

CHAPTER VII

THE INSCRIPTIONS

WHEN the first edition of this book was published, the meaning of the Hittite inscriptions was still a mystery. Beyond the interpretation of two or three characters the veil that covered them was still unlifted, or at most but a very small corner of it had been raised. Our knowledge of the people who used them was derived from other sources than the written records they themselves had left. It was based on archæology rather than on philology, though it was none the less certain on that account. The monumental inscriptions and papyri of Assyria and Egypt, the sculptured stones and gems found on Hittite sites, the rocks covered with their undeciphered hieroglyphs, and the references to the Hittites in the Old Testament, were the materials that had enabled us to reconstruct the history of a forgotten race and to build up afresh the fabric of a vanished empire. Like the monsters of the geological past which the palæontologist has succeeded in restoring, the Hittites, too, had risen as it were from the dead at the call of archæology.

But the Hittite inscriptions, scanty and undeciphered as they were, were not altogether useless. They served to connect together the scattered remains of



AN INSCRIPTION FOUND AT CARCHEMISH
(now destroyed).

Hittite dominion, and to prove that the peculiar art they accompany was of Hittite origin. It was the Hittite hieroglyphs at the side of the warrior in the Pass of Karabel, and of the seated goddess on Mount Sipylös, that proved these monuments to have been carved by Hittite hands. It was similarly inscriptions containing Hittite characters which allowed us to trace the march of Hittite armies along the high-roads of Asia Minor, to show how all these roads centred in Kappadokia, and to feel sure that Hittite princes once reigned in the city of Hamath.

The Hittite texts are distinguished by two characteristics. In the older inscriptions the hieroglyphs are invariably carved in relief; it is only in the later texts that they are incised. Then secondly the lines read alternately from right to left and from left to right, the direction towards which the characters look determining that in which they should be read. This alternate or *boustrophedon* mode of writing also characterizes early Greek inscriptions, and since it was not adopted by either Phœnicians, Kretans, Egyptians or Assyrians, the question arises whether the Greeks did not learn to write in such a fashion from neighbours who made use of the Hittite script.

Another characteristic of Hittite writing is the frequent employment of the heads of animals and men. It is very rarely that the whole body of an animal is drawn; the head alone was considered sufficient. This peculiarity would of itself mark off the Hittite hieroglyphs from those of Egypt.

But a very short inspection of the characters is

enough to make it clear that the Hittites could not have borrowed them from the Egyptians. The two forms of writing are utterly and entirely distinct. One of the most common of Hittite characters represents the snow-shoe, which, as we have seen, points to the northern ancestry of the Hittite tribes, while the ideograph which denotes a 'country' is a picture of the mountain peaks of the Kappadokian plateau. Like the animals whose heads or forms are used as hieroglyphs, they indicate that the Hittite system of writing originated in Kappadokia, and not in the southern regions of Syria or Canaan.

It is probable, however, that the invention took place after the contact of the Hittites with Egypt, and their consequent acquaintance with the Egyptian form of script. Similar occurrences have happened in modern times. A Cherokee Indian in North America, who had seen the books of the white man, was led thereby to devise an elaborate mode of writing for his own countrymen, and the curious syllabary invented for the Vei negroes by one of their tribe had the same origin. So too we may imagine that the sight of the hieroglyphs of Egypt, and the knowledge that thoughts could be conveyed by them, suggested to some Hittite genius the idea of inventing a similar means of intercommunication for his own people. The gold of Asia Minor was exported to Egypt as far back as the days of the Sixth Dynasty, and an African negro was sent by the Hittite king to Thothmes III.

Like the Egyptian hieroglyphs the Hittite charac-

ters are used, sometimes as ideographs to express ideas, sometimes phonetically to represent syllables and letters, sometimes as determinatives to denote the class to which the word belongs to which they are attached. It would seem, moreover, that a word or syllable might be expressed by multiplying the characters which denoted the whole or part of it, just as was the case in Egyptian writing in the age of Ramses II. At the same time the number of separate characters found in the Hittite inscriptions is far less than that employed by the Egyptian scribes. At present not 200 are known to exist, though almost every fresh inscription adds to the list. This comparative scarcity of characters is due to the fact that as a rule it is only the suffixes that are expressed phonetically, the roots or stems of the words being denoted by ideographs. It is but seldom that the latter are written phonetically or that the ideographs denoting them are accompanied by their phonetic equivalents.

