No. 6.

Ha g a. * Si thra * takh mu.

Hic (est)  

Sitrataches.

Yap ru šu.  

qui mentitus est  

ita: "Ego

Yakhus. sa. * Hu va ku is tar.

e stemmate  

Cyaxaris.'

No. 7.

Ha g a. * Hu viq da ta.

Hic (est)  

Veideses,

Yap ru šu.  

qui mentitus est  

ita: "Ego

* Barziya. bar. * Ku ra s.

Bardes, filius  

Cyri.'

No. 8.

Ha g a. * A ra khu.

Hic (est)  

Aracus,

Yap ru šu.  

qui mentitus est  

ita: "Ego

* * Nabu kuduru šur. bar. * * Nabu nit.

NabochoROSSOR, filius  

Nabonidi."
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DETACHED INSCRIPTIONS AT BEHISTUN.

No. 1.

Ha g a. * Gu ma ta.

Hic (est) Gomates

* Ma gu su. sa. yap ru šu. ki ma.

Magnus, qui mentitus est ita:


"Ego Bardes, filius Cyri."

No. 2.

ha g a. * A si na.

Hic (est) Atrines,

sa. yap ru šu. ki ma.

qui mentitus est ita:

ana ku. melek. * (— —).

"Ego rex Susianæ."

No. 3.

ha g a. * Ni di ta bil.

Hic (est) Niditabelus,

sa. yap ru šu. ki ma. ana ku.

qui mentitus est ita: "Ego
No. 3.—(continued.)

* * Nabu kuduru šur.
Nabochohrossor;

bar su. sa. * * Nabu nit.
filius Nabonidi.”

No. 4.

ha g a. * Pa r var ti s.

Hic (est) Phraorites,

sa. yap ru šu. ki ma. ana ku.
qui mentitus est ita: “Ego

* Kha sa t re ti.

Xathrites,

yakhas. sa. * Hu va ku is tar.
e stemmate Cyaxaris.”

No. 5.

ha g a. * Mar ti ya.

Hic (est) Martes,

sa. Yap ru šu. ki ma. a na ku.
qui mentitus est ita: “Ego

* Yam ma n e su. melek. * ( — — ).

Imanes, rex Susianæ.”
No. 6.

ha g a. * Si thr a = takh mu.

Hic (est) Sistratachmes,

sa. yap ru šu. ki ma. ana ku.

qui mentitus est ita: "Ego

yakhas. sa. * Hu va ku is tur.

e stemmate Cyaxarsa.

No. 7.

ha g a. * Hu vi š da ta.

Hic (est) Veisdates,

sa. yap ru šu. ki ma. a na ku.

qui mentitus est ita: "Ego

* Bar zi ya. bar. * Ku ra s.

Barden, filius Cyri.

No. 8.

ha g a. * A ra khu.

Hic (est) Aracus,

sa. yap ru šu. ki ma. a na ku.

qui mentitus est ita: "Ego

* Nabu kuduru šur. bar. * Nabu nit.

Nabochohroso, filius Nabonidi."
No. 9.

Hic est Phraates,

"Ego rex Margiana."
DETACHED INSCRIPTIONS AT NAKHSH-I-RUSTAM.

No. 1.

* Ku bar ra.  * Pi d di s khu ri s na(?). su va.

Gobryas

Patischorensis,

yas su(f) ma r u. sa. * Dar i ya vaş. melek.

arcifer

Darii regis.

No. 2.

* As pa si ma. ha ga. sa. * Dar i ya vaş. melek. ( — — — — — )

Aspathines

hic (est) qui

Darii regis sagitarum custos fuit.

No. 3.

ha g a. (f) * Mats ai.

ha (sunt)

Masii.
INDISCRIMINATE LIST

OF

BABYLONIAN AND ASSYRIAN CHARACTERS.

Note.—As several months must necessarily elapse before the Memoir on the Babylonian Alphabet, which I am now writing, can be completed and published, it seems desirable, for the convenience of students, that the foregoing sheets, which contain the Babylonian text of the Behistun and Nakhsh-i-Rustam Inscriptions, should be accompanied by a skeleton list of the signs which most commonly occur in those Inscriptions and in others of the same class, and that the phonetic and ideographic values belonging to such signs, so far as they are known to me, should be duly recorded.

I proceed, then, to copy out from my alphabetical note book an indiscriminate list of the Assyrian and Babylonian characters; but it is necessary at the same time to state that the list does not pretend to be complete, that many of the powers attributed to the characters are doubtful, and that in no case, probably, is the value of a sign exhausted.

To distinguish the different classes of sibilants, I have adopted for $\mathfrak{u}$ and $\mathfrak{v}$ (which in Babylonian were one and the same) the value of $\mathfrak{s}$, while I have rendered $\mathfrak{f}$ by $\mathfrak{s}$, and $\mathfrak{y}$ by $\mathfrak{z}$; but it is only in the simple characters belonging to these classes that the distinction can be depended on. For all details regarding the alphabet I must refer to the Memoir now in the course of publication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num.</th>
<th>Forms.</th>
<th>Phonetic Power</th>
<th>Ideographic value</th>
<th>Phonetic powers arising from Ideographic values. (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\mathfrak{u}$</td>
<td>a. ha</td>
<td>&quot;son&quot;</td>
<td>$\text{Pal. Bid}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$\mathfrak{v}$</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>sign of dual number (?) &quot;place&quot;</td>
<td>$\text{im (i)}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$\mathfrak{w}$</td>
<td>i, ya</td>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{nir}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$\mathfrak{x}$</td>
<td>yà</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$\mathfrak{y}$</td>
<td>ya</td>
<td>&quot;five&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$\mathfrak{y}$$\mathfrak{y}$$\mathfrak{y}$</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>monogram for &quot;the moon&quot; (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$\mathfrak{z}$</td>
<td>u, va</td>
<td>name of &quot;God,&quot; &quot;40,&quot; &quot;and&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$\mathfrak{z}$$\mathfrak{z}$$\mathfrak{z}$</td>
<td>u, hu, hva</td>
<td>monogram for &quot;the sun&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$\mathfrak{z}$$\mathfrak{z}$$\mathfrak{z}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num.</td>
<td>Forms</td>
<td>Phonetic Power</td>
<td>Ideographic value</td>
<td>Phonetic powers arising from Ideographic values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ak</td>
<td>monogram for &quot;the god Nebo.&quot;</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ik. yak</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>uk. yak</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td>&quot;low,&quot;(?) &quot;with&quot;</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ku</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>du</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>--kh</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>kha</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>khi</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>da</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>khu</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>gi</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>gu</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>ku</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>khas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ku</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>kam</td>
<td>det. of &quot;ordinal&quot;</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>khar</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>kun</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>kan</td>
<td>det. of &quot;ordinal&quot;</td>
<td>name of month ga (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>gap</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>kip(?)</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>kin</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>kuv</td>
<td>&quot;fire&quot;</td>
<td>bil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num.</td>
<td>Forms</td>
<td>Phonetic Power</td>
<td>Ideographic value</td>
<td>Phonetic powers arising from Ideographic values (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>קֵלָי, קֵלָי</td>
<td>at</td>
<td>&quot;father&quot;</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>בֵּקָלָי, בֵּקָלָי, בֵּקָלָי</td>
<td>it, yat</td>
<td>fem. of &quot;one&quot; or &quot;first&quot;</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>יֵקָלָי, יֵקָלָי, יֵקָלָי</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>&quot;from&quot;</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>נֵכָלָי, נֵכָלָי</td>
<td>ti</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>יֵקָלָי, יֵקָלָי</td>
<td>tu</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>יֵקָלָי</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>יֵקָלָי, יֵקָלָי</td>
<td>di</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>יֵקָלָי</td>
<td>du</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>יֵקָלָי</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>&quot;day,&quot; &quot;time,&quot; &quot;sun&quot;</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>יֵקָלָי</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>det. of &quot;large animals&quot;</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>יֵקָלָי</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>&quot;country&quot;</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>יֵקָלָי</td>
<td>ti</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>יֵקָלָי</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>יֵקָלָי</td>
<td>tar</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>יֵקָלָי</td>
<td>tak</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>יֵקָלָי</td>
<td>tuk</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>יֵקָלָי</td>
<td>tur</td>
<td>&quot;son;&quot; det. of &quot;rank;&quot; &quot;new;&quot; &quot;small&quot;</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>יֵקָלָי, יֵקָלָי</td>
<td>thra</td>
<td>&quot;Babil&quot;</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>יֵקָלָי</td>
<td>tik</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>יֵקָלָי</td>
<td>dam</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>יֵקָלָי</td>
<td>dak</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>יֵקָלָי</td>
<td>dan or adan</td>
<td>&quot;Babil&quot;</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>יֵקָלָי</td>
<td>duk</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>יֵקָלָי</td>
<td>dá</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

kina or gina

par

mat. sat(!) kur

khas

rip. lap. kal(!)
### Babylonian and Assyrian Characters

| Num. | Forms | Phonetic Power | Ideographic value | Phonetic powers arising from Ideographic values (?)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>takh or dakh (I)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>tap (I)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>ip. yap</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>up. vap</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>pa</td>
<td>“Nebu”</td>
<td>kha</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>pi</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>pu</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>ba</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>bi</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>bu</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>am. av.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>im. iv yam. yav</td>
<td>name of a god; det. of “cardinal point”</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>um. uv vam. yav</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>ma. va</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>mi. vi</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>mu. vu</td>
<td>“year,” “name”</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>bar</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>khu or khi?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>mar. var</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>mir. vir</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>par</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>gar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>bur</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>bir</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>bart</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num.</td>
<td>Forms.</td>
<td>Phonetic Powers</td>
<td>Ideographic value</td>
<td>Phonetic powers arising from Ideographic value. (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>bar(!)</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>bit</td>
<td>&quot;house&quot;</td>
<td>mal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>bit</td>
<td>&quot;house&quot;</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>bat</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>bi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>mi. vi</td>
<td>used for plural</td>
<td>sip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sign(?) &quot;100&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>bi</td>
<td>&quot;lord,&quot; det. of</td>
<td>bi, va</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>bul</td>
<td>&quot;year&quot;</td>
<td>mal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>makh</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>pis</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>bab</td>
<td>&quot;gate&quot;</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>va</td>
<td>&quot;and&quot;</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>ep</td>
<td>&quot;chief&quot;</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>an</td>
<td>&quot;a god&quot;</td>
<td>il</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>in. yan</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>un. van</td>
<td>&quot;mankind&quot;</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>sal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>nu</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>ana</td>
<td>&quot;one;&quot; &quot;to;&quot; det. of &quot;prop. name&quot;</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>nu</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>tu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>nis</td>
<td>&quot;king&quot;</td>
<td>man</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num.</td>
<td>Forms</td>
<td>Phonetic Power</td>
<td>Ideographic Value</td>
<td>Phonetic powers arising from Ideographic value (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>שֶּׁנְשׁ</td>
<td>ar</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>שֶּׁנְשׁ</td>
<td>ir. yar</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>שֶּׁנְשׁ</td>
<td>ur. var</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>lok, lik, liku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>שֶּׁנְשׁ</td>
<td>ra</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>שֶּׁנְשׁ</td>
<td>ri</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>שֶּׁנְשׁ</td>
<td>ru</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>שֶּׁנְשׁ</td>
<td>ur. var</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>שֶּׁנְשׁ</td>
<td>rab. rap</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>שֶּׁנְשׁ</td>
<td>rap or rip</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>שֶּׁנְשׁ</td>
<td>ras</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>kag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>שֶּׁנְשׁ</td>
<td>rat</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>שֶּׁנְשׁ</td>
<td>ras(l)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>שֶּׁנְשׁ</td>
<td>rikh(l)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>שֶּׁנְשׁ</td>
<td>al</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>as(l)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>שֶּׁנְשׁ</td>
<td>il. yal</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>שֶּׁנְשׁ</td>
<td>ul. val</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>שֶּׁנְשׁ</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>שֶּׁנְשׁ</td>
<td>li</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>as(l)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>שֶּׁנְשׁ</td>
<td>lu</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>שֶּׁנְשׁ</td>
<td>lu</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>שֶּׁנְשׁ</td>
<td>lu</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>שֶּׁנְשׁ</td>
<td>il. yal</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>שֶּׁנְשׁ</td>
<td>il. yal</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>שֶּׁנְשׁ</td>
<td>eli</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>שֶּׁנְשׁ</td>
<td>eli</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>שֶּׁנְשׁ</td>
<td>li or lu</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num.</td>
<td>Forms</td>
<td>Phonetic Power</td>
<td>Ideographic value</td>
<td>Phonetic powers arising from Ideographic values, (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>𒄏. 𒄏</td>
<td>ul. val(?)</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>𒄚</td>
<td>lat(?)</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>𒄜</td>
<td>li or lu</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>𒄝</td>
<td>ilu(?)</td>
<td>det. of &quot;precious metals&quot;</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>𒄞</td>
<td>lik or lak</td>
<td>sign for &quot;Merodach&quot;</td>
<td>mis or vis, &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>𒄠</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>𒄡. 𒄓</td>
<td>is. yas</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>mil or vil(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>𒄤. 𒄢</td>
<td>us. yas</td>
<td>masc. sign (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>𒆠</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>&quot;sun&quot; or &quot;fire&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>EditText</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>&quot;a thousand&quot;, epithet of &quot;sun&quot;</td>
<td>pan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>𒄥</td>
<td>su</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>𒄦</td>
<td>su</td>
<td>sign for &quot;Merodach&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>𒄧. 𒄥</td>
<td>sar</td>
<td>&quot;king&quot;</td>
<td>khar or khar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>𒄨</td>
<td>sur</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>𒄩</td>
<td>sip</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>𒄪. 𒄨</td>
<td>sak</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>rin(?) &amp;c. &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>𒄫</td>
<td>sut</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>𒄬. 𒄭</td>
<td>aş</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>𒄮</td>
<td>iš. yas</td>
<td>det. of (—?)</td>
<td>&quot;fire&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>𒄰. 𒄯</td>
<td>us. yas</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>𒄱</td>
<td>şa</td>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>𒄲. 𒄱</td>
<td>şi</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>sut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>𒄳. 𒄲</td>
<td>şu</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>nin or niba(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num.</td>
<td>Forms</td>
<td>Phonetic Powers</td>
<td>Ideographic value</td>
<td>Phonetic powers arising from Ideographic values (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>ल</td>
<td>लप</td>
<td>&quot;mankind&quot;</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>शण</td>
<td>शण</td>
<td>name of &quot;god&quot;</td>
<td>is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>ए</td>
<td>ए�</td>
<td>abbrev. for Assur, Assyria</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>शा</td>
<td>शा</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>शी</td>
<td>शी</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>शु</td>
<td>शु</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>रिम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>शिर</td>
<td>शिर</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>vas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>शुर</td>
<td>शुर</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>ए</td>
<td>ए</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>यि</td>
<td>यि</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>यु</td>
<td>यु</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>&quot;chariot&quot; (?)</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>यो</td>
<td>&quot;mother&quot;; &quot;woman&quot;</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDISCRIMINATE LIST OF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num.</th>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>Phonetic Power</th>
<th>Ideographic value</th>
<th>Phonetic powers arising from Ideographic values, (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td>.. “mouth”</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
<td>.. det. of “city”</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>.. “ir or er”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
<td>.. det. of “man”</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
<td>.. det. of “class,” or “rank”</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
<td>.. det. of “tribe”</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td>.. noun of “locality”</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
<td>.. prefix of “locality”</td>
<td>Karka(?)</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
<td>.. prefix of “locality”</td>
<td>Karka(?)</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
<td>.. in or yan “king”</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>sar(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td>.. “army”</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>ramani(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
<td>.. “forces”</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>saka(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td>.. “tribe” or “race”</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>lisanu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
<td>.. det. of “stones” in Babylonian</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
<td>.. det. of “stones” in Assyrian</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td>.. “walls” or “ships”</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>dikut or dikta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num.</td>
<td>Forms</td>
<td>Phonetic Power.</td>
<td>Ideographic value.</td>
<td>Phonetic powers arising from Ideographic values. (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td>sukh(?)</td>
<td>prefix of &quot;locality&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>det. of &quot;large city&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;war&quot;</td>
<td>takhaz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;battle&quot;</td>
<td>gati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
<td>khi(?)</td>
<td>adan(?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;line&quot; or &quot;family&quot;</td>
<td>yah(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;sheep&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td></td>
<td>sik(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
<td>gi(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
<td>gu(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td>gur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
<td>tan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
<td>ki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Num. | Forms | Phonetic Powers | Ideographic value | Phonetic powers arising from Ideographic values (?)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>[ IMAGE ]</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>with adjunct of “land” denotes “sea-coast”</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>[ IMAGE ]</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>monogram for “Nineveh”</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>[ IMAGE ]</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>[ IMAGE ]</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>[ IMAGE ]</td>
<td>kut(?)</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>[ IMAGE ]</td>
<td>kip(?)</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>[ IMAGE ]</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>[ IMAGE ]</td>
<td>di</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>[ IMAGE ]</td>
<td>sur</td>
<td>“brother”</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>[ IMAGE, IMAGE ]</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>relative pronoun</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>[ IMAGE ]</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>[ IMAGE ]</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>[ IMAGE ]</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>sign of “locality”</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>[ IMAGE ]</td>
<td>ru</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>[ IMAGE, IMAGE ]</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>masc. of “one” “first”</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>[ IMAGE ]</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>[ IMAGE ]</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>[ IMAGE ]</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>asru</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>[ IMAGE ]</td>
<td>khi (?)</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>adan (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>[ IMAGE (?) ]</td>
<td>sit (?)</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>[ IMAGE ]</td>
<td>dun</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE BY COLONEL RAWLINSON.

