceedingly obscure. The Hebrew כִּי is probably similar to them.

Farther remarks on the Etymology of Berber Demonstratives.

The demonstratives and relatives of this language are not wholly alien to the Syro-Arabian, as has been already indicated. — We compared *Id̃a*, *Id̃ak* with *Hād̃a*, *Had̃āk*; — *Anwa*, *Anta*, with *Ayna* or *Ana*; and *Dahinna*, there, is very like to Arabic *Honà* or *Henà*, here. — In the Galla, I find *Eniu?* for Who? Which? (Berb. *Anwa*); *Yawme*, When (Berb. *Uyawi*, whose etc.) *Kuni* (m), *Tuni* (f), This (Berb. *Winna* (m), *Tinna* (f).) *Aka*, as, according as, *Oka*, *Akana*, Thus; (Berb. *Akka*, so, *Akkanni*, as, so.) These similarities suffice to show, that the portion of Berber which is not Syro-Arabian is likely to discover affinities to other African tongues.

The Haussa language, though very remote from Berber in its vocabulary and its verb, is strikingly like in the class of words before us.

Haussa.	Berber.
<i>Mè, Mi, Mia</i> , what?	<i>Ma</i> , that etc. (So Arab., Heb.)
<i>Ma</i> , who, what.	(Ma, what? DELAPORTE.)
<i>Hakka</i> , <i>Hakkawa</i> , { so, as.	<i>Akka</i> , <i>Akkayyi</i> , { so.
<i>Hakkana</i> , so.	<i>Akkanni</i> , as, so.
<i>Awa</i> , as: <i>Amma</i> , but.	<i>Awa</i> , also: <i>Umma</i> , but.
<i>Dagana</i> , hence.	<i>Dayyini</i> , here. (<i>Dag̃ini</i> , Vent.)
<i>Ena</i> , <i>Nawa</i> , what?	<i>Anni</i> , that, which: <i>Anwa</i> , who?

Hausa.

Enda, where?*Kamma*, as: *Kaka*, how?*Wonne*, that: *Wongga*, this.*Woddanga*, these.*Wota*, another.

Berber.

Anid'a, where?*Amm*, as: *Amak*, how? (Arab.*Kema*, as.)*Winna*, that: *Wayyi*, this(*Wagi*, Vent.)*Wuyanni*, these.*Wayat*, another.*Substantives.*

Nouns have two genders. The masculines almost always begin with a vowel, which is ordinarily *A*; but *W* is frequently prefixed, or *A* changed into *U*, to express, as would seem, the article. Initial *I* appears to be written *Yi* or *Ya* at pleasure. Some prepositions change initial *A* into *U*, whether euphonically or to denote the article, cannot be here decided. Thus, *Afus*, hand, *Sufus*, by the hand.

Feminines almost always begin with *T*; sometimes with *T*. (Our *t* is habitually *t* in Venture.) They do not so uniformly end in *t* or *t*. A few have nothing to distinguish them in form; as *Yamma*, a mother, *Yalli* or *Yassi*, a daughter.

The plurals are so anomalous as to deserve comparison with those of Arabic. Nevertheless it is prevalent to end the plural masculine in *an* and the femin. in *in*, generally dropping *-t* or *-t*, the mark of the feminine. Initial *A* of the masculines is often changed to *I* in the plural: *in* is sometimes not added for the feminines.

*Examples of Masculines.**As*, day; pl. *Ussan*.*Ilis*, tongue; — *Ilsan* (Vent.)*Izim*, lion; — *Izmawan* (V.)*Argaz*, man; — *Irgazan*.*Afurak*, branch; pl. *Ifurkawan*.*Aslam*, fish; — *Isalman*.*Atad*, finger; — *Ittud'an*.

<i>Amdukkal</i> , fellow; pl. <i>Im-dukka</i> l.	<i>Ifri</i> , star; pl. <i>Ifrin</i> .
<i>Amaksa</i> , shepherd; — <i>Imak-sawan</i> .	<i>Akli</i> , **) a slave; — <i>Aklan</i> .
<i>Afus</i> , *) hand; — <i>Ifassan</i> .	<i>Uli</i> , heart; — <i>Ulawan</i> .
<i>Akarruy</i> , head; — <i>Ikarruyan</i> .	<i>It</i> , night; — <i>Ittawan</i> .
	<i>Atu</i> , wind, <i>Uttin</i> .

Feminines.

' <i>Takli</i> or ' <i>Taklif</i> , slave; pl. ' <i>Taklifin</i> .	' <i>Tagnaw</i> , heaven; pl. ' <i>Igenna</i> (Delap.).
' <i>Taddarf</i> , village; — ' <i>Tadrin</i> , ' <i>Tudrin</i> .	' <i>Tit</i> , eye, ' <i>Ifittin</i> (oftener) pl. <i>Allin</i> , <i>Wallin</i> .
' <i>Tamdint</i> , city; — ' <i>Tamdinin</i> .	' <i>Tikkalt</i> (a time, or turn: une fois:) pl. ' <i>Tikkāl</i> .
' <i>Takšišf</i> , girl; — ' <i>Takšišin</i> .	' <i>Tad'galt</i> , widow; — ' <i>Tud'gal</i> .

Some plurals belong to a different root from the singular: as '*Tamattuf*, a woman, pl. '*Kalat*, or in Venture, pl. '*Tulawin*: *Ajma*, a brother, pl. *Ayatma* or *Ayatmafan*: *Walatma*, a sister, pl. *Isitmaw*. In the two last examples, the change seems to be made at the beginning, by a method truly African. It may be inquired whether '*Kalat* is connected with *Alkalak*, a wife (Luke 1, 13), itself doubtless Arabic, though not intelligible by mere Arabic.

Maddan, men; *Allin*, eyes (fem. in Luke), *Imawlan*, folk, appear to have no singular. *Maddan* in sound resembles the Haussa word *Mutani*, men, from *Mutum*, a man, and *Mutu*, to die; so that we are brought back to the Arabic *Mut*, death. (I since find that Venture spells it *Muddam*.) That *Maddan* is foreign, might be guessed from its commencing with the consonant M. Its feminine seems to be '*Tamattuf*.

*) This word appears sometimes as feminine.

**) In Venture, *Akli* is a Negro.

Many nouns occur with and without the mark of gender, as *Aḥabbūt* or *Aḥabbūt*, the womb etc., *Laḥṣā* or *Talḥaṣīt*, the evening.

The last word belongs to a large class of nouns, viz. those which have been introduced from Arabic, with the article *Al* or the letter *L* adhering to them. Such are *Lamadd*, a space of time; *Lamna*, faith towards God; *Lakraya*, doctrine; *Laḡnān*, a garden or field; *Laswāk*, a market; *Liḥam*, iniquity.

The vague sense attributed to some of these, indicates that the words are not yet fixed in the tongue: thus from the Arabic *Amr*, a command, we have *Lumayra*, a divine commandment, a prodigy, a miracle, a sign. Sometimes the *L* is imbedded in the formation, by a Berber prefix; as in *Talḥaṣīt*, the evening: sometimes it is lost in one number; as *Laḡnūn*, a demoniac, pl. *Imḡanān* (as if from Arabic *Maḡnūn*): *Arrif* or *Rif*, an edge or border, pl. *Laryuf*. It may be probably inferred that *Rif* is an Arabic word, though it is not in Golius. Occasionally this formation with *L* is our sole reason for suspecting the Arabic origin of a noun; as *Lahḍir*, discourse, from (what might seem) a native Berber verb, *Ihḍar*, he discoursed: *Latṭaḥ*, anger, from *Itṭaḥ*, he was angry: *Lawham*, wonders, from *Yūham*, he wondered. Some Plurals appear to have been made in imitation of Arabic rules. Thus from *Lumayra*, pl. *Lumayraf*: from *Wāṣaya*, a divine precept, pl. *Wāṣayaf*. *Kalat* (women) also appears formed on a like model. — But perhaps these plurals may be found in Moorish Arabic.

There being no rule for forming the plurals, although they seldom go wide of the singular, they must be learned for each noun separately, and ought to be given in a Dictionary.

The *Cases* of the Noun which it is convenient here to establish, are, the Genitive, the Dative, and the Absolute

case. What is the strict logical idea of the last, will need farther investigation. It might at first appear that the plain noun, (as *As*, a day,) is nothing but what would be called „a Crude Form“ in the modern grammars of Greek; while the absolute case of the same (as *‘Das*) is the prepared and finished noun, like a Nominative or Accusative in Greek and Latin. Yet the parallel is not perfect; for the Berber does use the more naked form, as well as the other. A closer analogy may perhaps exist in a language under transition, as the modern Greek until recent times; in which it was uncertain whether to say *πόλις*, *πόλιν*, or to use *πόλι* for both. For the present, I waive the question, what is it that the Absolute case *means*, and consider only its form. Both numbers are declined alike.

First Declension.

Nouns, beginning with a Vowel.

	<i>Yamma</i> *), mother	<i>Argaz</i> , <i>Wargaz</i> , a man
Gen.	<i>Ayyamma</i>	<i>Nargaz</i> , <i>Awwargaz</i>
Dat.	<i>Iyamma</i>	<i>Iwargaz</i>
Abs.	<i>Adyamma</i>	<i>‘Dargaz</i>

Yirad°, *Irada*°, wheat

Gen. *Ayyirad*°

Dat. *Iyirad*° or *Iyyirad*°

Abs. *‘Dirad*° or *Adyirad*°

In the dative the *w* or *y* seems to be essential; but in the absolute case two forms as *‘Dargaz* and *Adwargaz* often exist.

*) This word also means a *maid servant*, by confounding two Arabic or Hebrew nouns.

Second Declension.

Genuine Berber nouns beginning with some other consonant than 'T or T.

	<i>Bàba</i> , a father	<i>Maddan</i> , men
G.	<i>Anbàba</i> , <i>Ambàba</i>	<i>Ammaddan</i>
D.	<i>Ibàba</i>	<i>Imaddan</i>
Abs.	<i>Adbàba</i>	<i>Admaddan</i>

No plural for *Bàba* is found in the MS. *Bàbatwan* is „your father“ or „your fathers“: etc.

Third Declension.

Feminine Berber nouns beginning with 'T or T.

	<i>Tamattuf</i> , a woman	<i>Takli</i> , a female slave
G.	<i>Natmattuf</i>	<i>Antakli</i>
D.	<i>Ifmattuf</i>	<i>Ifakli</i>
Abs.	<i>Attamattuf</i>	<i>Attakli</i>

Fourth Declension.

Arabic nouns beginning with *L* or *Al*.

