

distinctly derived, and No. III is more distinctly of Southern origin. No. IV seems nearest Palmyrene. No. II contains Aramean forms, together with the older form of the 'Ain, which is not Aramean. The Aramean 'Ain occurs in No. IV.

I would note, finally, that the Moabite Arabs use Himyaritic and Nabathean letters as *Ausdm*, or tribe marks (as I hope to show in "Heth and Moab"). These must not be mistaken for inscriptions, where they are found (as is often the case) cut in numbers on some monument or sacred stone. It is not difficult to make the distinction, partly because the tribe marks are cut irregularly and not in lines, partly because they are generally recent and very rudely cut. Nevertheless this mistake has been made by more than one traveller in Moab and in Arabia.

C. R. C.

THE HAMATHITE INSCRIPTIONS.

1st September, 1883.

IN the last *Quarterly Statement* (p. 133) I ventured to draw attention to the similarities of the Hittite and of the earliest Egyptian hieroglyphics. I have since been encouraged to pursue the comparison further, and to draw up a list of sixty-one Hittite symbols, for which a parallel may be found in Egyptian. I am aware of the comparisons made by Professor Sayce between the Lycian, Cypriote, and Hittite symbols; but it seems possible that the suggestion, to which I am now anxious to draw the attention of Egyptologists, will not ultimately conflict with these comparisons. I am also aware that the Hittite symbols have been compared with hieratic, without any very useful result; but it seems more likely that the key of one monumental system should be found in another, than that the monumental Hittite symbols should resemble that literary character which derives from the hieroglyphic or monumental Egyptian.

Among the symbols compared many of the Egyptian are ideographic signs, or determinatives, while others are well-known alphabetic forms; but as these occur together in Egyptian they may perhaps do so also in Hittite, and the comparison does not therefore seem to be vitiated. It is true that many normal Egyptian forms (such as the *Mem*, the *Caph*, the *Resh*) are not apparently traceable on the Hittite texts; but, on the other hand, the signs commonest in Hittite seem, as a rule, to be equivalent to common Egyptian symbols. The comparatively small number of signs used in Hittite reminds us of the selection by Thothmes III of a few of the commonest Egyptian symbols in his transliteration of the names of Semitic towns in the Karnak lists.

A few notes may be added as to some of the most interesting of these comparisons, but first I would note that all the Hittite texts as yet published appear to be written *boustrophedon*, or in lines alternately from left to right and from right to left. This has already been remarked in

the case of the Hamath stones, and a careful study of the texts, which now number over a dozen in all, brings this prominently before the attention. The heads, the figures of birds, and of beasts, &c., are all looking to the right in the first line, while in the second these same symbols will reappear all looking to the left, and in the third again to the right. One would be inclined to suppose that all these texts read from the left-hand top corner, were it not that in at least four cases the emblem No. 1 of my plate stands at the right-hand top corner, and seems to begin the text with a determinative, indicating speech.

The Hittite texts do not seem to be works of consummate art. The representations are far ruder than those of Egyptian hieroglyphics, and the symbol is not always exactly reproduced on each repetition. This may be due in part to the hardness of the basalt on which these figures are cut in relief; and the difference between the Egyptian and the Hittite is often in great measure due to the fact that, while the former symbols are cut *intaglio*, or painted, the latter are hewn in relief. For this reason also, perhaps, the old wooden hieroglyphs of Hosi's tomb (in relief) are much more like the Hittite texts than are the finished symbols cut *intaglio* at a later age. All the Hittite texts as yet published are in relief, although one in *intaglio* has been discovered by Sir C. W. Wilson, thus approaching even closer to Egyptian.

The Egyptian equivalents (if so they be) I have taken from well-authenticated copies of texts of all ages; but on the whole it seems to me that the oldest Egyptian texts give more forms for comparison than the later. The Hittite signs are mainly taken from photographs.

No. 1 is, I believe, a determinative in Egyptian. The finger raised to the lips indicates in Egyptian verbs of "speech"; No. 2, is the *Beth* in Egyptian; No. 4, *Daleth*; No. 13, perhaps *Vau*; No. 15, a determinative of verbs of action; No. 16, *Tau*; No. 21, *Tzadi* or *Teth*; No. 28, *Shin*; No. 32, *Samech*;¹ No. 34, *Vau*; No. 35, *Mim*; No. 42, *Gimel*; No. 43, the determinative for countries; No. 44, *Koph*; No. 45, *Tzadi*; No. 48, perhaps *Aleph*, &c. These are obtained by comparison with the normal Egyptian alphabet, and by the values assigned to the hieroglyphic in connection with the Semitic alphabet on the Pylons of Karnak. Some symbols, on the other hand, like Nos. 7 and 8, though not belonging to the normal alphabet, are found on the wooden text of Hosi's tomb, and on other early Egyptian inscriptions.² No. 50, in Egyptian, is the sign for the backbone, which has been compared with the linear Babylonian Cuneiform.