During the time consumed in writing and printing these papers on the Babylonian and Assyrian Inscriptions, continued accessions have been made to our store of Cuneiform materials, and I have found reason to amend or modify my opinions on many points of orthography, of etymology, and of grammar. A considerable difference will thus be found to exist between the Babylonian translation of the Behistun Inscription, as it is given in the sheets preceding the Memoir, which were printed on my first arrival in England, and that which is more recently repeated in the Analysis now going through the press. This difference applies not merely to the identification and rendering of the words in Roman characters, but even to the Cuneiform text, which, not unfrequently, was in the first instance erroneously printed. I wish it therefore to be understood, that in all cases of disagreement, a preference must be given to the text, rendering, and translation, as they appear in the Analysis; and I would further observe that, as in such a study knowledge must be necessarily progressive, I can only in reason be held responsible throughout my Memoir, for the explanations which, in point of time, have been the latest set forth by me. It is the more important, indeed, that I should thus assert my claim to consideration for amended readings, as a series of papers are being now published by Mons. Oppert, in the Journal Asiatique, on the Persian Behistun Inscriptions, which take cognizance alone of the original translation and meagre notes appended to my Analysis of the Persian text; and which systematically ignore the many corrections, and the diffuse etymological illustration contained in the Vocabulary subsequently published. This is, I think, to say the least of it, uncandid; and as I should be sorry to see the present Papers subjected to a similar scrutiny, I have thought it necessary formally, at the outset, to protest against such a system of criticism.
[Note.—The Analysis of the Behistun Babylonian Text which precedes the General Memoir, is paged with Roman numerals, to distinguish the introductory portion from the Memoir or body of the work; the continuation of the Analysis will be paged in the same way, so as to admit of binding up the whole in the proper order of succession. In consequence of the departure of Colonel Rawlinson from England while the printing was in progress, a considerable portion has been necessarily carried through the press without his superintendence; indulgence is consequently asked for typographical errors in a work of such unusual difficulty as that now published.—En.]

Insert the character 𒌭 at the end of the last line but three in page 13 of the Memoir; and add the remark at the foot of page 15, in note 2, that 𒄻𒄻𒄻 is now ascertained to be Marduk.
ANALYSIS

OF

THE BABYLONIAN TEXT AT BEHISTUN.

COLUMN I.

Par. 1. 1  ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ ⋅ }
titles are placed, is different from that followed in the version I am now examining; but the only doubt that can exist as to the identification of the Babylonian words, arises from the mutilation of the character, which may either be or . The translation, therefore is, "the Achæmenian, royal chief of the Persian nations (?) king of Persia."

Par. 2.  

* Da ri ya vaš. melek. ( — — — )  

ya gab bi. at tua. abua. * Vas ta š pi.  

abi. sa. * Vas ta š pi. — — —

* Ar ya ra m na , abi. sa.  

* Ar ya ra m na . * Si š pi s.  

abi. sa. * Si š pi s. * Ha kha ma ni š 'a

The meaning of the characters , which in this Inscription almost everywhere follow the monogram for "king," are still unknown to me. I doubt their being phonetic. The group may be compared, perhaps, with (Beh., No. 9, l. 3), the adjuncts and being qualifying signs attached to the monogram for "king," at the option almost, it would seem, of the sculptor. I do not think, at the same time, that or can be compared with , which,
in many of the Babylonian versions of the trilingual Inscriptions, is substituted for the Persian varzarka, in the phrase "the great king," and which seems to be cognate with a class of Assyrian epithets, such as \[ \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{I} \\text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array{c}}}

1 This is incorrect. The expression \[ \begin{array}{c} \text{I} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array{c}}}

1 On a further examination and comparison of the Khursabad Inscriptions, I find that the title of melek was especially applied to the rulers of the Khatti or Hitites, who held the Syrian cities of Carchemish, Hamath, Bambyeus, and Ashdod. The Khursabad king, at least, always styles himself "conqueror of the maliki" of these cities, and in no other passage do I find the title used. Compare with the phrase quoted in the text, the analogous passages of the Pavement and Bull Inscriptions of Khursabad, (such as 16, 23; 36, 14, &c.), and remark for the title maliki, the variant orthography of \[ \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array{c}}}

or \[ \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array{c}}}

plural. This discovery, of course, tends to discredit the reading of melek for the Assyrian \[ \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array{c}}}

1 This is incorrect. The expression \[ \text{I} \text{or } \begin{array}{c} \text{or } \begin{array{c}}}

maliq sun.\]
Yagabbi is the 3rd person singular Piel conjugation of a root gabaḥ, of the class ḫalāl. If any such root existed in Hebrew, the form would, I suppose, be written ⽴ 합니다 like ⽴ 합니다. It is not easy, however, to determine whether the 3rd radical was originally an ı or ı, that is, whether the root should belong to the class ḫalāl or ḫalāl, which, in Arabic, are distinguished from each other; for there is a constant interchange between these vowels in the Babylonian verbal forms: compare the different forms—

Falāl ṣalāb, 2nd pers. sing. do. N. R., l. 25; Beh., l. 97.

I may here observe, once for all, that a preterite tense, such as forms a part of the Hebrew and Arabic verb, is very rarely used in Babylonian. The future, in which the persons are denoted by preformatives, answers commonly both for past and present time, and thus is explained the anomalous use of what the grammarians call the Hebrew tense of narration with ֻּ אָּ n suffix.

In the phrase attua abu, "my father," we have an example of the double use of the pronoun; attua for antua is a possessive pronoun, compounded of the particle an, a form tu, identical with the characteristic of the 1st pers. sing. of the preterite in Arabic, and the true suffix of the 1st person sing. a. This same suffix also occurs in abu, where it is united by the euphonic ֻּ אָּ to the sign ֻּ אָּ, which is here used as a monogram for "father," and which corresponds, I believe, with the Hebrew ֻּ אָּ and Arabic ֻּ אָּ.

* The vowel used as the 3rd radical of this verb is, I now think, substituted for a Hebrew ı, gaba standing for gabaḥ, which must be compared with ֻּ פָּ.
In the phrase אבי sa Vastaspī, "the father of Hystaspes," the monogram אבי is used without any suffix; and the letter י which connects the definite noun with the following genitive, although properly a relative pronoun, seems in this and similar passages to answer to the Hebrew article, with which indeed, orthographically, it is identical, for י as a phonetic power is regularly represented in Babylonian by sa. The only other word which requires to be noticed is חخامנהש for Achæmenes; the adjectival form with a terminal א being here, as I think, irregularly put for the proper name.

In giving the translation of this paragraph, I place the restored portions in brackets.

"Darius, the king, says: My father was Hystaspes; the father of Hystaspes [was Arsames; the father of Arsames was] Ariyaramnes; the father of Ariyaramnes was Teispes; the father of Teispes was Achæmenes."

Par. 3. * Da ri ya vaṣ. melek. (— — —)

This paragraph is full of difficulties. We cannot tell, in the first place, whether the phrase ֶי be complete, answering to the Persian avahyādīya, and signifying "for this reason," or whether the word for "reason," is not rather to be
looked for at the commencement of the third line, "...", representing in this passage, as in so many others, a mere compound particle.

I prefer, I confess, the latter explanation; but I am quite unable either to identify this word "..." with any Semitic correspondent, or even to determine its true phonetic value. The only indication that I know of to its power is furnished by its occurring sometimes singly, but more commonly in connexion with "bi" or "bu", as if the sound it represented ended in "b"; while the strange discrepancy in its grammatical employment, standing as it does, for an adverb of place, as well as a conditional particle and a preposition of manner, seems to defy all comparison with Hebrew particles.

The following examples occur of the employment of the particle "..." in the trilingual Inscriptions.

"on account of this [reason]."
(Beh., l. 2.)

"8 from out of my race."
(l. 3.)

"The state into sin fell."
(l. 14.)

"from thence."
(l. 15.)

"he slew from among them." (passim.)

"so that he did not destroy."
(l. 28.)

"according as I wished thee."
(N. R., l. 24.)

"In that place."
(Beh., l. 47.)
According as I ordered them.”

(W‘aH., l.20.)

And in Assyrian the same part. is used with equal frequency, the form of $\mathbb{Q}$, however, being substituted for the Babylonian $\mathbb{Q}$. Comp.—

[Further text not legible]

I am much inclined to think that there is a certain connexion between $\mathbb{Q}$ and the Hebrew $\mathbb{Q}$, which, as Gesenius says, “denoted primarily the being and remaining in a place; was then transferred to the ideas of nearness and society, or accompaniment, and was coupled also with verbs of motion,” (Lex., p. 105); but I cannot venture on any positive opinion.

At the commencement of the third line, the orthography throughout is too doubtful to admit of any attempt at etymological analysis. “From antiquity,” is rendered in B. M. 40. 14, and in other places, by $\mathbb{Q} \mathbb{Q} \mathbb{Q} \mathbb{Q}$. $\mathbb{Q} \mathbb{Q} \mathbb{Q} \mathbb{Q}$; and it is quite possible that these

* As these sheets are passing through the press, it has occurred to me, that $\mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ are in all probability to be compared with $\mathbb{Q}$, the $t$ and $u$ replacing a primitive $t$, and the letter $\mathbb{Q}$ or $\mathbb{Q}$, which interchanges with $\mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$, having a guttural pronunciation like the Arabic $\mathbb{Q}$; $\mathbb{Q}$ is at any rate used like $\mathbb{Q}$, and $\mathbb{Q}$ $\mathbb{Q}$ $\mathbb{Q}$, like $\mathbb{Q}$.

1 In the phrase—

$\mathbb{Q} \mathbb{Q} \mathbb{Q} \mathbb{Q} \mathbb{Q} \mathbb{Q} \mathbb{Q} \mathbb{Q} \mathbb{Q} \mathbb{Q} \mathbb{Q}$.

"Which from antiquity, the kings, my fathers $\ldots$ had built.”
may be the words employed in this passage. "From," is every
where represented indifferently by $\text{𒀣ŠEMU}$ and $\text{𒀣ŠÉÉ}$; not as I think, with any attempt at alphabetic expression, for I cannot
venture to force $\text{𒀣ŠEMU}$ val, and $\text{𒀣ŠÉÉ}$ is, into phonetic identity\(^1\), but
with a mere employment of equivalent ideographs. Possibly, the pre-
position thus strangely represented, may require to be sounded min, but
I have no grounds for this conjecture beyond the general evidence
of agreement between the Babylonian and the other Semitic tongues.

The word answering to "antiquity," whether it be written
$\text{𒀣ŠEMU} \text{𒀣ŠÉÉ}$ or $\text{𒀣ŠEMU} \text{𒀣ŠÉÉ}$ is no doubt entirely ideographic. I
did at one time conjecture a connexion between the term $\text{𒀣ŠEMU} \text{𒀣ŠÉÉ}$,
and the monogram for "father;" tracing, as I fancied, the letters
$\text{𒀣ŠEMU} \text{𒀣ŠÉÉ}$ in a subsequent passage (line 18), where the Persian
phrase again occurs of haché paraviyat, but a more rigid examination
of the Babylonian cast has shown me there are no sufficient grounds
for either one orthography or the other.

The following word answering to omnítá, is probably a plural
participle; and a verbal form must then occur in the 1st person plural.

Further on we have for "our race," $\text{𒀣ŠEMU} \text{𒀣ŠÉÉ} \text{𒀣ŠÉÉ}$, where the
first sign is an ideograph for "race," or "family," and the termination
in uni is the suffix of the 1st person plural. I am still in doubt as to
the phonetic power of $\text{𒀣ŠEMU} \text{𒀣ŠÉÉ}$. The only Semitic words which I have
found at all resembling each other in sound, and which would give
the different significations of "family," and "holding," appertaining

\(^1\) The letter $\text{𒀣ŠÉÉ}$ has, however, in addition to its normal value of is, the
secondary power of mił or vil, which nearly assimilates with $\text{𒀣ŠEMU}$, so that very
possibly the term in question may, after all, be read as valtu or valtu. On the
other hand, $\text{𒀣ŠÉÉ} \text{𒀣ŠÉÉ}$, "from," is sometimes replaced by $\text{𒀣ŠEMU} \text{𒀣ŠÉÉ}$, as if
the pronunciation were gantu. In other passages, the particle is represented by
$\text{𒀣ŠÉÉ}$ tu, or $\text{𒀣ŠEMU} \text{𒀣ŠÉÉ}$, and sometimes even by $\text{𒀣ŠEMU}$.\n
to the Babylonian  and  I am hardly prepared to adopt this phonetic identification.

Another curious circumstance which leads me to suspect that my previous translation of the Persian original must have been incorrect, is that the sentence ends with  I "their kings,"  sun, which is equal to the Hebrew  evidently referring to some antecedent. Perhaps then the paragraph should have been rendered something as follows: "Says Darius the king. For that [reason are we called Achemenians] From antiquity we have been the chief among the tribes; from antiquity our family have been their kings."

Par. 4.  Da ri ya vaš. melek. (———)

In the phrase  "eight of my race," there is the same double employment of the personal suffix and independent personal pronoun which I have already noticed in  attua abua, "my father." The substitution of  for the more ordinary  in the compound proposition  "from out of," is exactly similar to the indifferent employment in Assyrian of  and  with the sense.

1 See Nakhsh-i-Rustam, l. 11,  "they held;" and l. 26,  he held," or "possessed." These terms might certainly be read yakhsu, the root khasal being identical with , and the sign as the monogram for "a family," having the phonetic power of yakhas. At any rate, the initial sound must be ya.
of "there," or "in that place." The particle ← aš will be found to be used with a great variety of significations. With יָדָא or יָדָא יָדָא, it means "of" or "from among;" with יָדָא ← יָד, as in the expression ← יָדָא ← יָדָא, immediately following, it signifies "before;" like the Hebrew יָדָא; alone, it generally implies "by" or "with, but sometimes "of" or "in." Etymologically, ← is, I suppose, to be compared with יָדָא, but in its use it more nearly resembles יָדָא. The phrase ← יָדָא ← יָדָא, יָדָא ← יָדָא is remarkable for more reasons than one. Very rarely do we find the Hebrew יָדָא written with ← יָדָא instead of ← יָדָא; and we have no other example of the possessive pronoun attua being used as a suffix with the elision of the initial בַּלּ. In Assyrian, for the expression "going before me," constantly used by the kings in allusion to their ancestors, we have many phrases which include the preposition יָדָא; such as—

1. בַּלּ תַּלּ ← יָדָא, בַּלּ תַּלּ ← יָדָא, יָדָא תַּלּ ← יָדָא. halik paniu, or ← יָדָא ← יָדָא, ← יָדָא ← יָדָא, ← יָדָא ← יָדָא. halik paniya, "he going before me." (Nim. Stand.'l. 15 and variants.)

2. ← יָדָא ← יָדָא, ← יָדָא ← יָדָא, ← יָדָא ← יָדָא, ← יָדָא ← יָדָא, ← יָדָא ← יָדָא. melk i ni rabi ← abuti ya. ha lik.

← יָדָא ← יָדָא ← יָדָא, ← יָדָא ← יָדָא, ← יָדָא ← יָדָא. makh ri ya. aš. pa ni.

"The great kings, my fathers, they going before me" (see B.M. 76. 22.)

3. ← יָדָא ← יָדָא, ← יָדָא ← יָדָא, ← יָדָא ← יָדָא. da ← ha lik. pa ni ya. ya na.

← יָדָא ← יָדָא ← יָדָא, ← יָדָא ← יָדָא, ← יָדָא ← יָדָא. pa na. e bu su. (British Museum, 33, 13.)

"Which ← ← he going before me formerly constructed." —

whilst in other passages makhri, which, like the Persian paru, seems to signify both "many" and "before," or "ancient," is used without

1 See also ← יָדָא ← יָדָא, ← יָדָא ← יָדָא, ← יָדָא ← יָדָא, ← יָדָא ← יָדָא, ← יָדָא ← יָדָא. "from former times." Khuru., 165. 14.
the addition of paniya. (Compare B. M. 25. 50; 37. 34; 38. 8; E. I. Col. 3. 4; 6. 24; 7. 13, &c.; and Khursabad, passim.)

The 𒂈𒄰 is of course elided in 𒂈𒄰 𒂈𒄱 𒉨 attua, in consequence of the pronoun being used as a suffix; but there is no similar instance of elision, that I am aware of, either in regard to this or the other pronouns.

