

# THE HITTITES

## AND THEIR LANGUAGE



LT. COL. C. R. CONDER











THE HITTITES AND THEIR  
LANGUAGE

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

---

THE BIBLE AND THE EAST. BLACKWOOD.  
1896.

"The work of a man of independent judgment and much knowledge."—*Times*.

"Deserves an equal welcome from the devout and from the critical reader."—*Scotsman*.

THE LATIN KINGDOM OF JERUSALEM. Palestine Exploration Fund. 1897.

THE TELL AMARNA TABLETS. Complete Translation, with Geographical and other Notes and Maps. Palestine Exploration Fund. Second Edition. 1894.

SYRIAN STONE LORE. Palestine Exploration Fund. New Edition. 1896.

PALESTINE. PHILIPS & SON. 1891.

# THE HITTITES

AND THEIR

## LANGUAGE

BY

C. R. CONDER, LT.-COL. R.E.

LL.D., D.C.L., M.R.A.S.

AUTHOR OF 'TENT-WORK IN PALESTINE,'  
'THE BIBLE AND THE EAST,' ETC.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD AND SONS

EDINBURGH AND LONDON

MDCCCXCVIII





## P R E F A C E.

---

IN 1887 I published a small volume on 'Altaic Hieroglyphs and Hittite Inscriptions,' now sold out. In this I explained the reasons for supposing this script to be decipherable by aid of Mongol speech, and added tentative renderings of some of the shorter texts; while the reader was duly warned that much time would elapse before final results, on the lines laid down, could be expected. I received kind encouragement from several well-known specialists to continue the study, which has now occupied me for ten years, with results which confirm the original suggestions.

Very little has been written as to the decipherment of these texts since my discovery was published. Dr Peiser in Germany has pronounced an opinion in favour of the comparison of Hittite and Turkish, which is practically what

I had previously indicated. Dr Peter Jensen of Marburg calls the Hittite a "suffixing language," and yet proposes a comparison with Armenian, which is a modern Aryan prefixing language. Neither writer claims to read the texts. In 1893 I published a further paper on the subject in the 'Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,' but since then I have found it possible to make considerable advance, in consequence of new sources of information. The publication of the Tell Loh and Tell Amarna texts, since 1887, has cast much additional light on the subject, as has the recovery of new "Hittite" inscriptions by Humann, Puchstein, Ramsay, and Hogarth, which were not copied when I first wrote on the subject.

It is hoped that the reader of these pages will find that the proposed renderings do not rest on arbitrary assumptions, but on the same principles which are now recognised in the reading of either Egyptian or Cuneiform records.

C. R. C.



## CONTENTS.

---

CHAP.	PAGE
I. EARLY HISTORY . . . . .	I
II. THE EGYPTIAN CONQUESTS IN SYRIA . . . . .	26
III. THE ASSYRIAN CONQUESTS IN SYRIA . . . . .	56
IV. THE RACES OF WESTERN ASIA . . . . .	88
V. MONGOL GODS AND BELIEFS . . . . .	111
VI. MONGOL HIEROGLYPHICS . . . . .	136

## APPENDICES.

APPEND.	
I. CHRONOLOGY . . . . .	171
II. THE AKKADIAN LANGUAGE . . . . .	187
III. NOTES ON DEITIES AND MYTHS . . . . .	210
IV. THE HITTITE SYLLABARY . . . . .	215
V. ORIGIN OF THE ALPHABET . . . . .	248
VI. THE HITTITE TEXTS. . . . .	257
VII. HITTITE VOCABULARY . . . . .	296
VIII. LIST OF AUTHORITIES . . . . .	304

---

INDEX . . . . .	306
-----------------	-----



## ILLUSTRATIONS.

---

	PAGE
MAP OF WESTERN ASIA, SHOWING DISTRIBUTION OF HITTITE MONUMENTS . . . . .	<i>At beginning of book</i>
THE HITTITE SYLLABARY, II Plates . . . . .	<i>between 236-248</i>
ORIGIN OF THE ALPHABET . . . . .	255

### PLATES AT THE END.

- I. MER'ASH TEXTS. No. 1. *From cast in British Museum.*
- II. MER'ASH TEXTS. No. 2. *From copy by D. G. Hogarth.*
- III. { MER'ASH TEXTS. Nos. 3 and 4. *From copies by O. Puchstein.*  
 { MER'ASH FRAGMENTS. *From copies by O. Puchstein.*
- IV.-VII. CARCHEMISH TEXTS—
  - No. 1. *From the Original.*
  - No. 2.            "            "
  - No. 3            "            "
  - Nos. 4, 5, and Fragments. *From the Originals.*
- VIII. HAMATH STONES. Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4. *From the casts by Dr Wright.*
- IX.            "            No. 5. *From the cast by Dr Wright.*
- X. BULGAR MADEN. *From copy by D. G. Hogarth.*
- XI. 1. IASIL-KAIA. 2. ALEPPO. 3. SIPYLOS. 4. KARABEL. 5 and 6. IBREEZ. *From copies.*
- XII. 1. IBREEZ. 2 and 3. ARSLAN TEPE. *From copies by D. G. Hogarth.*



XIII. SAMOSATA. KOLITOLU YAILA.

XIV. 1. BOR. *From copy by D. G. Hogarth.*

2. BILINGUAL BOSS OF TARKOTIMME.

3. BABYLONIAN BOWL. *From the Original.*

XV. SEALS—

1 to 9. LAYARD'S SEALS FROM NINEVEH. *See Wright's  
'Empire of the Hittites.'*

10 to 25. SCHLUMBERGER'S SEALS. *From photographs in the  
same work.*

XVI. SEALS—

26, 27. SEALS FROM TELL BASHAR. *Copied by D. G. Hogarth.*

28. SEAL FROM CULTE DE MITHRA. *Copied from Wright's  
'Empire of the Hittites.'*

29. THE HITTITE EMBLEMS ON THE ASHMOLEAN BI-  
LINGUAL SEAL OF ABD ISKHARA.

30. HITTITE EMBLEMS ON LACHISH SEAL. *From the  
Original.*

31. SEAL FROM LYCAONIA. *From Perrot's 'Hist. of Art.'*

32. EMBLEMS ROUND A SEAL. *From the same work.*











# THE HITTITES AND THEIR LANGUAGE.

---

## CHAPTER I.

### EARLY HISTORY.

SOME five thousand years ago the great river-valley of the Tigris and Euphrates was ruled by a sturdy Mongol race which dominated some earlier "dark-faced" people. These conquerors appear to have come from the mountains of Media, and were familiar with the bear, the wolf, and the tiger—which lives in cold mountain regions—while it is doubtful if they knew of lions, or of the palm among trees. They settled on the lower hills near Susa, and their kings reigned at Ur on the Persian Gulf. They soon became a seafaring people, having not only boats on the great rivers but also ships

with sails on the southern sea. They were a masterful race, with heavy features and round heads, and their warlike power made them rulers in time of all Western Asia. The name of the tribe is unknown; but the kings of Ur called themselves kings not only of Sumir ("the river-valley") but also of Akkad ("the mountains"), a term which included the region of Ararat to the north; while they also raided as far as the Mediterranean, and set up their images beside this "sea of the sunset."

The later Babylonians in the time of Cyrus had many traditions about Sargina, whom they regarded as the "founder; the king of the world; the maker of law and wealth." Nabonidus, the last king of Babylon—conquered by Cyrus—speaks of Sargina's son as having lived 3200 years before himself; but whether he was likely to have been well informed as to the lapse of so many centuries may be doubted. The exact measurement of time was not generally recorded till much later in history, and Orientals are fond of piling up the years, and of claiming a greater antiquity of origin than their neighbours. The Babylonians were not free from the tendency which gives a fabulous antiquity to Chinese or Indian civilisation; and all that we can safely say as to the origin of the kingdom of Ur is that it dates before the rise of Babylon, which was founded about 2250 B.C. The personality of

Sargina ("king of the land") is itself doubtful in absence of any monuments certainly his own;<sup>1</sup> while the favourite legend of his birth, of which several copies are known, is mythical. The later scribes seem to have copied it from a monument of some ancient hero, but it records his secret birth and unknown father, his nurture by a "waterman" while his father's brother ruled the land, and his being placed in a bulrush ark on the Euphrates by his mother. The story is that, common to many peoples, of the man born to be a king. It recalls not only the infancy of Moses, but the tale of Perseus among the Greeks, and of Darab<sup>2</sup> in Persia. Like other semi-mythical heroes, Sargina grew up to be a great king, ruling the "dark-faced people." He was said to have founded the city of Akkad north of Ur, and to have there erected the "high place" and the "star-gazing house." He conquered Elam, or Western Persia, and for four years he warred in the west as far as the sea-coast of Phœnicia, bringing back the spoil of its lands. He put down a revolt of the tribes which besieged him in Akkad, and conquered the people of Eden in the east or north-east.

The son of Sargina is said to have been named Naramaku (probably "of royal birth"), and to have yet further extended the empire to Magan,

<sup>1</sup> See note, Appendix I.

<sup>2</sup> See 'Syrian Stone-Lore,' 2nd edition, p. 436.



or the peninsula of Sinai, where some local ruler was captured. He built the temple of the Sun in Sippara (or Sepharvaim); and an inscription on a vase terms him the "king of the four quarters" of the earth. The names of many other local rulers believed to belong to this remote period are found at Ur, Nippur, and other towns of Chaldea; but their dates and succession are unknown, and it is unnecessary to burden the memory with strange titles of princes and temple-builders, many of which are perhaps not really personal names, but religious or honorary appellations. Such shadowy rulers are to us mere ghosts of the past, whose records have been well termed the "dust of history." The main fact which is important to our subject is the domination of Western Asia, from Ararat to the Persian Gulf, and from the mountains of Media to the Mediterranean, by the kings of Ur, at the earliest period of Asiatic history, and the apparent conquest of Syria, Palestine, and Sinai, down to the borders of Egypt, at a time which may prove finally to be more remote than that of the dawn of civilisation in Egypt itself.

After Sargina and Naramaku, the most conspicuous figures in the history of the kings of Ur are the monarchs whose names are generally read as Urbau, and Dungi his son. We here come into the full light of monumental records,



though the exact period can only be deduced from the later Babylonian statements, which would make Dungi to have ruled about 2800 B.C. Urbau was the founder of a temple at Zirgul, which was chiefly built in the time of his son. It is not impossible that he is the same king whose name is otherwise spelt as *Urbavi*, and even *Urnina*, and he appears to have ruled like his predecessors over Sumir—the southern valley of the Tigris and Euphrates—and over Akkad or the northern mountains. Dungi, his successor, makes the same claim, and in his time the Mongol princes of Ur were in communication with Phœnicia, Sinai, and Egypt.

Our knowledge of these reigns is due to the discoveries of De Sarzec, since 1880, at the palace of Tell Loh ("the tablet mound") marking the site of Zirgul, a city of which the name survives hard by in the modern village of *Zirghul*. It lay south of the great canal called *Khat el Hai*, which joins the Tigris and Euphrates below Babylon, and it was some forty miles east of the latter river. The mound, which is about forty feet high, was crowned by walls of baked brick, still standing to a height of ten feet. An oblong enclosure, with its angles to the cardinal points, surrounded a central court, on which thirty-six chambers of various sizes opened. A stepped pyramid formed the shrine of this

palace, which was adorned with eight statues of Sinaitic granite, covered with texts in the Sumerian language, one of these figures being colossal. The great builder of Zirgul was Gudea, the *patesi* ("prince" or "priest") of the place, who was a subject of Dungi, king of Ur. Bas-reliefs representing the victories of this king in Elam have been found, and one curious design appears to represent him as himself building the temple, aided by his wife and four sons, with a basket on his head—which is shaven for a vow—and a cloth round his loins.<sup>1</sup> The office of *patesi* was hereditary, and these princes may have been of the royal house. Like later kings, they were priests as well; but Gudea was a warrior who claims to have conquered from the sea of the "highlands" (*sinim*), probably the Caspian, to the lower sea or Persian Gulf. The city of Ansan, famous afterwards as the early capital of Cyrus, was also taken by force, and its spoils brought to Zirgul. This city lay in Sinim or Western Persia, which, it may be noted in passing, is probably the Sinim of the Bible (Isa. xlix. 12).

One passage in the dedicatory texts of Gudea is important historically, as showing the wide extent of country over which the power of the

<sup>1</sup> The text on this bas-relief reads: *E-gal-AN-Ningirsu-Zirgulla Sar Tur-sar-ni Tumgi mu ru . . . Ur-nina Sag-turda E-AN-Nina-mu-ni mu ru.* "The temple of Ningirsu of Zirgul the king, a king's son, Dungi builds. The eldest son of Urbau for an abode of Nina my goddess builds it."

kings of Ur extended, and the civilisation of the age. It may be rendered as follows:—

When I built the temple of Ningirsu . . . I was ruling from the sea of Sinim to the lower sea. I raised its roof with wood from Amanus, wood of seventy cubits, wood of fifty cubits, wood of twenty-five cubits. . . . I brought gold-dust from Upper Egypt for the façade of the temple. . . . I brought bitumen from the river of Gumir (Gomer), from the mountains of Media (Madga), for the floor of the temple. . . . I wrought with hard stone from the mountain of Musalla in Phœnicia. . . . I brought white stone from Tidalum, the mountain of Phœnicia, to form the foundation of the hinges of the temple doors. . . . Hard stone was brought from the land of Sinai (Magan): I made an image thereof. That my name may be remembered I have recorded this.

In other passages mention is made of the ships which conveyed precious woods and other materials; and, although basalt could be obtained nearer home, the Sinaitic granite of the statues was probably brought by sea to the mouth of the Euphrates, in which case the Sumerians must have circumnavigated Arabia and communicated with Upper Egypt, either from a port near Suez, or perhaps from the western shore of the Red Sea—the Abyssinian gold being brought down by the native tribes of that region to the coast. The materials used, and of which fragments are found in Gudea's palace, include alabaster, lapis-lazuli, and bronze, in addition to the cedar, marble, and granite mentioned in the text.

The contemporary history of Egypt is so un-



certain at this early period that it is doubtful what dynasty was then in power. The first three dynasties have left us no monuments that can be certainly ascribed to the legendary successors of Menes, but records begin with the fourth royal family, which ruled from Memphis, possibly about 2900 B.C. The founder of this dynasty—Senefru—has left an inscription in the Sinaitic peninsula, as has Khufu (or Cheops), his successor. The copper-mines were perhaps already being worked in this region when the ships of Dungi reached its coasts, and peaceful relations appear to have existed between the rulers of Western Asia and of Egypt. As, however, we depend—not only in Chaldea, but yet more in Egypt—on very late statements as regards this first age of civilisation, all attempts to define date must be regarded as doubtful. The Babylonians, in the later age of history-writing, were themselves uncertain as to the succession of the kings of Ur; and in one list of twelve names they have added the caution, “These are kings who were after the flood [*abubi*], not arranged respectively in order.” It seems probable, however, that the civilisation of Chaldea was actually older than that of the Delta, while it is clear that the power of its rulers was far more extensive than that of the monarchs of Memphis.

The mountains of Sinim or Western Persia were inhabited by a race of the same stock with that



which thus civilised Mesopotamia; and about 2280 B.C. (according to a later Assyrian statement) Kudur-Nanhundi, the king of Elam or Persia, conquered Akkad, and perhaps transferred the seat of the monarchy to the eastern uplands. We possess a short inscription of a monarch so named, which shows that the old language of Persia was a dialect closely akin to that of the Sumerians of Ur. Kudur-Nanhundi removed to Susa, east of the Tigris, the gods and the spoils of Akkad; and many of the temples and sacred groves which Assurbanipal (about 660 B.C.) desecrated, when conquering Elam, may have existed more than two thousand years before his time. As to these the Assyrian conqueror relates:<sup>1</sup>—

I brought out and counted the spoil, silver, gold, furniture, and goods, from Sumir, Akkad, and Babylon: all that the kings of Elam from first to last had carried off and brought to Elam, bronze hammered hard and pure, beautiful and valuable gems belonging to kings, which former kings of Akkad and Saulmugina (the Assyrian rebel prince) had paid to Elam for their aid; beautiful garments of royalty; weapons of war ready for battle, well fitted to the hand; the furniture of his palaces, all that was therein: the provisions for his food: the throne he sat on. Strong war-chariots adorned with bronze and painted, horses and great mules with trappings of gold and silver, I carried away to Assyria. The tower of Susa, whose floor was laid with marble, I destroyed. I broke down its roof of shining gold. Susinak, the god of their

---

<sup>1</sup> Translation by Fox Talbot. Records of the Past (Old Series), vol. i. p. 85.

oracle who dwelt in the groves, whose godhead none had seen (and other Elamite gods), with their belongings, their priests, and worshippers, I carried off to Assyria. Thirty-two statues of kings, made of silver, gold, bronze, and alabaster from Susa, . . . I carried to Assyria. I broke the winged lions and bulls watching over the temple. I removed all the winged bulls of the gates of the temple of Elam. I overthrew them till they were destroyed. His gods and goddesses I sent into captivity; their forest groves, which none other had entered, or trodden their outskirts, my warriors entered, and saw the groves and burned them with fire.

This text has been quoted somewhat out of place, because of its reference to the early Elamite conquest of Chaldea, and because of the vivid picture that it draws of the Mongol civilisation, common to Elam and Ur, before Babylon existed. The centre of power down to about 2250 B.C. lay in the south and south-east, and neither Babylon nor Nineveh had as yet become a royal city. But the Mongol population was not confined to Sumir—the river valley—for it existed also in the north, where the Minni had probably already settled west of Lake Van, while the Kassi (or “warriors”) had advanced from the Taurus along the Euphrates southwards. The original home of the Mongol race with which we are dealing seems to have been in the mountains of Kurdistan and Media. The southern division may be called Sumerian, while to the northern the term Akkadian may be more specially applied. There is evidence that the two dialects differed somewhat, the language

of the Kassites being nearer akin to that of the Minni and of the later Mongol tribes of Media. It is with the northern branch of the race that we are specially concerned, for the so-called "Hittite" texts appear clearly to belong to the Akkadians proper, and to the various allied tribes of North Syria and Asia Minor, which about 2200 B.C. acknowledged the supremacy of Tintir or Babylon, including among others the Hittites of Carchemish, who held the great ford by which most conquerors crossed the Euphrates to reach Phœnicia and Palestine. The script and language of this newly discovered series of monuments appear to have been peculiar to the north, while the older tongue of Sumir was written with emblems usually called "linear Babylonian," such as are found at Zirgul and in other cities of Southern Chaldea. The two systems of writing were as closely connected as were the two dialects, but they were not identical, and they appear to have developed independently in the north and in the south.

Berosus, the Babylonian historian of the Greek age, calls the dynasty which founded Babylon Medic, not because they belonged to the later Aryan race to which the name is usually given, but because the home of the new conquerors, who called themselves Kassi, was in Media, where their language survived even as late as 500 B.C. The names of the Kassites were translated into Semitic



speech by Babylonian scribes of the Persian period, and from these translations it is clear that the Kassite language was a Mongol dialect, similar to Akkadian, to Sumerian, and to the language of the Minni and of Matiene (Mitanni) farther north; but very few actual records of the 1st Kassite dynasty had been recovered till of late,<sup>1</sup> and our information was mainly derived from later Assyrian or Baylonian accounts, and from their transcripts and translations of texts which have now perished, or remain to be found. The Babylonians reckoned five kings, including Sumuabi the founder of Babylon, before the reign of 'Ammurabi (or 'Ammurabil), the famous conqueror who established the Babylonian empire throughout Western Asia. It is doubtful, however, whether the Kassite race was as purely Mongol as were the Sumerians of the south. The fourth and fifth kings (Abilsin and Sinmuballid) bear names which—if they were correctly represented by the Babylonian scribes—would be Semitic, though the originals may perhaps have given the Akkadian forms (Alamaku and Akupis), but of these monarchs no monuments are as yet known. The oldest inscription in a Semitic language belongs to the time of 'Ammurabi, and it is written in the character of Southern Mesopotamia. The home of the Semitic race—as

<sup>1</sup> The British Museum possesses commercial tablets of the time of Eriaku, 'Ammurabi, Samsuiluna, Ammi-Satana, and Ammi-Zaduga, in cuneiform script, but apparently none of the earlier kings. Nor were their names (2250-2140 B.C.) found at Nippur.



witnessed by the evidence of names for fauna and flora common to all Semitic dialects—appears to have been in Assyria,<sup>1</sup> and it is very doubtful whether they had met, in their first cradle, with either the ostrich or the palm, distinctive of more southerly climes. That they did not first live in the Arabian deserts is clear, from their acquaintance with the stork and the pelican, with the vine, the fig, the pomegranate, the almond and olive. They also named the bear and the boar, the lion and the panther; and they grew wheat, barley, and other vegetables, not to be found in the desert. The habitat so indicated lies in the foothills of the Taurus and of Syria, and in the Aramean uplands. The Semitic tribes may have existed among the Sumerians from the first ages of history, but if so they were as yet unimportant and illiterate. It was in the north of Mesopotamia that they first attained to a position which rendered it necessary to write inscriptions in their language; and it is just at this period (during the reign of 'Ammurabi) that the Hebrew ancestor is represented to have lived at Ur of the Chaldees, and at Harran in Northern Mesopotamia. His migration westwards to Palestine, where he found Semitic tribes, called Amorites ("highlanders") and Canaanites ("lowlanders"), already in possession, but mingled with Hittites, and other Mongol peoples to be considered later, also agrees

<sup>1</sup> Die Namen der Säugetiere. F. Hommel. Leipzig, 1879. And Von Kremer's 'Semitische Culturenlehningen.' Stuttgart, 1875.

with the account of Ammi Satana's invasion (about 2030 B.C.) of the land of the *Amurri* or Amorites, who here first appear in monumental history. It is probable that the Kassites, in their struggle for supremacy over Elam, were aided by the Semitic inhabitants of Assyria and Babylonia; and it is thought that the northern, or Akkadian, dialect of the old Mongol language shows signs of Semitic influence in both structure and vocabulary, being less pure than the older Sumerian of the south.

The transfer of power from Elam to Babylon was not effected without a struggle, and (apparently in the time of Sinmuballid) the Elamite king Kudur-Mabug established his son Eriaku as ruler of Larsa, north of Ur and east of the Euphrates. The latter claimed to be king not only of Larsa and Ur, but of Sumir and Akkad generally, as did his father before him, who also ruled in the "west": so that the whole of the ancient empire seems, in the time of Kudur-Mabug, to have been subject to Elam. A small figure, inscribed with his name and in his language, was discovered at Zirgul, and we possess also a copy of a dedicatory text by Eriaku, and another text on a cone in which he prays for the life of his father.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The reign of Eriaku in Babylonia is also attested by two tablets, in the British Museum, referring to sales of property, and dated, the first in the year when he "destroyed the wicked foe," the other in that of the taking of "eight fortresses" of Isin.

Eriaku is generally admitted to be the Arioch, king of Ellasar, noticed in the Bible (Gen. xiv. 1); and Chedorlaomer king of Elam was probably his brother. A recently deciphered text is supposed to mention both these monarchs, as well as Tidal king of the Goim, as contemporaries of 'Ammurabi or Amraphel, king of Shinar.<sup>1</sup> The Biblical account represents them as allies who invaded the west, and who, passing through Bashan and Gilead, reached Petra, and returned west of the Dead Sea to the Jordan valley, punishing the local kings or chiefs who had "served Chedorlaomer," but had rebelled. This monarch, therefore, like his predecessor Kudur-Mabug, was a "lord of the west": but the alliance did not endure; for 'Ammurabi threw off the Elamite yoke and defeated Eriaku and the allied king of Elam, assuming the titles of "king of Babylon, of Sumir and Akkad, and of the four regions" (or quarters of the compass), about 2139 B.C. 'Ammurabi is thus often regarded as the founder of the Babylonian dynasty, and was succeeded by five generations of descendants.

The struggles between the Kassites and the Sumerians seem to have continued for more than eleven centuries, and, from about 1950 to 1590 B.C., the kings of Uruku or Erech ruled

<sup>1</sup> This, however, is very uncertain. The name of 'Ammurabi does not occur, and that of Chedorlaomer is very doubtful. A much later invasion by Elamites may be intended.



Babylon, until the rise of a second Kassite dynasty, which appears to have endured side by side with other small princes till Irba-Marduk established an Assyrian dynasty about 1012 B.C.

In speaking later more in detail of the Hittite inscriptions, the reasons will be given for supposing that they represent the language and character used by this first Kassite or Medic dynasty in Babylon. The script in question has been found in use, not only in North Syria and Asia Minor, but also at Babylon itself, on a votive bowl; and on seals, from Nineveh and elsewhere, which appear to bear the names of several kings of this age. The local rulers who, in Syria and Asia Minor, have left us their records on palace walls, or cut on the rocks of boundary passes, speak of their suzerain at Babylon, just as Gudea at Zirgul acknowledges Dungi of Ur as his master. At Mer'ash in the Taurus we probably find the name of Sumuabi the first king of Babylon, and on the engraved lion in the same place possibly the name of Zabû the third of the line, to whom also a text at Carchemish is dedicated, while a seal from Nineveh may be his as well: others may bear the names of Ebisum, Ammi-Satana, and Ammi-Zaduga, kings of the 1st dynasty, following 'Am-murabi, who was the sixth, the total of known names being eleven. The Elamite supremacy under Eriaku is, on the other hand, apparently

acknowledged by a ruler of Aleppo, and at Bulgar Maden, a pass of the Taurus north of Tarsus in Cilicia. Whether 'Ammurabi himself is mentioned, both at Babylon and also as far west as Mount Sipylus near Smyrna, is more doubtful; but the unexpected recovery of so many names belonging to one period serves to confirm the decipherment of these texts, and agrees with the fact that some centuries later the Hittites, and the Western Asiatics generally, appear to have relinquished their own script in favour of the cuneiform, which had become the character generally used for writing letters. Their own emblems, however, still appear, as late as 1500 B.C. and perhaps later, on seals, side by side with early cuneiform signs—as on the bilingual boss of Tarkondemos and the seal of Abd-Iskhara. None of the texts of Southern Chaldea are as yet known to be in this newly studied character. It is found especially in the north, at Samosata on the Euphrates, at Pteria and Eyuk east of the lower part of the Halys valley, at various sites in Cappadocia and Cilicia, and far west in Lydia at Karabel and Sipylus; while sculptures of the same class with those inscribed in "Hittite" at Carchemish have been found, on the borders of Phrygia, at Ghiaur Kalessi, some thirty miles south-west of Angora, and at Kalaba immediately east of that city. A text of three emblems was copied by Professor Ramsay at

Doghanlu Deresi in Phrygia among later remains of the Aryan Phrygians, and a strange monument at Eflatun Bunar ("Plato's springs") in Galatia, nine miles north of Caralis, belongs probably to the same civilisation, which is thus shown to have extended over all the southern half of Asia Minor. In the north-east of Capadocia no such monuments have been found in spite of diligent search, nor are they known (excepting seals brought from Nineveh) in regions east of the Euphrates. In Syria they occur at Mer'ash, Carchemish, Aleppo, and Hamath, while seals have been brought from Tell Bashar. Far south in Philistia a seal discovered at Lachish appears to give Hittite emblems beside an Egyptian text, and the Hittites are said (Gen. xxiii.) to have lived at Hebron in Abraham's time, though the home of the race was in Northern Syria.<sup>1</sup>

It has long been held by scholars like Sir H. Rawlinson and Dr Birch that many of the early tribes of this region—the Hittites, the Gamgums, the Tablai, and Moschi—were of Turanian or Mongol race; and the evidence of language, independent of the texts in question, will be found to show their connection with the Akkadians, Kassites, and Minni. Such tribes were allied

<sup>1</sup> The Egyptian emblems on the Lachish seal have not been read with certainty. There are five Hittite signs, *Nun Mo-tur dim-pi* ("The seal of Lord Motur"). This was a Hittite name in the time of Rameses II.



to the conquerors of Chaldea who first founded Babylon; and the distribution of these sculptures, which bear a generally admitted resemblance to later Babylonian art; seems to show that the first kings, preceding 'Ammurabi, directed their energies specially to conquest in the north and west. They penetrated into Cappadocia, and by the great southern highway they followed the north shores of the Mediterranean as far as Smyrna—either themselves conquering the south of Anatolia or claiming kingship over the tribes who advanced in this direction, from Syria, into the country which they called *Kit-tu*, or “the sunset,” after the Kassite name (*kit*) for the sun. The influence of Babylon in these regions continued to be felt much later, as will appear in speaking of the texts from Elishah and from Cappadocia written in the Semitic dialect used about 1500 B.C., or later, in these regions. The presence of Mongols in Caria and Lydia is also witnessed by the survival of certain words in the languages of those regions long after they had been colonised by Aryans; and it was from Lydia, according to Herodotus (I. 94), that the Etruscans—a Turanian or Mongol race—reached Italy in later days.

But even the establishment by 'Ammurabi of a Babylonian empire in Western Asia does not represent the full extension of Akkadian power; for tribes of this same energetic stock found their way into the Nile delta, and ruled Northern

Egypt from Zoan and Avaris. The early chronology of Egypt is so uncertain that the period of this foreign supremacy cannot be fixed with any accuracy; but it would seem probable that the Hyksos, who were contemporaries of the weak 13th dynasty, had gained power at Zoan about 2130 B.C., and were not finally expelled till about 1700 B.C. or later. That they included among their subjects Semitic tribes from Syria there are many reasons to suppose; but the names of the Hyksos kings of the 15th dynasty appear to be Mongol and not Semitic, and they are stated in Egyptian records<sup>1</sup> to have called themselves Men or Minni—coming from a country east of Syria and near Assyria. Their home would thus appear to have lain west of Lake Van; and in this region a Mongol race called Minni, akin to the Kassites, was still in possession in the fifteenth century B.C.—the whole region of Matiene between Lake Van and Syria being then known to the Semitic tribes as the Land of *Khani-rabbat*, perhaps meaning “of the many khans” or Mongol kings.

The earliest notice of the relations between Egypt and Asia is found in the story of Saneha,<sup>2</sup> who states that he lived under the founder of the great 12th dynasty, which began to rule all Egypt from Thebes at a period which may roughly

<sup>1</sup> Brugsch, *Hist. Egypt*, vol. i. p. 234.

<sup>2</sup> *Proc. Bib. Arch. Soc.*, vol. xiv. pp. 452-458 (1891-92). *Records of the Past (New Series)*, vol. ii. p. 19.

be stated as 2300 B.C. The Sinaitic peninsula was at this time once more held by the Egyptians —texts of Usertesén I., son of the founder of the dynasty (Amenemhat I.), occurring at Wády el Maghârah, and at Sarbût el Khâdem; while Amenemhat II., who was the third king of the dynasty, built a temple at the last-named place; and the third and fourth kings of the same name (Amenemhat) also left inscriptions at both these stations. It is under the fourth king (Usertesén II.) that the Edomites are first noticed as bringing presents to Egypt, but not until the end of the dynasty did the Asiatics attain to power in Zoan; and several Theban kings of the 13th dynasty appear to have reasserted at intervals the native supremacy in Goshen.

Saneha was an Egyptian noble who, on the unexpected accession of Usertesén I., fled for some unexplained reason, first to Edom and thence to the land Aia (probably "the shores"), and to Upper Tonu, regions which are regarded by Brugsch as Phœnician (or Fenekh) lands. They cannot certainly have been in the Edomite desert, for in Aia there were figs, grapes, olives, and corn, as well as much cattle; but it is possible that the Hebron hills may be intended. Egyptian was spoken in Tonu, but the king of this region bore the very Kassite-sounding name of Ammiansi. He was assured by Saneha that the Pharaoh "did not covet the lands to the north," but was intent



on conquests in Upper Egypt. Among the Asiatics Saneha lived till he was old, marrying the king's daughter and commanding the archer troops, who were sent "afar off to strike and drive back princes of foreign lands." He finally made his peace with Usertesén, and leaving all his possessions to his half-bred sons, he returned to be buried in Egypt. In his speech to the Pharaoh he mentions Maki of Edom, and another chief, as though in habitual correspondence with Thebes, and his attendants were sent home in an Egyptian ship. It seems, therefore, that peaceful relations existed at this time between the rulers of Egypt and the Asiatics, and that Egyptian influence was already beginning to assert itself for some distance north of the Sinaitic peninsula.

Of the Hyksos we know but little from any monuments. They are said by Greek writers to have been Arabs or Phœnicians, and many Semitic words certainly found their way about this time, or later, into the Egyptian language; but similar loan terms also are to be found which are of Mongol origin, and it is possible that in Goshen, as in Asia, the Semitic people at this comparatively early time were ruled by Mongol princes. Certain monuments from Zoan, which used to be attributed to the Hyksos, seem now to be regarded as native work, appropriated by such foreign rulers as Apepa the Second, whose name is scratched upon one of them. A curious account of the

Hyksos attempt to fix a quarrel on the Pharaoh Ra-Sekenen, "king of the south"—who may have belonged to the 13th dynasty—has survived, and gives some valuable information, though the historic character of the story is doubted.<sup>1</sup> We here learn that Egypt was oppressed by "the unclean," and that On or Heliopolis was ruled by Ra-Apepa from Hauaru or Avaris in Goshen:—

All the land paid him tribute with its manufactured products, and thus loaded him with all the good things of Lower Egypt [or "the north"]. Now King Ra-Apepa took the god Sutekh for his master, and no longer served any god of the country save Sutekh, and he built a temple of excellent and imperishable workmanship at the gate of King Ra-Apepa, and rose daily to sacrifice daily victims to Sutekh.

Sutekh or Set being a deity worshipped as supreme by the Hittites, this statement, taken with considerations already noticed, leads us to suppose that Apepa was a Mongol of race akin to the Kassites. It may hereafter be discovered that these foreigners built and wrote in native style; but as yet nothing that can certainly be regarded as Hyksos work is known, except the scarabs of the two Apepis, and the name of the latter on monuments apparently re-used. These names are in Egyptian characters, which may have been the only ones in use in Goshen.

It was during the Hyksos period that Joseph was brought down to Egypt, and we are told

<sup>1</sup> Records of the Past (New Series), vol. ii. p. 37.

(Gen. xliii. 32) that Hebrews, and shepherds generally (xlvi. 34; Exod. viii. 26), were loathed by the Egyptians. But under Asiatic rulers they throve peacefully until, about 1700 B.C., the "new king" arose in Thebes, when Ahmes, first of the great 18th dynasty, began to reassert the power of the native Pharaohs, and to push back Mongols and Semitic settlers alike into Asia. A new chapter of history begins with this accession of a dynasty which seems to have been partly of Nubian origin; and within about a century the suzerainty of all Palestine and Syria was wrested from the Babylonian overlords, and the power of the Pharaohs established and maintained for about two hundred years.

These successes were mainly due to the energy of the new Theban dynasty, but also perhaps in a measure to the internal dissensions within the Babylonian empire. We have unfortunately very little information as to events in Asia preceding the Egyptian conquests, but there appears to be no doubt that the Semitic race was rising steadily in importance, and beginning to press on its Kassite masters from Assyria. Originally this region was ruled by *patesis*, or princes subject to Babylon, of whom the earliest known was Ismi-Dagon about 1850 B.C.; but some two centuries later, about the time when the first Egyptian onset in Asia took place, Bel-Kapkapu founded the independent kingdom of Assyria, having its



capital at Asshur south of Nineveh. The famous city on the Tigris, which became later the mistress of Asia and of Egypt, was probably not yet built, and is not known monumentally before the fifteenth century B.C.; but Asshur on the Tigris became, after 1700 B.C., the centre of the first Semitic kingdom known to history, and though, about 1500 B.C., Rimmon-Nirari—apparently an Assyrian ruler—wrote to Thothmes IV. as to a superior, half a century later Assur-Uballid writes to the successor of Amenophis IV. as an equal, and calls himself the “great king of Assyria.” The former was asking for aid against the Hittites, the latter was himself a conqueror of the Kassites in Babylon. The first great shock to the Mongol power in Asia was due to Egyptian conquests, but its final ruin was brought about by the power of the Semitic race in Assyria. The history of this important period, between 1700 and 1200 B.C., may be reserved for another chapter. Thus far we have dealt with the main outlines of history during the palmy days of Mongol rule in Asia, when the kings of Ur and of Babylon were without rivals, and when contests only occurred between the two great branches of the Mongol race—the Sumerians of the south, and the Kassite or Akkadian conquerors in the north, who succeeded to the imperial power which had been enjoyed for several generations by the kings of Elam.

