sanguinary, from the time of Muhammad to this moment) who is styled by European writers, and by them only, Jingis, Jhingis, Jinghis, Zengis, Zhengiz, Zenghiz, Gentchis, Gingis, Ghingis, Ginghis, Tchinggis, and the like—anything but his correct name.

At the same time, due allowance must be made for French and German pronunciation, as for example:—D'Ohsson writes *tch* for *ch* in *Chin*, and *guiz* for giz=Tchin-guiz (which is literally Chingiz written in French), but he does not put *j* for *ch* nor *s* for *z*, and never writes "Jingis," although he stumbles on "Mongol." The Germans pronounce *ch* as *tsch* and the other letters as in English: they would write Tschin-giz; and the *k* in Kublāe as *ck*, but they represent the vowels by the same letters as I have already given. The consonants of the Mughal dialect, as far as they go, correspond pretty much with letters of the Persian alphabet. The conqueror's name is written in two ways—چنگز and جنگز—the consonants in which are four—*Ch* (the same letter precisely as they write *Chin*—China—with), *n*, *g*, and *z*—and the vowels two, both short, as in the first word=*Chin*-giz, but, in the latter word given above, the vowel in the last syllable is long ī=*Chin*-gīz. The author of the 'Tabakāt-i-Nāsirī' was his contemporary. The word, as all Oriental writers say, signifies The Great Khān or great ruler, and the last word, giz or gīz, signifying great, &c., may be found as the termination of several words in the country of the Turks such as Tin-giz or Tin-gīz—the great lake—which Mr. Howorth (p. 33), or his authors, *will write* with the guttural *gh*—Tinghiz—which does not belong to it. The *ch* which occurs in *Chin*-giz is also in *Chin* Timūr (at page 128). Why not write that *Jin* Timur as well as Jin-gis?

As there is no چ—*ch*—in Arabic, this letter is known as 'Ajamī j, not that it is to be read as *j* but as *ch*, and, in some lexicons containing Arabic, Persian, and Turkish words, all the words beginning with either of these letters are ranged in one section, but it is not that the letters are the same; but when *k* and *g*, as we are told, are the same in Germany, *ch* may be anything.

For the above reason, in badly or carelessly written MSS., the name will be found written, *by careless or ignorant scribes*, with one dot under, as well as with three, or three jumbled into one, and sometimes without a single point to the whole word; but the practical linguist, knowing "flowers" from thorns, can understand what it stands for, and the tyro when in doubt can refer to a lexicon; but in no lexicon, Persian or Turkish, will any one show me Chingiz's name written and explained with *j* for the first letter. Further, even were the first letter *j*, how comes it that we have an *s*, as in Mr. Howorth's Jingis, at the end of the second syllable, for the last is simply English *z*? By the same theory his name should be Jinkiz or Jingiz. In a note (p. 709) he has the first syllable given him almost correct, by "Schmidt, Erdmann, &c.," as Ching, but as they are uncertain about it and add "*or* Jing," he is again left in doubt, as before.

I look for the origin of these errors partly in the old European travellers writing such words as Jingis, Zinghis, Mongol, and *Mungl*, &c., from recollection or from sound only. They doubtless wrote down what they *thought* they heard, but, for the names of persons and places, the ear is not to be wholly trusted. Possibly the natives sound the *gh* with a slight nasal twang in Mughūl, and hence the error may have arisen. There are scores of names in our beautiful Survey Maps of the Panjāb and Indus frontier, which, if used in asking a native the way, according to the mode you would pronounce the names as written on the map, would effectually prevent you from being understood. This I have myself tested.

Now I suppose there are few people who have not heard of the "Great Mogul," but not of the "Great Mongol." The sovereigns so styled were Mughals, and the old travellers, hearing the name, did not, as usual with them as well as with moderns, detect the guttural *gh* in the word, and called them Moguls. I notice moreover that Mr. Howorth himself, at page 34 of his book, quoting the "great Raschid," from some translation, for a list of the Turks, Tātārs, and Mughals, mentions the names of "Tatar Khan and *Mogol* Khan," while in Rashīd-ud-Dīn's work, as I have elsewhere stated, the latter is invariably written Mughūl. Tātār Khān and Mughūl Khān were the respective progenitors of the two great ī-māks of Tātār and Mughūl.

Something of a similar kind occurs in two words that we have heard much of lately—of the Sultān's issuing a *Hatti Humayoun*, or the like, which English people, in their innocence, suppose to signify some peculiar document, a despatch, or an Act of Parliament. The first word is pure Arabic and the second pure Persian, but, as in the case of چ—*ch*, so it is in the case of خ—*kh*, and some wiseacres, in former times, finding the first letter of the words written without a dot over it (that is Arabic ح—*h*), and not knowing the word, and, that the point had been omitted by the scribe, made it *H*att instead of *K*hatt. There is no such word as Hatt, but *K*hatt signifies "writing," "handwriting," "an epistle," "a letter," and Humāyūn, "august," "royal," "imperial," &c.=an imperial rescript. Dast-*kh*att, signifying "signature," "handwriting," is a compound from the same word, but those even who speak of and write "*H*atti-Humayoun" do not, I fancy, write of and say Dast-*h*att but Dast-*kh*att. With all this, such is the arbitrary effect of custom, that an editor would hold up his hands in horror at the bare idea of the term appearing correctly in print, and so the blunder goes on *ad infinitum*.