These I cannot positively undertake to decline; except that they do not allow of *An* or *N* in the genitive. I believe they form the cases thus:

	<i>Laḡma</i> , temple	<i>Laḡnàn</i> , a field	<i>Alhukùl</i> , the fields
Gen.	<i>Allaḡma</i>	<i>Allaḡnàn</i>	<i>Alhukùl</i>
Dat.	<i>Ilaḡma</i>	<i>Ilaḡnàn?</i>	<i>Ilhukùl</i> (?)
Abs.	<i>Dalḡma</i>	<i>Adlaḡnàn</i>	<i>Dalhukùl</i>

A few not known as Arabic begin with *Al*, and as they never *) assume either *W* or *An*, may be suspected as coming from some unknown dialect of Arabic. Such is:

	<i>Alḡaši</i> , the populace
Gen.	<i>Alḡaši</i>
Dat.	<i>Iḡaši</i>
Abs.	<i>Dalḡaši</i>

*) This, among other things, makes me slow to believe that the *W* can be merely euphonic.

The first and third declension contain the great mass of the nouns in the language. The double form for the genitive in the first declension, may hereafter appear to have a significance: for instance, *Nargaz* may mean „of a man“, and *Awargaz* „of the man“. But no such distinction is to me visible in the MS, and my prevailing belief is that *Nargaz* is only the more recent mode of formation, and, as such, inappropriate to the demonstratives. Trisyllables also appear to prefer the formation by U; as *Amākran*, a lord, Gen. *Umākran*. For the genitive of *Ussan*, days, I have never met *Nussan*, but always *Awussan*; and it is perhaps a matter of first importance for using the nouns aright, to know which of the two genitives is to be taken. At least, if they have no difference of signification, it is probable that the broadest distinction of the declensions turns on the form of the Genitive. Venture speaks of genitives formed by prefixing *eb*, *b*, *egī*, *gī*; but *b* must be a various pronunciation of *w*, especially as Venture judges *b* not to be a Berber consonant at all. His *egī*, *gī* are our *ag* and *g*, which in some connexions form the partitive genitive (E, Ex), and in the Algiers MS as often mean From, as In.

A vocative is formed by prefixing *A*, *Ay* (oh!), but it is not worth while to insert this as a case. *Afamattut*, Oh woman! *Ayargaz*, O man!

One noun has been observed to vary between the forms *Ammi* and *Mammi*. It appears to be thus declined:

Ammi, a son (often *Ammis* before genitive: and *Ammit* before heavy suffixes.)

(G. *Ayyammi*?)

D. *Imammi*

Abs. *Admammi*

Voc. *Amammi*

The syllabization of the absolute case may depend on euphony in a sentence. At least we find in Gen. 20, 5,

Nattat ad'walatma }
and *Tinni d'awlatma* } Illa (est) soror (mea.)

The prepositions *Ag*, *'Dag*, and perhaps some others, elide initial *I* from a noun; as *Iman-is*, his soul, himself; *Ag-manis*, from himself.

The Absolute case sometimes is denoted by *Ayd'* instead of *Ad'*; as (Mark 6, 16)

Gazmag ayd'-akarruy-is, Amputavi caput eius: but this is very rare except to express the logical copula, for which *Ay* often seems practically to stand. Thus:

Ad'wayyini ayd'-alkadma ar-Rabbi, hoc (est) opus Dei.

Ad'nakki ayd'-agrum nafmaddurt', ego (sum) panis vitae.

In John 6, 15. we read *Ayd'* both with subject and predicate:

Ayd'nakkini Aydagrum idran, Ego panis vivens:

but I have not noted the same elsewhere. With the feminine:

Ad'nakkini Ayattawart', Ego (sum) porta.

Were not this usage, with the predicate only, very uniform, it might be suspected that *ad'* and *ayd'* are but an arbitrary difference of pronunciation; especially since in John 17, 10, we twice have *aynu*, *inak*, for *inu*, *inak*. — I however believe that *Ay* is a syncopation of *Ayyi*, this; and like the Arabic *Hu*, he, is used as a substitute for the logical Copula.

It causes great obscurity, that the same modification of form in a noun which we name the Absolute case, is also the preposition *With*, and the conjunction *And*. Thus:

'Gar tudrin d'-alhukul, ad vicos et agros.

S-alg'as'i d'-alg'ama, in plebe et templo.

Agfassabba d'-assabba: propter et propter (Gen. 21, 12.)

and joining the two uses, we have, Gen. 2, 24,

Babas ad' d'ayammas, patrem eius et matrem eius.

In the last instance, the latter noun only is in the absolute case, though the two are in apposition: this often happens where it is a plausible thought that the absolute case marks the Predicate.

Illa Kàimun ḍ-afallah̄, Erat Kain arator.

Wissan nakki ḍ-Uḏay, Num ego Iudaeus?

Illa was anni ḍ-assab̄, Erat dies ille sabbatum.

Iskar amàn ḍ-aṣrāb, Fecit aquam (ut esset) vinum.

Fukkan ublat at-taḏyak, Perfecerunt τὸν lapidem arctum.

This is so frequent, that I cannot help thinking it a law of the language, although so much beside will remain unexplained. The similarity of sound between *Aḍ* (or *Eḍ*) and *an* is pretty close; but when we add that each of them means *both*, an absolute (or emphatic) case, *and* the preposition *With*, it appears a coincidence denoting identity. Only the poverty of the Berber has led to the employment of *Aḍ* for the conjunction *And*.

This use has curiously outstept the original justification, for occasionally in the MS we find cases in which *Aḍ* cannot at all be resolved into „*With*“. Thus:

{ *Agri aḍ gar aḍ winna is̄ an alḡatta*:

{ *Inter-me et inter τὸ habens corpus.*

{ *Illa m-arayaḡli yattig aḍ m-ara attuli fufuk̄*:

{ *Erat quando cadit vesp̄rus et quando surgit sol* —

{ *Gar imaksawan awwulli n-Ibrahim ad̄ Lūt*:

{ *Inter pastores pecudis Abrahami et Lot.*

In the last, perhaps we should correct *ad̄ an-Lūt*, „*et Loti*“; since we elsewhere have

{ *Did̄i ad̄ d̄id̄ ak*: { *Ad̄ d̄id̄ as*: { *Garyad d̄id̄ ak*:

{ *Mecum et tecum.* { *Et cum eo.* { *Inter me et tecum.*

But if Venture's word *ùk* (likewise), or *awa* (also) of the MS, can be substituted, these are clearly more convenient.

On the Forms of Nouns.

Nouns often appear as primitives; with forms such as *Awal*, vox; *Igar*, ager; *Argaz*, vir; and sometimes are modified by merely taking a feminine form, as *Tigarf̄*,

ager, (agellus?). Occasionally from such nouns, verbs are derived, as *Awal*, vox; *Isawal*, nunciavit.

The Nouns which are derived from verbs, are chiefly *abstract* feminines, beginning with 'T' or sometimes 'Tam'. Much doubt appears to rest on the initial *M* or *Am* as forming a genuine Berber noun; for though there are many such instances, they are not so numerous as they ought to be, if it were still a living principle of the language. Moreover some of the cases have other grounds of suspicion. *Ilul*, genitus est, whence comes *Milul* or *Milal*, natalia, is at first sight a purely native word: but I have once found it with the Arabic article *Al milul*. This suggests the possibility that this, and other verbs in which derivatives by *M* are found, may be early importations from some less known form of Arabic, not to speak of Punic. Yet a few derivatives of this sort may come from a derived form of the verb, commencing with *M*: as from *Ītabbar*, explicavit, *Imtabbar*, deliberavit, *Amtabrit*, consilium.

Examples of Derivatives.

<i>Issa</i> , stravit	<i>Usa</i> (V. <i>Tisi</i>) lectus
	<i>Isit</i> , 'Tussant, planities
<i>Irza</i> , fregit	' <i>Tarzi</i> , fractio
<i>Yura</i> , scriptum est	' <i>Tira</i> , scriptio, scriptum
<i>Īlāf</i> , cepit	' <i>Tāfā</i> , captura
<i>Ikkir</i> , surrexit	' <i>Tukra</i> , vigilia; <i>Alwakra</i> , resurrectio
<i>Yukar</i> , fraudatus est	<i>Umakra</i> , fraus, 'Takkurt, furtum
	<i>Imakaran</i> , fures. (V. <i>Imakrad</i> , fur.)
<i>Igli</i> , cecidit	<i>Ugalyaw</i> , casus — (chance)
	' <i>Tigalyawt</i> , casus — (a falling)
<i>Ikkal</i> , <i>Ikkal</i> , vertit	' <i>Tikkalt</i> , vicis — (a turn or time)
<i>Ikkim</i> , consedit	' <i>Tagimit</i> (' <i>Takimit</i> ?) sessio
<i>Ikkur</i> , aruit	' <i>Tagart</i> , arida (terra): (arida) virga

<i>Yuraw</i> , genuit	<i>Tarraw</i> , partus; proles
<i>Ifur</i> , abdidit	<i>Tawafra</i> , celatio
<i>Imgar</i> , metiit	<i>Tamagra</i> , messis
<i>Iḡra</i> , cievit, invitavit	<i>Tamagʻra</i> , epulum; nuptiae
<i>Imukkar</i> , grandis fuit	<i>Amḡar</i> , senex; <i>Tamḡar</i> , senectus
<i>Isla</i> , audivit	<i>D-asla</i> , auditus
	<i>Maslyūt</i> , <i>Timazlyūt</i> , rumor, auditus
<i>Yūfa</i> , percussit	<i>Tifi</i> , <i>Tiyyifi</i> , plaga, verberatio, iaculatio
<i>Issin</i> , noverat	<i>Al mussin</i> , doctor: (Arab. senex)
<i>Yūzal</i> , cucurrit	<i>Tamusni</i> , <i>Sinni</i> , scientia
<i>Izla</i> , mactavit	<i>Tizli</i> , cursus, celeritas
	<i>Immazlan</i> , mactatum; <i>Tizlyūt</i> , victima
<i>Iksa</i> , carpsit, pastus est	<i>Mazlyūt</i> , <i>Timazlyūt</i> , ara
<i>Izra</i> , vidit	<i>Amaksa</i> , pastor; <i>Takassawf</i> , pastio
<i>Izdʻagʻ</i> , habitavit	<i>Timazryūt</i> , visio
<i>Izwar</i> , antecessit	<i>Amazdʻugʻ</i> , habitator; <i>Tamazdʻugʻt</i> , habitatio
	<i>Amazwar</i> , primus; <i>Tazwara</i> , principium
<i>Izmar</i> , potuit	<i>Timazwartʻ</i> , principatus, regnum
<i>Iddar</i> , vixit etc.	<i>Tazmartʻ</i> , potentia
	<i>Tuddurtʻ</i> , oftener <i>Tamaddurtʻ</i> , vita.

These are enough to show that a power of forming abstract terms pervades the language; although it may be admitted that there is want of variety. — Compound words exist, barely in isolated instances; as (Vent.) *Agʻzimwas*, meridies, = coupe-jour.

Adjectives.

Either from meagerness in the language or from want

of skill in the writer, the adjectives appear to be defective in number and precision: moreover a constant recourse to Arabic, beyond what is necessary, occasions a neglect of existing Berber words.

