3606H

UC-NRLF
B 2 841 487

3606 H

[illegible]
LIBRARY
[illegible]
[illegible]

POEM OF MEYSŪN;

MEYSŪN'S CLAIM;

ARABIC TRANSLITERATION, &c.

A 21.—

list 681/541

Digitized for Microsoft Corporation
by the Internet Archive in 2008.
From University of California Libraries.
May be used for non-commercial, personal, research,
or educational purposes, or any fair use.
May not be indexed in a commercial service.

OBSERVATIONS

ON THE SO-CALLED

POEM OF MEYSŪN,

AND ON MEYSŪN'S CLAIM TO THE AUTHORSHIP
OF THE POEM.

WITH AN APPENDIX

ON ARABIC TRANSLITERATION AND PRONUNCIATION.

BY

J. W. REDHOUSE, LL.D., C.M.G., M.R.A.S., ETC.

LOAN STACK

HERTFORD:
PRINTED BY STEPHEN AUSTIN AND SONS.

366 H

PREFACE.

As my paper in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society refers its readers to a former page of the volume for Mr. Freeland's text and translation of Meysūn's poem, it is necessary to give them here for the benefit of readers who may not have access to the pages of the Journal.

They are as follows:

قَالَتْ مَيْسُونُ بِنْتُ جَنْدَلَ ٱلفَزَارِيَّةُ

لَلُبْسُ عَبَآءَةٍ وَتَقَرُّ عَيْنِى   أَحَبُّ إِلَىَّ مِنْ لُبْسِ ٱلشُّفُوفِ
وَبَيْتٌ تَخْفِقُ ٱلْأَرْوَاحُ فِيهِ   أَحَبُّ إِلَىَّ مِنْ قَصْرٍ مُنِيفِ
وَبَكْرٌ يَتْبَعُ ٱلْأَظْعَانَ صَعْبٌ   أَحَبُّ إِلَىَّ مِنْ بَغْلٍ زَفُوفِ
وَكَلْبٌ يَنْبَحُ ٱلْأَضْيَافَ دُونِى   أَحَبُّ إِلَىَّ مِنْ هِرٍّ أَلُوفِ
وَأَكْلُ كُسَيرَةٍ فِي كِسْرِ بَيْتٍ   أَحَبُّ إِلَىَّ مِنْ أَكْلِ ٱلرَّغِيفِ
وَأَصْوَاتُ ٱلرِّيَاحِ بِكُلِّ فَجٍّ   أَحَبُّ إِلَىَّ مِنْ نَقْرِ ٱلدُّفُوفِ
وَخِرْقٌ مِنْ بَنِى عَمِّى نَحِيفٌ   أَحَبُّ إِلَىَّ مِنْ عِلْجٍ عَلِيفِ

I give thee all the treacherous brightness
Of glittering robes which grace the fair,
Then give me back my young heart's lightness
And simple vest of Camel's hair.
The tent on which free winds are beating
Is dearer to the Desert's child
Than Palaces and kingly greeting—
O bear me to my desert wild!
More dear than swift mule softly treading,
While gentlest hands his speed control,
Are camels rough their lone way threading
Where caravans through deserts roll.
On couch of silken ease reclining
I watch the kitten's sportive play,
But feel the while my young heart pining
For desert guests and watch-dog's bay.
The frugal desert's banquet slender,
The simple crust which tents afford,
Are dearer than the courtly splendour
And sweets which grace a monarch's board.
And dearer far the voices pealing
From winds which sweep the desert round
Than Pomp and Power their pride revealing
In noisy timbrel's measur'd sound.
Then bear me far from kingly dwelling,
From Luxury's cold and pamper'd child,
To seek a heart with freedom swelling,
A kindred heart in deserts wild.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE VARIOUS TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS OF THE SO-CALLED "SONG OF MEYSŪN"; AN INQUIRY INTO MEYSŪN'S CLAIM TO ITS AUTHORSHIP; AND AN APPENDIX ON ARABIC TRANSLITERATION AND PRONUNCIATION.[1]

By J. W. Redhouse, M.R.A.S., Litt.D., C.M.G., etc., etc.

Dr. Carlyle's book, "Specimens of Arabic Poetry," may be somewhat scarce, and Captain, now Sir R., Burton's

CORRIGENDA.

P. 16, 2nd par., 9th line. For "A.H. 35 (A.D. 655)" read: "A.H. 40 (A.D. 660)."

P. 20, l. 2. For "the direct line of the great Mu'āwiya thus becoming extinct" read: "the remaining branches of the direct line of the great Mu'āwiya being then infants, the sovereignty passed to collaterals."

P. 23, first line. For "first and only son" read "only son that left male issue."

P. 23, ll. 4 and 3 from bottom. For "only son" read as above "only son that left male issue."

Society, Mr. E. J. W. Gibb, has kindly put my prose trans-

---

[1] As this paper may be considered illustrative of its author's method of Arabic transliteration, the native names are left precisely as spelt in the MS.; not modified to be in accordance with the orthography usually adopted in the Journal. The author, however, prefers a straight stroke under the letters ẖ ṯ s̱, instead of the dot (ḥ ṭ ṣ) as used throughout this article; see his reasons on p. 41.—Ed.

I give thee all the treacherous brightness
  Of glittering robes which grace the fair,
Then give me back my young heart's lightness
  And simple vest of Camel's hair.
The tent on which free winds are beating
  Is dearer to the Desert's child
Than Palaces and kingly greeting—
  O bear me to my desert wild!
More dear than swift mule softly treading,
  While gentlest hands his speed control,
Are camels rough their lone way threading
  Where caravans through deserts roll.
On couch of silken ease reclining
  I watch the kitten's sportive play

OBSERVATIONS ON THE VARIOUS TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS OF THE SO-CALLED "SONG OF MEYSŪN"; AN INQUIRY INTO MEYSŪN'S CLAIM TO ITS AUTHORSHIP; AND AN APPENDIX ON ARABIC TRANSLITERATION AND PRONUNCIATION.[1]

By J. W. Redhouse, M.R.A.S., Litt.D., C.M.G., etc., etc.

Dr. Carlyle's book, "Specimens of Arabic Poetry," may be somewhat scarce, and Captain, now Sir R., Burton's "Pilgrimage to El-Medinah and Meccah" gives only an English version, without the Arabic text, of the little piece of poetry attributed to Meysūn, the mother of the second Damascus Caliph of the house of ʾUmeyya, Yezīd son of Muʿāwiya son of ʾEbū-Sufyān Ṣakhr son of Ḥarb, etc.

Mr. Freeland has, therefore, rendered a real service to the many lovers of old Arabian literature by printing in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, New Series, Vol. XVIII. p. 90, a complete and fully-vowelled text of the ditty, as this allows them to compare it with the very free rhymed and metrical versions made by himself, by Sir R. Burton, and by Dr. Carlyle. Their talented, but somewhat florid productions disguise altogether the real form and the simplicity of the little poem. I have imagined, therefore, that a closer verbal prose translation of its distichs would not be a disservice to the cause of Arabic studies in England.

A valued and talented friend, one of the Members of our Society, Mr. E. J. W. Gibb, has kindly put my prose translation into a metrical form, with the same kind of monotone rhyme that is used in the Arabic original,—a system of versification for which he expresses a great attachment, and in which he has had much experience.

---

[1] As this paper may be considered illustrative of its author's method of Arabic transliteration, the native names are left precisely as spelt in the MS.; not modified to be in accordance with the orthography usually adopted in the Journal. The author, however, prefers a straight stroke under the letters ẖ ṯ s̱, instead of the dot (ḥ ṭ ṣ) as used throughout this article; see his reasons on p. 41.—Ed.

To enable the readers of our Journal to compare these five versions with one another, I here copy those of Dr. Carlyle and Sir R. Burton, while Mr. Freeland's rendering, with his recension of the Arabic text, can be studied at p. 90-91 of the present volume.

Dr. Carlyle says (according to Mr. Clouston's "Arabic Poetry for English Readers"):

"The Song of Maisuna.

"The russet suit of camel's hair,
With spirits light and eye serene,
Is dearer to my bosom far,
Than all the trappings of a queen.

"The humble tent, and murmuring breeze,
That whistles through its fluttering walls,
My unaspiring fancy please,
Better than towers and splendid halls.

"Th' attendant colts, that bounding fly,
And frolic by the litter's side,
Are dearer in Maisuna's eye,
Than gorgeous mules in all their pride.

"The watch-dog's voice, that bays whene'er
A stranger seeks his master's cot,
Sounds sweeter in Maisuna's ear,
Than yonder trumpet's long-drawn note.

"The rustic youth, unspoiled by art,
Son of my kindred, poor but free,
Will ever to Maisuna's heart,
Be dearer, pampered fool, than thee."

Sir R. Burton's "Pilgrimage," vol. iii. p. 262, has:

"O take these purple robes away,
Give back my cloak of camel's hair,
And bear me from this tow'ring pile
To where the Black Tents flap i' the air.

The camel's colt with falt'ring tread,
  The dog that bays at all but me,
Delight me more than ambling mules—
  Than every art of minstrelsy.
And any cousin, poor but free,
  Might take me, fatted ass! from thee."

From a comparison of these two versions, it is evident that Dr. Carlyle and Sir R. Burton have used the same Arabic recension, in five distichs, for their renderings, however widely these two differ in form and in words. Sir R. Burton's is less diffuse than that of Dr. Carlyle. The latter uses the expression 'pampered fool' where Sir R. Burton has 'fatted ass.' I had imagined, with only Mr. Freeland's Arabic text to judge from, that these two offensive variants were perhaps either poetic licences, or that the text or texts they had used had the word عِجْل 'a *calf*,' in the last hemistich, where Mr. Freeland gives the anagram عِلْجٍ. In that case, عِجْلٍ عَلِيفٍ would have meant, correctly rendered, 'foddered calf,' easily turned by poetic licence into both 'pampered fool' and 'fatted ass.'

My friend Mr. Gibb has, however, latterly favoured me with a copy of Dr. Carlyle's Arabic original, from the second edition of his "Specimens," London, 1810; and this has the same word, علج, given by Mr. Freeland. Neither of their translations has, unfortunately, a trace of either of the two real meanings of the term عِلْج, viz. 1st, 'an ass, wild or domestic, strong and fat;' 2nd, 'a man, foreign and non-Muslim' (i.e. an outlandish barbarian). But, as its accompanying adjective, عَلِيف, means, 'home-fed, foddered, not pastured or pasturing,' the two words combined can only indicate 'a fodder-fed domestic ass,' the alternative signification, 'an outlandish barbarian,' being, consequently, out of the question. Neither Dr. Carlyle nor Sir F. Burton is quite right, therefore, in this respect, as Dr. Carlyle's 'pampered fool' and Sir R. Burton's 'fatted ass' are somewhat wide of the original expression, 'a fodder-fed ass.'

I subjoin here Dr. Carlyle's Arabic text for comparison. It gives no vowel-points, and it contains some variants from Mr. Freeland's recension. Omitting the fifth and sixth distichs of the latter for the present, the two texts follow the same order of the verses.

قالت ميسون بنت بحدل

للبس عبا و تقر عينى * احب الى من لبس الشفوف (1)
و بيت تخفق الارواح فيه * احب الى من قصر منيف (2)
و بكر يتبع الاظعان صعب * احب الى من بغل رفوف (3)
و كلب ينبح الاضياف دونى * احب الى من هز الدفوف (4)
(5, 6)
و خرق من بنى عمى فقير * احب الى من علج عليف (7)

In 1873, Mr. Gibb has again informed me, Messrs. Henry S. King and Co. published some part of an Arabic work, printed in Egypt, but translated and annotated by a lady, Mrs. Godfrey Clerk, in which the song of Meysūn is given in seven distichs, like that of Mr. Freeland; evidently the same in words, but arranged in a different order. Her translation runs thus:

1 (2). A hut that the winds make tremble
Is dearer to me than a noble palace;

2 (5). And a dish of crumbs on the floor of my home
Is dearer to me than a varied feast;

3 (6). And the soughing of the breeze through every crevice
Is dearer to me than the beating of drums;

4 (1). And a camel's wool abâh which gladdens my eye
Is dearer to me than filmy robes;

5 (4). And a dog barking around my path
Is dearer to me than a coaxing cat;

6 (3). And a restive young camel, following the litter,
Is dearer to me than a pacing mule;

7 (7). And a feeble boor from midst my cousinhood,
Is dearer to me than a rampant ass.

The numbers in parentheses show Mr. Freeland's order of the distichs, for the sake of comparison. The words of each distich are mainly, essentially, the same in the two versions. Mrs. Clerk's translation is much closer to the Arabic text than either Dr. Carlyle's, or Sir R. Burton's, as a whole; though several words are incorrectly rendered, and many of the ideas incorporated in the lady's imagery are taken from Western life, not redolent of the Desert.

Mrs. Clerk's notice of Meysūn is to the following effect: "Mîsûn, the daughter of Bahdal, was married to Mŭâwiyah, and he brought her from amongst the wandering Arabs into Damascus. But she sorrowed exceedingly for her people at the remembrance of her home; and one day, whilst he was listening to her, he heard her reciting and saying" the verses given above. "Upon hearing these lines, Mŭâwiyah exclaimed, 'The daughter of Bahdal was not satisfied until she had likened me to a rampant ass!' And he ordered her to be packed off again to her family in the desert."

In a note, Mrs. Clerk says further: "She had an excellent genius for poetry; and at Mŭâwiyah's command, took her son Yezid (Mŭâwiyah's successor) with her into the desert among her own relations, in order to inspire him with poetic sentiments."

A foot-note in Sir R. Burton's "Pilgrimage" informs us as follows: "The British reader will be shocked to hear that by the term 'fatted ass,' the intellectual lady alluded to her husband. The story is, that Muawiyah, overhearing the song, sent back the singer to her cousins and beloved wilds. Maysunah departed, with her son Yezid, and did not return to Damascus till the 'fatted ass' had joined his forefathers."

Dr. Carlyle (in Mr. Clouston's book) gives the same story, but in more reserved terms, ending thus: "As a punishment for her fault, he ordered her to retire from court. Maisuna immediately obeyed, and, taking her infant son Yezid with her, returned to Yemen; nor did she revisit Damascus till after the death of Mowiah, when Yezid ascended the throne."