## CHAPTER II.

## THE EGYPTIAN CONQUESTS IN SYRIA.

AHMES (the "moon child"), founder of the great 18th dynasty, was the first Pharaoh who succeeded in wresting the land of Goshen from the Hyksos, and he fought against the Asiatics at Sharuhén east of Gaza, on the borders of Palestine. In his sixth year he invaded Zahi, a region which seems to have lain on the lower Hebron hills. But the conquest of Lower Egypt was not yet complete, and Amenophis I., successor of Ahmes, appears to have been at peace with Asia during a reign said to have lasted twenty-one years. The first conqueror of Syria was Thothmes I., third king of the dynasty, whose wars were in Ruten (or Luden), the Egyptian name for all the coast lands as far as the Taurus mountains. He even advanced into Naharina—the Aram Naharaim or "plateau of the two rivers" which in the Bible represents the northern part of Mesopotamia. Thothmes II. succeeded him, and fought the

Shasu, or "wandering" tribes of Southern Palestine. His reign appears to have been a short one, and Egypt was ruled after his death by Queen Hatasu his daughter, the guardian of her younger brother, the most famous and successful of the Pharaohs—Thothmes III.

The mummy of this remarkable man, when unrolled at Boulak in 1882, presented in perfect condition the features of a conquerer who reigned for fifty-four years, though, for sixteen or more, the influence of Hatasu seems to have restrained him from war during his boyhood and youth. The slight form and low stature, the delicate features and aquiline nose, of the Egyptian Alexander denoted a king well fitted for a soldier's life; and from his twentieth to his fortieth year the annals of his reign are full of records of conquests in Asia, no less than fifteen campaigns being conducted through Palestine and Syria even as far as Assyria, and a regular military occupation of all the plains of Philistia, Galilee, and Bashan, of Phœnicia and the Orontes valley, being organised, by a chain of "resting-places," where the Egyptian detachments were supplied by the Syrians with rations of bread, wine, oil, honey, balm, wheat, barley, spelt, and various fruits. In the fifteenth year a campaign against Ruten is mentioned; and at this time Sinai was probably already held, since an inscription of Hatasu occurs in the sixteenth at Sarbût el Khâdem. Philistia



also appears to have submitted early in the reign of the joint sovereigns, and the first real struggle began in the twenty-second year of Thothmes III.<sup>1</sup>

A great confederacy of Syrian tribes had gathered at Megiddo, the famous fortress which barred the road to Damascus at the mouth of the valley of Jezreel. It included not only the prince of Kadesh—perhaps the great Hittite city on the Orontes—but also chiefs from lands claimed by Egypt, with the Khar or Phœnicians, the Katu possibly from Cilicia, and the princes of Naharina beyond the Euphrates. In the spring of the twenty-third year Thothmes arrived by ship from Egypt, and camped at Yehem, which was perhaps the modern Yemma in the Sharon plain north-west of Shechem. He found his troops holding the high-road of Aaruna, probably that which leads by a main valley north of 'Arrábeh to the inland plain of Dothan. The royal advisers wished to march north by Gitta of Samaria—lying immediately north of Yemma—and thus apparently to cross the downs south of Carmel, but considerably north of Megiddo. "Let us go," they said, "north of Megiddo"; but Thothmes chose the shorter and more difficult direct route. "I will go," he said, "on this road of Aaruna if there be any going on it." The towns of Dothan and 'Ajja, which lie near this route, are noticed among those

<sup>1</sup> Records of the Past (Old Series), vol. ii.: "The Battle of Megiddo."

he captured, with others on either side of the line of advance, which led into the great plain of Lower Galilee by Jenîn. The Egyptian vanguard "coming out of the valley" into these plains, went forward, while the southern "horn," or rearguard, camped at the "waters of Kaina south of Megiddo," by which the fine springs of Jenîn may be intended. The actual contest appears to have been short, and the "vile foes of Kadesh," with their allies of Megiddo, fled to the fortress, and were hauled over its walls by their clothes. The Egyptians then besieged the city, which submitted, and an enormous spoil, attesting the wealth and civilisation of the Canaanites, was gathered in by the victors.

The articles enumerated included horses, and chariots plated with gold and silver; an ark of gold; a silver statue; thrones inlaid with ivory, ebony, and gold, and made of cedar; maces inlaid with gold (such as are represented on Hittite sculptures in the hands of kings); and images of ebony with golden heads. A great cup of Phœnician workmanship is specially noticed, with other vessels, and seven poles of the royal tent plated with silver. To these treasures, some of which were inlaid also with gems, are added many others—such as ring-money of gold and silver, painted chariots, coats of mail, swords and other weapons, rich cloths, innumerable flocks and herds, horses and mares, with wine in jars, and objects of lapis-lazuli, turquoise, and alabaster. The Egyptians

reaped 280,200 bushels of corn in the Galilean plains, besides what was trampled down. They took hostages and numerous prisoners, and by this first decisive victory they became masters of the plains as far as the foot of the Galilean mountains.

A year was passed in peace, and a temple was founded at Thebes; but the subjugation of the country continued, and the list of 119 towns conquered in Palestine includes not only those of Philistia, Sharon, the Dothan and Esdraelon plains, but also others in Upper Galilee, and in Bashan extending to Ashteroth-Carnaim, and to Damascus itself. The subsequent campaigns from the twenty-fifth to the fortieth year carried the power of Thothmes III. yet farther to Phœnicia, Syria, and Aram. In the fifth campaign, and in his twenty-ninth year, he took the fortress of Kadesh, and laid waste the lands of Tunep (or Tennib, north of Arpad), cutting down trees and reaping corn. He proceeded in the sixth campaign next year to Arvad on the Phœnician coast, and sent back by ship to Egypt the corn, wine, slaves, and treasures there found. The route then taken lay by Semyra, an important town at the mouth of the Eletherus, west of Kadesh. The spoils and tribute enumerated in the "Statistical Tablet" are similar to those already described; and on an obelisk it is recorded that Thothmes "passed through the whole extent of Naharina" (probably in the thirty-first year or seventh expedition) "as



a victorious warrior at the head of his army, placing his boundary at the horn of the world—the lands of the further waters of Naharina." He then set up two memorials by the Euphrates, where a tablet by his father (or ancestor—perhaps Thothmes I.) already existed, and passed on to Nini—probably Ninus Vetus on the Euphrates. The spoils included lapis-lazuli from Babylon, and Asiatic ivory. In the thirty-ninth year (the fourteenth campaign) an expedition to Zahi was undertaken, and among the articles of tribute we find mention of manna, and natron, incense, dates both fresh and dried, oil, honey, wine, and corn. In this year the chief of the Kheta or Hittites brought gold and negro slaves, and a boat-load of ivory, with other gifts. In the fortieth and forty-second years the tribute of Assyria is noticed, and included many precious gems, with chariots and vessels of various metals, vines, figs, mulberries, and cedar-wood. The high prosperity of Syria and Aram, under the Mongol suzerains before the Egyptian conquest, is attested by these lists; and the art of their *repoussé* metal-work is described and pictured on the Egyptian sculptures—including many vases adorned with heads of eagles, bulls, and lions—which represent a civilisation at least equal to that of Egypt, and extending over the whole of Western Asia south of the Taurus. Even Cyprus is supposed to be noticed (under the name of Asebi) as tributary

to Egypt, and may easily have been reached by the fleets which were then sailing in the Mediterranean as well as in the Red Sea.

A further list of 231 cities in Syria, north of Palestine, is given on the temple walls at Karnak. In some cases the names are Semitic, and in others they appear to be Mongolic, and survive in the Turkish nomenclature of our own time. None of the south Phœnician cities (such as Tyre, Sidon, Beirut, Batrun, and Gebal) are noticed, and it would seem that Thothmes advanced from Damascus into the Orontes valley, to Kadesh and Tunep, and only reached the sea by the Eleutherus valley at Semyra, thence pushing north to Arvad and Paltos (now Baldeh); but it is possible that the Phœnicians may have offered tribute after the battle of Megiddo. Among the more important Syrian towns are mentioned Hamath, Tunep, 'Azzaz, Nereb, and Tereb, south of Aleppo; Urum on the Euphrates, above Birejik; and Sarnuka, east of the river. Carchemish and Aleppo are also noticed, and Rezeph in the desert south of Tiphseh, with Pethor farther north and west of the Euphrates. Samalla, a famous town near the pass leading down to the Gulf of Issus, may perhaps be recognised in Samalua; but the northern Hittites of Mer'ash seem to have remained unconquered in their mountains. The list refers mainly to cities in the plains and valleys, and on the great highways from Egypt to Assyria,

where the chariots of Thothmes could be used in war.

The interesting memoir of an Egyptian captain, who fought under Thothmes III. in later years, but not apparently as early as the battle of Megiddo, refers to the same regions. His first services were in Nekeb—perhaps the Negeb or south of Palestine—but he crossed “the waters of Naharina” near Carchemish, and cut off the trunk of an elephant close to the Euphrates at Ni (or Ninus Vetus), saving the king, who was hunting a herd of 120 for their tusks: while at Kadesh he disembowelled a wild mare set loose by the Hittite king and took its tail as a trophy.<sup>1</sup>

The last fourteen years of Thothmes III. were spent peacefully in building temples, and Amenophis II., who succeeded him, appears also to have reigned quietly over the new empire, extending north for 500 miles from the borders of Egypt. In the great changes wrought by these important conquests the Semitic tribes seem to have willingly accepted their new master, and relied in future on Egypt for aid against Babylon. The 2nd Kassite dynasty was no longer supreme like the 1st, for Assyria was independent, and about 1440 B.C. Burnaburias calls himself only “king of Karadunias” or Babylonia. The Hittite tribes are very little noticed at this period, the name not having as yet become familiar to the

<sup>1</sup> Records of the Past (Old Series), vol. iv. p. 6.



Egyptians; but the policy of the Pharaohs seems to have been directed to strengthening their position by marriage alliances, not only with kings of Babylon, but with the northern Mongols of Matiene, who were directly in communication with the Hittites.

The population of Syria had, in great measure, become Semitic in consequence of Aramean migrations from Assyria, and was represented in the north by the Phœnicians along the coast, and by the Amorites in Lebanon and at Tunep. The region of Elishah—probably in Cilicia—together with Cappadocia, appears already to have used the cuneiform script; and as the former region was hostile to the Hittites, and to the Ligyes of the Taurus, it seems probable that the population was mainly Semitic. In Palestine itself the names of towns noticed on the Karnak lists appear to be all Semitic. Many of them are familiar Old Testament sites, but the forms of the words are Aramean rather than Hebrew, representing the language of Semitic Canaanites and Amorites then dwelling as a settled population in villages and cities.

The aid of Thothmes IV. was invoked by Rimmon-Nirari against the Hittites of Mer'ash about the close of the sixteenth century B.C., and this help was apparently given, since we have an allusion to his "first campaign in Naharina"; but it is also known that he contracted

a marriage with a daughter of the Minyan prince Sitatama, then ruling over the land of Mitanni or Matiene in Armenia. The Egyptian advances seem to have been regarded at first with suspicion, and the alliance was refused for a long time; but it was further strengthened on the accession of Amenophis III., who applied in his tenth year to Suttarna the son of Sitatama for the hand of his daughter Gilukhepa. An inscription on a scarab<sup>1</sup> refers to her appearance in Egypt with a train of 317 persons, and other references to her are found in the Tell Amarna Tablets. Yet earlier Amenophis III. had married the famous princess Thi, who seems also to have been connected with Armenia, as well as a relative of Callimmasin, king of Babylon. His reign lasted for thirty-six years, and appears to have been fairly prosperous throughout. He is called the "smiter of the Eastern foreigners," and in his hunting expeditions on the Assyrian borders he slew 102 lions. But in his later years — perhaps about 1480 B.C. or earlier — troubles arose in the north, which presaged the disasters of the following reign.

Suttarna, the friendly king of Mitanni, was murdered, and his son Artasumara was allied to the independent Hittites, while at the same time the city of Semyra was attacked by the Amorite Abdasherah ("servant of the goddess

<sup>1</sup> Records of the Past (Old Series), vol. xii. p. 39.

Asherah"), who also advanced on Ribadda, king of Gebal. Of this war we have many notices in the earlier letters of the Tell Amarna collection, and Ribadda informs us that, by aid of Amenophis III., the Amorite advance was stayed for a time. The hostile alliance included not only the Minni under Artasumara, and the Amorites under Abdasherah, but also the Kasi or Kassites, the Hittites of Mer'ash, and the king of Zinzar, a region east of the Hittites. The invaders advanced on Damascus, and overran Bashan, where they were met by the Egyptian general Yankhamu.<sup>1</sup> But the Egyptian success was doubtful, and Yankhamu appears to have been defeated. In the south, the 'Abiri or Hebrews attacked the Judean hills (about 1480 B.C.), and penetrated by Ajalon to the Philistine plains, reducing Ascalon, Lachish, Keilah, Zorah, and other places to tribute. The *pitati* or "archer" garrison of Jerusalem had been withdrawn, just before this invasion from the "land of Seir," and several Canaanite chiefs in the neighbourhood complain in their letters of the loss of this guard. The alliances of Egypt proved, however, very useful in the north, and on the accession of Kurigalzu the Babylonians refused to aid

<sup>1</sup> See my translations ("Tell Amarna Tablets") of the letters from the Berlin Collection numbered 1, 42, 43, 45, 52, 61, 79, 86, 101; and Brit. Museum Collection, Nos. 1, 2, 9, 10, 18, 21, 24, 25, 44, 57, 62.



the Canaanites in their revolt, while Artasumara was defeated by his brother Dusratta, who attacked the Hittites from the east and swept over Northern Phœnicia.

The temporary successes thus secured were celebrated by a further alliance between the king of Mitanni and the Pharaoh; and Tadukhepa, the daughter of Dusratta, became the bride of Amenophis IV., the heir of Egypt, within the lifetime of his father Amenophis III. The lists of her dowry give us a very clear view of the wealth and civilisation of Matiene under its Mongol rulers in the fifteenth century B.C.<sup>1</sup> The gifts sent with this princess included objects of gold, silver, copper, tin, and iron, necklaces and bracelets, earrings, anklets, and signet-rings, with robes adorned with thin leaves and fringes of gold, and embroidered in crimson, green, and other colours. They were carried in wooden boxes. There were also precious vases of bronze; and eighteen different kinds of gems are named, including jade, agate, and possibly pearls, with amethysts and rubies. Tusks of ivory are also mentioned, and a chariot and camel-litter. These last were adorned with carved figures of lions and eagles in gold, reminding us of the art of Troy and Mycenæ belonging to the same age. That the possessors of this wealth were Mongols is shown by the long letter—some five hundred lines of cuneiform, occupying a large tablet—which

<sup>1</sup> Berlin Collection, Nos. 25, 26.

Dusratta sent in connection with the negotiations for the marriage. It begins with a salutation in Assyrian, but the rest of it is in the native language of Mitanni—a dialect akin to the Kassite, Akkadian, and later Mongol speech of Media. The rest of the nine letters written by this king to Amenophis III. and Amenophis IV. are in Assyrian, which seems to have been better understood in Egypt; for the kings of Babylon also employed that language, though texts of Kurigalzu and Burnaburias at home are Akkadian. Out of all the great collection of more than 300 letters found at Tell Amarna—the 'palace of the 18th dynasty between Thebes and Memphis—only two are in Mongol speech, the second being from Tarkhundara,<sup>1</sup> the Hittite prince of the land of Ikatai near Rezep. The connection between his dialect and the Akkadian has already been admitted by specialists in Germany, but the translation is uncertain, though it clearly refers to the despatch of a daughter to Egypt, and enumerates the Hittite gifts which accompanied the messenger. Rezep, however, was much farther south than Mer'ash, which was the centre of resistance against Egypt about this time.

The victories of Dusratta over the Hittites led to peace in Syria till the death of Amenophis III., who "when he was forced to go to his fate"<sup>2</sup> was

<sup>1</sup> Berlin Collection, No. 10.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 24, line 55, obverse. *Sinti su ci illicu ictabuus.*

bewailed by his Armenian brother-in-law, in a pathetic letter to the widowed queen Thi and her son. Already there were signs of the approaching fall of the great Egyptian dynasty. The garrisons had been withdrawn in the south, and all the Judean hills were conquered by the 'Abiri or Hebrews. Communication with Phœnicia seems to have been mainly by sea, and Dusratta speaks of the insecurity of the Syrian route, which was again interrupted. Aziru, the Amorite chief of Tunep, professed, indeed, allegiance to Egypt, and honourably received Khai, the Egyptian envoy. But his father Abdasherah had been equally eager to receive a *paka* or Egyptian resident, though he made war on Semyra and Gebal; and Aziru, who writes as to his fears of the Hittite king of Mer'ash, again finally threw in his lot with the rebels, and advanced southwards in the reign of Amenophis IV., in alliance with the king of Nereb near Aleppo, and with Edugama the Mongol ruler of Kadesh on Orontes. He was proclaimed a rebel, and the surrender of certain criminals was demanded by Khani the Egyptian; but the new allies swept down the valley of the Eleutherus, and took Semyra, Batrun, Gebal, Beirut, and Sidon. Edugama attacked Sidon and wasted Bashan; and the fleet of Arvad, which cut off the Egyptian ships coming to relieve Gebal, also aided the Amorites in the siege of Tyre. From every quarter came cries for aid, but the letters



contain no indication that it was ever given. Within the lifetime of Amenophis IV. the whole of the Egyptian conquests appear to have been lost, and after his death (or murder) weak kings succeeded each other until, about 1400 B.C., the 18th dynasty was overthrown.

The Hittites of Mer'ash, Carchemish, Aleppo, and Kadesh appear for about a century to have thus regained their freedom. There is no mention of any aid given during this second war by either Mitanni or the Kassites. Burnaburias, son of Kurigalzu, in Babylon, was allied by marriage to Amenophis IV., to whom he sent friendly letters. But he was oppressed by the rising power of the Assyrians until (about 1430 B.C.) he agreed to the settlement of a boundary between Assyria and Babylon. He then married the daughter of Assur-Uballid, the Assyrian king, who was also well disposed to Egypt. At a somewhat later period the latter advanced over the Euphrates, to quell what he describes as a general rising of the various tribes, and he appears to have besieged Beirut, undermining its walls and carrying captives thence. Meanwhile the Kassites rebelled against Kara-Urutas, son of Burnaburias and of the daughter of Assur-Uballid, and set up a usurper named Nazibugas. The Assyrian monarch advanced on Babylon and dethroned this upstart, placing Kurigalzu II.—

a younger son of Burnaburias—on the throne about 1400 B.C. The Kassites thus became dependent on Assyria; and about half a century later, when Nazi-Urutas quarrelled with Rimmon-Nirari of Assyria, he was defeated, and a new border established between the two kingdoms. The Kassite dynasty, which counted in all thirty-six kings during a period of 577 years, continued to rule Babylonia till about 1012 B.C., but they had no power sufficient to oppose the ever-increasing strength of Assyria, and no longer played a part in the history of events west of the Euphrates.

To the early Assyrian age (the fifteenth century B.C.) may perhaps be ascribed the rude cuneiform texts, written in the Assyrian language, which have been found in Cappadocia.<sup>1</sup> One of these, now in the British Museum, is a trader's letter regarding certain goods—probably cloths such as are mentioned in later times as much prized by the Assyrians; another, now in the National Library at Paris, is about a disputed payment between traders. Two others from Gyül Tepe and Kaisârieh refer to loans of money. A rock-cut text, near Kaisârieh, accompanies a bas-relief in which a king, robed in the Assyrian style and seated on a throne, with fan-bearers behind him,

<sup>1</sup> Proc. Bib. Arch. Soc., November 1881, pp. 16-19, 31-36; December 1882, p. 41; November 1897, pp. 286-292.

touches with his spear a crouching captive in native dress. The legend,<sup>1</sup> which is very roughly written and somewhat defaced, appears to relate how Artes (perhaps an Aryan chief) was brought out by his subjects from his royal city in the land of Erime, to the presence of the conqueror Targontimme of Gauzanitis. This latter, whose name recalls those of many other Mongol chiefs of Syria and Asia Minor, may have been the same ruler who calls himself "Tarkutimme of the land of Erime" on the bilingual boss, which presents so-called Hittite emblems with early cuneiform translation. The influence of Assyria had already, as early as 1500 B.C., carried the Semitic language and the cuneiform characters to Asia Minor, as we see from the letters of the princes of Elishah found in the Tell Amarna collection.

About 1400 B.C., or rather later, the 19th or Ramessid dynasty arose in Egypt, and entered into new relations with Syria. A Hittite dynasty had established itself at Kadesh on Orontes, and Saplel, who may have been the son or grandson of the Edugama above mentioned, was attacked by Rameses I.; but the success of the Egyptians seems to have been doubtful, and a treaty of alliance was concluded which left the Hittites their freedom. Seti I. was the second king of

<sup>1</sup> *Eli AN Targuuntimme Sar Mat Guza[na?] . . . melama Uru [ci] Sarutu izzau Artes Sar Mat Erime.*



the 19th Egyptian dynasty, and attempted the reconquest of the Syrian empire. He attacked Kanana—a place apparently near Hebron on the south—and subsequently invaded Syria, where he was opposed by Mautenar of Kadesh. His conquests appear to have extended to the Euphrates, and in his ninth year Kadesh was again taken. But these raids had little permanent result, and the decisive struggle was deferred till the reign of the famous son of Seti, known as Rameses II. or Miamun. He was crowned in his father's lifetime when only about twelve years old, and his long reign appears to have lasted some sixty years, dating probably from about 1330 B.C.

In the fifth year of the reign of Rameses the Great, perhaps after the reconquest of Ascalon, a confederacy of Syrian and other northern tribes opposed his advance on Kadesh.<sup>1</sup> It included the chiefs of Aleppo and Carchemish, the Leka or Ligyes of the Taurus, with others whose geographical position is uncertain, but extending from "the sea-coast to the land of the Hittites" and to Naharina. Kadesh—a city probably founded by some Semitic people, but which had been ruled for more than a century by Hittite kings—stood on the west bank of the Orontes near the head of the valley of the Eleutherus, which forms the pass through the Lebanon leading down to Semyra—a

<sup>1</sup> Third Sallier Papyrus. Translated by E. L. Lushington. Records of the Past (Old Series), vol. ii. p. 67 ff.

natural highway from the coast to the river-valley east of the great chain. The city was further protected by a stream to its west, flowing into the Orontes immediately north of the site, and by a ditch on the south between the two streams. It was fortified with walls and towers, and the great mound of its citadel still retains the ancient name of this "holy city" south of Emesa. The Egyptians advanced in four brigades, one following the king, one remaining at Shabatuna—possibly in the Eleutherus valley—one in the centre, and the fourth on the borders of the land of Amairo. The Hittites repulsed the first brigade, and surprised the king from an ambush north-west of Kadesh, false information having led the Egyptians to suppose that the Syrian army had retreated. They are said to have had 2500 chariots with three warriors in each. The prowess of Rameses, who is said to have charged the enemy alone in his chariot, is related in extravagant language; but the result of the battle was the defeat of the allies, and the subsequent submission of the city. The enemy are represented on the Egyptian sculptures as driven into the river, in which the prince of Aleppo was nearly drowned; and Rameses, either during this campaign or on a later occasion when the cause of offence was the destruction of his statues in the town of Tunep, advanced yet farther north, and appears to have conquered Aleppo. He left

statues along his route at Sidon, and beside the Dog river at Beirut, at Gebal, and even possibly near Damascus. In the eighth year he invaded Galilee, and subdued Shunem, Meirûn, Tabor, and Beth Anath. His *mohars* or officials exacted tribute all along the main route, between Aleppo and Achshaph near Accho, as well as in the plains of Lower Galilee, and as far east as Megiddo. The whole of the Philistine plain was subdued, but the mountains of Samaria and Judah were never apparently conquered, or any part of Gilead or Moab.

In his thirty-fourth year of rule Rameses married the daughter of Khetasar the king of Kadesh, and thirteen years earlier the famous treaty had been concluded with the Hittites, which gives evidence of their power and civilisation about the beginning of the thirteenth century B.C., when they were able to treat on equal terms with the Pharaoh; while it equally informs us of their religious ideas, and of the history of the kings of Kadesh. The more important clauses of the treaty may therefore be given in full:<sup>1</sup>—

In the twenty-first year, on the 21st of Tybi, in the reign of Ra-user-ma Rameses Meriamen, . . . came a royal herald . . . from Khetasar the suzerain of the Hittites. Copy of the silver plate which [he] sent by the hand of his herald Tartisbu [and of his herald Rames?] to Rameses the bull of monarchs, whose boundaries are

---

<sup>1</sup> See Chabas, 'Voyage d'un Egyptien' (1866), p. 33; and 'Records of the Past' (Old Series), vol. iv. p. 25 ff.



extended to every land at his pleasure—the covenant of Khetasar suzerain of the Hittites, the mighty son of Maurasar the mighty suzerain of the Hittites, grandson of Saplel. . . . The good terms of peace and brotherhood for ever which aforetime were ever [observed]. . . . It came to pass in the time of Mautenar suzerain of the Hittites, my brother, that he fought with the great king of Egypt, but thus shall it be henceforth from this day. Behold, Khetasar suzerain of the Hittites covenants to abide by the terms made before the Sun, before Set, regarding the land of Egypt and the land of the Hittites, in order that no quarrel may arise between them for ever. . . . After the death of my brother, I Khetasar sat on his father's throne as suzerain of the Hittites. . . .

The suzerain of the Hittites will never invade Egypt or carry away ought thence, nor shall Rameses Meriamen, the great king of Egypt, ever invade the land of the Hittites or carry away ought thence. The treaty of alliance which was made in the time of Saplel suzerain of the Hittites, as also the treaty of alliance made in the time of [Maurasar]<sup>1</sup> suzerain of the Hittites, my father, as I fulfil it so also, behold, Rameses Meriamen, the great king of Egypt, shall fulfil it; . . . both of us from this day will fulfil it, to carry out the intention of alliance. If any foe shall come to the lands of Rameses Meriamen, the great king of Egypt, and he shall send to the suzerain of the Hittites saying, "Come and help me against him," then shall the suzerain of the Hittites . . . smite that foe, and if [he] cannot come he shall send his footmen and horsemen . . . to smite his foe. . . . But if servants of the suzerain of the Hittites shall invade Rameses Meriamen, . . . [or if] they come from the lands of Rameses Meriamen, the great king of Egypt, to the suzerain of the Hittites, then shall [he] not receive them, but [he] shall send them to Ra-user-ma, beloved of the Sun, the great king of Egypt. . . . And if any come to

<sup>1</sup> The copy reads Mautenar by mistake.

do any business in the land of the Hittites, they shall not be added to the land of the Hittites, they shall be restored to Rameses Meriamen, the great king of Egypt. . . . And if any come to the land of Egypt to do business of any sort, then shall not Ra-user-ma, beloved of the Sun, the great king of Egypt, claim such: he shall cause them to be restored to the suzerain of the Hittites.

This tablet of silver is witnessed by a thousand gods, the warrior gods and the goddesses of the land of the Hittites, together with a thousand gods, the warrior gods and the goddesses of the land of Egypt. . . . Set of the Hittites, Set of the city A . . . , Set of the city Taranta, Set of the city Pairaka, Set of the city Khisasap, Set of the city Sarasu, Set of the city of [Aleppo?], . . . Set of the city Sarapaina, Astarata of the Hittites, the god of Taitat Kherri, the god of Ka . . . , the goddess of the city . . . , the goddess of Tain . . . , the god of . . . , [the gods of] the hills, of the rivers, of the land of the Hittites, the gods of the land Tawatana, Amen, the Sun, Set, the warrior gods and goddesses of the hills, the rivers, of the land of Egypt, . . . the great sea, the winds, the clouds.

As to these words on the silver tablet of the land of the Hittites, and of the land of Egypt, whoso shall not observe them, the thousand gods of the land of the Hittites, and the thousand gods of the land of Egypt shall be [against] his house, his family, his servants. But whoso shall observe these words on the silver tablet, be he Hittite [or Egyptian], the thousand gods of the land of the Hittites, and the thousand gods of the land of Egypt, shall give health to his [family] with himself and his servants.

If one man or two or three shall pass over [to the land of the Hittites, the suzerain of the Hittites] shall give them up again to Ra-user-ma, beloved of the Sun, the great king of Egypt; but whoever shall be given up [to him], let not his crime be set up against him, let him not [be smitten] himself, or his wives or his children. If one

man, or two, or three, pass over from the land of the Hittites, and come to Ra-user-ma, the great king of Egypt, let Rameses Meriamen seize [such] and cause them to be given up to the suzerain of the Hittites, . . . himself, and his wives, and children; but let him not be smitten to death or [lose] his eyes, his nose, or his feet, nor let his crime be set up against him.

That which is on the [other side] of the tablet of silver is the [image] of the figure of Set, . . . of Set the great ruler of heaven, the [witness] of the treaty made by Khetasar, the great king of the Hittites. . . .

This remarkable treaty appears to have been strictly observed, and it is possible that Merenptah (Mineptah), the son of Rameses, who acceded about 1270 B.C., may have been the offspring of the marriage with the Hittite princess. He continued to be on friendly terms with this powerful race, which thus maintained its independence in spite of attacks from the north, and which we still find noticed as late as 1000 B.C. (I Kings x. 29; cf. Josh. i. 4), ruled by their own princes, to whom Solomon was also allied by marriage, even if he was not himself the son of a Hittite mother.

In the first years of Mineptah, however, great troubles came on both the Hittites and the Egyptians through the invasion of the south by Aryan tribes from Asia Minor, who are represented as a fair blue-eyed people. They acted in concert with the white Libyans west of Egypt, who seem also to have been perhaps early Aryan colonists of North Africa, and they spoiled the lands of



Hittites and Amorites on their way to the Delta, so that a subsequent famine was only averted by sending corn in ships from Egypt.

Among these invaders<sup>1</sup> are mentioned the Akausha, the Tursha, the Luku (Lycians or Ligyes), the Shardana (from Sardis), the Shakalisha, and "all the lands north of the great sea." The double attack was, however, repelled in Egypt itself with great slaughter, and a recently discovered inscription of the fifth year of Miniptah relates his subsequent raid along the coasts of Palestine.<sup>2</sup> This text, after referring to the retreat of the Libyans, continues to declare the success of Egypt in Asia. "The Hittites," it says, "are quieted, Pa-Kanana is ravaged with all violence, Askadna is taken, Kazmel is seized, Yenu of the Amu is made as though it were not. The people of Israel (*I-si-ra-al*) is spoiled, it has no seed. Syria has become [as the widows?] of Egypt. All lands together are at peace. Every one that was a marauder has been subdued by King Merenptah, who gives life like the Sun every day." It will be noted that the Hittites are only said to be "quieted," being apparently aided rather than attacked by Mineptah, and that Pa-Kanana ("the city of Canaan") is the extreme point of advance along the shore, being a town noticed in the preceding reign between

<sup>1</sup> Records of the Past (Old Series), vol. iii. p. 39.

<sup>2</sup> Prof. W. M. Flinders Petrie, Contemporary Review, May 1896.

Tyre and Accho. Askadna is thought to be a clerical error for Ascalon. Yenu may be Janoah on the hills immediately east of Tyre (now called Yanûh); while the reference to Israel, in this connection, is naturally regarded as showing them to be already in Palestine, and living as a settled population, whose crops were destroyed, leaving them without seed. There is no difficulty in the matter if—as several scholars have already admitted—the 'Abiri of the fifteenth century B.C. are identified with the conquering Hebrews led by Joshua.<sup>1</sup> Their raid on Philistia in the reign of Amenophis III. occurred just at the time which is given in the Bible (I Kings vi. 1) for the Hebrew conquest of Palestine, or about 1480 B.C., and the opportunity for such conquest arose during a period of general rebellion against Egypt. The presence of the Egyptians in any part of Palestine is not indeed noticed in the Old Testament at this time; but the Egyptian garrison had been withdrawn, as the kings of southern Palestine inform us, shortly before the Hebrew invasion. In the time of Mineptah Israel had thus dwelt in the hill country west of Jordan for two centuries, yet naturally continued to be regarded as an enemy, and one sufficiently important to be mentioned with other nations of Asia.

Of Hebrew history between 1480 and 1100 B.C.

<sup>1</sup> This is admitted by Dr Winckler and Dr Zimmern in Germany, but denied by Dr Hommel and Dr Sayce.

we have only a fragmentary account in the Book of Judges, but three references to foreign history may be recognised, which coincide with the monumental records above mentioned. Shortly after the death of Joshua Israel was oppressed for eight years by Chushan Rishathaim, king of Aram Naharaim (Judges iii. 8). His name has not yet been recognised, but we have seen that the kings of Naharina took part in the attack on Palestine, and advanced at least as far south as Bashan, in the wars of the fifteenth century B.C. It may have been at this time that Othniel fought against the Cushite or Kassite monarch in question. In like manner the story of the oppression for twenty years of northern Israel by king Jabin II. of Hazor (Judges iv. 3) agrees with the history of Rameses II. Early in his reign Rameses took Tabor (the scene of Barak's subsequent victory) and other places in Galilee. Sisera, whose name may be the Egyptian *Ses-Ra* or "child of Ra," was the *sar* or "ruler" of the host of Hazor, and his chariots were stationed at Harosheth under Mount Carmel. He may have occupied the position of *paka*, or Egyptian resident, among the Canaanite kings of Lower Galilee after the eighth year of Rameses II.<sup>1</sup> The twenty years of oppression would endure till towards the later years of the great Pharaoh,

<sup>1</sup> In the song of Deborah (Judges v. 2) the word "Pharaohs" actually occurs as denoting the tyrants conquered.



when peace had already been made with the Hittites. The victory of Barak, calculating from the conquest in 1480 B.C., would have occurred about 1300 B.C., which quite agrees with the probable duration of the reign of Rameses II. It was naturally more important in the eyes of the Hebrews than in that of the Pharaoh, for we have many instances of similar revolts in which various *pakas* perished. With advancing age Rameses II. appears to have become less warlike, so that a period of some "forty years" of rest (Judges v. 31) may well have elapsed before the Syrian campaign of Mineptah. Accuracy is not attainable within a few years, but there is a remarkable coincidence between the statement of the Pharaoh that "Israel is spoiled, it has no seed," and the Bible account of a contemporary time of trouble (Judges vi. 4) lasting for seven years, when the allied foes "destroyed the increase of the earth till thou come to Gaza, and left no sustenance for Israel," until rescued by Gideon. For it is evident that the Midianites cannot have been the only invaders, since they are never found in the Philistine plains in other accounts. After the retreat of the Egyptians we hear of no further oppressions until the twelfth century B.C., when the Philistines became the strongest tribe of the south-west. And here also the monumental accounts appear to be in accord with Bible history.

