

records of victories, and when they are read, as they *will be*, but *are not yet*, they will furnish us with names akin to those of the kings mentioned by the contemporaneous kings of Assyria and Egypt.

The only monument in this country which has been read does furnish a name such as is akin with other Hittite names, and so must the inscriptions from sites such as Carchemish and Hamath if they are correctly translated. Mr. Heath talks very glibly of an "emphatic looking aleph," and of expressions of causation, command, and possession; surely the kings who ordered the stones to be carved at Hamath or the lintel at Carchemish would not trouble to cut hard black granite to record such a thing as the charming of a sick man, and he one, by Mr. Heath's own showing, having no title of royalty or office.

Our knowledge of the Hittite inscriptions is not in an advanced state, being at present confined to four syllabic characters and two ideographs which are derived from the bilingual inscriptions on the boss. I may say, in reply to those who call this boss a forgery, let them prove the need or call for a Smyrna silversmith to forge an inscription in one little known and one quite unknown language, and I will believe in the spurious character of the disc. Had the inscription been in Egyptian and Cuneiform then it may have been a forgery, or had the name of the king been less like a Hittite name then the possibility of its forged character might have been admitted, but it cannot be now.

We cannot read the Hittite inscriptions, but still we can gather many facts relating to the kings and people which are of interest, and with none of which do Mr. Heath's theories agree. When more inscriptions have been recovered, and when explorations have been made on sites where bilingual inscriptions are likely to be found, then we can speak of reading the inscriptions.

Until that time it is premature to put forward readings such as Mr. Heath has attempted. I am certain that when the inscriptions are deciphered they will not contradict the historic records of the nations in contact with the Hittites as they now do. The question of the relation of the Hittites to the Aramean tribes is one which I will ask you at some future time to give me space to say a few words upon.

W. St. C. BOSCAWEN.

III.

NOTE ON ABOVE.

KNOWING the great value of your space, I will answer Mr. Boscawen as briefly as possible.

Mr. Boscawen says he does not profess to be a profound student of the Newtonian philosophy. It is not necessary that he should be so; but nevertheless all knowledge comes to us through the methods of that philosophy, and nothing in Mr. Boscawen's paper shows me that I have

erred in the application of it. Mr. Boscawen considers that my results are very unlikely, in consequence of the fact that they result in a "mixed vocabulary." Now my dictionary contains about 40 words, and in order to understand the charge, I should be glad of a few instances in which this property of *mixture* appears. Take the first three words, *asukh* an oil-jar, *ashdeka* to contemplate, and *ashibna* we restored. I really know not what the accusation means.

Mr. Boscawen says that the names of Hittite kings and towns are non-Semitic. Very likely. But then the names of Oxford and Cambridge Rhyd-Uchain and Caer-Grawnt are not English, and Laban the Syrian appears to have spoken Aramæan. It is also to be remarked that in the select Egyptian Hieratic Papyri, the Semitic words seem to be Aramæan, and that the Greek alphabet also was Aramæan.

As to the Cilician Boss, and other small finds, any one interested should give us an enlarged lithographic copy. It is a question of eyesight, and I do not at present see them to be Hittite. Fifty times more important than the Boss question is that of the name Jerablus. I read it in three places without the *l*, and I should be very much puzzled indeed if there be an *l*. Professor Wright has gone carefully into the subject, and says the *l* is due wholly to European travellers.

DUNBAR ISIDORE HEATH.

Esher, Surrey.

THE ASSYRIANS IN EASTERN PALESTINE AND SYRIA DESERTA.

THE existence of an Aramæan or Arab Semitic population as a trading element in Babylonia, together with the non-Semitic Sumero-Akkadian population, at a period as early as the eighteenth or nineteenth century before the Christian Era, is proved by the occurrence of Semitic names of a marked Arab character in the contract tablets of the time of the Kassite or Cossea dynasty founded by Khammuragas. Such names as Abbu, Abikhibu Libet, Kainuv (Hebrew Cain), Abbu (Abel), Mukhatu Pirkhu, and the many compound names formed with the gods Sin (Moon), and Shamas (Sun), both Arab deities as elements, seem to indicate the origin of the population who at this early period appear in the marts of Ur and Erech. It may not be a mere accident that the inscriptions of a bilingual class which were compiled by the scribes of Babylonia at an early period, and afterwards copied and re-edited by the scribes of Assurbanipal, are all of a commercial character, the non-Semitic phrases in one column being translated into Semitic Babylonian or Assyrian in the other. This would seem to show that the exigencies of trade produced these primitive editions of Clifton and Ollendorf.

Even earlier than the use of the Kassite dynasty, which is to be identified with the Median dynasty of Berosus, a Semitic population to