Mrs. Clerk writes "Mîsûn" instead of Meysūn. But, with Dr. Carlyle's ميسون, though he transliterates 'Maisuna,' we can see that Mr. Freeland's مَيْسُونُ, transliterated by him 'Maisun,' is the true name, as is confirmed in the Qāmūs lexicon under the root مَيَسَ, where it is said: وَمَيْسُونُ ٱسْمُ بِنْتِ بَحْدَلٍ أُمِّ يَزِيدَ بْنِ مُعَوِيَةَ "and Meysūn is the name of the daughter of Baḥdel, the mother of Yezīd son of Mu'āwiya.' Sir R. Burton's 'Maysunah' is, therefore, quadruply erroneous, the first vowel being, correctly, the soft *e*, not the hard *a*; while the second vowel is long, *ū*; and the final 'ah' a double interpolation.

Referring now to Mr. Freeland's text, p. 90, any one may observe, even if entirely uninstructed in Arabic, that it presents on the right-hand side of the left-hand column of hemistichs, as he looks at the page, a perpendicular row of the words أَحَبُّ إِلَىَّ مِنْ seven times repeated, once in each distich. These words simply mean: (were) lovelier to me than . . . . This one reiterated expression, then, heads the second clause, the second hemistich, of each verse or distich, without the alteration of a single letter or vowel-point, and indelibly stamps the type of the whole poem in a most determinate, remarkable manner.

But let the reader next examine the versions of Dr. Carlyle, Sir R. Burton, and Mr. Freeland, comparing them with Mrs. Clerk's rendering. He will perceive that they have all three systematically shunned this sevenfold, characteristic series of words; they have striven to give a variety to what requires uniformity,—they have attempted "to gild refined gold, to paint the lily," and they have merely overlaid naïve Eastern simplicity with a series of Western embellishments.

The somewhat metrical prose translation offered below for further elucidation gives as close an approximation to the sense of the original as I have been able to compass, in about the same number of syllables; and my friend Mr. Gibb's versification which follows it, without losing sight of the Arabic text, will be found, I trust, by our readers, to exhale, like the sweet wood-violet, an aroma as delicately poetic as the very simple ideas, clothed in the artless words of the poem, can well be made to furnish.

Meysūn's Ditty.

To dress in camlet smock, with tearless, cheerful eye,
  Were lovelier to me than gauzy webs to wear.
A tent through which the winds should waft their fluttering breeze,
  Were lovelier to me than sumptuous princely bower.
A wayward camel-colt, behind the litter-train,
  Were lovelier to me than nimbly-pacing mule.
A dog that bayed the coming guests not yet at hand,
  Were lovelier to me than fondly-coaxing cat.
To eat a crumblet in a tent's retiring nook
  Were lovelier to me than eating breadcake bun.
The hoarse, loud roarings of the winds in every glen,
  Were lovelier to me than timbrels' clattering pulse.
A generous, slender youth, one of my uncle's sons,
  Were lovelier to me than any foddered ass.

Mr. Gibb's versified rendering is as follows :

Meysūn's Ditty.

To dress in camlet smock with cool and placid eyne,
  Were liefer far to me than robes of gauze to wear;
A tent, wherethrough the winds in gentle wafts should breathe,
  Were liefer far to me than palace haught and fair;
A wayward camel-colt behind the litter-train,
  Were liefer far to me than hinny debonair;
A dog that bayed the guests ere yet they came me nigh,
  Were liefer far to me than cat with fondling air;
To eat a scantling meal aside within the tent,
  Were liefer far to me than feast on dainties rare;
The soughing moan of winds that blow through every glen,
  Were liefer far to me than sounding tabors' blare;
A slim but generous youth from 'mong my uncle's sons,
  Were liefer far to me than foddered ass, I swear.

The reader is now in a position to choose for himself which of the English versions given of this little Arabian song, ballad, or ditty he may think best adapted to convey its real meaning. The variants in Dr. Carlyle's text, as compared with that of Mr. Freeland, of عبا for عَبَآءَةٍ, of تختقق for تَخْفِقُ, of رفوف for زَفُوفُ, are not of much consequence, the last, رفوف, being probably a printer's error. His هز الدفوف, however, indicates that the sixth line of Mr. Freeland's version was not altogether unknown to some copyist through whom Dr. Carlyle's text was derived, as that distich ends with نَقْرِ ٱلدُّفُوفِ, of which the نَقْرِ is a synonym with Dr. Carlyle's هز ; and this last, again, is apparently a clerical substitute for Mr. Freeland's هِرٍّ, two distichs having been thus erroneously fused into one. The substitution of فقير for نَحِيفٌ accounts for Dr. Carlyle's expression of 'poor,' where Mr. Freeland's text requires a rendering of 'slim,' 'thin,' 'slender,' or the like, though Mr. Freeland's free-and-easy rendering suggests nothing of the kind.

Taking the distichs of Mrs. Clerk's version in the order of Mr. Freeland's text, it may be remarked that she has misunderstood the expression in No. 1 about the eye. It is not the 'abâh' that is to gladden the eye; but it is 'a camlet smock' together with a cool, *i.e.* an unreddened, uninflamed, 'tearless, cheerful eye,' or, in other words, "a camlet with happiness of mind were lovelier, dearer to me . . . . ." In No. 2, again, it should not be that 'the winds make tremble' the tent; but that the winds flutter as they pass through the tent. In No. 3, 'litter' should be *litters*, i.e. a train of several or many litters. In No. 4, "around my path" is a thoroughly Western misconception of what really means *in front of me*, i.e. between them and me, "short of me." In No. 5, "varied feast" is too far from the sense as to both words; the comparison is between a dry, broken little morsel, "a crumblet," and a fresh-baked, soft cake of bread, usually eaten in Syria, etc., with other food at meals. In No. 6, "crevice" is not right; and in No. 7, the خِرْقٌ of the text is the very reverse of "a boor," and really means *a fine, noble fellow;* while "rampant" is wrong altogether, unless we are to read, as is given further on, in Ziyā Pasha's recension, عَنِيفِ for عَلِيفِ after عِلْجٍ.

The text given by Ziyā Pasha (then Ziyā Bey) in a three-volume collection of Arabic, Persian, and Turkish poems, to which he gave the name of خَرَابَاتْ, is found in vol. ii. p. 442, of the collection. It does not agree in the sequence of the distichs with either of those of Mr. Freeland or Mrs. Clerk, except as to the last, and only important one. This occupies the same place in all three, as also in the versions of Dr. Carlyle and Sir R. Burton. Several variant words occur, too, in the distichs. No vowels are given. In the following copy Mr. Freeland's order of the distichs is again shown in the parentheses.

1 (2) لبيت تخفق الارياح منه * احب الى من قصر منيف
2 (1) ولبس عباءة وتقر عينى * احب الى من لبس الشفوف
3 (5) واكل كسيرة فى كسر بيتى * احب الى من اكل الرغيف
4 (6) واصوات الرياح بكل فج * احب الى من نقر الدفوف
5 (4) وكلب ينبح الطراق دونى * احب الى من قط الوف
6 (3) وبكر يتبع الاظلال صعب * احب الى من بغل ردوف
7 (7) وخرق من بنى عمى نحيف * احب الى من علج عنيف

The variant words are, in 1, الارياح منه for ٱلْأَرْوَاحُ فِيهِ; in 3, بيتى for بَيْتِ; in 5, الطراق for ٱلْأَضْيَافِ, and قط for هِرٍّ; in 6, الاطلال for ٱلْأَظْعَانَ, and ردوف for زَفُوفِ; and in 7, the last word, عنيف for عَلِيفِ.

Of these variants, ٱلْأَرْوَاحُ and ٱلْأَرْيَاحُ are both correct and synonymous plurals of ٱلرِّيحُ *the wind*; فِيهِ means *in it*, while

مِنْهُ signifies *from it*; in 3, بَيْتِي *my tent*, is for بَيْتٍ *of a tent*; in 5, ٱلطُّرَّاقَ *the sudden, unexpected droppers-in by night*, takes place of ٱلْأَضْيَافَ *the guests*; while قِطٌّ and هِرٌّ are synonyms for *cat*; in 6, ٱلْأَطْلَالَ, pl. of طَلَلٌ, means *the erect forms, the figures* (of men), while ٱلْأَظْعَانَ, pl. of ظَعْنٌ, signifies *camel-litters in which women sit when travelling*; ردوف, appears to be a misprint; and in 7, عِلْجٍ عَنِيفِ *a coarse barbarian, a tiresome lout*, is a much more apposite converse of خِرْقٌ نَحِيفٌ *a slender, generous youth*, than is عِلْجٌ عَلِيفٌ *a foddered ass.* Were the poem to be edited anew, this word عَنِيفِ should be adopted as the better and probably true reading. The distich could then be rendered:

> "A slender, generous youth, one of my uncle's sons,
> Were lovelier to me than any tiresome lout."

By further considering that, as none of the distichs except this last is composed of two rhyming hemistichs, it would be perhaps better if this distich also were deprived of its rhyme; a critic might feel inclined to prefer Dr. Carlyle's فَقِيرٌ at the end of the first hemistich, and the distich might stand thus in translation:

> "A generous youth, though poor, one of my uncle's sons,
> Were lovelier to me than rude, offensive lout."

But "poor" and "generous," again, are not very usual poetic concomitants; and a word such as شَفِيقٌ *tender-hearted*, حَلِيمٌ *considerate*, نَبِيلٌ *noble*, etc., if met with in any variant recension, would make a better antithesis to عَنِيفِ, and would be a still more preferable alternative to نَحِيفٌ or فَقِيرٌ in the hemistich here treated of.

Of the whole, very artless poem, it may be said that the repetition of لَبْسٌ in distich No. 1, and of اكْلٌ in distich No. 5, are doubtless blemishes. The repetition of بَيْتٌ in distichs 2 and 5, and the virtual repetition of أَرْوَاحٌ and أَرْيَاحٌ in distichs 2 and 6, are still open to objection, though less so than the former. The variation of the rhyming long vowels, by the use of four letters, ُو, and three letters, ِى, is at best a permissible licence in Arabic verse, is not tolerated in Persian or Turkish, and cannot be taken as adding beauty to the poem. The sevenfold repetition may be taken, perhaps, as a very effectual mark of individuality in the composition, which thus stands unparalleled, very likely, and can therefore be held to constitute a kind of beauty not advisable to imitate. We may, therefore, look upon "Meysūn's Poem" as a somewhat faulty, though striking, artless ballad, well adapted to captivate the rude, uncultivated children of the desert and villagers, so as to elicit their applause on being recited. We shall then have said as much in its praise as its subject admits of; and this preference for desert-life shown in its words may, it seems, have given to our own poet, Moore, the germ of the idea from which he evolved his charming little gem of "Fly to the desert, fly with me!" which is as untrue, in reality, as it is specious and captivating to young, ardent minds, unacquainted with the hard lot of incessant toil, frequent starvation, and ceaseless blood-feuds, of which the life of the desert is chiefly made up.

But a much more serious question arises with reference to the supposed authorship of this little Arabic ditty; more especially since it is known that Ziyā Pasha, himself a poet of high standing and research, avows himself ignorant of its composer. In a marginal note he has laconically marked the poem as being "by an author unknown." One would imagine that he must certainly have known that common rumour has for ages attributed it to Meysūn; and he may, therefore, in his judgment, have deliberately and definitively rejected this parentage. Before I had heard of his marginal note, I had myself felt inclined to doubt, urged by considerations of the status and known or probable precedents, respectively, of the *dramatis personæ* of the little burletta. Did, then, Meysūn probably compose or even sing these verses? Did Mu'āwiya, on hearing her sing them on a chance occasion, dismiss her summarily from his home—from his mansion of governor, for he was not a sovereign until many years later? His son and successor, Yezīd, from his recorded age of 34 at his accession, must have been born not many years after Mu'āwiya became governor of Damascus for the second caliph 'Umer; and thus, to answer the two foregoing questions with any degree of probability, we must trace the history, not of Mu'āwiya only, but of the rise and early progress of Islām, as follows:

Mu'āwiya's father, 'Ebū-Sufyān Ṣakhr son of Ḥarb son of 'Umeyya (whence the name of the 'Umeyyid dynasty), was born B.H. 57 (A.D. 565), being Muḥammed's senior by about five years. He was a rich, travelling merchant, became head and captain of the Qureysh tribe (from a branch of which, the Hāshimids, Muḥammed also sprang), and a kind of Doge or Mayor, Sheykh of Mekka. He bravely, sternly opposed Muḥammed in the field for some years, but failed, ultimately, of success. When Muḥammed, in the eighth year of the emigration (Hijra) from Mekka to Medīna, and sixtieth year of his age, advanced at length with a resistless force, and received the submission of his native place, he was met at some distance from the holy city, first by his own paternal uncle, 'Abbās, slightly his superior in age (who had always been friendly to him, and whose descendants eventually became the 'Abbāsid caliphs), and then by his hitherto determined enemy, 'Ebū-Sufyān, aged sixty-five (and whom 'Umer would have killed, had not Muḥammed restrained him). These both at that time made their profession of 'Islām, were accepted by Muḥammed, and followed him into Mekka. There and then did the wife of 'Ebū-Sufyān, with her two sons, Yezīd (aged thirty-one) and Mu'āwiya (aged thirty), also avow their adhesion to 'Islām. Mu'āwiya even professed to have secretly embraced the faith two years earlier, when Muḥammed made the truce of Ḥudeybiyya with the Mekkans. 'Ebū-Sufyān's daughter, Mu'āwiya's sister, 'Ummu-Ḥabība Remla, had already been married in that sixth year of the Hijra (A.D. 628), as a widow, to Muḥammed, having, with her first husband, early adopted 'Islām, and with him joined the former emigration to Abyssinia. There he died, and there she was betrothed by proxy to Muḥammed, joining him later at Medīna. Mu'āwiya was therefore Muḥammed's brother-in-law.

'Ebū-Sufyān, with his two sons, Yezīd and Mu'āwiya, as well as 'Abbās, fought for 'Islām under Muḥammed in the battle of Ḥuneyn after the conquest of Mekka, in the same year, A.H. 8 (A.D. 630). They each received from Muḥammed, as a share of the spoil captured through the victory, one hundred camels and forty ounces of silver. 'Ebū-Sufyān was present, later in the same year, at the siege and capture of Tā'if, where he lost an eye by a wound.