These are but a few examples given as showing the possible value of the comparison, but most of the symbols will be at once recognised by Egyptologists as of common occurrence, and of well-known significance.

¹ No. 32 would appear to be also an *S*, and this agrees in a very remarkable manner with Professor Sayce's comparison with the *Se* of the Cypriote syllabary.

² Professor Sayce compares No. 23 to the Cypriote *Ko*, but as the syllabary did not distinguish *K* and *Kh*, this seems not to oppose the identification with *Cheth*.

The only questions which will arise are as to the closeness of the comparison with the Hittite, and as to the meaning in Hittite of the symbols, and also concerning the language in which the inscriptions are written.

In connection with this side of the question I would draw attention to the peculiarly Egyptian character of many signs. This is not only the case with No. 1, which may be called the head of Im-hotep, but also with No. 11, which has been likened to the scarabeus by several writers on the Hamath stones. No. 18 may not perhaps be considered a good comparison, but in Egypt *Bes* is represented with his tongue protruding, and similar masks occur not only in Asia but even in the statues of South America. No. 12 may be compared with the ram-headed Kneph. No. 14 seems to be a donkey's or fawn's head, perhaps recalling the ass's head of *Aau*, or of *Set*. No. 27, the *Ankh*, and No. 26, the *Cross*, are found also in Assyria, and Nos. 29 and 23 may also be observed among Assyrian emblems. No. 54 is one of the most interesting because most artificial. No. 26 and No. 22 have been compared to the so-called emblem of stability in Egypt. No. 24 was long since said to be a mitre, and seems to bear a close resemblance to the *Pshent*, which occurs very often in hieroglyphic inscriptions.

I am far from supposing that this comparison is perfectly satisfactory. I have no doubt that Egyptologists who are familiar with the list of 400 Egyptian emblems will be able materially to improve on this rough first sketch of the subject. There are several emblems yet left, including a bear's head, a divided circle,¹ and a few doubtful forms for which I have

Another character found at Carchemish, and also on Babylonian seals, is the following:—



It may be compared with the Egyptian *Heh*—



¹ Professor Sayce has written at length on this sign , which may perhaps represent the *Ain*, if we follow his reasoning as to the goddess *Ate*. In this case it is to be compared with the hieroglyphic *Ain* which is the eye of Osiris. As to the signs resembling No. 27 of our plate, which occur in the hands of various deities at Boghaz Keui, I believe them to be variations of the *Ankh*, and probably phallic emblems. No student of hieroglyphics will deny that unmistakable phallic emblems occur in Egyptian writing, and the fact is admitted by Renouf, Pierret, and other authorities. It may have considerable value in assisting us to determine the value of various signs and the genders of nouns. Layard has given a cut representing a deity on a lion with such an emblem in his hand, and the *Ankh* is held by all Egyptian deities.

The information given in Professor Sayce's paper ("Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archæology," 1881, pp. 248-293) does not seem in any way to conflict with the suggestions of the present paper.

been able to find no equivalent. On the whole, however, the list represents the great bulk of the symbols, which recur again and again in the Hittite texts. In 1877 Professor Sayce published a list of fifty-six symbols. The present table contains a few more. Those for which Professor Sayce obtained very similar Cypriote characters are Nos. 25, 21, 47, 44 ; but, on the whole, I venture to think that the present comparison is fuller and more satisfactory. It seems hardly possible that so many coincidences can occur together merely by accident, and without giving any result.