𒂈𒅱 𒂏𒐯 𒂏𒂚 𒂏𒂝 𒂏𒂝 yatipu, is the regular 3rd pers. mase, plural of the Ifta'al conjugation of the root ābūs, the first radical being lost, and the second being changed from the sonant to the surd class, in consequence of its being subjected to the jesm. The 3rd pers. sing. of the same tense is 𒂈𒅱 𒂏𒐯 𒂏𒂝 𒂏𒂝 yatibus, and a variant or paragogic form is 𒂈𒅱 𒂏𒐯 𒂏𒂝 𒂏𒂝 yatibbusu. The word 𒂈𒅱, which precedes yatipu, is the abstract noun formed by the addition of 𒌂, as in Hebrew, to the theme, this termination being represented in Babylonian by 𒂏 or 𒇿, or optionally with the 𒂏 or 𒇿 interposed.

In the 4th paragraph, the Babylonian text thus gives us, “Says Darius the king, eight of my race before me reigned” (imperium egere)—the remainder, “I am the ninth; 9 of us have been kings in a double line,” is lost.

Par. 5. 1. 4

ya gab bi. as. yas mi. sa.

Hu ri mi ș da ș. ana ku. melek.

1 The letter 𒂏 in this form represents the conjugational characteristic, and the termination in ā marks, of course, the plural number, like the Hebrew  ג. It remains to be ascertained, however, whether there is any actual grammatical difference between the masculine plural endings in simple ā, and those to which the 𒂏 is attached in lieu of a primitive ā, or whether the distinction is merely orthographical.
In the phrase as yasmi za Hurimisda', for the Persian washnu A'uramazdadha, remark that the particle is here used in an instrumental sense, and that yasmi probably is the oblique case of a noun derived from a root signifying "to wish." Owing to the difficulty not only of discriminating between the Cuneiform sibilants, but of distinguishing also between the m and n, I cannot venture, at present, to identify the Hebrew root from which this noun is derived. There is no certainty, indeed, that the word in question is even rendered phonetically, for I have not met with any cognate derivatives, and the letter E, as an initial, is always liable to suspicion, from its extensive use as a determinative. We must be content then with knowing that E answers to washnu. The as is used to connect yasmi and Hurimisda, precisely as the article n would be employed in Hebrew according to Sect. 109 of Gesenius's grammar; and the following word, E; represents the orthography generally adopted at Behistun for the name of Ormazd, instead of the more usual

In continuation we have E, anaku melek, "I am king." E or E anaku, for the pronoun of the first person singular, is of course the Hebrew y'; Egyptian, anok, &c.; and as the monogram E is here used without the individualizing particle

1 The word ṣāמצ, I find, occurs in Genesis xi. 6, with the signification of "thinking," and this word may very well be of cognate origin with the Cuneiform E.
ana, we see that the sense is intended to be indefinite; that is, that
we must translate, “I am king;” and not “I am the king.”

In the following phrase, Hurimišda melku anaku yattaw (؟) “Ormazd granted me the empire,” remark that the verb
which answers to frābara governs a double accusative, a similar pas-
sage occurring in Nakhsh-i-Rustam, l. 21. I find it quite impossible,
however, to identify the root from which we have this form
_y.add , owing to the extraordinary difficulty of deter-
mining the phonetic value of , a sign which occasionally represents
the syllables rīp and lap, but which has, I think, several other inde-
pendent powers. It is possible that the form in question may be of the
Tiphah conjugation, and that the root may thus commence with a letter
belonging to the unknown syllable ; but this is not probable. I
should prefer regarding as a derivative from a
root commencing with u, the nasal being assimilated with the follow-
ing dental, and the sign thus representing a syllable which
must commence with t or d; (or, indeed, the form might be similar to
_yadda , “he gave,” which is probably the Niphah
conjugation of a hollown verb, dūn.) In reading the word conjecturally
as yattaw*, I have in view, of course, (from ), but I place
no reliance on this identification, for I have seen no other word

* On further consideration, I am pretty well satisfied that and
are cognate forms, pronounced yaddan and yaddanu,
and derived from a root dān, of the class. (Compare (from ))

There were probably two roots in Assyrian, dāna and dūn, immediately cognate,
and both signifying “to give.” They were extensively used, and one of their
principal derivatives was the word for “law,” or “religion,” as a thing given.
Compare dáta, (from dā, “to give.”) This word is written in Assyrian
or (dīna; but in Babylonian
; like the Hebrew and Arabic ْل.
in which מַעַנְיָה could be supposed to have the power of τα; nor, if the root employed were really the Babylonian correspondent of מַעַנְיָה, would it be possible to dispense, I think, with the particle מִפָּזְזּוֹ before מַעַנְיָה.  

The translation of the paragraph at the same time is undoubted—["Says Darius the king.] By the grace of Ormazd I am king. Ormazd has granted me the empire.'

Par. 6. יִכְלָא יִכְלָא יִכְלָא יִכְלָא יִכְלָא יִכְלָא יִכְלָא יִכְלָא.
* Da ri ya vaš. melek. (— — —)

מַעַנְיָה ya gab bi. ha g a.

מַעַנְיָה melek su na. at tur. * Pa r śu.

מַעַנְיָה * Nu va * * Babel * * Aś śur. * A ra bi.


* Y a va nu.

1 The term מַעַנְיָה is constantly used in Babylonian proper names as an adjunct to the names of gods; the meaning of such names being "granted by Nebo," "granted by Bel," &c., like the Midridates of old, or the modern synonyms, Atta Ullah in Arabic; Khodadad in Persian; and Tengri Verdi in Turkish. See the names in Grotefend's Plate, Zeits., vol. II. p. 177, and remark also, that the name of מַעַנְיָה is found in one of the Cyprus legends. Ges. Men. Phoen., p. 143.
* Ha re vu. * Khu va ri š mu.

* Ba kh tar. * S' u k du.

* Pa r 'u pa ra e ša n na.

* Gi mi ri. * S'a t ta g u.

In the clause which follows the formula, "Says Darius the king," and which should give us the translation of "these are the provinces which have come into my power," we have only the initial word, 𒉗𒉗, 𒆠 𒆠 haga, and if this word be complete, as it appears to be on the rock, it affords us a good example of the want of preciseness of the Babylonians in regard to grammar, haga being the masculine singular instead of the feminine plural, which ought to have been used in order to agree with "countries," as in the phrase 𒆠 𒆠 in the following paragraph. In the next phrase, which is 𒆠 𒆠 𒆠, "I am their king," the substitution of 𒆠 sune, for the more usual 𒆠 sumu (or sun, as it should, I think, be pronounced) is remarkable, and attur, "I am," or "I have become," is a very interesting word, the form in question which stands for attur, being 1st person singular apocopate of the Niphal conjugation of a hollow root tuw, which root again seems to correspond with the Hebrew נָהַ, "to go," although used in a somewhat different sense. As we have the Kal regular form of 𒆠 𒆠 𒆠 atturu, in another passage, for "I became," there can be no doubt, I think, but that the duplication in attur denotes the Niphal conjugation, which is thus shown to be employed irrespective of a passive signification.
I now go on to consider the Babylonian names of the Satrapies. Most of these names it will be seen are made to end in \( n \), a peculiarity which may well remind us of the Arabic nominative in \( e \), and which I believe to have been a real grammatical characteristic of the Babylonian language, although in practice it was very carelessly observed. Persia is here written \( \text{𐎦𐎭𐎼𐎠𐎠} \) Peršu, with the first syllable divided into letters, instead of being represented as it usually is by the syllable \( \text{𐎦} \). Regarding the name of \( \text{𐎦𐎭𐎼𐎠𐎠} \), which was applied to Susiana from the very earliest times, I entertain great doubts about its being intended to be read phonetically. In the 1st place there is no trace, I believe, of any such name as \( \text{Newaki} \), (which would be the phonetic value of the signs,) in all geography, sacred or profane. 2ndly, In the Epigraphs at Behistun, Nos. 2 and 5, the name is written \( \text{𐎦𐎭𐎼𐎠𐎠} \), as if it were optional to drop the \( \text{𐎠} \), which could hardly have been the case had the orthography really been phonetic; and 3rdly, The name of the province is also very frequently expressed by letters which give the reading of \( \text{Eluto} \), the vernacular form of Elam. I am inclined, therefore, to believe that the signs in \( \text{𐎦𐎭𐎼𐎠𐎠} \) are all ideographs, and that the geographical title was uniformly pronounced as written in \( \text{𐎦𐎭𐎼} \). The terminal \( \text{𐎠} \), indeed, is attached to many geographical names, indicating, as I think, "a low country," and \( \text{𐎦} \) occurs as an ideograph in the name of the god \( \text{𐎦𐎭𐎼} \), but I am quite at a loss to conjecture what may be the function performed by the \( \text{𐎠} \). It is not a little curious, also, to remark that the name of \( \text{Uweij} \), (whence the modern \( \text{Khu} \) Khus,) appears to have been entirely unknown to the Tartar as well as to the Semitic nations, for while in Assyrian and Babylonian we have the optional orthography of \( \text{𐎦𐎭𐎼} \) and \( \text{𐎦𐎭𐎼} \), in the so-called Median Inscriptions the title is written in different passages as \( \text{𐎦𐎭𐎼} \) or \( \text{𐎦𐎭𐎼} \) or \( \text{𐎦𐎭𐎼} \) or \( \text{𐎦𐎭𐎼} \), the
normal pronunciation being probably haparti or haftari, which is fully as difficult of explanation as the Assyrian 𒊠𒈾𒈾𒈾.

The third name is 𒌷𒇃𒇃𒆠, which is certainly an ideographic mode of expressing the name of Babylon or the Babylonians. The first sign, it must be observed, is not the usual determinative of a country, 𒇃, although so printed in the text; but the letter 𒌷 which has the phonetic power of add. Where the name occurs in the E. L. H. Inscription, the 𒌷 is replaced by 𒇃, the determinative of a tribe, or people, (Col. 4. 70; Col. 7, ls. 32, 48, &c.); and in two passages, at least, at Behistun, instead of 𒌷𒇃𒇃𒆠 we have simply 𒇃𒇃𒆠. I am thus led to suspect, as 𒇃 is a general affix of locality, and 𒇃 seems to signify "low in situation," that the entire group 𒌷𒇃𒇃𒆠 may have meant "the people of the [great] city of the plain." At any rate, although we may still adhere to the name of Babel, we may rest assured that the signs composing the group in question cannot possibly have had that phonetic power. The name of Babylon in its simplest form is expressed by two ideographs, the one denoting "a gate," bab, and the other "a god," ilu. In B. M. 54: 1.5, and 2.6, the name is thus written—𒉗𒉗; but the first element changes optionally with 𒉗 in Babylonian, or 𒉗 in Assyrian; and the second is often augmented by the addition of a qualitative sign 𒉗, which in one case is altered to 𒉗. Upon the meaning of this sign 𒉗 I can offer no opinion, but it certainly was not intended to be pronounced. An adjunct also, 𒉗, referring to geographical position, and equally non-phonetic with

1 I have lately met with the name of Susa, (written 𒈾𒈾𒈾), in an Ins. of the time of Darius Hystaspes, discovered by Col. Williams among the ruins of the city, and I have also found the same place noticed in the campaigns of an early monarch of Assyria, under the title of 𒉗. 𒈾𒈾𒉗; Susa. 
the last, was almost universally employed to close the name, so
that there is usually presented the complicated orthography of
\(\text{𒈨} \text{𒈠} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \). Not unfrequently, however, the name is
written altogether phonetically; that is, instead of the sign for "a
gate," we have the letters \(\text{𒈨} \text{𒈠} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \) or simply \(\text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \), the non-phonetic \(\text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \) being
however, appended, even to these forms.

The fourth name in the Behistun list, is \(\text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \), for Assyria, which
is here written \(\text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \) (instead of the more usual \(\text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \))
with the phonetic letters \(\text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \) and \(\text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \) disunited, and without
the non-phonetic termination in \(\text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \).

In the fifth name, \(\text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \), \(\text{Arabi}\) represents the Persian
\(\text{Arabayya}\), the terminal \(\text{i}\) apparently replacing the Persian \(\text{ya}\). In the
Inscriptions of Assyria, a nation is often spoken of on the Lower
Tigris under the name of \(\text{Aravu}\), \(\text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \) (British Museum,
17; 5: 65; 14, 15, &c.), or \(\text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \) \(\text{Aravu}\), (British Museum,
63; 13, 16, &c.), which I should wish to identify with the Arabians;
but the identification is not altogether made out, as the \(\text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \), in the
Behistun name, is not an immediate congener of the \(\text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \).

The name of Egypt, which in the Persian is \(\text{Mudaraya}\), and in the
Median \(\text{Mutsariga}\), is here written \(\text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \) \(\text{Miṣir}, \) exactly
equivalent to the Arabic \(\text{مصر}\), and the original form of the Heb. dual
\(\text{Miṣir}. \) In Assyrian, the usual orthography is \(\text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \) \(\text{Miṣir.}\)

For \(\text{tyiya darayahyai}, \) "those which are of the sea," we have

---

1 There is also an Eastern tribe of \(\text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \text{𒈨} \), frequently spoken
of in the Khursabad Inscriptions, in connexion with Media, but they can hardly
be \(\text{Arabi}.\)
in the sea";" the allusion evidently being to the Islands of the Archipelago, rather than to the
maritime possessions of the Greeks, as I once supposed. It is remarkable, that varrat, the sea, should be here mentioned without the deter-
nominative 
, which in every other passage precedes it. The
Assyrians employed the term to designate the Persian Gulf and the
Mediterranean, applying to the localities, however, sometimes the dis-
tinctive epithets of "this sea," and " that sea," as in Westergaard’s H.,
ls. 9, 10, and 17, 18; and sometimes titles alluding perhaps to geogra-
phical position, as in the Cyprus stone, side 1, ls. 23 and 24. The
name itself would seem to be cognate with the Latin more, the root
from which the word is derived having a reference to the green colour
of the sea. It is here in the oblique case.

The names of Saparda and Ionia are here written Sapardu and
Yavanu ( 
 and 
) instead of the
Saparda and Yavanu, 
 and 
 of
Nakhsh-i-Rustam. The termination in u is probably a mere mark of
the nominative.

1 The Babylonian term is thus absolutely the same as the Latin word insula which also signifies "in the sea."

2 The Sanskrit śrīk "green," has produced on the one side, the Zend saraga, Persian daraga, &c., applied to "the sea," and on the other the Latin "viridis," in French "vert," almost an identical term with the Babylonian varrat.

3 The discovery that the phrase sī varrat, or tya daragah, does not refer to the names of Saparda and Yunai, but denotes an independent Satrapy, removes all plausibility from my proposed identification of the former of these names with Šēqera. I am now obliged to agree with those who identify Saparda with Lydia, or rather, perhaps, with that portion of Asia Minor west of Cappadocia, but I still see no sufficient grounds for connecting a great geographical name, such as the Saparda of the Inscriptions, with the obscure Hāll of Obadiah. Neither Saparda nor Ionia, I think, are mentioned in the Inscriptions of Assyria, though there is the nearly similar name of ὸσὲα Yavanai, for a maritime people of Phoenicia, corresponding with the Ἰουνία of Scripture. (2 Chr. xxvi. 6. &c.)
After an hiatus which includes the names of Media, Armenia, Cappadocia, Parthia, and Zariangia, names that are fortunately preserved to us in the Inscription of Nakhsh-i-Rustam, we have the forms of 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣, for the Persian Horia, Aria, (the first letter being wrongly printed in the text as 𐎠𐎢𐎠𐎣); 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣, Khwarizmna for Chorasmia, (the termination at Nakhsh-i-Rustam being in 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎡𐎣 me, instead of 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎡𐎣 mun,) and 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎡𐎣 ᴾakhtar, and 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎡𐎣 ᴾakhtar.

S'akda, for Bactria and Sogdiana; the orthography of the two latter names, which are absolutely identical with the forms used in the Nakhsh-i-Rustam Inscription, being most valuable for the identification of some of the rarer characters.