Mu'āwiya, the younger of the two sons of 'Ebū-Sufyān, was henceforward employed by Muḥammed as one of his secretaries, scribes, or amanuenses; being one of twenty-three whose names are recorded as having served in that capacity, some more, some less. Zeyd son of Thābit was the most usual scribe, and Mu'āwiya stands next; having served so more than any of the remaining one-and-twenty, although the whole of the first four caliphs, 'Ebū-Bekr, 'Umer, 'Uthmān, and 'Aliyy, are included among them by history.

Muḥammed died in A.H. 11 (A.D. 632) at Medīna, and was succeeded by 'Ebū-Bekr, "the Most Faithful," as guide and ruler of young and orphaned 'Islām; spontaneously elected by his peers, the acknowledged leaders of the infant community. He took the title of Khalīfa (substitute; whence our "caliph"). He had first to recall to their faith and allegiance many of the tribes of Arabia. Then, in A.H. 12 (A.D. 633), he sent an army to oppose the Romans in southern trans-Jordanic Syria. He gave the chief command to Yezīd, Mu'āwiya's elder brother, son of 'Ebū-Sufyān. Yezīd repeatedly broke the Roman levies opposed to him, and sent rich spoils to Medīna, the "City of the Prophet," where Muḥammed was buried; his grave, with those of his three immediate successors, being piously visited to this day. Mu'āwiya accompanied his brother Yezīd in this expedition, and never quitted him as long as they both lived. They never returned to Arabia from Syria.

Yezīd's successes paved the way to the further despatch of warriors from Medīna; and these were put under the command of 'Amr, son of 'Āṣi (written also 'Āṣ). In his younger days 'Amr had persecuted Muḥammed with insulting jeers and stinging lampoons. He now showed himself a zealous Muslim, a good general, and, later on, a no less skilful diplomatist.

When yet more numerous levies were gradually forwarded from Medīna, coming from all Arabia, 'Amr was directed to draw towards Palestine, while Yezīd advanced on the road towards Damascus, and other captains were sent to different quarters. The chief command was entrusted to 'Ebū-'Ubeyda, son of Jerrāḥ. Though eminently prudent, he lacked all military dash, celerity, and ability. Success now seemed to favour the Romans, conquest came to a standstill. 'Ebū-Bekr therefore recalled from Babylonia, where he had begun to make himself felt, the redoubtable K͟hālid, son of Welīd, Muḥammed's "Sword of God," to infuse new vigour into the Syrian campaign. In a short time Buṣrà (Bostra) fell to his arms; and next, Damascus was besieged.

The Roman emperor Heraclius, then holding his court at Antioch, thrice sent a large force to relieve Damascus. Thrice was the siege suspended to go and meet these reliefs. Thrice were the Roman succours defeated in the field, twice near Baalbek, the third time at 'Ejnādeyn (Aiznadin), near Anti-Lebanon. After this, Damascus did not long hold out against the Muslim hosts. But on the very day of its capture, the caliph 'Ebū-Bekr breathed his last at Medīna, when sixty-three years of age, in A.H. 13 (A.D. 634). He was succeeded by ‘Umer, son of K͟haṭṭāb, now fifty-three years old. This caliph reappointed ’Ebū-‘Ubeyda to the chief command, and Baalbek was taken in A.H. 15 (A.D. 636). Emessa (Ḥimṣ) was next occupied, after Resten and S͟heyzer had surrendered.

’Ebū-‘Ubeyda now went southwards to meet a fourth Roman army under the emperor's son Constantine, who was at Cæsarea (Cæsarea Philippi, Banyās ?) with fifty thousand men. They were met, however, by a still larger force of eighty thousand, under a general named Manuel, who had been further reinforced by sixty thousand Christian Arabians from the trans-Jordan regions, under Jebela, son of ’Eyhem, the last king of the line of Gassān, who later embraced ’Islām, but again apostatized. The two opposing forces met on the banks of the Yermūk river, the Hieromax of classical authors. A battle ensued and lasted several days, the Romans being at length utterly defeated, and Manuel killed in A.H. 15 (Nov. A.D. 636). The victors returned to Damascus.

The caliph ‘Umer now ordered the siege of Jerusalem. Yezīd son of ’Ebū-Sufyān led the van from Damascus, and ’Ebū-‘Ubeyda followed with the main force. After four months' siege, Jerusalem offered to capitulate on condition that the caliph should come from Medīna to take possession. He did so, and the surrender took place in A.H. 17 (A.D. 638).

Aleppo and Antioch next fell to the Muslim arms that same year, and from this latter city the Roman emperor Heraclius fled to Constantinople.

On the other hand, the caliph ‘Umer, after the capture of Jerusalem, ordered ‘Amr son of ‘Āṣi to proceed to the conquest of Egypt. He first laid siege to Cæsarea, and sent Yezīd son of ’Ebū-Sufyān to attack Tyre, which was given up to him by treachery, as Tripoli of Syria had been delivered to the Muslims before. Constantine now left his camp, and retreated to Cæsarea Palæstinæ on the sea-coast; but he ultimately fled thence by sea, and this town was surrendered to ʿAmr son of ʿĀṣi. Other places fell in succession, and the conquest of Syria was completed in the fifth year of the caliph, and latter part of A.H. 17 (A.D. 639). A pestilence now broke out at Emmaus, and spread all over Syria, from which both ʾEbū-ʿUbeyda and Yezīd son of ʾEbū-Sufyān died in A.H. 18 (A.D. 640), the latter leaving no issue, and appointing his younger brother Muʿāwiya to succeed him in his command over Damascus and Syria. He had earned the popular name of Yezīd the Good.

In the year A.H. 20 (A.D. 641) the caliph ʿUmer made Mūʿāwiya son of ʾEbū-Sufyān governor of Syria, as he had been *locum tenens* until then of his deceased brother. He was then about forty-two years of age, and continued governor for nineteen years during the caliphates of ʿUmer, ʿUt͟hmān, and ʿAliyy. He and ʿAliyy at first, and next he and ʿAliyy's eldest son Ḥasan, were rival caliphs during the last five or six years of that period; but ʿAliyy being murdered at Kūfa in Babylonia in A.H. 35 (A.D. 655), and Ḥasan resigning soon after, Muʿāwiya was at length universally acknowledged as the sole caliph of ʾIslām in A.H. 41 (A.D. 661), being then sixty-three years old.

As Muʿāwiya son of ʾEbū-Sufyān died in A.H. 60 (A.D. 679), when his son and successor Yezīd was thirty-four years of age, the latter was, consequently, born in A.H. 26 (A.D. 646); and, as there is no mention made of his having had any brother or sister, his father most probably took Yezīd's mother Meysūn to wife in A.H. 25 (A.D. 645), the year after he was confirmed in his government by the third caliph ʿUt͟hmān. She was, most likely, at that time from twelve to fourteen years of age, and Muʿāwiya was forty-seven.

Muʿāwiya had asked permission of the caliph ʿUmer to fit out ships on the coast; but ʿUmer was averse from the project. When he was murdered in A.H. 24 (A.D. 644), and ʿUt͟hmān succeeded him, ʿUthmān gave the required sanction. In A.H. 26 (A.D. 646), then, the very year of his son Yezīd's birth, he sent his first ships to sea, and the firstfruits of the expedition was the capture of Aradus and Cyprus. The defeat of a Roman fleet was the next exploit. Then Crete and Malta were visited, and Rhodes captured. Old Phenician days had returned. Another Roman fleet was beaten on the coast of Asia Minor; every port in those parts was thrown into a state of alarm, and the harbour of Constantinople itself was the scene of naval hostilities. Such was Muʿāwiya at and about the time of Yezīd's birth.

The caliph ʿUthmān now dismissed the conqueror and governor of Egypt, the talented ʿAmr, son of ʿĀṣi. He appointed in ʿAmr's stead his own foster-brother, ʿAbdu-'llāh son of Saʿd. Troubles broke out in Medīna itself, ending in the assassination of the caliph in A.H. 35 (A.D. 655), and the proclamation of ʿAliyy, son of 'Ebū-Ṭālib, Muḥammed's cousin-german and son-in-law. He had married the youngest of the prophet's daughters, Fāṭima, and by her was the father of Ḥasan and Ḥuseyn, who were about seven and six years of age, respectively, when Muḥammed and also their mother died in one year. From these five, Muḥammed, Fāṭima, ʿAliyy, Ḥasan, and Ḥuseyn, are descended, through fathers or mothers, all the Seyyids and Sherīfs of 'Islām. The five are known as "*the holy mantle family*, 'ehlu 'l kisā'."

But Muʿāwiya accused ʿAliyy of being privy to, if not of covertly instigating, the murder of ʿUthmān. He proclaimed himself the avenger of the slaughtered ruler, and his party saluted him as caliph. He called to his councils the talented ʿAmr son of ʿĀṣi, promising to reinstate him in Egypt. Armies were levied on each side, and in A.H. 37 (A.D. 657) the two conflicting Muslim hosts, ʿAliyy's from Babylonia, and Muʿāwiya's from Syria, came in sight at Ṣiffīn, on the bank of the Euphrates, and fought several severe battles with balanced success. Negociations were set on foot; and it was arranged that, for the peace of ʾIslām and avoidance of further bloodshed, the rivals should defer the question of the caliphate to umpires, and should meanwhile retire, each to his own capital. Muʿāwiya named as his umpire the astute and talented ʿAmr son of ʿĀṣi, and ʿAliyy another. These met, after some delay, at Dūmetu-ʾl-Jendel (the biblical Dumah, the modern Jewf, Palgrave's ʿ Djowf'), on the south border of the Syrian desert. By a stratagem, ʿAliyy was deposed by his own umpire, and ʿAmr son of ʿĀṣi proclaimed Muʿāwiya to be the sole and rightful caliph.

Each of the rivals, notwithstanding, kept possession of what he held, until, in A.H. 40 (A.D. 660), ʿAliyy was murdered in his own capital. His eldest son Ḥasan, then 36 years old, was set up in his place by his party. Difficulties arising, however, Ḥasan made terms with Muʿāwiya, abdicated, and retired to Medīna with his younger brother Ḥuseyn.

Muʿāwiya thus became at length, in A.H. 41 (A.D. 661), the undisputed caliph of ʾIslām. His father ʾEbū-Sufyān had died ten years earlier, in A.H. 31, at the age of eighty-six. His son Yezīd was now fifteen years old. His dynasty, the house of ʾUmeyya, the ʾUmeyyids, vulgarly denominated by Europeans the Ommiads, ruled for ninety-one years, until A.H. 132 (A.D. 749), when they were exterminated by the descendants of ʿAbbās, the ʿAbbāsids. They conquered all north Africa, invaded Spain, and pushed on, in the east, to India and China.

Muʿāwiya surrounded himself with men of talent; and under his auspices Roman or Greek science began to be cultivated by the Arabian Muslims, in addition to their own native poetry and the various nascent branches of Muslim theology, philosophy, tradition, law, etc. This is not to be wondered at, when we reflect what numbers of Roman citizens and subjects embraced ʾIslām, many of them persons of rank, culture, and learning. Faithful to his promise, Muʿāwiya reinstated immediately the able ʿAmr son of ʿĀṣi in his government of Egypt, where he died and was buried in A.H. 43 (A.D. 663).

Mu‘āwiya now, A.H. 44 (A.D. 664), made an effort to obtain possession of the capital of the eastern empire of Rome, the city of Constantine the Great. His general was the veteran Sufyān son of ‘Abdu-’llāh, who had under his command Mu‘āwiya's only son Yezīd, aged 18, the younger son of the murdered caliph ‘Aliyy, Ḥuseyn, aged 46, and the venerable ’Ebu-’Eyyūb K͟hālid son of Zeyd, who, forty-four years before, at Medīna, had been the host of Muḥammed for a month, on his first arrival as a fugitive from Mekka; besides other warriors of renown or promise. Six years were unavailingly consumed in this distant enterprise. ’Ebū-’Eyyūb was one of its victims. His death occurred about the year A.H. 50 (A.D. 670); and a mausoleum was built over his grave in later days, having by its side the cathedral mosque where the Ottoman Sultan-Caliphs now assume the sabre at their ceremonial accession.

Mu‘āwiya's only son Yezīd, born, as before mentioned, in A.H. 26 (A.D. 646), had married, when only sixteen years of age, in A.H. 42 (A.D. 662), and had become a father the year following, A.H. 43 (A.D. 663), before he went to seek renown at the siege of Constantinople. After his return from thence, when Ḥasan, the eldest son of the former caliph ‘Aliyy, was poisoned at Medīna, as was said, in A.H. 49 (A.D 680), Yezīd, then twenty-three years old, was accused or suspected, perhaps by sectarian or family enemies of his line, of having instigated Ḥasan's murder by one of the wives of the victim, so as to clear the way to his own succession. But the murdered man left a brother; and they both had several sons. Moreover, Yezīd did not succeed his father until eleven years later, A.H. 60 (A.D. 679), as Mu‘āwiya lived to be eighty years old, or more. Yezīd was then thirty-four, reigned but five years, died in A.H. 65 (A.D. 684), and had for his successor his only son, Mu‘āwiya II., aged twenty-two. He abdicated after a reign of only six months, and died soon afterwards, the direct line of the great Muʿāwiya thus becoming extinct, and the sovereignty passing to collaterals.

From this cursory survey we see that history is silent respecting Yezīd son of Muʿāwiya and his mother Meysūn from the time of his birth until his father sent him to the siege of Constantinople when he was eighteen years old, and when Muʿāwiya was an undisputed and mighty monarch. It cannot, therefore, be directly disproved that Meysūn was sent away for singing her song, or that she took her son away with her. It may be remarked that the words said to have been addressed to her on the occasion by Muʿāwiya, "Rejoin thou thy people," do not constitute a full divorce *a vinculo matrimonii* in 'Islām, but are recallable.

If we suppose that she was dismissed to her own kin when Yezīd was about a year old, he may have been recalled by Muʿāwiya as soon as was deemed necessary for his education. This was, apparently, completed when he was allowed to marry at the age of sixteen, and was sent to the siege of Constantinople when eighteen. If he remained with his mother till he was eight or ten, he may have imbibed poetic notions from her kindred, sufficient to be improved by culture under teachers provided by his father, a man of mark in all the learning of the period. His training by such teachers from that time till he was sixteen, and even eighteen, was ample. He must by then have acquired enough of the vernacular purity of diction and poetic eloquence to warrant the reputation he has left of being an accomplished orator and a talented extemporiser of verse. The Arabian tribesmen, before Muḥammed's advent, as they are still, were, many of them, good scribes and first-rate oral poets, whose verses flew far and wide over the whole peninsula, to be repeated at social gatherings even to our day. Almost all the early generals of 'Islām were famed as poets also.