A time of confusion followed the death of Mineptah, and for a while Arisu, a Phœnician, ruled in the Delta.<sup>1</sup> Rameses III. was the next native king able to restore for a time the waning fortunes of his race about 1200 B.C.; but he was attacked by the Aryans, who invaded the country of the Hittites and Amorites, and who appear to have advanced far south against Egypt. Among these tribes who "came by land and sea" to the Delta are mentioned the Purosata, the Zakkar, the Shakalisha, and the Danau. The latter are perhaps Danai or Greeks, while the Purosata or Pilista (as variously interpreted) have been thought to be Philistines. They are, however, in dress and feature indistinguishable from their Aryan allies, and may have been inhabitants of Prusias (or Broussa), in the far north-west of Anatolia. The Hittites and Phœnicians suffered most from this onset, and the Aryans pushed as far as Carchemish and Arvad, and "remained encamped in the land of the Amorites." Rameses III. appears to have driven back all these peoples "of the coasts and islands," and received tribute from Syria. There is nothing to show his presence in Palestine proper, but his fleet attacked Cyprus, while he himself invaded Zahi and Sahir (probably Seir) and reopened the Sinaitic mines. Among the names of thirty-nine cities which he claims to have

<sup>1</sup> Brugsch, *Hist. Egypt*, vol. ii. pp. 136-152.

conquered we find not only places like Carchemish in Syria, and Athena (probably Adana in Cilicia), but others, such as Salamis, Kition, Soli, Idalium, Akamas, and Kebyra, in Cyprus, which could only have been reached by ships; and it seems probable that—as in earlier times—the expedition was carried to the coasts of Syria and Cilicia by the Egyptian fleet.

This expedition is the latest historically known to have been carried by the Egyptians into the Hittite country, for the account of the visit of Rameses XII. to Naharina appears to be legendary. The Assyrians began to be so powerful in the north that their supremacy ceased to be questioned. In the time of Rameses XIV. they seem to have reached Egypt as conquerors, and there in the time of Rehoboam they founded the 22nd dynasty. Egypt was again split up into small states in the twelfth century B.C., and the only further notices of any attacks on Palestine are those found in the Bible, when the father-in-law of Solomon (1 Kings ix. 16) is said to have burned Gezer—being perhaps the energetic Saamen of the 21st dynasty; and again when Shishak swept over the country (1 Kings xiv. 25), as we learn from his own list of 133 conquered towns in Galilee and Judea.

With the decay of Egyptian power, after the time of Rameses III., we reach the close of the second period in the history of the Mongols of



Western Asia. From the dawn of history till about 1700 B.C. their power was unrivalled; and for five centuries after they held their own against Aryans, Assyrians, and even—in the far north—against the Egyptians. But the area of their rule was gradually restricted, and Semitic races replaced them in Palestine and dominated their scattered tribes from the Upper Tigris. The final period between 1200 and 700 B.C. shows us the gradual decay and final overthrow of the Hittite power in Syria, and the yet earlier subjection of the Kassites in Babylon. The story of Assyrian conquest throws much light on the relations of the various tribes which have been popularly grouped together as "Hittite"; and although the use of their peculiar script had ceased before 1500 B.C., it will be well to relate shortly how the Hittites fared in the times of the Hebrew monarchy.

## CHAPTER III.

## THE ASSYRIAN CONQUESTS IN SYRIA.

AFTER the death of the successful Assyrian king, Assur-Uballid—which apparently took place at the end of a long reign in about 1390 B.C.—the Assyrians were engaged in a constantly recurring struggle with the Kassites of Babylon, and only two kings are known to have invaded Syria between 1400 B.C. and the time of Solomon. The dissensions east of the Euphrates and the decay of Egypt led first to the increase of independent power among the northern Hittites, whose great city—Carchemish—barred the passage of the Euphrates; and secondly, to the rise of the Hebrew kingdom under David and Solomon. Not until about eighty years after the death of the latter was any Assyrian ruler to carry his arms victoriously to the Mediterranean after the early raids of Assur-Risisi and Tiglath-Pileser I., which are about to be noticed.

Glancing back to the Kassite history, it appears that the 1st dynasty of Babylon came to an end

about 1948 B.C., and was followed by eleven Mon-gol kings of *Uruk* (probably Erech), who reigned altogether for 358 years, down to 1590 B.C. The records of the 3rd dynasty (mainly Kassites) are much injured on the only historic tablet that we possess. The best known of these monarchs is Burnaburias, who, as we have seen, was the contemporary of Amenophis IV. He may have been the eleventh king of the line, and probably acceded about 1440 B.C. Ten years later he had made peace with Assur-Uballid, and married the daughter of the latter; but in his earlier letters he writes of an expected Assyrian attack. Assur-Uballid appears to have had a long reign, since he saw his grandson on the throne of Babylon, as already related; but, as women are married in the East at the age of twelve or fourteen, he may not have been much older than Burnaburias, whom he survived for many years—setting up on the throne of Babylon a son of Burnaburias called Kurigalzu II.<sup>1</sup> The latter, however, quarrelled with the next Assyrian king, Bel-Nirari, and sought aid from the ancient enemy of the Kassites—the king of Elam. The alliance led to another attack on Babylon by Bel-Nirari, and the Kassites were again defeated; while two generations later they once more suffered under Nazi-Urutas (about 1330 B.C.) at the hands of Rimmon-Nirari.

<sup>1</sup> According to Dr Peters (*Nippur*, vol. ii. pp. 133, 255), Kurigalzu II. made conquests in Elam.



The great city of Nineveh already existed, and already had a shrine of Istar in its midst, in the fifteenth century B.C.; but the Assyrian capital is believed not to have been transferred northwards to it, from the town of Assur, until the reign of Shalmaneser I., successor of Rimmon-Nirari, who acceded about 1320 B.C. Another war followed in the reign of Tiglath-Adar, son of Shalmaneser, who took Babylon in 1292 B.C.; but somewhat later the tide of Assyrian success was checked, when, in 1220 B.C., Bel-Kudur-esser of Assyria was slain by the king of Babylon, and his successor, Adar-Pileser, was hemmed in by the Hittites and by other tribes. He died about 1200 B.C., and the next king of Nineveh, Assur-Dan, is said to have had a long and prosperous reign, and made further inroads into Babylonia. The power of the Kassites steadily decreased, and that of Assyria was consolidated, by a succession of kings handing down the sceptre from father to son, until in 1150 B.C. Assur-Risisi extended his conquests, not only in Armenia and Babylonia, but far south in Syria, where he left his monument carved on the cliff of the Dog river north of Beirut. He was followed, about 1130 B.C., by a still more famous son — Tiglath-Pileser I., who, in the first five years of his reign, claims to have subdued forty-three kings, from the borders of Babylon to the mountains, and in the land of the Hittites as far as “the upper sea of sunset.” We learn, however, from other

accounts that, later in his reign, he was less successful against the Kassite ruler of Babylon, and a period of weakness follows, during which the Assyrian nominees, allied by marriage to the kings of Nineveh, appear to have been set up and dethroned in Babylon, according as the Semitic race in the north, and the Mongols of the south (Kassites and Elamites), prevailed in an equally matched struggle—as when Assur-Bel-Kala established Rimmon-Baladan, his son-in-law, who was succeeded by Kassite monarchs about 1110 B.C., after which the names of Babylonian rulers are sometimes Semitic, sometimes Mongolic. The Assyrian royal house decayed during the eleventh century, and Babylon still remained the capital of a separate kingdom down to 1012 B.C., when the 1st Assyrian dynasty took the throne. We hear of various short dynasties—probably contemporary—including kings of the “sea-coast”; but there is as yet a gap in Assyrian history from 1085 to 935 B.C., filled only by the names of Assur-Nirari, and Nebo-Dan. The power of the Ninevites cannot, however, have been entirely lost, as we learn from Egyptian sources. About 1000 B.C. a king called Naromath, “the great king, the king of Assyria,” died at Abydos in Egypt,<sup>1</sup> where his body was burned. He was the father of Shishak, the enemy of Rehoboam, and his mother—married to an earlier Shishak, king of Assyria—was the

<sup>1</sup> Brugsch, *Hist. Egypt*, vol. ii. pp. 197-202.

daughter apparently of Rameses XIV. Naromath plundered the altar of Abydos; yet after his death a statue was there set up, with an inscription "in the language of Babylon," in which he was called "king of kings." It would seem, therefore, that he must have been a conqueror, who reached Egypt either by sea or along the Palestine coast, in the time of David, although no monuments of this invasion are known to tell the story of the first establishment of an Assyrian dynasty in the Delta.

Turning to the victories of Tiglath-Pileser I., already mentioned, we find an important account of the tribes which he encountered in Syria,<sup>1</sup> in the well-known annals of his first five campaigns, which have often been translated with minor differences of interpretation. In his first year (about 1130 B.C.) he pushed west into Commagene, where five petty kings of the Moschai (the Old Testament Meshech), ruling in Western Armenia, had for half a century exacted tribute, and were able to assemble an army of 20,000 men. Conquest in this region, and in the next year on the Tigris near Diarbekr, and at Malatiya on the borders of Armenia, opened the road westwards to the region of the Kaska tribe, west of the latter city. These tribesmen appear to have belonged to the Mongol population of Asia Minor, and they were aided by "soldiers of the Hittites" from Urum

<sup>1</sup> Records of the Past (New Series), vol. i. p. 86.



on the Euphrates in an attack on Commagene. The Assyrians drove back the tribesmen and took 120 chariots. Further wars in the east followed, extending to the "upper sea," probably the Caspian, before the campaign of vengeance west of the Euphrates was attempted; but in his fourth year Tiglath-Pileser again advanced to Malatiya and to the land of Khani-rabbat—the old kingdom already noticed as ruled by the Minyan king Dusratta. The whole of Southern Armenia appears to have been still held by Mongol tribes, but without any central authority; and the Assyrian soldiers were floated over the Euphrates on inflated sheepskins, and reached "the city of Carchemish in the land of the Hittites," taking also three towns near Bisri, which is thought to be the famous fortress of Tell Bashar farther north—a place whence seals with "Hittite" characters have been recovered. The expedition was pushed westwards to the Mediterranean; and, near Arvad in Northern Phœnicia, Tiglath-Pileser embarked on this sea and hunted a porpoise. He speaks also of the wild bulls which he hunted near Carchemish, and of the elephants found near Harran, east of the Euphrates, of which four were taken alive. Elephants in the same district have already been noticed in the sixteenth century B.C. Lions also were still numerous, and Tiglath-Pileser slew 120 on foot and 800 from his chariot. Like his Babylonian

predecessors, he also prized the cedars of the Northern Lebanon, and transplanted some of them to Assyria. His campaign thus gives us a glimpse of Hittite history in the twelfth century B.C., and shows the condition of the countries west of Assyria, where the Mongol tribes were fairly able, as a rule, to hold their own against weaker kings than this Assyrian conqueror.

The next account of these regions dates about 270 years later, after the great gap in Assyrian records. The kings of Nineveh, while conquering in the Armenian mountains, and striving to form a permanent union with Babylon, appear, as far as is known, to have left Syria in peace until the accession, in 883 B.C., of Assur-Nasirpal, who has left a long account of his victories. On the north and east he penetrated into part of Kurdistan and of the region round Ararat, which he says no former kings of Assyria had reached. On the west he advanced to the Mediterranean over Lebanon, and received tribute from the Phœnician cities of Gebal, Sidon, and Tyre, as well as presents from Egypt.

Through Commagene Assur-Nasirpal<sup>1</sup> reached the towns of Surieh and Helebi, the first on the west bank of the Euphrates between the mouths of the Khabur and the Belikh, and the latter a little above the point where the Belikh joins the Euphrates. The power of Assyria seems by this

<sup>1</sup> Records of the Past (New Series), vol. ii. p. 128.

time to have been so fully recognised that the tribes submitted, as a rule, without fighting; and the gifts received from "the son of Bakhian of the land of the Hittites, and the kings of Khanirabbat," included not only oxen, sheep, and horses, but also silver, gold, lead, and copper. The racial connection with the Kassites may account for the advance of "soldiers of the land of the Kassî," together with the Kaldu or Chaldeans of Lower Mesopotamia, who were defeated by Assur-Nasirpal after this first expedition to the borders of Syria. He subsequently marched again to Carchemish, and received as tribute from Sangara the "king of the Hittites" twenty talents of silver, beads, chains, sword scabbards of gold, 100 talents of copper and 250 talents of iron, with spoils of his palace (or temple), including bronze (or copper) objects representing sacred bulls, and bowls, libation-cups, and censers, as well as couches, seats, thrones, dishes, ivory instruments, and 200 slave-girls. The Assyrians seem to have specially prized the embroidered robes of linen and fine stuffs in black and purple, which are noticed with gems and elephants' tusks in this record. Chariots, horses, and prisoners were also carried away to Nineveh from Carchemish.

The advance continued westwards to 'Azzaz, in the country of Lubarna king of the Khattinai; and the Assyrians crossed the Afrîn river to Kunalua (supposed to be Gindarus), his capital. The spoil



taken was similar to that from Carchemish, including a thousand oxen and ten thousand sheep. Female musicians are also noticed, and the *pagiti* or maces, which were sceptres of "great lords," such as the Egyptians mention earlier among the Hittites, and which are represented on the Mer'ash bas-relief. Other unknown tribes were next encountered, before the river Orontes was reached and the country of Yarakî near Hamath. Lubarna appears to have ruled over a wide region, and the Khattinai were probably a Hittite tribe. The corn of the Hittites was reaped, and various enemies were empaled, while colonists from Assyria were settled in the country. The slopes of Lebanon were crossed, and the "great sea of the West" was seen, and adored with sacrifices. Tribute came from Arvad, an island city "in the midst of the sea," as well as from the "kings of the coast," including those of Tyre, Sidon, and Gebal. The objects noticed are the same as above mentioned, including linen vestments, maces great and small, precious woods, seats of ivory, and "a porpoise offspring of the sea." From Amanus (the Northern Lebanon near Antioch) were brought logs of cedar, pine, box, and cypress. The whole account gives evidence of the great wealth and civilisation of the region, and of the intermingling of Semitic and Mongol tribes, to whom a new element was added in the Assyrian colonists.

These conquests were maintained during the next reign — that of Shalmaneser II., son of Assur-Nasirpal, who ruled from 858 to 823 B.C., and of whom several important inscriptions are known, including the famous “black obelisk.” His victories extended from the Caspian and the Persian Gulf, Media and Cappadocia, to the Orontes and to Phœnicia, but he met with stubborn resistance from a league of twelve Syrian princes, although his army, which was specially strong in archers, numbered perhaps 100,000 men. The safety of his dominions was secured by alliance with Babylon; but on the north we hear for the first time of the appearance of a new race, which was destined to bring about the ruin of Assyria — namely, the Medes, who were encountered in Armenia. The old Mongol population of the regions round Lake Van, and in Matiene, had probably by this time been destroyed or greatly reduced by Assyrian invasions, but a new dynasty had established itself at Lake Van, and had adopted the cuneiform script for rock-cut texts in their own Aryan language. The names of these kings appear also to be Aryan, and Argistis, the fourth of the dynasty, about 800 B.C. warred with Rimmon-Nirari III., and appears to have been victorious over various tribes. The texts are not as yet read with certainty, but Argistis speaks of the *Khati* among his enemies, between Malatiya and

Nereb (in Syria), and the new Aryan invaders thus appear to have been also enemies of the Syrian Mongols. This further change in the character of the population of Western Asia will be found important in connection with the question of the "Hittite" texts, and further evidence of the presence of Aryans on the borders of Assyria is furnished by texts of later kings down to Sargon.

Turning to the records of Shalmaneser II.,<sup>1</sup> we may consider the main points of interest in his two great texts. During thirty years of fighting he came nearly every year into Syria, or sent his generals to maintain his authority; and, although the record of his conquests is incomplete, the gradual extension of Assyrian power to Cilicia on the west, and to Damascus and Bashan on the south, is made clear. Even in the first year of his reign (858 B.C.) he marched to the Mediterranean near Antioch, and in the second he received tribute — silver, gold, oxen, sheep, and wine—from Katazilu of Commagene. Tell Barsip, which is thought to be Birejik on the Euphrates, was attacked, and 1300 soldiers of Ahuni, son of Adini, were slain. The Gamgums were a people living west of this crossing-place under a king named Mutalli. They presented tribute like that of Commagene; and the advance thence was on

<sup>1</sup> Records of the Past (New Series), vol. iv. pp. 39, 53. Schrader, *Cuneif. Inscript.* and *Old Testament*, vol. i. pp. 183-209.



Samalla, now known to be an important city on the plateau commanding the principal pass to the Gulf of Issus. The chief of this region was Hayan, son of Gabbar—a Semitic ruler apparently of Phœnician race—with whom were allied Sangara of Carchemish and Ahuni of Birejik. The confederacy was defeated, and the submission of the Gamgums seems to have led to an alliance with Assyria—Mutalli presenting his daughter with a dowry to Shalmaneser, who set up his own statue at the foot of the Amanus near Samalla, and, turning south to the Orontes, attacked the Khattinai in the region west of Aleppo.

In the third year (856 B.C.) Ahuni advanced across the Euphrates from Tell Barsip, and was defeated by Shalmaneser, who crossed the river in flood (in April or May), and burned 200 villages near Tell Bashar. Passing south, by Dabigu (now Toipuk) east of 'Azzaz, through the lands of Carchemish, he received tribute from the Khattinai—including three talents of gold, 100 of silver, 300 of copper, and 300 of iron, with 1000 bronze vases and 1000 embroidered robes; and in this instance again took away a Mongol princess with a dowry, and imposed a yearly tribute, stated to have consisted of a talent of gold, 100 logs of cedar, and other gifts. From Samalla like riches were extorted, with cedar-resin, flocks and herds; and a Phœnician princess with a dowry was accepted. Such tribute was, however,

only paid when enforced. And the expedition seems to have been repeated in the fourth year, when Pethor was the crossing-place of the Euphrates south of Carchemish, the advance thence being by the valley of Antioch, and the return farther north by Mer'ash, where a road was cut in the mountains; and Armenia was traversed as far as Ararat on the way home to Nineveh.

The campaign of the fifth year (854 B.C.) was one of the most arduous, for the whole of Syria—as far south at least as Damascus—was leagued to oppose the insatiable ambition of Assyria, and to shake off the heavy yoke and annual exactions which single tribes could not resist. On sheep-skin floats the Assyrian force of about 120,000 soldiers crossed the Euphrates in flood a second time. Kundaspi of Commagene, Lalli of Malatiya, Hayan of Samalla, Girparuda of the Khattinai, and Girparuda of the Gamgums, hastened to offer tribute of gold, silver, copper, and lead (meeting the king at Pethor), as being “under the yoke.” Aleppo also submitted, and offerings were made to Hadad its god; but south of this the road along the Orontes was barred by the allies of Hamath, who mustered altogether nearly 4000 chariots and 62,000 fighting men.

The twelve kings so allied included Hadadezer of Damascus, Irkhulena of Hamath, Ahab of Sirlai (an unknown site), with the Guai near the borders

of Cilicia, the Phœnicians of Arvad, Arkah, Huzu (probably el Ghaziyeh near Sidon), Baashah of Amanus, Adonibel of Sizana, and Gindub the Arab with a thousand camels. The Hamathite fortresses were wasted, and a great battle near Karkar on the Orontes is said to have led to the defeat of the allies, who fled, leaving 14,000 slain. But the Assyrian advance was checked for a time, and in the following year (853 B.C.) Hadadezer and Irkhulena roused the "kings of the Hittites" and of the "sea-coasts," and advanced on Assyria, "trusting in each other's might." They lost, however, 20,500 men, with chariots, horses, and baggage; and the struggle between Nineveh and Damascus remained undecided, and does not seem certainly to have been renewed for thirteen years, although in 849 B.C. (the tenth of Shalmaneser) tribute from Carchemish included a Hittite princess with a dowry, while in the following season many Hittite and Hamathite towns were raided, Hadadezer with his eleven allies being put to flight. The Assyrian lands, in which new colonists were settled, now included all the north of Syria to the borders of Hamath, and in the thirteenth year (846 B.C.) tribute was taken from the "Land of Yadaï" round Samalla, this region being again visited in 842 B.C., the seventeenth of Shalmaneser.

The subjection of Hamath was evidently next brought about, though the record is wanting, for in 840 B.C. Hazael of Damascus found himself



forced to meet the invader on the slopes of Hermon. Of this final success in the south in the eighteenth year of his reign, Shalmaneser tells us that, crossing the Euphrates for the sixteenth time, he marched on Bashan:—

Hazael of Damascus trusted to the number of his host, and gathered his armies without number, and made Shenir [or Hermon], the topmost mountain east of Lebanon, his stronghold. I strove with him and beat him; sixteen thousand of his warriors I overcame with the sword. Eleven hundred and twenty-one of his chariots, four hundred and seventy of his horsemen, I took from him with his baggage. To save his life he fled away. I pursued after him and went down to Damascus, his royal city. I besieged him. I destroyed his gardens. I went to the land of Hauran. I destroyed unnumbered towns. I wasted and burned with fire. I carried off his prisoners without number. I marched to the mountains of Baal Ras close to the sea [probably near Beirut]. I set up my royal image at that place; and at that time I took tribute of the Tyrians, of the Sidonians, of Jehu son of Omri.

The statue of a Shalmaneser still stands on the cliff above the sea near the Dog river, to attest this victory which placed all Syria at the mercy of Assyria. The Hittite power, which had long barred the way to Palestine, was broken down; and the fear of further conquest fell on Israel. But although in the next year (839 B.C.) another campaign was made, in which four cities were taken from Damascus, and tribute received from Tyre, Sidon, and Gebal, the attention of the

Assyrians was for a time diverted to countries farther north, and to the consolidation of their new possessions in Northern Syria.

In the twenty-second year (836 B.C.) the army of Shalmaneser took a route by Malatiya in Armenia, to the forests near the head of the Jihun river, and the valleys of the tribes of Tubal in Cappadocia, where twenty-four petty kings were then ruling. The silver-mines in these spurs of the Taurus seem to have been the object of the campaign, and marble and woods were also seized. The way to Cilicia was thus opened, and next year the Cappadocians gave tribute, while the wars were directed against the Parsua, who lived on the south-west of Lake Urumia, east of Nineveh. It was not till the twenty-fifth year (833 B.C.) that further attempts on the far west were made, when the cities of the Guai north of Antioch were attacked, from across the Amanus. A year later these tribes, ruled by Tulka—apparently a Mongol—gave tribute of silver, gold, sheep, and oxen, while those farther west fled inland to the mountains; and Tarsus in Cilicia submitted to the Assyrians, Pikhirim the Cilician king being defeated.

In the twenty-eighth year (830 B.C.) troubles arose among the Khattinai, who murdered Lubarna the Assyrian vassal king. Shalmaneser himself no longer led his army, but sent his *tartan* or "great chief" to Kunalua near the Afrin

river, where, on the submission of the tribe, a great statue of the king was carved, and tribute of silver, gold, lead, copper, iron, and ivory exacted. The rebellion appears to have been fermented by Sapalulme the new king, allied with Sangara of Carchemish, and Hayan of Samalla, though the reference in this case may be to an earlier year. This was the last of Shalmaneser's wars in Syria, and the latest campaign was led by a *tartan* in the thirtieth year against Artasari, apparently an Aryan ruler of the Minyans near Lake Van, and of the Parsua farther east. In the thirty-fifth year of his victorious reign (823 B.C.) Shalmaneser died, having added to the empire a rich and civilised province in Syria, which was held for more than two hundred years afterwards by the Assyrians, besides enlarging his borders on the north and east. The ruin of the Hittite power dates from the early years of his reign.

Shamash-Rimmon II. succeeded his father, but reigned only thirteen years, till 810 B.C., when Rimmon-Nirari III., the grandson of Shalmaneser II., acceded. Shamash-Rimmon fought only with Arameans and Elamites, but his successor was forced to assert his authority in Syria, as well as against the Minyans. He attacked Arpad (thirteen miles north-west of Aleppo) in 806 B.C., and 'Azzaz in the same region during the following year; but no great resistance seems to have been



encountered, and tribute was offered by Tyre, Sidon, Damascus, and even Edom. His record runs as follows,<sup>1</sup> after noticing the building of temples and expeditions into Kurdistan:—

I conquered the mountain to its farthest extent, to the great sea of sunrise from beyond the river Euphrates, the land of the Hittites, the land of the Amorites, to the limits of the land of Tyre, the land of Sidon, the land of Omri, the land of Edom, the land of Philistia, to the great sea where the sun sets. I made them give tribute. I also marched against the land of Damascus. I shut up Mari, king of the land, in his royal city Damascus. The terror of Assur his lord cast him to the ground: he embraced my feet, he offered allegiance. I received 2300 talents of silver, 20 talents of gold, 3000 talents of copper, 5000 talents of iron, embroidered robes of cloth, an ivory couch, ivory images. I took away his goods, his treasure, his property, uncouneted from Damascus his royal city, from within his palace.

The condition of Syria was thus that of a tributary region; but the tribute was perhaps only paid when an expedition was sent to demand it. Damascus still remained, under its native kings, the last bulwark protecting Israel from the north, but Galilee had already been overrun by the Syrians (1 Kings xv. 20), and the dissensions of the southern states rendered them helpless against any sudden attack. The recently discovered inscriptions of Samalla (Sinjirli) cast further light on the condition of the region near the Taurus, and prove that the inhabitants were

<sup>1</sup> Schrader, *Cuneif. Inscript. and Old Testament*, vol. i. p. 203.

Semitic, using the Phoenician alphabet and language, and forming a link between the Amorites and Arvadites to the south, and the old Semitic population of Cilicia and Western Cappadocia, which has been already mentioned. It appears that Hayan, son of Gabbar, was succeeded by Bar-Karal, in the time of Shamash-Rimmon; and the latter by his son Panammu I., whose statue of Hadad is inscribed with a text conveying some historic indications.<sup>1</sup> We learn that Yadai, the land of which Samalla was the capital, was a country of corn, wine, and oil, prospering under its native kings in the absence of the Assyrians, and unaffected by the conquests of Jeroboam II., which probably followed the ruin of Damascus in 806 B.C. (2 Kings xiv. 25), but which extended only to Hamath. In 803 B.C., however, Panammu I. was probably visited when Rimmon-Nirari marched west to the sea, for a later text at Samalla speaks of the troubles of the country as then beginning, and lasting seventy years, and of the destruction of flocks and herds, wheat and barley, the increase of debt and scarcity of food.

Shalmaneser III., following Rimmon-Nirari III. in 781 B.C., was mainly concerned with Armenia, though he advanced in 775 B.C. to the "cedar country," and two years later to Damascus.

<sup>1</sup> See Quarterly Statement, Pal. Expl. Fund, January 1896, pp. 60-77.

Assur-Dan III. acceded in 771 B.C., and a rebellion in Arpad was quelled in the last year of his reign. The Assyrian royal house was decaying, and no conquests are recorded of the next king, Assur-Nirari, who acceded in 753, and whose reign closed with the rebellion of Calah in 746 B.C. Until the rise of a new dynasty, when Tiglath-Pileser II. took the throne, in the following year, Syria appears to have been left in peace, and the fear of Assyria passed away for a time; but the conquests of this new and vigorous ruler were carried farther than those of any of his predecessors, and included the final overthrow of Damascus, with raids far south into Philistia. From the spring of 745 B.C. down to 728 B.C. his wars were incessant, and only the last year of his life appears to have been passed in peace. The first two campaigns were against Babylon and Media, when Tiglath-Pileser assumed the ancient titles "king of Babylon, king of Sumir and Akkad, king of the four quarters," in addition to that of king of Assyria. It was not until 743 B.C. that he advanced on Arpad, and besieged the city for three years, in the second of which Azariah of Judah aided the nineteen Hamathite districts which revolted — an alliance which would seem to have existed throughout the half-century of Azariah's reign (2 Kings xiv. 28). The text is broken, and is thought to refer to Azariah's becoming tributary,



but may perhaps rather relate to the tribute of Hamath during its defection from Assyria. The north of Syria had shaken off the yoke, and the Hamathites had conquered as far as the Amanus in the north-west, with other districts of uncertain position "on the shores of the sea of sunset. In their wickedness they plotted with Azariah to revolt. I restored their country to Assyria, I set up over them my officers and residents."<sup>1</sup>

The first period of Syrian campaigns, under Tiglath-Pileser II., occupied five years in all. In 739 B.C. the Hamathites were carried away captive, and the Hittites gave tribute, and the record of this or of the next year shows the completeness of Assyrian success:—

"I received tribute of Kustaspi of Commagene, Rezin of Damascus, Menahem of Samaria, Hiram of Tyre, Sibitbel of Gebal, Urik of the Guai, Pisiris of Carchemish, Iniel of Hamath, Panammu of Samalla, Tarkulara of the Gamgums, Sulumal of Malatiya, Dadil of the Kaska, Vassurmi of Tubal," and of other obscure tribes, including even "Zabibi, queen of the Arabs." For four years the submission of the west was thus preserved without further wars. In 734 B.C., however, Syria became the base of an advance along the shores of the Mediterranean, by Semyra and Arka, as far as Gaza in Philistia. The succession of

<sup>1</sup> Schrader, *Cuneif. Inscript. and Old Testament*, vol. i. pp. 209, 242-249.

events is not quite certain, but either in this year or after the fall of Damascus, tribute was received from the whole of Palestine east and west of Jordan, the Assyrian advance through Bashan being pushed even to Moab, while according to the Bible Upper Galilee was also wasted (2 Kings xv. 29).

The fall of Damascus, in 732 B.C., led to the submission of Ahaz of Judah. The citizens of the Syrian capital, which was besieged during the raid on Gilead, were impaled on its capture, the trees were hewn down, and the native dynasty displaced. Pekah was set on the throne of Samaria, and during the following year, while wars in Babylonia began against Merodach-Baladan, there was a temporary respite in the west. But apparently in 729 B.C. a further expedition to the south took place, when Pekah was slain, and Hoshea of Samaria became an Assyrian vassal in his stead. The triumphal inscription of the last year of Tiglath-Pileser II. records the result of his wars as follows:—

[I received tribute of] Matanbel of Arvad, Sanibu [Shinab] of Beth Ammon, Solomon of Moab, . . . Mitinti of Ascalon, Ahaz of Judah, Kausmelek of Edom, . . . Hanun of Gaza.

During the same period the final submission of Samalla took place. In 734 B.C. the Assyrians took 800 captives or hostages from this region, and its king fled to Damascus. Panammu II. was, however, taken thence, and restored as an Assyrian vassal to his throne, according to the

inscription of his son Bar-Rakab, which has been found in the ruins of this Phœnician city of the far north, and which recounts the miseries of the country before the king of Assyria:—

Restored the captivity of Yadai . . . and set up [my father] on his father's throne, and made it better than aforetime. And I myself have increased the wheat and the barley, and the flocks, and the grain in my day, and have eaten thereof. . . . There is cheapness of price in my day. My father Panammu set up many owners of villages, and . . . was great among kings. Did not he own silver and gold through his wisdom and goodness. He received orders from his protector the king of Assyria. . . . The Assyrian chiefs were brethren of Yadai, and his lord the king of Assyria favoured him beyond other kings. He was great . . . in the sight of his lord Tiglath-Pileser, king of Assyria, who is obeyed . . . from the rising of the sun to the going down [of the same], in the four quarters of the earth, and has been gracious to the west and to the east. And my father [was given] borders by his lord Tiglath-Pileser king of Assyria from the border of Gargam . . . (Carchemish). Moreover, my father Panammu was very careful of fealty to his lord, Tiglath-Pileser king of Assyria: he was very obedient, . . . and his people have mourned him as king, and all those who obey his lord the king of Assyria have mourned him. He took the king of Assyria for his lord. . . . He spoke to him, and made him build a palace, and he brought my father from Damascus, to prosper during all the days of his reign. And I myself am Bar-Rakab; for the goodness of my father and of myself my lord the king of Assyria has placed me on [the throne] of my father Panammu, the son of Bar-Tsur.

This text, which concludes by dedicating the statue before the tomb of Panammu to "Hadad



god and cherub, lord of the house, and Sun, and to every god of Yadai," as a memorial "before God and before men," receives a strange commentary in the existence of records which show that in 681 B.C., or half a century later, the native house of Samalla was swept away, and an Assyrian official took their place.

Shalmaneser IV. succeeded his father in 727 B.C., but his annals have not been discovered. He is said by a Greek writer to have besieged Tyre, and cut off its supply of water through the great aqueduct;<sup>1</sup> and he began the siege of Samaria, which city was taken in 722 B.C., or in the first year of his famous successor Sargon, who accomplished the final ruin of Carchemish in 717 B.C., transporting the Hittites, as he had before transported Israel, to new homes in the far east, and replacing them by Babylonians. The Bull Inscription of Sargon speaks of his conquest of "all the land of Tabal, the land of Beth Burutas, the land of Cilicia," and (on a cylinder text) of "the land of Ararat, the land of the Kaskai, the land of Tabal, as far as the land of the Moschi." But in Palestine the Assyrian authority was still disputed by the kings of Judah. In 720 B.C., Yehubidi the Semitic king of Hamath revolted, and was defeated at Karkar and skinned alive. Sargon then advanced against So the king of Egypt to Raphia, Hanun of Gaza being captured,

<sup>1</sup> Menander. See Josephus, *Antiq.*, ix. 14: 2 Kings xvii. 3, 5; xviii. 9.

and in 717 B.C. Pisisis of Carchemish suffered the same fate; but later wars were against Media, where the Aryan power was steadily growing, and where a king bearing the Persian or Medic name Bagadatta was attacked. In 715 B.C. tribes from Hamath, and others from districts in Mesopotamia, were transplanted to Assyria, and Sargon claims to have received tribute from Egypt, from Samsi of Arabia, and Ithamar of Saba. In 712 B.C. Tarkhunazi (a Mongol chief of Malatiya) was subdued, and in the next year Tarkhulara (also probably a Mongol) was set over the Gamgums, and Ashdod in Philistia was captured. A year later Merodach-Baladan of Babylon was dethroned, and in 709 B.C. tribute was taken from Cyprian kings. There is a curious notice of the Hittites in connection with Ashdod as follows:—

Azuri king of Ashdod would not give tribute, he hardened his heart, he sent to the kings near him to revolt from Assyria. I therefore wrought vengeance. I set up Ahimiti his own brother to rule over them. The people of the Hittites plotting rebellion despised his rule. Yaman, not a royal person, who like them knew not the duty of tribute, they set over themselves.

On the advance of Sargon Yaman fled to "a district of Egypt on the borders of Nubia." The Assyrians besieged Ashdod, and "took his gods, his wife, his sons, his daughters, his goods, his treasures, his valuables, with hostages of the people of his land."

The king of Egypt gave up the fugitive, who was brought captive in chains before Sargon in Assyria. The interesting point in this account is the appearance of Hittites in Philistia;<sup>1</sup> but as Carchemish, which Sargon calls the city of "the king of the Hittites," had already been destroyed, and its population removed, it is possible that some of the fugitives had taken refuge in the far south, where they endeavoured to set up a king over the Semitic Philistines.