We may gather that the oldest writing-material of the Hittites consisted of plates of metal, on the surface of which the characters were hammered out from behind. The seal of the Hittite copy of the treaty with Ramses II must have been engraved in this manner, though both the obverse and the reverse were beaten into relief. In the centre of the obverse was a representation of the god Sutekh embracing the Hittite king, while a line of hieroglyphs ran round him. This central ornamentation, surrounded by a circular band of characters or figures, was in

accordance with the usual style of Hittite art, and we have many seals that illustrate it. The Egyptian monuments show us what the silver plate was like. It was of rectangular shape, with a ring at the top by which it could be suspended from the wall. If ever the tomb of Ur-Maa Noferu-Ra, the Hittite wife of Ramses II, is discovered, it is possible that a Hittite copy of the famous treaty may be found among its contents.

At all events the Hittites already in the age of the Exodus were a literary people. The Egyptian records make mention of a certain Khilip-sira, whose name is compounded with that of Khilip or Aleppo, and describe him as 'a writer of books of the vile Kheta.' Like the Egyptian Pharaoh, the Hittite monarch was accompanied to battle by his scribes. The broken cuneiform tablets found on the site of the citadel at Boghaz Keui prove that here too there was a library similar to those that existed in the towns of Babylonia and Assyria.

These tablets, which were first noticed by M. Chantre, reveal to us the Hittite language of Kappadokia. The language is the same, or very nearly the same, as that of the two letters from Arzawa which form part of the Tel el-Amarna correspondence, and to which reference has already been made. As the cuneiform signs can be read we can gather from them what was the type and nature of the language they serve to express. Thanks moreover to the ideographs employed in them and to the stereotyped formulæ of the Tel el-Amarna letters, it is possible to determine the signification of some of the words they contain, as

well as of certain grammatical forms. Thus we learn that *mi(s)* is 'mine' and *ti* or *tu* is 'thine,' that *khalugatallas* is 'messenger' and *lali* or *laliya* 'I sent.' The nominative of the noun ends in *-s*, the accusative in *-n*, and the oblique case in a vowel; while the adjective agrees with its substantive and employs the suffix *-nas* to express geographical relationship, *sarrus Khattannas*, for instance, signifying 'the Hittite king.' It is obvious that if the Hittite hieroglyphs are deciphered correctly, the grammar they reveal will be similar to that of the cuneiform tablets.

Nearly twenty years ago I pointed out that the figure of a yoke denoted the suffix of the nominative, and that as the Egyptian and Assyrian inscriptions showed that this case usually terminated in *-s*, the phonetic value of the hieroglyph was probably *-s*. I had already, at the outset of my Hittite studies, discovered the determinative of 'deity,' which we now know to be probably a picture of a sacred stone wrapped in cloths, and this had led me to identify the curious symbol which at Ibreez in Cilicia accompanies the figure of the god Sandes or Sandan, and must therefore represent his name. But it was just after my Paper was read in 1880 before the Society of Biblical Archæology, announcing the discovery of a Hittite empire and the connexion of the art of Asia Minor with that of Carchemish, that I fell across what I hoped would be the 'Rosetta Stone' of Hittite decipherment. It was a bilingual inscription in cuneiform and Hittite, and was engraved on a disk or boss of silver.

The story of the boss is a strange one. It was purchased many years ago at Smyrna by M. Alexander Jovanoff, a well-known numismatist of Constantinople, who showed it to the Oriental scholar Dr. A. D. Mordtmann. Dr. Mordtmann made a copy of it, and found it to be a round silver plate, probably the pommel of a dirk, round the rim of which ran a cuneiform text. Within, occupying the central field, was the figure of a warrior in a new and unknown style of art. He stood erect, holding a spear in the right hand, and pressing the left against his breast. He was clothed in a tunic, over which a fringed cloak was thrown; a close-fitting cap was on the head and boots with upturned ends on the feet, the upper part of the legs being bare, while a dirk was fastened in the belt. On either side of the figure was a series of 'symbols,' the series on each side being the same, except that on the right side the upper 'symbols' were smaller and the lower 'symbols' larger than the corresponding ones on the left side.