Some nouns are used alternately as substantives or adjectives; as *alḡali*, good, *ḡiri*, evil; yet the adjectival use is the rarer, and the tendency is to use both words as indeclinable. Thus instead of *argaz ḡiri*, „a bad man“, we have oftener, *argaz an-ḡiri*, „a man of evil“. In the MS I often find it hard to judge whether words are true adjectives. Such as *Amsūm*, unjust, *Ihwah* or *Ahwah*, silly, from their very form we may almost suspect to be substantives, as also *Ihwah* is used.

The adjectives however, as well as the substantives, generally begin with a vowel. For *ḡiri*, Venture gives *Dirif* and *Irif*. The *ḡ* is probably only the mark of the absolute case, which has wrongly cohered. Many adjectives may be called Participial, and perhaps this is the only living part of the adjectival system. The participle is formed from the root of the verb, chiefly by adding *an* and prefixing *I*: the participial adjective merely prefixes *A* instead of *I*; and it seems probable that by inventing an adjective for every participle, that is for every verb, we might supply a great want without becoming obscure, or violating any analogy.

It is so habitual with the Berbers to prefix *ḡ* to the masculine and *ḡ* to the feminine adjective, as to make it rather rare to meet the pure form. This will remind an Arabic scholar of the words, *ḡālek* (m), *ḡālek* (f), „this“, in which it may seem that the Arabs have preserved an early tendency which has had a wider range in the Berber. Delaporte has *yad*, *ad*, „ce“, and Venture has *ati*, *cette*. These may seem an older pronoun, *yad* (m), *ati* (f) this; which would be important in etymology.

Examples of Adjectives.

'Diri, (Iri?) evil	Alḡāli, good
Mazzi, little	Ag'allil, poor
'Kiralla, many, much	Amallal, white
Mazlat, poor	Azaggag, Azwag, red
Kammil, { long, wide, large	Abrikan, black
Kammiyal, {	Azagzaw, green
Ad'argal, blind	Amakran, great
Abarkus, leprous	Amazyan, little
Aḡaggun, dumb (?)	Ag'uzzifan, (Vent.) long
Aḡazzuz, deaf (?)	Agazlan, short
Abag'gus, maimed	Akamlan, long
Ag'dur, lame	Amsawan, equal (Arab)
Astalay, hot (?)	Azaddigan, clean
Asammit, cold	Agazman, crippled, maimed
Afazzat, false	Amazwar, first
Adrus, few, a little	Anaggar, last
Awlan, near	Ifuban, mild, benign
Alhan, beautiful	Ims'uman, oppressive = Am-
Arbah, rich	s'um?
Azzayf, heavy	Ilwan, riotous (?)
Yumdar, foolish	Ihwah, silly
Ad'his, narrow	Alhal, wanton (?)
Amgar, old	

When the substantive is understood, the adjective forms a genitive just as if it were itself a substantive. Thus:

Arzan atar umazwar, they brake a foot of the first. I apprehend that „the first foot“ must be expressed by atar d'amazwar; so that ambiguity is avoided. In the same verse however, is added:

d'-utar anaggar, and the foot of the last; where we should expect unaggar: nor is it easy to think the change form atar to utar intentional, unless d'u means „and“. Venture gives d'u for Avec.

As a substitute for adjectives, we often find a noun preceded by a preposition. Thus from *attabuf*, holiness, (or, meekness? goodness?) we have not only *Iman natta-buf*, „the Spirit of holiness“, but *Isakr-iff nattabuf* (Gen. 2, 3), „he made it of holiness“, i. e. „he made it holy“. So *‘Dakrayallan as-watū*, every thing in life, i. e. every thing living; and *Suḥabbūl*, literally „in utero“, ἐν γαστρὶ, is used for ἔγγαστρος, pregnant.

In number and gender, the perfect adjective is thus declined:

Sing.	Plur.
{ <i>‘Diri</i> , malus:	<i>‘Dirin</i> , mali
{ <i>‘Diriḥ</i> , mala:	<i>‘Dirint</i> , malae.
{ <i>Alḥālī</i> , or <i>‘Dalḥālī</i> , bonus:	<i>‘Dalḥālīn</i> , boni
{ <i>‘Dalḥālīḥ</i> , bona:	<i>‘Dalḥālīnt</i> , bonae.

(I have never met *‘Talḥālīḥ* as a feminine.)

{ <i>Azaddigan</i> , purus:	<i>Izaddiganan</i> , puri
{ <i>Tazaddigant</i> , pura:	<i>‘Tazaddiganin?</i> purae.

How the pl. fem. in such as the last, is to be formed, I cannot decide by positive example. It rather seems to me that *‘Tazaddigant* is of both numbers.

{ <i>Amḡar</i> , senex, senior:	<i>Yamḡaran</i> , senes, seniores.
{ <i>Tamḡart</i> , vetula:	

Venture gives *Ilha*, handsome, (f) *‘Telha*. But I have only met *Alhān*, which may be the participizing form.

Some plurals are irregular; as *Amazwar*, prior, primus; pl. *Imazwara*; (dative, *imazwara*): *Anaggar*, posterior, postremus, pl. *Inaggura*.

Adverbs formed as *Abagḡuṣ*, *Asammit*, seem to be a class of themselves; so are such as *Agallil*, *Amallal*, *Azaggag* (or *Azagḡag*), which have only two robust consonants.

Even from Arabic words of recent introduction the Berbers form adjectives of participial form; as *Imalhan*,

profitable; *Īkarban*, near; *Īlazman*, needful; *Inakkasan*, sinful (i. e. reproachful?)

Degrees of Comparison.

Adjectives have no change of form to express Comparative or Superlative: but several substitutes are used.

1. The Arabic words *ak'ir* (melior), *ak'ar* (plus) and improperly (maius), are borrowed; in which case the preposition *an* or sometimes *ag* follows, with the sense of „quàm“, or sometimes a genitive of another form.

2. The Berber preposition *annig* or *anniz'*, (super); else *ag'fa* or *falla*; after the positive. *Annig* may then take a genitive after it, which seems to imply that it is not properly a preposition.

3. *Is'at*, „amplus erat“, appears to take the adverbial sense of „amplius“; but perhaps in strict analysis this is not the case. The Berbers, like the Hebrews, say: „He added to take“, for, „He again took“: so too perhaps, „He was abundant to love“, is the formula for, „He loved more“. Indeed, „He added to fear“, for, „He feared the more“. *Is'at*, at least sometimes, is followed by *Ag'fa*, super.

Examples.

- { *Urilli a'rabba' ak'ir n-iyyan as-isaknan*:
 { Non est discipulus(?) melior quàm oi ei monstrantes.
 { *Iskawas alk'ad'ma ak'ir an-tayyi*:
 { Monstravit ei operam meliorem quàm hanc.
 { *Guri lahd'ir, ak'ar ay Yuh'ana*:
 { Mihi (est) sermo, maior Iohannis.
 { *Hammilan azzak'a ammaddan, anniz' n-azzuk' ar Rabbi*:
 { Amabant honorem hominum, super quàm honorem Dei.
 { *Ad' B'aba ay-d'amkaran ag'f-akrayallan*:
 { Pater (est) magnus super omnes.
 { *Ad'natta ay-d'amazwar falli*: } (but in John I, 27,
 { Ille (est) antiquus super me. } d'amazwar-yù.)

{ *Ayanni* *) *is̄tan* ag'f-ayyi —
 { Quaecunque abundant super hoc —
 { *Aggalla Wuday is̄s̄at ad ibg'an almut'is* —
 { Factus est Iudaeus *amplius* volens (?) mortem eius —
 (One might have expected, *is̄s̄at ad ibg'a*, addidit cupiat.)

Numerals.

In the MSS of the four gospels and Genesis, all the numerals after the two first are borrowed from the Arabic; but Venture and others have given the purer Berber forms, which in great part are unconnected with the Syro-Arabian, and may be here properly re-exhibited.

Berber.	Amharic.	Arabic.
1. (m) <i>Yiwan</i> , (f) <i>Yiwat</i>	<i>And</i>	
2. (m) <i>Sin</i> , (f) <i>Asnat</i>		<i>'Tenin</i>
	<i>Sinat</i>	
3. <i>Kerad</i>		
4. <i>Kūz</i>		
5. <i>Summus</i>	<i>Amest</i>	<i>Kamsa</i>
6. <i>Sedis</i>	<i>Sedest</i>	<i>Setti</i> (for <i>Sedsi</i>)
7. <i>Set</i>	<i>Sabāt</i>	<i>Sabaε</i>
8. <i>Tem</i>	<i>Sement</i>	<i>'Temānia</i>
9. <i>Tzau</i> , <i>Dza</i>	<i>Zatāñ</i>	<i>'Tisaε</i>
10. <i>Merawa</i>		
20. <i>Sin d'emrawinin</i>		
30. <i>Kerad d'emrawinin</i>		
etc. etc.		
100. <i>Miyet</i>	<i>Mutoe</i>	<i>Mayyat</i>
200. <i>'Tenat miyet</i>		
etc.		
1000. <i>Ifid</i>		
2000. <i>'Tenat ifid</i> etc.		

*) indeclin. participle.

The Arabic and Amharic have been annexed, where they are to the purpose; the latter from ISENBERG'S *Dictionary*. In the first numeral only is the Berber like the Amharic but contrasted with Arabic; its other resemblances to Amharic are found in those numerals which the latter has in common with the Syro-Arabian family. Yet *Set* for „seven“ seems to retain final *t* from a contraction of *Sabat*; so that in 5, 6, 7, 9, the language is nearer to Amharic than to Arabic.

On the *Ordinals* no information is contained in the only sources to which I have access.

Various peculiar idioms in the use of the Cardinals show themselves in the Algiers MS. One is the use of the *genitive plural* after a number; as:

Reḡa nīrgazan, quatuor virorum

Aḡnaṣ naḡtallaḡin, duodecim sportularum

Rabḡin awwussan, quadraginta dierum

Rabḡin ayyatawan, quadraginta noctium.

On the contrary, to judge by the analogy of

Kerad ḡemrawinīn, three tens,

the native cardinals are followed by the Absolute case.

A more perplexing idiom is the *genitive singular* after the word *Yiwan*, one; as:

Yiwaf an-tamdint, una urbis = una urbs;

Yiwaf an-tiramṡ, una horae = una hora.

I cannot help suspecting that this is erroneous, though its recurrence proves it to be no casual error or slip of the pen.

The Cardinals are sometimes used with a peculiar idiom to supply the place of ordinals; as:

{ *Agg-as n-aḡmanya wussan*:

{ E die octo dierum = Die octavo.

I am disposed to think this may be the genuine Berber method of evading the need of Ordinals.

On the Forms of Primitive Verbs.