Sargon was succeeded by Sennacherib, whose famous attack on Hezekiah and on Egypt in 702 B.C. was unsuccessful. That the Assyrians met with some great disaster near the borders of Egypt seems to be shown, not only by the Bible account or by the statement of Herodotus, but also by an inscription of Tirhakah of Egypt in the Gizeh Museum, which speaks of a campaign in Syria against Arvad, the Hittites, and as far as the borders of Assyria. Sennacherib ruled from 705 to 686 B.C., but he never appears to have again entered Palestine. He is known monumentally to have been murdered by his son (compare 2 Kings xix. 37), and was succeeded by another son, Esarhaddon. He was mainly engaged in later years with wars against Babylon, and his annals

<sup>1</sup> Khorsabad Text (Botta, 149, 6): *Am Khatti dabib zararti bilut su iziru ma. Yamani la bel kussi sa kima sasunu ma palakh biluti la idu urabbu elisunu.*



cities I had wasted from his land. I gave them to Mitinti king of Ashdod, to Padi king of Ekron, to Zilbel king of Gaza. I diminished his land. . . . The fear of my majesty overcame even Hezekiah, and he sent his favourite soldiers whom he had gathered to defend Jerusalem his royal city. He paid tribute, 30 talents of gold, 800 talents of silver molten, with many rubies and sapphires, a throne of ivory, tusks, hides of elephants, and precious woods of all kinds known, a great treasure; and noble ladies of his palace, slaves and slave-women, he sent after me to Nineveh my royal city, giving tribute; and as my servant he sent his envoy.

The conquest of Palestine was delayed by this resistance for a century, and was effected not by the Assyrians but by the Babylonians after the fall of Nineveh. Esarhaddon held Syria, and set up a magnificent monolith at Samalla, in which he records his third expedition to Egypt in 670 B.C. Manasseh was his tributary in Jerusalem, and this successful monarch calls himself "king of Assur, suzerain of Babylon, king of Sumir and Akkad, king of the kings of Egypt, of Pathros, of the land of Cush." In 673 B.C. he mentions as tributaries "twenty-two kings of the Hittites and of the sea-coast," but the old Mongol names are no longer found in his lists, the petty monarchs being all Semitic except in Cyprus (already conquered by Sennacherib), where they are clearly Greek. The gradual extermination of the Mongols is witnessed by the disappearance of the name of the Hittites, in the palmy days of Assyrian rule over all Western Asia, from Media to Cilicia,

say little of the condition of the west ; but certain important passages in the account of his great expedition may be noted :<sup>1</sup>—

In my third campaign I went to the land of the Hittites. I conquered Luli king of Sidon. . . . The great Sidon, the little Sidon, Beth Zeit, Sarepta, Mahaliba, Usu, Achzib, Accho, his strong towns, his places of pasture and water, the stations of his army, by force of the arms of Assur I overcame. They submitted to me. I set Tubel on the king's throne over them. I imposed on him an offering of tribute to my government, as an unalterable yearly payment—on both Menahem of Samsimuruna and Tubel of Sidon : on Abdeleth of Arvad, Urumelek of Gebal, Mitinti of Ashdod, Puduel of Beth Ammon, Melekram of Moab, the kings of the land of the Amorites all of them.

The text continues to relate the battle near Joppa in which Tirhakah was defeated, and the advance on Ekron, Ascalon, and Lachish, with which we are not immediately concerned. The passage as to Hezekiah slurs over the fact that Jerusalem was never reached save by envoys:—

But as for Hezekiah of the land of Judah, who was not subject to my yoke, 46 of his strong cities, and towns of their districts on their borders, of unknown names, I attacked, . . . and 200,150 people great and small, male and female, with horses, chariot-horses, asses, camels, bulls, sheep, unnumbered, I took from their midst. . . . He himself, like a bird in a snare, shut himself up in Jerusalem his royal city, and raised forts for himself. The door of the gate of his city he barred. I cut off the

<sup>1</sup> Taylor Cylinder. See Schrader, *Cuneif. Inscript. and Old Testament*, vol. i. p. 280. I have, however, suggested a slight change justified by the original.

and from Matiene to Egypt, under the prosperous Assurbanipal, the founder of Assyrian literature and science. Even in Khani-rabbat, where Esarhaddon defeated an enemy, it was probably with the Medes who were finally to ruin his empire that he fought, the older Mongol Minyans having long since been destroyed.

With later history of the fall of Nineveh and of Babylon, the defeat of the Medes, and the establishment of the Persian empire under Cyrus, we are not here concerned; for the races that then contended for supremacy were Aryan and Semitic, and the old Mongol stock disappears, the names of the Hittites being unknown after Esarhaddon. In Media, it is true, a Mongol population must have existed still, in the time of Darius I. about 500 B.C., since one version of his great inscription at Behistun is in a dialect admitted to be Mongol, and akin to the ancient Akkadian, and to the language of the Minyans in the fifteenth century B.C. But it was only in Central Asia, north of the Oxus, that the ancient stock remained in power, where gradually grew up the Turkish race, whose tongue preserves the Akkadian vocabulary to our own times: where also the Khitai, whose power in the twelfth century A.D. extended over Bactria and Mongolia, and who yet earlier gave their name to Cathay or China, might possibly be connected with those Kheta or Hittites who were carried captive to



the east by Sargon. It was not till about 1000 A.D. that these Altaic peoples again obtained power in the west, creating a Turkish empire which, after many vicissitudes, still dominates all that part of Asia which the Kassites had ruled in Abraham's time; but in the dogged character of the modern Turk we find the same qualities which enabled the Hittite kings to oppose both Egyptians and Assyrians for nearly a thousand years.

The object of the preceding pages has been to place before the reader a clear idea of the known facts regarding the ancient populations of Western Asia, and especially of Syria, and to show both the racial differences and the civilisation of its tribes at various periods. The importance of such knowledge, in considering the question of Hittite writings, is evident, and historical as well as linguistic indications must be held in view in endeavouring to determine the language in which these texts are inscribed. The question of race may first be considered from the various statements that have been now collected; and it will be necessary, in order to interpret the accompanying sculptures, to say something of the religious ideas of the Mongols and of others: but the monuments as we now see never speak of the Hittites themselves as suzerains of an empire, and we must search in other directions for the origin of a script widely used in Syria, Asia Minor, and Mesopotamia; while, as already noted, the peculiar character under con-

sideration was not in general use in 1500 B.C., nor, as far as is known, at any later time. Historically, therefore, it is to be attributed to an earlier period, when the Kassite Mongols were ruling all over the west.

To sum up the monumental statements as to the Hittites themselves, we find the earliest notice of their existence in North Syria in the fifteenth century B.C. After the fall of the Egyptian empire—about 1450 B.C.—the Mer'ash Hittites spread south to Kadesh on Orontes, whose king a hundred years later calls himself “suzerain of the Hittites,” and makes alliance on equal terms with Rameses II. This was the palmy age of their independence in the great cities of Kadesh, Hamath, Aleppo, Carchemish, and Mer'ash. On the north were tribes of the same race, but of other names, under petty kings—Gamgums, Tablai, Moschi, and Minyans. On the south-west were the Semitic Amorites and Phœnicians; and in Solomon's time the princes of the Hittites were confined to Syria, as they already were also in Joshua's age.

As we advance in history the area of the Hittite country diminishes, until we hear of them only at Carchemish. Syrian populations pushed them out of Hamath, and Phœnicians settled in Samalla. The Khattinai (or Patinai, as the word may also be read), living west of Aleppo, may have been a kindred tribe in the ninth century B.C., and the northern peoples—Gamgums, Tablai, and

Moschi—continued to be ruled by Mongol chiefs in Sargon's time after the fall of Carchemish. But the Samalla chiefs were Semitic, and a Semitic people lived in Cilicia, and probably in Western Cappadocia, as early as 1500 B.C. The Phrygians and other Aryans from Europe held the north of Asia Minor quite as early, and about 850 B.C. the Medes appear to have replaced the older Mongol population near Lake Van, while somewhat later the names of rulers in Commagene seem also to be Aryan. East of the Euphrates the Hittites appear only as occasional invaders. The name is that of a Syrian tribe belonging to what is sometimes called the Altaic stock, and the kings of the Hittites are never historically known as suzerains of other peoples.



## CHAPTER IV.

## THE RACES OF WESTERN ASIA.

IN glancing over the history of more than two thousand years in the preceding chapters, we have met with tribes belonging to each of the three great Asiatic stocks, commonly called Turanian, Semitic, and Aryan. The Turanians or Mongols, whose home seems to have been in Media, sent out two great swarms—the Sumerians to the south-west, and the Kassites on the north-west. The former, though ruling some “dark race,” were of pure blood; the latter, who spread over Syria and southern Asia Minor, were early mingled with the Semitic peoples, whose home appears to have been near Ararat. These Arameans first appear in history about 2100 B.C., and soon colonised the Lebanon and its shores as Phœnicians and Amorites, occupying all Palestine before 1600 B.C., where, however, they seem to have been preceded by Mongols; they spread yet farther south into the Delta, and on the

north-west to Cappadocia and Cilicia about the same time. The Aryans first appear about 1300 B.C., pushing east and south from Thrace and Greece; but it is not until about 850 B.C. that they are noticed as issuing from the Caucasus in the neighbourhood of Lake Van. The cradle of this race was on the north shores of the Caspian, whence the main swarms followed the steppes of Southern Russia and spread over Europe, superseding Finnic tribes, of whom the last traces are found in the Basques between France and Spain. The eastern swarm descended into Media, and passed along the Oxus into Bactria, whence some went on to India (apparently about 800 B.C.), and others at the same time overcame the earlier Mongols of Persia. These eastern Aryans are usually called Iranians—a name still surviving among the Iron of the Caucasus, whose customs resemble those of Persia. It was not until the sixth century B.C. that they won the empire of Western Asia, and, under Persian kings, the later Lycians appear to have been of Medic race. But Aryans had already reached Cappadocia by 650 B.C., while the European Phrygians, at a period supposed to date back to at least 1000 B.C., had colonised the north part of Asia Minor in company with the Bithynians from Thrace. The Armenians were of Phrygian origin, and had advanced far east by the middle of the fifth century B.C.

We may now consider more in detail questions of language and of race—under the heads of Mongol, Semitic, and Aryan stocks—which are important in forming a judgment as to the character of the language and script, which is the main subject of inquiry. Even from the first it is difficult to point to either a race or a language which is entirely pure, for the various nations were intermingled and intermarried, and the languages borrowed from each other terms for foreign objects. Yet, broadly speaking, the distinction of race can be recognised on sculptures without difficulty; while the various classes of speech are equally separated by grammatical structure, even when the vocabulary is mixed.

The present racial conditions are not as different as might perhaps be expected from those found in Asia at an early historic period, while the three great stocks speak the same class of language respectively, in our own time, that they spoke from the first. No race has ever willingly abandoned the speech of its fathers; and if a language dies out it is because the old pure stock that spoke it has also died, or become fused with some stronger people. The result of foreign conquest is to produce a mixed vocabulary, and if the languages of conqueror and conquered are akin, a new form of speech is created—as has happened in England itself. It is the tongue of the majority that prevails, the tongue of the more civilised that fur-



nishes terms relating to culture; but the native language may still be recognised, in spite of the change of vocabulary, by grammatical structure, which is the most enduring feature of speech. Thus the pure Persian of the sixth century B.C. soon became full of Semitic terms after the conquest of Babylonia, and modern Persian has a large Arabic vocabulary, but retains its distinctive Aryan grammar. The Turkish of Central Asia is almost pure; that of the Ottomans is so mixed with Persian and Arabic, that only about one word in ten in an Ottoman-Turkish dictionary is really Turkish. Yet the grammar of the Turkestan dialects is preserved almost unaffected in the speech of Constantinople.

The ancient Mongol speech of the west is now represented by Turkish—the tongue of Asia Minor—while Persian is the surviving descendant of the language of Medes and Iranians. The Semitic stock, covering Syria, Palestine, and Arabia, still uses in the Arabic dialects a language closely connected with the ancient Assyrian. The Phrygian is represented by Armenian—a pure Aryan language which is intermediate between the Iranian and the Slav families of speech, while in the west of Anatolia Greek is largely spoken by citizens and traders. The three races are still distinguished by the same three classes of language which they used from the first, and their geographical positions are unchanged. It appears, therefore, that

although mixed tribes—Aryan and Mongol—now live in the Caucasus, as they were living together when Herodotus wrote in the fifth century B.C., and speak mixed languages as do the Aryanised Mongols of Kurdistan, still we may regard language—especially in early times—as the surest indication of race that we possess.

It is beyond the present purpose to inquire into the origin of speech, and the relations of the various classes of languages. The Aryan and Turanian, or Mongolic, are more closely connected with each other than they are with highly developed Semitic speech. The latter is, on the other hand, related in a recognisable manner to the ancient Egyptian. But Aryan speech is inflected, whereas Mongolic languages are of ruder agglutinative structure. Semitic tongues are yet more highly inflected, while the ancient Egyptian only approaches to that later stage of speech. The roots of all Asiatic languages, and of Egyptian, are so similar, and the cradles of the Asiatic stocks, in the upland valleys of Kurdistan and the Caucasus, are so close together, that we may well suppose a prehistoric period in which a single primitive race spoke a single primitive tongue in this cradle of mankind. We are concerned, however, with later historic languages, which developed very distinct peculiarities among peoples who—when population was sparse and settlements far apart—may have become (like the modern Caffres of South Africa)

unable, in a very few generations, to understand each others' dialects.

As regards race, however, it must be remembered that communications over great distances, between various nations, have been shown to have existed from the very earliest known times; and it has also been shown that intermarriages between the various stocks were not uncommon. The examples of kings, who made political marriage alliances, may have been followed by their subjects. Amenophis III. had Babylonian and Armenian wives, Rameses II. admired the beauty of the Hittite princess whom he wedded (as the historian particularly states), and Shalmaneser II. took brides with dowries from both Mongol and Semitic vassal rulers. We find the same mingling of race in the early part of the Old Testament history. Hagar was an Egyptian, and her son Ishmael only half Hebrew. Esau married both Hittites and Ishmaelites, some of his descendants thus having in their veins the blood of three races. Solomon married not only Egyptian, Ammonite, and Moabite women, but Hittites as well. Even Moses had a Cushite wife, and if Hittites are mentioned in the Bible with Semitic names, it is probably because the pure stock was rapidly mingling in the south with Semitic tribes. In the north also, where Iranians, Arameans, and Mongols may at one time (about 700 B.C.) have been living together



in Cappadocia, as Jews, Greeks, Armenians, Kurds, and Turks now live together in Asia Minor, it is probable that much mingling of race took place. Some of the Scythians, as described by Herodotus, appear to have been Mongols; but most of those who, in his day, spoke fifteen different dialects, were clearly Aryans; while in Lydia and Caria, although the languages were Aryan in the seventh century B.C., Mongol words were still to be found, pointing to admixture with the older Mongol population. From Lydia, according to tradition, the Mongol Etruscans reached Italy, and mixed with Aryans — the Umbrians, Oscans, and Latins. In the Caucasus, which was filled in later times with broken tribes — Jews, Arabs, and Turks flying from the Aryans of Persia—we find a very primitive Aryan population in the Iron tribes, side by side with the Mongol Lazis. In Russia the Finns and the Ugric peoples are mingled with Slavs, as the Austrians are mixed with Hungarians of Mongol origin. It is indeed impossible now to point to any part of the world in which a single pure stock can be found living alone, and it is almost as impossible even five thousand years ago to indicate a quite pure race. But we are concerned with the royal governing class in dealing with royal records, and pride of race among both Semitic and Mongol peoples generally kept up the purity of the stock in

ruling families, as also in a remarkable degree among the Aryan Persians.

There is nothing new or revolutionary in the idea that the first ruling race, all over Western Asia, was Mongol. It has been argued with clearness by Sir H. Rawlinson, by F. Lenormant, and by many later scholars. Dr Oppert and Dr Sayce call the Akkadians an "Altaic people," referring to the connection between the Akkadian language and that of the Ural-Altaic or Turkish tribes of Central Asia. The evidence of type and language is conclusive, and we may proceed to consider in order the physical characteristics, speech, and customs, first of the Turanian or Mongol tribes, and more briefly those of Semitic and Aryan races in the same regions between Persia and the Mediterranean.

It is difficult to find a satisfactory term to describe the early race of Media. The word Turanian is indefinite; the word Mongol as usually understood is too special; the word Altaic presents the objection that it supposes the race to originate in the Altai mountains of Central Asia, whereas its cradle was probably farther west: the terms Akkadian and Sumerian are geographical, not ethnical; and the name Kassite belonged to a single tribe. But English scholars usually speak of the Akkadians, and French or German scholars of the Sumerians, as the original civilisers of Chaldea. Adopting the latter and more generally

used term, it is to be understood that the type of the Sumerians racially was not that of the Eastern Mongols, such as we find in the heavy Mantchus or the Chinese. It was rather the type of the pure Turks and Tartars of Bactria, as preserved to our own times among the Turks of Asia Minor, and among the Kalmucks—a people well made, of moderate stature, and not inclined to obesity like the Mantchus. The forehead is often receding, and the chin as well, with a large nose, sometimes curved, sometimes straight and thick. The eyes have a slight obliquity, but not as exaggerated as in China: the complexion is light, the hair dark, and the beard is scanty, and only grows late in life. The head, which is the most marked racial peculiarity, is short and round, and the cheek-bones high and wide. It is not either a very highly intellectual or beautiful type, but betokens the stubborn will and endurance which have always made the Tartars formidable as warriors and rulers.

The statues and bas-reliefs of Tell Loh (Zirgul) present this type, the faces being usually beardless, though aged kings, such as Naramaku, are sometimes bearded. The two heads of statues recovered present a better type than the bas-reliefs. In one the skull is large and round, and the nose arched. The other greatly resembles the features of a modern Turk of the upper class; and the head, with broad cheek-bones, is covered with an astrakan-wool cap. The bas-reliefs representing



Urnina and his family, or showing workmen building a mound over the bodies of the dead, present a more exaggerated type, with large noses, receding chins and foreheads, and slanting eyes. The Sumerian priests appear, like the Phœnicians and Egyptians, to have shaved their heads, and all the figures as a rule have hairless faces. It is probable also that the head was shaved in fulfilment of a *sagba* or vow, as among Semitic peoples, the long hair being an offering to the deity in whose name the vow was made. Sacred garments of skins seem also to be represented on both deities and worshippers, unless the marking represent striped dresses such as are common in the East. Long robes and high hats, such as are now worn by Persians, Kurds, and Circassians, distinguish princes from their subjects; and the round lamb's-wool cap, now worn by Asiatic Turks, is also represented, indicating probably an original home in countries colder than the Mesopotamian plains. The weapons include short thick swords, spears and bows, and chariots were also used by the Sumerians in war.

Without entering into a grammatical disquisition, it is enough to say of the Sumerian language that it presents all the main features of Turkish speech. The syntax is unlike that of either Aryan or Semitic languages. The verb must always stand at the end of the clause, and post-positions are used instead of prepositions,

while there are no genders of nouns, and only two tenses for verbs. The "vowel harmony," which makes the suffix agree with its root in vowel sound (as in Turkish), and also a "consonantal harmony" (equally Turkish), are peculiarities which, though found in Celtic and Iranian speech, have died out of other Aryan languages. The peculiar "encapsulation," by which a case suffix governs a string of nouns, is equally a mark of Mongol speech. The vocabulary contains upwards of three hundred words,<sup>1</sup> which are easily compared with pure Turkish and with Mongolian. It should be noted that the meaning of Sumerian words is obtained, not only from the original texts in that language, but from thirty bilinguals, in which Akkadian hymns, songs, and tales have been translated into Assyrian, in the time of Assurbanipal. The language is still not perfectly mastered, but its character and vocabulary are thus placed beyond doubt.

The language of Sinim or Elam is less known than the Sumerian, only three or four texts having been found. The names of Elamite kings of the earlier period appear to be Mongolic, and the inscription of Kudur-Nanhundi, and those at Susa, certainly belong to the same class of speech. Certain changes, such as *m* for the nasal *n̄g*, and *t*

<sup>1</sup> Dr Hommel has pointed out some of these, others are given by F. Lenormant. See the results of my own study of the vocabulary in 'Journal Royal Asiatic Society,' October 1893.

or *d* for *k*, are believed to distinguish the Sumerian and the Akkadian; and similar changes distinguish Turkestan dialects of the present day. The language was guttural, but the definitions of sound were not as perfect as among Aryan or Semitic peoples. The *g*, *k*, and *kh* do not seem to have been very distinct, while *b*, *m*, and *v* among labials, *t* and *d* in the dentals, and *s* and *z* in the sibilants, were interchanged. The distinction of long and short vowels had also not the importance that it assumes in inflected Aryan speech. Yet the language was that of a civilised people, who had native names for the numerals to a thousand, for colours, and for metals, including gold, silver, copper, bronze, lead, tin, and iron, and names for different kinds of gems, for the horse and camel, as well as the ass, for chariots, ships, ploughs, houses, and cities, and for temples and pyramids. Most of these are still found in existing languages, thus confirming the Assyrian translations of the words.

Of the Kassite language much less is known. The names of Kassite kings are translated on an existing tablet, and serve to show that their speech was akin to the Sumerian. Such words, for instance, as *gal*, great, and *zu*, thou, are common to both languages; and others like *am*, family, and *ulam*, son, recall the Turkish *aim*, tribe, and *ulan*, boy. Very few of the Kassite names, even as copied out by Semitic scribes, can be supposed to



be Semitic, and the translation was a necessity in consequence.

North of Babylonia and Assyria the region of Mitanni stretched between Erzerum and the great Lake Van, and even extended at one time to the river Halys. It is called Matiene by Herodotus, and its inhabitants in 1500 B.C. were Minni or Minyans, a title mentioned in the Bible (Jer. li. 27), and well known to later Assyrians and Greeks. The Minni were ruled by Khakhans—a title which is commonly found throughout history among Turkish tribes; and, as already mentioned, a letter by Dusratta, the Minyan king, to Amenophis III. is written in the native language, which closely resembles that of Media as found at Behistun in 500 B.C. The cases of the noun are the same now used in Turkish, the structure is agglutinative, the syntax is Mongol, and the vocabulary compares to a great extent with the Sumerian. The evidence of this letter enables us to say that the earlier inhabitants of Southern Armenia were of the same stock with the Kassites in the fifteenth century B.C. Their power and civilisation were great, and the Hyksos rulers of Egypt sprang from the same race; but we have no sculptures to enable us to describe with certainty the Minyan features or dress, unless they be recognised in the bas-reliefs of Eyuk and Boghaz-Keui, on the western borders of Matiene.

Of the Hittites much more is known, from

Egyptian bas-reliefs and inscriptions, and it is very generally admitted that they were a Mongol people. The stern hairless faces of their chiefs, with slanting eyes, receding foreheads, and large curved noses, are faithfully represented on the walls of Karnak near Thebes. The high cap worn by Khetasar recalls the still more remarkable pointed caps of the Boghaz-Keui reliefs. It was a head-dress worn later by Scythians, and by natives of Media, and resembled the *tutulus* represented in Etruscan tombs. It was also a distinctive Turkish head-dress—though surrounded by the Moslem turban—down to quite recent times, and a distinctive costume not found in use among Aryan or Semitic peoples. Another marked peculiarity of the Hittites was the wearing of pigtails, like the Tartars. The pigtail was not a Chinese fashion, but was very unwillingly adopted in China after the Mongol conquest. Not only do these pigtails distinguish the Hittites at Karnak, but they occur also on the "Hittite" bas-reliefs of Carchemish. They are found on Akkadian gems, and they seem to be represented also among the Susians, on the fine battle-pictures of Assurbanipal, about 650 B.C. Racial type and costume thus seem alike to identify the Hittites as of Mongol race.

The evidence of language is the same. A single letter from Tarkhundara of Rezep, who calls himself "prince of the Hittites," in the fifteenth cen-

ture B.C., has been already noticed. The language is expressed in well-understood cuneiform symbols, and is admitted by specialists not to be Semitic, but to present points of grammatical similarity to the Akkadian. It can no longer be doubted that the Hittites not only were Mongols by race, but that they spoke a Mongol language. The word Tarkon, which is a common constituent of royal names or titles among Hittites and neighbouring tribes, is found also in Etruscan (whence the well-known Tarquin), in Turkish as Tarkhan or Targan, and in Mongolian as Dargo, with the meaning "tribe-chief," and both *tar* and *khun* are Akkadian words for "tribe" and "prince." It is only natural to conclude that the texts accompanying pigtailed figures at Carchemish, and generally assigned to the Hittites, are probably written in a dialect of the same language found among Kassites, Minyans, and Sumerians.

The only alternative to this view is put forward by scholars who point to the inscriptions found in the Minyan country, dating from about 840 B.C., in a language known as Vannic. The existence of so-called "Hittite" monuments in Cappadocia and Matiene is pointed out in support of this view. But the date is much later than that which must be attributed to the Hittite script, since they had adopted the later cuneiform by 1500 B.C. Lenormant, whose linguistic studies were of high value, proposed to compare the Vannic language



with the Georgian of the Caucasus, but never carried out his intention. The theory has survived, but the necessary comparisons have not been produced. The Georgian words for nouns and verbs of which the meaning is known in Vannic do not bear any resemblance. Georgian is a modern and very mixed dialect. It is inflexional, and the cases of its noun are Aryan; but its vocabulary is full of borrowed words. Its literature goes back only to the eighth century A.D.—a date much too late to be of any use in comparison with Vannic, and the theory is thus unsupported and leads to no result. Vannic, on the other hand, is an inflexional language, of which the vocabulary compares easily with the pure Persian of the time of Darius I., and yet more closely with the Iranian (probably Medic) language known somewhat later from the monuments of Lycia. The Medes, we have seen, had already reached the neighbourhood of Lake Van by 850 B.C., and the Aryan character of their language has been shown by Sir H. Rawlinson. If it be admitted that the texts now in question—commonly called “Hittite”—are written in a suffixing agglutinative language, and that they were—at least in Syria—written by the Hittites, it follows that the Vannic language cannot assist our inquiry, being Iranian and inflected, and belonging, not to the old Mongol population of this region, but to later Medic conquerors, after the original Minni had been de-

stroyed by Assyria. Neither will Armenian be found comparable either in grammar or in vocabulary with the Hittite. It is not a suffixing but a pure Aryan language, using prepositions and prefixes, and belonging to the European group, so that it does not either compare closely with the Vannic. None of the distinctive titles or known words of the Hittite have ever been shown to exist in either Georgian, Vannic, or Armenian. They have been found only in early Mongol speech and in the Turkish which has sprung thence.<sup>1</sup>

A few words may be added as to the Mongol tribes which surrounded the Hittites and bordered on Matiene. The names of various chiefs of such tribes have already been noticed, and these appear to be neither Aryan nor Semitic, but in some cases are clearly Mongolic, as has long been upheld by Sir H. Rawlinson and by other scholars.

The Ligyes were a people living west of Matiene,<sup>2</sup> but whether the Leka or Luku of Egyptian records

<sup>1</sup> Dr Sayce, writing in 1884, says: "There is also another inflectional family of speech known as Alarodian, once spoken through the Armenian highlands, of which Georgian is now the chief representative." I am not aware of any evidence for such a statement. Mongol and Aryan languages in this region are known. Sir H. Rawlinson (*Rawlinson's 'Herodotus,'* vol. i. p. 702, vol. iii. p. 190, 3rd ed.) regards the tribe of Alarodians as Mongols, the Scythians and Medes as Aryans. Vannic is an East Aryan language, Georgian a corrupted Aryan dialect, Hittite a Mongol dialect. They cannot, therefore, be grouped together to form a new hypothetical family of speech.

<sup>2</sup> Herodotus (*Rawlinson, vol. iii. p. 230*).

are the same, or represent the Lycians, is doubtful, the next tribe in Assyrian records being the Kaska, whose chief Dadilu is noticed in 738 B.C. North of these were the Muskai (Meshech, Gen. x. 2), who had five chiefs in 1130 B.C., and are thought to have been also Mongols, and west of these the Tablai (Tubal, Gen. x. 2) with twenty-four chiefs in 836 B.C., and one named Vassurmi a century later. Esarhaddon speaks of "the inhabitants of the forests on the borders of the Tablai" near the head of the river-valleys leading down to Cilicia. The Guai (whose name recalls the Koa of the Bible) lived farther west, and in the eighth century the names Urikku, Kirri, and Kati are noted among their chiefs, while Cilicia included the Kiti, whose chief was Pikhirim, in the same century. Farther east, on the Upper Euphrates at Malatiya, the names of Sulumal in 735 B.C., and of Tarkhunazi in 712 B.C., are distinctively Mongol. In Commagene, however, the kings named Kundaspi in 854, and Kustaspi in 727, might be Aryan, while Katazilu is noticed earlier in 857, and Mutallu in 708 B.C. The Gammugs were in all probability Mongols, the name perhaps meaning "conquerors," and their chief from 738 to 711 B.C. bore the Mongol name Tarkhulara, and yet earlier in 857 B.C. another was named Mutalli. They appear to have lived immediately north of the Hittites of Carchemish,



south of whom were the Khattinai with chiefs named Sapalulme, Girparuda, and Lubarna in the ninth century. The latter name seems to have been dynastic, and occurs also in 1130 B.C.

In the far west the Aryans date back to Gyges in Lydia as early as 727 B.C., and the various tribes of this region in 1300 B.C. are represented with light hair and blue eyes, as described in connection with the attacks on Egypt by the Aryan allies. The names of Hittite chiefs are too numerous to be mentioned here, but are often clearly Mongolic. Those of the Hyksos are not of importance to the present question.

The inquiry thus made into the relations of Syrian and Armenian tribes shows us that they were Mongolian, down to a late period, in just those parts of the region where the "Hittite" sculptures are found. In the farther north, where Aryan tribes were early found, such monuments are absent. In the west the Ionians are noticed by Sargon as living "fronting the sea in the land of Ionia spawning like fishes," and raiding through the Guai country even to Tyre till checked by his army. On the south and south-west the people of Samalla, the Phœnicians, and the Amorites were Semitic, the latter represented as a dark people with beards and eagle noses of very Phœnician type. In the eighth century the kings of Hamath—Iniel in 738 B.C.

and Yehubidi, who was, however, a usurper, and may have been a Hebrew, in 720 B.C., are Semitic; but the name of Irkhulena in 854 B.C. might be Mongolic. The Syrian league consisted, however, mainly of Phœnicians, Syrians, and Arabs, who belonged to the Semitic race; and the whole of Palestine proper was Semitic as early as the sixteenth century B.C., while from at least a century later the names of Philistine rulers belong also to Semitic speech, and in Cyprus we find only Phœnicians and Greeks. The population of Syria was much affected by the Assyrian policy of transplanting whole tribes from one end of their dominions to the other, which broke up the native alliances and decreased the power of the Mongols to combine against their masters. This policy is traced as early as the twelfth century B.C., when Tiglath-Pileser settled Aramean colonists in the country of the Khattinai. Sargon sent the Hittites to the east, and brought Hamathites and Arabs to Samaria, when he took Israel captive to the "cities of the Medes"; and Esarhaddon also records in Syria, "I settled the people of the mountains, and of the eastern sea, there; and placed my officer as a resident over them." By these means, therefore, the Hittite race was scattered east and south by about 715 B.C.

The names of tribes of the Canaanites noticed

in the Bible are chiefly Semitic. The Philistines were "emigrants" from Egypt (Gen. x. 14), but may have belonged to the old half-Semitic, half-Mongol race of the Hyksos period. The names of their chiefs (such as Abimelech) are usually Semitic, and this also applies to those whose letters in the Assyrian or Babylonian language, from Ascalon and Joppa, Lachish and Gezer, are preserved, dating from the fifteenth century B.C. But there was an older population, represented by the Anakim, the Zuzim, or Zamzummim, and the Emim, to whom perhaps the Amalekites may be added, which appears to have been probably Mongol, as the names have no Semitic interpretation. The Anakim were called Rephaim or "tall men" in Hebrew, and the word *anak* in Mongol speech would mean "high." Zuzim may only mean "tribes" as a Mongol word, and Emim also signifies "families" or "tribes." Amalek would perhaps mean the "lowlanders," and they dwelt in the plateau south of the higher Hebron hills. The term Hittite has no true Semitic sense, but as a Mongol word would mean the "allies" or "related tribes." Of the Hittites noticed in the Old Testament some bear Mongol names such as Beeri, "soldier," and perhaps Uriah, "the strong" (*Uri*), while others, like Elon and Ephron, have names with no appropriate Semitic meaning. But, as already said, the southern Hittites seem to have



soon been merged into the Semitic population which predominated in Palestine proper.<sup>1</sup>

The result of this inquiry is to show us that the Mongol tribes west of the Euphrates were confined to Syria and southern Asia Minor. That their greatest extension was in early ages before the Semitic race had gained power. That they were hemmed in by Aryans on the west and north, and by Semitic races on the south. That they were gradually displaced by their rivals, and finally scattered by the Assyrians. Their strongholds in the Taurus were invaded by the Medes and the early Phœnicians, and their territory finally taken from them by Medes and Syrians, till Carchemish alone remained to the Hittites, who once had spread over Bashan. The reader will judge from

<sup>1</sup> There is absolutely no reason for supposing the Kēteioi of Homer (Od. xi. 516-521) to have had anything to do with the Hittites. They were led by a chief named Eurypylos—a clearly Aryan name, not recalling any of those found among Hittites. The words have no philological connection, for the proper Greek equivalent of *Cheth* is *Chi*, not *Kappa* (*Caph*), while the long vowel *Eta* denotes probably an Aryan tribe, and finds no counterpart in the name of the Khatti, Kheta, or Beni Heth. Homer tells us practically nothing about language in Asia Minor, save that several dialects were spoken. He was acquainted with the Phœnicians; but the earliest date possible for his writings is long after the decay of Mongol power, and after the growth of younger Aryan and Semitic populations in Anatolia. There is, as we have seen, no evidence that the Hittites made conquests in Ionia; and even the Karabel monument is far distant from Troy. The Hittites are mentioned only in Syria, and Semitic populations separated them from the west.

the evidence whether there is not sufficient reason to suppose that texts written in a very early pictorial script, and occurring in a country whose population was certainly Mongol, are not naturally to be regarded as written in a Mongol dialect, even if the internal evidence of the texts themselves were not available. That evidence must now be explained; but a short consideration of the Mongol beliefs, which find expression in the sculptures accompanying the "Hittite" inscriptions, must first engage our attention for a few pages.

## CHAPTER V.

## MONGOL GODS AND BELIEFS.

THE inscribed rocks, slabs, and seals which present "Hittite" texts also often represent deities, sometimes standing erect on lions and other beasts, sometimes themselves winged. It has often been remarked that the symbolism is the same which we find on Assyrian bas-reliefs; but the character of the art is more archaic, and resembles rather that of Chaldea in the earliest age than that of Nineveh. These sculptures will be more particularly described later, but the religious ideas conveyed are important to our main subject.

It may appear hopeless to convey a clear idea of the confused Pantheon of the Mongol tribes, with innumerable gods and many local names for each deity. All the great cities had their famous Istars, who resembled the various Madonnas of Europe, from "Nôtre Dame de la miséricorde" to "Nôtre Dame de la haine."



The Hittites, we have seen, had local Sets of various towns; yet Set was "Lord of Heaven and Earth," just as all the local Madonnas represent but one person. The varying names were—as in this later instance given in illustration—only honorary titles or attributes of a single deity. The ideas that underlay this nomenclature were simple and primitive; and when these are grasped, and the realities which gave rise to various myths are held in remembrance, it is not difficult, by aid of what is known of the later ideas of Tartars and of Mongol superstitions, to identify the great gods and to understand the legends.