In an article published some years later on the cuneiform inscriptions of Van, Dr. Mordtmann referred to the boss, and it was his description of the figure in the centre of it which arrested my attention. I saw at once that the figure must be in the style of art I had just determined to be Hittite, and I guessed that the 'symbols' which accompanied it would turn out to be Hittite hieroglyphs. Dr. Mordtmann stated that he had given a copy of the boss in 1862 in the 'Numismatic Journal which appears in Hanover.' After

a long and troublesome search I found that the publication meant by him was not a Journal at all, and had appeared at Leipzig, not at Hanover, in 1863, not in 1862. The copy of the boss contained in it proved that I was right in believing Dr. Mordtmann's 'symbols' to be Hittite characters.

It now became necessary to know how far the copy was correct, and to ascertain whether the original were still in existence. A reply soon came from the British Museum. The boss had once been offered to the Museum for sale, but rejected, as nothing like it had ever been seen before, and it was therefore suspected of being a forgery. Before its rejection, however, an electrotype had been taken of it, an impression of which was now sent to me.

Shortly afterwards came another communication from M. François Lenormant, one of the most brilliant and learned Oriental scholars of the past century. He had seen the original at Constantinople some twenty years previously, and had there made a cast of it, which he forwarded to me. The cast and the electrotype agreed exactly together.

There could, accordingly, be no doubt that we had before us, if not the original itself, a perfect facsimile of it. The importance of this fact soon became manifest, for the original boss disappeared after M. Jovanoff's death, and in spite of all inquiries no trace of it could be discovered. I have just learnt, however, that it is said to have been found in a private collection in England.

The reading of the cuneiform legend has been the

subject of much discussion, for the most part needless. It gives us the name of the king whose figure is engraved within it, and the first portion of it reads: 'Tarqu-dimme king of the land.' The second portion is of more doubtful interpretation, and the actual meaning of it could not have been arrived at with certainty before the decipherment of the Hittite texts. The last word *me-e* or *mê* is, in fact, a transliteration of the Hittite *mê* 'I (am),' and the preceding character is not phonetic but the ideograph of 'city.' The whole legend is, consequently, 'Tarqu-dimme king of the land of the city (am) I.'

The name Tarqu-dimme is evidently the same as that of the Cilician prince Tarkondêmos or Tarkondimotos, who lived in the time of our Lord. The name is also met with in other parts of Asia Minor under the forms of Tarkondas and Tarkondimatos; and we may consider it to be of a distinctly Hittite type. The boss probably came from Cilicia.

The twice-repeated Hittite version of the cuneiform legend naturally corresponds with the latter. But the arrangement of the characters composing it, due more to the necessity of filling up the vacant space on the boss than to the requirements of their natural order, allowed more than one interpretation of them. There were, however, two facts which furnished the key to their true reading. On the one hand, the inscription is divided into two halves by two characters whose form and position in other Hittite texts show them to signify 'king' and 'country'; on the other hand, the first two characters are made, as it

were, to issue from the mouth of the king, and must thus express his name. Hence the first of them, which represents the head of a goat, will have the ideographic value of *tarqu*, while the second, which has not hitherto been met with elsewhere in the inscriptions, will be *dimme*. Then follow the ideographs of 'king,' 'country,' and 'city,' the first being a picture of the royal and priestly tiara and the third a representation of a plough, while in the second Mordtmann had already seen a likeness of the peculiar shafts of rock which rise out of the Kappadokian plateau. The last character is phonetic, with the value of *me*, a short oblique line attached to it further expressing the vowel *e* of the cuneiform text.

