Tamâraq Tuaregs in the Canary Islands
(Linguistic Evidence)

A. Militarev - Moscow

[There are some phonological parallels between Guanche, the extinct language of the first inhabitants of the Canary Islands, and one of the Berber dialects of the Tuareg population of the Sahara desert. Although those dialects belong to the same Guanche-Berber linguistic family, the afore-mentioned parallels are so typologically unique that they only can be explained as lexical loan-words from Tuareg into Guanche. A series of such loan-words enumerated in this article gives ground to the hypothesis of Tuareg immigration to the Canary Islands, glotto-chronologically datable as being around the 7-8 century B.C. Basing his ideas on this hypothesis, the author endeavours to decipher some Guanche inscriptions, written in Lybic script, with the aid of the Tuareg dictionary and shows that they are composed in Tuareg.]

1. The Guanche language or dialect group is genetically related to the Libyo-Berber languages of the North Africa. This may be proved by numerous morphologic, phonetic and lexical isoglosses, many of which were registered and analysed by the founder of Guanche linguistics D. J. Wölfel and his precursors.

1.2. The Guanche and Berber groups are regarded by the writer as two taxonomically equal branches of the "Berber-Guanche" family, which also includes Epigraphic Libyan (inner classification and genetic status not clear) and is, in its turn, part of the Afrasian (Afro-Asiatic, Semito-Hamitic, Hamito-Semitic) super-family. The Berber-Guanche genetic dichotomy is sustained by:
   certain archaic morphologic and phonetic features in Guanche unattested in Berber and well explained from common Afrasian patterns; a series of innovations common to all subgroups of Berber and, consequently, reconstructable as Proto-Berber, but not attested in Guanche; a number of loan-words in Guanche from various Afrasian and non-Afrasian languages, unattested in Berber, which seem to have been very old "continental" borrowings synchronous to the Proto-Berber period or, in other words, prior to Proto-Berber splitting into dialects in the last third of the 2nd millennium B. C. according to the author's glottochronological calculations.

2. There are certain facts which seem to contradict a postulated dichotomy within Berber-Guanche family. These are separate Guanche-North Berber (Taşalhâyt-Tamaziyt; Zenata; Qabyle) and Guanche-South Berber (Tuareg) isoglosses. Whereas the former are but a few cultural terms and as such irrelevant
for a genetic classification, the latter share certain phonetic peculiarities proper, of all the Berber subgroups, to the Tuareg one only, and thus need to be explained.

2.1. Partly, these Guanche-Tuareg isoglosses are accounted for by a reputed conservatism of Tuareg languages owing to their relative isolation from an all-penetrating impact of Arabic. They have retained so many common Berber features lost by other Berber languages, that Prof. K.-G. Prasse even says the Proto-Tuareg reconstruction should not differ in principle from the Proto-Berber one (the opinion I can’t wholly accept).

2.2. An alternative explanation, namely that Guanche and Tuareg make up a separate group inside Berber, or Libyo-Berber, seems to me the least plausible, though cannot be completely disregarded. The third, and most reasonable, interpretation is offered in point 3.2.3.

3. Apart from common Guanche-Berber and separate Guanche-Tuareg lexical items there exists a series of isoglosses linking various Guanche languages/dialects with one North Tuareg dialect cluster known as Tamāraq.

3.1. That could have been, and partially is, accounted for by a simple fact that, thanks to the first-class dictionary by Father Ch. de Foucauld unparalleled in African lexicography, a student may operate with a huge amount of words of the most important Tamāraq dialect, that of Ahaggar (Tahaggart). Since the number of the Ahaggar words available surpasses by far that of any other Berber language, the probability of coincidence of any kind with the Ahaggar data is the highest for every possible language drawn to comparison.

3.2. However, there is a series of Guanche and Ahaggar words revealing such a striking phonetic affinity that it cannot be elucidated by the above reason. The affinity in question concerns, above all, a phonetic phenomenon quite unmotivated in Guanche, but historically well explained in Ahaggar. What is meant here can be clearly illustrated by the word used by most Berber-speaking unities to designate their mother tongue. In North Berber it is ta-mazīṭ- (from a-mazī, ‘a Berber’, pl. i-mazīt- an), in various Tuareg languages tā-mašāq, tā-mažāq, tā-maζiq, and in Ahaggar and several closely related dialects – tə-maŋa (or tə-mahāq). The phonetic correspondences based on this comparison are as follows: North Berber z - Tuareg (except Ahaggar and the other Tamâhaq dialects) ʃ - ʃ - ʒ - ʒ - Ahaggar (Tamâhaq) h.

3.2.1. The corresponding Proto-Berber phoneme is reconstructed by K.-G. Prasse as *z. This consonant regularly voices a voiced sibilant (or possibly a sibilant affricate, in several cases) in Guanche, corresponding to more than one common Afroasiatic affricates: *ʒ, *γ, * Csv, partially also * ʃ (see Comparative-historic phonetics of Afroasiatic, forthcoming). Examples:


3.2.1.2. Guanche (Palma) zeloy “soleil”, “el sol” - Berber *ā-zayl: Siwa a-zəl “daytime”, Fodjaha a-zal, pl. a-zal-w-an, Iyr a-zil, Semlal a-zal “sunset”, Izayan a-zil “heat of the day”, Qabyle a-zal, pl. i-zil-an “daylight” - Ahaggar a-hal (according to K. G. Prasse, a-hal “sunlight”. [Cp. Wölfel, op. cit., p. 583-584].

1. Out of over thousand words, mainly cultural terms and toponyms known of Guanche (presumably extinct since 17th century), most items were recorded in 14-16th centuries by Spanish, and some by Italian, French, English and other visitors to the Canary Islands. Transliterations (followed by a translation) in recorder’s mother tongues often help to reconstruct a Guanche phonetic word.

2. Hyphen is used to separate a root morpheme from an affixal one (e.g. i- is a feminine prefix, i-... - is a fem. prefix, i-... - an is a plural suffix, a- is an article-like noun marker, etc.)
3.2.1.3. Guanche (Palma) aziqauquhe "moreno o negro", aziqauquhe "moreno", azaqauquhe "brun", azaqauquhe "le brun", azaqauquhe "black or dusky", etc. - Berber *az-zi-qauquhe³: Siwa a-zaggary, (gg. -< *ww).
Audjila a-zwery, Ayr a-mi-zwery, Taneslem Staggary, Izdeg a-zaggway, Djerba a-zaggary. Qable a-zaggway "red" - Ahaggar ihwery "to be red". [Cp. Wölfel, op. cit., 425-426].