The adoration of life and the fear of death lay at the root of all these religious systems. The word for God—*Dingir* (the Turkish *Tengri*)—signified the "life-giver," and the appellations of deities meant usually "the immortals," "the shining ones," or "the powers"; while demons and ghosts were called "the feeble" and the "evil" beings, whose wrath was deprecated or from whom safety was besought of the gods. Religion consisted in the praise and supplication of beings able and willing to help man, and in the deprecation of the wrath of angry deities whose will was neglected through sin. Black magic or witchcraft was the invocation of evil demons and malignant gods, with the intent to injure others. It has been regarded with fear

and wrath by all primitive peoples. The worship of life took many forms, and was expressed often by very rude emblems. The abstract idea of force, or of the unity of natural forces, was not conceived; and creation was regarded as an assemblage of living beings and of spirits, sometimes invisible, like the wind, sometimes embodied in immortal forms, like sun or moon. The fire was a creeping snake, as was the pure stream. The earth was a mighty animal. The sun, moon, and stars were great birds soaring in heaven, or beings who trod the crystal floor of the firmament, drove their chariots along appointed roads, climbed the eastern steps, descended to rest in the ocean, or entered the flaming portals of hell, when, the gates being opened, the glow of its furnaces coloured the western sky, while the roses of Paradise lit up the east at dawn.

Every river and spring, every mountain, every forest, each great tree or standing-stone, was the abode of a spirit. There is no distinction possible between the ideas of Sumerians, Babylonians, Egyptians, Assyrians, Greeks, Etruscans, or Latins. The words were different, but the ideas were the same. They still can be studied among Hindus, Tartars, and Chinese, and even among the peasantry of Western Asia and of Europe in our own times. In ruder forms they are found among savages; and even Caffres and Hottentots possess the same leading beliefs. Animism is the true explanation

of all ancient superstition. The terror of death, the fear of the dead, the belief that ancestors watched over pious descendants, the worship of fire and water, trees and stones, sun, moon, and stars, are all to be traced to the universal belief in the countless "spirits" with which man surrounded himself.

Over all these genii, according to the Akkadians, ruled the primeval pair—the father spirit of heaven, and the mother spirit of earth—from whom they all sprang. The two great gods of the modern Mongols and of the Chinese are the same; and in Egypt the only difference was that the mother was heaven and the father earth. These two spirits are continually invoked in Akkadian litanies,<sup>1</sup> of which the following is one of the most remarkable:—

The man who dies without food, the man who dies without drink, the man whose food is but dust, the man who dies when earth is destroyed by floods, the man who dies of famine in the desert, the man burned by the sun in the wilderness, the concubine without a master, the wife without a husband, the man despised, the man forgotten, the man without food, the man who in an evil month falls sick. Spirit of Heaven, dost not thou remember! Spirit of Earth, dost not thou remember!

The seven great gods in other enumerations included children of this ancient pair—*Cælus* and

<sup>1</sup> The bilingual religious texts are given in the cuneiform characters by F. Lenormant in his 'Études Accadiennes.' The following translations differ only in minor details from those which he suggests.



*Terra* of the Latins. They were the spirits of Heaven, Ocean, and Hell; of the Sun and Moon, the Wind, and the Earth. Their messenger was the eighth, and these great figures (*Kabiri*, or "great ones") meet us in every ancient system with but slight differences. Among Aryans, Semitic races, Egyptians, Persians, and Hindus, the divine family is ever the same. Heaven was the parent of all; but *An*, the sky god of the Sumerians, "lord of powers of heaven and earth, lord of all lands"—"the first ancestor of the gods," as the Assyrians called him—dwelt alone.

The great judge of mankind was the ocean god *Ea*, whose name may only be the Turkish *ee* for a "spirit." Like Osiris, he pronounced the doom of each ghost brought before him, sitting on his throne beneath the deep. The third brother was the terrible god of Death and Hell, who had many names, and was represented with a lion's head. He was *Nergal* (probably "lord of fire"); *Mul-lil*, "the ghost king"; or *En-ge*, "the prince beneath"; and his savage consort was *Nin-ki-gal*, "lady of the fiery land."

The Earth goddess had also many names. She was *Ma*, "the Earth"; *Amma*, *Nana*, or *Nina*, "the mother"; *Dam-ki-na*, "lady of the Earth" and, like *Terra*, she was the wife both of Heaven in one aspect and of Ocean in another, for by both was she embraced. Thus the Sun was born of Heaven and Earth, climbing to his father's

throne above, and also of Sea and Earth, "the eldest-born of Ocean"—according as he rose from the mountain or from the sea. He was *Dum-zi*, "the child spirit," seated on the knees of Ma; but he was also *Ir-galla*, "the man of fire," who crossed the ocean, and passed into Hades every night. He had many other names, but, like Horus in Egypt, he was ever youthful. His bride was *Is-tar*, "the enlightener," the lamp of mankind at night, whose names and attributes were uncounted, but who is said to have married *Dum-zi* in her youth, and to have received from him her shining ornaments. To these gods was added the deity of storm and wind, of the air and of the sky, who (like *Shu* in Egypt) personified the atmosphere, and was called *Im* ("the wind"), or *Mer* ("the tempest")—a *Jupiter Pluvius* and *Tonans*, like the Assyrian *Rimmon* and the Syrian *Hadad*. The eighth great deity was the messenger of heaven—the Greek *Hermes*, the Egyptian *Anubis*, called by the Sumerians *Ak* ("the wise"), whom the Semitic peoples called *Nebo* ("the herald"), and identified with the planet *Mercury*. An Akkadian hymn in his honour thus describes him:—

To *Ak* the great and wise, seeing all things clearly, the scribe who knows all that is mysterious, holding the great sceptre, ruling the earth, who completes a record of all his judgments on earth, showing the deeds of the wicked.

These gods ruled over the good genii, and fought with demons, who, however, were also at times

their ministers against the sinful. The terror of demons was ever present in the minds of the Akkadians, and many spells were made to defeat them. In one tablet they are thus described:—

They go from land to land. They drive the slave-girl from her mother's house. They drive the wife from her happy home. They drive the son from his father's abode. They drive the calf from its stall; they chase the bird from its young; they chase the swallow from her nest. They steal the cattle, they steal the sheep. Every day the wicked spirits are hunting. . . . They go from house to house, the door stays them not, the bolt turns them not back at the gate. They creep in as snakes, they blow through the roof as wind. They hinder the wife from her husband's arms; they steal the child from the knees of men. They drive the free woman from her happy home. They are the voice of a curse that cleaves to man.

Charms and amulets protected the wearer from these fiends, and temples and houses were protected by images of the gods, and especially by the terrible form of the lion-headed Nergal, who was the lord of ghosts and demons, as we learn from another text:—

The image of Nergal the peerless on the wall of the house—image of a peerless hero-god. The image of the Sun king (Nar-udi), lord of all gods, beneath the couch, that no evil may arise; . . . the hero fighting demons within the door.

This inscription explains the carving of gods and demons on the thrones of Assyrian kings, the bas-reliefs of Nergal at the temple doors near



Pteria, and the various images buried in tombs or beneath the floors of temples, as well as the designs on signet-rings which represent Akkadian myths. Evil persons alone held commune with the fiends, and are conjured in another litany:—

The man who makes a figure in order to hurt a man.  
The evil look, the evil eye, the evil word, the evil lip, the  
evil poison. Spirit of Heaven, dost not thou remember!  
Spirit of Earth, dost not thou remember!

The early Mongols were as fond of mythical or imaginative stories concerning the phenomena of nature—the daily or yearly adventures of the gods—as were the early Aryans; and the legends of Turkestan in our own times often recall those of the Akkadians—especially the strange figure of the friendly Minotaur who aided the Chaldean Hercules, and went down with him to the underworld, which is to be found in one of the folk-tales of the Kirghiz Tartars.<sup>1</sup> As yet only a legend of creation has been found in the Akkadian language, but it is believed that many others known in Assyrian were of Akkadian origin. Their antiquity is witnessed—as well as their wide diffusion—by the occurrence of two such tales in Babylonian language, which for some unknown reason were preserved with the political correspondence at Tell Amarna in the fifteenth century B.C. One of them relates to the terror felt when the Sun

<sup>1</sup> See A. de Gubernatis, *Zoological Mythology*, vol. i. p. 129.

(*Adapa*, "the soarer") did not appear for several days, and was thought to have been poisoned in Hades. The message of Heaven, and the rebuke he received, are related. In the other we hear that *Iris-ki-gal* ("the bride of Hell") was a sister of the gods whom *Nergal* forbade to return on high, until he was besieged by all the hosts of heaven, when he made up the quarrel and gave her all she wished. The story of *Istar* visiting Hades is but a variant of this legend, and clearly indicates that she was the Moon goddess. She was gradually deprived, as she entered seven successive gates, of her glory and ornaments, and kept a prisoner by the terrible goddess of Hell, until at the command of Heaven she was released, washed with the water of life, and her ornaments restored during seven successive exits. The lunar month with its twenty-eight days is clearly in the myth-maker's mind.

Two other curious emblems may be noticed—namely, the "World Mountain" and the "Tree of Life," which were of Akkadian origin. The Babylonians, knowing of seas to the east, west, north, and south, and living in a great river-valley surrounded by mountains, with the sea beyond, conceived the world to consist of a plain with a surrounding chain, floating on ocean and domed over by a firmament. They describe the *Im Khar-sak*, or "sky mountain-top," as having glistening horns and slippery sides; and refer probably to the

mountains of their original home, the chain of Elburz and the snowy heights of Ararat or Caucasus. This idea of the World Mountain survives in Persian sacred books, and in the *Kâf* or boundary mountain of Arabs.

The jewelled Tree of Life is also found among the Chinese, the Hindus, and many others. The Chaldean Hercules, who, like the Greek hero, crossed the ocean to a garden of the Hesperides, failed to gather the fruit of this tree, which was guarded by a snake. In Egypt the Tree of Life stood in Hades. Among modern Moslems it is only the "bitter tree" that is found in hell, while the "Tree of the Limit," on whose leaves (shaken yearly in the "night of power") are written the names of those about to die, is found in heaven. The Tree of Life was called *Tin-Tir* ("life-tree") by the Akkadians, and Babylon was named by them *Tin-Tir-Ki* ("life-tree-place"). The figure of this artificial tree, common on seals and bas-reliefs, is well known. It was guarded by griffons, by cherubs, or by the eagle-headed gods. This tree was also apparently called *Sakh* or "holy," and this is translated *Asher*, "holy" in Assyrian. It became the *Ashêrah* of the Amorites and of idolatrous Hebrews, rendered "the grove" in our version. In later times it is represented in the south as a palm; but the old Akkadian name of the vine was *Iz-tin* or



"wood of life," and the conventional form, with its projecting leaves, seems to represent a vine growing on a trellis. The vine did not flourish at Babylon, and Herodotus (i. 194) says that wine was brought down the river from the north; but the home of the vine is on the foothills of the Taurus and in Armenia, and it was here probably that the Kassites and Akkadians first discovered wine, and named the vine the "Tree of Life."

How widely spread this ancient system of religion must have been we gather by comparison with certain features of Greek mythology. The Greeks borrowed many figures and names from Phœnicia, but they seem also to have been in contact with the earlier Mongols of Asia Minor. The name of Hercules has no satisfactory Aryan derivation, but his legend presents many points of contact with that of the Chaldean hero called Izdubar, or Gilgames—or perhaps *Uddu-mas*, "the spirit of the rising sun." Hercules may be the Akkadian *Irgalla*, another name for the sun; and in like manner the name *Kentaur*, or "man-beast," is Mongol rather than Aryan, and refers to the man-beasts of Akkadian imagery, while the Amazons may have been *Ama-zun*, or "women-warriors," of Asia Minor. The figure of Pegasus, the winged horse of the Sun, occurs on a "Hittite" seal, as well as at Carthage; and many Greek myths, such as those of Perseus (*Sargina*), of

Ganymede (the Babylonian Etana carried by an eagle to heaven), of Actæon, and of Prometheus (the Babylonian hero *Zu*, "the wise," who stole the secrets of heaven), may have been of Mongol origin, learned from the border tribes of Cappadocia.

Vows and the curses of the wronged were recorded in heaven, and are noticed in inscriptions on statues both Akkadian and Assyrian. Temples were built in fulfilment of a *sagba* or vow: curses were inscribed against those who should injure boundary-stones or historic records. One curious text refers to the effects of a curse by some unknown person unintentionally wronged:—

The curse descends on a man like a whirlwind. A voice is ever crying against him. An evil voice is against him still. Istar afflicts him because of another's grief. The voice that cries cloaks him as a garment. Bowed down he bends. Marduk pities him, goes to his father Ea and says, "My father, a curse has come on a man like a whirlwind," and he answers again, "Who did it?" He replies, "The man knows not who did it." Ea answered his son Marduk, "My son, you know not whom. How can I answer you? Marduk, you know not who it is. How can I answer you? Come now, my son, Marduk may lead him to the dwelling of my power, and may explain his curse and show his curse: the evil that troubles his heart, be it his father's curse, or his mother's curse, or his elder brother's curse, or the curse of some head of a house that the man knows not. By prayer to Ea as to the curse, let him ask favour as of one who will hear. It may be shown to be an accident—it may be shown to be an error. The curse! O Spirit of Heaven, dost not thou remember! O Spirit of Earth, dost not thou remember!"

Of vows we read also :—

The vow, the vow. The aid of the gods is an everlasting help; the aid of Heaven and Earth, which never fails. God only is unchanging. God is not understood by men. The snare for the wicked is not removed. An impassable decree is set against the sinner.

Another darker feature of the Akkadian superstition was human sacrifice in time of trouble. Of this we hear indeed only from a Semitic text, which says, "He cried to the Lord of all, and gave the offspring first born among men for himself." But this terrible custom was not confined to Phœnicians or Assyrians. It is found among Mongols, as also among Greeks and other Aryans. A seal with "Hittite" characters shows a human sacrifice, and the two emblems may be read, *Tur-Sak*, "the first-born." Among Arabs and in Phœnicia the rite was still in use as late as the fifth century after Christ.

The main features of Akkadian religion have thus been sketched in order to illustrate the sculptures about to be described. In great measure they were common also to the Semitic population of Babylonia; but the regular pantheon of twelve gods connected with the year, and identified with the planets, is Assyrian and not Sumerian. The old names, such as Nergal, were often adopted in modified forms, *Nirgallu* in Assyrian being the same, while Istar became *Istaratu* with a feminine termination—the Canaan-



ite Ashtoreth, who, however, appears as *Astar* on the Moabite Stone, and as *At-thar* in Arabia. The name of Ea was also unchanged; but An the Heaven god became *Ilu* as well as *Anu*, and Ninib ("the chief") became *Adaru* ("the glorious"), while *Bel* was the common Semitic term for the infernal deity, *Shamash* for the Sun, and *Rimmon* for the Air god. A male deity of the Moon, *Sinu*, represents the Akkadian *Aku*, whose name is still found in one of the Turkish names for the moon, another (*Ai*) being the same as the Akkadian *Aa* for the Moon goddess, wife of the Sun—a title of Istar. Several names which in Akkadian appear to have belonged to the Sun-hero were by the Assyrians assigned to the various planets.

The names of Kassite gods are peculiar, but are explained in Assyrian. *Sikhu*, or "the good," was a name for Marduk the Sun warrior, who conquered the dragon of chaos and storm. *Urus*, "the lion," was a term for the lion-headed Nergal or Bel. *Sam* was a name of the Sun, *Sumu* of *Rimmon*; and *Bel* was called *Lar* or "chief," a word also found in Etruscan. Each tribe appears to have used its own terms, but the deities so named were common to all.

A curious bronze tablet found near Palmyra, and which has often been described, may belong to the "Hittite" art, though in absence of any text it might also be supposed to be of Amorite

or Phœnician origin. The seven great gods are represented with animal heads, many of which are indistinctly characterised, and with their emblems above them. Beneath these a corpse lies on its bier guarded by fish-headed men, representing probably *Da-kan* ("the man-fish"), who was a form of Ea, and became the Phœnician and Philistine Dagon. The soul or shade walks safely away from two demons who are fighting each other, and at the bottom we see Nergal beside the infernal river, with a lion head, while Nin-ki-gal, his wife, comes in her boat, kneeling on the "death horse," and suckling two lion cubs. She also is lion-headed, and with open mouth approaches the offerings laid on the banks, among the reeds (or asphodel plants) of the infernal river.

This tablet gives us a clear conception of the ideas as to death which were common to many early peoples. On the Akkadian signets the ghost is represented with feathers, and birds with human heads also represent the soul—as in Egypt, in Lycia, in Phœnicia, and elsewhere. In the legend of Istar the feathered garments of ghosts are described, and the cuneiform emblem for a ghost represents a feathered man. Other emblems which are common to the Akkadians and the Hittites include the sphynx, the two-headed eagle, the stag, which was sacred to Ea as was also the bull, and the winged figure of the

Sun, which is found at Birejik, on the Euphrates, above a pigtailed figure in the dress commonly represented as that of the Hittites. There is practically no distinction between the religious emblems of the Sumerians and Assyrians, and those in use on supposed Hittite sculptures. The gods are shown at Carchemish, and near Pteria, standing erect on lions, just as on the great Assyrian bas-relief of Bavian, or the monolith of Esarhaddon at Samalla. At this latter site there are bas-reliefs, one of which represents the lion-headed Nergal, and all of which so greatly resemble Hittite art that they were classed as Hittite, until found to accompany Phœnician inscriptions.<sup>1</sup> It is only by aid of such inscriptions that the origin of sculptures can be safely distinguished; and in Cyprus many statues supposed to be Phœnician bear Greek texts. Emblems like the winged sun, wherever they originated, are common to Egypt and Phœnicia, to Assyria, and to the earlier Mongols of Babylonia and Syria.

The Hittite deities have already been noticed in the famous treaty text. Chief among them were Set and Istar; but there were a thousand gods and a thousand goddesses, including those of "rivers,

<sup>1</sup> One design seems to show a Hittite prisoner held by the pigtail; on another a bearded chief sits by an altar, facing a pigtailed, beardless prince, with a mace sceptre, who may be a Hittite. Humann and Puchstein's 'Reisen,' Tafeln xlv. 2, xlv. 1.



hills, the great sea, the winds, and the clouds." The name of Set may perhaps mean "fire," and we are told by Plutarch<sup>1</sup> that he was represented with the head of an ass. In Egyptian the ass head stands for "light," and in Hittite texts the symbol is also found, probably with the sound *Is*, signifying both "ass" and also (as in Akkadian) "light." The common emblem of Set in Egypt was a sort of monster with a long-eared head, which may represent that of an ass; and the same emblem exactly is once found on a text from Mer'ash, and probably denotes the Hittite god. At Carchemish Istar is represented naked and winged, holding her hands to her breasts—a figure also found (without wings) in Babylonia and Phœnicia. The great examples of so-called "Hittite" religious symbolism occur, however, near Pteria in Armenia, at Ibreez in Cilicia, at Mount Sipylos near Smyrna, and on certain seals chiefly from Asia Minor.

Boghaz-Keui, near one of the lower affluents of the Halys in Armenia, is believed (though this has been disputed) to be the ancient Pteria. The ruins include a throne with lions; and a defaced Hittite inscription of eleven lines has been said to occur at the site. Two miles to the east is the curious rock-temple known as Iasili-Kaia ("written stone"); but only eight symbols are found accompanying the figures, of which there are no less than ninety in all. Of these forty-one form a long

<sup>1</sup> Isis and Osiris, §§ 22-33.

procession on the north wall of a rock-chamber, stretching east about thirty yards, the figures being all male and wearing the high-pointed cap as a rule; while on the south wall a similar female procession also passes east to meet the former, and includes twenty females and one male figure. The central design is at the east or inner end of the temple; and in each procession deities are followed by genii, these by kings and queens, and these again by their subjects. On the western rocks is another design, and the entrance on the south is guarded by two lion-headed genii. An outer chapel has on its north wall a procession of eleven warriors, and eleven unarmed men, and on the south are two designs in separate bas-reliefs. The gods are six feet high, and the human figures about three feet. The whole represents one of the most remarkable and probably one of the oldest carvings of Asia.<sup>1</sup>

The two central figures on the east—facing each other—are a god supported by two human figures on whose necks he treads, and a goddess standing on a lion. These probably are the “Spirit of Heaven” and the “Spirit of Earth”; for the latter is evidently *Ma*, a goddess who is known to have been represented as borne by a lion.<sup>2</sup> The younger

<sup>1</sup> See the plates in ‘History of Art in Asia Minor,’ vol. ii., Perrot and Chipiez; and the photographs in Humann and Puchstein’s ‘Reisen,’ Tafeln vii.-x.

<sup>2</sup> Macrobius, Saturnal., i. 26. See Rawlinson’s Herodotus, vol. ii. p. 538.

god, also on a lion, who stands behind the goddess, is probably the Sun; and behind him the two-headed eagle supports two goddesses, while two male gods follow the "Spirit of Heaven." Several of the smaller figures are winged, or otherwise indicated as deities or priests, and human worshippers follow in their train.

The two-headed eagle here shown is a distinctive Mongol emblem. It is as old as 2800 B.C. among the Sumerians of Zirgul, and it is found at Eyuk, north of Pteria, where each talon grasps a hare. It was used by the Turks on coins and standards in 1217 A.D., and carved on the walls of Diarbekr. It is found at Devrik,<sup>1</sup> and on medals of the Arsacidæ in Persia. It only reached Flanders after the Crusades in the thirteenth century A.D., and Russia in 1472, and may have been taken from the Turks by the Franks. In India it represents the Garuda bird of the gods, but its origin was clearly Mongol.

The western bas-relief at Iasili-Kaia represents a priest or prince, over whose extended hand is a shrine or temple, in which a deity, girt with flames, stands between two objects which resemble the great cone or cylinder which, on Akkadian gems, other deities appear to be turning, as also does a figure found at Zirgul. The meaning is obscure, but we are reminded of the *mandara* of India, with which the world was made from the sea of milk, gods and genii churning with this great churn,

<sup>1</sup> Wandering Scholar in the Levant, D. G. Hogarth, p. 142.



round which a serpent was twisted. In the outer chapel, on the south wall, a deity in a pointed cap leads another long-robed priest or prince, who, like the former, has on his head a skull-cap, and in his hand a *lituus* or whip. Above them is a shrine like the former one, but with an emblem within, probably phallic. Close to this is an extraordinary composite figure, beardless and wearing ear-rings, with a pointed head-dress. This figure terminates in a stump, and the body is formed by two inverted lions, reminding us of those which spring from the body of the Anatolian Cybele or Ma, and of the lions suckled by the infernal goddess, as above mentioned. The female figures in the processions wear long pleated dresses, and cylindrical bonnets. The males have in some cases long robes, but the chief male deity, and most of the men, wear short jerkins, and are bare-legged. This short dress is usually distinctive of Hittite sculptures. The chief male procession is broken by a design of two genii supporting a crescent. The warriors in the outer chapel have heavy swords held erect, and all wear the shoe with a curled-up toe, commonly found in this class of sculpture, and worn by the Hittites. It is the *calceus repandus* of the Etruscans, but not peculiar to any race, being found also among Phœnicians, and even worn by the Jewish tribute-bearers, who bring the tribute of Jehu to Shalmaneser II. on the "Black Obelisk." The Turkish slipper of our own times is the same,

and is worn not only by Turks but by Arabs as well.

At Eyuk, north of Pteria, similar carvings were found by Hamilton, including the two-headed eagle, and two sphynxes in bas-relief, with figures of worshippers, short-robed and pigtailed,—one raising the hands in supplication, two others ascending steps, and another bringing three rams and a goat. These wear the skull-cap, which may have been a priestly head-dress. An altar, a sacred bull, and a goddess seated on a throne, are also represented, with harpers; and on other blocks a butting bull, and a lion devouring a ram. No inscriptions accompany these figures, as far as is at present known.

At Mer'ash there is a very archaic relief, showing the goddess *Ma* with the infant Sun-god on her knees. She sits on a throne, and holds a mace sceptre. On the altar before her is a harp, on which a very rudely carved eagle is perched. Other designs here show a short-coated worshipper presenting offerings to a long-robed giant deity, while his horse is held by a groom beneath. In general character these carvings are clearly "Hittite," though not inscribed. In their arrangement and execution they also resemble the Sumerian bas-reliefs of Zirgul.

At Eflatun Bunar (Plato's Springs), in Galatia, a remarkable monument of the same class represents a number of rude caryatide figures, like one

found at Zirgul; and the whole is surmounted by the winged Sun, already mentioned at Birejik. The great rock carving at Ibreez, which bears "Hittite" texts, is cut beside a stream on a cliff, and shows us a gigantic short-robed deity, holding corn and grapes, and approached by the smaller figure of a long-robed worshipper. In this case both deity and worshipper have curled beards, without moustache—a fashion among both Phœnicians and early Greeks—whereas nearly all the figures previously described have hairless faces. As already noticed, however, the Sumerian bas-reliefs occasionally present bearded kings, though as a rule the male figures have smooth chins. The only other clearly religious design is that of the figure on Mount Sipylos, which is nearly 20 feet high. It is described by Pausanias (iii. 22) as a Niobe, but the "Hittite" emblems, discovered on this bas-relief by Consul G. Dennis in 1881, probably preserve the name of *Ma*, the "Spirit of the Earth." The cartouche of Rameses II. is asserted to be also cut, as a later addition, on the field of the design, but its existence is disputed.

Some of the medals and seals on which the same "Hittite" emblems are found also present us with divine figures. Such small objects being easily transported, it is difficult to know where they were originally cut. Two of them come from Aidin in Lydia: the first represents three gods, one of whom presents a cross to three worshippers, and a flail



to two demons of lion form who are fighting each other: above them is the word *Ne-gug* (contest): the god himself, in his double character, as favouring the pious and judging the wicked, is two-headed like the Etruscan Janus: to his left is a figure apparently in a pit of flame: to his right is the heaven god on his throne marked with a star; and beyond him another, bearing the stag of Ea, and a sacred mound (perhaps the "World Mountain" already described), guarded by winged genii eagle-headed. The second Aidin seal gives five deities, three male and two female: the god on the left is winged, short-robed, and bull-headed, with an eagle at his feet, and the word *Adda* (father) beside him. He probably represents the "Spirit of Heaven." The second to the right is two-headed, short-robed, and carries a palm. He has beside him the sign *Ye*, and may here represent Ea, the judge of good and wicked. The third is winged, and bears an axe and a cross, with an altar before him. The goddesses face away from these two gods, the first to the left having the emblem *Mu* (for "mother"), and the second—the last figure to the right—has the sign *Se* (the favourable or good). Beneath these five figures are their distinctive animals,—the eagle for the first, the stag of Ea for the second, the ass-headed monster (Set) for the third, the lion—as in previous cases—for Ma, the "Spirit of the Earth," and the dove for the last, who is clearly Istar. This design presents

us, therefore, with the same deities already distinguished, omitting the infernal god Nergal, and the air-god Im; and Set here seems to stand for the god of the Sun and of the altar-fire.

Two seals, one of them from Nineveh, conclude our enumeration of religious designs. The first, which may bear the name of the Kassite king Ammi-Zaduga, has on one side the winged sun, and on the other the winged horse, both rudely carved. The second, which seems to have the name *Meli-sumu* ("man of the air-god"), also known as a Kassite name, represents a short-coated male deity standing on a lion (as does the younger male god of Iasili-Kaia), representing *Sumu* or "the sky." A seal now in the Ashmolean Museum belongs to this class, and is of peculiar value since it presents a short bilingual. The cuneiform legend, which is in characters at least as old as 1500 B.C., is easily read—"Indilimma ben Sirdamu, servant of the goddess Iskhara," while the Hittite presents only four emblems, which may be interpreted *Isgar Raba*, "the slave of Isgar." The name of this goddess, "the light-maker," is probably synonymous with that of Istar, "the light-maker" or "enlightener."

The study of these religious designs thus serves to show that the religion of the Mongol race of Syria and Armenia, and even of Western Anatolia, was portrayed by symbolism identical with that of the Sumerians and Akkadians. The beardless pig-

tailed figures serve to class these rude and early sculptures, even when inscriptions are absent. The Set-monster is found even as far west as Lydia, and his name has perhaps also been found in Akkadian. The Sumerian and Akkadian hymns furnish us with suitable explanation of the lion-headed figures which guard the temple near Pteria; and the eagle-headed genii are known in Assyria as well as on the Lydian seal. The sphynx, and the winged sun, the two-headed eagle, and other emblems, are common to the Akkadians and the Hittites, as are the naked Istar and the conventional tree of life, the mother goddess nursing her babe, and the lion-headed god of Hell. Religious symbolism, therefore, like racial type and language, supports the contention that the script about to be specially considered was that of the northern Mongols of the earliest age, who were akin to the Kassite kings ruling in Babylon from about 2250 B.C.



## CHAPTER VI.

## MONGOL HIEROGLYPHICS.

THE four great hieroglyphic systems—Egyptian, Cuneiform, Hittite, and Chinese—sprang undoubtedly from rude picture-writings, probably first known in Asia, and which may have been the one common original of them all. With the hieroglyphics of Mexico and Peru we are not concerned. As yet they are unread; but there is evidence which points to their having been derived from China, at the time when (about the sixth century A.D.) the west shores of America were first visited by Buddhists. The Red Indian picture-writing may represent the survival of early attempts at record, or communication, by aid of drawings, and may also have been carried from Asia, since, both by language and physical type, the native Americans are connected with Mongolia. It shows us how limited were the powers of expression of so primitive a method. Human and animal forms were portrayed, numbers represented by strokes,

and rude sketches of enclosures indicated towns or camps attacked; but colour could only be shown by the use of pigments, and abstract ideas found no expression. In Africa an equally primitive pictorial record is found in the Bushman pictures of the south, which are thought to indicate a faint memory of Egyptian graphic art.

About seventy emblems may be considered original, and appear in two or more of the historic systems, some twenty being common to all the four. They may be divided into four groups: first, animal forms; secondly, limbs; thirdly, natural objects not animate; and fourthly, human inventions. In the first class may be found figures of human beings, male and female, kings, soldiers, and (in cuneiform) ghosts, with the more advanced representation of two enemies opposed, or two allies shaking hands, and with the full figures or heads of the bull, the ram, the sheep, the goat, the stag, the ass, the hare, the lion, wolf, and dog, as well as birds, snakes, and worms, all of which were distinguishable by even primitive artists without much trouble and in a few lines. The second class, including limbs, was specially useful for verbs, such as refer to action by seeing, hearing, or touching. We find very common use of the eye, the ear, the face (or mouth), the tongue; of the foot or legs for movement, and the hand in various attitudes of taking, giving, supplication, or menace. The phallus, the *kteis*, and the horns of animals,

are also emblems common to the various systems. The third class includes such emblems as sun, moon, and star, fire and water, the thunderbolt, the firmament, and rain, an outline of mountains denoting "country," and vegetable objects, such as tree, herb, flower, corn, reed, and the vine. In the last group emblems of royalty and of war, of civil life and religion, are included, such as the throne, crown, sceptre, crook, axe, sword, arrow, and bow; the house and altar, with pots, bowls, and bottles of various form, erect stones or monuments, ploughs, sails, boats, pyramids, tablets, cloths, chains, and keys, all more or less clearly used for special words.

The Hittite, Egyptian, and Cuneiform agree in the notation of numbers, strokes representing units, while hoops stand for the tens. The plural in each of these systems is marked by three or four strokes following the noun emblem, and sometimes by reduplicating the emblem. The reduplication of a sign standing for a verb always signifies causative repeated or intense action.

The four systems, however, developed independently at different centres, and soon became very peculiar and distinct, through invention of new emblems or new combinations, and according to the requisites of languages of very different character. The Hittite symbols do not exceed about 160 in all; but the Egyptian soon possessed 400, the Babylonians in later times distinguished 550,



and the Chinese have now 24,235 signs. The first tendency was to combine the old signs, and so form compound pictures having a special meaning. These are usually called *ideograms*, and are often very ingenious. Thus in cuneiform the original bull emblem (a bull's head) was reserved for the domestic herd, and the sign "mountain" was written on the forehead of the wild bull. The old signs for man and woman had in the same way the sign for "land" or "mountain" attached, and then denoted the native population as "slaves." The single star stood (as in Egypt and among Hittites) for deity, two stars for light, and three for all the stars or host of heaven. The emblem for a house with the plural strokes inside meant many houses or "town"; and with a fish inside, a fishing village. The square enclosure with plural strokes signified a "place" or region: with corn-sheaves included it became a "storehouse": with the sign for water within it denoted "swamp"; and with a star inside it was "heaven," the house of God. The firmament in all systems was shown as an arch, and when rays or strokes descended thence they indicated either light or rain descending. The moon with the sign "thirty" within stood in early times for the month, and many similar combinations are easily understood on the same lines.

The Chinese adopted this method, and thus

continually increased the number of their signs, until the system has become so cumbrous as to be only imperfectly known even to native experts. Their combinations were often most ingenious, as, for instance,<sup>1</sup> where the compound sign for rain, under the sign for roof, indicates a "leak." But they had taken a wrong principle in thus multiplying emblems which — when roughly sketched—became difficult to understand, instead of simplifying their script, as was done in the West. The more practical Japanese found a way out of the difficulty by forming a syllabary of selected Chinese signs. We are unable to completely trace the history of Chinese earlier than about the Christian era, when they had already greatly increased the 200 emblems thought to be primitive, and had already so modified the forms, by generations of hasty sketching, that they are for the most part difficult to recognise. The original connection of Chinese hieroglyphics with those of Babylonia was advocated as an explanation of their origin by F. Lenormant, and the question has since received much study; but the results cannot be said to be conclusive, owing to the absence of early Chinese texts. In their oldest forms the Chinese and Babylonian show few resemblances, and many features of the Chinese system—such as the notation of num-

<sup>1</sup> For the Chinese generally see Chalmers's 'Structure of Chinese Characters.' Hong-Kong, 1882.

erals, and figures of the rat, tortoise, monkey, dragon, elephant, &c., are quite unknown in the Western Asiatic systems. The Chinese language is in like manner of Mongol origin and remotely akin to the Akkadian, but it has become so changed through lapse of ages, and has so much modified its vocabulary within historic times, that even the primitive Cantonese gives few reliable comparisons with Akkadian words, while the grammar has equally been modified, especially in syntax.

In the West it soon became customary to use the pictorial emblem simply as a sound, in order to spell words with it as with syllables. The principle was that of our modern picture-puzzles, in which, for instance, "I see" may be represented by an "eye" and "the sea." This method represented a great advance in thought and in the requirements of an increasing vocabulary. By such means abstract ideas could at length be represented, and the number of emblems could be limited. Even in Chinese three-quarters of the modern emblems are estimated to be "phonetic" or syllabic, the rest being pictures or ideograms. But such puzzle-writing being notoriously difficult to read, it became a practice common to all systems to add "keys," or, as they are called by scholars, *determinatives*, which indicated the class of object, of which the name was spelt by one or more syllables. Early languages being all derived from



monosyllabic roots, the original words required only single signs; but as language advanced and words became longer, the use of syllables became imperative. The commonest "keys" in all four systems are those distinguishing gods, towns, countries, male and female names, and royal titles. Thus "eye" alone would stand for the pronoun "I"; but with a key, showing that a "limb" was intended, it meant "eye." Or "sea" alone would read "see," but with the key for "water" attached would mean "sea." The reading of ancient inscriptions is rendered much easier when these keys are known. Personal names and other classes of nouns are thus at once distinguished from others which are not proper names. On the same principle we still use capital letters to distinguish proper nouns in rapid reading.

The old picture emblem had clearly no single sound attached if the language contained more than one word for the object. Thus the horned head might at will be read "stag," "deer," or "buck"; the head of the ass might be read "donkey," and the house would stand for "home" or "abode." The difficulty was increased when two nations used the same script—as in Babylonia. The Akkadian word attached to the "star" was *An* for god. The Semitic people read it *ilu* (god); but when they used the sign as a syllable, it was with the old Akkadian sound *An*, showing that they were not the inventors of the system, which

they borrowed from the Mongols. Thus in Chaldea every symbol had several sounds, some of which were Mongol and some Semitic. Many uncertainties arise from this natural development; but they are dispelled to a great degree by the lists prepared in the seventh century B.C. by Semitic scribes, who have given us in parallel columns the Mongol and Semitic sounds. What has been said of this single example *An* applies to all the rest of the cuneiform emblems, and "polyphony," as it is called, is one of the difficulties with which a student of cuneiform has to deal, accounting for many differences of interpretation among scholars. In Egypt the difficulty is less, since only one language was used, and because, as a rule, only one sound was attached to each emblem.