The hope I had cherished that in the bilingual boss of Tarkondêmos we had found the key to Hittite decipherment was not realized. The key refused to turn in the lock. System after system of decipherment was proposed, which satisfied none but its author, and not always even him. For more than twenty years I had vainly tried every possible or impossible combination; a blank wall invariably defied my efforts. I came at last to the conclusion that without a long bilingual inscription the decipherment of the Hittite hieroglyphs was a hopeless task.

For this the silver boss was itself in part responsible. It misled instead of assisting. The analysis of the Hittite legend upon it given above has been made possible only now that the decipherment of the texts has become an accomplished fact. We now know that the last character but one is an ideograph

and not phonetic, and that the first element in the name of the king is used with its ideographic and not its usual phonetic value. This was *is*; it was only when it denoted a goat that it was pronounced *tarqu*.

But it was not alone our misunderstanding of the legend on the boss that stood in the way of a successful decipherment of the inscriptions. The inscriptions themselves were mainly in fault; not only were they few and mutilated, the copies we possessed of them were bad and untrustworthy. It is impossible to copy correctly half-obliterated texts when we know neither the language nor the true forms of the characters; and this is especially the case where the texts are in relief. The decipherer had to work with imperfect tools.

During the past twenty years, however, the number of inscriptions has been considerably increased; more perfect ones have been discovered; and above all we are no longer dependent on copies made hastily with the eye and hand. When the originals are not in the safe custody of a museum, we now have casts, squeezes and photographs which reproduce them with fidelity, and can be examined and re-examined at leisure. We can now separate characters which had been confounded together, or trace the exact forms of mis-drawn hieroglyphs.

The first result of this better acquaintance with the real forms of the Hittite characters was to reveal to me an important fact. In the early days of my Hittite studies, misled by the copies we then possessed of the Hamath texts, I had confused together the two

ideographs of 'king' and 'district.' Decipherer after decipherer had followed me in my error, thus missing the sense of the inscriptions and losing the help of the geographical key. As long as the ideograph of 'district' was supposed to mean 'king,' the decipherer did not know where to look for the geographical names. Once the determinative was discovered, however, he knew that he would find them in the words to which it was attached.

The ideograph denoting a 'district' which derived its name from the capital city is not quite the same as the ideograph for 'country' which figures on the silver boss. It represents only one mountain peak, whereas the ideograph for 'country' represents two. But the two ideographs interchange in the inscriptions, their signification being almost the same. There was yet a third ideograph with three peaks which was sometimes used in place of them, and properly signified a 'mountainous land.'

The discovery of the determinative of 'district,' or rather its separation from the ideograph of 'king,' gave me the clue for which I had so long been seeking. I could now tell where the geographical names in an inscription were to be found. And the first to be found was the name of Carchemish.

The name is met with in all the more perfect inscriptions of Jerablûs, and, with one exception, in them only. It stands at the head of the more complete texts and occupies the foremost place in the titles of the Carchemishian kings. It is, moreover, the only name to which the determinative of 'district'

is attached, so that what it represents can no longer admit of doubt.

Many years ago the Dutch numismatist, M. Six, suggested to me that it was the name of Carchemish. I do not know what reasons he had for his suggestion, but the erroneous belief that the determinative of 'district' was identical with the ideograph of 'king' stood in the way of my accepting it, as well as the fact that the fourth character of which the name is composed is the goat's head. The boss of Tarkondêmos seemed to demand for the latter the sound of *targu*.

Since the death of M. Six, however, new inscriptions have come to light which show that the last argument cannot be pressed. In them the goat's head interchanges with the yoke when used to denote the suffix of the nominative, and it must therefore have the value of (*i*)s. It was only when signifying a 'goat' that the hieroglyph was pronounced *targu*.

The name in which Six proposed to see that of Carchemish consists of four characters. The fourth and last, as I have said, is the goat's head. The third is the character which, as the bilingual boss has informed us, has the value of *me*. The second is the head of a rabbit, while the first is a hieroglyph which does not occur elsewhere in the inscriptions, and may accordingly be presumed to denote a closed, and not an open, syllable.