3.2.1.4. Guanche (Tenerife) mencei "nove regni", "amparo y defensa", menzei "rey (i.e. defensa)", mensey "el rey, rey, soberano", "le seigneur ou le roi", etc. [menzei?] - Berber *a-menzi-y³ "first", first-born, one who comes the first ("< *a-menzi-y³ "come or come early in the morning, to come or go first")
Ghadames a-menzi, menzyay "beginning, start", Rif šenwa a-menziy "first-born, aged, eldest", Nefusi a-menziy "the first, first-born, the eldest", Qable a-menzi, pl. i-menziy "one who comes the first, first-born" - Ahaggar e-menziy (Prasse: e-ma-ñi) 'forerunner, herald'. [Cp. Wölfel, op. cit., p. 465-466].

3.2.2. Besides the words of the above group in Guanche with *z (transliterated as z, sometimes as s) between vowels, occasionally as c or ch possibly rendering an affricate variant of *s, namely [ʃ] corresponding to Berber *z, there is a group of Guanche words with *h (rendered by h and, in Spanish transliteration, also by j, sometimes x, g) corresponding to Ahaggar h, the one proceeding from Proto-Berber *z as described in point 3.2.1. Examples:

3.2.2.1. Guanche (Lanzarote) hyquyeres (es appears to be a French plural ending) 'une manière de bois qui... ne peut ardoire nulle manière jusques à tant qu'il est sec et pourris' [Wölfel, op. cit., p. 572] - Ahaggar a-haggory (Prasse: a-hagqory) 'beam made of a palm-tree' - Zekkara a-zaggory 'tree', Snus ʃa-ʃeqquir-l 'firewood', Qable a-zaggory 'trunk of a dry tree' (< Berber *a-zaggory possibly related to Berber *eqquir/*eqqur 'to be dry').

3.2.2.2. Guanche (Herrero) a Eho 'fontana', gapoi 'fuente', hapio 'fountain', gapo 'fuente' [Wölfel, op. cit., p. 590] - Ahaggar tâ-haf-t 'irrigation channel, ditch' - Ghat ta-zaf-do, pl. di-zif.

3.2.2.3. Guanche (Gran Canaria) taharenemen 'higos pasos', 'figues sèches' (definitely a composed word: *ta-har-en-yamen 'fig of drought'? ) - Ahaggar ahar. Taytoq ahar 'fig', Ahaggar t-ahar-t, pl. t-ahar-in 'fig-tree' - Ghat ahar (Ayr t-ahar-t, Taneslem a-har are borrowed from Ahaggar, which explains -h in place of the expected -z) 'fig', Ghadames t-azar-t, pl. t-azar-in, Qable t-azar-t 'dry figs'. As for Berber parallels to the second part of the Guanche composed word, cp. Tuareg Ayr. East Tawlemmet mānna 'drought'. Ahaggar mānna 'long drought'.

3.2.2.4. Guanche (Gomera) tahuyan (t-ahu-yan, pl.) '... faldetades de... pieles pintadas', 'enaguas de pieles', 'basquinas', 'jupes', 'pettycoats of goat skins', (Palma) tahuy (t-ahu-y) 'piel' - Ahaggar t-ahu-yayt 'long-fringed leather bag' (< *azayayt) - Ayr, East Tawlemmet a-šayyuha 'kind of leather bag (for clothes). [Cp. Wölfel, op. cit., p. 530].

3.2.2.5. Guanche (Lanzarote, Fuerteventura) maho 'a shoe', 'calzado', mahos (maho-s, with a Spanish plural ending) 'calzados de los cueros de las cabras, el pelo afuera, unos como zapatos', maxo 'zapatón', 'bottines', majo 'el calzado', maohs (maoh-s) '... un pezgo di corame di capra avvolto à i piedi' - Ahaggar t-mišt, pl. ti-mišt-in 'middle-size bag made of a whole goat or sheepskin' - Tadghaq, Taneslem t-umš-t 'leather bag'. [Cp. Wölfel, op. cit., p. 530-531].

3. The symbol V in a reconstructed form stands for a vowel of an unidentified quality.
4. Ahaggar h is of a mixed origin, reflecting three Proto-Berber consonantis, namely: *h and *h (or *w). [Cp. Wölfel, op. cit., p. 504-505].
6. Prof. Prasse suggested in a personal communication the Guanche -harenemen might be understood as *yemenen, compare Qable yirfan, pl. yirfan-y 'dry fig' with metathesis. If this comparison is valid, I would analyse the Guanche form rather as t-ahar enemen (< *ar-yemen with the fallen or unheard uinal).
7. This Common Tuareg *a-zayka is possibly related to the Common Berber verb *azab, perfective *azabab 'to skin': Ghadames ʃab, Ghat až, perf. yaza, Ahaggar at, perf. yah, Ayr až, Semial ak, perf. yaza, etc. [Cp. K.-G. Prasse, A propos del 'origine de H tuareg (tahaggari), Keubnian, 1969, p. 43].
8. Possibly < Common Tuareg t-um-azur-t (> *tum-azayr-t > *tum-azur-t) < *tum-azayr-t related to *a-zayka, see note 7.
3.2.2.6. Guanche (Palma) ahuar (a-hi'har) "tierra" [Wölffel, op. cit., p. 600], benahorare 'patria, mi patria, mi tierra', benahorare 'mi patria... mi tierra', benehoare 'the name of the Island [of Palma]', banahore 'mi patria, o mi tierra' [Wölffel, op. cit., 476-477, 611] (< *ben a-hi'har[n]-e < *wa/a n a-hi'har-i 'that of my land', cp. Ahagar wa n 'celui de' [Foucauld, le père Charles de, Dictionnaire touareg-français. Paris 1952, p. 1448-1450] and -i, -e affixed pronoun 'de moi' [Foucauld, op. cit., p. 685]) - Ahagar ā-haggar 'central part of the plateau in the country of Kel-Ahagar; the Tuareg inhabitants of this country' (< *ā-hawwar). This term borrowed in other Tuareg languages (e.g. in Ayr in the form āhaggar with -h-) is, according to K.G. Prasse, undoubtedly identical with the ancient tribe name Hawwāra cited by Ibn Khaldun, which means that ā-haggar is originally an ethnonym rather than a toponym. In its turn, it seems to be derived from the verb šhwar 'to precede, to go before, to be older than' (< Common Berber *ażwar 'to precede, to march ahead, to be the first'; Ghadames ężwar, Ayr awar, Qabyle zwir, etc.). The primary meaning of ā-haggar would be then something like 'the one used to precede, to be the first' (< āhgar, a habitative form of šhwar), which fully corresponds to the traditionally high position of the Kel-Ahagar people among the neighbouring tribes.