The "law of least effort," which Dr Isaac Taylor lays down as accounting for the gradual deterioration in the recognisable outline of any emblem, is very important for our inquiry. No one would suspect, when looking at the letter *m* in Egyptian, as written in Ptolemaic times on papyrus, that this was the last trace of an outline which, on well-carved hieroglyphic texts, represented an "owl." When writing was confined to records on hard stones, the hewn emblems kept their shapes. But much depends on the materials used; and when in later days scribes familiar with the script sketched (ever more and more rapidly) the old pictorial em-

blems with ink on papyrus, they constantly simplified labour by omitting strokes, just as in our own days we fail to cross the letter *t* or to dot the *i* in hasty writing. In Babylonia the incised outlines of the old granite inscriptions are fairly recognisable though conventional; but when clay came into use for writing epistles, and a wooden or copper graver was dug into the soft surface in sketching the forms, it resulted that a series of wedge-shaped prickings produced a very special effect, which we call cuneiform writing, as distinguished from the original "linear Babylonian." And so familiar became the conventions thus arising, that in later times the wedges were reproduced even when the text was on stone. In the Hittite system the same rough sketching is observable in the case of incised inscriptions, while those which are cut in relief are more clearly defined, and give us with more certainty the original outline of the emblems.

From the syllable to the letter was a third step, which finally produced the alphabet; yet so abstract is the idea of a letter by itself, that at least two thousand years passed before syllables were superseded, and the number of emblems thus reduced to an eighth approximately of those before considered necessary to learn. The Egyptians appear to have been the first so to form an alphabet of twenty-five letters proper, which they used for spelling words; but they



never wholly confined themselves to these, and continued to regard the keys as necessary, and to express unusual words by special pictorial signs. The Babylonians never adopted this system, but continued, even down to the first century A.D., to employ syllables and wedges long after Phœnician, Greek, and Roman letters were in common use. The Persians, however, did simplify the cuneiform into a rude alphabet, which retains indications of syllabic origin; but they also retained the use of the "keys" to distinguish various classes of nouns. As to the origin of the Phœnician alphabet, more remains to be said later.

The arrangement of the emblems differed in different scripts. In Egypt there is no general rule, and symbols were placed with a view to artistic effect, either vertically or side by side, reading from either left or right. The Chinese write vertically, and the Akkadians placed two or more syllables of a word one below another, and if the word was long it occupied two rows. The writing was from right to left, and the lines were scored across horizontally, while the words were also divided by vertical lines into compartments, indicating a clause in the sentence. When, however, short texts came to be written on clay, it was found just as easy to read them sideways, and the curious result has been that this latter became the accepted fashion. The emblems when in profile faced to the right—looking towards the beginning

of the line—and thus, when seen sideways, they all fell on their backs, and the line began on the left. Babylonian and Assyrian and all the derived scripts thus read horizontally from the left.

The early Greek inscriptions are written in alternate lines, from right to left and left to right, the letters in the second line being reversed. This system had some advantage in writing, but was not generally adopted. Until the discovery of the Hittite script it was supposed peculiar to Greece, and was known as *boustrophedon* writing, from the plough-furrow which turns back at the end of the field. It is remarkable, however, that all Hittite texts are so arranged, every emblem in the alternate lines being reversed. Like the Akkadians the Hittites placed the syllables vertically one below the other, to the number of three or four, and divided the lines by horizontal divisions. They also used a sign for division between words, which is of great value for correct reading; and they used large emblems for important parts of speech, and smaller ones for suffixes, just as they made their gods much larger than the worshippers. It is also evident that a single emblem, occupying the total height of the line, generally marks the end of a clause, and that in certain cases the position of a sign standing alone, and not so filling the line, is important, and meant to show its special use, whether as a prefix or as a suffix—the one at the top, the other at the bottom, of the line.

These general principles, then, which apply to all hieroglyphic writing, must guide us in decipherment of any newly found system. We have first to catalogue the emblems, and to discover whether there is a limit to their variety. If such a limit exists, the writing cannot be purely pictorial. In Chinese there is practically no limit. In Akkadian the old system consisted of about 160 emblems as used at Zirgul, but when special compounds are added it is found (from various sources) to have gradually amounted to 300 in all, which the Babylonians again increased to about 550 signs. Only about 150, however, were commonly used as syllables. The Hittite emblems, as far as known, do not exceed 160 in all, including compounds, and we may feel sure, therefore, that we are dealing, not with pure picture-writing, but with some kind of syllabary. If we found only some 25 or 30 signs, we should feel sure that they represented an alphabet; but no alphabetic system is expressed by signs so clearly pictorial in origin. The lapse of time, and the "law of least effort," had conventionalised the signs till they had lost their original outline, long before any alphabet was used in Asia.

But how, it is often asked, can it be possible to read inscriptions, when you have no knowledge of either sounds or language, and no bilinguals in some other script to assist? It must not be forgotten that this problem was actually solved, nevertheless,



in the case of the cuneiform. The Persian texts presented only a few signs, which were treated as a cipher, and as the language was suspected—from accompanying sculptures—to be Persian, the cipher was finally discovered, after many partial attempts; and from this starting-point Sir H. Rawlinson and others advanced to the reading of the Babylonian and Akkadian texts, which appeared hopelessly unintelligible on account of the much larger number of their emblems. It was then found that bilinguals in Greek and cuneiform actually existed, and the reading of these showed the correct solution to have been already found. The problem was thus far more difficult than that solved by Champollion, since a long bilingual in Greek and Egyptian was available in the Rosetta Stone. But the cuneiform interpreters had the benefit of Champollion's experience, and were able to apply principles laid down by him to their work. In the case of the Hittite the same principles apply, and the methods of the discoverers of the two previous systems may be copied.

At the same time, it is clear that no true readings can be obtained unless the sounds of the emblems are known, and the language definitely fixed. Grammatical structure differs so much in various classes of speech, that it is first necessary to determine the class of language to be expected. Many had tried to read Egyptian before Champollion, but they failed because they tried to run before

they could walk, and to read before they could spell. The cuneiform was once said not to be a script at all, but merely an ornamental pattern of various kinds of flowers. Egyptian students regarded the hieroglyphic system as purely pictorial, and tried to read it as such. The Hittite, in spite of its limited number of signs, has also been regarded as picture-writing, and it has even been denied that the sculptured emblems are inscriptions at all. Experience should have taught us the reverse; but it was long before vicious methods were abandoned in Egyptian, and the genius of Champollion was long unrecognised. He determined to exhaust the study of each emblem, and to find its sound before beginning to try to read. He traced the history of each sign from its old hieroglyphic form, through the hieratic, down to the yet more cursive hand called Demotic, and showed that the Demotic and hieroglyphic signs of the Rosetta Stone were but older and later forms of the same emblems. He also remarked that a pure picture-writing was incapable of expressing the names of persons, such as Ptolemy and Cleopatra, which were distinguished in their various recurrences by the surrounding cartouches; and having by means of these—as known from the Greek—recovered many sounds, he found in the Coptic a language descended from Egyptian, and, applying it to the text, was able to read the whole. It is not until a similar process has been completed

for the Hittite, and both the sounds of the emblems and the class of the language defined, that any but arbitrary results can be expected. But it must not be forgotten that, in this instance, we actually have two bilinguals—unfortunately very short ones—whereby to check results, and, as will now be explained, we have means of recovering the sounds of the language, and indications of its character. The problem is therefore not as hopeless as it might at first be thought to be, and the indications noted in previous pages all point us in one direction.

First, then, as regards the sounds of the emblems, which we must know before the inscriptions can be spelt out: a very valuable clue was discovered by Dr Isaac Taylor and Dr Sayce some fifteen years ago—namely, the existence of a later hieratic form of this script, with known sounds, depending on a yet earlier discovery by G. Smith, which rests on a bilingual in Greek and Phœnician found in Cyprus. The Greeks are believed to have received the Semitic alphabet before 1000 B.C., but in the sixth and down to the fourth century in Cyprus they were using a syllabary of 54 signs, which is also found in Lycia, and forms the original source of several peculiar Lycian and Carian letters not used by Greeks. It was recognised that the emblems of this Cypriote syllabary were in many cases the same found in Hittite, and though some of the comparisons appear to have been incorrect,



others, like the syllables *mo*, *ne*, *ka*, *ti*, &c., were indisputable. The recovery of some of the sounds required was thus first made, and was an important step towards final decipherment.

But it is also noticeable that this syllabary was of very rude character, and very ill fitted to express the sounds of the Greek language. It is of course no more necessary to suppose that the script was of Greek origin, than it was to suppose that the Persians invented cuneiform. The syllabary might be borrowed from some neighbouring people of another race. It could not well have been Semitic, because it fails to distinguish the special sounds on which Semitic languages lay stress. It might, however, easily be Mongol, since it would suffice for the sounds of a Mongol dialect. The Cypriote syllabary does not distinguish *g* from *k*, or *t* from *d*, or *m* from *v*, nor is the distinction very clear between *l* and *r*, or between *s* and *z*; and these indefinite sounds we have already found to be equally indefinite in Sumerian and Akkadian speech. The Mongol origin of the syllabary is thus indicated by the peculiarities of its sounds. The alphabets required for Aryan or Semitic speech must contain more consonants, and more vowels, than are required in writing a Mongol text.

But when all the Cypriote emblems have been compared with their Hittite originals there still remains much to be done. Only 60 out of about 160 sounds can be so recovered, and we have still

to determine the class of language with which we are dealing. A further step had to be taken—namely, to show, from internal evidence of form and sound, that the Cypriote emblems were originated by people speaking a Mongol language. These steps having now been attempted require to be carefully explained, that the reader may see the reasons for assigning certain sounds and values to the emblems in question, and may be satisfied that the suggestions are not arbitrary, but based on special reasons in each case.

As regards the first point, we have a Cypriote sign representing the outline of two mountains, and having the sound *mi*. We require a language, then, in which—judging from Egyptian and cuneiform analogy—*mi* means “mountain” or “country.” This would be the language of those who invented the sign. We have a sign which originally was a hand holding a stick, and its sound is *ta* or *da*. We require a language in which this sound means to “beat” or “drive.” We have a male emblem with the sound *ne*, and a female emblem with the sound *mo*; we need, therefore, a language in which these sounds signify male and female. And so on with the rest of the signs—such as *ti* for an arrow, or *ga* for a crook; and if in any one language all these words can be found, so that the word for the emblem coincides with its form and its sound, as separately determined, that beyond reasonable doubt would be the speech of those who originated the script.

Guided by considerations already noticed, we look then to Mongol speech for the clue, especially because monosyllabic words are commonly found in this class of language, and are uncommon in Semitic tongues, and not usual in Aryan languages. We find at once that *ma* and *mi* are widely spread words for "earth," "land," or "place" in Mongol languages, as, for instance, in Finnish, and that in Akkadian *ma* means "abode" and probably "earth." In this language also *da* means "to drive," *na* means "male," and *muk* "female," *ti* is the sound accompanying the arrow emblem, and *ga* is a crook. We are dealing with a language contemporary with the Hittite, the sounds of which, however, survive still in great measure in pure Turkish—a language, therefore, probably in the same linguistic stage with that to be discovered, but one with a very peculiar grammatical structure. The next question, therefore, is whether the structure as well as the sounds will suit the inscriptions which are to be read.

The internal evidence of the texts shows that structure also is Mongol. Most scholars appear now to admit that we are dealing with agglutinative speech, and with a language using suffixes rather than prefixes. When we have so described the language we are, in fact, only saying that it is Mongolic. Aryan languages are not agglutinative but inflexional. They use prepositions,



not post-positions. Semitic speech agrees in these features with Aryan, not with Mongol grammar. The reason why the language must be regarded as Mongolic in structure is, that on Hittite texts the smaller signs, recognised to be probably cases and affixes, occur under the large signs for nouns and verbs. The signs at the beginning of a text have after them strokes like those which represent the plural, in Egyptian and in early cuneiform. These, then, are probably nouns and adjectives. The signs at the ends of inscriptions are often those legs, arms, and faces which, in other systems, signify "go," "take," "speak." These, then, are probably verbs. The proper structure of Akkadian speech invariably places the verb last, whereas in Aryan and Semitic languages it may precede the noun. So the Persian (Aryan) texts begin "Saith Darius the king," but the Medic (Mongol) version of the same inscription reads "Darius the king saith." Finally we discover strings of nouns and adjectives followed by a single sign of case, and forming a "packet" governed by this sign; and we recognise in this what is called the "encapsulation" of the Akkadian—a peculiar feature of Mongol grammar. Structure, therefore, like vocabulary, points to a Mongol language as that of the Hittite texts, and of all those written in the same script.

The emblems in Hittite had probably—as in Akkadian—more than one sound, but those which

are commonest—amounting to some 50 in all—which are constantly repeated in varying combinations, are probably syllables used with a single well-known sound. How, then, are we to recover the sounds of those which are not found in the Cypriote syllabary? If the latter gives us the syllables *ta, ti, tu*, but not *at, it, ut*, how can the latter—which by the analogy of the cuneiform are to be expected—be distinguished? We might feel justified in assuming sounds fitted to the form of the emblem, and so call the sign for the sun *ut* as in Akkadian. But without some further check this would not carry conviction. The problem, however, is simplified by aid of the bilinguals, which not only give a few sounds, but which show us, in at least one case, that the Hittite emblem is actually the same which was used in the Sumerian system. This connection between Hittite and linear Babylonian was suspected by George Smith; and now that the latter script is better known than it was ten years ago, it is evident that the two systems are very closely connected, for out of 160 Hittite signs there are only about 40 which cannot be so compared. The two systems are not identical, but they are only branches of one original script, developing independently in the north and south of Mesopotamia. The better formed emblems of the Hittite texts give us the prototypes of most of the signs more rudely sketched in Chaldea.

Our way is now clear, and the method for pre-

liminary study of the separate emblems is the same used for former scripts. It remains to utilise the bilinguals, and to discover the "keys" which may be expected to distinguish proper names. The Ashmolean seal has already been noted, with the Hittite text *Is-gar Raba*; and *raba* is an Akkadian word for "servant," so that *Is-gar Raba* answers to the cuneiform legend of the seal, *Abd Iskhar*, "the servant of the deity Iskhar." The silver boss found in Cilicia, which may have been the head of a sceptre, bears the cuneiform text *Tarkutimme* (or *Tarraktimme*) *sar mat Erime*, "Tarkotimme king of the land of Erime." The so-called Hittite emblems are six in number, symmetrically repeated on each side of the central figure of a long-robed priest or king with a spear. They may be read *Tar-ko tim mi Eri-me*. The first is a stag's or goat's head, and in Akkadian we have the words *dara* and *darag* for "buck"; the second has the form of the Cypriote *ko*; the third has the form of the Akkadian emblem *dim*; the fourth is the double mountain (*mi*) already mentioned. It may either mean "land" or simply be a syllable. The fifth is not unlike the early cuneiform *ir*; and the last consists of four strokes, indicating that *me* was a plural sound, as it is also in cuneiform. The bilingual boss, therefore, not only agrees with the principles laid down for finding sounds from the Cypriote, but also shows us in two cases a "Hittite" form of emblem similar to one known in cuneiform,



and having the same sound. Thus by spelling we arrive at reading, and check the previous conclusions as to the required sounds.

The Babylonians and Assyrians placed a vertical stroke before the names of men, but one of the difficulties of reading Sumerian historic texts is that this stroke is not used, and consequently the personal names are not always certainly distinguishable. On the two Hittite bilinguals this stroke is also absent from the native texts; but on other texts, names which seem clearly personal are accompanied by a sign which seems to represent a monolith on a base. It has probably the sound *us* (male), and appears to be a "key" by which personal names are distinguished.

Other "keys" can also be recognised—namely, a star for deity (occurring over the figure of a god on the Lydian seal already noticed), which star also denotes god in cuneiform and Egyptian. The proper sign for "country" seems to be a three-peaked mountain, as in the two systems just noticed. The sign for "city" is a peculiar one, found also in cuneiform, and supposed to represent a "seat." The sign for "king" is a head with a high cap. The emblem for "region" is a cord, probably with the sound *ip* (Akkadian *ip*, "region," and "cord"—as also in Turkish); while the throne stands for "prince" as in cuneiform—probably with the sound *en*. The Akkadian pronouns and case-endings are in like manner easily

recognised by the Cypriote sounds, and the whole Hittite system bears a most marked resemblance to that used by the Sumerians of Chaldea at a yet earlier age.

Even when this preliminary work is accomplished, the reading of the texts presents many difficulties. The subject has to be determined, and many texts are fragmentary or indistinct, while others have been badly copied by explorers to whom the character was strange. The emblems are often written in a crowded and irregular manner, and when the inscriptions are incised they are only roughly sketched. We must rely chiefly on those of which the originals can be studied, or on the copies made by Mr D. G. Hogarth, who possessed a list of emblems known from other texts, and was thus able to copy those he found with accuracy.

As regards the subject of the texts, it was not unnatural, at first, to suppose that they were religious, since they accompanied figures of deities in many cases and might be dedications. But, on the other hand, historic texts are often accompanied by religious figures, and personal names on seals are generally consecrated by similar images of protecting deities. A sign which may represent an "eye" was thought, by Dr Sayce and others, to be that used in Hittite for deity. Others urged that it was the "key" for names of countries. The former supposition seemed to be supported by a similar sign (if correctly copied) occurring

on the sceptres of gods at Iasili-Kaia. But its occurrence in the more recently discovered inscriptions seems now to render this explanation improbable. The sound of the emblem is probably *si*, which does not mean god, but is an Akkadian word for "eye" and for "country." The meaning of the texts in great measure depends on whether they refer to "places" or to "gods," as in one case they might be historic, and in the other would be religious. In the one case the person invoked may be the human overlord, in the other the protecting god. Ten years of study seem to result in the historical rather than the religious being the true explanation. In this case the curious horned head, which clearly denotes an "evil" person, will apply, not to the fiends, of whom, as we have seen, the Mongols were so much afraid, but to human foes; and the texts on which this occurs may relate to victories over such, and not to the assaults of demons.

The reader who wishes, after considering the general question, to proceed further into detail, will find, in the Appendices of this volume, both the translations proposed by the author for the known texts in "Hittite" script, and the reasons for assigning a sound to each emblem. In conclusion of the present chapter, it is proposed to consider the later history of the script, and to describe the monuments and the seals. The names found on both, which are historic and



belong to the first Babylonian dynasty, furnish a further argument in favour of the decipherment which has here been attempted.

The ancients were very uncertain as to the derivation of the great alphabet which superseded all other scripts in Asia and Europe alike. Herodotus (v. 58) says that the Phœnicians taught the Greeks letters. Berosus<sup>1</sup> claimed the invention of writing for Babylon. Tacitus<sup>2</sup> favoured an Egyptian origin. Pliny was doubtful, saying (v. 12) that the Phœnicians invented letters, but assigning to them only 16, others being added by Greeks (vii. 56). Aristotle thought that 17 of the letters then in use were ancient; but the balance of opinion was in favour of Phœnician origin, though Tacitus thought that they were taught to the Syrians by the Egyptians—a theory which De Rougé revived in the present century, and endeavoured to trace Phœnician letters to the hieratic script.

The objections to this view are briefly—First, that we do not even then account for the whole alphabet, for the Greeks had 5 more letters than the Phœnicians, and the Carians and Lycians had others. Secondly, that the supposed resemblances between hieratic and Phœnician letters are very faint. Thirdly, that the Egyptian emblems did not represent the objects which we should expect from the Phœnician names, such as *Aleph*, ox,

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius, Chron. Can., v. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Ann., xi. 14.

*Beth*, house, &c. The extra letters of the Greek have been traced to the Cypriote syllabary, and as a single origin for the whole alphabet, and one native rather than foreign, is probable, this raises the question whether Cypriote is not the real basis of Phœnician and Greek letters alike, in which case the Hittite emblems would be the original symbols.

The Greeks adopted Semitic names for most of their letters, but it is remarkable that the Etruscans did not know these, but only called their letters as we do, *Ba*, *Da*, &c. Possibly, then, the Etruscans took with them an alphabet of Mongol origin, being Mongols themselves. The Greek letters *Phi*, *Khi*, and *Psi*, in like manner, have only syllabic titles, and may have been taken from Mongols. The problem, therefore, is to discover whether, in Hittite speech, the syllabic name of each emblem might be such as to denote the object to which the Phœnicians referred in giving Semitic names to the letters. It will be seen from an investigation of each letter that this appears to have been really the case, and that the emblems were used not only by the Hittites, but by the Akkadians as well, although the comparison is closer with the signs of a script used as we know on the very borders of Phœnicia.

That the alphabet should have originated in Arabia is improbable. The Arabs adopted the

civilisation of Babylon, and of the Hebrew and Phœnician traders who first visited Yemen about the time when letters took the place of cuneiform signs in Syria. The antiquity of recently found texts of Yemen has been exaggerated, and the majority of these inscriptions do not date earlier than the third century B.C. In North Arabia an Aramaic alphabet was used which may have been known as early as 500 B.C., but the Moabite Stone is four hundred years older, and the ancient text of Panammu I. at Samalla dates from 800 B.C. The alphabet came into use after 1500 B.C., since cuneiform was then the common script of all Western Asia, but it was probably invented at least as early as 1200 B.C. It was from Phœnicians that the Arabs must have learned letters, and no ancient author ever suggests the contrary explanation.

The history of the letters is detailed in the Appendix. We find, for instance, that *ā* or *av* was the old Mongol word for "bull," and the bull's head is the very evident origin of the letter called Aleph (bull), whence our A is derived. The old Akkadian word for "house" was *ab* (Turkish, *ev* or *eb*), and the sign common to Hittites and Akkadians was the probable origin of *Beth* (house), whence our modern B. The letter L was called *Lamda* by the Greeks, and *Lamed* by the Phœnicians. It appears to have represented a yoke, and may be derived from the Hittite *lu*, "yoke,"



while in Akkadian *lu* also means "yoke," and *lam-da* "the plough-yoke." These instances may suffice for the present, but nearly every letter of the alphabet may be similarly explained, and it seems that to the Hittites, not to the Egyptians, we owe the invention of those letters in which all civilised nations of Europe and America now write.

The known inscriptions in the character used by Hittites, Kassites, and other tribes are as yet few in number, and the script is confined to Syria and Asia Minor, with exception of a votive text on a stone bowl found at Babylon, and now in the British Museum, together with several Ninevite seals. The bowl might have been carried off as spoil from elsewhere, and some of the seals appear to have royal Babylonian names upon them, showing that in the earliest age the script may there have been used by the Kassite kings. It is only in later times that the Kassites used the cuneiform, Agukakrime, about 1500 B.C., calling himself "king of the Kassi and of Akkad, king of the wide country of Babylon," in a Semitic text, while Karandas, about twenty years later, is "king of Babylon, Sumir, and Akkad, king of Kassu, and king of Karadunias." These monarchs belong to the third dynasty, and of the 1st we have no monuments before Ammurabi unless they be recognised in those inscribed with so-called "Hittite" emblems.

The texts at a distance from Babylon seem to

have been written by local rulers, who acknowledged the monarch of Babylon as an overlord. There are, as already said, only two groups of four emblems at Iasili-Kaia, and several other sites have been described which have yielded no inscriptions. The Ninevite signets may have been collected by Assurbanipal, or some other Assyrian king who gathered the earlier monumental records of the empire. At Samosata an imperfect example has been copied by Puchstein, but is not certainly legible. In Cappadocia the remains are found in the south and west, the texts being generally incised like that on the bowl. Among these are two from Gurun, some sixty miles south of Sivas, discovered by Sir C. W. Wilson, and carefully copied by Mr D. G. Hogarth. The more important of these two is notable as showing numerals, and the name of the city Gorumo may be found on it, with the date of carving. It is unfortunately much injured, but was written apparently by a certain Tarkatimme, the local ruler. This title was common, and the name of Tarkondimotos, known as a Cilician prince as late as the time of Augustus, is clearly similar, as pointed out by Dr Mordtmann.

At Izghin a text in relief, with seventy very short lines, runs round the four sides of a limestone obelisk eight feet high. It was hastily copied, but seems to refer to a ruler established in his paternal possessions, whose name has been defaced. At Palanga a text in four lines, incised and beginning

on the left, occurs on the front, left side, and back, of a basalt statue representing a seated figure. On this may probably be read the name of Sumuabi, the first Kassite king of Babylon (2250 B.C.), and it records the establishment of a ruler named Nana-eri ("the servant of Nana") after conquest of the region under his overlord.

At Tyana an obelisk was found by Dr Ramsay which came from Bor, at which place the lower half is still preserved, but could not be copied. The upper part represents a king's head, with beard and hair in Babylonian style, and four lines of incised writing. These also refer to conquest and allegiance to a monarch whose name is doubtful, but may be *Sumalu*, equivalent to that of Sumulailu (or Sumulan), the second Babylonian king (2236 B.C.) Farther west in Cilicia the great pass of Bulgar Maden is the site of a very fine rock-cut text, which seems to refer to Eriaku of Larsa (2140 B.C.), and which marks the boundary of conquest in this direction. It consists of five lines beginning on the right, and is one of the most perfect known, and well copied by Mr Hogarth. The script is more hieratic than that of earlier examples, and often closely reproduces the Cypriote forms of emblems.

At Kolutölu Yaila is another inscription, also well carved in relief on a block of red calcareous stone, but much injured, the reading being doubtful. The great bas-relief at Ibreez, west of Tarsus,



has already been noticed. Two short texts accompany the figures, and were copied by Major Fischer in 1838, by Rev. E. J. Davis in 1875, and by Mr Hogarth in 1890. These are dedicatory. A broken fragment of a third inscription, much worn, also occurs below. Yet farther west, on the north side of Mount Sipylos, two leagues east of Magnesia, is the Cybele statue already described; and near Ephesus, at the Karabel Pass, are two figures, one of which was first described by Texier and bears a short text. These are noticed by Herodotus (ii. 102), who describes the spear and bow borne by the figure in one case. The pointed cap, short jerkin, and curling shoes resemble the costume of the gods at Pteria. Herodotus thought that they represented Sesostris, and says that an Egyptian text ran across the breast between the shoulders, but if so it has disappeared, and only the native inscription on the field of the bas-relief remains. The second figure was found by Dr Beddoe in 1856, and is not inscribed.

The most northern sculptures of this class west of the Halys river include the two figures of a king and a warrior at Ghiaur Kalessi ("the infidel's fort"), some thirty miles south-west of Angora, and a lion at Kalaba, east of that town, but neither of these has an inscription. The king at Ghiaur-Kalessi is bearded, and wears a crown apparently marked by an Uræus snake in front, if correctly copied. He follows the warrior, who

wears a round cap or helmet, and has a broadsword. These figures are each ten feet in height.

At Doghanlu Deresi, in Phrygia, a very primitive figure, with three very rude emblems, seems to belong to the same class. This figure is some two feet in height, and was sketched by Prof. Ramsay.<sup>1</sup> The site lies between Koutahieh and Sevri Hissar. At Arslan Tepe, near Malatiya, Mr Hogarth found bas-reliefs with two texts, one of which is a dedication after victory, as more fully described in the Appendix.

The most beautifully executed of these hieroglyphs occur at Carchemish, and three texts are now in the British Museum. The first accompanies the figure of a king named Tarkotimme, the vassal of Zabu, the third king of the 1st Babylonian dynasty (2201 B.C.): it is injured to the left. The second runs round the recesses of a door-jamb, and is broken off. It presents five lines of well-finished emblems in relief, cut in hard basalt, and appears to refer to a conquest. The third is on the curved surface of a basalt monolith, and is much worn. It refers to war, and appears to contain the name of the city, written Karkumis. Besides these there are several other fragments in the Museum; and a text, above a seated figure, lies yet in the ruins, and has been only very imperfectly sketched.

At Aleppo there were at least two such texts,

<sup>1</sup> Journal of Hellenic Studies, vol. iii. Pl. xxi B, pp. 9, 10.

but they have now been destroyed. Four copies of one of these made by different explorers exist, but differ a good deal, and are very indefinite, showing the decayed condition of the original. Not impossibly the name of Eriaku occurs here also.

At Hamath four stones, first seen by Burckhardt in 1812, and now in Constantinople, are less well preserved. They present five inscriptions, of which there are two sets of casts in England. The name of Dutar (like the Hittite Totar of the Egyptian records) may perhaps be read, and that of his overlord was apparently Sumumelu (perhaps the same as Sumulailu), in two cases. These texts also perhaps preserve the Mongol name of the city as Karak (fortress), equivalent to the Semitic Hamah—or "fort." The expression of allegiance might refer to a deity, but the historic explanation seems on further study to be preferable. In the Hamath as in the Carchemish texts, Babylon seems to be noticed under its old name as the "holy" city of the Tree of Life.

At Mer'ash, north of Carchemish, there are four texts, one found by Dr Gwyther in 1882 on a carved lion, which is now at Constantinople. It is the most perfect known, and the cast can be seen in the British Museum. The name of the chief who erected it is Targon, and that of his suzerain probably Zabû. It is a monument of victory. The second text at Mer'ash accompanies two very



archaic figures, of a king whose name was apparently Zumoebi (or Sumuabi as before), and of a prince named Kesir, who owned him as overlord. This is therefore one of the oldest of all, and earlier than the better executed lion. The third and fourth texts are hardly legible from the copies.

With the addition of the seals on which occur perhaps the names of Ammi-Zaduga, Ammi-Satana, and Ebisum, these are the only known Hittite inscriptions, numbering 70 in all, and all belonging to the period of the 1st Babylonian dynasty. Excavation in the palace of Tarkudimme at Carchemish would probably bring other remains to light, and a bilingual in cuneiform might well be expected in this frontier fortress.

In conclusion of this general account, the following results of ten years' work are submitted to the reader's judgment. First, that it is shown, by language and physical type, that the Hittites were a Mongol tribe, who were finally scattered in the seventh century B.C. Secondly, that the peculiar script of Syria and Asia Minor is intimately connected with that of the Sumerians in Chaldea. Thirdly, that the language is clearly Mongol, and not Aryan or Semitic. Fourthly, that the historic references point to the age of the first Kassite kings of Babylon, between 2250 and 2000 B.C., and that this agrees with the archaic character of the script, and of the accompanying

sculptures. Those to whom the arguments here adduced appeal as being well founded may be inclined to study the subject more in detail, and to read the Appendices to this volume, in which those details are given, and translations resulting from the spelling out of the texts are developed. The results may perhaps be modified by further discovery; but it appears unlikely that the main features of the solution offered for this problem will be disturbed, and an interesting chapter in the very early history of Asiatic civilisation will, it is hoped, be considered to have been made intelligible by the study of this intricate and difficult question.

## APPENDIX I.

## CHRONOLOGY.

To settle as far as possible the chronology of our periods is important for comparative purposes. Egyptian chronology is notoriously uncertain, and requires to be checked as far as possible by the Babylonian, which is far better established. The Assyrian canon begins in 893 B.C. and comes down to 666 B.C., forming a basis for calculation reliable within a year, being checked by the notice of an eclipse of the sun on 15th June 763 B.C. Earlier dates are less exact, but a catena is established by various statements of Assyrian kings, and of Nabonidus of Babylon, which give results probably reliable at least as far back as the time of the foundation of Babylon, as below:—

1. Sennacherib in his text of the tenth year, at Bavian, speaks of the defeat by Marduk-Nadinakhi of Tiglath-Pileser I. as occurring 418 years earlier (or 618 according to another decipherment, which, however, agrees less well with other data), so that the probable date is 1113 B.C. As, however, this defeat does not appear to have belonged to the early part of the reign of Tiglath-Pileser I., the first five years of which at least were victorious, his accession may be placed as early as 1120, and perhaps as 1130 B.C.

2. Sennacherib also speaks of the seal of Tiglath-Adar of Assyria as having been carried off 600 years before his



own conquest of Babylon in 692 B.C., giving a date 1292 B.C. Tiglath-Adar conquered Babylon—probably earlier—and would accede roughly about 1300 B.C.

3. Tiglath-Pileser I., rebuilding a temple in Assur, sought for the foundation cylinder, and says, "The monumental stones of Samas-Rimmon my ancestor I anointed with oil, a victim I sacrificed, and restored them to their place." He further states that the temple had then lain waste for sixty years, in the reign of Assur-Dan, roughly from about 1200 B.C. Again the text states that the temple had gradually decayed for 641 years before Assur-Dan, from the time of Samas-Rimmon, *patesi* of Assur, son of Ismi-Dagon, *patesi* of Assur, who would, roughly speaking, have reigned (as a prince dependent on Babylon) about 1850 B.C.

4. The contemporary of Assur-Dan in Babylon about 1200 B.C. was Zamama-mumu (if the name is Kassite).

5. Nabonidus, the last king of Babylon, states that Burnaburias of Babylon set up an image of the Sun in Larsa 700 years before Khamzir of Babylon restored it, which carries back his reign to 1420 B.C. As the earlier part of this reign was disturbed by Assyrian disputes, the Temple building may be supposed to be in the later period, and Burnaburias may have acceded as early as 1440 B.C.

6. Nabonidus also says that 'Ammurabi reigned 700 years before Burnaburias, which will bring his accession to about 2140 B.C. or later.

7. Assurbanipal states that Kudur-Nanhundi of Elam invaded Babylonia 1635 years before the date of his own conquest of Elam in 645 B.C. The Elamite king was thus ruling about 2280 B.C.

8. Nabonidus mentions Dungi as living 700 years before 'Ammurabi—or, roughly, in 2800 B.C.

9. Nabonidus discovered the cylinder of Naramaku, whom he believed to have lived 3200 years before himself, or about 3750 B.C. The father of the latter (Sargina) would thus be ruling about 3800 B.C., but this remote

period is not likely to have been very accurately known.<sup>1</sup>

10. Nabonidus speaks of a (Kassite) king, named Sagsalti-burias, as reigning 800 years before himself, or about 1350 B.C.

These references contrast remarkably with the absence of chronological statements in Egypt, and though they may not be accurate, they are at least better foundations for history than the garbled texts of later Greek writers, like Berosus or Manetho. From various Greek sources,<sup>2</sup> however, Sir H. Rawlinson calculates, by separate series of dates, that the foundation of Babylon occurred in either 2234, 2233, or 2231 B.C. This appears to agree with monumental history within some twenty years—for two valuable tablets, discovered by Mr H. Rassam and translated by Mr T. G. Pinches, record the reigns of the Babylonian kings from the first; and though they are injured,

<sup>1</sup> At Nippur Dr Peters found the bricks of Sargina and Naramaku immediately under those of Urbau (who has even been thought to have been the son of Naramaku). In this case Sargina may be brought down to 2900 B.C. at earliest. Whether a text by a certain Sargani (if this is a proper name) should be attributed to Sargina is very doubtful. The inscription on a gate-socket reads probably—

- (1) *AN ENLIL gal Ba Sargani Sar Uru da khuv Sar Agade [cī]  
Ba tum Ekur e AN ENLIL in ENLILKI sa Dub.*  
(2) [*gina?*] *lila [gin?] AN ENLIL Bae ANUT Bae Dingirri  
[ussu?] lila khu bae seballa lili NA GU tu.*

“Sargani, who is king of the city, king of the place Agade, has made this for the great genius, a temple of the high house of the genius, in the place of the genius making a tablet of consecration, a shrine of the genius, a shrine of the Sun-god, the mighty god, which shrine to the spirit being worshipped, the spirit descends to the place of rest” (or to the district).