Such being the possibilities, what, on the other hand, are the probabilities that common sense may educe out of the meagre details that must serve as the premisses to any conclusion as to Meysūn and the poem attributed to her?

We learn, in short, from the historical fragments given above, that 'Ebū-Sufyān, and also his two sons, Yezīd the Good and Mu'āwiya, were men of talent and learning. Verses by the father have come down to us; Yezīd was a successful leader; and Mu'āwiya excelled in all the qualities that go to make up a great ruler. They all three went to Syria after Muḥammed's death, aided in the conquest of that country, and died there. Mu'āwiya, more especially, after he became governor of that province, made himself so beloved or feared that he ultimately became the greatest potentate of his time, as he was also a most generous patron of talent and learning.

Was he, then, the man, the prince, in the early years of his delegated governorship, when he must have been most prudent and circumspect, most careful of all his words and actions, when Meysūn was newly united to him, and his only son Yezīd was an infant, when all his powers of body and mind were at their prime, or in their early maturity; was he a man likely to take to himself, in the first place, as his wife, a raw, untutored child of the desert, and was the young lady he selected as his partner likely to have preserved in her mind so lively a preference for the desert life as to long for it in the midst of the splendour with which he doubtlessly surrounded her? Even had she been so, she was a mother as well as a wife and a great princess. Would she, then, be likely to look upon the grand, wise, brave, learned, generous, and generally beloved father of her infant son as a "foddered ass," or, taking Ziyā Pasha's version, as a "coarse barbarian," "outlandish miscreant," or "tiresome lout"? Spoiled, haughty, even enervated, he may have possibly grown in far later years; but at the time of his life in question he must have been in the constant habitual practice of all the noblest and most considerate punctilios natural to a rising prosperous statesman, trusted by his distant sovereign, loved by and relied on by those around and under him, respected or feared by his neighbours. "Ass," "barbarian," "boor," "clown," "lout" he certainly could not have been, save in the eyes of a sectarian or personal jealous enemy, and reckless vituperation.

Is there not then, even on these considerations alone, a certain weight, a preponderating importance, to be attached to Ziyā Pasha's marginal remark that the author of the verses attributed to Meysūn is unknown? He most likely was well aware that they commonly pass as the production of the fretting petulancy of Yezīd's talented but untamed mother, Mu'āwiya's Bedewiyy wife. But, weighing the crucial expression of the poem, "foddered ass" or "coarse barbarian," as has been done here, Ziyā Pasha may well have concluded in his own mind that the case was "not proven," as far as Meysūn and Mu'āwiya are concerned; and thereupon curtly recorded his conviction that the verses, though worth insertion in a miscellany, are the production of some unknown author. The words of the poem would far better suit the case of some recently captured and enslaved desert girl, held as his mistress by some "coarse," unfeeling, well-to-do citizen or petty governor.

A far more improbable detail in the story about the dismissal of Meysūn by Mu'āwiya when he chanced to overhear her singing her ditty, beyond the likelihood, even, that he should apply the offensive expression to himself, is that, on going away from him to join her own kin, she should be allowed by him to take his infant son Yezīd, the sole hope of his line, with her, according to Sir R. Burton, "to her cousins and beloved wilds," as Mrs. Clerk says, "into the desert," but, as Dr. Carlyle more definitely puts it, "to Yemen."

Now Yezīd appears, as has already been stated, to have been Muʿāwiya's first and only child. He may possibly have had other offspring before his union with Meysūn, and he may have begotten other children from other wives or concubines after her departure, if he really did dismiss her. But history makes no mention whatever of any such; and the first authentic notice of Yezīd in active life, after his birth, that I know of, is the account of his being sent with the fleet and army that fruitlessly besieged Constantinople, after Muʿāwiya had become sole caliph, and when Yezīd was already eighteen years old; for his marriage at the age of sixteen is a mere computation backwards from the age of his son and successor, Muʿāwiya II., at the date of his accession.

Let us now contemplate the complexion of the times at and after Yezīd's birth, in A.H. 26, until his father had become sole caliph, in A.H. 41, and his own marriage the year following, A.H. 42, at the age of sixteen, when he must have been at Damascus with his father.

At the very time of Yezīd's birth, Muʿāwiya was fitting out his first ships and personally conducting his maritime expeditions against Cyprus, the islands of Aradus, Rhodes, Malta, etc.; and it was nine years before the murder of ʿUt͟hmān, in A.H. 35, called Muʿāwiya to declare against ʿAliyy, and to become his competitor for the caliphate. If Yezīd ever was allowed to leave Damascus with his mother, it must have been during a portion or the whole of the last seven or eight of those nine years.

But all the reported facts of Muʿāwiya's life, including his maritime expeditions, besides the character that history has recorded of him for moderation, generosity, perseverance, and astuteness, seem to make it in the highest degree improbable that he should have sent away for so frivolous a cause the mother of his only son; much less that he should have allowed her to take that only son of his into the desert, and least of all to distant Yemen, fifteen hundred miles from Damascus.

The Arabian tribesmen are by no means all of them nomads. The great majority of them, on the contrary, are denizens of villages, towns and cities; agriculturists, manufacturers, tradesmen, merchants, soldiers, sailors, lawyers, professors of science, princes; and most of the members of all these classes are habitual warriors and natural poets. It is hardly possible, therefore, that Muʿāwiya, a chieftain among the Qureysh of Mekka, for five or six years an inhabitant of Medīna, a confidant of Muḥammed and of ʾEbū-Bekr, successor designate to his own elder brother, Yezīd the Good, and confirmed in the office of Governor-General of Syria by two caliphs, ʿUmer and ʿUthmān, the patron of poets and of all kinds of learning, the organizer of armies and planner of fleets to be, should, after all these glories were his own, find no other partner in his greatness, no other mother for his anticipated line, than a nomad girl, still so little tamed, still so wildly wedded to desert life and its accompaniments, as to prefer its fancied freedom to the splendours and refinements of a great provincial court, and to the love and society of so eminent a man, so great a prince.

Meysūn, the daughter of Baḥdel the Kelbite, may have been, in reality, every way worthy of her distinguished husband. She may have been, for aught we know, the daughter of a wild nomad chieftain, or even of a Bedewiyy commoner, free or slave, in Damascus. The caliph ʿAliyy, after the death of Fātima, had married the captive Ḥanefiyya girl; and her son by ʿAliyy, Muḥammed son of the Ḥanefiyya, became as celebrated a man of learning and piety as either of his elder half-brothers. So may Meysūn have been, as nothing to the contrary is known, that I am aware of. But Muʿāwiya's character makes it far more likely that she was the beautiful child of a man of mark and cultivation, even if he were from Yemen.

Yemen was then, as it had been for many centuries, and as it continued for centuries afterwards, until ruined by

European enterprise passing to India and China, Persia, etc., round the Cape of Good Hope, the commercial centre of Arabia, the emporium where the rich products of the East, together with its own native drugs and manufactures, were bartered for such articles as the Roman world, Syria, Egypt, and Africa could bring to its marts. When 'Islām roused the whole of the Arabian tribes, urban and rustic, to the conquest of half the known world, warriors from Yemen, Yemāma, and 'Umān, flocked to the standards, as well as the men of the Ḥijāz, as well as the desert nomads. They were accompanied by their wives, sisters, and daughters, in large numbers, as well as by their sons. History frequently testifies to this; and, as town after town, city after city, was captured from the Romans, garrisons and governors of Arabian blood were placed in them. These last would be the picked men of the nation, more generally townsfolk, men of learning and refinement, as well as brave warriors and subtle negociators. The rank and file would be peasantry; the nomads would generally be skirmishers, and avoid town life.

Colonies and families of the Kelbite race are met with in all parts, as conquest extended. Baḥdel, Meysūn's reported father, may have been an officer, a subordinate governor, a merchant, a man of letters, a functionary of the new worship, a professor in a college, etc., as these were quickly founded. He may have been established in Damascus, in any of these capacities, before Mu'āwiya returned there as governor-general. Meysūn may have been born in Damascus, or brought there an infant by her father and mother; for she married Mu'āwiya twelve years after Damascus was taken. Her mother may have been a Roman or Syrian captive. Girls are married young in those parts, and mothers of twelve and thirteen are not uncommon. Admitting, then, for argument's sake, that Meysūn composed, or only sang, the ditty; admitting that Mu'āwiya overheard her, applied the one offensive word to himself, grew angry in consequence, and instantly dismissed her to her own people; admitting that she went, then and there, to her own family, her father's kith and kin, taking her infant son with her under Mu'āwiya's sanction, and retaining him until he was of an age to do without her maternal care; it by no means follows that she went herself and took her child to the desert, still less to Yemen. She would most likely go to her father's house in Damascus; and Mu'āwiya could consent to this, as he was now frequently absent in his naval expeditions. The child would still be under the supervision of any one he might appoint. His father could assure himself that Yezīd was duly taken care of, properly tended in sickness (for he was attacked by smallpox at some unknown period of his life), properly schooled when of the requisite age, and recallable to his own guidance when he saw fit, or when danger loomed in the distance, as it did so soon as the tortuous policy of the caliph 'Uthmān raised troubles in Egypt first, and then at Medīna, ending in his assassination in A.H. 35 (A.D. 655), when Yezīd was nine years old. Now, if not before, Mu'āwiya would assume the personal supervision of his son's training.

It is true that Muḥammed himself, when a poor orphan-suckling after the death of his father, was given to a foster-mother of a stranger tribe, with whom he remained two years, until he was weaned; as most of the children of Mekka were so put out to nurse with rustic women of the neighbourhood, trusted by their parents. But the story of Meysūn's being allowed by Mu'āwiya to take Yezīd into the desert or to Yemen from Damascus, so recently captured and occupied, is utterly incredible, as it would always be difficult or impossible to recall him when old enough, and equally impossible to watch over him if allowed to remain longer with his mother. It may, therefore, almost with certainty, be concluded that Ziyā Pasha gave a true and correct judgment when he recorded his marginal note to this little poem: "By an unknown author." According as tastes vary, this simple ditty may be pronounced sublime or commonplace, but that it was not indited or sung by Meysūn the mother of Yezīd son of Mu‘āwiya, is a moral certainty, though sectarian or dynastic rancour has succeeded in commonly coupling her name with it.

Appendix.

A study of the variously transliterated names connected with the so-called "Poem of Meysūn," coupled with long-continued former tentatives on my part to elaborate a satisfactory system for the rational rendering of Arabic names, words, and sentences in English letters, as far as possible, has revived in me a desire to lay before the Council and Members of the Royal Asiatic Society a tolerably complete view of my present matured system, adapted to an approximatively correct scientific method of writing Arabic in our characters, so to say, as it is pronounced by professed reciters of the Qur'ān, on the basis of the special science called ‘*Ilmu-'t-Tejwīd* عِلْمُ ٱلتَّجْوِيدِ, which may be translated *Kalophonesis* ‘good enunciation.’

This definition of the system naturally excludes any consideration of the ever-varying local, provincial modes of pronouncing vernacular Arabic, as practised by nations inhabiting different parts of the extensive regions, from Arabia to Morocco, where that language is the mother-tongue; and still more so, forbids any reference to the variously modified methods of pronouncing Arabic words and names by East Indians, Malays, Persians, Turks, etc. Of Ottoman pronunciation I have fully treated in my Ottoman Grammar recently published by Trübner and Co.

Each one of such provincial dialects of Arabic, and each one of such national adaptations of Arabian words and letters, would require a special treatise for its elucidation in a scientific manner, of which each would be perfectly capable in the hands of a competent master. But when to these we add the chaotic jumble resulting from attempts to transliterate the whole of these modes of pronunciation by one unvarying system, or by hap-hazard, one is apt to sink down in despair. As well might one essay to write all the languages of Europe with our unmethodical English mode of spelling.

But confusion worse confounded is created by writers who, not able to read the language, and casually visiting one or several of the Arabic-spoken countries, try their skill at portraying in English letters or books, and guided by their untutored ear alone, not only what they fancy the provincial natives utter, but also the vile composts that pass from mouth to mouth among ignorant *laquais-de-place*, self-styled interpreters or dragomans, of many a nationality; and when to this ear-guidance of their own, they add a medley of correct or erroneous Arabic words or names copied from other writers of some other nationality, the *ne plus ultra* is reached of puzzling empiricism. Our newspapers and periodicals, even our official correspondence, and our East-Indian compositions, afford ample proof of this, which need not here be further dwelt upon.

It was a singular aberration of a highly-gifted mind, when a rough and ready, though erroneous, rule had been enunciated for such transliterations, viz. "all consonants as in English, and all vowels as in Italian," that a great scholar should arise to teach English university men, and others, to forsake the horizontal straight stroke used over the long vowels of their school and college prosodial exercitations, and bid them adopt the right-to-left-downward sloping "*dash*" of the French *é* (*e aigu*), for the purpose of marking a long Arabic (or other eastern) vowel; informing them at the same time, forsooth, that this is the Italian method. The Italians have no such usage. They never mark their long vowels in any way whatever. What they really do is to mark with that accent, in dictionaries only, the vowel of that syllable of a word on which the stress falls; and never do they use it in ordinary books or in writing. But, when such vowel is final, with the stress on it, they mark it in print and in writing with a dash sloping down from left to right, the French *accent grave*; as in *facoltà, appiè, cio è, oggidì, verrò, virtù*, etc.

It amounts almost to a national sin, to a crime of *lèse majesté*, when English scholars, men of truly profound learning, condescend, in English publications, to adopt the French method of transliteration;—with its diphthongs, which do not exist in Arabic; with its *accent circonflexe*, ^, unknown in English, to mark the Arabic long vowels; with their erroneous *o* instead of the Italian *u*; and with their erroneous *e* in place of the Italian *i*. There is no vowel *o* in the whole Arabic language; though the consonant-ended combination َوْ , *aw* or *ew* (as the word or syllable is hard or soft) is vernacularly uttered by provincials in such a way that unaccustomed foreign ears take it for a vowel *o*. Still, this is a different thing to the systematic misrepresentation of the Arabic vowel *u*, which, short or long, is always pure, as in Italian. It must have been originally given to Jewish teachers of Arabic from Spain, whose pronunciation always has been abominable in every respect, to mislead Italian students in the middle ages, and make them sound the *d̲zamma* vowel as an *o*; and it is full time that so pernicious a practice were discontinued, both here and on the continent. The *e* instead of Italian *i*, above spoken of, has no basis whatever, except perversely erroneous and general French usage. The "accent circonflexe" of French orthography has a special history of its own, quite different from that of a true long vowel; but, as their writers have chosen to make this *accent* the sign of an Arabic long vowel, we need not complain, for we are under no compulsion to adopt their unscientific makeshift. To mark an Arabic long vowel in a thoroughly English and scholarlike manner, we have our well-known legitimate, prosodial symbol, ¯, straight and horizontal; though, unfortunately, I know of no technical name for it. How much more English and scholarly, how much better and more correct, to transliterate *Kātib*, than to pervert this into *Kâteb*, or into *Kátib*.