The title which follows is very remarkable. It is written— 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎣 𐎠𐎢 والله 𐎠𐎢 والله, which must be pronounced Paravarashana, and as it answers to the name of Gandara in the Persian, corresponding with the Gaedápa of Herodotus, the natural inference is, that we have here the true orthography of a name which the Greeks rendered Ἡπαρακάννα, and applied to the mountains above Sindhu Gandhára. As the name, however, of Gandara is reproduced in the Nakhsh-i-Rustam Inscription by the group 𐎠𐎢 والله 𐎠 والله, Gandari; as the conversion of Paravarashana into Panisus, or Parnisus, requires a greater license of orthography than the Greeks even ordinarily indulged in, while in the Caneiform word, moreover, the juncture of the letters 𐎠 والله and 𐎠 والله is so unusual as to raise a doubt about their being employed phonetically; and lastly, as it appears quite unaccountable how or why the Babylonians, instead of the vernacular title of the country, should have employed a descriptive epithet evidently of a Sanscrit etymology, I cannot pretend that the "primâ facie" explanation of Paravarashana which I have hazarded, is at all satisfactory.\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) The first syllable in Parapanias is certainly 𐎠 والله parsh, "a mountain;" the etymology of the latter part of the name is more obscure.
The only other names preserved in the Behistun Catalogue are .'<.\: for Sacæ, and .'<.\: Sattagu for the Persian Thatagush. In regard to the latter name, which answers to the Σατραγάχ of Herodotus, I have only to remark on the employment of the soft sibilant for the Persian aspirated th, (pronounced like the Greek θ), a power which the Babylonians did not possess, and on the substitution for the Persian case ending in ush, of the Babylonian nominative in u; but the former name deserves a much more lengthened consideration. In the Nakhsh-i-Rustam Inscription, the name is everywhere written .'<.\: .'<.\: .'<.\: , which only differs from the Behistun orthography in the duplication of the final r, while in Assyrian, the form is usually found of .'<.\: .'<.\: , without the plural termination. It will thus be seen, that the initial .'<.\: is preserved throughout, and up to the present time I have discovered no certain clue to the identification of the phonetic power of this character. As on the one hand, however, the termination of the name is certainly miri or mirri, while on the other, the identification of the Persian Sacæ or Scythians with the people named by the Greeks Κυμήπου, in Scripture Νῦξ, and by the Armenians Gamir, would seem highly probable, I venture to give to the character .'<.\: the power of Gi, (which would otherwise be wanting in the alphabet,) and to read the entire name Gimiri. From the frequent occurrence of this name in the Inscriptions of Assyria, it would seem to have originally denoted the general militia of the tribes, and to have been without any special ethnographic application, but there is nothing improbable in the idea that the Celtic tribes may have subsequently appropriated the title to themselves, being thus known to the Greeks and Latins on their first immigration into Europe as Κυμήπου, or Cimbi, and having perpetuated their ancient designation, not only in the Crimea of Southern Russia, but in the Cymri of modern Wales.

The names of Arachotia and Mecia, and the numerical total of the Satrapies which we find in the Persian text, are lost in the Baby-
lonian; and in giving the following translation, therefore, of the entire paragraph, I distinguish the restored portions by placing them in brackets:

"Says Darius the king: these [are the provinces which have come into my possession: by the grace of Ormazd] I am king of them: Persis, Susiana, Babylonia, Assyria, Arabia, Egypt, the Archipelago, Saparda, Ionia, [Media, Armenia, Cappadocia, Parthia, Zarangia,] Aria, Chorasmia, Bactria, Sogdiana, Gandara, (1) the Cimmerians or Scythians, Sattagydia, [Arachotia, and Mecia; in all, 23 provinces.]"

---

Par. 7. 1. 7

( — — — — ) ha ga n e t.

* * * sa. ana ku. ya ts iv va ' in ni.

aš iq vi. sa. * Hu ri mi š da a na. a na ku. (— — — — ) yit tu ru n.

1. 8

man da t ta. ( — — — — — — )

a na. š a su. yap nu su .

Hayanet, for the nominative fem. plural of haga, is a remarkable word. We have in other passages, for the same Persian word imā, "these," annita, — — — — , in the nominative, and anniti, — — — — , in the oblique case; but these terms come,
I think, from a distinct pronominal base. In the word—

 pregunta is the pronoun signifying "this,"

(a hardening perhaps of the Hebrew ṃun); the n following is the
numeral characteristic, and the feminine gender is marked by the
terminal ṃun. The employment of the ṃun, however, in this last
syllable, is unusual, and I know not if the ending should be pro-
nounced et or eta. The same word occurs also in the next paragraph
for the oblique case, but I am unable to throw any light on the
decension, as the pronoun in question seems to have been peculiar to
the later Babylonian, and is never met with in the inscriptions of
Assyria.

The following word, "province," is expressed by the duplication
of the monogram ḫḵ: perhaps in reading, the term ḫḵ ḫḵ, or

should be pronounced mati².

In the next phrase—

sa anaku yatsiewa inni, "which belonged to me," we have an example
of the double use of the pronoun anaku, which precedes the verb, being
used apparently as its object, and a suffix, inni, being employed after

---

¹ ḫagā, at any rate, may be compared immediately with the Latin hio, and
with the Pushtoo ḫagā, both as to sense and sound, although these forms are
supposed to be intimately connected with the Indo-Germanic pronominal system.
(Compare Sans. सखः; Zend ḫagā, &c.)

² ḫḵ as an ideograph for a country, as well as a phonetic power, is thus often
replaced by mati. See the orthography of the name of the city of Hamath, and
compare ḫḵ, Ḫ K K Khur., 152. 8, with Ḫ K K, Ḫ K K, Ḫ K K,
"this country," in Khurasbad, 129. 5. For "this my country," we have also,

mati ḫagā, in Nakhsh-i-Rustam, l. 33;

but in Westergaard's H., l. 8 and 16, ḫḵ ḫḵ and Ḫ Ḫ Ḫ are
used in apposition to each other, as if they were different terms.
the verb, to make the signification more precise. There are other examples of such a construction in the trilingual Inscriptions—(compare 𒉗𒈹𒈺𒈻 šēš IPs a še, ṣaarakki luṣur anni, “protect me;”) and the pleonastic use of pronominal suffixes is not altogether unknown to the Hebrew. We have hardly examples enough at present to be able to decide whether the suffixes in Babylonian follow the precise rules observed in Hebrew in regard to their pointing, and their mode of union with the verbs. The use of the epenthetic nun to connect the suffix of the first person singular with the verb, seems, in Babylonian as in Hebrew, to be restricted to the future tense; but I cannot ascertain that the same rules prevail with regard to the respective employment of the a and i for the connective vowel. I observe at any rate that the i is used when the verbal form ends with a as well as o, and that the a occurs both after the regular form and the apocopate. Compare the following examples taken from the trilingual Inscriptions:

𒉗Šʬ𒈹𒈺𒈻 yatsîkta anni, “they belonged to me.”

𒉗Šʬ𒈹𒈺𒈻 yakkiru anni, “they rebelled against me.”

𒉗Šʬ𒈹𒈺𒈻 yâdammu anni, “they obeyed me.”

𒉗Šʬ𒈹𒈺𒈻 luṣur anni, “may he protect me.”

𒉗Šʬ𒈹𒈺𒈻 yupti — anni, “he granted to me.”

𒉗Šʬ𒈹𒈺𒈻 takkara anni, “it rebelled against me.”

The form 𒉗Šʬ𒈹𒈺𒈻 yatsîkta’, to which the suffix anni is attached, must be the 3rd person plural Piēl of a root

---

1 This is the feminine singular of the 3rd person, the feminine plural being yakkira’.
tsavah, which seems to correspond in form, though not in sense, with the Hebrew יִתְנַה. The termination in a' instead of u' is indicative, I think, of the feminine gender. I observe, at least, that wherever in the trilingual Inscriptions, a future plural form ends in o', the immediate nominative is אֵּלָא אֵלָא, which is certainly of the feminine gender. It would be moreover in strict analogy with Hebrew and Arabic grammar, that the true masculine and feminine endings should be um and an, of which u' and a' might be supposed to be contractions.

After the phrase answering to vaskhā Awramadāka, which has been already explained, we have יִנָּה יִנָּה אֵלָא אֵלָא. אֵלָא אֵלָא אֵלָא, for manā badakā dāka, “to me submissive they have become.” Ana anaku, “to me,” does not require any special notice, but the other words are of interest. The term אֵלָא אֵלָא אֵלָא, I can neither read nor explain. It is hardly possible that the letters should have their true phonetic power, for epnai would be etymologically quite unintelligible. I would rather take אֵלָא אֵלָא אֵלָא for a compound ideograph: אֵל at any rate, in other words, such as אֵל אֵל אֵל for fratama, “chief;” אֵל אֵל אֵל for dipi “a tablet,” &c., is evidently used with an abnormal value, derived, perhaps, from its ideographic application; and with regard to the אֵל אֵל אֵל, although it is one of the least doubtful signs in the alphabet, its mere combination in this word with the plural ending in 3, shows that it cannot represent its ordinary phonetic power of 3a. In the meantime, as I have met with no other example of the word in question, I abstain from conjecture, and pass on to the verb with which it is allied.

אֵל אֵל אֵל אֵל אֵל אֵל, yatturun, for yanturun, signifying “they have become,” must be the 3rd person plural of the Niphal form of the hollow root 3a, from which we have already met with
another derivative in the term $\text{attur}$. I have not yet ascertained the reason why, in a few instances, and a few instances only, we find the true plural inflexion with an $\nu$; (compare—

Sing.

$\text{yattur, "he became."}$

Plur.

$\text{atk, "I assembled."}$

$\text{yatkuni,}$

$\text{yatru, "he came."}$

It can hardly be that such forms belong to a tense resembling the Paragogic future of the Arabic; nor that the full termination and the apocopate may be used indifferently. I should rather attribute the appearance of the nasal to some prosodaic rule regarding the weight of the vowels in concave and defective roots; but the examples are too few to afford any determinate grounds for enquiry*. It should further be remarked, that the verb is here placed in the masculine gender, as more worthy than the feminine, and in consequence of being removed from immediate contact with the nominative, whilst the employment of the letter $\upsilon$ instead of $\eta$ for the silent terminal $\nu$ after the vowel $\nu$, is owing probably to a mere laxity of orthography*, such as is observable in the indifferent use of $\upsilon$.

---

1 The analogy between the forms $\text{attur, or \text{adduk,}}$ would lead to a suspicion that the root of the substantive verb might be $\text{tarar}$ like $\text{dakak}$, and that the duplication might be similar to the Daghestan used in Hebrew with the first radical of one of the future forms of the $\text{verba geminata.}$ Compare $\text{dakak}$ for $\text{dakak.}$ This explanation is, at any rate, preferable to that given in page xv.

* In Mr. Layard's new Inscriptions, I have met with numerous examples of this plural ending, which seems, in fact, to be used indifferently with the contracted form in $\nu$.

2 It seems to me impossible that the letter $\upsilon$ can here represent its full power of $\nu$, as that termination is unknown to any of the plural forms, either in Hebrew or Arabic.
and 𒉺𒌌 in Assyrian, to express the pronominal affix of the 3rd person plural masculine.

The next word is 𒉺𒌌𒉍𒉕𒆠𒉆𒈼mandatte, “tribute,” a term which nearly coincides with the Chaldee Ṿを迎え, the Babylonian always hardening the feminine termination into a dental, as it is hardened in Arabic, and in the construct state of the Hebrew or Chaldee noun1. In Assyrian, the usual orthography employed is 𒉺𒌌𒉏𒉆mandate, oblique 𒉺𒌌𒉏𒈼 madate, forms which bear the same relation to 𒉺𒌌𒉆 that Ṿを迎え bears to (Paint). The Ṿ, however, is sometimes found in the Assyrian term, and the duplication of the t is common. In the Nakhsh-i-Rustam Inscription the terminal letter is 𒉺𒌌 instead of 𒉺𒌌, the final Ṿ, in both examples, marking the oblique case.

The verb signifying “they brought,” which governs mandatte, is lost: the only other words, indeed, which can be recovered in the paragraph are, 𒉺𒌌𒉕, 𒉕,<ingly,  and sasu yapnusu, “that they did:” ana in this passage and in several others, seems to perform the function of the Hebrew י in as the particle governing the accusative case; but this employment of it is, I think, in reality, rather owing to its individualizing power. The next word 𒉕, which, if phonetic, must be read sasu, occurs very frequently, both in Babylonian and Assyrian, for the accusative case of the pronoun of the 3rd person singular, and curiously enough it seems to be irrespective of gender. I am not quite sure, however, that the term is phonetic, for the corresponding phrase in the Nakhsh-i-Rustam

1 If the derivation of this term from the root Ṿ獗 be correct, the nasal, of course, must be explained as in Chaldee, by the Daghest to be being resolved, a curious illustration being thus obtained of the applicability to the Babylonian of the orthographical rules proper to the Hebrew and Chaldee.
Inscription is 𒂆𒅗𒆠 𒈨𒆠 𒃂, where 𒂆𒅗𒆠 𒈨 answers to the Behistun 𒅗 𒈨 𒈨, and is apparently ideographic. The verb 𒅗 𒆠 𒈨 𒅗 𒆠 𒈨 𒅗 𒆠 𒈨 yapnušu', "they did," is the 3rd person masculine plural of a root which seems to be identical with the Hebrew 𐤆𐤂𐤀, signifying literally, "to build," but tropically, "to do," or "make." This explanation, however, is not quite satisfactory, for in the first place, the letter 𐤆 as the third radical of a Hebrew root should be converted in Babylonian to 𐤁 or 𐤂; and in the next place, we have numerous examples of Cuneiform derivatives from 𐤆𐤀, which do actually follow this orthographical rule. Compare 𒂆𒅗 apknu, or 𒂆𒆠 apknu, "I built;" 𒂆 apknu, "he built," &c. All that I can say, therefore, at present is, that yapnušu' for yapnušun, comes from a Babylonian root, which may be either banas or panaš, and which signifies, "to do," or "make."

The following is the translation of the paragraph with the restored portions in brackets.

["Says Darius the king:] these are the provinces which came into my power. By the grace of Ormazd they have become subjected to me; tribute [they have brought to me]. As to them it has been ordered by me, that they have done."

---

1 On a further consideration, I am satisfied that this phrase should be read 𒂆𒅗𒆠 𒃂, ana apasu yabhumu', "they did the doing," according to a system of redundant expression which the Babylonian particularly affected.

2 Ana asu yapnušu' might signify "to that they turned," the verb employed corresponding to the Hebrew 𐤆𐤀. The term apasu, however, is, I think, again used in line 11, and the context will there require a verb similar to the Latin ago.
After the usual formula, we have for atara inā dāhyāwē, "within these countries," a phrase, in which the only difficulty regards the particle aššu. Following Semitic analogies it would, of course, be most natural to read this word as biš, the compound particle šišu being equal to the Hebrew Cần, but I have found no other passage in which the letter šišu could be supposed to represent the syllable in. Presuming, indeed, that the characters šitu and šitu are identical, the two forms, although distinguished at Behistun, being certainly confounded in other Babylonian Inscriptions, and being represented in Assyrian by the single character šitu, the complemen
power of e or m after the vowel u must be admitted as the normal value of the sign, and this value attached to the syllable bi, would seem by some strange phonetic fiction to be combined into the single articulation of bu or bo, as in the last syllable of the name of the god Nebo\(^1\). I am however, for my own part, disinclined to read the word in question either as bin or bu. I would rather suppose the letter  を to correspond with the Hebrew ב, and would conjecture the 賑 to be a mere non-phonetic adjunct, employed for some purpose which must remain for the present obscure.

The next words are of interest. In the Persian, we have martiya

\textit{hya agatá aha;} in the Babylonian, 賑  a 賑  a 賑, the last character being alone liable to doubt. Now, 賑 is well known as the monogram for "a man," which it was probably allowable to read phonetically as \textit{ish}, or \textit{adam}, or \textit{mat}, or according to any of the sounds representing the idea of "a man;" and the second word, therefore, \textit{pīḻut}, stands for the Persian \textit{agatá}, a noun which has hitherto baffled all attempts at interpretation. The root, however, \textit{patak} or \textit{batak}, is used in so many passages of the Assyrian and Babylonian Inscriptions, that its signification can hardly be mistaken. In all the following examples the allusion evidently is to "carving," or "fashioning," or "working," or perhaps "building;" and the root may, therefore, be compared either with the Piel form of נְלָל or with the verb נְלָל, which is once used in Eze. xvi. 40\(^2\).

---

\(^1\) This name is written phonetically as 賑  a 賑 賑, a form which we are certainly warranted, on the united authority of ancient and modern languages, in reading \textit{Nabu}, rather than \textit{Nabiue}.

\(^2\) The Piel form of נְלָל signifies, "to engrave," or "carve," or "sculpture," and would suit the Assyrian verb therefore sufficiently well. I doubt, however, the interchange of the Hebrew נ with the Babylonian ק. נְלָל merely means "to cut in pieces," and is but remotely connected, therefore, as far as sense is concerned, with the verb in question.
1. da.  p i li.  pi  š e.  ya na.  ir.  Ta  š ti a ti.  yap tu ku.  "Who fashioned the cut stones in the city of Tastiat." (B.M., 38. 9.)

2. da.  ma na ma.  la.  yap ti ku.  melek.  pa ni.  makh ri ya.  "Which no king before me had done (or fashioned.)" (B.M., 41. 22.)

3. da.  melek.  ma kh ri.  ya na.  kaspi.  yap ti ku.  bi ti k su.  "Which the king before me had fashioned in silver." (E.I., c.3. 1.4).

4. a na.  Nebo (— — — ) bit.  (— — — ) ya na  Bab ilu  ya na.  ku  p ri.  va.  ha  gur ri.  e p ti k.  pi ti k su.  "To the god Nebo (- - -) a temple (- - -) in Babylon, of bitumen and brick, I fashioned or made." (E. I., col. 4. 1. 18. sqq.)