Now the rabbit's head is frequently met with. It is found, for example, in a word which the ideograph often prefixed to it shows must mean 'high-priest,'

and which consequently I had already identified with the word *abaklêlôs* or *bakêlôs*, given by classical writers as the Kappadokian term for 'high-priest.' I had already therefore assigned to the rabbit's head the value of *ka*.

Here, then, we have a territorial name, standing in the forefront of the inscriptions of Carchemish and practically unknown elsewhere, which consists of four characters, the last three of which represent the syllables *ka*, *me*, and *is*. That the first stands for *kar* is an irresistible conclusion. The decipherment of the Hittite texts has at last become possible!

The name of Carchemish also appears under an adjectival form agreeing with the substantive which precedes it. For reasons which need not be detailed here, I was able to show that the adjective should be read *Karkamêsiyas*, thus furnishing us with the values of three more characters *si*, *ya*, and *yas*. In one instance between *me* and *si* a character is inserted, which we find elsewhere inserted or omitted at will by the scribes. As was perceived by M. Halévy, it must therefore be a vowel, and its position in the name of Carchemish further indicates that it represents the vowel *i* or *e*. On similar grounds I was able to point out another vowel and to identify it with *a*.

Then came further discoveries. One of the cases of the noun is denoted by the picture of a sleeve, and from its position in an inscription which runs round a bowl we gather that the case in question was the accusative. The same hieroglyph also denotes the ordinary suffix of the gentile adjective, and what this

was we have learned from the Arzawa letters, where *sarrus Khattannas* is 'the Hittite king,' as well as from the name of Khattinâ applied by the Assyrians to the 'Hittites' in the neighbourhood of the Orontes. The sleeve must therefore have the value of *n*, and the Hittite language, like that of Arzawa and Boghaz Keui, will have formed the nominative of the noun in *-s* and the accusative in *-n*, while the common suffix of the gentile adjective was *-na(s)*.

Two other hieroglyphs interchange with the sleeve, and will accordingly have substantially the same pronunciation. Similarly we obtain for other characters the values of *-nas*, *-nis*, and *-nen*, while the interchange of other characters again with *me* and *s* enables us to discover the representatives of *ma*, *mes*, *as*, *iz*, and the like. In this way a sufficient number of values can be determined to form the beginnings of a working syllabary.

This we can now apply to an inscription from the site of the ancient Tyana, one of the few perfectly preserved texts which we possess. It begins with the name of the priest-king, followed by a gentile adjective, to which the determinative of 'district' is attached. This is composed of six characters, the last five of which read *a-n-a-na-s*. As *-nas* is the gentile suffix, the name of the city will have ended in *-ana*, and the first character must consequently be *tu*.

But the phonetic decipherment of the inscriptions by no means exhausts our task. The texts are largely made up of ideographs; in fact, as has already been stated, it is, as a general rule, only the grammatical

suffixes and proper names that are expressed phonetically. Although, however, we cannot read the ideographs phonetically, we can in a considerable number of cases tell what they mean, thanks to their pictorial forms. As in all hieroglyphic systems of writing, plentiful use is made of determinatives, that is, of characters which indicate what is the class of words to which they are attached. Thus there are determinatives of priests and officials, of action and power.

Among the determinatives is one which is employed to divide words. Its meaning was discovered by Dr. Peiser, and it characterizes more especially the later inscriptions which are incised and not in relief. In the older texts it is found but rarely; in these, indeed, it is prefixed only to words that denote officials. It serves to mark them off as a class apart, and so starts on its career as a 'word-divider.' Its importance to the decipherer need not be pointed out, for it tells him where words begin and where they end.

A commencement has thus been made in Hittite decipherment. But it must be remembered that it is a commencement only. There are many characters the phonetic values of which are merely probable or possible, there are many more to whose pronunciation there is as yet no clue. There are determinatives whose meanings have yet to be fixed, and ideographs whose signification is unknown. Our materials are still scanty and defective; we need more inscriptions and, above all, more perfectly preserved inscriptions, before further progress is possible. Because I can partially

read the few we possess, it would be affectation to pretend that I have any real knowledge of them. The names of the deities they mention are still undetermined; even the royal names they contain can be read only in part.