As was remarked above, there are no diphthongs whatever in the Arabic language (nor, indeed, truly, in any language). What are erroneously styled Arabic diphthongs, namely, a *fet-ḥa* vowel, ´, followed by a consonantal *w* وْ, or *y* یْ, final to the syllable, are no more diphthongs than are *ab*, *eb*, *ad*, *ed*, etc. The French, denying that final *y* is ever a consonant, and having no *w* in their alphabet, attempt to figure the words قَوْلْ *qawl*, قَيْنْ *qayn*, يَوْمْ *yewm*, بَيْنْ *beyn*, by the monstrosities *kaoul*, *kaïn*, *iaoum*, *beïn*, etc.

Another Arabic combination of an altogether different nature, but also, quite erroneously, denominated a diphthong by many, is where two vowels, belonging to two successive syllables in a word, are brought by transliteration into forced juxtaposition, through the incorrect elision, owing to our alphabetical deficiency, and lack of equivalents for the two Arabic consonants, *hemza* ء, and ʻ*ayn* ع. These two letters, ء and ع, are as truly and as efficiently consonants, as are *all* the letters of the Arabic alphabet in their primary values. They both represent, to European ears, a kind of hiatus or gulp where they occur, the *hemza* being soft, something in the nature of our *diæresis* or *trema*, while the ع is very harsh and gulpy, totally unknown to us. They are, therefore, true, efficient consonants, though we may be unable to articulate them. They are, both of them, capable of reduplication in the pronunciation and grammar of a derived word, exactly like all other consonants; as in تَفَأَّلَ *tefe''ela*, تَفَعَّلَ *tefa''ala*; and they may be conveniently transliterated by two distinct modifications of our ordinary apostrophe reversed, one turned to the left, the other to the right. The apostrophe is wanted in transliterating Arabic compound names and clauses, to represent a different incident that befalls some letters ا initial to words. Three signs of elision are therefore used in the present or proposed system, the ordinary apostrophe, ’, indicating the omission of an initial letter in pronunciation; the inverted apostrophe turned to the left, ʾ, showing the place of a consonant which we do not possess in our alphabet, the *hemza;* and the inverted apostrophe turned to the right, ‘, to represent the harsh consonant *‘ayn*, which also our alphabet does not contain. All three are perfectly distinct; each represents a distinct Arabic letter; and retransliteration back into Arabic characters is kept free from all doubt. For, any system of transliteration, to be considered perfect, must represent unmistakably to the eye of the scholar the original letters, while it enables a reader who is unacquainted with the written characters of the original text, to read the words with a fair approximation to correctness, with a little practice. It is a lamentable error, propagated in our Hebrew grammars to the effect that the Hebrew equivalents to the Arabic ء and ع, namely א and ע, have no value, and go for nothing, etc. In ordinary books and newspapers, the apostrophe might be used for all three purposes; though the two inverted forms of it would always be preferable, in their respective places.

As is well known, the three Arabic *short* vowels are usually omitted in ordinary print and handwriting, having to be supplied in reading and speaking by the person who reads or speaks. He must know what vowels are omitted, or he cannot read; and of course he cannot converse unless he knows the vowels of his words. But in books used by learners, and in copies of the Qurʾān, etc., the vowels are marked, in whole or in part. They are called collectively *ḥareka* حَرَكَةٌ ‘movement, motion’; by us, “vowel-points.” The three are, respectively, named *fet-ḥa* فَتْحَةٌ, *kesra* كَسْرَةٌ, and *d̲zamma* ضَمَّةٌ, which names mean, in their order, an "opening," a "breaking," a "folding"; and their marks are the following: ´, ˏ, ʼ. Their values are, respectively, *a* or *e*, *i*, *u*, as is more fully explained further on; thus: مُتَحَرِّكْ *mutaḥarrik*, مُتَصَوِّفْ *mutaṣawwif*, مُتَبَرِّكْ *muteberrik*, مُتَسَلِّمْ *mutesellim*. The vowels that, in theoretic grammar, follow the final consonant of a word, whether they be the mark of a case in nouns, or of a result of conjugation in a verb, are generally omitted in the vernacular; and when the word stands alone, or is final in a sentence, they are omitted even in reading the Qur'ān, subject to rules that are beside our present subject.

The three Arabic "long" vowels that correspond with the three "short" ones mentioned above are the three letters (consonants in all other circumstances): ا, ى, و, then called "letters of prolongation," *ḥurūfu 'l-medd* حُرُوفُ ٱلْمَدِّ (sing., *ḥarfu 'l-medd* حَرْفُ ٱلْمَدِّ). They are also said to be "prolonged," *memdūd* مَمْدُودْ; thus, long ا is called *'elif memdūda* أَلِفْ مَمْدُودَةْ; long ى is *yā memdūda*, يَآءْ مَمْدُودَةْ; and long و is *wāw memdūda*, وَاوْ مَمْدُودَةْ. To become a long vowel, however, each of these three letters, otherwise consonants, must immediately follow the homogeneous short vowel-points; ا must follow *fet-ḥa*, ى must follow *kesra*, and و must follow *dzamma*; as in بَابْ *bāb*, بِيضْ *bīdz*, حُورْ *ḥūr*.

Whenever letter ا is a consonant, it is usually marked in writing by a *hemza* sign being placed over it, أ. It is then named *hemza-'elif*, *hemz'-'elif*, or simply, for brevity, *hemza*. Consonantal *'elif* is really one and the same thing with *hemza*, and in certain cases is written as *hemza* alone, without a letter ا as its support, as in جَآءَ *jā'a*, شَآءَ *shā'a*, etc.

But this consonantal أ, this *hemza*, is capable, like every other consonant, of taking every one of the three vowels, short and long, after it in pronunciation; as it is also capable, like them, of being *quiescent* (as it is called); *i.e.* of being vowelless, and of thus ending a syllable. The subject of the various conditions of *hemza*, or consonantal *'elif*, is somewhat intricate, as is shown in the following paragraphs.

1. When *hemza* is initial to an ordinary word (*i.e.* when it is not a *hemza of junction*, which see further on), and is followed by any one of the three *short* vowels, it always keeps the one, unchanging written form, like every other consonant. Thus, أَرْضٌ *'ardz*, أَلَمٌ *'elem*, أِنْ *'in*, أِنْسَانٌ *'insān*, أُصُولٌ *'uṣūl*. With *kesra* vowel, the *hemza* sign is more generally placed, with the vowel-point, below the ا; as إِنْسَانٌ, etc.

2. When *hemza* is initial to an ordinary word, but is followed by a *long* vowel, it still follows the foregoing rule of no change in its written form, so long as the vowel is *heterogeneous* to the *hemza*; i.e. when the vowel is either *kesra* or *dzamma*, as in إِيرَادٌ *'īrād*, أُولَى *'ūlà*. But, with the *homogeneous* long vowel, the two letters, consonantal initial أ, and long-vowel ا, coalesce into one sole letter ا; and this one ا is then marked in writing with a special symbol, ˜, called *medd* مَدٌّ, or *medda* مَدَّةٌ ("prolongation"); generally without, but sometimes, optionally, with the *hemza* sign; thus, آلْ or أٓلْ stands for أَالْ, and is transliterated *'āl*.

3. When أ is not initial to a word, other rules have to be observed. It may then be either movent or quiescent, i.e. followed or not, accompanied or not, by its own vowel in pronunciation; and this is tantamount to saying, in other words, that non-initial أ may either begin or end a non-initial syllable in a word (exactly like every other consonant). Its rules in these cases vary greatly.

4. When أ, non-initial to a word, is initial to a syllable, whether its own vowel be short or long, we have to take notice of the vowel that accompanies the consonant preceding the أ in the word, as well as its own vowel.

5. If that preceding vowel, as well as its own, be the homogeneous short *fet-ḥa* ´, then أ suffers no change in

its written form. Thus, ثَأَرَ *theʼera*, جَأَشَ *jeʼesha*, رَأَسَ *reʼesa*, etc. But if its own homogeneous vowel be long اَ, after a preceding short *fet-ḥa*, then آ is written instead of اَ; thus, سَآفَةٌ *saʼāfa*, مَآلٌ *maʼāl*, etc.

6. If non-initial *hemza* be preceded in the word by a heterogeneous short vowel, *kesra* or *dzamma*, its own vowel still continuing homogeneous and short, the أ undergoes a corresponding change in its written form, and becomes ئَ after *kesra*, and ؤَ after *dzamma*; as, رِئَةٌ *riʼa*, طِئَةٌ *ṭiʼa*, مِئَةٌ *mʼia*, ثُؤَبَآءُ *thuʼebāʼ*, جُؤَرٌ *juʼer*, رُؤَسَآءُ *ruʼesāʼ*, etc.

7. If, in such case, its own vowel be long, it then takes itself one or other of the two forms given in the preceding paragraph, but is followed by that one of the three long-vowel letters, ا, ى, و, which is homogeneous with its own long vowel; thus رِئَاسَةٌ *riʼāsa*, رِئِيٌّ *riʼiyy*, رِئِيسٌ *riʼīs*, رِئُونٌ *riʼūn*, جُؤَارٌ *juʼār*, ذُؤَابَةٌ *dhuʼāba*, رُؤَآءٌ *ruʼāʼ*, ثُؤُورَةٌ *thuʼūra*, etc.; and ئَا is sometimes written آ; as, آرْتِآسٌ for آرْتِئَاسٌ *ʼirtiʼās* (*ʼrtiʼās*).

8. And if the *hemza's* vowel in such case be short, and the preceding vowel be short *fet-ḥa* َ, it still changes its written form as above; thus, بَئِسَ *beʼisa*, بَؤُسَ *beʼusa*, ذَئِبَ *dheʼiba*, ذَؤُبَ *dheʼuba*, رَئِفَ *reʼifa*, رَؤُفَ *reʼufa*, etc.

9. If the preceding vowel be short *fet-ḥa* َ, while its own vowel be long and heterogeneous, the change in written form occurs as above, but the long-vowel letter is added; as, تَئِيمٌ *teʼīm*, رَئِيسٌ *reʼīs*, دَؤُوبٌ *deʼūb*, رَؤُوفٌ *reʼūf*, etc. The second و is often, perhaps mistakenly, omitted in writing and printing such words as these last two, even in copies of the Qurʼān, from reverence for ancient use.

10. If the preceding vowel be long *fet-ḥa* اَ, and the *hemza's* vowel be short, it takes the written form of ء, ئِ or ؤُ, according to which vowel belongs to it; and the ا of the preceding long vowel is marked with the *medd* sign آ; thus, تَبَآءَسَ *tebāʼesa*, تَفَآءَلَ *tefāʼela*, مُتَآءَمٌ *mutāʼem*, مُتَبَآئِسٌ

mutebā’is, مُتَفَآئِلٌ *mutefā’il*, مُتَآئِمٌ *mutā’im*, مُرَآئِلٌ *murā’il* مُذَآئِرٌ *mud͟hā’ir*, ثَآئِرٌ *thā’ir*, رَآئِفٌ *rā’if*, زَآئِرٌ *zā’ir*, قَآئِلٌ *qā’il*, تَبَآؤُسٌ *tebā’us*, تَفَآؤُلٌ *tefā’ul*, etc. In this last case, ؤُ, the vowel is sometimes long, as in زَآؤُولٌ *zā’ūl*. In some of such words the *hemza* is radical, as in رَائِفٌ *rā’if*, etc.; in others it is servile and formative, as in بَهَآئِمٌ *bahā’im*, etc.; and in others again it is a commutative substitute for a radical consonant ى or و, as in زَآئِرٌ *zā’ir*, سَآئِرٌ, *sā’ir* قَآئِلٌ *qā’il*, etc. This is a very difficult part of Arabic grammar.

11. There are some, comparatively few, words in which أ is the second radical, and has short *kesra*, ◌ِ, for its vowel, while it is preceded by a short *d͟zamma* vowel ◌ُ. It does not then conform in writing to that preceding ◌ُ vowel, but is written ئِ; thus, دُئِلٌ *du’il*, ذُئِبَ *d͟hu’iba*, سُئِلَ *su’ila*, etc.

12. Non-initial *hemza* in a word, when initial to a syllable, may be immediately preceded by a quiescent consonant, marked in writing, when necessary, with the *jezm* جَزْمٌ sign over it ◌ْ, which is also called *sukūn* سُكُونٌ; the quiescent consonant then ends the preceding syllable of the word. The *hemza*, in such case, figures, in writing, as أ, ئِ, or ؤُ, according to its own vowel, if short: thus, جَيْأَلَةٌ *jey’ela*, مُتْئِمٌ *mut’im*, مُرْئِلَةٌ *mur’ila*; أَبْؤُرٌ *’eb’ur*, أَجْؤُمٌ *’ej’um*, أَدْؤُرٌ *’ed’ur*, etc.; or as آ, ئِي, ؤُو, if its own vowel be long; thus, مِتْآمٌ *mit’ām*, تَرْئِيسٌ *ter’īs*, مَثْؤُوبٌ *met͟h’ūb*, etc. But مَسْئُولٌ and مَسْؤُلٌ are sometimes found written for مَسْؤُولٌ *mes’ūl*.

13. When medial (non-initial) *hemza*, being the second radical in a derivative word, is reduplicated, exactly in the same way with any other consonant of the alphabet, it ends one syllable, and also begins the next. It then still follows, in writing, the rules given above, whether its vowel in the second of those two syllables be short or long. Thus, تَفَأَّلَ *tefe’’ela*, تَفَؤُّلٌ *tefe’’ul*, مُتَفَئِّلٌ *mutefe’’il*, مُذَئِّبٌ *mud͟he’’ib*, جَأَّابٌ *ja’’āb*, جَأَّارٌ *ja’’ār*, etc.