Before proceeding to the Conjugation of Verbs, it may be expedient to exhibit the forms of their radical part. Whether indeed the Imperative or the third p. sing. of the Aorist is the truest root, must at present remain doubtful; and in perfect verbs, the discussion appears nugatory. At present, in these verbs at least, following the practice usual in Hebrew and Arabic, we shall refer to the 3rd. p. sing. aorist.

I. *Perfect Triradical Verbs.*

1. With three true consonants:

<i>Izmar</i> , potuit	<i>Ikriz</i> , aravit	<i>Iskan</i> , monstravit
<i>Iskar</i> , fecit	<i>Imgar</i> , metiit	<i>Ihd'ar</i> , locutus est
<i>Inkar</i> , negavit	<i>Ilkim</i> , pervenit	<i>Iskaf</i> , suxit, sorbuit
<i>Ifsar</i> , tetendit	<i>Ihlik</i> , aegrotavit	<i>Ikmiš</i> , vi prensavit
<i>Irwal</i> , fugit	<i>Izwar</i> , antecessit	<i>Ikmaž</i> , scabit
<i>Ilmad</i> , didicit	<i>Ig'zim</i> , secuit	<i>Iks'am</i> , intravit
<i>Idwam</i> , serviit	<i>Irtal</i> , mutuum dedit	<i>Izgan</i> , medius erat.

2. With one radical an immutable vowel: or with a reduplication:

<i>Iš'ad</i> , (V) lapsus est	<i>Yug'am</i> , hausit	
<i>Ilüz</i> , esurivit	<i>Yurag'</i> , somniavit	
<i>Ifud</i> , sitivit	<i>Yug'ad</i> , timuit	<i>Ihuzz</i> , movit (Ar.)
<i>Ifük</i> , finivit	<i>Yulan</i> , aegrotavit	<i>Ig'azz</i> , rosit
<i>Iür</i> , plenus erat	<i>Itrü</i> , flevit	<i>Izzal?</i> precatus est.
<i>Ifüh</i> , oluit	<i>Iddü</i> , ivit	(= Arab صلی)
<i>Izük</i> , ornavit		

The first column of the 2nd class is of the sort called *Concave Verbs* in the Arabic grammars. They retain the long vowel unchanged in the Aorist, but (if the sources can be trusted) not in longer tenses, where the accent shifts away from it.

3. With some elongation of the Primitive:

<i>Ikūkar</i> , mente concepit	<i>Ismūn</i> , collegit	<i>Imukkar</i> , grandis fuit
<i>Isudan</i> , osculavit	<i>Ismāh</i> , ignovit	<i>Ihammil</i> , amavit
<i>Yunād</i> , quaesivit	<i>Iksūd</i> , metuit	<i>Isaklad</i> , miscuit
<i>Yukkal</i> , reversus est	<i>Isirad</i> , lavit	<i>Ifaddū</i> , ambulavit.

Idargal, caecus fuit, is *Quadriradical*; as a few beside.

Some are perhaps really *Biradical*; but without a fuller certainty concerning their vowels and their secondary forms than our materials give, it may be impossible to decide whether they have lost a weak radical. Such are:

<i>Ikir</i> , surrexit	<i>Iffag</i> , exiit	<i>Isag</i> , aspexit
<i>Isal</i> , vidit (V.)	<i>Ikkān</i> , ligavit	<i>Izzag</i> [*] , mulxit (V.)
<i>Issin</i> , noverat	<i>Igan</i> , cubuit	<i>Iras</i> , depositum est
<i>Igal</i> , iuravit	<i>Idis</i> , visit	<i>Ikis</i> , amovit (V.)
<i>Isāt</i> , amplum erat	<i>Izig</i> [*] , decepit (V.)	<i>Iddiz</i> , contrivit (V.)

In these, the first consonant is often doubled, for mere euphony.

II. *Imperfect Verbs* are those, in which one or more radical, *ā ū ī*, is liable to obliteration or change. These constitute the principal difficulty in conjugating, from the frequent uncertainty what are the true radicals and from the shifting orthography by which we are embarrassed.

1. Imperfect in First Radical.

a. *Ibad*, stetit (Ar.), *Isāt*, amplius fuit, abundavit.

β. *Yūzal*, cucurrit, *Yūkar*, furatus est,

Yūman, credidit (Ar?).

2. Imperfect in Second Radical. (Perhaps these include those above given as Biliteral, beside such verbs as *Ilūz*, *Itūr* etc. which appear in some tenses to lose their vowel.)

3. Imperfect in Third Radical, (very common).

*) *To Milk* so easily gains the metaphorical sense of *To Deceive*, that these two verbs are possibly but one.

<i>Ibā'a</i> , incepit (Ar.)	<i>Ilsa</i> , indutus est	<i>Irza</i> , fregit
<i>Ibna</i> , aedificavit (Ar.)	<i>Ipsi</i> , solvit	<i>Izla</i> , mactavit
<i>Iswa</i> , bibit	<i>Insa</i> , noctem est	<i>Isla</i> , audivit.
	commoratus	

Some verbs are doubly imperfect, as:

<i>Illa</i> , erat	<i>Itā'a</i> , comedit	<i>Yūsa</i> , venit
<i>Iga</i> , erat (D.)	<i>Iḡḡa</i> , reliquit	<i>Yūḡa</i> , sumsit
<i>Inna</i> , dixit	<i>Irra</i> , rettulit	<i>Yūli</i> , ascendit
<i>Illi</i> *), aperuit (V.)	<i>Izza</i> , convertit	<i>Yūbi</i> , { tulit, duxit
<i>Yūfa</i> , invenit	<i>Yūra</i> , scripsit	<i>Yūwi</i> , {
		<i>Yūfā</i> , percussit.

III. There is strong ground for suspecting, that where the language is or was spoken in greatest purity, it had a *Passive* distinguished by *mere vowels* from the *Active*. Of this I notice the following symptoms from Venture.

Under COUVRE: *Delig*, J'ai couvert: *Dilag*, J'ai été couvert.

Under LÈSE: *Darrag*, J'ai fait du tort: *Durrag*, J'ai été lésé: (though *Durr* is the Arabic, and is active.)

In Hodgson's MS also I have noted, that although the *ū* is constant in *Yūfa*, invenit, f. *Tūfa*; yet we have *Tafa* for „inventa est“; *Itsayal*, iudicavit; *Ittusayal*, iudicatus est; *Ifur*, abdidit, *Iffir*, abditum est. In practice the Berber language is involved in miserable confusion from using the same verb indifferently as *Active* or *Passive*. The cause not improbably is, that the old vocalized *Passive* has gradually become obsolete, as with the Arabs, and that no well settled system for supplying the defect has yet grown up. The materials however are close at hand, and the evil will be remedied the moment that cultivated natives arise; as will appear from the following.

IV. From primitive verbs are derived others with a modified meaning, exactly on the same principles as in the

*) Probably a mere vulgarism for *Ildi*, which is the only form used in Hodgson's MS.

Ethiopian and Syro-Arabian. A fuller knowledge of the more regular and perfect verbs would no doubt clear up the uncertainties now overhanging the imperfect ones: but as the latter recur by far the oftenest, it is not easy to effect this without ampler trustworthy sources. Venture could no doubt have performed the task, but it does not appear to have occurred to him as of importance.

1. The commonest of the derivative verbs is formed by prefixing *S* or *Sa* to the primitive, and generally communicates a *causative* sense. Such are:

<i>Irwal</i> , fugit	{ <i>Ibad</i> , stetit	{ <i>Iīg'ar</i> , accessit
<i>Isarwal</i> , fugavit	{ <i>Isbad</i> , stare fecit	{ <i>Isatj'ar</i> , (Deo) obtulit
<i>Iras</i> , depositum est	{ <i>Irūh</i> , ivit (Ar.)	{ <i>Irwà</i> , satiatus est
<i>Isras</i> , deposuit	{ <i>Isarwah</i> , ire fecit	{ <i>Isarwa</i> , satiavit.

This is so entirely a living process, that a causative verb, it would seem, may always safely be invented from any given verb, without risk of being misunderstood. It is perpetually employed even upon Arab roots. Yet even this advantage is often thrown away in Hodgson's MS by employing the two forms (as *Iras* and *Isras*) each for both senses. — This method of derivation for the Causative verb is found also in Amharic.

Several of the examples given above under the 3rd class of Perfect Verbs, probably belong to this form; viz. *Isūden*, *Isirad'*, *Isaklad*. The same is true sometimes in cases which might not be suspected. Thus Venture gives *Isubb*, „coxit“, which might be taken for a mere reduplicate, as *Ihuzz*; but under „Cuit“ „Viande“ „Fruits“ and „Oeufs“ the student will find repeated proof that there is a verb *Yubba*, „coctum est“; of which *Isubb* must be the causative.

2. A second mode of derivation is by prefixing *Ta*, *TTa* or *T*, which in Venture occasionally exhibits the form *Ts*, *Tes* and *D*. This may sometimes be a genuine passive, as in the Ghÿz and Amharic; but it oftener has a neuter, a reciprocal or a frequentative sense, bearing much analogy

to the Hebrew Hithpahhel. The form in *Ts* is possibly produced from the Causative; but *Ts* in Venture's dialect is apt to replace 'T' of Hodgson's MS.

<i>Ilsa</i> , indutus est	<i>Irag</i> , arsit	<i>Yuzal</i> , cucurrit
<i>Isalsa</i> , vestivit	<i>Isarag</i> , incendit	<i>Ittezal</i> , (V.) fluxu
<i>Illus</i> , vestitus est	<i>Itserag</i> , (V.) fulsit	laboravit.
(Lus = Arab لبس)		
<i>Yuraw</i> , genuit		
<i>Ittaraw</i> , genitus est		
<i>Izza</i> , convertit, circumdedit	<i>Ihuzz</i> , movit (Ar.)	<i>Iddu</i> , ivit
	<i>It-huzzu</i> , concussus est	<i>Ifaddu</i> , ambulavit
<i>Ilezzi</i> , convertit se		
<i>Iwat</i> , (V.) percussit	<i>Ikkat</i> , percussit, cecidit	
<i>Itsawat</i> , (V.) percussus est	<i>Ifikkat</i> , (V.) violenter cecidit	
<i>Yufa</i> , percussit	in MS	<i>Iswag</i> , corripit, perdidit
<i>Itwat</i> , percussus est		<i>Itwag</i> , corruptum est.

3. A verb expressing chiefly mutual or reciprocal action is often formed by prefixing *Ma* or *M*. This is combined with the preceding.