There are scores of other examples, in which the root patak, being applied either alone, or in conjunction with a redundant noun, to the
construction of buildings, can only signify "making," or "fashioning," and it remains, therefore, to be decided whether the allusion in this difficult Behistun passage may be to "workmen" in general or to the "masons," who were especially employed in the sculpture of the Achaemenian monuments. The former is, I think, the most natural explanation, for there is certainly an antithesis in the Persian between the verbs abaran and aparasan, and in spite, therefore, of etymological difficulties, I translate the nouns agatā and aviko, by "industrious," and "idle." Pitkut is, I think, a Kal plural participle, formed from patak, precisely as nikrut is from nākār. It is difficult, at the same time, to understand why a plural form should be thus joined to a singular noun,—the more especially as the demonstrative pronoun which follows is also apparently in the singular; perhaps, however, mā may mean, "one of the industrious," or possibly pitkut may be an erroneous orthography altogether: the last letter may be ṭ, and the word may thus be read simply pitkū, and may be regarded as a singular participle.

Ana suv was noticed in the last paragraph. If the particle ana be here used with its usual signification of "to," the verb forming the complement of the sentence must signify "granting favor." It is much to be regretted that we are without the Babylonian correspondents of abaran and aparasan, for the terms are probably of frequent occurrence in the independent Inscriptions of Assyria.

The next phrase to be examined is that which answers to waššuwa Auranāmadhārā išā dāhūva tyānā išuwa dādā apriyāga. The Babylonian words are—

\[ \text{waššuwa Auranāmadhārā išā dāhūva tyānā išuwa dādā apriyāga} \]

Ast yāni sa Hurimēda' dināt attu aš bi moti hagānē hēnasēgū; and they may be, I think, translated: "By the grace of Ormazd, my laws by these nations have been observed." There is indeed, an
analogous expression at Nakhsh-i-Rustam, which is rendered in the Persian, *Ditam tyu maná, avem adâraya*, and in the Babylonian, *dinašt attua yakhashe*, "they hold my laws;" and it is chiefly upon this authority that I venture to assign to the root, which must be *pari* in Persian, and *sašag* in Babylonian, the sense of "holding" or "observing."

*dišt*, is of course the (fem.) plural of a noun answering to the Hebrew נין, "a law," or "decrees." We find, indeed, the two words *dat* and *din*, which are used as correspondents in this passage, associated in the Scriptural phrase יְהוָה יִשָּׁבֶץ יִשָּׁבֶץ, (Esther i. 13), to express the same meaning. The root נין from which the Hebrew *din* is derived, is supposed to have the sense of "ruling," or "judging;" but as in the Persian, *data* certainly comes from *dâ*, "to give," so would I assign a similar significations to the original Babylonian verb. *Din*, indeed, or *dun*, would be immediately cognate with the Latin *dono*, and the term *saddânu*, which answers so frequently to *oda*, "he gave," in the Standard trilingual Inscriptions, can only be explained as a derivative from the same root\(^1\). *Attua*, "my," united to *dinašt*, has its usual possessive sense.

The following words *may*, perhaps, be rendered "among these countries," as in the previous clause. If, indeed, we read the compound particle *dun*, this significations must be necessarily assumed, and so slight

---

\(^1\) *Yaddînu* will more probably come from *danan*, as *yaddâku* comes from *dakak*; (compare *bâši* from *bâbâb*). The connexion, indeed, between *din* and *danan* is further shown, by the common use in Assyrian of *gâl*, *gal*, for "law," or "religion," answering to the Arabic *kalim* which is, of course, etymologically identical with the Hebrew נין. In the Inscriptions lately brought by Mr. Layard from Assyria, numerous examples occur
an alteration will not affect the general sense of the paragraph. If on the other hand, we scrupulously follow the Persian original, the reading of **at bi** would seem to be preferable for **a|k b|l|m**, and an instrumental sense must be given to the particle.

The verb from which is derived **b|e|f|w** **h|w|a|s|a|r|g|u**, I have not yet been able to identify, owing to the confusion and uncertainty in which is involved the employment of the Babylonian sibilantes. I feel pretty certain, however, that the root must be **sazag**, rather than **sagah**, and that the term employed is a mere plural passive participle, formed like the Arabic **iṣmī maf'al**, rather than after the fashion of the Hebrew. I should expect, indeed, the Hebrew corresponding root to be written **g|a|b|u**, and it is the more important follow out this etymology, as the commencement in **b|e|f|w** **h** being identical with that which characterizes the Hiphil participle of the Babylonian, would be apt to mislead, were not due attention paid to the vowel-pointing. The initial **b|e|f|w**, as will be abundantly shown in the alphabet, answers to the **b** of the Hebrew, and the termination in **u**, (which causes the second radical to be jesmated), is the inflexion of the plural masculine (for **un**), agreeing with **dindt**, and thus showing that either the plural ending in **at** is not restricted to feminine nouns, or that the participial plural in **u** is common to both genders.

I have failed to recognise the root from which we have the participle **hwasargu**, in any other passage of the Inscriptions.

The termination of the line, **b|e|f|w** **h|w|a|s|a|r|g|u** sa la paniya attua, is sufficiently clear. **Sa** is used in this passage for the relative, “that which;” and we thus see that the sign **h** or **>**

of the indifferent orthography of **b|e|f|w** **d|a|n|a|n** and **b|e|f|w** **d|a|n|a|n** **dani**, for the word signifying “laws,” a further proof being thus afforded of the derivation of the noun from the root **danan**, which has supplied us with the future forms **b|e|f|w** **d|a|n|a|n** **g|a|d|a|n** or **b|e|f|w** **d|a|n|a|n** **g|a|d|a|n** **g|a|d|a|n**, “he gave,” or “granted.”
answers both to the article ʼ and to the pronoun יִכּ of the Phœnician and the Rabbinic Hebrew. It is interesting also to observe, that this pronoun is expressed by ʼ or יֵ יֵ, by יֵ יֵ or יֵ יֵ, and by יֵ יֵ almost indifferently, an apt illustration being thus afforded of the direct passage of יֵ into the Chaldee ʼ, without having recourse to the conjecture of Gesenius, which would derive the latter form from the demonstrative יֵ through the Arabic نَ.".

The compound particle, ḫαני, although absolutely identical with the Hebrew נַּ as far as the etymology is concerned, is used, I think, in this and other passages, in an ablative or instrumental sense, rather than with any immediate reference to the root נַ, "to turn." Perhaps, however, we might translate ḫαניya attua, "ab ore mea," as well as "a me;" for the verb which follows must signify "said;" the Persian corresponding term being ḫαּ. The use of a double pronoun is again to be remarked in this phrase, the possessive attua being employed, notwithstanding that the suffix in a of the 1st pers. sing. is attached by a euphonic ʼ to the particle pani.

In the Nakhsh-i-Rustam Inscription, the corresponding passage is שונא יִ יֵ יֵ יֵ יֵ, and I am thus led to suspect that the character יֵ in addition to its normal value of si, must have had the secondary power of pani, or at any rate, must have been ideographically equivalent to the Hebrew נַ. I give the translation, therefore, of the Babylonian portions of this paragraph as follows:—

"Says Darius the king: throughout these provinces the industrious man, to him [I have granted favor or protection; the idle man I have punished with severity]. By the grace of Ormazd, my laws throughout these provinces have been observed. That which from me [has been declared to them, that have they performed]."

* In Mr. Layard’s new Inscriptions יֵ יֵ יֵ יֵ יֵ is repeatedly put for ḫαני, "from."
In the phrase which follows the formula, "says Darius the king," and which is rendered in the Persian, Auramazdá maná khuktram frābara, we remark in the Babylonian, that the pronoun of the 1st pers. is omitted. The terminal 𒈦𒈬𒈨 in the word for "kingdom," must necessarily, I think, represent the syllable 𒌇, rather than 𒌇, but I am still at a loss to decide whether the entire word should be read melkut or sorret. With regard to the following verb, also, 𒈬𒈦𒈬 I have nothing to add to the conjectures already advanced in my analysis of line 4*

The next phrase, answering to the Persian, Auramazdāmāyā upostām abara, "Ormazd brought help to me," is given in Babylonian as, 𒈬𒈬𒈨𒈬𒈬𒈬𒈬, and although there are here only two words to be explained, considerable difficulty attaches to them. Until lately, indeed, relying on the usual collocation of the Semitic languages which places the verb after the object, I have supposed gašēti to signify "help," being a derivative from the root ⸔⸔, and I have conjectured ⸔⸔ to be allied to

* But see the new foot-note to p. xii.
TEXT AT BEHISTUN. xxxvii

E'nah, as abara, in the Persian, contains the same root as fridbāra. At present, however, I see reason to doubt this explanation, and to suspect even that E\[1\] may be the verb, and E\[2\] the noun; for in the Nakhsh-i-Rustam Inscription, the phrase bājim abara, “they brought tribute,” is rendered by E\[1\] E\[2\] E\[3\]. I E\[4\], the verb employed being apparently the same which occurs in E\[1\] for abara; and it is possible, also, that as the Persian upastām “help” comes from a root stā, indicating “stability,” so E\[2\] in this phrase, (however it be pronounced,) may be allied to the adjective E\[4\] E\[5\] E\[6\], which is used so often in the Inscriptions of Assyria to indicate “strength,” or “power.”

If the verb E\[1\] be expressed phonetically, it may be read yasē, for yasē, the root being E\[2\] E\[3\] E\[4\], which is often used in Hebrew with the sense of “bringing,” as in the phrases “the east wind brought the locusts,” Ex. x. 13; “the ships of Hiram, which brought gold from Ophir,” 1 Kings x. 11, &c. The only irregularity would then be, that the third radical had been treated like the weak letter ṣ, in roots of the “beth class, (for ṣ, as for instance, E\[2\] E\[3\] is for ṭa. See Ges. Grammar, p. 71.) In the same view I should take E\[1\] for the construct infinitive, the particle ana being generally used before such forms in Babylonian, (compare E\[2\] E\[3\] E\[4\] E\[5\]. ana esipu takhaya, “to do battle; E\[1\] E\[2\]. E\[1\] E\[2\] E\[4\] E\[5\] ana kosadi, “on arriving; E\[1\] E\[2\] E\[4\] E\[5\] ana sadari, “to write.” &c., &c.) and ši being a cognate form with E\[2\] (Ps. 89. 10), or as the word is more commonly written in Hebrew, ṣiū.

With regard to the pronunciation of E\[1\], I am unable to state anything positive. Forms such as ripnu or lapnu, appear to
me in the highest degree improbable; and *dans* after the analogy of the probable relationship of *EIL* with *EIL*, presents even some difficulties of explanation. All that I can do is to refer to the many phrases in Assyrian, where *EIL* indicates "strength," or "power," and suggest their derivation from the same root which has furnished the noun, here signifying "help," or "sucour." Compare the title *EIL* (nom.) or *EIL* (oblique,) applying everywhere to the king of Assyria, and the epithet *EIL*, or *EIL*, or *EIL*, or *EIL*, constantly attached to cities to denote their strength or magnitude, *EIL* or "small," being the term used in contradistinction to *EIL* (See British Museum, 63, Is. 23 and 24). Another common phrase referring to an insurrection is—

*EIL* (referring to an insurrection). 

"from among my servants (withdrawing himself) he rose into power."(?)

I observe also *EIL* (British Museum, 89, 47), "At its head he placed;" (l?) and again, *EIL* "I placed them in dependency on the city of Kerkha Sargina;" (Khur. 147, 6), &c. &c. &c.

* Consequent on the discovery that *EIL* and *EIL* are mere variant orthographies for the same word, I would now propose to refer all these forms to a root *dans*, signifying primarily, "to give," but used like the Hebrew *EIL* to express other meanings, such as "to rule," "to judge," "to protect," or "defend." *Dans*, "help," may thus be connected with the idea of "protection:" *dans*, applied to a king, may mean "ruling," or "governing," (see 1 Sam. ii. 10; Zech. iii. 7, &c.): *dans*, applied to cities, may indicate "walled cities," or "places of defence." The same word may also denote "laws," or "things given," and *limit* *hedius*, as in the last
The adverb which follows, answering to the Persian yddit, “until,” is interesting. It reads 𐎗𐎹 ša, and is formed of three distinct words: adi is the Hebrew יָד; Syriac ܐܕ; Latin, ad, &c., and signifies properly “to,” or “as far as,” though it is often used in Assyrian for the simple conjunction “and.” 𐎗 ša (or, as it is sometimes written, 𐎗 ša) eli, corresponds with the Hebrew יָד and Arabic ܐܠ, and, as an independent preposition, has the sense of “over” or “upon;” here, however, it seems to be used for ܢ, as in the phrase ܢܘܒ ܝ, “until he came,” (Judges iii. 3), while ša is the relative, ي or ܝܐ, which is constantly joined with ša in Hebrew to express the fuller sense of “until that.” Adi eli ša may thus be correctly rendered in Latin by adeo ut.

The only other word to be noticed in this line is the demonstrative pronoun 𐎗 ša, where the feminine characteristic in ša, is added to the theme hoya, to agree with the feminine noun 𐎗 ša.

At the commencement of the next line we have the word 𐎗 ša anaku, “I,” and an imperfect verb, which should perhaps be restored to 𐎗 ša apnusu, the 1st person of the same verb of which the 3rd person has been already examined in the phrase— 𐎗 ša ša ša ša ša ša, anu šašu yapnusu’, “that they did.” Although the idiom, indeed, of imperium agere is foreign to the Persian, the Babylonian and the Scythic versions of the Behistun Inscription constantly make use of the same root for performing an act and exercising rule. As indeed, in line 3, we have, in the phrase, 𐎗 ša ša ša ša ša ša ša, an example of the example here quoted, may be translated, “I gave as dependencies.” The two preceding examples are very doubtful: 𐎗 ša ša ša ša ša ša ša seems rather to signify “he threw off allegiance.”
employment of *ebas*, in connection with *melkut*, in order to give the sense of "reigning," so I conjecture that "khakatram darayāmiya, "I hold the empire," or "reign," is here represented by *melkut* *anaku* *apnašu*; the root *panas* or *banas*, being, as I have before shown, an exact synonym of *ebas*, "to do."

The translation then will be as follows:

"Darius the king says: Ormazd granted (me) the empire. Ormazd brought help to me, so that this empire [I gained. By the grace of Ormazd] I rule."

Par. 10. * Da ri ya vas. melek (*— — — *)

* Da ri ya vas. melek (*— — — *)

ya gab bi. ha g a. sa. ana ku. e bu su. aš.

yaš mi. sa. * Hu ri miš da. akhar(!)

sa. a na. melek. a tu ru. (*— — — *)

su va. ha kan nu. a na. melek. yat tur.

* Kam bu zi ya. ha ga su va.

akhi su. * Bar zi ya. asad.(!) abu su n. asat (!).

imi su n. (*— — — — — — — *)
For the first clause, *ima tyu mand kartam pasiwa yathá khshâyathiya abaucam,* “this is what was done by me, after that I became king;” the Babylonian has, *haga sa anak u ebusu az yašmi Hurimšiä akhar sa ana melok hatur,* “this is what I did, by the grace of Ormazd, after that I became king.” Most of these words are already known to us.

The substitution of *u* for *a* between the 2nd and 3rd radicals, is in perfect accordance with Hebrew and Arabic grammar, and the termination in *u* corresponds also with the usage of the latter language.
Owing, however, to the first radical of this root standing half-way as it were between the guttural $\gamma$ and the weak letter $\aleph$, the Babylonian conjugation cannot be compared with any of the Hebrew classes. The letter $\varepsilon\lambda$ here stands for what in Hebrew would be expressed as $\aleph\aleph$, while in the 3rd person, the guttural altogether falls away, and $\varepsilon\lambda$ replaces $\aleph$. It is singular, that the Babylonian version should introduce after the verb, “by the grace of Ormazd,” which is wanting in the Persian.

The term which follows, and which, throughout this Behistun Inscription, answers to posēwos, “after,” is written $\varepsilon\lambda\varepsilon\lambda\gamma$, and if expressed phonetically, must be read therefore as sopki; but no other Semitic language furnishes any resemblance to such a particle, and I am strongly inclined, accordingly, to believe that the word is represented by a compound ideograph. The final character $\varepsilon\lambda\varepsilon\lambda$, at any rate, is frequently employed, as I have already shown, as a non-phonetic adjunct to names of places in plain countries, and it has, I suspect, therefore, the ideographic value of “low,” or “down.” If then, $\varepsilon\lambda\varepsilon\lambda\delta$ could also be supposed to indicate “time,” we might understand how the word “after” came to be written $\varepsilon\lambda\varepsilon\lambda\varepsilon\lambda\gamma$, and we might employ as its phonetic correspondent any standard Semitic term, such as $\nu\nu\alpha$ or akhar. Pending the discovery, indeed, in other Inscriptions, of the same particle written phonetically, I thus venture to substitute for it the Hebrew $\aleph\aleph\aleph$, and read the word in the Roman character as akhar. The conjunction of this adverb, at any rate, with the relative $\eta\nu$, exactly corresponds with the use of $\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph$ in Hebrew. (Ezek. x. 1).