14. When medial *hemza*, not being reduplicated, ends a syllable, its written form depends entirely on the vowel of the syllable it ends, being written أْ after *fet-ḥa*, ئْ after *kesra*, and ؤْ after *dzamma*. Thus, بَأْسٌ *be’s*, دَأْبٌ *de’b*, ثَأْرٌ *the’r*, جَأْشٌ *je’sh*, ثَأْرَةٌ *the’ra*, رَأْفَةٌ *re’fa*; بِئْرٌ *bi’r*, بِئْسَ *bi’sa*, ذِئْبٌ *dhi’b*, ذِئْبَانٌ *dhi’bān*, رِئْلَانٌ *ri’lān*, زِئْبَقٌ *zi’baq*; بُؤْسٌ *bu’s*, ثُؤْلُولٌ *thu’lūl*, رُؤْيَا *ru’yà*, لُؤْلُؤٌ *lu’lu’*, ذُؤْنُونٌ *dhu’nūn*, etc.

15. When *hemza* is final in a *word*, it *must* form a syllable by itself with its own short vowel (or case-ending nunnation, ٌ, ٍ, or اً). It may then follow, either a quiescent consonant, or a consonant accompanied by its following short or long vowel. Thus, بَدْءٌ *bed’*, دِفْءٌ, *dif’*, جُزْءٌ *juz’*, دَفَأْ *defe’*, دَفِئْ *defi’*, دَفُؤَ *defu’a*, جَزَآءٌ *jezā’*, دَفِيءٌ *defī’*, مَجْزُوءٌ *mejzū’*, etc. The transliterations here given, exclusive of the case-endings, show how the words are pronounced when they stand alone, or come before a full stop in a phrase or sentence. The oblique cases, بَدْءٍ *bed’in*, بَدْءِ *bed’i*, بَدْءًا *bed’an*, بَدْءَ *bed’a*, need but to be mentioned without detail, as there is nothing else to separate them from the other final consonants.

16. At the beginning of certain well-defined words only, initial *hemza*, when any one of those words follows any other word in a phrase or sentence, becomes elided in pronunciation alone, being still written. It is then called the *’elif of junction*, أَلِفُ ٱلْوَصْلِ *’elifu ’l-waṣl*; and is marked with a special sign, ⌢, called *waṣla* وَصْلَةٌ, placed over it thus, ٱ. The words in question are of four classes; viz. 1, the definite article ٱلْ alone; 2, the ten following nouns: ٱبْنٌ, ٱبْنَةٌ, ٱبْنَمٌ, ٱثْنَانِ, ٱثْنَتَانِ, ٱسْتٌ, ٱسْمٌ, ٱمْرَءٌ, ٱمْرَأَةٌ, and ٱيْمَنٌ; 3, the imperatives regular of verbs of the first or primitive form; and 4, every word of the seventh and following derivative forms of verbs that begin with *hemza*, with the exception of the first person singular of the aorist tenses.

In transliterations of all these words, our apostrophe is the fitting sign of such elision.

17. But, with regard to the definite article and this elision of its *hemza* when not initial in a sentence or solitary word, the further observation is needed that, in this respect, the Arabic alphabet of twenty-eight letters is divided equally into two classes of fourteen letters each, denominated respectively the "lunar" and the "solar" letters; because the words قَمَرٌ *qamer* (the moon), and شُمْسٌ *shems* (the sun) have their initial letters in the two classes respectively. The lunar letters, ٱلْحُرُوفُ ٱلْقَمَرِيَّةُ *'el ḥurūfu 'l-qameriyya*, are, أ, ب, ج, ح, خ, ع, غ, ف, ق, ك, م, و, ه, ى; while the solar letters, ٱلْحُرُوفُ ٱلشَّمْسِيَّةُ *'el ḥurūfu 'sh-shemsiyya*, are, ت, ث, د, ذ, ر, ز, س, ش, ص, ض, ط, ظ, ك, ل. The difference seen above in the two class-names is that when a noun, the initial of which is a lunar letter, حَرْفٌ قَمَرِيٌّ *ḥarfun qameriyy*, is shown to be definite by the article that precedes it, no further change occurs in the group beyond the simple elision of the initial ٱ of that article in its pronunciation; thus, قَالَ ٱلْأَوْلَادُ *qāla 'l-'ewlād*, دَقَّ ٱلْبَابَ *daqqa 'l-bāb*, خَسَفَ ٱلْقَمَرُ *khasefa 'l-qamer*, etc.; but, when the initial letter of the noun is a solar letter, حَرْفٌ شَمْسِيٌّ *ḥarfun shemsiyy*, then, not only does the elision of the initial ٱ of the article take place as before, but the لْ also of that article is transformed, in pronunciation, though not in writing, into the initial solar letter of the noun, which is then marked by the sign of reduplication ّ, the *jezm* sign ْ of the لْ disappears in writing, and the *wasla* sign ˜ is extended (in handwritings only, not in print) so as to cover the whole article ٱل; thus قَالَ ٱلرَّسُولُ *qāla 'r-resūl*, شَقَّ ٱلثَّوْبَ *shaqqa 'th-thewb*, كَسَفَ ٱلشَّمْسُ *kesefe 'sh-shems*, etc.

18. A penultimate long vowel in any Arabic word *must*

be followed by a consonant with its short vowel, or its nunnation; and this consonant may be *hemza*, radical or servile, as well as any other of the letters of the alphabet, all of which are consonants originally. Thus, بَابْ *bāb*, قَالَ *qāla*, قِيلَ *qīla*, سُورْ *sūr*, دَآءْ *dā'*, حَمْرَآءْ *ḥamrā'*, جَآءَ *jā'a*, جِيءَ *jī'a*, مَبْدُوءْ *mebdū'*, etc.

19. Final short-vowel radical or commutative ا occurs in many words; as لا *la*, ما *ma*, غَزَا *gaza*, etc. It should never be marked with a grave accent in transliteration. But there is a final short-vowel servile *à* in Arabic, originally written with ى preceded by *fet-ḥa* ىَ, and then termed "shortened" ا, *'elif maqṣūra* أَلِفْ مَقْصُورَةْ, which should be so marked with the grave accent in transliteration, because it bears the stress or accent of the word; as بُشْرَى *bus̲h̲rà*, حُبْلَى *ḥublà*. حُسْنَى *ḥusnà*, طُوبَى *ṭūbà*, etc. This is the real, true Italian method of marking the final short vowel of a word, when the stress falls on such final short vowel. But, when this short vowel ىَ, pronounced *à*, ceases to be final to the eye in writing, and to the ear in pronunciation, by reason of a pronominal suffix or a ةْ of unity or femininity being added after it in the word, then the vowel is written in Arabic with ا, and no longer with ى. It cannot, then, by mere inspection or audition, be distinguished from the final radical ا above mentioned; and this is probably the reason why it is called *'elif maqṣūra*; thus, بُشْرَاهُ *bus̲h̲rà-hu*, بُشْرَاهَا *bus̲h̲rà-hà*, بُشْرَايَ *bus̲h̲rà-ya*, بُشْرَاكَ *bus̲h̲rà-ka*, etc.; حَمَاةْ *ḥamāt*, حَصَاةْ *ḥasāt*; etc.

Short final vowel ى after *kesra* is elided in ordinary writing or print, when the word is an indefinite noun; but is written when the noun becomes definite; as قَاضٍ *qād̲z̲i*, ٱلْقَاضِى *'el-qād̲z̲i*, عالٍ and ٱلْعَالِى *'āli*, etc. It is omitted at the end of a few well-known definite words, exceptionally; as ٱلْمُتَعَالِ for ٱلْمُتَعَالِى, ٱلْعَالِ for ٱلْعَالِى, ٱلْعَاصِ for ٱلْعَاصِى, etc.

Short-vowel final و is perhaps not met with; for ذُو *dhū*, probably, and the apocopated regular plural nominatives, certainly, as, بَنُو, etc., end in long-vowel وْ.

The third person plural masculine of preterite verbs regular, and some persons plural masculine of subjunctive and conditional aorist verbs, as well as the imperative plural, also end in long-vowel وْ; but, when such verbs are not followed by a pronominal suffix, the و has a silent ا added after it in writing; thus, كَتَبُوا *ketebū*, كَتَبُوهُ *ketebū-hu*, etc.

The foregoing remarks may be regarded as fairly sufficient, if not exhaustive, for the subject of the Arabic short and long vowels, as also of the *hemza* consonant. This appendix is not an Arabic grammar. It may, however, be usefully added as a fundamental axiom of the Arabic written and spoken language, that *no Arabic word or syllable can really begin with a vowel*, whatever European ears and minds may think; for, the initial *hemza* of a word or syllable is always a consonant, and represents the gentle but perceptible opening of the vocal passage. The ع, the hard or harsh analogue of the soft, gentle *hemza*, represents the strong, guttural hiatus or gulp of such opening or closing; and initial ى or و, in word or syllable, is always a consonant, *y* or *w*.

Before leaving the question of the Arabic vowels, it is essential to press home the conviction of the utter erroneousness, the mischievous misleadingness of the system adopted by our transliterators, that of using the combinations *ah* or *eh* to represent the Arabic feminine termination of nouns, which is, in fact, a consonant letter *t* ة, and not a letter *h* ه, at all. What has led to this serious European mistake, servilely adopted by so many unreflecting English scholars of incontestable merit, is that when a full stop follows such feminine noun,—and every isolated word is naturally followed by such full-stop,—its final ة, called تَآءُ ٱلتَّأْنِيثِ *tā'u 't-te'nīth*, *t* of femininity, as well as its case-vowel, disappears from the pronunciation. Thus, كَلْبَةٌ *kelbetun*, كَلْبَةٍ *kelbetin*, كَلْبَةً *kelbetan*, كَلْبَةُ *kelbetu*, كَلْبَةِ *kelbeti*, كَلْبَةَ *kelbeta*, are then all equally pronounced *kelba*. But this pronunciation might quite as well be written كَلْبَ; only, this كَلْبَ, with the vowel-points marked, is not differentiated in any respect from the objective definite of the masculine كَلْبَ; and for this reason alone, as in the parallel case of the termination وا, in plural verbs, a difference of terminal form, spoken and written, was devised, to show the feminine noun without its distinctive final ة, when the word was followed by a full stop. That spoken form was, as said above, to drop the feminine ة and its case-vowel, saying, for instance, *kelba*. The written form was, to drop the dots, the diacritical points, of the final feminine ة, which thus became, in form, a ه; mimicking the soft aspirate when written, but never pronounced as one. A final soft aspirate ه is always a radical letter, whereas a final feminine ة, and its undotted representative, unaspirated ه, is always a servile formative letter. A knowledge of grammar enables one to distinguish between such feminine nouns and words really ending with radical, aspirated ه. This last is, and always should be, as scrupulously and as audibly aspirated at the end of a word, in Arabic, as at the beginning or in the middle; exactly as is the case with its hard or harsh analogue ح *ḥ*. Thus, هُبُوبٌ *hubūb*, حُبُورٌ *ḥubūr*; رَهْطٌ *rehṭ*, رُحْمٌ *ruḥm*; تَنْبِيهٌ *tenbīh*, تَقْبِيحٌ *taqbīḥ*, etc. But the undotted ه, standing really for servile ة at the end of a feminine noun, is never aspirated; and, as it is always preceded by a *fet-ḥa* vowel accompanying a preceding consonant in the same, final syllable of the word, it has come in course of time, *if not from all antiquity*, to be the outward and visible sign of a final *unmarked fet-ḥa* vowel in a feminine noun. It is, virtually, a fourth Arabic vowel letter, used in Arabic at the *end* of feminine nouns only; as, بَرَكَه (for بَرَكَةٌ, etc.) *bereka*, بِرْكَه (for بِرْكَةٌ) *birka*,

تُرْبَه (for تُرْبَةٌ) *turba*, فُرْصَه (for فُرْصَةٌ) *furṣa*, مَدِينَه (for مَدِينَةٌ) *Medīna*, مَكَّه (for مَكَّةٌ) *Mekka*, جِدَّه (for جِدَّةٌ) *Jidda*, حُدَيْدَه (for حُدَيْدَةٌ) *Ḥudeyda*, فَاطِمَه (for فَاطِمَةٌ) *Fāṭima*, خَدِيجَه (for خَدِيجَةٌ) *K̲h̲adīja*, etc. This peculiar use of final (virtually) vowel ه may be compared to the French usage of not pronouncing the final consonant or consonants of most words, when not followed by an initial vowel in the next word of the phrase or sentence, as in "c'est lui," compared with "c'està lui," etc. Europeans are misled by the similarly erroneous transliteration of feminine Hebrew Biblical names, such as Rebekah, and the like; but the true origin and value of the (virtually-vowel) final feminine ه for ة, and its not being an aspirate, is correctly set forth in the present paragraph; and thus comes to a close the discussion of the Arabic vowels.

The consonants, that is, *all* the letters, of the Arabic alphabet, twenty-eight in number, have their isolated written forms, and their values, as nearly as our letters and combinations of letters (never more than two letters in one combination) can represent them, as follows:

أ (ئُ, ؤُ, ء) ʼ, ب *b*, ت *t*, ث *t̲h̲*, ج *j*, ح *h̲*, خ *k̲h̲*, د *d*, ذ *d̲h̲*, ر *r*, ز *z*, س *s*, ش *s̲h̲*, ص *s̲*, ض *d̲z̲*, ط *t̲*, ظ *t̲s̲*, ع ʻ, غ *g*, ف *f*, ق *q*, ك *k*, ل *l*, م *m*, ن *n*, و *w*, ه *h*, ى *y*.