<i>Ikammam</i> , opinatus est (Ar.)	<i>Izhar</i> , iratus est
<i>Itkammam</i> , miratus est	<i>Amzahran</i> , mutuo irati sunt
<i>Imkammam</i> , intus reputavit,	<i>Idal</i> , <i>Ital</i> , texit, obvolvit
pl. inter se dubitaverunt	<i>Imtalu</i> , sepelivit
<i>Itkafa(y)</i> , ratiocinatus est	<i>Itabbar</i> , interpretatus est
<i>Imakfi</i> , { secum reputavit, pl. in-	<i>Amtabbaran</i> , inter se con-
<i>Itmakfi</i> , { ter se reputaverunt	suluere
<i>Igra</i> , iecit, proiecit, demisit	(Arab. <i>Sewa</i> , pariter)
<i>Imyaggar</i> , iactatus est, agita-	<i>Siwàn</i> , par
vit se	<i>Imsawa</i> , par fuit
<i>Ittamgar</i> , iactatur	<i>Amsawan</i> , iustificatus
	(fortasse, iustus)
	<i>Issamasawan</i> , aequavit.

More derived forms than these exist; but as they cannot yet be methodized, it belongs to a Dictionary rather than

a Grammar to treat of them at present. By far the most interesting must be the substitutes for the *Passive*; and in hope of affording hints that may promote enquiry, I add the following examples which have met me in the Algiers MS.

Isabbar, solatium dedit: *Itwašabbar*, solatium cepit.

Issan (Isin), novit: *Itwassan*, agnovit, agnitus est.

Iḡuṣṣ, oderat: *Itwaḡuṣṣ*, exosus est.

Itaf, cepit: *Aṭwatufa*, caro ferina — (qu. venatu capta?
Itwatuf, captus est?)

The form *Ittusayal*, iudicatus est, is probably to be regarded as identical with *Itwasayal*; in which case we should have another formation on the same model,

Isayal, iudicavit: *Itwasayal*, iudicatus est.

Conjugation of the Perfect Triliteral Verb.

Root: *Iskar*, fecit.

IMPERAT. Sing. *Asakar*, (contracted) *Askar*, *Sakr*-.: fac.

Pl. (m) *Sakaraf*, — *Sakraf*

(f) *Sakaramt*, — *Sakramt*.

AORIST: Sing. 3. (m) *Isakar*, (contr.) *Iskar*, *Isakr*-

(f) *ʿTasakar*, — *ʿTaskar*, *ʿTassakr*-

2. *ʿTaskarat*, *) — *ʿTaskarī*-

*) Venture writes *d* for *t*; and in his Dictionary, (but not in his Grammar,) often writes *ʿTaskar* for the 2nd person; thus confounding the Berber with the Arabic form and making the 2nd p. the same as the 3rd fem. Moreover he seems to regard the *-d* to be the same euphonic addition as that which we have set up for a Preterite; and naturally does not acknowledge such a form as *ʿTaskar-tad*, (which he would write *Tesker-dad*). In the MSS however the termination *-tad* has been found, and the *t* and the *d* are uniformly distinguished; and I have never had reason to suspect that *ʿTaskar* could be used as a 2nd person: yet I do not dare to deny it, since it has not occurred to me to watch for it.

1. *Sakarag*, (contr.) *Sakrag*
 Plur. 3. (m) *Sakaran*, — *Sakran*, *Sakarn*-
 (f) *Sakarant*, — *Sakrant*
2. (m) *Taskaram*, — *Taskarm*-
 (f) *Taskaramt*, —
1. *Nasakar*, — *Naskar*, *Nasakr*-?

PARTICIPLE: *Isakran*; which perhaps is indeclinable, except when it becomes an adjective. In Luke 21, 47, *Ibd'an*, „beginning“, is almost used absolutely.

In Hodgson's MSS the contracted forms alone are found, namely, the one for an isolated verb, and the other for the verb when followed by certain suffixes; as *Iskar*, fecit; *Isakr-it*, fecit eum. On this evidence alone we might infer a primitive form *Isakar* from which both have degenerated; but in fact several of the longer forms are common in Venture.

The tense which is here called *Aorist*, is ordinarily the Past, having close relations with the tense so named in Hebrew and Arabic. Nevertheless it has an extreme vagueness of use which may suggest that the language is often spoken as a *lingua franca* or Negro patois, in which one tense does duty for all. Especially when a pronoun is prefixed, I remark that (in the MSS) the Aorist is apt to acquire a Future or Subjunctive sense: as, *Rafad'n-ak*, sustulerunt te; *Ak-rafd'an*, te tollant. I suspect that the latter is only a syncopation for *Ad'-ak-rafd'an* which is the proper Subjunctive or Present tense.

The tenses which remain are derived from the Aorist, which alone can be called Primitive.

1. First, is a tense which (provisionally at least) I venture to call the Preterite. It is formed by adding *-d* or *-ad* to the Aorist; (*-id* or *-d* in Venture) and is regarded by Venture as merely a euphonic variety of the same. It is hard to conceive by what law of the ear the Berbers should say *Ug'magd* for *Ug'mag*, „pour adoucir la pronon-

„ciation“: but independently of this, I have remarked that the termination *-d* in the MS often recurs where pure *) past time is evidently intended; whereas I have never been struck by a passage, in which it is used as a Present; for instance, in enunciating a general sentiment; which is so common with the Aorist. Under correction therefore, I thus exhibit the PRETERITE.

Sing. 3. (m) <i>Iskarad</i>	Pl. 3. (m) <i>Sakrand</i>
(f) <i>'Taskarad</i>	(f) <i>Sakrantad? ***</i>
2. <i>'Taskartad **</i>	2. (m) <i>Sakramd</i>
	(f) <i>Sakramtad? ***</i>
1. <i>Sakrag'ad, Sakrag'd</i>	1. <i>Naskarad.</i>

It is very remarkable that the final *ad* is uniformly separated from the verb when a Pronoun is to be suffixed; as *Ibàn-* as *-ad*, apparuit ei: this †) seems to me to make it certain, that the syllable is significant, and not merely euphonic, much less (as Venture supposes) especially adapted to soften a *g*.

Moreover, when any thing occasions the pronoun to be prefixed instead of suffixed, the *ad* appears also to be prefixed: as *Is'ayyaε*, misit, mittit, mittet etc.: *Is'ayεad*, misit (strictly past), *Is'ayεid*, misit me; *Winna ay-add-is'ayyaε* (not, *Winna ay-is'ayεad*.) qui me misit. That this is the strict translation of the Berber phrase, I assert with some diffidence. Initial *ad* has a different meaning, (viz. the Present tense), and *ad* is very liable to turn into *add*. Yet

*) Thus in the Genealogies, *Yurwad* is always used, not *Yuraw*, for „genuit“.

**) As John 9, 34, *Kat'ti taskantad*, tu monstrasti.

**) The feminines being rare, I have formed these by analogy from those which occur sometimes in Imperfect Verbs or in the Imperative.

†) So indeed Venture has *Rig'-tes-id*, clausi eam; and other such, after my rule.

I have strong impression that after *Winna*, *Ur* and other words which cause an inversion of the pronoun affix, the *ad* or *d* cannot be suffixed to the tense: but to prove a negative assertion is arduous.

Again, there are two or more verbs which distinguish the Aorist from the present by the consonants and vowels, and not only by *ad* prefixed to the Present: as *Inna* or *Innad*, dixit, *Adyini* (not *Adinna*), dicit, dicat. Yet such forms are found as, *Ayanni addinna Rabbi*, quae dixit Deus; in which, I think, *addinna* ought not to be confounded with *adyini*, but = *innad*, only that the *winna* causes inversion of the tense mark.

This may seem too subtle to be true; but a similar inversion of the *n* which characterizes the participle, takes place after *Ur*, not:

<i>Isēan</i> , habens, possidens	<i>Ur-nasēa</i> , non habens
<i>Izran</i> , videns	<i>Ur-nazri</i> , non videns
<i>Isnan</i> , sciens, peritus	<i>Ur-nissan</i> , insciens,

nor have I ever met in the MS a case in which this rule is violated.

2. The Imperative takes a modification perfectly similar, by adding *-ad* or *d*; after a suffix pronoun, if there be one.

As: *Tafriy* or *Tafrid*, sequere me:
and from *Yusa*, venit; *As-ad*, veni tu, *Asf-ad*, venite.

Sakr-it, fac eam (id); = *Sakritt-id*.

I suspect that this final *d* also forms a kind of Past Imperative, giving urgency to the command; so that in strictness *Tafriy* is „sequere me“ and *Tafrid*, esto secutus me: *Sakrit*, do it (ποιεῖ αὐτό), *Sakrittid*, get it done (ποίησον αὐτό).

3. The participle is also modified by prefixing *add*. I do not remember ever to have met it in the form *ad*; which induces me to think that this is intended to express a change of sense similar to that which final *-d* gives to the Aorist. In fact, for the very common phrase, „the Father

which sent me“, in the gospel of John, we do sometimes read *Winna ay-išayḥan*, ὁ με mittens; (ὁ με νέμψας?) but much oftener *Winna ay-addišayḥan*. This would be going out of his way to injure the sense, if, while *išayḥan* means either νέμψας or νέμνων indifferently, *addišayḥan* were specifically the present νέμνων. I rather believe the very contrary, that *addišayḥan* is the Past Participle νέμψας.

4. PRESENT TENSE, used also for Future, and for Subjunctive, like the Hebrew Aorist. It is formed by prefixing *Ad* (in Venture *Ad*) to the Aorist: after which *Ad* and *Adn* are generally changed into *Att*, *Ann*.

Sing. 3. (m) *Adiskar*, 2. *Attaskaraṭ*: 1. *Adsakrag*.

(f) *Attaskar*:

Plur. 3. (m) *Adsakran*, 2. (m) *Attaskaram*, 1. *Annaskar*.

(f) *Adsakrant*: (f) *Attaskaramt*:

Ventures gives *Adsakrand* as a euphonic alteration of 3rd pl. m. This would be similar to *Awand*, *Asand* for *Awan*, *Asan* above noticed.

This tense, by supplying the place of Subjunctive Mood, supplies also that of Infinitive Mood, as in modern Greek or Arabic. The particle „that“ before it is systematically understood.

When a pronoun is to be affixed to this tense, it ordinarily is interposed between *Ad* and the rest of the verb; as, *Ad-awan-iskar*, vobis facit. But if a relative (as *Winna*, *Widak*) or, perhaps, the particle *Ur*, precedes, then the pronoun is prefixed to *Ad*. Thus Luke 1, 4, *Anni ak-adhadrág*, Quod tibi narro. Sometimes also, but not always, the same order is used, when the verb is Subjunctive, and the relative conjunction „That“ is understood; as John 4, 10, *Am-addifk*, (U) tibi det. Such are, at least, the best rules I have been able to draw up. Of *Ur* thus used I have noted one example, but cannot now find it.

