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Tis the twentieth symbol in our alphabet. It has varied but little in form since the earliest days when it ap­peared in Greece and Italy, though some of the Italic alphabets exhibit variants : *e.g.,* in Umbrian and Etruscan inscriptions we find the horizontal stroke sometimes on one side only, and slanting; sometimes the form is nearly that of our ordinary small *t* without the ornamental turn at the bottom. In value it has been in all languages a surd or voiceless dental, corresponding to *d,* which is voiced. But the term “dental” includes some varieties of position, of which the most definite are—(1) where the point of the tongue touches the teeth (true “ dental ”), as in French ; (2) where the tongue touches the gum behind the teeth, and not the teeth at all, as in English ; (3) where the point of the tongue is slightly bent back against the palate, produc­ing the sound much heard in south India (often called “ cerebral ”). T when followed by *i* or *y* is liable to pass into the *s-*sound ; this happened in the local dialects of Italy before the Christian era *; at* Rome the transition was later. This changed sound passed on into the Romance lan­guages, *e.g.,* in French “nation,” pronounced “nasion,” whence in England it was sounded first as “nasiun” and now as “nashun.” Similarly in English *t* followed by *u* undergoes a change of sound ; this is due, however, to the old sound of ū*,* viz., long French *u,* or Old English *y.* This long *yy* developed into the *iu* sound heard in “use,” “cure,” &c. ; then the new *i* affected the preceding *t,* and the result is *tsh,* as in “ nature ” (natshure) ; similarly *d* in “ verdure ” is sounded as *dzh* (verdzhure).

English employs the digraph *th* to denote two sounds, differing as voiceless and voiced sounds—the initial sounds of “ thin ” and “ then ” respectively. It would be a great convenience if *dh* could be used for the voiced sound, so that “then” should be written “dhen.” But it would be even better if the single symbols could be employed to denote these single sounds, as was to some extent the case in the earlier days of our language : in Anglo-Saxon we have the two symbols ð and *p.* The first is only a *d* crossed ; the second was a rune and was called “ thorn.” These, however, were not consistently employed one for the voiceless and one for the voiced sound ; also *th* is actually found in the oldest texts, and later on it occurs together with ð and þ. It is probable that the voiceless sound was originally the only one in Teutonic. It was eventually differentiated into two sounds ; but, as is usually the case, writing remained more archaic than speech. In modern English and Ice­landic, and probably in the parent Teutonic also, initial *th* is voiceless, except in English in a small number of pronouns and particles in common use, as “thou,” “this,” “that,” “then,” “than,” “though,” “thus”; and it is regu­larly voiceless when final. The nature of the two sounds is this : the tongue is pressed against the back of the teeth (sometimes, especially when used by foreigners, against the bottom of the upper teeth) and either the breath for *th* or the voice for *dh* is forced through the interstices of the teeth. This pair of sounds is found in modern Greek, where *th* ap­pears as *θ* and *dh* as δ. In Spanish and in Danish under certain circumstances the sound denoted by *d* is *dh.*

TABARÍ and Early Arab Historians. Arabian historians differ from all others in the unique form of their compositions. Each event is related in the words of eye-witnesses or contemporaries transmitted to the final narrator through a chain of intermediate reporters *(ráwís),* each of whom passed on the original report to his successor. Often the same account is given in two or more slightly divergent forms, which have come down through different chains of reporters. Often, too, one event or one important detail is told in several ways on the basis of several con­temporary statements transmitted to the final narrator through distinct lines of tradition. The writer therefore exercises no independent criticism except as regards the choice of authorities ; for he rejects accounts of which the first author or one of the intermediate links seems to him unworthy of credit, and sometimes he states which of several accounts seems to him the best. Modern judgment does not always confirm this choice ; some authorities much esteemed by Moslems are by European scholars deemed untrustworthy, and *vice versa.* Fortunately the various historians did not always give preference to the same account of a transaction, and so one supplies what another omits.

A second type of Arabian historiography is that in which an author combines the different traditions about one occurrence into one continuous narrative, but prefixes a statement as to the lines of authorities used and states which of them he mainly follows. In this case the writer