Nevertheless, I can now make out the general sense of most of the longer inscriptions, and draw certain historical conclusions from their contents. The three shorter Hamath texts, for instance, record the building or restoration of a temple which had been destroyed by an invader from the far north. The longer inscriptions of Carchemish do not belong to the same king. In one we read of the shrine and images that had been erected in the holy city of Carchemish; another is merely a long list of the titles of the priest-king, while a third describes the appointment of various priests and the rededication of the sacred stone. But the most interesting fact connected with the inscriptions of Carchemish is derived from two half-obliterated texts cut on the rocks of Gurun in Eastern Kappadokia, where they were discovered by Sir Charles Wilson. Gurun lies on the banks of the Tokhma-Su, and is mentioned by Sennacherib under the name of Guriania, in a letter written to his father while he was still crown prince. The inscriptions are dedicated to the divine triad of Hittite religion, and record the name of a king of Carchemish who had carried his arms thus far. It is these inscriptions, which are duplicates one of the other, that form the sole exception to the exclusive occurrence of the name of Carchemish

in the inscriptions of Jerablûs. The whole country, however, from Malatiyeh southwards to Carçhemish, must once have acknowledged the sway of the same Hittite king. This is clear from the fact that the lands which the king of Malatiyeh is said to govern are the same as those which are found in the titles of the kings at Carçhemish. At what date this was the case we are still ignorant.

The Cilician inscriptions belong to a much later epoch. Near the silver mines of Bulgar Maden a memorial of himself has been left by the high-priest Sanda-aitis, who calls himself *Sandanyas*, 'the Sandanian,' that is to say, 'of the city of Sandes.' This was the neighbouring town of Kybistra, known to the Greeks as Herakleia, the city of Hêrakilês, who was identified by them with the Cilician god. It is still termed Eregli. Sanda-aitis further declares that he belonged to the family of King Aimgalas—the Aingalis of Greek inscriptions—who is probably to be identified with Mugalla, the contemporary of the Assyrian Assur-bani-pal. On a stela found at Bor, the ancient Tyana, are the portrait and written record of Aimgalas himself. My translation of the inscription would be as follows: 'Aimgalas, the Tyanian priest-king, the dirk-bearer, the lordly, the prince of Cilicia, the Cataonian, the lord of the men of the city of the Eneti, the prince. The sacred stone belonging to the royal (?) city of the Eneti, dedicated to the god Sandes, as it was formerly, anew I set up.'

The kings are high-priests as well as kings, in accordance with the fact that the cities over which

they ruled were sacred, being not only consecrated to a deity but themselves deities, and, as such, objects of worship. But it is on the eastern side of the Taurus alone that the royal scribes assume the title of 'Hittite.' The title is found on the monuments of Hamath and Carchemish, of Merash and even Izgin north-west of Albistan—in fact, throughout the region where the Hittites are placed in the Egyptian, Assyrian, and Vannic inscriptions—but we look for it in vain in Cilicia and Kappadokia. So far as can be judged at present, the name was reserved for the Hittites of the east. At the same time the people of Komana appear among the Hittite adversaries of Ramses II, though the famous treaty places Aranna or Arinna, which, as we learn from the Assyrian king Tiglath-pileser I, was a city of Komana, not in the land of the Hittites but in that of Qizawadana.

It is possible that the Hittite system of writing did not pass away without leaving some permanent traces of its existence in the alphabets which superseded it. Apart from certain characters peculiar to the alphabets of Asia Minor, it may be that the names assigned to the letters even of the Phœnician alphabet were influenced by it. When the Phœnicians borrowed or adapted the alphabet called after them, they gave names to the letters beginning in their own language with the sounds expressed by the several symbols. Thus *a* was termed *aleph*, because the Phœnician word *aleph* began with that sound, *k* was *kaph*, 'the hand,' because *kaph* in Phœnician began with *k*. It was but an early ap-

plication of the principle which made our forefathers believe that the child would learn his alphabet more quickly if he were taught that 'A was an archer who shot at a frog.'