It is remarkable that while finding remains of the early Sumerian kings above mentioned, and of Urbau and Dungi, as well as of rulers of the 2nd Kassite dynasty, none were discovered of the first Babylonians—Sumuabi, Zabu, &c.; which shows either that they had not conquered the Sumerians before the time of Eriaku, or that they did not use the Sumerian script. The names of various rulers, supposed to be mentioned in Nippur, are doubtful (since no determinative of personal names is used); and some, like *Sar ki ra nidudu* (“made for the king of the place”), are probably not proper names at all.

<sup>2</sup> Rawlinson's Herodotus (3rd edition, 1875), vol. i. p. 423.

the totals for the dynasties are fortunately preserved<sup>1</sup>. The tablets bring us down to the Persian conquest, and some of the reigns noticed are very long, but the information is the best we have, since copyists' errors are not encountered, unless they were made by the Babylonian scribe himself. As the later kings are enumerated, and their dates fixed independently by the Assyrian canon—since they include conquerors such as Pul (Tiglath-Pileser II., 729 B.C.), Sargon (710 B.C.), Sennacherib (705 and 688 B.C.), and Esarhaddon (680 B.C.)—we have a secure starting-point for the beginning of the 8th (or 1st Assyro-Babylonian) dynasty in 1012 B.C.

The lengths of the periods for the first three dynasties given in these tablets are as follows:—

1st dynasty of Tintir (Babylon)	.	.	.	.	Years.
2nd " Uruku <sup>2</sup> (Erech)	.	.	.	.	294
3rd " (the Kassites)	.	.	.	.	368
					<u>577</u>
Total	.	.	.	.	1239

If these dynasties were succeeded by the 1st Assyro-Babylonian, the establishment of Babylon as a royal city is thus carried to 2250 B.C., which is as near as could be expected to the calculations from Greek sources above noticed.

Four other short dynasties are noticed on the more complete tablet, first published—namely:

11 kings of Pase (otherwise Isin)	.	.	.	.	Years.
3 " Tamtim (the sea-coast)	.	.	.	.	for 72'5
3 " Beth Basi (or Ebasi)	.	.	.	.	" 21'3
1 king of Elam	.	.	.	.	" 20'2
					<u>6'0</u>
Total	.	.	.	.	120'0

If these kings are to be regarded as reigning after the 3rd dynasty, the date of foundation of the royal capital of Babylon must be shifted back 120 years, to 2370 B.C. But the names so occurring may be those of kings con-

<sup>1</sup> Proc. Bib. Arch. Soc., December 1880, May 1884.

<sup>2</sup> The Babylonians did not distinguish clearly the *koph* and *kaph*.



temporary with the end of the 3rd dynasty—a period of weakness in Babylonia before the Assyrians became its overlords. If we so consider the 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th dynasties, it will be found that the date of accession of 'Ammurabi (sixth king of the 1st dynasty) is brought to 2139 B.C. We have already seen that the statement of Nabonidus would make him accede in 2140 B.C. at earliest, and this being quite an independent determination, it seems clear that the date is fairly certain as far as the calculations of the later Babylonians can be believed. Hence the foundation of Babylon in 2250 B.C. is accepted in this volume as approximately correct. Calculations based on the remains of the writings of Berosus (which are imperfect) have been thought to give the date about 2200 B.C., which agrees as nearly as could be expected.

The following dates for the first three dynasties result from this calculation. In cases marked by a star the tablets are erased, and the names are supplied from other sources, with approximate dates. Those with lengths of reigns attached are found in the dynastic tablets; and the contemporary Assyrian monarchs are added from the sources above noted and from other lists:—

BABYLON.			ASSYRIA.
1st Dynasty.	Years.	B.C.	
1. Sumuabi . . .	15	2251	
2. Sumulailu . . .	35	2236	
3. Zabu . . .	14	2201	
4. Alamaku <sup>1</sup> . . .	18	2187	
5. Akumupalab <sup>2</sup> . . .	30	2169	
6. 'Ammurabi . . .	45	2139	
7. Saamsuiluna . . .	35	2094	
8. Ebisum . . .	25	2059	
9. Ammi-Satana . . .	25	2034	
10. Ammi-Zaduga . . .	21	2009	
11. Saamsusatana . . .	31	1988	
2nd Dynasty.			
1. Anman . . .	51	1957	
2. Ki ni bi . . .	55	1906	

<sup>1</sup> As a Semitic name *Abilsin*, but the other names are Kassite, as a rule.

<sup>2</sup> Or *Sin-Muballid* as a Semitic name.

BABYLON.				ASSYRIA.	
2nd Dynasty.	Years.	B.C.	Patesis of Assur.	B.C.	
3. Damkilisu . . .	46 <sup>1</sup>	1851	Ismi-Dagon . . .	1850	
4. Iskupal . . .	15	1805	Samas-Rimmon . .	1820	
5. Sussi . . .	27	1790			
6. Gulkisar . . .	55	1763			
			Kings of Assyria.		
7. Kirgal . . .	50	1708	Bel-Kapkapu . . .	1700	
8. Aadara . . .	28	1658			
9. Akurul . . .	26	1630	Adasi.		
10. Melamma . . .	6	1604	Bel-Bani.		
11. Eaga . . .	9	1598	Irba-Sin.		
3rd Dynasty.					
1. Kandis . . .	16	1589			
2. Agumsi . . .	22	1573			
3. Aguasi . . .	22	1551	Assur-Nadinakhi <i>circa</i>	1550	
4. Ussi . . .	8	1529	Assur-Nirari.		
5. Adumetas . . .	<i>circa</i>	1515	Nebo-Dan.		
6. Taziumas . . .	"	1510	Assur-Sumesir.		
*7. Agukakrime . . .	"	1500	Bel-Tiglat-Assur.		
*8. Calimmasin . . .	"	1490			
*9. Karaindas . . .	"	1480	Rimmon-Nirari.		
*10. Kurigalzu I. . .	"	1470	Assur-Belnisisu <i>circa</i>	1470	
*11. Burnaburias . . .	"	1440	Buzur-Assur	" 1450	
*12. Karaurutas . . .	"	1410	Assur-Uballid	" 1435	
			(father of next).		
*13. Kurigalzu II. . .	"	1400	Bel-Nirari . . .	" 1390	
*14. Kudururas . . .	"	1370	Budilu . . .	" 1360	
*15. Sagasaltiburias . . .	"	1350	Rimmon-Nirari	" 1340	
*16. Naziurutas . . .	"	1330	Shalmaneser I.	" 1320	
*17. Karaenkit . . .	"	1300	Tiglat-Adar . . .	" 1300	
18. . . . .	"	...	Bel-Kudureser.		
*19. Rimmon-Sumnasir	"	...	Adar-Pileser.		
*20. Zamama-Sumedin	"	1200	Assur-Dan . . .	" 1200	
21. . . . .	"	...			
22. . . . .	22	1176	Mutakkil Nebo	" 1175	
*23. Nebo-Kudureser	26	1154	Assur-Risisi . . .	" 1150	
*24. Marduk-Nadinakhi	17	1128	Tiglath-Pileser I.	" <sup>2</sup> 1130	
25. Kara . . . . .	2	1111 <sup>3</sup>	Assur-Belkala	" 1110	
26. Izameti . . .	6	1109			
27. Sagasal . . .	13	1103			
28. Kasbat . . .	8	1090			
29. Bel-Nadinsumi . . .	1½	1082	Samas-Rimmon	" 1085	
30. Karaurus . . .	1½	1080			

<sup>1</sup> Or thirty-six years, which would bring the foundation of Babylon to 2241 B.C.; on the other hand, <sup>2</sup>Ammurabi is otherwise stated to reign fifty-five years.

<sup>3</sup> Reigning in 1113 B.C., according to Sennacherib.

<sup>2</sup> Two short reigns of Marduk-Supilakullat, and Rimmon-Baladan (Assyrians), are believed to follow No. 25, when a new dynasty (No. 26) followed.

BABYLON.			ASSYRIA.
3rd Dynasty.	Years.	B.C.	Kings of Assyria.
31. Rimmon-Nadinsumi	6	1079	
32. Rimmon-Sumnasir	30	1073	Assur-Nirari.
33. Melisikhu . . . .	15	1043	Nebo-Dan.
34. Marduk-Baladan	13	1028	
35. Zagaga-Sumedin	1	1015	Shishak.
36. Bel-Sum . . . .	2	1014	Naromat.

This brings us down to the foundation of an Assyrian dynasty in 1012 B.C. The subsequent reigns do not concern us, as the Kassites ceased to rule Babylon. The names of kings of the 1st and 2nd dynasty, and those of the third (except No. 8, who is only noticed in a letter from Amenophis III., and one from himself in the Tell Amarna Collection), appear to be Kassite down to the time of Shalmaneser I., the sons of Burnaburias (and of his own daughter) being supported by Assur-Uballid. After about 1300 B.C. they are Semitic until the establishment of a Kassite family (1111-1090 B.C.), and then (if transcribed, and not translated into Assyrian by the scribe) they are again Semitic. A constant struggle between Assyria and Babylon went on from 1400 to 1000 B.C.

Turning to the Egyptian chronology, we notice that Burnaburias wrote letters to Amenophis IV., as did Rimmon-Nirari to Thothmes IV. These are the only synchronisms on which we can rely, and there are no means of fixing accurately the Egyptian dates from Egyptian evidence. The dates proposed by Mahler, and accepted by Dr Flinders Petrie, do not agree with the Babylonian chronology. The latter authority places the accession of Amenophis IV. in 1383 B.C., or about thirty years after the latest date we can assign for the last years of Burnaburias. Yet, that these two kings were contemporaries is certain. Dr Brugsch, on the other hand, supposes Amenophis III. to have acceded about 1500 B.C., and as he reigned thirty-six years, Amenophis IV. would accede about 1464 B.C., which fits far better, Kurigalzu I., father of Burnaburias, being known to be a contemporary of



Amenophis III., while Assur-Uballid wrote a letter to Horus, the successor of Amenophis IV. From the letters it appears that Burnaburias was younger than Amenophis IV., who is believed to have reigned some thirty years.

According to the Bible (Hebrew text, 1 Kings vi. 1), the conquest of Palestine appears to have occurred about 1480 B.C., in the middle of the reign of Amenophis III., and this is perfectly in accord with the account of the victories of the 'Abiri, or Hebrews, in Palestine in that reign, as mentioned in the Tell Amarna tablets. The synchronisms which result in the reigns of Rameses II. and Mineptah, and the notice of Israel in Palestine in the time of the latter, have been explained in chapter ii. The dates of Dr Brugsch thus agree with the Babylonian, the Assyrian, and the Hebrew chronology, and have consequently been here adopted.

The reason which induces Dr Petrie to accept the later dates of Mahler is, that they are supposed to be fixed by astronomical calculations of the rising of Sirius just before the sun (or heliacally) on certain days of the vague Egyptian year; and it is claimed that they can thus be fixed within ten years. This argument sounds very strong, and it is necessary, therefore, to examine it, and to show where it fails. Dr Brugsch suspected its reliability, but does not enter further into the question.

The Egyptian year was one of twelve months, each of thirty days, with five extra days at the end of the year, or 365 in all. This year was as old as the 12th dynasty, when kings swore not to change it; but since the tropical year consists of 365·242 days, the Egyptian year constantly lost, and its seasons shifted, so that in about 1507 tropical years New Year's Day had run through all the days of the true year, back to the starting-point. This was observed as early as the time of Mineptah; but the Egyptians continued to use the vague year, while the Babylonians were careful to keep their months in their seasons, by interpolating an extra month to make up the

deficiency of their lunar year.<sup>1</sup> The Akkadians also seem to have made their months agree with seasons, judging from the names of their calendar.

## CALENDARS.

SEASON.	AKKADIAN.	ASSYRIAN.	EGYPTIAN, 750 B.C.
1. March-April	<i>Bar-siggar</i> , bright sky	<i>Nisan</i> , beginning	<i>Thoth</i>
2. April-May	<i>Le-sidim</i> , herd-fattening	<i>Iyar</i> , light	<i>Paopi</i>
3. May-June	<i>Murge</i> , bricks	<i>Sivan</i> , bricks	<i>Athir</i>
4. June-July	<i>Su-kulga</i> , ripening seed	<i>Tammuz</i> , sun	<i>Kekak</i>
5. July-Aug.	<i>Nenegar</i> , very hot	<i>Ab</i>	<i>Tubi</i>
6. Aug.-Sept.	<i>Gi-sukus</i> , fruit (?)	<i>Elul</i>	<i>Mechir</i>
7. Sept.-Oct.	<i>Dulku</i> , cloudy	<i>Tasrit</i> , beginning	<i>Phamenoth</i>
8. Oct.-Nov.	<i>Apin-gaba</i> , irrigation	<i>Marchesvan</i> , eighth	<i>Pharmuthi</i>
9. Nov.-Dec.	<i>Gan-ganna</i> , very cloudy	<i>Cisleu</i> , giant	<i>Pachons</i>
10. Dec.-Jan.	<i>Abba-uddu</i> , floods	<i>Tebet</i> , rain	<i>Paoni</i>
11. Jan.-Feb.	<i>Assur</i> , rainy	<i>Sebat</i> , storm	<i>Epiphi</i>
12. Feb.-March	<i>Sigitar</i> , sowing	<i>Adar</i> , dark	<i>Mesori</i>

The incidence of the Egyptian and Julian years, in Greek and Roman times, is known from several statements. In 24 B.C. the 1st of Thoth, or New Year's Day, was on the 29th August. In 198 B.C. (Rosetta Stone) the 18th of Mechir was the 4th of the Greek spring month Xanthicus.

We have also certain statements as to the day of the Egyptian year on which Sirius (Sothis) rose immediately before the sun, but not obscured by its rays so as to be invisible. Thus the "heliacal" rising was as follows:—

In 9th year of Amenophis I.	on the 9th of Epiphi.
" 2nd " Mineptah	" 29th " Thoth.
" 11th " Takelut II.	" 1st " Tybi.

Also, in a year not stated during the reign of Thothmes III., Sirius so rose on 28th Epiphi. In the decree of Canopus (ninth year of Ptolemy Euergetes) it is noticed that the Egyptian year was losing a quarter day annually as compared with the rising of Sirius, and (taking into account the effect of precession of the equinox) this was

<sup>1</sup> If, as usually believed, their months had thirty days, the interpolation was only required every six years, with a fourteenth month every 124 years. But the 1st of the month may, as among the Jews of the later Roman age, have been fixed by actual observation of the moon.

roughly correct. Hence, in a cycle of 1461 Julian years, the date of rising ran through all the days of the Egyptian year in succession.

Censorinus the astronomer, writing in 239 A.D., states that a century earlier Sirius had been rising on the 1st Thoth. This was approximately correct, since in 139 A.D. the 1st Thoth was the 19th July of the Julian year, which is within a day of the heliacal rising of Sirius at Memphis for that date. The exact rising is stated as 19.7 July for the year 45 B.C. (the Julian era), and by Palladius (vii. 9), referring to Egypt, it is given as the 19th July. The calculations by Biot (as early as 1831) have been relied on by later Egyptologists, and Mahler's late dates depend on the statement of Censorinus, and on the Sothic cycle of 1461 years, supposed to be that of Sirius as compared with the Julian year.

But these calculations have not the certitude that has been supposed. If we had ancient observations, in terms of the tropical year, for the rising of Sirius, dates not very remote from these years could be fixed with some accuracy; but the cycle cannot be used by simple addition, because the effects of the precession of the equinox differ at different periods, to say nothing of the exactitude of ancient observations, which may easily have been a day out on any occasion. At present the rising of Sirius takes place about two and a half minutes later each succeeding year, but in 1000 B.C. the difference was about twelve minutes yearly, so that the calculation fails us most just about the historic period when it would be most useful. The observations are stated in days only, and would jump nearly a whole day at times in consequence, being made at sunrise. A day represents a difference of 120 years in date at the time in question, and the uncertainties amount to some 200 years in calculations based on these data.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I am indebted to a well-known astronomer for these facts. The rising of Sirius about 1600 B.C. is calculated to have occurred 18.6 July (Julian), which would agree with the dates given in this appendix, as far as such a method can be used.



Hence astronomical observations do not enable us to fix the reigns of the 18th dynasty with any approximation to exactitude ; and when the results differ by half a century from those obtained from the more accurate Babylonian chronology, it is clear that half a day in the time of rising of Sirius would, at this period, cover the discrepancy. It is safer, therefore, to abide by the rough dates of Dr Brugsch, which are probably as near as we can hope to approach, in absence of further information as to Egyptian chronology. The calculations of Egyptologists differ by more than a century as to the date of accession of Ahmes, founder of the 18th dynasty ; while as regards the date of Menes, the first Egyptian king, we have the following results from the same data :—

	B.C.
Lenormant and Mariette . . . . .	5000
Flinders Petrie . . . . .	4777
Lepsius . . . . .	3892
Bunsen and Renouf . . . . .	3000
Wilkinson and Stewart Poole . . . . .	2691

When calculations thus differ by more than double the time between Alfred and Queen Victoria, for the foundation of Egyptian civilisation, it is best to acknowledge that the date is unknown.

The discrepancies are due to the unreliable character of the data on which they are founded, both those which are monumental and those derived from Manetho. It is not certain how far the dynasties were successive or contemporary, nor is the time of the duration of any dynasty certainly known. Monumentally we have the famous Abydos tablet, which gives the names of seventy-six kings preceding Seti I. and his son Rameses II. It gives no dates, and it entirely omits not only the 7th, and the 14th, 15th, 16th, and 17th (foreign) dynasties, but the 13th Theban dynasty as well, so that the names of the 12th are followed immediately by those of the 18th dynasty. An average of fifteen years would probably be sufficient for these reigns, bringing the date of Menes to

about 2800 B.C.; but the 13th dynasty should be added on the one hand (perhaps 453 years, as in Manetho), while, on the other, historical monuments date only from the 3rd (or 1st Memphite) dynasty, and it is not certain that the Thinite kings of the 1st and 2nd dynasty, as to whom we have only mythical tales, may not—if they existed at all—have been contemporary with those of Memphis.

In addition to the two copies of this list found in 1818 and 1864, by Banks and Mariette, we have the Tablet of Sakkara, published by Mariette in 1863, and the tattered fragments of the Turin Papyrus, acquired by Drovetti in 1818. The latter gives, where it is not torn, not only the years but the months and days of certain reigns, and it was probably founded on ancient records; but the dates are, unfortunately, for the most part destroyed. The 2nd dynasty included six kings according to the Abydos tablet, eight according to the Sakkara text, seven according to the Turin Papyrus, or nine according to Manetho. The monuments give five kings for the 3rd dynasty, and Manetho nine kings; and similar discrepancies occur throughout.

The text of Manetho, as partly preserved by later writers, is hopelessly corrupt. The summations do not agree with the details, and some of the reigns are of improbable length. Manetho lived in the third century B.C., and no doubt honestly reported what was then known; but we have no attempts at history earlier than the list prepared in the time of the 18th dynasty, and the Egyptian information, as to kings living nearly 2000 years earlier, is not likely to have been very exact, while another thirteen centuries separates this period from the age of Manetho. The work of the latter has perished, or has at least not yet been recovered; and the extracts of Josephus, Eusebius, Africanus, and George the Syncellus, between the first and ninth centuries A.D., conflict with each other, and may themselves have suffered from careless copying. The statements are equally discordant

with those of the Turin Papyrus, as the following cases show :—

		Turin Papyrus.	Manetho.
1st dynasty (Thinite)	Maribi	reigned 73 years	26 years.
	Samsu	" 72 "	18 "
	Kabhu	" 83 "	26 "
2nd dynasty (Thinite)	Bezau	" 95 "	38 "
	Binutri	" 95 "	47 "
	Senda	" 74 "	41 "
	Nefr Kari I.	" 70 "	25 "
3rd dynasty (Memphite)	Zazai	" 37 "	7 "
	Nebkari	" 19 "	17 "
	Zozirsa	" 19 "	16 "
	Teti II.	" 6 "	19 "
4th dynasty (Memphite)	Nefr Kari II.	" 6 "	30 "
	Senefru	" 24 "	29 "
	Khufu	" 23 "	66 "

It is clear that the monumental numbers themselves are unhistoric for this early period. The results are not more satisfactory in later dynasties. Thus we have the following summations :—

		Monumental.	Manetho.
5th dynasty	(Elephantine)	about 160 years	221 years.
12th "	(Theban)	" 190 "	176 "

We have likewise the following discrepancies in Manetho :—

1st dynasty.	Total stated at 253 years, details amount to 263 years.		
4th "	" 274 "	" "	284 "
5th "	" 244 "	" "	218 "
14th "	" 484 "	" or otherwise	184 "

When we come down to the Greek and Persian kings, where chronology is actually known, we find Manetho half a century wrong in his dates—in one case too early, and in another too late. With such a mass of corrupted numerals it is clear that we can only obtain a very rough result, and one which depends on whether dynasties were successive or contemporary.

Of the 1st and 2nd dynasties there are no monuments, while a pyramid is only doubtfully ascribed to the 3rd. Senefru, founder of the 4th dynasty, is the first king really known from his inscriptions in Sinai and in Egypt, and the Elephantine kings of the 5th dynasty have also



left remains, while the 6th (Memphite) family was an important race of powerful monarchs. Those which succeeded are less known monumentally till we reach the 12th (Theban) dynasty, which ruled all Egypt and Edom. Great uncertainties follow after this till the rise of the 18th (Theban) house of Ethiopians, who conquered Syria; and here the history of Egypt becomes full and important, though its chronology can only be roughly checked by aid of the Babylonian. The Hyksos rulers appear to have been in Egypt for 500 years, probably when the 13th dynasty was ruling the south from Thebes (for 453 years according to Manetho); but it appears to be doubtful whether they erected any monuments as yet known.

As a rough approximation the following may perhaps represent the actual lapse of time for the various dynasties:—

LOWER EGYPT.				UPPER EGYPT.			
Memphite	3rd dynasty	200 years.	Thinite	1st dynasty	260 years.		
"	4th	" 250 "	"	2nd	" 300 "		
"	6th	" 180 "	Elephantine	5th	" 200 "		
"	8th	" 130 <sup>1</sup> "	Theban	11th	" 50 "		
Heracleopolite	9th	" 400 "	"	12th	" 160 "		
"	10th	" 200 "	"	13th	" 450 "		
Total	.	1360 "	Total	.	1420 "		

These summations are (in round numbers) those of Manetho. They give the dynasties enumerated in the Abydos list, adding, however, the 13th, which was perhaps omitted because it was a weak dynasty, confined by the Hyksos to Upper Egypt. In the first 760 years the centre of power lay at Memphis, but on the rise of Thebes this power was replaced by petty kings in the Delta, and the great 12th dynasty furnished suzerains of all Egypt for a time. The smaller local dynasties are not noticed at Abydos, and appear to have been contemporary with the 9th and 10th at Heracleopolis, and with the 13th at Thebes. These included the 14th at Xoïs in Lower

<sup>1</sup> The 7th dynasty of seventy kings for seventy days is omitted (Memphite). If seventy years are intended, the total 1430 is within ten years of that for Upper Egypt.

Egypt (184 or 484 years), the Hyksos of the 15th and 17th dynasties at Zoan (together amounting to 435 years as given by Manetho, or 511 according to Josephus); and finally the "Greek shepherds" perhaps at Naucratis (stated at 518 years). This period no doubt followed the decay of the great 12th dynasty, but should not (on the evidence of the Abydos list) be added to the total of years. The important dates which would result if we take the 18th dynasty to have arisen about 1700 B.C. or a little later are—

	B.C.
The era of Menes . . . . .	3100
Beginning of 12th dynasty . . . . .	2300
End " . . . . .	2150
Rise of the Hyksos . . . . .	2130
Expulsion of the Hyksos . . . . .	1700

With the materials available a closer approximation to Egyptian history is probably not possible, but the parallelism of the dynasties does not appear to be forbidden by the distribution of the monuments, when we remember that Memphis was more powerful than the southern kingdom for some 700 years, and Thebes more powerful than the north for another 700 afterwards.

The following are the chief parallelisms which result in history from the calculations above made:—

BABYLONIA.		ASSYRIA.		PALESTINE.		EGYPT.	
	B.C.		B.C.		B.C.		B.C.
Sargina	3800					Menes	3100
Dungi of Ur	2800					Senefru	2900
Sumuabi	2250					Amememhat I.	2300
Amraphel	2139			Abraham	2140	Hyksos	2130
Anman	1957			Joseph	1950		
Damkilisu	1851	Ismi-Dagon	1850			Ahmes	1700
Kirgal	1708	Bel-Kapkapu	1700			Thothmes III.	1600
Kandis	1589	Assur-Nadinakhi	1550			Thothmes IV.	1546
				Exodus	1520	Amenophis III.	1500
				Conquest	1480		
Kurigalzu I.	1470					Amenophis IV.	1465
Burnaburias	1440	Assur-Uballid	1435			Rameses II.	1330
		Shalmaneser I.	1320	Barak	1300		
				Gideon	1260	Minepthah	1270
						Rameses III.	1200
		Tiglath-Pileser I.	1130	Solomon	1004,	Saamen	1022
Irbamarduk	1012						

The Babylonian chronology is so much more certain than either of the others, for this period before 1000 B.C., that they must be compared with its statements as a basis ; but these do not conflict with the Hebrew or the Assyrian, and the Egyptian may be reconciled as shown. If Nabonidus really knew the date of Sargina, it would seem that civilisation was about 1000 years old in Chaldea before any known monuments had been built by the Pyramid kings of Memphis, and all Western Asia was ruled from Babylon before north and south were united in a consolidated kingdom in Egypt.



## APPENDIX II.

## THE AKKADIAN LANGUAGE.

THE name Akkadian is used in these pages to signify the northern division of the Mongol race of Mesopotamia. The word is explained by Assyrian scribes as equivalent to *tilla*, "high," and probably comes from the root *aka*, "to raise": it is explained to refer to mountain regions such as Ararat. It was also the name of a city in Babylonia (Gen. x. 10) noticed by Nebuchadnezer I. about 1150 B.C. (Abu Habba text), probably the same place as Agade of which Sargina was king. The term Sumir, on the other hand, is rendered *emecu*, probably for *emeku* (with the Koph), "valley," and *mer* also means the same, *su* being no doubt the common Mongol word for "stream." Lenormant renders it "swamps," but "river-valley" is more probable. That it has any connection with the name of Shinar seems improbable. As regards the relative position of these regions they are clearly explained:<sup>1</sup> "The south is Elam, the north is Akkad, the east is Su-Edin (perhaps river Eden) and Gutium (probably Jebel Judi), the west is the land of Martu ('sunset Phœnicia)"; and again, "south of Akkad, north of Elam, east of Martu, west of Su-Edin and of Gutium." This leaves the river-valley for Sumir.

The elements of the Akkadian or Sumerian language are explained in the bilingual texts by Semitic

<sup>1</sup> See Proc. Bib. Arch. Soc., February 1883, p. 74.

scribes.<sup>1</sup> The following is a comparison of the noun suffixes of various dialects, including the Hittite:—

	AKKADIAN.	MINYAN.	HITTITE.	TURKISH.	
1. Nom. definite	-bi	-pi	-pi		the
2. Nom. indefinite	-s	-s	-s		a
3. Possessive	-na	-na	-ne	-n	of
4. Locative	-ta	-ta	-da	-de	at
5. Dative (1)	-a	-a	-a	-a	to
6. Dative (2)	-ga		-ka	-ga	to
7. Accusative	-e	-e	-e	-e	Acc.
8. Instrumental	-li	-li	-li	-li	by
9. Comitative	-la	-allan	-lu	-ailan	with
10. Causative	-ku	-ku	-ko	-ichun	for
11. Comparative	-dim	-tim	-tim	-tiñ	as
12. Ablative	-ta	-dan	-da	-den	from
13. Locative	-sa	-sa	-sa		in
14. Relative	-ra	-ra	-ra	ara	towards

Among the most important words which may be compared with pure Turkish of Central Asia (especially the Yakut dialect in the north) are the following, out of more than 300 given in the paper cited in the note:—

AKKADIAN.	TURKISH.	MEANING.	HITTITE.
<i>Akharra</i>	<i>Akhara</i>	grey	
<i>Aga</i>	<i>Agha</i>	chief	
<i>Am ia</i>	<i>Em</i>	ill	
<i>Aus</i>	<i>Aus</i>	opening	
<i>Bat</i>	<i>Bot</i>	fortress	
<i>Pakh, Pak</i>	<i>Bogh</i>	prince	<i>Bakh</i>
<i>Pal</i>	<i>Beil</i>	axe	<i>Pal</i>
<i>Pal</i>	<i>Beyil</i>	year	<i>Pal</i>
<i>Pa</i>	<i>Bai</i>	a spell	
<i>Par</i>	<i>Bor</i>	white	
<i>Bar</i>	<i>Bar</i>	live	<i>Bar</i>
<i>Pis</i>	<i>Bis</i>	birth	<i>Pis</i>
<i>Dara</i>	<i>Tor</i>	god	<i>Tar</i>
<i>Dim</i>	<i>Dem</i>	ghost	
<i>Dim</i>	<i>Tim</i>	peace	
<i>Tim</i>	<i>Tem</i>	bond	<i>Tim</i>
<i>Dimirsa</i>	<i>Timir</i>	iron	
<i>Dingir</i>	<i>Tengri</i>	god	
<i>Tum</i>	<i>Tamu</i>	hell	
<i>Tur</i>	<i>Tore</i>	chief	<i>Tar</i>
<i>Khan, Kan</i>	<i>Khan, Kān</i>	prince	
<i>Khilib</i>	<i>Chelep</i>	god	<i>Khilib</i>
<i>Khir</i>	<i>Khir</i>	engrave	<i>Khir</i>

<sup>1</sup> See my paper, "Notes on Akkadian," 'Journal of Royal Asiatic Society,' October 1893.

AKKADIAN.	TURKISH.	MEANING.	HITTITE
<i>E</i>	<i>Ev</i>	house	
<i>Ib</i>	<i>Ib</i>	cord	<i>Ib</i>
<i>Idu</i>	<i>Yida</i>	month	<i>Yede</i>
<i>Im</i>	<i>Im</i>	sunset	
<i>Eri</i>	<i>Er</i>	man	<i>Eri</i>
<i>Erim</i>	<i>Eren</i>	hero	
<i>Izik</i>	<i>Izik</i>	door	
<i>Gab</i>	<i>Khab</i>	rejoice	
<i>Gam</i>	<i>Jam</i>	bend	<i>Gam</i>
<i>Kar</i>	<i>Kir</i>	field	
<i>Gar</i>	<i>Khari</i>	cubit	
<i>Gar</i>	<i>Karan</i>	stomach	
<i>Kiel</i> (fem.)	<i>Gul</i>	slave	
<i>Guk</i>	<i>Kök</i>	blue	
<i>Gug</i>	<i>Koch</i>	ram	<i>Gug</i>
<i>Kum</i>	<i>Kom</i>	top	<i>Kum</i>
<i>Kumas</i>	<i>Komüs</i>	silver	
<i>Makh</i>	<i>Makh</i>	great	<i>Makh</i>
<i>Man</i>	<i>Manap</i>	chief	<i>Man</i>
<i>Sakh</i>	<i>Sakh</i>	good	<i>Sakh</i>
<i>Sar</i>	<i>Syir</i>	write	<i>Sir</i>
<i>Sikh</i>	<i>Atikh</i>	a bear	
<i>Su</i>	<i>Su</i>	flow	
<i>Unu</i>	<i>Unne</i>	abode	<i>Unu</i>
<i>Uru</i>	<i>Auru</i>	town	<i>Uru</i>
<i>Us</i>	<i>Es</i>	basis	<i>Us</i>

The Hittite words are taken from the Akkadian, but the sounds are in some cases otherwise confirmed by their occurrence, as will appear later.

The leading peculiarities of Akkadian grammar are as follow. Just as in Turkish, the noun has no gender, and the cases above given apply to all alike. The harmonic law is the same in both languages, and is briefly a natural euphony by which strong roots have strong suffixes and weak roots weak suffixes. The commonest derivatives from the roots are—

	AKKADIAN.	MINYAN.	MEDIC. <sup>1</sup>	HITTITE.	TURKISH.
Abstract noun	-ma	-ma	-ma	-ma	-m
"	-da	-da	-da	-da	-it
Verbal noun	-ik	-k	-k	-k	-k
Verbal adjective	-ga	-ga	-ka	-ka	-kei
Adjective	-ra	-ra	-ra	-ra	-r
Noun of action	-ra	-ra	-ra	-ra	-l
"	-la			-lu	-li
Present participle act.	-lu	-lan		-lu	
Past participle pass.	-ga	-ka, -kha		-ga	

<sup>1</sup> The "third language" of Behistun.



The plural is either *me* or *ne* in these languages, and it follows the base of the noun, preceding the case suffixes. There are prefixes like *nam*, condition; *sak*, state, &c. (*si*, before, is also a prefix), which form compounds and abstract nouns. The adjective follows the noun in the ancient dialects, though in Turkish and other modern Mongol languages it precedes. It agrees in number; and the case is often the syllable following a string of nouns and adjectives forming a "packet," and is not separately applied to each, this being a Mongolic feature of grammar. The verb has very little distinction of tense, the Babylonian grammarians apparently only noting the present, formed by adding *e* to the root, which is the past or the imperative. The pronouns precede the verb, while the possessive follow the noun: they are as follows:—

	AKKADIAN.	MINYAN.	MEDIC.	HITTITE.
I, me, my	<i>mu zu</i>	<i>u -mu</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>u -mo</i>
Thou, thee, thy	<i>zu za</i>	<i>zu -ti</i>		<i>zu (ʔ) -ti</i>
He, him, his	<i>na sa</i>	<i>na sa</i>		<i>ne sa (ʔ)</i>
Him	<i>-ir</i>	<i>-ir</i>	<i>-ir</i>	<i>-er</i>
We, us, our	<i>unene</i>			
You, your	<i>zunene</i>			
They, them, their	<i>nene bi</i>	<i>bi</i>		<i>nene bi</i>
This	<i>ma a</i>	<i>imma au a</i>		<i>a</i>
That	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>		<i>ne</i>
This	<i>ba</i>	<i>bu</i>		<i>bu</i>
Who, what	<i>khu kha khi</i>	<i>khu kha khai</i>		<i>khu khi</i>
Which		<i>abbi ubbi pi</i>	<i>appo</i>	<i>uppi uppa pi</i>
Same	<i>su sa</i>	<i>su</i>		
Who	<i>ka</i>		<i>akka</i>	<i>ak akke</i>

These pronouns have no gender, and apply to feminine and neuter as well. In Medic (or so-called Proto-Medic), and in Minyan, an emphatic possessive is made by prefixing the pronoun to a noun, and this seems to occur in Hittite also. The moods of the verb are formed by prefixed syllables, not by suffixes as in the modern dialects, such as *tan*, compel; *khe* or *gan*, let; *man*, made. Thus in Tarkhundara's Hittite letter we find *khu-man*, "may it be caused," as in Akkadian, which was the first clear case of comparison between the languages, noticed by Dr Winckler in 1887, after my first publication on the sub-

ject. The passive is formed in Minyan, and apparently in Hittite, by adding *il* or *al* to the root, like the Turkish *il*. There is also in Minyan and Medic a participle, *-man*; and the reciprocal *-manlu*, "jointly," occurs in Medic and in Hittite as well as in Minyan. The latter appears to have *-sa* for the present, *-ta* for the past, of the third person singular of the active voice, and *-sena*, which is the Medic *-sne*, for the same person precative. In these two languages the second person singular imperative ends in *-s*. Participial forms are much used; and the older dialects—Sumerian and Hittite—have generally a less developed grammar, especially for the verb, than have the later Minyan and Medic. In Minyan there is a verb substantive *ai*, as in Turkish, which may exist in Hittite, but the commonest verb for "be" or "exist" in Hittite is *bar*, as in Turkish. Causatives are found also in *pe* and *ib* in all these dialects.