3.2.2.3. The only explanation I can give to this phenomenon is the lexical borrowing from Ahagar, or rather from its ancestor language (Proto-Tamāraq), in Guanche, whatever historical, cultural or other implications.

3.2.2.3.1. The time-span, within which the contacts between Tamāraq-speaking Saharan migrants and the Canarian aborigines took place, can be roughly estimated on the following basis. Since Ahagar is a "h-language" opposed to the non-Tamāraq Tuareg ā-, ē-, z- languages" (see point 3.2.), the time of separation of Ahagar resp. Tamāraq from the rest of Tuareg would be a terminus ante quem non of a presumed Tamāraq migration to the Canary Islands. The date is the 7th century A. D. It is obtained through glottochronological calculations based on new methods evolved by Dr. Sergei Starostin from Moscow, which yield much more reasonable and precise datings wherever they can be independently checked than those produced by the traditional Swadesh's glottochronology. For example, the separation time of the main stock of Romance languages is, according to Starostin's formula, the 4th or 5th century A. D., which is exactly the time of the loss of contacts between the Latin-speaking communities in various provinces of the falling Roman Empire. What is relevant for our subject is that the percentage of coincidence within a hundred-word list between most of the Romance languages is 80-82%, and between Ahagar and other Northern Tuareg languages such as Ghat, Ayr and East Tawilemm it is 86-88%, hence 7th-8th centuries A.D. as dates of separation. The terminus post quem non can be easily made up. This is naturally the beginning of the European colonization of the Canary Islands, since after that time a migration from Sahara could have hardly remained unnoticed and unrecorded.

3.2.2.4. There are several cases in Guanche of the alternation z/h, which in Ahagar is purely morphological: the old z is retained when reduplicated in certain verbal forms, but yields h when not, e.g. ig̣hal (imperfective) versus gzzul (perfective) 'to be short'.

3.2.2.4.1. Guanche (Hierro) eraoranhan 'un Ídolo maschio9, eroranhan, erahoranhan, erararan 'God of the people of Hierro', 'male Deity', 'le Dieu des Hommes', orahan 'un Dio', orajan, oranjan 'Dios' [Wölffel, Monumenta..., p. 437]. This is to be analysed as era 'he who', in one instance followed by the nota genitivi n (eroranhan, i.e. era n orahan), plus *fjorafn/jh/zn meaning 'recompensing, requiring, giving (back)', n before h/z being probably the result of a secondary positional development. The first element, era, corresponds to Ahagar ere 'celui que', which when a subject in a sentence, requires a participle after it10 represented here by the second element, orahan (oranhan, oranzan, etc.) exactly correspon-

---

9. The comments made in Spanish: "...esta devoción se entendía por los juramentos, ruegos y peticiones que hacían: no le sacrificaban mas de rogarias por los temporales para herba bajo a sus ganados" [Abreu de Galindo, Padre Fray, Historia de la Conquista de las siete islas de Gran Canaria. Año de 1632].

10. E.g. Ahagar ere iizzal-on 'he who is right', lit.'he being right', iizzal-on being a participle of the verb azzaal 'to be right'.
ding to Ahaggar participle yorrâh-dan derived from arath ‘donner en retour’. This Ahaggar verb is related to Ayr, East Tawlemmet araz, Tedhaq, Taneslemt arao (Prasse’s notations), the Proto-Tuareg form being *araz.

3.2.4.2. Guanche (Tenerife) anepa ‘la asta que el rey llevaba delante de si’, ‘unas varas tostadas de tea y sabinas muy agudas’, ‘lana de tea, que precedía al rey’, ‘gran lanza de tea fina, con una banderilla de juncos al extremo’, ‘lana o guión real’, uanepa ‘la lanza que el rey llevaba delante’, ‘a Scepter o Spear’, ‘étendard du roi’, (sic) anza ‘... una pertica sottile... ben lavorata, la quale era il segno reale’ - Ahaggar â-nilhâf ‘a thick and long pole (from 0.3 to 5 cm in diameter and from 1.5 to 1.8 m long)’. [Cp. Wölfl, op. cit., p. 477-478]. This is the most striking case. In Ahaggar h, as shown by K.-G. Prasse (A propos de l’origine de H touareg), three Common Berber consonants have merged. Besides h < *z (see point 3.2.), this Ahaggar laryngeal may reflect the old *h yielding h in other Tuareg languages and usually no consonant in non-Tuareg Berber, and the old *h, otherwise *b, yielding h Tuareg and b in Ghadames and Audjila of the Eastern Berber group. In Ahaggar, the nasal n gets palatalised before h < *z, but does not before h reflecting the two other protophonemes, e.g., Ahaggar a-nilhe ‘ostrich’ - a-nilh, a-nilh, etc. in other Tuareg languages (h < *h), but Ahaggar te-nilhâr ‘nosteri’ - Ghat ta-nizzâr, Ayr ča-nizzâr (Ahaggar h < *s). Thus, in Ahaggar: *nz > (*nh >) nh.

So, Ahaggar a-nilhe (or, according to Prasse, < *ń-nilhîf), cp. Ghat a-nîzh ‘tison’, while Guanche anepa is from *a-nilhepa representing one more instance of the alternation h/z. Taking into account the semantic affinity of the Ahaggar and Guanche terms, Wölfl was quite right to regard them as related. But the development *nz > nh in Ahaggar is so unique that a similar case in a non-Tamâraq language cannot be explained as an independent parallel development. Therefore, the only plausible interpretation would be a borrowing of the Guanche word from Ahaggar.

3.3. There is a series of Guanche words containing *h which correspond to Ahaggar words with h reflecting Common Berber *h. These can be interpreted either as Tuareg-Guanche isoglosses (not borrowings) reflecting Common Berber-Guanche *h (see point 2.) or as more Ahaggar loans in Guanche.