In such cases as *Ad-awan-iskar*, Venture regards *Ad* as a preposition which means „To“: and it is certainly

striking that he always writes it with \bar{d} , while he, as regularly, has *Ad*, not $\bar{A}\bar{d}$, to mark the Present. He has only one example which is irreconcilable with my theory, viz. under LEUR: „ $\bar{A}\bar{d}$ asant *awid tini*, porte à elles des dattes“. If we may correct it to $\bar{A}\bar{d}$ asant *tawid* (= *tawit* of my notation) perhaps this would no longer be an exception. Although I do not know how the distinction of *Ad* and $\bar{A}\bar{d}$ may be explained by euphony, still I feel persuaded that $\bar{A}\bar{d}$ is in no case any thing but the sign of the tense. In Mat. 8, 31, I read $\bar{A}\bar{d}$ -*ag'-tussufgāt*, „nos eicies“; which, interpreted according to Venture, ought to mean, „nobis eiecisti“. So again, Mat. 6, 25:

Sag'a ak-ig' aladdaḥwa agr-alḥālim; ad'-ak-ig'

Ne te-linguat inimicus apud-iudicem; te-linguat

alḥālim agf-usufag'; attammugrat' g-alḥabs.

iudex penes-eiectorem?; *) iaciaris in carcer.

Here we see *ak-ig'* and $\bar{a}\bar{d}$ -*ak-ig'* to express the same idea, Te linguat; since after the particle *Sag'a* (ne), — which is common in the MS though unknown to Venture, — the $\bar{a}\bar{d}$ is easily dropt without obscurity; when however the verb is repeated, the Subjunctive tense $\bar{a}\bar{d}$ *ig'* is clearly brought out, as in *attammugrat'*. According to Venture, $\bar{a}\bar{d}$ -*ak-ig'* would mean „tibi reliquit“. More evidence of the same kind might be adduced; yet, on the whole, less than I could wish, because of the strong tendency to drop the $\bar{a}\bar{d}$ when a pronoun is prefixed to the verb. But the evidence must be viewed in connection with the perfectly similar idiom of the tenses compounded of *Ara*, which follow.

5. By prefixing *Ara* to the Aorist a tense is formed (unrecognized by Venture) which, until better advised, I call the *Future*; because it is often met where the Future emphatically is needed, although now and then it is certainly

*) In Mat. 15, 17, *usufag'* seems to mean „excrementum“.

found where a mere Present is expected. (Delaporte has this tense, and distinctly with a Present meaning.)

FUTURE.

Sing. 3. (m) *Arayiskar*, facturus est, } etc.
3. (f) *Arattaskar*, faciet. }

Thus in the imperfect verb *Ima*, dixit, is formed *Ad'yini*, dicit, *Ad'-awn-inig'*, vobis dico; *Ar-ak-nig'*, (or *Ar-ak-inig'*?) tibi dicam, *Ar-awn-inig'*, vobis dicam. From *Illa*, erat, and *Yuraw*, genuit, (John 3, 4):

Amak arayili, ad'yaraw wargaz d'amakran?

Quomodo erit, *) gignat vir senex?

Here *arayili* might be rendered „debet esse“; a sense often natural to this tense. There is no room for explaining *ara* as a preposition; and the analogy of *Ad'-awn-inig'* and *Ar-awn-inig'* makes me believe that *Ad'*, like *Ar*, is a mere sign of a tense.

It does not seem difficult to conjecture the primitive sense of this *Ara*. As a preposition, *Ar* means „usque ad“, and after a negative with the verb, *Ara* is like the French *pas*, *point*, and not unlike the Greek *ποτε*. Thus:

Ur abg'ig'-ara, non volui omnino; οὐκ ἤθελόν ποτε.

Also after an interrogative or relative, *ara* = *ποτε* in *τίς ποτε*; *ὅστις ποτε*. If *ara* strictly means „at sometime or other“, this would be not remote from the „until“ of *Ar* the preposition, and would account for its imparting the sense of Future Time, when it becomes a temporal prefix. Finally, it must be remarked that the Future with *ara* is steadily used in the MSS after *akkanni* (ut) to express intention. (Venture gives *akkin* with the Aorist.) Thus:

Akkanni arayfuk, ayanni adinna Rabbi:

Ut finiat (=finirentur) quae dixit Deus.

*) The sense wanted is „gignatur“. May we think that we have here a vocalized passive, *Ad'yaraw*, gignitur, from *Ad'yaraw*, gignit? I fear the *u* is of course obliterated in the Present.

That *ara* is no mere various pronunciation of *ad̄*, appears from their combination.

6. Another tense is formed by prefixing *Arad* to the Aorist. Thus from *Yusa*, vēnit, comes *Adyas*, vēnit, and *Aradyas*, venturus est, *Arattas*, ventura est. It may seem that *Arayiskar* differs from *Aradyiskar*, in that the former is more vaguely either „faciet“ or „facturus est“, while the latter is exclusively „facturus est“. But to assert any thing positively concerning the difference would be rash, since the signs *Arad-* and *Ara* are not often enough found coexisting in the same verb, to contrast them pointedly. The two forms often appear exchangeable, and when the *d̄* is assimilated to *f* or *n* following, it becomes obscure whether *Ara* or *Arad̄* is the origin. Thus *Arattaskar* may be explained as euphonical change either of *Ara-faskar* or of *Arad̄-faskar*.

7. The Participle undergoes a like modification to the Aorist, by receiving the prefixes *Add*, *Ara* and *Araddi*; and the only doubt concerning the change of sense intended, is, whether *Add* is for *Ad̄*, denoting present time, or (as has above been imagined) is for the Preterite.

Examples of *Ara* and *Aradd*.

Winna araddilulan galgatta, d̄algatta natta:

τὸ nascendum ex corpore, corpus illud;

winna addilulan gal Rūh, natta d̄al Rūh:

τὸ natum ex Spiritu, illud Spiritus.

Winna ar-af-itafran, ur-ittusayal:

ὁ eum-secuturus, non-iudicabitur.

Winna araddilulan d̄ag-s, natta n-ar Rūh n-attabūt:

τὸ nascendum ex eā, illud Spiritus sanctitatis.

8. There is another anomalous form, which must be here noticed. Instead of *Ad̄*, it is stated by Venture that *ē* is sometimes employed; which is spelt *ai* or *ay* in the Algiers MSS. It also deserves remark, that in place of *ay*,

the syllable *ag* seems to be found. What indeed this *ag* means, has long perplexed me; and for awhile I mistook it for a derived form of the verb; but from not finding it except in the 3rd p. sing. and in the participle, I now suspect that it is only a variety of the sound *) *I* or *Yi*. Yet we must not forget that *Ay* was used for the logical copula.

Examples of *Ay*.

Ayyassak ayfarhag, in te gavisus sum (gaudeo).
Asihāl aynasla, quaecunque audimus (audivimus?)
Ayḥattagām, recipietis, from *Yūḡa*, sumsit, *Ittag*, accepit etc.
Ayatmutal, (ea) similis est (Ar. *mīl*, similiter.)

Examples of *Ag*.

{ *Kul ši ayyas aggalla* (= *yalla*, *illa*?)
 { Omnis res per eum erat (= *facta est*).
 { *Adkalṭi agsinnan s-akrayallan*:
 { Tu (es) sciens de omnibus.
 { *Annamūs as-Mūsas aggaska*:
 { ὁ νόμος per Mosen datus est.
 { *Aggabḏa Yuhāna adīsafrāh*:
 { Incepit Iohannes laetificet (= *evangelium promulgare*).

In John 18, 20, we have *Ag*, *Ay* and *Ara*.

Adnakki agluḥan alḥālam nazzah: *adnakki ay-asn-isaknan*

Ego compellans mundum valde: ego iis monstrans
kul tiramt kalḡasī ḏalḡamaḥ, etc. *arahadrag s-ākra*
 omni horā in? plebe et templo etc. loquor de nihilo
g-atwafra:

in secreto.

*) Venture gives *i* as an isolated pronoun, to mean „He“; and in one sentence which I cannot recover, he separates it from the verb by a word intervening. If this is correct, we have here the derivation of the Arabic and Hebrew sign of the 3rd. p. masc. sing. in the Aorist.

Imperfect Verbs.

It is quite unnecessary to repeat in any detail the formation of other tenses from the Aorist, which is generally the same in these verbs as in the perfect ones. The only exceptions, I believe, are, that when *ù* is the first radical, it is liable to be shortened into *a* after *qđ* or other formative prefixes, (as *Yùli*, *arattali* for *arattuli*, (ea) ascendet,) next, that when the last radical is weak, it is apt to vanish entirely, in the longer forms. 1) Yet the *u* is often retained; and the loss of it is sometimes so inconvenient as to suggest the possibility that it is an error of writing: for instance, the tenses derived from *Yùli*, ascendit, and *Illa*, erat, confound themselves. From *Yùsa*, venit, are found *Adusig*, venio, *Adyusa*, vënit, as well as *Addasag*, venio, *Adyas*, vënit; and if both forms are allowable, perspicuity dictates the retaining of the *u*. In the derivative verbs *u* is, sometimes at least, fixedly retained, as in *Isuli* (not *Isali*) ascendere fecit. 2) The dropping of the final vowel which represents the last radical, appears to be sometimes quite arbitrary; as *Yuli* or *Yùl*, ascendit; *Yug'a* or *Yug*, sumsit. Yet I have observed a prevailing tendency to drop it when the Subjunctive Mood is to be expressed, as opposed to the Pres. Indicative: as *Adyusa*, venit, but *Adyas*, *Adyas*, veniat, veniret; *Ifka*, dedit, *Adifk*, det, daret. This has appeared to me to recur too often to be accidental, and to have a real analogy to the apocopated Subjunctive of Arabic. Nevertheless, in minutiae of this sort, the Algiers MS cannot be trusted.

In the syllabization of Imperfect Verbs many differences appear between Venture and the Algiers MS; nor can I find any sure method of deciding how to form the Imperative, when the Aorist is given. Yet the doubts lie within rather narrow limits. Thus, given *Issin* or *Isin*, scivit, noverat, we may be certain that *Scito* will be expressed by *Sin*,

Asin, *Assin* or *Asn*. Given *Yûg'a*, sumsit, we may conjecture that the imperative is *Ag'a*, *Ag*, *Awag*, *Awg* or *Awg'a*.

Examples of the Principal Types.

(The feminines are omitted.)

	Plenus est	Movit	Quaesivit	Somniavit
Sing. 3.	<i>It'ûr</i>	<i>Ihuz</i>	<i>Yûnâd</i>	<i>Yûrag</i>
2.	<i>Tat'ûrat</i>	<i>Tahuzzat</i>	<i>Tunâdît</i>	<i>Tawarg'at</i>
1.	<i>Tûrag</i>	<i>Huzzag</i>	<i>Nâdag</i>	<i>Ûrg'ag</i> , <i>Warg'ag</i>
Plur. 3.	<i>Tûran</i>	<i>Huzzan</i>	<i>Ûnâdan</i>	<i>Nûrag</i>
2.	<i>Tat'ûram</i>	<i>Tahuzzam</i>	<i>Tunâdim</i>	<i>Tawarg'am</i>
1.	<i>Nat'ûr</i>	<i>Nahuz</i>	<i>Nûnâd</i>	<i>Ûrg'an</i> , <i>Warg'an</i>

The Imperative of the 3rd is *Nâdi*, and the crude form of the verb seems to be *Ûnâdi*.