The syntax is also the same in all. The order is object, subject, verb. When a noun is defined by another, the defining noun may either precede without suffix or follow with a suffix. So in Sumerian we have *Is-tar*, "Light-Lord," and *Dam-ki-na*, "Lady-earth-of." In Hittite we have, *Kheta-sar*, "Hittite-lord"; *Tar-kon*, "Tribe-chief"; and *Is-gar Raba*, "Isgar's-slave." The former of these constructions distinguishes the Mongol from the Semitic languages, where the proper construction is the reverse, as *Bel-matati*, "Lord (of) lands." The Aryan syntax, however, agrees in this point with the Mongolic, but not in other peculiarities. In Sumerian we have cases where the construction seems more like the Semitic, as in *Mul-lil*, generally supposed to mean "Lord (of) ghosts." This may, however, be due to the determinatives being always prefixed, as, for instance, *GAL-LU*, which was read *Lu-gal*, "man-great"—the adjective always following its noun.

The intimate connection of the Hittite with the other Mongol known dialects will be apparent from these and future considerations.

The Minyan, or language of Mitanni, may be best illus-



trated by the more important passages of Dusratta's long letter. The number of personal names (marked by the determinative) occurring in various cases formed one of the first clear indications of the character of this language. An interlinear translation will explain the grammatical peculiarities. Many of the words which are syllabically spelt are Akkadian, and some are Hittite. They present for our use a vocabulary of some 400 Mongol terms of great value for comparative study.<sup>1</sup>

- III. 92-94. *Nimmurias KUR Mizripinis ipris tase ab sutta a*  
 Amenophis III. D.P. Egyptian lord (?) as home far it  
*NU-mansa URU Ikkhibeni URU Simigini epi nie mán ú*  
 is ruling D.P. Ikkhiben city Simigis of which it is I  
*NU-mansa.*  
 rule.
- IV. 10, 11. *Senippi úe nie en Nuukha-ti . . . nuukhamanlu*  
 Brother me it so province thy (to be) ruled jointly  
*be Khepia-tilan zuga Esippias dan api adduga.*  
 making, to whom all known, a prince great whom you named
- VII. 35-38. *Pazadu Paza Manienan Senippi ue passidkhi pazadu*  
 Besides also Menes brother's my envoy besides  
*paza Gilianan Artessupanan Asalin naan passidkhippi Gilianan*  
 also Gilias (and) Artessupas Asalis he the envoy of Gilias  
*talami Asalin naan dubsarippi ú pazani ki bu SU-ú*  
 interpreter Asalis of him the scribe I also him as this writing my  
*ussi Senippi da-allan niirusae tissan passusa-ú*  
 knowing brother's speech with to make clear? quickly my chief (?)  
*Senippi-ú ullan pirieta.*  
 my brother willingly I have sent.
- X. 5-7. *Atinin maanni I imma maian ú ú Khalki mā-na*  
 This of not is it clear this made I for me Chalcis land of  
*sue-ni Kharru MI KUR SAR Minian ú ú Khalki*  
 peoples Phoenicians west land king Minyan I for me Chalcis  
*mā-na sue-ni gammā as ria-anni KUR SAR Mini*  
 land of peoples conquered whatever servant its land king Minyan  
*Senippi úe GIZ astis.*  
 brother for me a record grant.
- XI. 73. *KUR SAR Minnaa sa piriasa Khiarukha attan*  
 Of land king Minyan she is sent to be wedded going

<sup>1</sup> See my translation, 'Journal of Royal Asiatic Soc.,' October 1892.



*temanna Senippius gipanu en pipulli tipippi sukku*  
 being given brother's papyrus as causes the message settlement  
*taa na asti en.*  
 so its desiring.

- XII. 103-107. *SAL Tadukhepa-an ma-anni Dusratta api KUR*  
 Woman Tadukhepa she is it not Dusratta who of land  
*SAR Mittannipi ipripi Immuriasi KUR Miziripi ni epi*  
 king Mitannian the ruler Amenophis III. land Egypt of who  
*ipripi astinna arusa a asse Immurias - sa-an*  
 the ruler desiring this thing in it consenting Amenophis III. son of  
*zalam-si taa sa khiarruka nakkasa Dusratta api mangie*  
 publicly(?) so of him wedded is made Dusratta which reply  
*nuusa taa tarasise.*  
 orders so disposing.
- XII. 117 - 119. *Senippius KUR Masrianni KUR SAR Miniene*  
 My brother land Egypt of land king Minians  
*Khakhaniene Nuutiene sugganiman sueni rabippia etitan*  
 princes ruling having satisfied peoples to service reduced  
*u betiiman guru kharammaman.*  
 I cause speak all that is written.

These main passages, in a very prolix and complimentary epistle, give good instances of construction, of the "harmony" of suffixes, and of other points above mentioned. Historically they show the conquests claimed by Dusratta in Phœnicia, and the subsequent marriage of his daughter to Amenophis IV. One other passage refers to the Hittites, who had aided his brother Artasumara, and whom he defeated, as is described in one of his letters written in Assyrian:—

- X. 16, 18. *IM bu u US kha manlu u Khatti ma an dangu*  
 Region this I ruled jointly I Hittite land of powerful  
*Esippias dan man NU ukka tilan api latakha Senippi*  
 prince great being chief people all of who conquered brother  
*ua allan URU Kharranu sa a ussena IM paza NU*  
 to me holding city Harran in it let extend region also chief  
*sa a ullaman pirieta - allan.*  
 in it consenting having been sent.

Translated into the syntax of the reader's language, the passages mean: "As Amenophis III. lord of Egypt rules his far-off home, I rule the city of Ikhabin, the city of the [god] Simigis." "So, brother, causing me to rule

jointly all thy province, being known there to all as a prince whom you have named." "Besides Menes my brother's envoy, and Giliās [and] Artessupās, Asalis the envoy, the interpreter of Giliās, Asalis the scribe, I have also willingly sent, as my [chief?] brother knows how to explain quickly this my writing by my brother's language." "Is not this clearly it? I having conquered for myself the peoples [*su*, Turkish *soi*, Akkadian *su*, 'race'] of the land of Chalcis ['the fortress' near Aleppo], the Phœnicians west of the Minyan kingdom, grant me, brother, a recognition that whatever people of the land of Chalcis are subject to the Minyan kingdom are mine." "She is sent by the Minyan kingdom, being surrendered, going to be wedded, as my brother's letter causes to be done, the message desiring such a fulfilment." "Is it not this? Taduḳhepa is to be wedded by the son of Amenophis III.; Dusratta, who is ruler of the land of Mitanni, consenting to the wish therein of Amenophis III., who is ruler of Egypt. Which reply Dusratta orders, so arranging." "My brother of Egypt having satisfied the Khakhans ruling the Minyans of the kingdom, the people being reduced to submission, I have caused all that is written to be said." "I having jointly ruled this region, I being suzerain of the power of the Hittite land, chief of all the conquered peoples, let my possession, brother, extend to the city of Harran, a chief also being sent into the region by its consent."

As regards the Kassite language, we are less fully informed from any cuneiform documents; but lists of Kassite names translated into Babylonian exist, and are sufficient to determine the Mongol character of the dialect which has been very generally admitted. The most interesting of these names is that of 'Ammurabi or 'Ammurabil, which is rendered *Kimti rapastu*, "my family is large." It must be remembered that while many names of tribal chiefs are merely titles and not really personal names, those of the Kassite kings are not usually of this character. Names in the East are founded to a great

extent on some pious expression of the father or mother at the time of the child's birth, or even on some simpler remark caused by circumstances. Thus among the Bedawin, one child was named *Makhâdah* because born at the river "ford," another *Yerbo'a* from a jerboa seen beside the tent at the moment. In the Bible we have such names as Benoni, "son of my sorrow" (on account of Rachel's death), and Ichabod, "no glory" (because of the defeat of Israel at the time of the child's birth), while the gratitude of parents is shown by such titles as Belnirari, "Baal is my helper." The name of 'Ammurabi in like manner may either signify an increase to the family, or might be a title taken later when the conqueror had enlarged his border. It is evidently the Mongol *Am-mu-ra-bi* ("Tribe-my-spread-makes"), or *An-mu-ra-bil* ("Tribe-my-spread-is-made), agreeing with the Babylonian explanation. Similar translations are given<sup>1</sup> for twenty-four other names, including those of the kings of the 2nd dynasty, as follows, with others which are earlier:—

1. [ISKI] PAL, "Subduing the enemy's land." *Is*, master; *ki*, place; *pal*, rebellious.
2. [GUL KI] SAR, "One who makes multitudes subject." *Gulki*, to many; *sar*, lord.
3. AA [DARĀ] GI MA,<sup>2</sup> "Son of Ea [lord] of lands." *Aa*, son; *Darā*, to Ea (Dara being one of the titles of Ea); *gi-ma*, here on earth.
4. A KURUL AN NA,<sup>3</sup> "Son of the lord of the herald of heaven." *A*, son; *kur*, dawn; *ul*, star; *an*, god; *na*, of—"Son of the god of the morning star."
5. SAR GIN NA, "King established." *Sar*, king; *ginna*, made. This is not spelt the same way as *Sargina*, "king of earth."
6. KU BAU, "*Bau* is bright" (or "holy"), *ku*, shining or silver. "*Bau* of what is bright." The name may be *Ur-bau*, as *ur* also means "light," but the translator probably misunderstood the meaning.

<sup>1</sup> Proc. Bib. Arch. Soc., January 1881, and 'Records of the Past' (New Series), vol. i. p. 32.

<sup>2</sup> Called for short *Adara*.

<sup>3</sup> Called for short *Akurul* in another tablet.



7. AMMI-ZADUGGA, "The family is established." *Ammi*, tribe (Turkish *am*, *aim*); *zadugga*, set firm.
8. KURGALZU, "Leader be thou." *Kur*, lord; *gal*, great; *zu*, thou ("art" understood).
9. SIMMAS-SIKHU, "Offspring of Marduk." *Simmas*, a seed; *sikhu* (or perhaps, as otherwise rendered, *sipak*), of the good one (*sikh* and *söp* both meaning "good").
10. ULAM BURIĀS, "Offspring of the lord of lands." *Ulam* (Turkish *ulan*), child; *Buria*, to Buri (the Kassite god, perhaps the Akkadian god *Bar*, the living one); *as*, he ("is" understood).
11. MELI SIKHU, "Man of Marduk" (see No. 9). *Meli* is probably, like the Akkadian *mal* or *val*, connected with the root *ul*, to be (Turkish *ol*).
12. NAZI-URUTAS, "Shadow of Adar." The Sultan is so called "Shadow of God" to the present day. Apparently *Nazi*, shadow; *uru*, shining one; *ta*, from; *as*, he (is).
13. BURNA BURIĀS (see No. 10), "Relative of the lord of lands." *Bur*, people; *na*, of; *Buria*, to Buri; *as*, he (is).
14. KARAEN KIT, "Empowered by the Sun." *Kara*, doing; *en*, as; *Kit*, Sun. Perhaps another way of writing the name *Kara indās*: *Kara*, working or worker; *in*, the sun; *da*, from; *as*, he (is).
15. ULAM URU US, "Offspring of Bel" (see No. 10). *Ulam*, child; *uru*, of the shiner; *us*, man, or kin, or he.
16. MELI KHALI, "Man of the great goddess" (see No. 11). *Meli*, man (or creation); *kha*, princess; *li*, by.
17. MELI SUMU, "Man of power." *Meli*, man; *sumu*, powerful.
18. MELI SIBARRU,<sup>1</sup> "Man of the glorious one." *Meli*, man; *si*, appearance; *bar*, shining; *ru*, for.
19. MELI KIT, "Man of the Sun." *Meli*, man; *Kita*, to Sun.
20. NIMGIRABI KIT, "Merciful is the Sun-god." *Nimgirabi*, one considerate; *Kit*, the Sun-god (is).
21. NIMGIRABI BURIĀS, "Merciful is the lord of lands" (see No 20), but apparently it means "worshipper of Buri."
22. KARA BURIĀS (see No. 14), "Empowered by Buri he" (is).
23. KARA KIT (see No. 14 and No. 19).
24. NAZI BURIĀS (see No. 12 and No. 10).

These translations appear to show that the Kassite lan-

<sup>1</sup> *Sibar* is preceded by the sign for deity.

guage was closely akin to the Sumerian and Minyan, and they aid us with Hittite names.

The names of Hittites noticed in Egyptian and Assyrian records have long been known to be non-Semitic. By aid of the preceding they can with some certainty be rendered as Mongol, and they certainly do not recall Aryan names. Those noticed by the Egyptians include:—

1. AAKITASEBU. Apparently *aa*, son, *Kit*, the Sun; *a*, him; *sebu*, favouring, or "Favoured child of the Sun."
2. AKAMA. From *aka*, to raise, meaning exaltation, majesty.
3. KAMAIŠ. Probably "conqueror," from *gam*, to conquer.
4. KARBATUS for Karabatus. *Kara*, one empowered; *bat*, securely; *us*, he (is).
5. KAUISIRA from *kui*, all (in accusative); *sira*, commanding.
6. KHELEP - SAR, "Lord of Aleppo" (compare *Kheta Sar* above).
7. KHIR-BASAR, "Of writing the master." (He was a scribe, as stated in the Egyptian text).
8. MAS-RIMA from *Mas*, a spirit; *ri*, service; *ma*, making—a "servant of God."
9. MAURA - SAR from *murū*, place (in dative); *sar*, lord—"Lord to the place."
10. MOTE-NAR. Perhaps *mu*, throne; *te*, on; *nar*, king.
11. MO-TUR, "Son of the throne."
12. NAZIRA. Perhaps "His [*i.e.*, God's] shadow" (see No. 12, Kassite list).
13. PEIS, from *pas*, to lead. Also transliterated PAZ.
14. SAMARITAS from *Sām*, the name of a deity (as in the Kassite name *Sām - suiluna*, "a man of the race of *Sām*); *ri* servant; *as*, he—"He who has served (*rita*) *Sam*."
15. SAP-LEL. Probably "Lord of all"; from *sap* (Akkadian *šib*), a gathering, and *lel* (Akkadian *lala*), ruling.
16. SAP-SAR (see No. 15), "King of multitudes."
17. TARKANANAS, "High chief" (Turkish *Tarkan* and *ön*).
18. TARKATASAS. Perhaps "Chief in Kadesh."
19. TARTISEBU. Perhaps "Lord of justice; from *tart*, judgment, and *esebu*, chief (Akkadian and Minyan).
20. TATAR or TATIL. The root *tat* signifies "firm." Otherwise rendered *Totar*.
21. ZUAZAS or ZUZASE. Perhaps means "given"; from *zu*, to give—that is to say, "given by God."
22. RAB-SUNNA or LAB-SUNNA. The Egyptian language does not distinguish *l* from *r*. *Labsunna* might mean "hero

of battle"; from *lab* (as in Turkish), a brave man, and *sun*, battle, defeat (Akkadian: like the Turkish *şin*); on the other hand, *rab* signifies "servant" in Hittite and in Akkadian, and *Sunna* may be for *Sumu-na*, "of Sumu," who was a Kassite god. The name of Sumu is represented in the Babylonian translation by *Sukamuna*, apparently "he who consumes us," and this again is rendered by *Kittum*, perhaps the sun, or if a Semitic word, "the overwhelmer": *sun*, to defeat or destroy (in Akkadian), and *sum*, to make an end (in Akkadian), with the Turkish *soñ*, end, may be compared. This deity seems therefore to be Rimmon, the god of Storms.

The Egyptian transliteration is unfortunately not quite certain, since there are differences between experts as to vowel sounds, while *t* and *d*, the sibilants, and *l* and *r*, are indefinitely represented by the hieroglyphic alphabet. The general result, however, is confirmed by the names mentioned in Assyrian records, and in other documents:—

23. TARKHUNDARA, whose letter (No. 10, Berlin Collection) is found in the Tell Amarna Collection. Probably means only "ruling chief."
24. TARKONTIMME or TARKUDIMME. Perhaps "Prince of Peace," "Peaceful chief." Akkadian *dim*, Turkish *tim*, peace, quiet. Dr Sayce has suggested that Tarku was the name of a god, and this is supported by the determinative (*AN*) which precedes the word in the name of Tarkutimme as found on a Cappadocian text. *Tar* and *tur* (Turkish *tore*) signify both "chief" and also "god"—that is to say, in both cases "the judge"; and *Tarku* may have had the same double meaning. If this is the case, Tarkudimme would mean "God-created."
25. BAKHIAN, king of Carchemish about 1130 B.C. His name may be connected with the Akkadian *pakh* and Turkish *boğh*, prince.
26. SANGARA. Another Hittite king of Carchemish of the same period. The name also occurs again in 857 B.C., and was apparently dynastic. It may mean "the noble." Turkish *san*, *sang*, noble, with the termination either *ra*, man, or *ra* for the adjective suffix.
27. PISIRIS. A Hittite king of Carchemish in 738 B.C. The Turkish *bisir* for a "rich man" might be compared.



In addition, we have names of the same class among the neighbouring tribes—viz.:

28. TARKULARA, chief of the Gamgums in 738 B.C., while in 711 B.C. the name is spelt *Tarkhulara*. The first word is common, and *lar* is rendered *bel*, master, in Babylonian, and is an Akkadian word. It is the same as the Etruscan *lar* for "chief" and for "deity," whence the Latin *lares*. The name would mean only "ruling chief."
29. GIRPARUNDA or GIRPARUDA is the name of a chief of Gamgums and of another of the Khattinai chiefs in 854 B.C. Compare Nos. 20, 21, of the Kassite list. *Gir*, to regard or worship; *bar*, the name of a deity (as before mentioned); *un*, God or Lord; *da*, at or to—"Worshipper of the living God."
30. LUBARNA, "Man of the god Bar," a chief's name in 1130 and 854 B.C. among the Khattinai. *Lu* is Akkadian for "man," and occurs in Finnish also. On the other hand, *labar* is explained in Babylonian to mean "servant"—*Labarna*, his servant.
31. TARKHUNAZI, of Malatiya in 712 B.C. (see No. 24), "Shadow of God." Other names might be added, such as the Minyan *Sut-tarna*, "Set (is) his lord." Some of the above names are clearly personal; others, especially in the Egyptian records, are only royal titles. The Minyan names in the Tell Amarna correspondence include *Pirkhi*, "warrior"; *Masepalali*, perhaps "God has given a son"; *Tunepripi*, "the servant of the Almighty"; *Nakhramassi*, perhaps "resting in God" (*nakh* is rendered in Assyrian *pasakh*); *Artasumara*, "worshipper of Sumu"; *Artatan*, "worshipper of Tat" (perhaps *Dad*, "father," a name of the god Rimmon); *Asalis*, "desired" (Akkadian *as*, Turkish *az*, wish, with the passive suffix); *Artessupas*, "worshipper of *Tessub*," known as an Akkadian name of Rimmon; *Dusratta*, possibly "victor chief," from *dus* (Akkadian *tas*, Turkish *tus*, to contend), *r*, the suffix of the verbal noun; and *atta*, chief (Turkish and Akkadian); *Gilias*, probably "the illustrious"; *Sitatama*, perhaps from *Set*, with *at*, father, and *am*, race—one of the family descended from Set. The names of women include *Yuni*, wife of *Dusratta*, perhaps "little one"; *Gilukhepa* (his sister), "all glorious"; and *Tadukhepa* (his daughter), "all sweet." Finally, we have other names, such as *Mutalli* of the Gamgums ("the Creator has given"); *Dadilu* of the

Kaska ("exalting Rimmon"); *Sulumal* ("ruler of the land") of Malatiya; *Urik* ("heroic"); *Tulka* ("exalted"); *Kati* ("lucky"); *Kirri* ("worshipper") of the Guai; *Sapalulmi* (see No. 15 of the Egyptian list), probably "ruling multitudes"—a chief of the Khattinai; *Vassurmi* of Tabal, *Mutallu* and *Katazilu* among the chiefs of Commagene in 708 and 857 B.C. respectively, and *Kundaspi* in 854, *Kustaspi* in 727 B.C., which two latter might be Aryan. The nationality of Ahunu, son of Adini, is not clear, while all the Samalla and Hamathite names appear to be Semitic.

We have thus examined all that remains to us indicating the language of Hittites, Kassites, and other early tribes of Aram and Asia Minor, in the names and titles of rulers. The Hyksos names given by Josephus seem to be of the same class (*Contra Apion*, i. 14, 15):—

1. SALATIS. This was a goddess *Sala*, "the shining," and the name may mean "illustrious" (Akkadian *sal*, to shine, Finnic *sal*).
2. BEON or BNON. Perhaps only "Lord of the race."
3. PAKHNNAN, otherwise APAKHNAS (see No. 25 of the Hittite list). Perhaps only "their king."
4. ARKLES. Like *Irkalla* in Akkadian, "the fiery." The name *Irkhulena* in Hamath (if not Semitic) may be connected.
5. APOPHIS or APEPA. Perhaps only from *ab-ab*, ancestor (Akkadian *ab*, Turkish *eb*, father).
6. IANIAS, "the younger" (Turkish *yeni*, young).
7. ASSIS (compare the Minyan *asalís*). Possibly from *as*, first, and *sis*, brother.
8. STAAAN, given by Africanus from Manetho, is probably corrupt. Perhaps *Setan* or *Setam*, "of the family of Set," the god worshipped by the Hyksos.

These names are certainly not Egyptian, nor do they seem to be Semitic or Aryan, but rather Mongol titles. As regards the name of the Khatti, Kheta, or Hittites itself, *khat* means "dawn," and they may have been "Easterns"; but, on the other hand, in Turkish dialects *khat* means "to join," whence many names for "allies," "relations," &c., and the term may mean the allied tribes, *Khattina* having a similar meaning perhaps as a plural.

The *Khitai* of Central Asia gave their name to Cathay or China, and the word recalls the Egyptian *Kheta* and Hebrew *Heth*. In Semitic speech the latter only means "fear."

The only Hittite text as yet known written in the cuneiform script is the letter of Tarkhundara to Amenophis III., in the fifteenth century B.C. Its translation is difficult, on account of many words of unknown or doubtful meaning, and of uncertainties as to some of the emblems. It is published in facsimile,<sup>1</sup> and has been recently recopied by Dr Sayce.<sup>2</sup> The following translation is purely tentative; but the first salutations, and the references to a "daughter," to the "prince of the Hittites," and to the presents, are certain. The language is clearly akin to Akkadian, on account of the precative verb—as has been pointed out by several specialists; and for this reason the syntax proposed by Dr Sayce appears inadmissible.

- Line I. *DUB ma D.P.* *Ni mu ut ri ya Sar gal Sar kur*  
 Letter this to Amenophis III., king great, king land  
*Mi iz za ri.*  
 Egypt.
- Line II. *NU UD D.P.* *Tar khu un da ra [da ?] Sar kur Ar za pi*  
 lord Sun Tarkhundara from, king land Rezeph  
*D.A. bi ma.*  
 it is.
- Line III. *Ka ti mi KURU in E ZUN mi DAM MES mi*  
 all region peaceful my houses my wives  
*TUR MES mi.*  
 my sons.
- Line IV. *GUM MES GAL GAL as ZAB MES mi D.P.*  
 men chief my soldiers  
*kur-ra ZUN mi.*  
 my cavalry.
- Line V. *Bi ib bi it mi KUR KUR ZUN mi gan an da khu u ma an*  
 whatever mine countries my all at may be  
*KURU in.*  
 at peace.

<sup>1</sup> No. 10, Berlin Collection, Tell Amarna Letters.  
<sup>2</sup> Proc. Bib. Arch. Soc., Nov. 1897, pp. 281-284.



- Line VI. — *Du-ug MAS KA<sup>1</sup> ta khu u ma an KURU in*  
 saying moreover to thee may be at peace  
*GIZ MES tu.*<sup>2</sup>  
 [likewise?]
- Line VII. *E ZUN ti DAM MES ti TUR MES ti GUM MES*  
 thy houses thy wives thy sons men  
*GAL GAL as.*  
 chief.
- Line VIII. *ZAB MES ti D.P. kur-ra ZUN ti bi ib bi it ti*  
 thy soldiers thy cavalry whatever thine  
*GIZ MES tu.*  
 [likewise?]
- Line IX. *KUR ZUN ti khu u ma an KURU in.*  
 thy lands may be at peace.
- Line X. — *Ka a la at<sup>3</sup> ta mi — E nu un D.P. Ir sa ap pa.*  
 lord to thee my chief Irsappa.
- Line XI. *GUM kha lu ga tal la an mi in a u ma ni TUR SAL ti.*  
 man swiftly sent he me of this is, daughter thy.
- Line XII. *AN UD mi KU in<sup>4</sup> DAM an ni u fi da an ZI.<sup>5</sup>*  
 Sun-god my protecting lady she I whom must send.
- Line XIII. *NU US si li il<sup>6</sup> khu ud i ni an sak du*  
 no servant [being sent?] this day this of first he comes  
*si.*  
*lo.*
- Line XIV. *Ka a la ta<sup>3</sup> up Pa akh khu un<sup>7</sup> I su kha la li ia*  
 lord to, region king who of one [bag?] giving  
*GUSKIN KURU an ta*  
 gold [a peace-offering?]
- Line XV. — *a ni ia at ta la mu ku un da as kha at ra [mu?]*  
 it this to despatched me for he was; speed for of me
- Line XVI. *Ub bi fi ra at mu ne it ta up Pa akh khi<sup>7</sup>*  
 what sent for me of him hand at region king who,  
*EGIR an da.*  
 after, him at.

<sup>1</sup> *Mas*, second, further; *ka*, measure.

<sup>2</sup> *GIZ MES*, perhaps pronounced *nen*, these; *TU* or *tum*, like.

<sup>3</sup> *Kalat*, abstract from *kal*, great.

<sup>4</sup> *KU*, translated *tugultu* in Assyrian, help, protection, service.

<sup>5</sup> *ZI*, rendered *saparu*, to send, in Assyrian.

<sup>6</sup> *Silil* from *sil*, to go; *sila*, road, passive form.

<sup>7</sup> *Up Pakh* from *UB* Assyrian *cipru*, region; *PAKH*, Assyrian *sarru*, king; Turkish *Bag* or *Bek*, chief.

- Line XVII. *Pal ta GUM kha lu ga tal la at ti in<sup>1</sup> am me el la.*  
time at man swiftly sent to this is intrusted.
- Line XVIII. *GUM kha lu ga tal la an EGIR khat khat ra a*  
man swiftly sent he after expedite  
*khu u da ak.*  
may make.
- Line XIX. *Na i na at u pi an du.*  
this it from I which him give.
- 
- Line XX. — *NU UD ta u pi an ZI [u?] da an ZI*  
Lord Sun to thee I whom her send I must send,  
*KU GAR ta TUR SAL ti*  
protection making, thy daughter,
- Line XXI. *GUM kha lu ga tal mi is GUM kha lu ga tal la ta*  
man swiftly sent my thus, man swiftly sent from
- Line XXII. *KU is tu el lu KAR na as ag ga as*  
protection thus makes taking, city of any great one any
- Line XXIII. *NU mu an tu SAL su us ga as ga as<sup>2</sup> KUR*  
Prince my him causing women folk making travel land  
*ia as ub bi is ta US as su un*  
to any which thus to thee is subject
- Line XXIV. *ZI in nu uk khu u ma an da.*  
borne let be.
- 
- Line XXV. *NU kha at te sa as sa kur E i ga id*  
Prince Hittite ordering land Ikatai
- Line XXVI. *NU UD ta GIZ kal la bi ib bi es li up*  
Prince Sun to thee wood usu which [due?] region  
*Pa khu un la li*  
king of gives
- Line XXVII. *Ki is sa RI is si D.P. Ir sa ap pa GUM kha lu*  
as thus in appears thus see Irsappa man swiftly
- ... ..
- Line XXVIII. *I en su kha la li ia GUSKIN ki lal bi TU . . . .*  
one [bag?] giving gold as weight the weighed
- Line XXIX. *XX. ma-na GUSKIN III. KA SHI III. KA*  
20 manahs gold three pounds ivory three pounds  
*ZAB KAR . . .*  
[copper?]
- 

<sup>1</sup> *Atin*, Turkish *atin*, Minyan *atinin*, this.

<sup>2</sup> *Gas-gas* from *KAS*, Assyrian *kharanu*, road; causative, making travel.

- Line XXX. *III. KA KHU UZ ZI VIII. KA KU SI IT TI IN*  
 three pounds . . . . . eight pounds . . . . .
- Line XXXI. *C. KA Anna tab al ga an C.*  
 one hundred pounds tin beaten one hundred  
*KA KHA AB [RI?] . . .*  
 pounds . . . . .
- Lin XXXII. *C. KA Sir ri li ia as sa . . . . .*  
 one hundred pounds . . . . .
- Line XXXIII. *IV. TAK KU KU PU GAL LI DUG GA VI. TAK*  
 four stones precious greatly good six stones  
*KU KU PU . . .*  
 precious
- Line XXXIV. *GAR ZAL DUG GA III. GIZ GU ZA GAR GIZ<sub>i</sub>*  
 make shine good three wood seats work wood  
*Pa-na . . .*  
 Pana . . . . .
- Line XXXV. *X. GIZ GU ZA GAR GIZ KAL mil-li bi ib bi . . .*  
 ten wood seats work wood usu polished which . . . . .
- Line XXXVI. *X. AKH KHU UZ TAB GIZ KAL la li.*  
 ten . . . . . also wood usu gives.

Taking the words in the ordinary sense and the ordinary syntax of the Akkadian language, the meaning of this letter appears therefore to be as follows:—

“This letter to Amenophis III. the great king of the land of Egypt, the Sun-lord, is from Tarkhundara the king of the land of Rezeph. All the region is at peace. Peace be to my abodes, my wives, my sons, the great ones of my soldiers and chariots, whatever is mine in all my lands.

“Moreover, saying to thee, May there be peace likewise. Peace be to thy abodes, thy wives, thy sons, the great ones of thy soldiers and thy chariots, likewise thy lands.

“To thee, my lord, this chief Irsappa is my messenger, protecting thy daughter my Sun-god—the lady whom I must send; no servant having been sent, lo! this day he comes first of all for this; giving a [bag?] of gold as a peace-offering, to the lord who is king of this region.



"Therefore he was despatched for me; moreover, to speed for me what is sent for me by his hand, to the king of this region, it is intrusted at the [same] time to the messenger. That the messenger may speed moreover that which thereby I give him.

"To thee the Sun-lord I must send her whom I send. Thus my messenger is a protection to thy daughter. Thus there is protection by taking the messenger, any great man of any city—a prince of mine—sending the women-folk on the way, let them be carried to each country subject to thee.

"By order of the Hittite prince the land of Ikatai presents to thee the Sun-lord the *usu* wood [due to?] the king of the region, as thus appears: so behold. Irsappa the messenger presents the [bag?]-gold by weight weighed, 20 *manahs* of gold: three pounds of ivory: three pounds of [copper?]: three pounds of . . . eight pounds of . . . one hundred pounds of beaten tin [or lead], one hundred pounds of . . . Four very precious gems, six gems of good water, three chairs of *Pana* . . . wood-work, ten chairs of *usu* wood-work polished, which . . . ten . . . also of *usu* wood he gives."

The translation of this text, though uncertain in parts, very strongly confirms the conclusion that the Hittite language was closely akin to Akkadian and to the cognate language of Mitanni. The letter, indeed, may refer to the despatch of Tadukhepa from Mitanni to Egypt.

In conclusion we may refer to languages, of the Minyan country about 840 B.C., and of Cappadocia after 1500 B.C., from which light has naturally been sought in studying the populations of these regions. In the one case, however, the Vannic language is only known about the time when the Aryan Medes were encountered in this region by the Assyrians, while on the other the Cappadocian texts are Semitic.

The Vannic appears to be an Iranian dialect, as shown

by its vocabulary, compared with the Persian of 500 B.C., and the Lycian about 414 B.C. :<sup>1</sup>—

Vannic, <i>esi</i> ,	law ;	Sansk., <i>yoś</i> ; Latin, <i>jus</i> .
" <i>asi</i> ,	horseman (?)	Persian, <i>aça</i> ; Sansk., <i>asva</i> , horse.
" <i>a</i>	sacrifice ;	Persian, <i>aya</i> , sacrifice.
" <i>tumeni</i> ,	towns ;	Lycian, <i>tomena</i> , house.
" <i>Niribi</i> ,	dead ;	Sansk., <i>mri</i> ; Lycian, <i>mra</i> , to die.
" <i>Euris</i> ,	lord ;	Persian, <i>aura</i> ; Lycian, <i>auru</i> , lord.
" <i>asis</i> ,	house ;	Sansk., <i>vesas</i> , dwelling.
" <i>sal</i> ,	year ;	Persian, <i>sal</i> ; Lycian, <i>shal</i> , year.
" <i>are</i> ,	men ;	Lycian, <i>are</i> ; Armenian, <i>ayr</i> , man.
" <i>ip</i> ,	flood ;	Persian, <i>api</i> , water.
" <i>Vedia</i> ,	women ;	Sansk., <i>vedha</i> , woman, wife.
" <i>sardis</i> ,	year ;	Persian, <i>çareda</i> , year.
" <i>Bag</i> ,	God ;	Persian, <i>Baga</i> ; Phrygian, <i>Bagaios</i> ; Lycian, <i>Phaga</i> ; Slav., <i>Bogu</i> , God.
" <i>avis</i> ,	water ;	Persian, <i>awi</i> ; Latin, <i>aqua</i> , water.
" <i>zad</i> ,	to build ;	Persian, <i>zad</i> , to build.
" <i>par</i> ,	to carry ;	Sansk., <i>bhri</i> ; Lycian, <i>far</i> ; Latin, <i>fero</i> .
" <i>gu</i> ,	to cut ;	Sansk., <i>cho</i> , cut.
" <i>di</i> ,	to call ;	Sansk., <i>da</i> , to say.

The Vannic grammar is equally indicative of an inflected Aryan language. The noun cases, including *s* for the nominative (as in Persian, Lycian, Sanskrit, &c.), appear to be Iranian, and are not those above given for the Mongol languages. Among pronouns, prepositions, &c., may be noticed—

Vannic, <i>ui</i> ,	and ;	Persian, <i>va</i> .
" <i>ini</i> ,	this ;	Persian, <i>anya</i> .
" <i>isti</i> ,	"	Latin, <i>iste</i> .
" <i>mes</i> ,	"	Sansk., <i>ma</i> ; Lycian, <i>ma</i> .
" <i>pari</i> ,	out of ;	Persian, <i>para</i> ; Greek, <i>paros</i> .
" <i>cha</i> ,	this ;	Persian, <i>hya</i> .
" <i>ies</i> ,	who ;	Persian, <i>yo</i> .

These are all quite different from Mongol words of the same meaning, nor are prepositions used in Mongol speech.

The Vannic verb possesses the augment for the imperfect and the reduplication for the perfect, as in Iranian speech ; and the syntax is not Mongol, for the verb may precede its subject. The adjective follows the noun as

<sup>1</sup> See my paper, "The Lycian Language," Journal of Royal Asiatic Society, October 1891.