3.3.1. Guanche (Gran Canaria) fayahuracan ‘capitán’, fayahuracanes ‘...como capitanes, eran caudillos en la guerra de mucho respeto, que se elegían por su nobleza, fuerzas y destreza para el ejercicio de su empleo, obedeciendo los vecinos de sus pueblos a su llamamiento, y de sus bocinas...’ [Wölfl, op. cit., p. 470]. This is a composed word, the first element of which is attested in the dialect of Gran Canaria as faya ‘hombre poderoso’, ‘resto o mencey de aquella parte’ [Wölfl, op. cit., p. 469] comparable with Ahaggar ifû, Ayr afû (reciprocal nayfû), Qabyli if, etc. ‘to be best, better than’, whereas the second, huracan, is from *hurak-an (es in huracanes) is a Spanish plural ending with the participle marker -an, to be compared with Ahaggar horak-ak ‘to respect’ - Ayr, East Tawlemmet horakk-at. So the meaning of fayahuracan can be surmised to be somewhat like ‘best (and) respected’.

3.3.2. Guanche (Gran Canaria) guaires ‘capitanes de los más esforzados y valientes’, guaire ‘el noble’, guayre ‘el consejero’, guayres ‘consejeros de guerra’ (also cuayres), gayres ‘poderosos’, ‘consejeros de la guerra’, ‘the members of the Privy Council’, gayre ‘noble’, etc. [Wölfl, op. cit., p. 470-471]. This could be reconstructed as *guyare, possibly reflecting *huyre or even *wayre, and as such is comparable

---

11. In Prof. Prasse’s notation. In Ahaggar the whole construction would be ere yorrâh-dan.
12. For example, yorrâh-a’wan Yâllâ (again in Prasse’s notation) ‘que Allah vous donne en retour!’ [Foucauld, Dictionnaire, p. 1609].
13. aepa with this meaning was attested also in Tenerife.
14. The form anza was suspected by Wölfl to be a mistake but it is certainly not.
15. The definite dimensions of the anilhe pole given by Foucauld point to a certain specific function of this implement.
16. Also known as a proper name of a "caborrolo canario" [ibid.]; for the meaning of mencey see point 3.2.1.4., reste is another high title [ibid.].
with Ahaggar *ihorar ‘the fact of being much respected’

17. An alternative Ahaggar term for comparison mentioned by Wölfel is ag `r ‘to be bigger than, to be superior’. Fitting quite well semantically, it does not explain the evident labilization of the Guanche term.

18. K.-G. Prasse employs the terms perfect - imperfect.


20. This is exactly the case mentioned in point 3.4. (*bi < *bh with a laryngeal in the same root), which is corroborated by external comparison: Berber *Harab ‘to write’ - Egyptian (Pyramid) h/sh ‘to send (a letter or message inter alia), to write a letter’. (Middle Kingdom-New Egyptian) ‘letter, message’ (< *hrb) - Chadic: Hausa rabbota, Buduma rebote. Afade oharboto, etc. ‘to write’.

3.3.3. Guanche (Gomera, Hierro) ada ‘eau’, ‘agua’ - Ahaggar tâ-hala ‘weak source’ - Snus t-ala ‘a pool filled from one source’, Qabyle t-ala ‘fountain’, etc. [Cp. Wölfel, op. cit., p. 513-514]. The double a in the Guanche form serves to convey either a long vowel, or more likely a laryngeal in between, i.e. the word should have actually sounded like [ahala].

3.4. Finally, there is a series of Guanche examples with *h corresponding to Ahaggar h or o (no consonant) and to Ghadames and Audjila b, thus reflecting Common Berber *h₁ (according to K. G. Prasse, *h₂ or *h₃) or *b, which may have been a positional variant of *b in the vicinity of a laryngeal. Such cases, just as in point 3.3., can be interpreted either as common Berber-Guanche terms or as Ahaggar borrowings in Guanche; the second explanation is more valid at least in one case (see point 3.4.3.).

3.4.1. Guanche (unidentified dialect) guío ‘Las relaciones entre los dos sexos... tienden a rodearse de misterio y de reserva... Hay quien tiene a orgullo el poner de manifiesto los guiros de sus contemporáneos...’. Wölfel reads this word as [g küro] (the real pronunciation can be [əwro] as well, in Spanish transliteration) comparing it with Ahaggar or ‘to love’ and similar Berber forms [Wölfel, op. cit., p. 410-411]. The Proto-Berber form would be, in Prof. Prasse’s opinion [personal communication], * urlString, perfective * urlString, obtained on the basis of Ahaggar. Ayr är, West Tawllemmet iru, perfective yara, yara, Adghaq, Taneslemt ärh. Intensive imperfective * harr, Ghadames aber, perfective aber, intensive imperfective aber Tašelhait iri, verbal noun t-ayri ‘to love’; for all these I should rather reconstruct * h₂-but/* urlString in some of the forms due to metathesis) comparable with Guanche giúro (fh₂-wor or fwi or in a real pronunciation, see point 3.3.2.).

3.4.2. Guanche (Hierro) hero ‘... fuente De que le dieron título a la Isla’, ‘la cisterna’, ‘la citerne’, hero ‘la arena donde el agua estaua’, hieri, hiero, hero ‘Hierro’ - Ahaggar aber ‘source d’une débit extrêmement faible, alimentée par une ou plusieurs veines imperceptibles’ [Wölfel, op. cit., p. 511]. K.-G. Prasse wonders, whether the Ahaggar from could be a verbal noun from aber ‘boucher une ouverture, une chose chose ouverte’ [Prasse, A propos..., p. 65], which corresponds to Ayr, East Tawllemmet aber, Ghadames aber (ahor, in Prasse’s modern notation). While this is possible, though somewhat doubtful semantically, there is a much better parallel to the Ahaggar aber in Ghadames aber (Prasse: elabar) ‘canal, rigole, séquia d’irrigation’¹⁹ with the regular Ahaggar h – Ghadames b correspondence, though with a metathesis of vowels.