But the names must have been assigned to the letters not only because they commenced with corresponding sounds, but also because of their fancied resemblance to the objects denoted by the names. Now in some instances the resemblance is by no means clear. The earlier forms of the letters called *kaph* and *yod*, for example, both of which words signify 'a hand,' have little likeness to the human hand. If we turn to the Hittite hieroglyphs, however, we find among them two representations of the hand, encased in the long Hittite glove, which are almost identical with the Phœnician letters in shape. It is difficult, therefore, to resist the conclusion that the letters *kaph* and *yod* received their names from Syrians who were familiar with the appearance of the Hittite characters. It is the same in the case of *aleph*. Here, too, the old Phœnician letter does not in any way resemble an ox, but it bears a close likeness to the head of a bull, which occupies a prominent position in the Hittite texts. *Aleph* became the Greek *alpha* when the Phœnician alphabet was handed on to the Greeks, and in the word *alphabet* has become part of our own heritage. Like *yod*, which has passed through the Greek *iota* into the English *jot*, it is thus possible that there are still words in daily use among ourselves which can be traced, if not to the Hittite language, at all events to the Hittite script.

The Hittite language was Asianic, that is to say, it was one of a group peculiar to Asia Minor. Long ago the Hittite proper names preserved on the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments showed that it was not Semitic; but it was not until the discovery of the cuneiform tablets of Arzawa and Boghaz Keui that its exact character was disclosed. In many respects it resembled the Indo-European languages; indeed, its grammatical and structural likeness to Greek is almost startling. But the same likeness is displayed by the language of the Lykian inscriptions, which will probably turn out to be related to that of the Hittite tribes. As in Indo-European, so, too, in Hittite and Lykian the relations of grammar were expressed by suffixes.

Whether there is any connexion between Hittite and the languages of ancient Armenia and Mesopotamia, which have been revealed to us by the cuneiform texts of Van and Mitanni, is more problematical. But in all three we have the same linguistic type and a remarkable similarity of grammatical flexion. The nominative and accusative of the noun, for example, are in all alike denoted by the terminations *-s* and *-n*.

We must be on our guard, however, against supposing that there was but one uniform language throughout the district in which the Hittite population lived. Different tribes doubtless spoke different dialects, and some of these dialects probably differed a good deal from one another. But they all belonged to one and the same form of speech, and may therefore be collectively spoken of as the Hittite language, just as the various dialects of England are collectively

termed English. Indeed, it is difficult to find any indications of dialectical differences in the existing Hittite inscriptions, in whatever part of Asia Minor or Syria they are met with. They all exhibit the same suffixes and the same groups of characters constituting words.

The Hittites of Southern Palestine must have lost their old language and have adopted that of their Semitic neighbours at an early period. In Northern Syria the change was longer in coming about. The last king of Carchemish bears a non-Semitic name, but a Semitic god was worshipped at Aleppo, and Kadesh on the Orontes remained a Semitic sanctuary. The Hittite occupation of Hamath seems to have lasted for a short time only. The king who appears on the Assyrian monuments as the contemporary of Ahab has the Semitic name of Irkhulena, 'the moon is our god'; and his successors were equally of Semitic origin. It is more doubtful whether Tou or Toi, whose son came to David with an offer of alliance, bears a name which can be explained from the Semitic lexicon.

In the fastnesses of the Taurus, however, the Hittite dialects were slow in dying. In the days of St. Paul the people of Lystra still spoke 'the speech of Lycaonia,' although the official language of Kappadokia had long before become Aramaic. But the Aramaic was itself supplanted by Greek, and before the downfall of the Roman empire Greek was the common language of all Asia Minor. In its turn Greek has had to make way in these modern times for Turkish.

Languages, however, may change and perish, but the races that have spoken them remain. The characteristics of race, once acquired, are slow to alter. Though the last echoes of Hittite speech have died away centuries ago, the Hittite race still inhabits the region from which in ancient days it poured down upon the cities of the south. We may still see in it all the lineaments of the warriors of Karabel or the sculptured princes of Carchemish; even the snow-shoe and fingerless glove are still worn on the cold uplands of Kappadokia.