As may be readily seen above, seventeen out of the twenty-eight Arabic consonants have letters in our English alphabet that exactly correspond with them in value, viz. ب *b*, ت *t*, ج *j*, د *d*, ر *r*, ز *z*, س *s*, غ *g*, ف *f*, ق *q*, ك *k*, ل *l*, م *m*, ن *n*, و *w*, ه *h*, ى *y*. None of these require any mark to distinguish them from others; but it may be here noticed that ج *j* is pronounced like hard *g* in Egypt; that غ *g* varies in pronunciation, softer or harder, and in a peculiar manner, in different places, and is frequently, but needlessly, represented by *gh*; and that ق *q* also varies in special ways. Those special peculiarities can only be learnt by ear, like our own provincialisms. The ق *q*, again, is by some still, and was, formerly, by all, written with a *k* in transliterations, and later on, was distinguished from the ك, also shown by a *k*, by having a dot placed under it, *ḳ*. But the very Arabic letter ق, as well as both our capital and small letters *Q*, *q*, are but modified forms of one original Phenician, old Hebrew, or old Arabic letter, whence old Greek Ϙ and Latin Q, q. It never was pronounced by Semitics with the same organ as the *k*, also directly derived from the Phenician; but the Greeks were the first to confuse *q* and *k*, as they confused almost every letter of the primitive alphabet; much more so than did the Etruscans and Latins. Some writers use our *c* to represent ق; but our *c* is the descendant, as is the Arabic ج, and the Greek *Γ*, of the Phenician. It is therefore erroneous so to use a *c*, and as we now know the filiation of our letters, as well as that of the Semitic characters, our scholars are gradually becoming unanimous in the use of *q* to represent ق, without putting the needless *u* after it. Thus we write قَابِلٌ *qābil*, قَبُولٌ *qabūl*, قِيرَاطٌ *qīrāṭ*, قِرَبْ *qireb*, مَقُولٌ *maqūl*, قُرْآنٌ *qur'ān*, etc.

Of the eleven remaining Arabic consonants, three, ح *h̲*, ص *s̲*, ط *t̲*, are distinguished, in transliteration, from three of the foregoing seventeen, by a short stroke placed under them. Hitherto a dot has been used for this purpose; but as it is frequently very indistinct, a bold short stroke is preferable, both for print and for handwriting; especially as a long stroke is used for the letters of the class here following, as also to mark the long vowels, as explained above, when put over them.

Of the eight Arabic letters now left for explanation, our alphabet offers no equivalent single character. But our *t̲h̲* and *s̲h̲* give a combination, each, that exactly represents the value of one Arabic letter, viz. ث *t̲h̲*, ش *s̲h̲*. There is a difficulty about our *th*. It has in our language two values, soft in *thee,* sharp in *three.* The latter alone is the value of the Arabic ث; as in ثَوْبٌ *thewb,* مِثْلٌ *mithl,* بَثٌّ *bethth.* We are therefore driven, in order to avoid doubt and ambiguity in transliterating, to adopt the modification *dh* to represent our value of *th* in *thee,* etc., which is the power of the Arabic ذ (a modified د *d*); thus, ذَاكَ *dhāka,* ذِئْبٌ *dhi'b,* ذُؤَابَةٌ *dhu'āba.* Fitting examples of the power and transliteration of ش are found in شَمْسٌ *shems,* تَشْدِيدٌ *teshdīd,* حَشِيشٌ *ḥashīsh.* It may be useful here to point out that ث is, in some parts, provincially sounded like *s,* and in other parts like *t*; while ذ is here sounded like *d,* there like *z,* just as French tyros sound our *th.*

Three Arabic letters, again, خ *kh,* ض *dz,* ظ *ts,* have no English equivalents in single or double letters, though we can manage to represent them in transliterations. The value of خ *kh* can be learnt from a Scotchman when he says *loch,* or from a German when he says *ach.* The reason for not taking *ch* to represent خ is, that *ch* is, in French, equivalent to our *sh* and German *sch*; also, that our *ch,* the equivalent of French and English *tch,* as of German *tsch,* is a useful representative of Sanskrit, Persian, and Turkish letters which do not exist in Arabic. But, the student must never pronounce *kh* as *ḳ,* though this is natural in ordinary English and French readers. Until the correct sound is learnt, it would be far better to pronounce *ḥ,* and not *ḳ,* in such words as خُرُوجٌ *khurūj,* خَارِجٌ *khārij,* فَخْرٌ *fakhr,* فَاخِرٌ *fākhir,* سَلْخٌ *selkh,* etc. (pron. *hurūj, hārij, fahr, fāhir, selh*).

The ض *dz* is sounded as a *d* in some parts, and as a *z* in others. But it is the most characteristic letter in the Arabic language. A good professional or amateur reciter of the *Qur'ān* is as proud of his perfect pronunciation of this letter ض, as is a Parisian of his *r grasseyé* or as an Englishman of his accuracy in sounding such a medley as "though thou think the thing thine, this threefold thong thrown through

the throng shall thoroughly thwart thee." Hence, قَضَآءٌ *qadzāʼ*, قَاضِى *qādzi*, قَبْضٌ *qabdz*, فَضْلٌ *fadzl*, ضَبْطٌ *dzabṭ*, ضَابِطٌ *dzābiṭ*, مَضْبُوطٌ *madzbūt*.

The ظ, frequently sounded provincially as a very hard *z*, is, perhaps, the most disputable letter, as to its correct sound, of the whole Arabic alphabet. It is a sibilant modification of ط *ṭ*, and *ts* is the only possible value. Thus, ظُلْمٌ *tsulm*, ظَالِمٌ *tsālim*, مَظْلُومٌ *matzlūm*, نَظَرٌ *natsar*, نَاظِرٌ *nātsir*, مَنْظُورَ *mantsūr*, حَظٌّ *ḥatsts*, مَحْظُوظٌ *mahtsūts*.

All these six double consonant combinations for one Arabic letter each must carefully be marked with a long line under them, because, in Arabic words, the single letters composing them frequently occur separately in succession, and must be pronounced independently.

There now remain the *hemza* ء, أ, ئ, ؤ, already sufficiently enlarged on, and the ʻ*ayn* ع, also mentioned above, for which no English letter or combination of letters, is available. As was said before, they both represent the *hiatus* that introduces a vowel, or separates two vowels, in a word, by opening or modifying the aperture of the vocal passage, and thus beginning a syllable without the aid of an ordinary consonant or aspiration; and also the *hiatus* that closes a syllable after a vowel without such aid of an ordinary consonant or aspiration; the *hemza* being soft and gentle, the ʻ*ayn* being harsh and deeply guttural. To represent such *hiatus* without a letter in transliterations, the reversed apostrophes, ʼ for *hemza*, ʻ for ʻ*ayn*, appear the most appropriate symbols, as they efficiently separate two following vowels in two following syllables of a word, by beginning the second syllable, as they open or close any syllable, and also admit of reduplication when required. Thus, أَمْرٌ *ʼemr*, أَمِيرٌ *ʼemīr*, آمِرٌ *ʼāmir*, مَأْمُورٌ *meʼmūr*, رَأّسٌ *reʼʼās*; عُمْرٌ *ʻumr*, عَامِرٌ *ʻāmir*, مَعْمُورٌ *maʻmūr*, فَعَّالٌ *faʻʻāl*.

Two passing remarks, even three to an Englishman, may be useful. 1. In Arabic writing, two separate letters never combine to form such combinations as our *ch*, *tch*, *sh*, *ph*, *rh*, *th*, or as French *dj*, or as German *ch*, *sch*, *dsch*, *tsch*, etc. But, on the other hand, juxtapositions occur commonly that are unknown in our tongue; such as صُبْحْ *ṣub-ḥ*, فَتْحْ *fet-ḥ*, فَسْحْ *fes-ḥ*, قِدْحْ *qid-ḥ*, كُنْهْ *kun-h*, نَبِيهْ *nebīh*, تَنْبِيهْ *tenbīh*, مُتَنَبِّهْ *mutenebbih*, أَبْلَهْ *'ebleh*, etc. 2. In Arabic, an aspirate must always be aspirated, wherever placed in a word, whether as an initial, as a medial, or as a final. The preceding words are instances of final aspirates, and they may be reduplicated when medial or final, like any other consonant; thus, مُصَحِّحْ *muṣaḥḥiḥ*, مُصَحَّحْ *muṣaḥḥaḥ*, صَحَّافْ *saḥḥāf*, مُكَهَّلْ *mukehhel*, كَهَّالْ *kehhāl*. Initial and simple medial aspirates abound; as, حَقِيرْ *haqīr*, حِكَايَةْ *ḥikāya*, هَدْمْ *hedm*, هَاضِمْ *hādzim*, سَحْبْ *saḥb*, سَهْمْ *sehm*, صَاحِبْ *ṣāḥib*, سَهِيلْ *sehīl*, مَصْحُوبْ *mas-hūb*, etc. Whenever an aspirate occurs in a transliteration so as to be preceded in the word by a consonant that, in English, would make a combination having the value of a single Arabic letter, the aspirate should, by way of precaution, be separated from the other consonant by a hyphen, to mark that they belong grammatically to two syllables. Several examples are seen above. 3. An Englishman should never allow letter *r* at the end of a syllable in an Arabic word to modify and debase the vowel that precedes it in the syllable, as is so general in English words. All Arabic vowels must always be kept pure in pronunciation, as vowels are always kept pure in Italian, and most other languages; no modification of their one sound each is in any case permissible.

The twenty-eight Arabic consonants are further divisible as to pronunciation, into two very distinct, but numerically unequal classes, "soft" and "hard" (or "harsh"). Nineteen are soft, أ, ب, ت, ث, ج, د, ذ, ر, ز, س, ش, ف, ك,

ل, م, ن, و, ه, ى; while only nine are hard, ح, خ, ص, ض, ط, ظ, ع, غ, ق.

The chief result of this division of the consonants is that the short *fet-ḥa* vowel ′, when following one of the former in the same syllable, generally takes the value of our short *e* in b*e*t, m*e*n, p*e*n, t*e*n, etc.; whereas, in accompanying a consonant of the hard class, it invariably takes the sound of our short surd vowel *a*, as heard in the first syllable of the word *a*-bove, and in the indefinite article of the phrase *a* man. The vowel *kesra* ˏ is also affected in an analogous manner to be explained further on; but the vowel *dzamma* ᑋ is not so affected, always having the Italian *u* value, short or long.

The difficulty experienced by an English student of Arabic, in respect of transliterating the vowels, does not arise from the Arabic vowels themselves, but from the uncertain, indefinable, ever-changing sound of our vowel-letters. Every one of our vowels takes, at times, the short surd value of *a* in *a*-bove; thus, h*e*r, f*i*r, act*o*r, *bu*t. Our East-India service once adopted the use of this *u* of b*u*t, *u*s, etc., to represent the Arabic short *fet-ḥa* vowel in *all* cases invariably; and some still do so. Thus we meet with *Mohummud, Syud*, etc.

Every one of our English vowels, moreover, has several values, as in f*a*t, f*a*te, f*a*ther, f*a*ll, *a*bove; m*e*, m*e*t, h*e*r; rel*i*ance, p*i*t, f*i*r; g*o*, g*o*t, sh*o*ve; p*u*rity, p*u*dding, g*u*t. By reason of this uncertainty, the deceptive, incorrect rule was adopted: "the vowels as in Italian," the *a* to be always read as in f*a*ther, *e* as in p*e*t, *i* as in p*i*n, *o* as in g*o*, *u* as in p*u*ll. If this rule is incorrect, how are the three Arabic vowels to be correctly represented in our characters? and what is the incorrect part of the rule?

1. The Italian *a*-sound *does not exist in Arabic* as a short vowel *at all*. Our English short surd sound of *a*, unknown in Italian, is the only true equivalent of Arabic short *fet-ḥa* following one of the nine hard consonants; as, حَمْد *ḥamd*,

خَبْثٌ *k̲h̲abt̲h̲*, صَدْرٌ *ṣadr*, ضَبْطٌ *d̲z̲abṭ*, طَبْعٌ *ṭab'*, ظَفَرٌ *t̲s̲afer*, عَبَثٌ *'abet̲h̲*, غَدْرٌ *gadr*, قَلْبٌ *qalb*.

2. With any one of the nineteen soft consonants, short *fet-ḥa* is *generally* equivalent to Italian *e*, as in our m*e*n, m*e*t, etc. Thus, أَمَدٌ *'emed*, بَرٌّ *berr*, تَلٌّ *tell*, ثَوْبٌ *t̲h̲ewb*, خَلْبٌ *jelb*, دَفْنٌ *defn*, ذَنَبٌ *d̲h̲eneb*, رَسْمٌ *resm*, زَجْرٌ *zejr*, سَمْتٌ *semt*, شَجَرٌ *s̲h̲ejer*, فَمٌ *fem*, كَلْبٌ *kelb*, لَزْمٌ *lezm*, مَرْءٌ *mer'*, نَسْجٌ *nesj*, وَتَرٌ *weter*, هَزْلٌ *hezl*, يَمَنٌ *yemen*. But, the occurrence of any one or more of the nine hard consonants in a word, wherever placed in it, has a tendency to cause the short surd *a* value to be assumed by the *fet-ḥa* of the nearest soft consonant, or even of any soft consonant in the word. This detail can be learnt only by hearing correct readers and speakers pronounce the words.

3. Long *fet-ḥa* اَ has two different values, also, with the two classes of consonants. With the soft class, it has the Italian sound of *a*, lengthened as in our word fāther (like French *â* in pâtre); but with the hard class, it no longer has the Italian or French sound, but becomes very similar to our broadest long *a* in w*a*ll, f*a*ll, c*a*ll. We have no method to distinguish these two values in writing, and continental scholars are usually ignorant of their difference; neither can they mark it in any way. The class of the Arabic consonant marks the difference effectually, indubitably; and English scholars should emphasize this difference in their pronunciation of Arabic. Thus, بَارِزٌ *bāriz*, تَاسِعٌ *tāsi'*, جَارِى *jāri*, etc., as fāther; but حَامِلٌ *ḥāmil*, خَاطِرٌ *k̲h̲āṭir*, صَادِرٌ *ṣādir*, ضَالٌّ *d̲z̲āll*, طَاهِرٌ *ṭāhir*, ظَافِرٌ *t̲s̲āfir*, عَاطِرٌ *'āṭir*, غَابِنٌ *gābin*, قَادِرٌ *qādir*, etc., almost like our broad *a* in h*a*wk, v*a*ult, etc. There are a few well-known words in which the Arabic long-vowel *fet-ḥa* ا is dispensed with in writing, though still fully pronounced; such as رَحْمَنٌ for رَحْمَانٌ; and مُعَوِيَةٌ is sometimes met with

for مُعَاوِيَةٌ. The forms حَيَوةٌ and صَلَوةٌ are much used, from reverence for an archaic usage found in the *Qur'ān*.