The phrase $\aleph\gamma\varepsilon\lambda\varepsilon\lambda\varepsilon\lambda\gamma \nu\varepsilon\lambda\varepsilon\lambda\varepsilon\lambda\varepsilon\lambda\varepsilon\lambda\gamma \nu\varepsilon\lambda\gamma\varepsilon\lambda\varepsilon\lambda\varepsilon\lambda\gamma$ for “I became the king,” is also of interest, the particle $\nu\nu$ being employed like $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ in the older Hebrew, with a definite or demonstrative power, rather than with the sense of “to,” or to mark the object of a transitive verb, while $\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph\aleph$ is the regular 1st person singular Kal of the hollow root $\nu\nu\nu$, which also supplies us with the Niphal apocope forms of $\aleph\aleph\aleph$.
and yattur, singular; and with yatturun for the plural of the same conjugation.

Of the next phrase, which signifies, "A man named Cambysee, son of Cyrus, of our race, he was here king before me," we have merely a fragment suwa hakannu ana melek yattur. Suwa, signifying "he," or "this one," is exactly the Hebrew נון, and Arabic ﷺ, the Hebrew aspirate being regularly replaced in Babylonian by the sibilant; and the same relationship being thus indicated between the languages, that exists between the old Persian and the Sanscrit, or between the Greek and Latin. We shall subsequently find this pronoun suwa united to the demonstrative ħaga, and we shall, also, repeatedly meet with the suffix ו or י, which is, of course, a remnant of the same theme.

In the older Hebrew, as it is well-known, נון was used indifferently both for the masculine and feminine; and this confusion of genders is, I believe, often to be detected in the Inscriptions of Assyria. The true feminine, however, of י is written י or י, san or sa, the connexion between the two forms being similar to that which exists in Hebrew between י and י.

The adverb of place, hakannu, answering to the Persian  işlemleri, "here," is of course, formed from the demonstrative base ħaga, but I do not recognize any immediate correspondent, either in Hebrew or Arabic. It appears, also, to be immaterial in what vowel the word may terminate, for in Westergaard's Inscription E. l. 8, we have the phrase, יא תינא, hakanna ebussu, "quod ego hic feci," standing for the Persian 휢ו 만다 kartam 干事创业. The connexion of יא is.

* I now prefer explaining forms in which the first radical is doubled, such as yattur, yaddahu, yaddanu, by supposing the roots to be of the י class.
with ܢ  $$ is established beyond dispute by the orthography of the masc. plur. of the demonstrative pronoun, which is written ܢ  $$ in lines 106 and 112 of this Inscription.

The phrase, ܢ  $$, ܐܢܐ ܡܠܐ ܟܠܐ, "he was the king," which follows ܗܟܢܢ, may be compared with the ܐܢܐ ܡܠܐ ܟܠܐ of the last line, ܟܠܐ and ܟܠܐ being the 1st and 3rd person respectively of the same tense.

For the fourth clause, which reads in the Persian, ܢ ܐܢܘܚ ܟܒܘ ܒܝܬܐ ܒܕܝܐ ܢܡܐ ܐܗܐ, we have in the Babylonian, ܢ ܐܢܐ ܡܠܐ ܟܠܐ ܐܢܐ ܡܠܐ ܒܕܝܐ ܢܡܐ ܐܗܐ, ܥ ܐܒܦ ܒܬܐ ܢܒ ܒܬܐ ܢܒ ܒܬܐ ܢܒ ܒܬܐ ܢܒ ܒܬܐ, "of this Cambyses, the brother was Barzis."

The use of the relative ܣ, to form a genitive at the commencement of a phrase, is sufficiently common in Babylonian, although such an employment of ܢ ܐܢܘܚ or ܢ would hardly be allowable in Hebrew or Chaldee. In the names of Cambyses and Bardes, it will be seen that I represent the Babylonian ܢ ܐܢܘܚ by ܙ, as an intermediate articulation between the dental and the sibilant. The variant orthography, indeed, of the names in different languages, furnishes us with a good illustration of the gradual change from one articulation to the other. We have thus, ܟܬܒܬ in Egyptian, ܟܒܘ in old Persian, ܟܒܘ in Babylonian, ܟܡܒܘ in Greek, and ܟܒܘ in modern

* As we have masc. plur. ܐܢܐ ܡܠܐ ܒܕܝܐ ܢܡܐ ܐܗܐ ܡܕܢܐ; fem. plur. ܐܢܐ ܡܠܐ ܒܕܝܐ ܢܡܐ ܐܗܐ ܡܕܢܐ, so we have masc. plur. ܢ ܐܢܘܚ; fem. plur. ܢ ܐܢܘܚ. The undoubted connexion, indeed, of these last terms, leads me to suspect that the letters ܢ ܐܢܘܚ and ܢ ܐܢܘܚ must be placed in the same phonetic category, either the sign ܢ ܐܢܘܚ having the secondary power of ܒܢ, or the sign ܢ ܐܢܘܚ being valued in certain positions as ܓ. I leave this point, however, for subsequent research.
Persian; while the name of Bardiya, which becomes in Babylonian, 
Barziya, is written Mīpās or Șmīpās by the Greeks, and Mergis by 
the Latins.

The demonstrative pronoun hagassuma, compounded of haga, “this,”
and sura, “he,” has been already noticed. It only remains, therefore,
to explain the monogram ьстъ, which, whatever be its pronunciation,
must certainly stand for “brother.” The character ьстъ seems to
be peculiar to the later Babylonian. As it represents the last element
in the name of Nabochodrossor, interchanging in that position with
ьстъ ьстъ ьстъ, it must have the phonetic power of sur, but I
cannot believe that sur signifies “a brother.” It is more probable
that, like all the other signs appropriated to the expression of rela-
tionship, the ьстъ has in this passage a purely ideographic value, and
with a due respect therefore for Semitic analogies, I venture to read
the word as akki, supposing the Ё which is attached to it, to be the
suffix of the 3rd person, used phonetically, according to the genius of
the Babylonian language. At the same time, I have neither dis-
covered the alphabetic equivalent of ьстъ, in Assyrian, nor even have
I succeeded in finding how the idea of “brother” was expressed in
that language.

After the name of Barziya, the word answering to náma, “by name,”
has been omitted as of no consequence: I pass on accordingly to the
fifth clause, where for the Pers. hamätzit hampitá, ȝnomárpos, ȝnomárpos,
we have the Babylonian ььтъ ььтъ ььтъ ььтъ ььтъ, unicum erat pater eorum; unica erat mater eorum. The use of ььтъ
for the masculine ordinal of the number “one,” is proved by many
examples. We have thus at Hamadan, for aieam parwam khkhá-
yathiyan, ььтъ ььтъ ььтъ ььтъ ььтъ or
ььтъ ььтъ ььтъ ььтъ ььтъ, phrases, which I read
as yastic aš melki madut, or yastic aš melki makhra, “first of many
kings,” for ььтъ in other copies of the Standard trilingual Inscrip-
tion, is written phonetically as ṣ approving. “In the first year,” again,
is rendered by $\text{Y} \cdot \text{I} \cdot \text{I} \cdot \text{I}$ $\rightarrow \text{Y}$ $\cdot \text{I}$ $\cdot \text{I}$ $\cdot \text{I}$ (British Museum, 88. 26,) and numerous other instances occur of the use of $\text{Y} \cdot \text{I} \cdot \text{I}$ or $\text{Y} \cdot \text{I} \cdot \text{I}$ for the cardinal "one," or ordinal "first."

With regard to the pronunciation of $\text{Y} \cdot \text{I} \cdot \text{I}$, I propose to read asad for the cardinal, and iesi or yaedi for the ordinal. The former word I compare immediately with יִמְנָה, the י being sometimes replaced by a sibilant in Babylonian, while I would explain iesi or yaedi, by supposing that the masculine termination in י by which the other ordinals are formed in Hebrew, applied also to asad, and that this inflexion caused a corresponding change in the initial vowel. But if $\text{Y} \cdot \text{I} \cdot \text{I}$, united with יִמְנָה, "a father," be the masculine ordinal, יִמְנָה which is prefixed to יִמְנָה, "a mother," must be the feminine form. I have not been able to verify this use of the letter יִמְנָה in the Inscriptions of Assyria, but the evidence of the passage which I am now considering is almost conclusive, and comparing the sign, therefore, with the Hebrew יִמְנָה, I give to it the phonetic power of asat. Perhaps, indeed, there is some connexion between the feminine ending, which we see in יִמְנָה and the normal value of י or ya, which belongs to the character יִמְנָה. For the use of the numeral "one" with the sense of "the same," such as $\text{Y} \cdot \text{I} \cdot \text{I}$ and יִמְנָה must have in this phrase, see Gen. lx. 5, and Job xxxi. 15.

It remains to examine the sign יִמְנָה. Being used in contradistinction to יִמְנָה, which we know, from numerous examples, to denote "a father," it can only represent the idea of "mother." In the Inscriptions of Assyria, the sign is sometimes found, it is true, to denote women generally, as in the phrase,—

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hominex eys,} & \quad \text{feminas} \quad \text{innumerabilex,} \\
\text{eys eys} & \quad \text{et greges} \quad (et) \text{hoves(?) deportavi.}
\end{align*}
\]
(Brit. Mus., 20. 24,) but it is more frequently employed, as at Behistun, for the word “mother.” Compare the epithet  רַבּּ֣יָּ לְאֹ֣שַׁר, “mother of the gods,” applying to the goddess  רַבּּ֣יָּ לְאֹ֣שַׁר or  רַבּּ֣יָּ לְאֹ֣שַׁר, who must, accordingly, represent the Beltis of the Greeks. (See British Museum, 87. 12.) For the phonetic power of  אַמ, which I have ventured to assign to the character, I have, however, no other authority than the indication of the Hebrew אַמּ.

The suffix of the 3rd person plural אָמַנִּי, sunu or sun, which is attached both to אֶמֶלֶל and אֶמֶלֶל, has been already explained.

The sixth clause is lost; but the seventh is almost entire. The Babylonian version, indeed, of  יָתָּה קְבַגִּיָּ לְבַדִּיָּ עָנֶיהָ,  כַּחְיַּבְּנֵי יִנֵּהָ עָנָּדָּ,  בֶּהָדָּ עָנָּדָּ, is legible throughout, with the exception of the initial adverb, and the correspondent of that most difficult word עָנָּדָּ. It reads:—

—Kambujiya yadduku ana Barziya, ana hvaku val — — ki, sa Barziya diyaki, and may be thus analysed. The adverb answering to yadduku, “when,” at the commencement of the phrase, is probably אָמַנִּי יָתָּה, as in line 29. Yadduku is the 3rd person singular masculine of the Kal conjugation of a root identical with the Hebrew יָתָּה, which follows the paradigm of the “verba geminata” given in Gesenius, § 66, or page 143. For the Hebrew future of this conjugation, there are, it is well known, two forms; 1stly, יָתָּה (for יָתָּה = יָתָּה) with the long instead of the short vowel in the preformative; and 2ndly, יָתָּה (for יָתָּה) with a daghesh supplied in the first radical, instead of doubling the third.
The Babylonian conjugation follows almost implicitly the analogy of the Hebrew, and the Behistun Inscription thus presents us with both forms. *Yadduku*, in fact, would be written in Hebrew as לָדַכּ, while יָדַדְיָו aduku, which we shall subsequently meet with, must be compared with לָדַכּ שָׁלֵג. In the expression *ana Barziya*, the particle is used like the Hebrew לָגוּ עַי merely to mark the object of the verb; but in the following phrase, יָדַדְיָו לָדַדְיָו, it must rather stand for לָגוּ עַי, "to." The noun with which it is joined, and which answers throughout this Inscription to the Persian کاْرا, constitutes one of the many difficulties of Babylonian writing which I am still unable to resolve. I can hardly believe that such a term as *hruku* could have been used for "the people," and yet I can give no other phonetic rendering to יָדַדְיָו שָׁלֵג, nor can I explain the signs in any way ideographically. As far as its use is concerned, it answers in every respect to the Hebrew לָגְשַׁי.

The words which follow יָדַדְיָו לָדַדְיָו, are unfortunately mutilated. They consist, however, I believe, of the negative particle כְּלָנָה, and of a passive or participial form of a root, answering to the Hebrew לָגְשַׁי, "to know."

I was, for a long time, owing to the mutilation both of the Persian and Scythic texts, uncertain as to the meaning and etymology of the verb which is used in this and similar passages, but I am now satisfied that the word נֶגֶה must be lost at the commencement of line 32 of the Persian text, and that the word *asadá*, which follows, must signify "known," being a derivation from נֶגֶה. In the mutilated Scythic text

---

1 That the root *dakak* was in use as well as *dak* is shown by the form of the participle in Assyrian, which is usually written אֶנְדָּכִיק, or אֶנְדָּכִי אֶנְדָּכִיק אֶ.productId אֶנְדָּכִיק. See Brit. Mus., 17, 8; 76, 6; and Khur. revers, passim.

2 It would of course be more correct etymologically to translate *asadá* by "unknown," supposing the initial א to be the privative particle; and in this par-
we have merely ꞌ้ำ ꞌ้ำ ꞌ้ำ ꞌ้ำ ꞌ้ำ. anni tarnas, “non fuit,” but the term ꞌ้ำ ꞌ้ำ, which answers to azadá, and signifies “known,” may be restored with safety before anni. The letter ꞌ้ำ ꞌ้ำ, then, which is clearly to be read in the Babylonian translation, must be recognised as the term that commonly interchange with ꞌ้ำ ꞌ้ำ for the particle of negation, the one form being read as vəl, and the other as la, and the same relation existing between them which unites the Hebrew ꞌב with ꞌב. I cannot venture to complete orthographically the word ending in ꞌ้ำ ꞌץ, which follows ꞌ้ำ ꞌץ and signifies “known,” but I can cite some cognate derivatives and show their common connexion with the root ꞌץ.

The Persian phrase adatiyá azadá bauátiya, which occurs at Nakhsh-i-Rustam, and signifies “then shall it be known to thee,” is thus rendered in Scythic by ꞌ้ำ ꞌץ ꞌץ ꞌץ ꞌץ ꞌץ ꞌץ ꞌץ. ꞌץ ꞌץ ꞌץ, ꞌץ ꞌץ ꞌץ, ꞌץ ꞌץ ꞌץ, the last word, which I read varvadalaka, meaning “it shall be known to thee,” and being, I think, the 3rd pers. sing. future of the passive form of vədak, with the suffix of the 3rd person added. The same verb is found, particular passage such a translation would suit the Scythic and Babylonian texts without the necessity of supplying the word nisya; but in the Nakhsh-i-Rustam passages, where a negative signification is impossible, azadá must be rendered almost certainly by “known” and I am obliged, therefore, to regard the initial ꞌa as a mere unmeaning prosthesis.

3 This word may rather, perhaps, be read varvadalaka for yvarvadalaka, and may be identified with the passive causative form of the root vədak. There are good grounds, indeed, for reading ꞌץ ꞌץ as vəl, rather than vəs, and there are many examples of the introduction of the ꞌl in Babylonian, in order to give a causative power to the verb. I would suggest, therefore, the gradation of vədak, “to know;” “vədak, “to make known;” “nisvədak, “to be made known;” and would translate yvarvadalaka by “it shall be made known to thee.”
also, in another passage of that Inscription, the Persian text giving (as I would now propose to restore it,) adamsxam patiyakhahayisp mana bajiim abarataniya, "I made known to them to bring me tribute," (or "that they should bring me tribute"); the Scythian translation having I EII. E IV. IC. I. EII. E IV. IC., where the verb "to know" is again represented by the root I. EII., and the Babylonian version, which more immediately concerns us, being expressed by I EII. E IV. IC. I. EII. E IV. IC. IC. EII. IC., aniku as eli sun sa aldak mandatta enasi, "I to them what I made known [was] to bring tribute." Relying on the undoubted connexion of these three phrases, I feel pretty sure, 1stly, that the Babylonians used for the root yvda, the form of vadak, the initial yod as usual being altered to sar, and a guttural replacing the impossible articulation of ain; 2ndly, that the causative of this root, which in Hebrew would be yvrdn, was in Babylonian vaddak, the weak initial radical in aldak having fallen away before the conjugational characteristic l, which is constantly used in Babylonian to give a causative power to the verb; and 3rdly, that yvda must be pronounced yaddadak, and must be compared directly with ydvn, the future of the Niphal conjugation.3

The clause finishes with sa Barziya digk, "that Bardes was killed," the relative n being used as a conjunction like the Hebrew yvnn, and EII. E II. IC. being a past participle from the same verb which has already given us the form of yadduku. I conjecture, how-

---

1 I should have expected borataniya for the infinitive form; but there may have been an initial n, answering to the Sauscrit ma, and preserved in the modern Persian n xawardan, "to bring."  
2 But see the note on the last page.
ever, that in the conjugation of this verb two cognate roots were employed, dakak and duk: it is, at any rate, to hollow verbs only that I can refer that large class of Babylonian and Assyrian vocables to which the term יַכְּל belongs, and which have the sign כ for their middle radical. Diyaki might very well be derived from duk, as יַכְּל comes from יָכָל, יֵכָל from יִכָל, &c.; but it would be impossible to obtain such a form from dakak, according to any principles of Hebrew or Arabic conjugation. That there may again have been such a root as duk interchanging with dakak, we are warranted in believing, from the large proportion of Hebrew roots which take both the hollow and the double form, and also from being able to refer to existing hollow roots, most of those other terms in the Inscriptions which are immediately analogous to diyaki, such as יָכָל כְל יָכָל כְל miyati, from יָכָל, “to die,” כְל יָכָל כְל biyasu from יָכָל, “to be bad;” כְל יָכָל כְל kiyanu, from יָכָל, “to set;” כְל יָכָל כְל piahali, from יָכָל, (or יִכָל) “to roll,” &c., &c., &c.