	Timuit	Reversus est	Cucurrit	Mactavit	Precatus est
S. 3.	<i>Yûg'ad</i>	<i>Yûkkal</i>	<i>Yûzel</i>	<i>Izla</i>	<i>Izzâl</i>
2.	<i>Tûg'ad'at</i>	<i>Tûklat</i>	<i>Tûzlat</i>	<i>Tazlut</i>	<i>Tazallat</i>
1.	<i>Awg'ad'ag</i>	<i>Ûklag</i>	<i>Azlag</i>	<i>Zalig</i> , <i>Azlig</i>	<i>Zûllag</i>
Pl. 3.	<i>Awg'ad'an</i>	<i>Ûklan</i>	<i>Azlan</i>	<i>Zalan?</i> <i>Azlan?</i>	<i>Zâllan</i>
2.	<i>Tûg'ad'am</i>	<i>Tûklam</i>	<i>Tûzlam</i>	<i>Tazlum</i>	<i>Tazallam</i>
1.	<i>Nûg'ad</i>	<i>Nûkkal</i>	<i>Nûzal</i>	<i>Nazla</i>	<i>Nazzâl</i>

The irregularities of some of the vowels appear more like carelessness or error than fixed principle.

	Scivit	Surrexit	Exiit
S. 3.	<i>Isin</i> , <i>Issin</i>	<i>Ikir</i> , <i>Ikkar</i>	<i>Iffag</i>
2.	<i>Tassinat</i> , <i>Tasnat</i>	<i>Takkirat</i> , <i>Takrat</i>	<i>Tafg'at</i>
1.	<i>Assinag</i> , <i>Asnag</i> , <i>Sinag</i>	<i>Akkirag</i> , <i>Akrag</i>	<i>Afg'ag</i>
Pl. 3.	<i>Assinan</i> , <i>Asnan</i>	<i>Akkiran</i> , <i>Akran</i>	<i>Afg'an</i>
2.	<i>Tassinam</i> , <i>Tasnam</i>	<i>Takkiram</i> , <i>Takram</i>	<i>Tafg'am</i>
1.	<i>Nasin</i> , <i>Nassin</i>	<i>Nakir</i> , <i>Nakkir</i>	<i>Naffag</i>

It is remarkable that although *u* does not enter *Iffag*, *exiit*, it appears with much uniformity in its derivative, *Isufug*, *exire fecit*, *eciecit*.

In a verb of two strong radicals, as *Isin*, it is often a question whether its 1st p. sing. and 3rd p. pl. are to be

Asnaġ, *Asnan* or *Sinaġ*, *Sinan*. Perhaps the true forms are *Asinaġ*, *Asinan*, and all the rest accidental corruptions.

The most difficult is the final vowel, as in the following.

	Oblitus est	Incepit	Constitit	Dimisit
S. 3. <i>Yitsu</i>		<i>Ibḍa</i>	<i>Ibad</i>	<i>Ibra</i>
2. <i>Tatsūt</i>		<i>Tabḍit̄</i>	<i>Tabaddat?</i>	<i>Tabrut̄</i>
1. <i>Atsuġ</i>		<i>Baḏiġ</i>	<i>Baddaġ</i>	<i>Baruġ</i> , <i>Abruġ</i>
Pl. 3. <i>Atsawan</i>		<i>Baḏan</i>	<i>Baddan</i>	<i>Baran</i> , <i>Abran?</i>
2. <i>Tatsam</i>		<i>Tabḏam</i>	<i>Tabaddam?</i>	<i>Tabrum</i>
1. <i>Nitsa</i>		<i>Nabḏa</i>	<i>Nabad?</i>	<i>Nabra</i>
		Sanavit	Tulit	
S. 3. <i>Ihla</i>			<i>Yübi</i>	
2. <i>Tahlit̄</i>			<i>Tübüt̄</i>	
1. <i>Ahlig̣</i>			<i>Übig̣</i>	
Pl. 3. <i>Ahlan</i>			<i>Ubbiyan</i> , <i>Büyan</i>	
2. <i>Tahlam</i>			<i>Tübidam</i> (V.!)	
1. <i>Nahla</i>			<i>Nübi</i>	

It may appear that a final vowel *ü* or *i* ought (1) to be retained when a consonant follows; (2) to vanish before *an*, or else to become *w* or *y*; (3) to become *a* at the close of the word. Yet it sometimes is retained even in the close, as in *Yüli* (not *Yüla*) ascendit, plural *Ulin*, not *Ulan*.

A final *ü* or *i* which has vanished in the Aorist, (at least in the 3rd p. sing. and 1st p. pl.) is often regained in the Present, as *Ibḍa*, inceptit, *Aḍibḍu*, incipiat; *Irwa*, satiatus est, *Adirwü*, satiabitur.

Verbs of the form *Ibad*, *Iras*, *Igan*, as far as I have found them, make their feminine *Aṭbad*, *Atras*, *Afgan*; while those which the Algiers MS writes with a double consonant, as *Issin*, *Ikkir*, *Iffag̣*, *Ikk̄an*, make *Tassin*, *Tak̄kir*, *Taffag̣*, *Tak̄kan*. (Yet *Tasna* is found.) These variations are too systematic to be accidental, and indicate a difference in the form of the root, not yet cleared up. Venture generally spells such words as the last with a single consonant. They differ in the MS also as to the form of

the imperative; as *Bad*, asta! (not *Abbad*) but *Assin*, scito! *Akkir*, surge! -- May the radicals of the latter set be SSN, KKR, etc. the first and second being the same?

There is an uncertainty as to the formation of Participles in these verbs. *Isla*, audivit, makes *Isallan*, audiens; *Izra*, vidit, has either *Izarran* or *Izran*, videns; *Ibd'a*, incepit, *Ibd'an*, incipiens.

The verb *Ifka*, dedit, is liable to lose its *f*, by assimilation to the *k*; as, *Urakkaḥ* (for *afkaḥ*) ne date; *Attak-gas* (apparently for *Attak-gas* (do ei). This is extremely common in the Algiers MS, yet is perhaps a needless vulgarism; since we have also *Ad'ifk*.

Verbs doubly Imperfect.

The frequent recurrence and the importance of these may make it worth while to exhibit them more particularly: when gaps are left, it is because the words which should fill them have not been found.

YLY?	YNY?		
<i>Ili</i> (esto)	<i>Ini</i> (dic)	<i>Azzi</i> (circumda.)	<i>Azzu</i> (torreface)(from Venture.)
<i>Ilif</i> (estote)	<i>Inif</i> (dicite)		
3. <i>Illa</i> (erat is)	<i>Inna</i>	<i>Izza</i>	<i>Izza</i>
2. <i>Tallit</i> etc.	<i>Tannit</i>		<i>Tazit</i>
1. <i>Allig</i>	<i>Annig</i>		<i>Zig</i>
3. <i>Allan</i>	<i>Annan</i>	<i>Azzan</i>	<i>Zan</i>
2. <i>Tallam</i>	<i>Tannam, Tinnim</i>		<i>Tazzam</i>
1. <i>Nalla</i>	<i>Nanna, Ninna</i>		<i>Nazza</i>
3. <i>Ad'yili, Ad'yil</i>	<i>Ad'yini, Ad'jin</i>	<i>Ad'izzi</i>	
2. <i>Attilit</i>	<i>Attinit</i>	<i>Attazzi</i>	
1. <i>Ad'ilig</i>	<i>Ad'inig</i>	<i>Adziyag</i> V.	
3. <i>Ad'ilin</i>	<i>Ad'inin</i>	<i>Ad'izzin, Adziyan</i> V.	
2. <i>Attilim</i>		<i>Attazziyam</i>	
1. <i>Annili</i>	<i>Anmini</i>	<i>Adnazzi</i>	
3. <i>Arayili</i> etc.	<i>Arayini</i> etc.		
Participles: <i>Illan</i>	<i>Innan</i>		

USA?		AW'G?	Specimen of Second Future.
<i>As-ad</i> (veni)		<i>Ag, Awag</i>	
<i>Asf-ad</i> (venite)		(cape)	
3. <i>Yusa-d</i>	<i>Yuf a</i>	<i>Yug a</i>	3. <i>Aradyas</i> (venturus est)
2. <i>Tusit-ad</i>	<i>Tuf it</i>	<i>Tugit</i>	<i>Arattas</i> (ventura est)
1. <i>Usig-ad</i>	<i>Uf ag</i>	<i>Ugig-ad</i>	2. <i>Arattasat?</i>
3. <i>Usan-d</i>	<i>Uf an</i>	<i>Ug an</i>	1. <i>Araddasag</i>
2. <i>Tusam-d</i>	<i>Tatwam</i>	<i>Tugim</i>	3. <i>Araddasan</i> (ventura sunt)
1. <i>Nusa-d</i>		<i>Nug a</i>	2. <i>Arattassam</i>
			1. <i>Aradnas</i>
3. <i>Ad'yusa, Ad' yas</i>	<i>Ad'yuf</i>	<i>Adyag</i>	The verbs <i>Illa</i> , <i>fuit</i> , <i>Inna</i> , <i>dixit</i> , most regularly exhibit the doubled consonant in the Aorist, which is single in the Present.
2. <i>Atlasat</i>			
1. <i>Ad'usig, Addasag</i>	<i>Ad'uf ag</i>	<i>Adag ag</i>	
3. <i>Addusan</i>	<i>Ad'af an</i>	<i>Adag an</i>	
2.			
1.	<i>Anmut</i>		

Participles:

Yusan? *Ad'yusan*;
Arayasan, Aradyasan.

The verb *Inna* habitually annexes a pronoun to itself (often redundant) in the Algiers MS, as *Innayàs*, *dixit ei*, *Ammanàs*, *dixerunt ei*, *Tannayàsan*, *dixit ea iis*. The form is such as to suggest that *Innayà* i. e. NYA is the root.

Why in some of these verbs the consonant is doubled, in others single, is far from clear. Venture's forms might sometimes imply different radicals from those of the Algiers MS.

Forms derived from the above.

<i>Ittas</i> , <i>vēnit</i>	<i>Itwat</i> , <i>percussus est</i>
<i>Ittas-ad</i> , <i>vēnit</i>	<i>Ad'ittawf</i> , <i>percutitur</i>
<i>Ittasan-d</i> , <i>venerunt</i>	<i>Ittag</i> , <i>sumpsit, cepit</i> (ut haeres)
<i>Ur addittas</i> , <i>non vēnit</i>	
<i>Ur addittassin</i> , <i>non venerunt</i>	<i>Issag a</i> , <i>Isg a</i> , <i>emit. Sag</i> , <i>eme.</i>
	<i>Ittug a</i> , <i>captus est</i> (?)