Some may say, like Mr. Howorth, about the "pronunciation in Mongolia," that the Turks of Istāmbūl pronounce the guttural *kh* rather differently from any other people. This may be true in a measure, but they do pronounce it, and not as *h*, although in Arabic words in which *h* occurs, as in A*h*mad, we constantly find European professors and authors writing it A*ch*mad, A*ch*met, and A*kh*mad!—thus, in each case, *substituting the wrong* for the right letter; and only very recently (in the *Geographical Magazine* for December, 1874, page 389) I find no less a person than the President of the recent St. Petersburg Oriental Congress, M. Grigorief, writing A*kh*med for the common, every-day, name of A*h*mad, which is derived from the same root as Mu*h*ammad, and, I suppose, after the same fashion, he writes Mu*kh*ammad for Mu*h*ammad. But whatever the pronunciation of words may be, as with English, Scotch, and Irish (or in out-of-the-way parts, as in the extreme west of England, with a twang such as "watter" for water, or "duff" for dough, as I once heard a young Cornish civic official, when reading the lesson in a parish church say), the original orthography is not changed; and, if we want correctness, we must go to the *written form* of a language, not to the spoken.

H. G. Raverty.

## Literary Gossip.

Miss Harriet Martineau's Autobiography will be published on the 1st of March. It is said it will contain a good deal of piquant matter, which will give rise to controversy.

The Hon. Dudley Campbell is about to publish a pamphlet giving the results of his recent observations in Turkey. Mr. Campbell accompanied Sir George Campbell during a portion of his tour.

Lord Acton is the author of the article on 'Wolsey and the Divorce of Henry the Eighth' in the current number of the *Quarterly Review*.

The new agent, at the Vatican, of the Record Office, Mr. Bliss, is actively and successfully prosecuting the researches entrusted to him to make. The same facilities are afforded to him as were so generously accorded to his predecessor by the Papal authorities.

Messrs. Bell & Sons have in the press the long-expected volume which contains a brief autobiography of Barry Cornwall, followed by a biographical notice, and some unpublished poems and personal sketches of his literary contemporaries.

The inaugural meeting of the Caxton Celebration is fixed for Saturday, the 17th instant, at the Jerusalem Chamber, Westminster Abbey, when the Dean of Westminster will preside; and the invitation tickets, which are necessarily limited, will be issued by the Provisional Committee through the Secretary, Mr. Hodson, 20, High Holborn.

Prof. Kennedy, of Cambridge, is about to bring out a collection of his fugitive pieces and translations, which will be welcomed by his pupils and admirers in both Universities. It is well known that many of the most finished compositions in the 'Arundines Cami' and the 'Sabrinæ Corolla' are from Dr. Kennedy's pen; but few people know how prolific that pen has been at all times, and how much scholarly work it has done, of which the newspapers and the booksellers have taken no cognizance. A complete collection of all these *brochures* is hardly to be expected. As it is, the volume will extend to nearly four hundred pages.

There will soon be no such thing as a "Jesuit in disguise." The volume of 'Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus,' which was printed for private circulation, at the Manresa Press in 1875, is to be thrown upon the market, for any one who likes to buy of Messrs. Burns & Oates. It is to be followed in the course of the summer by a second volume, of some seven hundred pages, full of curious information on the personal history of the English members of the Society, derived from the archives at Rome, Belgium, Spain, and elsewhere, and is likely to prove a very valuable collection in more ways than one. The Jesuits just now seem to be courting publicity, and appear to believe that the more Englishmen know of them the better they will love them. Who knows?

Capt. Burton writes:—

"Kindly allow me to express a hope in your valuable columns that some publisher will favour the public with a reprint of 'The Turks, the Greeks, and the Slaves,' the work upon which Mr. Gladstone based his lecture at Hawarden. Since 1872 I vainly advised the late Lady Sebright (Miss G. Muir Mackenzie) to give us a second edition; nor have I been fortunate with Miss A. P. Irby, whose energetic and benevolent labours in Slavonia and at Knin allow her no literary leisure. The book gives a vivid and circumstantial picture of the three races which are now interesting all Europe, and, being written before 1867, it is equally free from the exaggerated Slavophilism and Turcophilism of England in 1877."

M. Rothschild, the well-known Paris publisher of *ouvrages de luxe*, has in preparation a second volume, as a supplement to the sumptuous work on Venice which he issued lately. M. Charles Yriarte has been at Venice for the purpose of collecting fresh materials, and much assistance has been obtained from the Library of St. Mark's, the Bibliothèque Nationale, and the library of M. A. Firmin-Didot. The book will contain chapters with the following headings: "Painting," "Typography and Literature," "Costume," "Lace," "Glass," "Mosaics," "The Doge," "Medals," "The City," "Venetian Life." It will contain at least three hundred woodcuts.