The construction, it is true, of such terms, especially where they represent past participles, is not to be immediately traced in Hebrew; but, admitting that the Babylonian particularly affected the change of the י into י, as the middle stem letter, we may then compare יָכָל כְל יָכָל כְל, (perhaps pronounced diki, or simply dik, in preference to diyaki) with יָכָל כְל, which would be the past participle of a root duk. The forms of יָכָל כְל and יָכָל כְּל are so often confounded in the Behistun Inscription, that I cannot venture to assign to the terminations in י and in י the numerical distinction which might ‘primâ facie’ be supposed to belong to them.

Of the eighth clause we have merely the commencement,—

“then Cambyses went to Egypt,” and in the ninth also, which reads in the Persian, yathā Kubujjya Mudrāgam ašiyava, pasiva kāra avika above, “when Cambyses went to Egypt, then the state became wicked,” there are several deficiencies. The beginning, indeed, answer-
ing to "when Cambyses to" is lost, and of the verb corresponding to asheiyava, the letter  is alone legible. The phrase, however, standing for "then the state became wicked," is complete: it reads,  which I conjecturally pronounce as ebbie, being a preposition corresponding with  or  , biyasi or biwu, representing a noun which may be derived from  , "to be bad," and may be cognate with the Latin poius, Turkish  , French pis, &c. I have already shown, however, in examining the Babylonian term,  , pitkut, that the Persian aruka, which is here translated by  , may be supposed, from the context, to signify "idle," and I must add, that in a passage of the Nakhsh-i-Rustam Inscription, biyasi seems also to stand for "decay," so that I cannot place any great dependence on the connexion of  and  . The verb, too, which terminates this clause has resisted all my attempts to analyse it, or to trace it to a Hebrew root. It may be read almost certainly as yatlakkan, the character  having in this place its secondary power of lak; and if  signify "into sin," the most suitable meaning for the verb will be "it fell." Whether yatlakkan, however, be a paragogic future of a root dalak or talak, or whether it be a

* I now read  as qabi, and compare 2, although it must be confessed that that particle will hardly suit the context of the present passage.

1 The imperfect Persian phrase in the Nakhsh-i-Rustam Inscription, l. 52, pittuti hachâ sava — , "protect from decay," is translated in Babylonian, by  ,  , ruisar anni lapani miwa bigasi; and the Sythie correspondent for this word, bigasi, is the same which answers to the Persian thataya, "decay," in line 56 of the same Inscription.
Tiphal form of ḫān, or a metathesis for yullakkan, (known from many kindred forms,) I cannot pretend to say. As the letter  applies especially to the root  which in Phoenician and Arabic signifies "to be," and as the Persian correspondent of the verb is the term 钹, I should certainly wish to regard the  and  in yullakkan as servile letters. In this view, however, it would be necessary to suppose the serviles to have been barbarously transposed, and to refer yullakkan to an Itaphal conjugation, which seems to have been peculiar to the Babylonian language.  

The last clause which is expressed in Persian, by  dāvṣa darangā dāhasumā waṣiya abeza, utā Parsa ya, utā Mādiya, utā aniyatwā dāhasumād, is complete in the Babylonian, with the exception of the two concluding words. The text has  akhar parāz aṣ mati bu madu jamīdu, aṣ Parša, Madai — — — "Then lies became abundant in the countries, in Persia, in Media, [and in the other provinces.]" The root  "to lie," furnishes us with many forms

* The connexion of  and  having suggested the attribution to the letter  of the secondary power of gs or ka, I would now propose to read  as yullakka, and to explain it as the Tiphal form of a root answering to  "to go," the duplication being similar to that which we also find in another Tiphal form yuttueva, and the first radical having fallen away as a weak letter, before the conjugational characteristic; or it might be better, considering the guttural  and its congener  to be especially appropriated to gutturals of the  class, to derive yullakka from  In Tiphal forms of  indeed, the conjugational characteristic would require, I think, to be doubled, to compensate for the lapse of the first radical.
in the Behistun Inscriptions, but is, I believe, without any cor-
respondent in the other Semitic languages. The regular Kal future,
3rd person singular, is אָפָרֵעַ yaprɑsu; the Piēl form of
the same is אָפָרֵע yaparəs; the Piēl participle is אָפָרָשָׁו
kəparəs, or אָפָרָשָׁו kəparəs. The Hīta'āl participle is אָפָרֵט
vaphet, and the plural noun is אָפָרֶת parət. These forms
are not less valuable for grammatical illustration, than for the clas-
sification of the sibilant characters: they furnish us, indeed, with five
out of the six normal characters belonging to the Sameech, and deter-
minately connect the signs in the same phonetic category. The noun
parət, I may add, is precisely similar to dinat, being inflected with
the plural termination appropriated in Hebrew and Arabic to the
feminine gender.

For “abounded” or “became abundant,” we have one of those
redundant expressions in which all the Semitic languages delight.
The phrase, אָפָרֵעַ אָפָרֵע, means literally,
“abundantly they abounded;” madu and yamidu being derivatives from
the same root, which root, in Hebrew, is written יָפָר or יָפָר, and is
used with the kindred meaning of “length,” or “extension.” I cannot
positively explain the sign אָפָר which is prefixed to madu. In Assy-
rian, אָפָר or אָפָר אָפָר, pronounced probably as lu, is very com-
monly used as a mere pleonastic particle, without in any way altering
the sense of the sentence; here, however, I should rather take אָפָר
to be a preposition prefixed to the theme madu, in order to form an
adverb; and presuming that the sign has its normal power of lu,
should thus compare it with the Hebrew ב in בָּן. Of the term
אָפָר we have many different forms in the trilingual Inscriptions:
אָפָר אָפָר אָפָר אָפָר אָפָר אָפָר אָפָר אָפָר אָפָר אָפָר אָפָר אָפָר אָפָר אָפָר.
“many kings;” אָפָר אָפָר אָפָר אָפָר אָפָר.
TEXT AT BEHISTUN.

"many lawgivers," madat tabbanut, "many buildings," (W.'s D. l. 12, &c.), the termination in ut representing in all these forms, the masculine plural; while the fem. plur. is found in the expression mati madet, "many countries" given in Westergaard's H., l. 6. The orthography of yamdu, for the Hebrew יָםִדָּה shows us the facility with which the u and i interchange in Babylonian, and exposes at the same time, the inconvenience in the Cuneiform alphabet, of being unable to distinguish between the long and short vowels, a defect, owing to which there are no means of marking that increased weight in the preformative, which the Hebrew employs to compensate for the loss of duplication.* Yamdu from madad, may be compared, however, with aduku from da'ak; and the masculine termination in u agreeing with the feminine(?) noun pargat, may be cited as an instance of the same careless construction which I have before noticed in explaining the words dinat hamsagur.

The entire paragraph will thus read:

"Says Darius the king: this is what I have done, after that I have become the king. [A man named Cambyses, son of Cyrus, of our race, before me] this one was here the king; of this Cambyses, his brother was Barde; one was their father; one was their mother; [then Cambyses slew this Barde; when] Cambyses slew Barde, then to the people it was not known(?) that Barde had been killed; then Cambyses to Egypt [proceeded; when Cambyses to] Egypt went, then the people fell into sin(?)!; then throughout the countries lies abundantly abounded, both in Persia and in Media [and in the other provinces].

* I am now rather inclined to think that there is a distinction between אֶל and אֶל, the former being sounded as ya with the short vowel, and the latter as ya with the long.
Par. 11. (--- --- --- --- ---) yat b a.

val tu. * Pi si 'a khu va du.

A ra ka t ri 'a ta v. sum su.

val tu. eb bi. yom. XIV. kam. sa. hodeh.

* Kam bu zi ya. akhar. hva ku.

gab bi. la. pa ni. * Kam bu zi ya.

yat ti k ru 'a. ana. eli su.


* Kam bu zi ya. mi tu. tu ra. man ni su.

mi ya ti.

The eleventh paragraph commences with, "Says Darius the king:
Then a Magian named Gomates arose from Pissachada, the hill named
Aracadres, from thence.” The first Babylonian word that can be traced
answers to "udopatati, “he arose.” It should probably be restored to
$yatcha$, and should be regarded as a cognate deri-
vative with $yathareva$, which is the form
used in all other passages. I am not quite sure of the etymology of
these terms, but I conjecture them to be Tiphal forms of a root cor-
responding with the Hebrew נד. The words נד, singular, and
$yathareva$, plural, are at any
rate commonly used in Assyrian for “he came,” and “they came,”
and it might be supposed, moreover, from the example of $yathareva$,
that the Tiphal conjugation in Babylonian affected the duplication of
the second radical, which would sufficiently explain $yathareva$. $yatcha$
and $yathareva$, also, might be compared with the Hebrew preterite
forms נכ and נכ (1 Sam. xxv. 8,) and the only difficulty would
thus be to account for the Babylonian version, which usually follows
the Persian original with rigorous exactitude, having modified the
sense from “arising,” to “coming.” ¹

The names of “Pisiakhuvadu” and “Arakati,” do not require any
special explanation, but I may observe of the latter, that instead of
having the determinative before it, as is the universal rule in express-
ing the names of cities, rivers, and countries, it is followed by the
signs ה$מ$ which denote “a mountain,” and which, if pronounced
phonetically, I would propose to read $tar$, comparing the term with the
Egyptian $\Delta Y$. The next word, י$כ$, is a monogram for
“name,” and is, I think, to be read $sum$, like the Chaldee $\text{נש}$. This,
indeed, is the exact sound of י$כ י$כ which optionally inter-

¹ Perhaps, however, $yatcha$ and $yathareva$ mean in Assyrian, “arising,” rather
than “coming.” I should wish, indeed, to derive these forms from a root $tabah$
or $dobah$ (for $tabu$ or $dubu$), but the orthography of the cognate form of $yathareva$
renders such a derivation impossible, for the duplication would then fall on the
3rd radical, which is entirely opposed to the rules of Hebrew conjugation.
changes with  at Behistun as the correspondent of nima, and
many examples occur, moreover, in the Assyrian Inscriptions, of  being put phonetically for  . In the same way that the pre-
position hachá is repeated in the Persian expression hachá awadash,
"from thence," so we have  repeated in the Babylonian
phrase,  . These words correspond in use
with the Hebrew  but I have been unable to come to any trust-
worthy opinion as to their pronunciation.

The date which follows is expressed in Babylonian by  ,
the signs  and  serving as monograms for the words "day" and "month." The first
of these monograms is variously employed in the Inscriptions.
United with the determinative for "a god," and augmented by a qual-
ificative epithet  , it denotes "the sun," the real meaning of
being thus, as I think, "the bright god of day." It
is perhaps, the same monogram which occurs in the Behistun phrase,
, for daragyam jaixa, "mayest thou live long," or "may thy days be prolonged;" and
again, in the phrase  ,  ,  ,  , "from
remote days,"  being here often written as  , and a
fair presumption arising, therefore, that the reading is yomi (or
yommi) rukuti.

* There can be no doubt, but that  in this passage and in many
others, signifies "there," or "that place," meanings which it is very difficult to
connect with the Chaldee  ; nevertheless, I shall still continue to read
  as qabi, until some more suitable explanation can be given.

1 No great weight after all attaches to this example, for it seems pretty certain
that the sign  can be used instead of  to represent the plural ter-
nimation of nouns without any reference to its phonetic value. Of more importance
For the phonetic rendering however of 𒐡 š (commonly written in Assyrian as šš) I have, I confess, no authority. There is hardly a single document, historical, religious, architectural, or legal, throughout the whole extensive range of the Assyrian and Babylonian Inscriptions, in which we do not find mention of a monthly date, but never have I yet met with a phonetic reading for the word "month," and my comparison of the term accordingly, with the Hebrew נֵכֵן, is a mere conjecture. The use of šš for the numeral 14 is sufficiently intelligible, and the sign 𒀀, which follows, is the mere mark of the ordinal number. This sign is phonetically šam, (as for instance, in the first syllable of the name of Cambyses,) but it is hardly probable that it should have that power when attached to numerals. In such a position, however, it is very commonly replaced in Assyrian and cursive Babylonian by 𒈠, which has the nearly similar value of šam, and its claim, therefore, to a phonetic employment, cannot be altogether rejected.

The month of Vayakhana is represented in Babylonian by the signs 𒉌𒈠, which I am altogether unable to explain. Although, indeed, I have already formed a list of more than twenty different names for the Assyrian months, and have thus obtained sufficient grounds for doubting that a year depending on a system of lunations, could have existed in the Assyrian calendar, I have not yet succeeded in iden-
tifying the names with other Semitic correspondents, nor in ascertaining even upon what principles the divisions of time were arranged among the inhabitants of Babylon and Nineveh.\(^1\)

The last word in line 15, seems to be אָּרָּתָּ, and may belong to a phrase answering to תָּקָּדָּ, “then,” or “at that time.”

Of the fifth clause nothing is visible but the last word, אָּרָּתָּ, Cambyse."  

The sixth clause is complete. “Then all the people from Cambyses rebelled,” is expressed by אָּרָּתָּ, אָּרָּתָּ, אָּרָּתָּ, אָּרָּתָּ, Akbar hekki gabbî lopani Kambusiyâ yattikruw. In examining the word gabbî, “all,” I have been led to suspect the existence of a certain phonetic relationship between the Babylonian and Hebrew, which, if verified by subsequent research, will serve to explain many difficulties. It seems to me, then, that the final l of the Hebrew, is constantly softened in Babylonian to the vowel u or i; gabbî, “all,” thus standing for gabbal, and being equivalent to אֵּשֵּׁ, the true form of אֵּשֵּׁ, while the root gabal or gaba, “to say,” will in the same way stand for gabal, and be equivalent to אֵּשֵּׁ. It is, at any rate, impossible to avoid noticing the coincidence between the double meaning of “all,” and “saying,” appertaining to the Cuneiform אֵּשֵּׁ, and the phonetic assimilation of אֵּשֵּׁ, אֵּשֵּׁ, which are the Hebrew words possessing those respective significations. Gabbî is used in the trilingual Inscriptions indifferently.

---

\(^1\) Since writing the above, I have examined some Assyrian Calendars brought by Mr. Layard from Nineveh, and I find that the year did consist of twelve lunations, of thirty days each. The same name, therefore, must be represented by variant monograms.

\(^2\) With this indication, I would venture also to compare אֵּשֵּׁ and אֵּשֵּׁ with אֵּשֵּׁ or אֵּשֵּׁ, with which they certainly coincide very nearly in use, and would thus assign to the letter אֵּשֵּׁ or אֵּשֵּׁ the phonetic power of qu.
for harava and visasa; and there can be no doubt, therefore, as to its meaning. It is also, however, attached in Babylonian to plural nouns as a pleonastic, and perhaps a non-phonetic, affix; (compare

Lapani, "from," has been already explained as the orthographical correspondent of רָפַף. In its use however it rather resembles רָפַף.

Yattikru, "they rebelled," stands for yantikru, and is the 3rd person masculine plural of the Ifta'al form of a root, which is absolutely identical with the Hebrew יָודַע, "not to know," or "to reject." It may be interesting to compare the following derivatives from the root in question, all of which are found in the Inscription of Behistun.

yattikru (for yantikru). Ifta'al conj. fut. 3rd pers. plur. masc.

yattikir (for yantikir). Ifta'al do. 3rd pers. sing. masc. (apoc.)

yakkira (for yankiran). Kal do. 3rd pers. plur. fem.

takkira (for tankira). Kal do. 3rd pers. sing. fem.

nikrut. Kal participle, masc. plural.

Clause seven. "To him they went over, Persia, Media, and the other provinces," is rendered by—

the two last words being lost. Ana eli su is properly "to upon him? eli, indeed, (written indifferently אֶלִי or אֶלִי or אֶלִי אֶלִי) is identical with בָּלָה or בָּל, and usually signifies "over," but in combination with other particles, (compare
it is almost redundant, merely indicating "motion."

3rd pers. plur. mase. Kal future of a root corresponding with  \(\text{yadrik}u\) for \(\text{yadrik}u\), is the regular "to go;" (compare \(\text{yadrik}u\), "a way;" Arabic  طريف &c.) I have not yet been able to ascertain the laws which determined, in the Assyrian and Babylonian verb, the pointing of the second radical of the future form, but I apprehend there was the same uncertainty in this respect which we find in the conjugation of the Arabic verb. At any rate, Kal futures are met with in Babylonian pointed with the \(\text{a}\), the \(\text{i}\), and the \(\text{u}\), in the middle stem letter, without any apparent grammatical distinction. \(\text{Yadrik}u\) is a perfectly regular form, the first radical being sharpened owing to the \(\text{jem}\), and the final  replacing, probably, a primitive \(\text{n}\).