3.4.3. Guanche (Gran Canaria) tara, tarja ‘rayas en tablas, pared o piedras’, ‘señal para recuerdos’, tarha ‘marque pour les souvenirs’, ‘señal para recuerdos’ – Ahaggar t-ér-t-l, t-étera ‘lettre (missive); amulette consistant en un écrit; dessin d’ornement (consistant en lignes, points, figures géométriques)’, Ayr t-ér-t-l, t-éra ‘letter (message), amulet with an inscription on it’, Ghadames urah, verbal nouns a-t- urah, urah, Zenaga arha, Semal aru, Qabyle aru ‘to write’, t-ira ‘writing’, etc. [Cp. Wölfel, op. cit., p. 461-462]. The Common Berber form is *Harah (or *Harab), verbal noun *Harah (or *Harab); the forms in brackets, i.e. with *-h ²⁰ seem preferable in the light of epigraphic East Numidian irab and trībhn.
derived from the verb *rb 'to write' [Wölffel, *ibid., p. 462]. The weakening of the expected *h > w in Tuareg is not unusual, the interesting fact being an old laryngeal retained in Zenaga where it normally falls out. Anyhow, for Ahaggar the form *t-erāh-t. pl. *t-erāh is reconstructable, the latter being a plausible source of the presumably borrowed Guanche [t-artha] with a very close meaning.

3.5. Once the hypothesis of Ahaggar borrowings in Guanche is taken into consideration, one can trace more such cases, not based on the above phonetic developments. Only a few examples.


3.5.2. Guanche (Hierro, Tenerife?) heres ‘pozas, charcas’, ‘albercas en el Hierro’ (this can be of course understood as the form identical to hero in point 3.4.2. with the Spanish plural ending), ‘la citerne’, herez ‘la cisterna’, eres ‘hoyo or poceta en las rocas impermeables del alveo de los barrancos, donde se acumula con el agua de lluvia arena fina y limpia. Cuando se quiere extraer el agua se forma un pequeño hoyo en la arena, hasta que aparece el agua...’ - Ahaggar ḡaras ‘puitt (trou creusé dans le sol pour en tirer de l'eau, ayant plus de 2 m de profondeur)’ [Wölffel, *op. cit., p. 511-512] - Ayr, East Tawlemmet, Adghqar ḡaras do. In the Guanche forms, the initial h- in Spanish and French transliteration may be a mute consonant without any phonetic value. On the other hand, if this h- renders a laryngeal in a real pronunciation, it is also comparable with the Tuareg forms reconstructed as *(H)irās wherein a stable initial vowel may reflect either *y- or *(H)i-. The interpretation of Guanche [heres] as a probable borrowing of Tuareg *(H)irās is based on the assumption that the latter is a form derived from the Tuareg and Common Berber verb ḡaras ‘to descend, to go down’ (> Ahagagar eris ‘descending → bottom of a hollow object’).

4. The known Guanche lexicon contains a series of Arabisms, which can be explained either as direct borrowings from Arabic1, or as loans through the mediation of Berber.

4.1. Guanche (Palma) badanas ‘...los cueros [de las ovejas de pelo liso] muy gruesos y sueltos’, (Gran Canaria) badanas ‘... pieles adobadas de color acanelado’ – Semlal a-badain, Seghrusen, Qabile a-baţan, Ghadames a-baţan-t ‘skin of a goat or sheep’ [cp.Wölffel, *op. cit., p. 533]. This term, which I could not find in Tuareg, is borrowed from Arabic biţ-ān-at- ‘tanned sheepskin used as lining’, the primary meaning of the Arabic word being ‘lining, inner part’, the form developed from baţn- ‘belly, maw’ (-Semitic, cp. Hebrew baţān ‘belly’).

4.2. Guanche (Gran Canaria) sabor ‘consejo’, ‘consulta y congregación’, ‘consejo de guerra’, ‘cortes o dieta general’, ‘una especie de diète’, ‘the Privy Council’ (also sambor and tabor, the latter being a variant of a different term for ‘council’, namely taborfor, tagorfor) [Wölffel, *op. cit., p. 474-475] looks very much like a widely spread Arabic term šir-ā, dialectal šawr ‘advice, council’ borrowed in most Berber languages: Ahaggar šawr, Ayr, East Tawlemmet šawwār ‘to consult’, verbal noun e-šawr, a-štawwar, Baamranī šawr, Snus šawr, Qabile šawr ‘to consult’, etc. Guanche -b- may render *w in a Spanish transliteration (probably repeated in a French and English record where otherwise -b- would not be used to render w) or *hb yielding *ww like, say, in Qabile.

Since the meaning of ‘writing’ in Egyptian h/h seems to have developed from ‘sending > sending a message/letter’ and, hence, is secondary, the Berber and Chadic forms ought to be regarded as early borrowings from Egyptian.

21. The problem which could be formulated as “Arabs in the Canary Islands?” (as well as “Phoenicians in the Canary Islands?”; “Cretans in the Canary Islands?” and so on) needs to be specified. The question is not whether some Arabic seamen ever reached one of the Canary Islands in accordance with this or that tradition, but: was there any cultural impact on the aborigines traced archaeologically, ethnographically or linguistically? Today the answer seems definitely negative as far as archaeology and ethnography are concerned. Such “marked” culture as Islamic Arabic leaves perceptible traces everywhere, a taboo of eating pork being one of the most conspicuous, while pig-breeding was evidently one of the main occupations of the Canarians.
4.3. Guanche (Gran Canaria) taifā ‘concurso o reunión’ - Arabic ta’ifat- ‘troop, band, gang, people, crowd, etc.’ [cp. Wölfel, op. cit., p. 423-424]. The Arabic term passed into North Berber (cp. Qabyyle ḫayfā ‘society, group of people’) which must have been an immediate source of the Guanche word.

4.4. Guanche (Tenerife?) arba ‘cuatro’, arbaqo, arbiago ‘40’ [Wölfel, op. cit., p. 626-636]. Wölfel suspects the identity of this numeral practically rejecting the possibility of an Arabic loan in Guanche and only wondering how this Arabic term for ‘four’, arba‘-(at)-, passed into the so-called “second list” of Guanche numerals. Still the derived form arba-go, arbia-go ‘40’ (ep. linago ‘20’ < liin or lini ‘2’, cansago ‘50’ < cansa ‘5’, etc.) cannot be haphazard. The Arabic arba‘- is a well-known borrowing in Berber (with the exception of Tuareg), cp. Baamrani arbea, Qabyyle ḥafra, arbē ‘4’, etc., which could have been an immediate source of the Guanche term.