4. With the nineteen soft consonants, the short-vowel *kesra* ِ is again exactly represented by the Italian sound of *i*, as in our f*i*n, p*i*t, etc. Thus: إِذْ *'idh*, بِنْتٌ *bint*, جِسْمٌ *jism*, دِرَايَةٌ *dirāya*, رِدْيَةٌ *ridya*, لِسَانٌ *lisān*, etc. With the long vowel *kesra* ِي the sound is the same, but prolonged as in our words rav*i*ne, fasc*i*ne. Thus: سِيرَةٌ *sīra*, فِيلٌ *fīl*, دِينٌ *dīn*, etc.

5. With the nine hard consonants, the short and the long-vowel *kesra* requires a sound of which we have no conception in English, and which does not exist in French, Italian, or German, but is well known in Russian, where it is represented by the special vowel letter ы. Until its true sound can be learnt by ear, a student must of necessity pronounce it as the Italian *i* when short, and as the French *î* when long. Thus: حِدْثَانٌ *ḥidthān*, خِدْمَةٌ *khidma*, صِبْغَةٌ *ṣibga*, طِبْقٌ *ṭibq*, عِلَّةٌ *'illa*, قِرَانٌ *qirān*; صِيغَةٌ *ṣīga*, ضِيفَانٌ *dzīfān*, عِيسَى *'īsà*, قِيرَاطٌ *qīrāṭ*, etc.

6. With short or long-vowel *dzamma* ُ or ُو, the two classes of consonants make no difference of sound in Arabic, except in the quantity, Italian *u* being always the model of the sound; as, بُرٌّ *burr*, حُورٌ *ḥūr*, etc.

The following remarks may usefully be added:

1. In transliterating and pronouncing Arabic, never reduplicate a consonant unless to represent a *teshdīd* ّ, in the original; and always reduplicate such letter in writing and in pronouncing; as in رَبٌّ *rabb*, رَبَّانِيٌّ *rabbāniyy*, سِكِّينٌ *sikkīn*, قَهَّارٌ *qaḥḥār*, مُتَأَسِّفٌ *mute'essif*, etc. This rule is strictly Italian as well as Arabic. Englishmen, slaves to French example, write double letters in words, and then pronounce but one; as in *command, sunny, turret*, etc. And yet we say *mad dog, if fair, in nature*, etc., correctly, sounding the

two successive consonants; and it is just as easy to do so in the middle or at the end of one word.

2. It will not have escaped the reader, that, in transliterating Arabic words that end with a short-vowel *fet-ḥa* after a soft consonant, the letter *a* has constantly been used in the present paper. This is merely a compliance with the necessities of English orthography, since we do not possess the French *é* or the German final value of *e*; and final *e* in an English word is always dropped in pronunciation, producing an effect on the preceding vowel instead. A final *a* has not this effect, though it does not truly represent the sound of Arabic *fet-ḥa* after a soft consonant. It is a vowel, one of the equivalents to *fet-ḥa*, and is more correct, by far more preferable, than the erroneous and objectionable *ah* or *eh* used by so many. It is an unfortunate necessity, and may sometimes be evaded in compound expressions, such as قَالَ ٱلرَّسُولُ *qāle-'r-resūl*, etc.

3. A very erroneous method of transliterating Arabic compound terms and sentences, prevalent all over the continent, as well as among English scholars, is, to sink the final vowel of a word, leaving its consonant bare; and then to treat the next word, commencing with an *'elif of union* ٱ, as though it were the initial word of a sentence, or an isolated word. Thus they write, for instance: *Jemāl-ed-dīn*, etc., instead of *Jemālu-'d-Dīn* (*Jemāli-'d-Dīn*, *Jemāla-'d-Dīn*), etc. It is a most reprehensible practice, and a careful student should break himself of it as speedily as possible. De Sacy (Gram. Ar. vol. i. pp. 79-81, seconde édition) transliterates correctly in this respect; and Wright (Gram. of Arab. Lang. vol. i. pp. 19-22) gives the correct rules on this point.

4. When a word commencing with an *'elif of union* stands alone, begins a discourse, or comes after a full stop or pause, or after a word ending with a quiescent consonant, a vowel must be borrowed for that initial ٱ, as is said, from our own

pocket, or mind. It is always *fet-ḥa* with the initial definite article, which then becomes pronounced as أَلْ *'el;* and so it is with ٱيْمَنُ, which becomes أَيْمَنُ *'eymen.* But with the other nine nouns, if initial, ٱبْنٌ, ٱبْنَةٌ, etc., *kesra* is borrowed, and they become إِبْنٌ *'ibn,* إِبْنَةٌ *'ibna,* etc. For the ٱ of the verbs, too many rules exist to be given here. But, when these various classes follow a word ending with a quiescent consonant, it is this consonant that borrows the vowel required, and then becomes movent. The special rules must be studied in a grammar.

The following words and names are offered as examples of the system advocated, with instances (in parentheses), gathered from various sources of great authority, of different kinds of erroneous transliteration :

أَبٌ 'eb (ab).

أَبْرَهَةُ 'Ebreha (Abrahah).

إِبْنُ ٱلْمُغَاوِرِ 'Ibnu 'l-Mugạ̄wir (Ibn el-Moghâwir).

إِبْنُ جُبَيْرٍ 'Ibnu Jubeyr (Ibn Jubair).

أَبُو 'ebū (abû).

أَبْوَآءُ 'Ebwā' (Abwa).

أَبُو سُفْيَانٍ 'Ebū-Sufyān (Abû-Sofyân, Abu Sufiyan).

أَبُو لَهَبٍ 'Ebū-Leheb (Abu Laheb).

أَبُو هُرَيْرَةٍ 'Ebū-Hureyra (Abu Horeira).

إِخْمِيمُ 'Ikhmīm (Akmim).

أُسْوانُ 'Uswān (Assouan).

أُشْمُونَيْنِ 'Ushmūneyn (Ashmuneim).

ٱلْقُدْسُ 'el-Quds (Al-Kods).

أَوْطَاسٌ 'ewṭās (Autas).

أَوْقَافٌ 'ewqāf (aukaf, efkaf, evcaf).

بَصْرَةٌ Baṣra (Bassorah, Basrah).

بُصْرَى Buṣrà (Bostra).

بَكْرُ بْنُ وَآئِلِ Bekru 'bnu Wā'il.
بَكْرُ وَآئِلِ Bekru Wā'il.
(Bakr-Wâil).

بَيْدَآءُ Beydā' (Baidâ).

اَلتَّلُّ ٱلْكَبِيرُ 'Et-Tellu 'l-Kebīr (Tel el-Kebir).

تَيْمَآءُ Teymā' (Teymah).

جَبَلَيْنِ jebeleyn (obl. of جَبَلَانِ jebelān, dual of جَبَلٌ *a mountain*) *two mountains* (gebelên).

جِدَّةٌ Jidda, جُدَّةٌ Judda (Jeddah).

جُدَيْدَةٌ Judeyda (Jedaydah).

جِزَّةٌ Jizza (*Egypt*. Gizza), (Ghizeh).

جَعْفَرٌ Jaʻfer (Jaafar).

حَآئِلٌ Ḥā'il (Hayel).

حِجَازٌ Ḥijāz (Hejaz).

حُدَيْدَةٌ Ḥudeyda (Hodeidah).

حَرَمٌ Ḥarem (Haram).

حَمِيدُ ٱللّٰهِ Ḥamīdu-'llāh (Hameed-Ullah).

خُرْطُومٌ K̲h̲urṭūm (Khartoum).

خُلُجٌ K̲h̲uluj (Kholoj).

خُلَفَآءُ K̲h̲ulefā' (Kholefâ).

خَلِيفَةٌ K̲h̲alīfa (Khalifah).

دَرْعِيَّةٌ Derʻiyya (Derey'eeyah).

دُوَيْمٌ Duweym (Duem).

دَهْنَآءُ Dehnā' (Ḍahnā).

دَيْرٌ deyr, *a monastery* (dêr).

ذَكْوَانْ Dhekwān (Dhakwân).

رَمْيٌ remy (rami).

رِيَاضٌ Riyādz (Ri’aḍ).

زُبَيْرٌ Zubeyr (Sebehr, Zebehr).

زَيْدُ ٱلْخَيْلِ Zeydu ’l-Khayl (Zaid al-Khail).

زَيْلَعْ Zeyla‘ (Zeilah).

زَيْنَبْ Zeyneb (Zainab).

سَبْتَةٌ Sebta (Ceuta).

سَعِيدٌ Sa‘īd (Said).

سَوَاحِلُ Sewāḥil (Suahil, Saouâhil, Souahhel).

سَوَاحِلِيٌّ Sewāḥiliyy (Suahili, Saouâhili, Souahhéli).

سَوَاكِنُ Sewākin (Suakin, Suakim).

سُودَانٌ Sūdān (Soudan).

سُوَيْسٌ Suweys (Suez).

سَيِّدٌ Seyyid (Seid, Syud).

سَيِّدُ ٱلسَّلَاطِينَ Seyyidu ’s-Selāṭīn (Saiyidu-selátín).

شَفَقَةٌ Shefaqat (Chefkat).

شَيْبَةٌ Sheyba (Shaybah).

صَعِيدُ مِصْرَ Ṣa‘īdu Miṣr (Saaid-Misr).

ضَيْزَنٌ dzayzen (ḍaizan).

طَآئِفْ Ṭā’if (Taïf).

طَنْجَةٌ Ṭanja (Tangiers).

طُوَيْقٌ Ṭuweyq (Ṭoweyk).

عَارِضٌ ‘āridz (’Aareḍ).

عَآئِشَةٌ ‘Ā’isha (Ayesha, ‘Âisha).

عَبْدُ ٱلْحَقِّ ‘Abdu ’l-Ḥaqq (Abd-el-Hakk).

عَبْدُ ٱلْحَمِيدِ ‘Abdu ’l-Ḥamīd (Abd-el-Hamid).

عَبْدُ ٱلرَّحْمَانِ ‘Abdu ’r-Raḥmān (Abd-el-Rahman).

عَبْدُ ٱلرَّحِيمِ ‘Abdu ’r-Raḥīm (Abd-el-Rahim).

عَبْدُ ٱلْغَفَّارِ ‘Abdu ’l-Gaffār (Abd-el-Ghaffar).

عَبْدُ ٱلْقَادِرِ ‘Abdu ’l-Qādir (Abd-el-Kader).

عَبْدُ ٱللّٰهِ ‘Abdu-’llāh (Abdallah).

عَبْدُ ٱلْمَجِيدِ ‘Abdu ’l-Mejīd (Abd-el-Mejid).

عَبْدُ ٱلْمُطَّلِبِ ‘Abdu ’l-Muṭṭalib (Abd-el-Mottalib, —Muttaleb).

عَبْدُ ٱلْوَهَّابِ ‘Abdu ’l-Wehhāb (Abd-el-Wahab).

عُثْمَانُ ‘Uthmān (Othman, Osman, Othoman, Ottoman).

عَدَسٌ ‘ades (Adas).

عَدَنٌ ‘Aden (Aden).

عُدَيْنٌ ‘Udeyn (Odden).

عِلْمُ ٱلْعَرُوضِ ‘ilmu ’l-‘arūdz (ilm el aruz).

عُمَانُ ‘Umān (Oman, Omman).

عُمَرُ ‘Umer (Omar).

عَمْرُو ‘Amr (Amrou).

عِنَايَةُ ٱللّٰهِ ‘Ināyetu-’llāh (Inyatullah).

غَازِى gāzi (ghâzi).

غَزَآءٌ gazā’ (ghazâ).

غَيْرَةٌ gayra (ghairah).

فَرَزْدَقٌ ferezdaq (Farazdac).

قَاضِى qādzi (cadi, cauzee).

قَاهِرَةٌ qāhira (Cairo, le Caire).

قُبَّةٌ qubba (cobba).
قَحْطَانُ qaḥṭān (caḥṭân).
قُدْسٌ quds (cods).
قُزَحُ quzaḥ (cozaḥ).
قُصَيْرٌ quṣayr (Cosseir, Kosseir).
قُضَاعَةُ qudzāʻa (Coḍâʻa).
قِنَّةُ qinnā (Keneh).
قُوصٌ quṣ (Goos).
قونيةُ qūnya (Coniah, Konieh).
قَهْوَةٌ qahwa (K'hawah).
كُبَيْشَةُ Kubeysha (Ḳobaisha).
مُحَمَّدٌ Muḥammed (Mahomet, Mohammad, Mohummud).
مُدَّعِيَّةُ Muddaʻiyya (Maddey'yeeyah).
مَدِينَةُ Medīna (Medinah).
مَدِينَةُ ٱلنَّبِيِّ Medīnetu 'n-Nebiyy (Medínah ar'rasúl).
مَرْيَمُ Meryem (Maryam).
مَسْجِدٌ mesjid (masjid).
مَسْقَطُ Masqat (Muscat).
مُسْلِمٌ muslim (moslem).
مُصَوَّعُ Muṣawwaʻ (Massowah).
مَكَّةُ Mekka (Meccah, Makkah).
مَكَّةُ ٱلْمُعَظَّمَةُ Mekketu 'l-Muʻatstsama (Mekkah Maaẓmeh).
مِنْيَةُ Minya (Minieh).
مَوْصِلُ Mawṣil (Mosul).
مُوَيْلَةُ Muweyla (Moilah).
مَهْدِيٌّ mehdiyy (Mahdi).
نَجْدٌ Nejd (Nejed).

وَهْرَانُ Wehrān (Oran).
هَارُونُ Hārūn (Harun, Haroon).
يَنْبُعُ Yenbu‘ }
يَنْبُوعُ Yenbū‘ } (Yembo).

From these examples a judgment may be formed as to how far from correct is the new Admiralty system of transliteration for Arabic words, recently adopted by the Royal Geographical Society;[1] more especially the rule to reduplicate a consonant when it is wished to show that the preceding vowel is short.

---

[1] It should be observed that the "system" here adverted to was rather an endeavour to insure uniformity under reasonable precedent, than to illustrate any strict adherence to grammatical orthography.—Ed.

14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED
LOAN DEPT.
RENEWALS ONLY—TEL. NO. 642-3405
This book is due on the last date stamped below, or
on the date to which renewed.
Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

DEC 13 1969 # 2

REC'D LD NOV 29 '69 -3PM

LD21A–60m-6,'69
(J9096s10)476–A-32

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

Gaylord
GAYLAMOUNT®
PAMPHLET BINDER
Syracuse, N.Y.
Stockton, Calif.