I would propose, then, that, in the first place, an attempt should be made to read these inscriptions as though Egyptian, both in symbolism and in language, each line being read alternately right and left, beginning on the right in the first line. If it be ascertained that the language is not Egyptian, we might still use the symbols with the Egyptian value, and endeavour to interpret the language by aid of Accadian or of some kindred Turanian tongue, on the supposition that the Hittites borrowed hieroglyphic signs from Egypt as the Phœnicians borrowed the hieratic. Mr. D. I. Heath believes that the inscriptions are written in a Semitic tongue, which is, of course also, *primâ facie*, very possible, considering that the monuments occur either in or on the border of a Semitic land ; and though the evidence so far goes against the supposition that the Hittites were a Semitic people, it must not be forgotten that they had Semitic deities (Ashtoreth, Baal, &c.), and were near neighbours of the Phœnicians. While it yet remains to be proved that the inscriptions in question really are of Hittite origin.

Without wishing for a moment to be thought ignorant of the valuable work of Professor Sayce concerning Hittite antiquities, I would venture to urge that, although it may be convenient to class all the new monuments and texts under the title Hittite, it must be considered only a provisional term, and the fact yet remains to be proved. The character may be Alarodian or may be that of the old Caucasian type, whence the Egyptians were derived. The Hittites were one tribe of a great race, but we know the names of many other kindred tribes further north. Until the language of the inscriptions is determined we are unable to state positively what race invented the character, and although it has been shown that the Hittite language was probably Aryan or Turanian, and not Semitic (as evidenced by the titles following the proper names, and by the proper names of Hittite princes themselves), it yet remains to be shown that the inscriptions are not in a Semitic tongue. At Ibreez the figures have the beard and whiskers with shaven moustache, which, as we know from the Egyptian monuments, was a Phœnician fashion. The probabilities are perhaps in favour of a non-Semitic origin of the so-called Hittite inscriptions, but as yet nothing is proven.

My reasons for making these suggestions are mainly historical. The Hittite texts (as we may continue to call them, since they are found in the land of the Hittites) might be either a rude and not very intelligent reproduction of Egyptian hieroglyphics, borrowed by the less civilised from the more advanced race ; or, on the other hand, they may be

extremely archaic, and represent the true Asiatic origin of the Egyptian system. It is well known that the Egyptians came from Asia, and certain tribes which they greatly respected, because they were circumcised (the Caucasians, Achæans, Sardones, Taurians, Ossetes, Zygritæ, Ligydes, and Zagylites) may have been of common stock with the old Egyptian race. Herodotus tells us that the Colchians were an Egyptian colony, but perhaps they were really of the stock from which the Egyptian emigrants sprang. However it be, the comparison which he draws shows how strong was the affinity between Egyptians and certain tribes of Asia Minor. Herodotus also believed the statues near Ephesus, which Professor Sayce calls Hittite, to be Egyptian. How if the father of history were right after all? or, at all events, right so far that the character employed was one also used by (if not borrowed from) the Egyptians? A German Professor discovered on the Niobe near Smyrna, only a few months ago the cartouche of Rameses II, and notes the Phœnician-like execution of this Egyptian text.

I must here finally mention what seems to be, perhaps, a strong confirmation of the present suggested theory. Professor Sayce has published a drawing of a silver boss ("Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archæology," Vol. VII, pp. 298, 443), with a Cuneiform and Hittite bilingual. The Cuneiform reads: "Tarrik timme, King of the Country of Erme." The Hittite legend is twice repeated, and consists of only six characters. The one which Professor Sayce considers to be the first is No. 8 of our plate, viz., *Tau*. The one which he considers to be the third is either No. 39 or No. 44 of our plate, and would appear from the Egyptian to be a *Koph*. Here, then, we have in their proper order two letters of Tarak-timme's name; the one between must be the *R*, and is, perhaps, No. 59 of our plate. Perhaps, by aid of Egyptian, we may yet read the rest. The four vertical strokes are common in Hittite, and vertical strokes also occur in hieroglyph.

The Phœnicians have been shown to be the originators of the true alphabetic system, which they developed from the Egyptian cursive hand, according to Professor Isaac Taylor (i, p. 88). The Hamathite stones represent evidently a syllabary, or idiographic forms, or letters with prefixed determinatives. They may fairly be supposed to be older than the introduction of the Semitic alphabet, but they possibly might, in the end, prove to be hieroglyphs, used by early Phœnicians before that alphabet came into use. The *boustrophedon* arrangement is exactly that which the early Greeks obtained with their alphabet from Phœnicia.

All these suggestions I offer, with much diffidence, to the consideration of those who may be able to decipher the Hittite monuments, hoping that the comparison of sixty-one symbols will, even if many are rejected, perhaps prove a basis on which to work, and that we may thus finally become possessed of the secret which these mysterious emblems preserve.

C. R. CONDER, R.E.