5. The distribution of Arabisms attested in Guanche within the Berber-speaking area speaks against an intermediary part of Tuareg; it was supposedly played by a North-Berber language, the speakers of which must have constituted a non-Tuareg wave of migrants to the Canary Islands. This is corroborated by a series of cultural terms common for Guanche and non-Tuareg Berber (i.e. unattested in Tuareg), which, for some reason or other, can hardly be regarded as belonging to the old Proto-Berber-Guanche stock, e.g.: Guanche (Tenerife) xercos ‘un calcado hechura de abarcas’, ‘zapatos’, ‘espèce de bottes’, also jercos—Berber: Snus a-harḵwäs, a-harḵkäs ‘des sortes de pantoufles de cuir, sans talon, en cuir de mouton ou de chèvre’, Ntifa (pl.) hirkas-in, Rif a-harkus, Imesfiwan i-hirkas, etc. All these forms Wölfel compares with Latin hircus ‘goat’, which could be the source of Berber *hirḵwa/*hirkus ‘shoes made of goat skin’ [cp. Wölfel, op. cit., p. 532-533].

5.1. This non-Tuareg Berber migration wave which brought Berber and Arabic terms to the Canary Islands should have taken place after the contacts of Berbers and Arabs in the continent had reached the stage of adoption of Arabic cultural realia by Berber tribes retaining their mother tongue (otherwise we must suppose that Berbers who reached the Canary Islands were Arabic-speaking which would contradict the above argumentation). Therefore, 8th-9th centuries are to be considered terminus ante quem non for this migration.

6. Compared with the non-Tuareg Berber wave postulated in point 5, the Tuareg one seems to have influenced the Canarians much more as seen from the analysis of the presumed Ahaggarisms in Guanche. Their number and a touch of prestige about at least part of them suggest the Tamáraq-speakers’ impact should have been sensible enough. But the question is: are there any facts outside of linguistics that could serve as evidence of Tuareg contacts with the aboriginal Canarian culture?

6.1. Before trying to answer this question, we have every reason to put a counter-question: what could the distinctive features of Tuareg culture be that are expected to have been manifested in the Canary Islands as the traces of Tuareg migration provided the life of pastoral Tuaregs of the early 20th century had not essentially changed since the second half of the 1st millennium? Extremely poor material culture and a Spartan way of living of Tuaregs in Sahara leave little opportunity of revealing such features.

6.1.1. One of them, and the most disputable, is a rather vague vestige of monotheism, possibly even of Christianity, both in pre-Islamic Tuareg22 and Canarian24 traditions. For the Tuareg one, the only plau-

22. And xerco, jercos which is a “reverse” formation of singular from xercos felt as Spanish plural, thought in this case it is certainly not judging by the comparative Berber data.

23. Besides the famous Tuareg crosses, there is a number of Latin borrowings referring to a religious sphere, in Tuareg lexicons, e.g. Ahaggar angalus, Ayr angalus, Ghat agalus ‘angel’ < Latin angelus; Ayr abâkkad, Ghat âbâkkad, Ahaggar abâkkâd ‘sin’ < Latin peccatum, etc. There is also a term of Berber origin: Ahaggar mas-sînay, Ayr, East Tawillemmet mîs-sîna ‘our Lord, God’ (alongside with yalla ‘Allah’ of Arabic origin), probably reflecting a pre-Islamic monotheistic tradition.

sible explanation is a cultural heritage of those Libyan tribes, Garamants and the associated ones, which once came in touch with the Christian world and received a certain impulse from it lost later on in the process of Islamization. For the Canarian tradition, I am inclined to identify that hypothetic vestige with the Tamâraq migration thus dating the latter to the period when Tuaregs were not yet influenced by Islam.

6.1.2. Still one feature of Tuareg culture can be justly regarded as both distinctive and prominent, that is Tuareg script, *tifinay*, one of the varieties, and the only living one, of what is known as Libyan script. There are several slightly differing variants of *tifinay* employed by various Tuareg tribes, and one differing much from the others published by Foucauld without indicating the source; this latter was no longer in use at the beginning of our century and could be thus called old Tuareg. The most striking thing about *tifinay* is that, as far as I know, it is the only script used for a long period of time by ethnic groups standing very far in their social and economic development from the stage of proto-civilization typical of cultures based on early written tradition (like Sumerian, Egyptian, Chinese, Phoenician and so on). It would be easy to explain that, if *tifinay* had been one of those short-lived ephemeral alphabets which have been invented here and there, or if it had been recently borrowed from a more developed culture, or if, at least, it had been an esoteric cryptography preserved through centuries. None of these is the case. One of the two bilingual (Libyan-Punic) inscriptions in the East Numidian script related to *tifinay*, is dated to the 2nd century B.C.; as for the social characteristics of *tifinay*, in the middle of our century every second woman and every third man could easily write and read short inscriptions in it made on rocks, vessels, shields and bracelets (nowadays also in paper) conveying dedications, love messages, marks of property, dictums, etc.25.

6.1.3. Recent investigations reveal an increasing number of rock inscriptions in Libyan characters found in various Canary Islands, but mostly in the island of Hierro. In the light of our hypothesis of a Tuareg migration to the Canary archipelago it would be only natural to try to read them with the help of the Ahaggar dictionary. As a first step I chose the inscriptions containing characters having the same graphic form and phonetic value in most varieties of the Libyan script (the main difficulty for a decipherer being certain similar graphemes with quite different reading). They are as follows:

1) Canarian x  - Old Tuareg x - Ahaggar  - Tripolitanian  - Tripolitanian  - Tripolitanian  - Tripolitanian  - Tripolitanian  (developed from ) - Tripolitanian  - East Numidian  - East Numidian  - East Numidian  - East Numidian

“Christianization” of the image, the striking thing about the term is its Tamâraq origin. The reconstructed form of it is *ya-HiraH-ì* < *ya HiraH* (Tenerife e < *ì, H being any unspecified uvular or laryngeal), lit. ‘she-of-HiraH-my’, cp. Ahaggar ta ‘celui qui’ which is feminine of wa (see point 3.2.2.6.). Now, *HiraH* is well-attested in the forms *aabaH*varaxa ‘el que todo lo sustenta’, ‘the maintainer of all’ (< *a aH *wa H* *aH*), *guayaxarax* ‘sustentador y autor de lo creado’ (< *wa yaH* *H* *H*), etc. [Wölfl, op. cit., p. 362-363]. The verbal form *ya-HiraH* (the sustains, preserves) is the Ahaggar *yara* ‘serrer; conserver, placer en lieu sûr’; h < *ì (proving its Tamâraq origin in Guanche, cp. point 3.2.2.) assured by the related Ghat verb *yara*. *yara* [Prasse, A propos..., p. 86] and the Guanche variant form *guayaxarax* (on z/h see point 3.2.4.). So the exact reconstruction of *chaaxina* would be *ya *pirah-ì* ‘she of my Sustainer’.