Winna addimasġan, *o emtus*, = *is qui emtus est* (Gen. 17, 12); implies *Imasġa*, *emtus est*.

I have observed that after *Ur* (not), they say *Ur illi*, „it was not“, (or, „it is not“). I cannot remember to have met either *Ur illa* or *Ur ili*, although (without *Ur*) *Illa* and *Adyili* are the constant forms.

So in the plural (which is very rare), John 7, 5,
{Ur-illin wayafmas assawlan —
{Non erant fratres eius declarabant etc. (for, crediderunt!)
 where *illin* stands after *Ur*, although *Allan* is the regular form for „erant“: and with the fem. sing. *Ur falli*, not *Ur falla*.

On the Negative Particle.

Ur is never used without a verb immediately following. At least, nothing may interpose, but a pronoun prefixed to the verb: as *Ur-ak-azrag*, *non te vidi*. When we wish it to precede a noun, it must be done by introducing the verb *Illa*, (erat,) redundantly: i. e. by using *Urilli* for *Ur*. They also use the Arab word *Ulaš* in this case.

Perhaps through carelessness, the Aorist after *Ur* is employed in past, present and future time. It stands for the Subjunctive in Gen. 4, 15,

{Ur-f-inak yiwan, ara-f-yufan:
{Ne eum necet quis, eum reperiens:
 but for „lest“ we generally find *Saġa* (often also *Wissan*, num, si forte) and not *Ur*. In direct prohibition, *Ur* is used with the Imperative.

{Ur nakk ara: ur faż (or, ur zann ara): ur attakkar:
{Ne neca: ne stuprum fac: ne furare.

Ur appears unable to bear either *Ad* or *Ara*, (prefixes of tenses) after it. Instead of *Ur adazran*, *non vident*, they would say either *Urazran*, or if this will be too vague as to the time, it may be expressed by *Urillin*: . . . *adazran*. Thus:

Urilli d'agrūm iyananis ad'issut' argaz, non est panis per se pascet hominem.

It has been already stated that the negative particle causes an inversion of the final *an* of the participle, as, *Winna illan*, ὁ ὠν = Qui est: *Winna ur-nalli*, ὁ μὴ ὠν = Qui non est. So with a pronoun interfixed; as *Winna ay-ibg'an*, ὁ με αmans; *Winna ur-ay-nabg' ara*, ὁ non me αmans.

I know not whether it is by an extension of the principle, that *interrogations* may invert the termination of the participle, when they imply a negation. At least I read, (Mat. 25, 44.)

{ *Aywak' ak-nazra nalluz nassud' d'ag'riban*,
 { Quando te vidimus esurientem sitientem et hospitem,
 { *urnals ara; nakman, ur-ak-naskira?*
 { neque vestivimus; captivum, neque tibi fecimus (serviebamus)?

Here *nalluz nassud' nakman* (if correct) are used, with the sense of *illuzan, issud'an, ikmanan*, the participles. There is something in all this so artificial, that I have constantly doubted my own perceptions; and the idiom (if it be one) is highly inconvenient, as it so confounds the participle with the 1st p. pl. of the Aorist. Yet I think I cannot be mistaken as to the fact, in reference to *Ur*. I have this instant before me 23 clear examples of the idiom, and I never remember to have met with a violation of it.

On the Consecutio Temporum.

A translation from Arabic is in danger of imitating the Arabic idiom, slavishly. It is therefore with caution that the following must be received. Next in frequency to the use of *illi* after *Ur*, is that of *Illa* (or *Talla, Allan*), like the Arab *Kān*, at the beginning of clauses, to give a Past sense to all that follows. Thus:

{ *Allan kiralla zad'man ad'hadran* —
 { Erant multi certaverunt (?) narrent —

{ *Widāk illan* *) *agbakri zarran, allan afkādš an lahd ir* :
 { qui erant ab initio viderunt, (et) erant ministrant sermonem.
 This formula is repeated to satiety.

Sometimes the Present of *Illa* precedes an Aorist:

{ *Ad'ilig argig rawlay galka* *ga* :
 { Ero exivi, fugi e terrā (Gen. 4, 14.)

More remarkable is the use of the 2nd person of the Aorist or Present with an Imperative sense, *when an Imperative has preceded*.

{ *Hasbat abrid ar-Rabbi*; *at'haynam aššaglis* :
 { Praeparate iter Dei; *facilitetis* operam eius.
 { *Akkar, attaf akšiš*, *at'ruhat gar Mašar* :
 { Surge, cape puerum, *eas* ad Aegyptum.

I have mislaid my examples of the Aorist, which form the more striking part of the idiom. They are such as the following:

{ *Addu agr-igar, tahūfat izamaran* —
 { I ad agrum, *quaesivisti* oves (= quaere),

but the difference of sound between the 2nd person of the Aorist and of the Present is so slight, that this, after all, may be, though not unfrequent, a mere carelessness.

Remarks on M. DELAPORTE'S specimens.

The deviation of the dialect here set before us, is so great, that much more study would be needed than I have yet been able to give, in order to appreciate aright its re-

*) participle *past*.

lation to Venture's Berber. Yet certain peculiarities are on the surface, and may here be noted.

Certain new forms of letters are found. P. 3, l. 2. the word for *Azrig*, (vidi, video) is written *arzig* by M. Delaporte, and for *z* has a *z* with three dots above. The same is constant with the same verb. For *Izmar*, potuit, he has *Izdar*, with a like *z*, p. 5, l. 4; p. 9, l. 7; and so with other words. In l. 4, *bizzâf* (beaucoup) is written not with the common *z* (ز), but two dots are placed over it instead of one. Whether this recurs, I cannot yet say. The *g* has often three dots below it, for our hard *g*. In p. 4, l. 8. is also *g* with three dots below, explained by *f*. The common *f* is found elsewhere.

The Arab *ص* is rather common, in words which Venture spells with *d* and the Algiers MS with *ط*; as *ادو* for *adu*, or *adu*, wind. Even the Arabic verb *Ibd'a*, inceptit, is spelt *أبصا*. — We cannot therefore be sure that *ص* is the stricter orthography.

A difference in the vocabulary is observable, but perhaps only as from province to province we ordinarily find certain favorite words. So also the Arabic words most common, seem to be a different set from those in the Algiers MS.

Besides, *Illa*, fuit, (which is connected with the Amharic *Ala*) M. Delaporte gives: *İga*, est: *Ur iga*, non est: *Gan*, ils sont; *Tga*, elle est; *Adgin*, qu'ils soient; *Tegit*, tu es. This is a useful addition to the language. The two verbs *İga*, est; *Illa*, fuit; are like the Arabic *صار* est, *كان* fuit; virtually giving to the verb To Be a great completeness of tenses and better defined time, than to any other verb in the language. It is remarkable that the Latin Verb has been generated by a like process.

In that MS the Arabic verb *Ibğ'a* is used in many

vague senses; (amavit, voluit, decuit, dignus fuit!) but especially serves for a kind of future tense, as: *Ibg'a ad'ihuf*, vult quaerat = quaeret. M. Delaporte similarly uses *Ira*, il veut, *Tritt*, tu veux, *Rig'*, je veux; (a word found in Venture:) as, *Lihal ira ibdal*, tempestas voluit mutavit = mutabit. (Perhaps *ira ad'ibdal* would be more accurate.) Again: *Idhar isira agbadel*, videtur vult mutet.

The Demonstratives, Interrogatives and Conjunctions deviate more or less. This will be most concisely represented in columns.

	Hodgson's MS.	Delaporte.
In this day	<i>Agg-ass-ayyi</i>	<i>Gassad</i>
How?	<i>Amak?</i>	<i>Mamnik?</i>
Behold!	<i>Afayan</i>	<i>Hatin, Han</i>
		<i>Ha</i> = ecce (p. 2, l. 9.)
When —	<i>Imir ma —</i>	<i>Mekk: Illeg'</i>
Like as	<i>Am, Amzun</i>	<i>Zon(d), Zun</i>
Whence?	<i>Ansi?</i>	<i>Mani? Manizig? Zegmanig?</i>
This wind	<i>Watu ayyi</i>	<i>Wadu yad</i>
Wherein?	<i>Aswayas? etc.</i>	<i>Maneg</i> = quoi en (Delaporte)
Where?	<i>Anid'a?</i>	<i>Menz'a</i>
If	(No specific word)	<i>Ig'</i> (p. 7, l. 6.)
There	<i>Dahinna</i> }	<i>Gid</i>
Here	<i>Dayyini</i> }	
When?	<i>Anta firamt?</i>	<i>Matta?</i> (Ar.?)
That (conj.)	<i>Akl-</i>	<i>Izde</i> (p. 11, l. 4.)
Is it that?	(Wanting)	<i>Is?</i>
How many?	<i>Asihal?</i>	<i>Mins't?</i>
Who?	<i>Anwa?</i>	<i>Ma?</i>

He uses *yan* (one) for the indefinite article *A*, *An*: as p. 5, l. 6, *yan oyis*, a horse: p. 6, l. 2, *yan Uday*, A Jew.

We may remark:

Guyguy, in me; for which *Aggi* might be expected in the Algiers MS.

Guys, in eo; for (*Aggas*) *Ayyas*.

Idudano, digiti mei; for *Ittūd'anyū*.

Idarino, pedes mei; for *Itarnyū*.

The tense formed by *Ara* is common, and generally means the Present. For the Subjunctive, (or Infinitive) p. 9, l. 7, I find the tense of *Ad'*; (*Ur zamrag' adaftuġ*, non possum exeam; except that he writes *zadrag'*, and with the peculiar *z*.) This latter tense appears rare. The tense with *Ay* at the beginning is more common, and being used as a Subjunctive, seems to be the substitute for *Ad'* or *Ad*. Delaporte seems to interpret this particle by „Que“.

In a future sense, *Raneggawar* (sedebimus); for *Ara-neggawar*.

The entire difference of the two dialects when divested of Arabic words, does not appear great in a scientific point of view, however embarrassing in conversation.

Conclusion.

More than enough has been written to show that the prevailing genius of the whole language marks it to be of the kind which PRICHARD has denominated Hebraeo-African.

The mode in which verbs and nouns are generated, the principles of conjugation and of declension, the apparatus of affixed pronouns, the structure and order of sentences, — assimilate it very closely to Hebrew and Arabic. Its use of the participles, and its tendency to invert the pronouns into prefixes in certain cases, is a step in the direction of the Amharic language. Its possession of Dative and Accusative pronoun affixes, introduces a complexity which shows the system to be of native growth, and that what it has in common with the Syro-Arabian nations is not to be imputed

to recent importation. In its use of Relatives and Interrogatives it shows much disposition to adopt outright the European (as opposed to Hebrew) principles of Grammar: insofar as to leave it doubtful which of the two tendencies is properly native. — Perhaps fresh light would be thrown on the last topic, by learning whether in this respect the Moorish Arabic has at all deviated from its Eastern parent.

FRANCIS W. NEWMAN.