26. Graphic variants of the same character are separated by a comma.
4) Canarian n: I — Old Tuareg — Ahaggar I — Tripolitanian — (and I ?) — East Numidian I — —.
6) Canarian r: • □ • — Old Tuareg • □ · Ahaggar • □ — Tripolitanian • □ — East Numidian • □.
7) Canarian h: |||| — Old Tuareg |||| — Ahaggar • — Tripolitanian • • • • (this sign unattested in East Numidian seems to have developed from n.° 8).
8) Canarian γ: || — Old Tuareg || — Ahaggar • (developed from • •, cp. also • • • g developed from || )—Tripolitanian • • • • — East Numidian • • • • (reading uncertain, possibly h).
9) Canarian g (reading uncertain): J L — Old Tuareg J L — Tawleemmet and Taneslerm tifnay •, J J (read as J J probably from • g; not attested in Ahaggar tifnay) — Tripolitanian L J J, J J — East Numidian L J J, J J.
11) Canarian s, j: • • • • • • — Ahaggar • • • • • • — Tripolitanian • • • • • • — East Numidian • • • • • • (?).
12) Canarian s, j: 8, 8, 8, 8, 8, 8 — Adyaq tifnay 8, 8 — East Numidian 8, 8 (possibly also 8, 8, 8).
14) Canarian z (?): U, U, U — Old Tuareg U, U, U, U — Ahaggar Z (a sign for rendering Arabic s).
Ghat tifnay Z, s — Tripolitanian M, M, U, U — Tripolitanian M, M, U, U (reading unknown, see n.° 17) — East Numidian M, M, M, Z or Z.
16) Canarian t: +, X — Old Tuareg +, X — Ahaggar +, X — Tripolitanian +, X — East Numidian +, X.
17) Canarian t (or less probably, d): • — Old Tuareg •, • — Ahaggar •, •, • — Tripolitanian •, •, • — East Numidian •, •, •.
18) Canarian d: • • • • • — Old Tuareg • • • • • — Ahaggar • • • • • — Tripolitanian • • • • • (reading uncertain, cp. n.° 9) — East Numidian • • • • • (and possibly • • • • •).
19) Canarian h (?): • • • • • • — Old Tuareg • • • • • • — Ahaggar • • • • • • — Tripolitanian • • • • • • — East Numidian • • • • • • (and • • • ?).

27. There are two styles of the East Numidian script, a "horizontal" one used in the so-called monumental inscriptions, and a "vertical" one used mostly in epitaphs. The two seemingly identical graphemes for w and l are in fact distributed between them: w is rendered by • •, and l by • l in a horizontal, and w by • l, l by • • in a vertical style.

28. Three series of symbols for a voiceless sibilant (corresponding to Ahaggar x phonetically -see below) cannot be explained so far, cp., however, the diversity of symbols for s/s in tifnay and East Numidian.

29. Unattested in what we call Tripolitanian inscriptions (see the reference to Brogan's article in note 23), this sign occurs in the epitaphs of the cemetery near Djemaa ( x and ♣ ), which I tend to unite, under the name of Fezzan inscriptions, with Tripolitanian ones into a separate subdivision of the Lybian script.

30. This sign renders v or c.
6.1.4. A "Tripolitanian" inscription from Ghirza (Wadi Zemzem) in Lybia is taken for comparison with Canarian inscriptions. The former had been scratched on the plaster wall of a house rebuilt on the ruins of a pagan temple and occupied, according to O. Brogan who found it, in the 10th century, probably by Hawara (Hawára, see 3.2.2.6.)\(^1\), a tribe with the ethnic name identical with that of Ahaggar; the attempt to read it has been made by the writer. It is to note that in Libyan inscriptions made into vertical columns the usual direction of reading is from the bottom to the top. As for the direction of "words", i.e. columns of characters, in some inscriptions they are read from the left to the right, in others vice versa (in the Girza inscription it does not matter, for the "words" are not syntactically linked).

Transliteration:

line (A) \(\rightarrow\) (B) \(m \, ṣ \, w \, r \, n\)
line (C) \(\rightarrow\) (D) \(l \, g \, q\) \(w\) \(l\) \(l\) \(n\)\(^{\text{(2)}}\)
line (E) \(\rightarrow\) (F) \(z \, n \, g\) \(n\) \(l \, l\) \(l\) \(n\) \(ṣ\) \(m\) \(n\)

Reconstructed vocalized form:

line (A) \(\rightarrow\) (B) \(mīṣūr-an\)
line (C) \(\rightarrow\) (D) \(lagg\)\(^{\text{n}}\)\(a\)-\(t\)-\(an\)
line (E) \(\rightarrow\) (F) \(z\)\(n\)\(a\)\(n\) (or \(i\)\(z\)\(n\)\(a\)\(n\)) \(ḥl\)\(st\) \(nāṣūm-an\)

Interpretation:

Each of the first two lines (A) \(\rightarrow\) (B) and (C) \(\rightarrow\) (D) represents a noun with the typical Berber plural suffix \(-n\). In the line (E) \(\rightarrow\) (F) three words are distinguished, the first and the third also being nouns with the plural \(-n\) suffix and the second being a kinship term meaning "daughters" in Ahaggar (the term is known to other Tuareg and Berber languages, but in a different form). The four nouns in plural coincide exactly with four well-known ethnonyms of Lybian and Berber tribes: Missuran\(^{34}\); Leuathae (of Procopius) or Laguanten (of Corippus); Nasamones (of Herodotus and Strabo); and Zenaga (cp. the same name of modern Berber-speaking groups of Mauritania).

Translation:

Miṣūran, Lag\(^{\text{W}}\)atan, Zenagan daughters of Naṣūman.

32. The grapheme \(\text{gg}\) transcribed as \(\text{gg}\) renders in Ahaggar \(t\)\(s\)\(n\)\(a\)\(y\) the stop \(g\) originated from \(*\text{gg}^{\text{H}}(<\text{ww})\) and thus opposed to the spirant or palatalised \(g(<\text{g})\). In our inscription \(g^{\text{H}}\) is rendered by the succession of two signs: \(\text{Y}\) and \(\text{=}\).
33. The combined character \(\text{h}\)\(\text{t}\) (read as \(\text{h}\)) made of \(\text{h}\) (for \(\text{h}\)) and \(+\) (for \(i\)) is current in Ahaggar \(t\)\(s\)\(n\)\(a\)\(y\).
34. The interesting thing is that this well-known Libyan tribal name written in the "native" alphabet appears to coincide with the Semitic name for Egypt (Hebrew \(M\)\(s\)\(r\)\(y\)\(m\)\(n\), Arabic \(M\)\(s\)\(r\), etc.).
6.1.5. Here are several rock inscriptions found in the island of Hierro. Some of them have been published, while the others reached the author through the kind collaboration of Prof. H. Nowak who was the first to find and copy them.

6.1.5.1. Inscription published by H. Biedermann in his article “Altkreta und die Kanarischen Inseln” (in Almogaren I, 1970). It was found by H. Nowak on the coast of La Caleta.

Transliteration:

line (A) \(\to\) (B) \(w \cdot d\);\(^{35}\) \(s \cdot n\)
line (C) \(\to\) (D) \(t \cdot s \cdot d\)
line (E) \(\to\) (F) \(m \cdot t\)

Reading in the Ahaggar language and the English translation:

line (A) \(\to\) B) è wad assan ‘hey, you! know (or beware):’
line (C) \(\to\) (D) tassaáda ‘sinking’
line (E) \(\to\) (F) mài ‘(is) death’

Comments:\(^{36}\):

line (A) \(\to\) (B) è is a vocative particle; wad (< wa di) is 2nd person singular pronoun; assan is imperative of the verb ‘to know’.
line (C) \(\to\) (D) t-assaáda is a verbal noun of assad ‘to plunge, to sink, to immerse’.
line (E) \(\to\) (F) mài is a derivative of the verb ámbár ‘to die’, it has no syntactic relations in a sentence and is always placed at its end conveying the idea of a sudden or violent death.

Interpretation: a warning on a coastal rock against getting into water?

6.1.5.2. Inscription found in El Julan by H. Nowak (personal communication).

Transliteration:

line (A) \(\to\) (B) y m r n
line (C) \(\to\) (D) y n m s. d l

35. The dot in East Numidian is a sign of word-border and is surely the same in Canarian inscriptions.
Reading in the Ahaggar language and the English translation:

line (A) → (B) *yəmməran* '(a) passing (one)'
line (C) → (D) *i n massa sədəl* 'anyone of (the) master (or the Lord): come (and stay) overnight!'

Comments:

line (A) → (B) *yəmməran* is a masculine singular form of a participle of the verb *əmmər* 'to pass (by)',
line (C) → (D) *i* is an indefinite pronoun; *n* is nota genitivi; *massa* means 'master, owner' and 'the Lord' when used with enclitic possessive pronouns of the 1st person singular (*Mass-i*) and plural (*Mass-in γ*); *sədəl* is imperative of the verb 'to come for a night, to stay overnight at'.

Interpretation: sort of invitation or advertisement for passers-by of a certain category in a local inn?

6.1.5.3. Inscription published by H. Biedermann (see in 6.1.5.1.) found by H. Nowak in the mouth of the Barranco de Tejeteita.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{n (E)} & \\
\text{s} & \\
\text{r} & \\
\text{d} & \\
\text{m (D)} & \\
\text{n (C)} & \\
\text{y (B)} & \\
\text{y (A)} & \\
\text{n (B)} & \\
\text{y} & \\
\text{s} & \\
\text{n} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Transliteration:

line (A) → (B) *y s n y n*
line (C) → (D) → (E) *n m d r s n*

Reading in the Ahaggar language and the English translation:

line (A) → (B) *yəssən yən* 'knows one'
line (C) → (D) → (E) *n imədrəsən* 'of (the) few'.

Comments:

line (A) → (B) *yəssən* is imperfective 3rd person singular of the verb *əssən* 'to know'; *yən* is a numeral 'one'.
line (C) → (D) → (E) *n* is nota genitivi; *i-mədrəs-* *n* is plural of *ə-mədrəs* (these forms are not attested in Foucault's dictionary, but are easily reconstructable after a current morphological pattern), verbal noun from *ıdrəs* 'to be not numerous, to be few'.

Interpretation: a notice or a maxim (kind of Canary-Tuareg gnosis?).

6.1.5.4. Inscription published by H. Nowak in his article "Neue Felsbilderfunde auf der Insel Hierro" (*Institutum Canarium Nachrichten* 37/38 [1981]). It was found by him in Hoyo Blanco.
Transliteration:

line (A) → (B) w r d l
line (C) → (D) t d n t
line (E) → (F) n m r

Reading in the Ahaggar language and the English translation:

line (A) → (B) ur adal ‘don’t beg (or hope) for’
line (C) → (D) tādānt ‘fat’
line (E) → (F) animit ‘any more’.

Comments:

line (A) → (B) ur (or w r) is a negative particle used prepositionally with verbs; adal is imperative of the verb ‘to hope for, to beg for’.
line (C) → (D) t-,ādānt is a feminine singular noun meaning ‘fat, lard’.
line (E) → (F) animit (probably an-imirt, from ēmir ‘moment’) is an adverb meaning ‘still, yet, not yet, more, no more, etc.’

Interpretation: this trivial household message looking strange enough on a rock is not unusual for the genre of tifinay inscriptions.

6.1.5.5. Inscription found in La Caleta by H. Nowak (personal communication).

Transliteration:

line (A) → (B) n m r y n

Reading in the Ahaggar language and the English translation:

line (A) → (B) anni yem yr ‘read sometimes’

Comments:

line (A) → (B) anan is imperative of the verb ‘to spell (out), to read letter by letter’ conveying the idea of reading only in tifinay (a general term for ‘to read’, ēmir, is borrowed from Arabic); ēmir is a noun
meaning 'moment' and, followed by ān 'one', 'one moment, a moment' and in certain cases 'sometimes'.

Interpretation: all the three lines are identical and arranged in such a way that the lower symbol of the upper line is on the same level as the upper symbol of the middle line, while the lower symbol of the latter is on a level with the upper symbol of the lower line; the whole group looks like an exercise in reading or an inciting slogan (in school?).