The eighth and ninth clauses are lost, with the exception of the verb  \(\text{yass}abat\), "he seized." \(\text{Yass}abat\) comes from a root \(\text{sabat}\), "to seize," which is identical with the Arabic verb  باسغ, and with a root  ظل, which Gesenius conjectures to have existed in Hebrew, with the sense of "grasping" (with the hand). In the trilingual Inscriptions, this verb generally appears with the 1st radical doubled; (compare 1st person singular  ظل  ظل \(\text{ass}abat\); 3rd person  ظل  ظل \(\text{yass}abat\); and active participle  ظل  ظل  ظل  ظل \(\text{yass}abat\), or  ظل  ظل  ظل  ظل \(\text{yass}abat\); and there is no rule in Hebrew which will account for such an orthography, for I can hardly suppose verbs implying direct action to be of the Niphal conjugation. It may be that there was an intensive conjug. in Babylonian, which was marked by the doubling of the first radical, or the duplication may have been owing to a mere careless orthography.\(^1\) The true Kal form of  \(\text{sabat}\) is, at any rate, sometimes

\(^1\) In the rendering of proper names, at any rate, we see that the Babylonians doubled the consonants as they pleased, without any regard to the orthography
used in the trilingual Inscriptions, for we have at Nakhsh-i-Rustam the orthography of अष्ट, for the Persian agarbāyam, "I seized." In the Assyrian Inscriptions, also, this is the conjugation usually employed; compare the future forms अष्ट and गाष्ट, and active participle गाष्ट, or गाष्ट, गाष्ट, kāṣṭāta; and passive part. (Hiphil) गाष्ट, or गाष्ट; and remark, that the verb has the double signification of "seizing," and "establishing," which appertains to the root in Arabic. Possibly, too, in the Assyrian records, forms of सष्ट may sometimes be confounded with derivatives from गाष्ट, "to give."

The last clause is as follows:—

The corresponding Persian phrase being pasēsā Kambubjiya svāmashīyūth, "then Cambyses, self-wishing to die, died;" सष्ट, must be here accordingly, the rarely-used preterite form of गाष्ट, answering to गाष्ट (or supposing a plural form to be used, to गाष्ट), and the three following words must answer to svāmashīyush, which signifies literally, "self-wishing to die." I conjecture, then, that तृत is a preterite form of the substantive verb, cognate with ottur, aturu, yattur, yatturun, &c.; that अष्ट, which I read doubtfully as मानसु, of the Persian originals; and it would be too much, therefore, to expect from them a rigorous attention to grammatical rule in representing their own language.

1 I can hardly believe that अष्ट really represents the particle अष्ट, notwithstanding the applicability of such an explanation to this phrase, for I have never met with min, "from," written phonetically in any other passage of the Inscription. I should rather suspect अष्ट, तृत to represent a noun in combination with the suffix of the 3rd person. It is possible, indeed, as अष्ट and
must signify "his wish," and that % miyati, (possibly miti or mit,) is either the infinitive absolute or the construct noun, which in Hebrew would be written ַלמ.

The analogy, at the same time, of ַלמ diyaki and similar forms would seem to point out miyati, (or mit,) as a participle corresponding with ַלמ, and I give accordingly the variant translation of tura, "he became," manner, from himself," miyati, "dead."

The translation of the eleventh paragraph will stand as follows:—

["Says Darius the king: there was a Magian named Gomates; he arose from Pisistradhis, the mountain of Aracadres from thence, in the fourteenth day of the month ַלמ, at [that time he appeared; He falsely declared to the state, I am Bardes, the son of Cyrus and brother of] Cambyses; then all the people revolted against Cambyses and went over to him (Bardes); both Persia and Media [and the other provinces; on the ninth day of the month —— the empire this Bardes] seized; then Cambyses died; he committed suicide, (or "his death was from himself.")

Par. 12. ַלמ- ַלמ. ַלמ ַלמ.

Da'ri ַלמ ַלמ. ַלמ.

ya ַלמ bi. ַלמ.

(— — — — — — —)

ga. ַלמ tu. ַלמ tu. u. at tu n u. ss.

ַלמ are both polyphone signs, that the true reading of the word may be mishadnu, (Hebrew ַלמ); and that the phrase may signify "he was delivered by death," or his deliverance was dying."
This paragraph is unfortunately of little assistance to us, as the most interesting passages are illegible. We have the termination of the second clause, answering to the Persian aita khshatram hochá paruwíyata amákham taumáyá aha, "that empire had been in our family from antiquity," but it is quite impossible to fix the orthography of some of the principal words, and etymological speculation, therefore, would be worse than useless. I should wish to suppose the phrase <8> <5> <5> <5> <5> to signify "from the olden time," <5> <5> <5> being the same word which occurs under the forms of <5> <5>; or <5> or <5> in other passages, in reference to time; and the following word being a qualifying epithet used like <5> or <5> <5> <5> with the signification of "former," or "remote;" but there is no certainty in the orthography of either of the words; and to add to our embarrassment, if the form of <5> <5> <5> <5> <5> be correct, it is so nearly identical with a term which occurs in paragraph 14, for the possessive pronoun of the 1st pers. plur., that notwithstanding the position which it here occupies before the noun, it would be most natural to connect it with <5> <5> <5>, and to consider these words as a translation of amákham taumáyá. The expression <5> <5>
at any rate, means "of our family," as in line 3, and the last word of the sentence, must, accordingly, be the verb answering to aha. How this term, however, which is written $\text{\textmt{54}}-\text{\textmt{55}}$, is to be pronounced, I am quite unable to conjecture, for each of the signs which compose it has several independent powers, and I have not recognized any cognate forms elsewhere.\footnote{I observe, in many passages of this Inscription, an extraordinary similarity between suffixed pronouns of the 3rd person and forms of the substantive verb, a similarity which strikingly resembles the presumed relationship in Hebrew between the pronouns $\text{\textmt{54}}\text{\textmt{56}}$ and $\text{\textmt{54}}\text{\textmt{57}}$ and the verbs $\text{\textmt{54}}\text{\textmt{59}}$ and $\text{\textmt{54}}\text{\textmt{60}}$. In line 3, $\text{\textmt{54}}\text{\textmt{57}}$ sun, seems to be used for "have been." The common phrase $\text{\textmt{54}}\text{\textmt{56}}\text{\textmt{57}}$ which precedes the dates, may mean "these were." $\text{\textmt{54}}\text{\textmt{56}}\text{\textmt{57}}$ sin, in the same way, in line 106, replaces the substantive verb in the fem. plural, and $\text{\textmt{55}}\text{\textmt{56}}\text{\textmt{57}}$ siga, in the present passage must, I think, be similarly explained as standing for the fem. sing. I conjecture, accordingly, that the suffix of the 3rd person, agreeing with its antecedent in gender and number, was optionally used in Babylonian for the substantive verb; and I thus define $\text{\textmt{54}}\text{\textmt{56}}\text{\textmt{57}}$ siga as the suffix of the 3rd person singular, answering to the Hebrew $\text{\textmt{54}}\text{\textmt{59}}\text{\textmt{60}}$, and put in the feminine gender to agree with the nominative melkut or sarrut, "empire."} The third clause of the Babylonian does not precisely follow the Persian original. Instead of "After Gomates, the Magian, had dispossessed Cambyses of Persia, Media, and the other provinces," the Babylonian construction would seem to be, "After Gomates, the Magian, had transferred the empire to himself." \footnote{I observe, in many passages of this Inscription, an extraordinary similarity between suffixed pronouns of the 3rd person and forms of the substantive verb, a similarity which strikingly resembles the presumed relationship in Hebrew between the pronouns $\text{\textmt{54}}\text{\textmt{56}}$ and $\text{\textmt{54}}\text{\textmt{57}}$ and the verbs $\text{\textmt{54}}\text{\textmt{59}}$ and $\text{\textmt{54}}\text{\textmt{60}}$. In line 3, $\text{\textmt{54}}\text{\textmt{57}}$ sun, seems to be used for "have been." The common phrase $\text{\textmt{54}}\text{\textmt{56}}\text{\textmt{57}}$ which precedes the dates, may mean "these were." $\text{\textmt{54}}\text{\textmt{56}}\text{\textmt{57}}$ sin, in the same way, in line 106, replaces the substantive verb in the fem. plural, and $\text{\textmt{55}}\text{\textmt{56}}\text{\textmt{57}}$ siga, in the present passage must, I think, be similarly explained as standing for the fem. sing. I conjecture, accordingly, that the suffix of the 3rd person, agreeing with its antecedent in gender and number, was optionally used in Babylonian for the substantive verb; and I thus define $\text{\textmt{54}}\text{\textmt{56}}\text{\textmt{57}}$ siga as the suffix of the 3rd person singular, answering to the Hebrew $\text{\textmt{54}}\text{\textmt{59}}\text{\textmt{60}}$, and put in the feminine gender to agree with the nominative melkut or sarrut, "empire."}
term *hagawen* which connects them is a further illustration of the use of the pronoun for the article, although in this case a demonstrative form is employed rather than a relative. At the commencement of the next line, we have some of the words corresponding to the Persian phrase *huwa ayastâ nérâpiyam akutâ*, but they are too doubtful and imperfect to be worth analyzing. The fourth clause, *wa ana melek yattur*, “he became the king,” requires no comment.

The Babylonian fragments will thus read:

“Says Darius the king: [the empire of which Gomates, the Magian, dispossessed Cambyses] from the olden time had been in our family; after Gomates, the Magian, had transferred the empire to [himself, both Persia and Media, and the other provinces, he did] as he pleased: he became the king.”

---

Par. 13.  

* Da ri ya vaš. melek (— — —)  

ya gab bi. man ma. y a nu. (— — — ) * Gu ma ta. ha ga su va.  

Ma gu su. melk u t. yak ki mu. hva ku.  

m a du. la. pa ni su. yap ta khat(†).

l. 21  

(— — — — —) hva ku — du ku v.
ANALYSIS OF BABYLONIAN

1. 22
   (- - - - - - - - - - - -) ana ku.

   * Hu ri mi ṣ da. aṣ(?) ṣal la.

   * Hu ri mi ṣ da. yaṣ si. da nu. aṣ.

   yaṣ mi. sa. * Hu ri mi ṣ da.

1. 23
   (- - - - - -) Ma gu su. va. (-)

   (- - - -). sa. yaat ti su. aṣ er.

   Sik ta hu va t ti ' mat. Ni ṣ ṣ ai.

   I. 7. - C. 1. EK. 11. 1. 24
   sum su. sa. aṣ. * Ma d ai.

   (- - - - - - - - - - - -) * Hu ri mi ṣ da.

   melk u t. ana ku. yud da nu.
In the second clause, for niya aha, "there was not," we have \textit{manma yānu}, both of these words being interesting. \textit{Manma} is a negative pronoun, compounded of \textit{man}, "any one," (comp Chal. \textit{ṭ ṭ}, "whosoever,"\textit{)} and the negative \textit{ma}, "not," corresponding with the Arabic \textit{ல}. Many examples occur of the employment of the pronoun; as in the phrase already quoted from the Koyunjik Bulls, P. xxxi. 2, and in a passage of the E. I. Ins. col. 61. 24.,

\begin{verbatim}
 da manama surru makhri la yabusu, "which no king did before me;"
\end{verbatim}

and its etymology is made out quite satisfactorily. \textit{Yānu}, also, must be cognate with, or rather a more ancient form of, the Hebrew \textit{נ}. It would seem to be a regular 3rd person future of a root \textit{anak}, which we may suppose to correspond with \textit{ננ} or \textit{נכ} in Hebrew. A portion of the second clause is lost; but we have the concluding phrase, "who would deprive Gomates, the Magian, of the empire;" and we here find the Babylonian verb \textit{yakkīnu}, answering to \textit{dītam chakhriyād}. Now, \textit{yakkīnu} must stand for \textit{yankīnu}, and the root, therefore, would seem to be the same as the Hebrew \textit{ךך}. Whether, however, we are to translate "there was no one to \textit{vindicate} the empire," or whether \textit{nakan} may not have signified in Babylonian, "rescuing," rather than "avenging," I cannot pretend to say, as I have found very few undoubted instances of the employment of this

\footnote{1 Etymologically it would be proper to translate \textit{manma} by "aliquis," rather than by "neqo," for the Hebrew \textit{נתו}, which is the original of the Arabic \textit{ל}, has a mere indefinite sense, corresponding, in fact, exactly with the indefinite affix \textit{chīma}, in the compound pronoun \textit{chishīna}, which is the Persian equivalent to \textit{चच}; but, on the other hand, I observe that \textit{manma} is only employed where the action is negative, and the double negative is quite agreeable to Semitic usage.}

\footnote{2 For the cursive rendering of this line, see Bellino's Cyl., side 2, line 4.}
verb in other Inscriptions. The third clause signifies, I think, “the State feared him greatly,” the sense being slightly altered from the hāchā daršhata atarsa of the Persian. یا دارشکا اطراس, at any rate, must be the word which everywhere answers to wasiya, and which has been already examined in line 14; la poni su, “from him,” is self-evident, and the concluding word یا دارشکا یا can only be the 3rd person future of a verb signifying “to fear.” I have great difficulty, however, in identifying the root from which this form is derived, owing to the doubtful power of the sign یا. From the context, I should wish to read the verb as yaqtiqhat, and to regard it as an Ifta’al form of یا, “to fear,” but I have not yet been able to verify the attribution to the sign یا of the secondary power of khat or khad.

The commencement of the 21st line is too doubtful to admit of being analyzed. Adopting Mons. Oppert’s amended translation of the 4th clause, I think it probable that the mutilated word in which the

---

1 For the Piel participles, singular یا hvanakkim, plur. یا hvanakkim; see East Ind. Ins., col. 7, l. 21, and 8, l. 18.

8 The letter یا is a variant for یا as the monogram for “a house;” and it has thus several phonetic values, such as bit, mbl, &c., in common with that sign; but I suspect that the two characters have also independent powers. At any rate, the verb یا یا یا which occurs in this passage, cannot possibly have the same meaning as the term یا یا یا, used in line 22 of the Nakhsh-i-Rustam Inscription, which, however, if یا and یا were phonetically identical, would have every appearance of being a cognate Ifta’al form.

9 Mons. Oppert’s amended readings of the Behistun Inscription are now in the course of publication in the Journal asiatique. His learning is undoubtedly, and some of his corrections are important; but a large portion of his criticism is to be found in my Behistun Vocabulary, the 1st volume of which was published in
characters  can alone be clearly traced, is derived from the root duk or dokak, “to smite,” and that it answers to the Persian avājaniya. The term which follows is quite irrecoverable. We have then, apparently, for māṭya kahandātiya, “lest it should be discovered.”  la ḫamaššu, the first word being the negative particle, and the second a passive particle from a root maṣan, which I am quite unable to identify. The next phrase is easy. “That I am not Bardes, the son of Cyrus,” is rendered by  sa la Baršiya anaku baršu sa Kuras, “quod non Bardes ego [sum] flius ejus qui Cyri.” The term for “son,” is here represented by the monogram  , which was perhaps pronounced bar, and the suffix of the 3rd person is added, as in the phrase  sa Kambušiya akhiu, which has been already examined. Affiliation is thus usually expressed in Babylonian by “son his of;” but sometimes a variant monogram,  or  , is employed, or the mere sign of the genitive  is considered sufficient to mark the relationship.

The 5th clause is rendered by Mons. Oppert, after the Persian text, “no one dared to say anything of Gomates, the Magian,”

1849, but of the very existence of which Mons. Oppert seems, nevertheless, to be completely ignorant.

1 As there appear to have been no signs of the  class of sibilants, appropriated to the syllables se and se, the corresponding signs of the  class (namely, ) and  were necessarily used in conjunction with  and , but for the syllable asi there was a distinct character  ; and wherever, accordingly, we find the assimilating with the  or  (as in this word it must be considered an instance of careless orthography.
and this amended reading is, no doubt, perfectly correct. In the Babylonian we have merely the commencement of the sentence "\( \text{manma.} \)" ret. \( \text{ya} - - \text{va. aš. eli}; \) and owing to my having failed, up to the present time, to ascertain the power of the compound sign "\( \text{I-} \)" I am neither able to identify the verb "\( \text{E-} \)" nor to determine positively, whether it means "saying" or "daring." I should think, however, that "\( \text{E-} \)" answered to niya adarshanaush, "non anus est;" for there is a participle, derived apparently from the same root, which is applied to the god "\( \text{I-} \)" and to which, accordingly, the sense of "daring" is more applicable than that of "saying." The compound particle aš eli must be here

---

1 The following are the materials I have collected for determining the power of "\( \text{I-} \)". In the annals of the Kuyunjik king, it stands for the numeral 3.

In the Kharsabad Inscriptions, the term "\( \text{E-} \)" commonly interchanges with "\( \text{I-} \)." The word "\( \text{E-} \)" signifies "he dared." The standard epithet applied to the god "\( \text{I-} \)" at Kharsabad is "\( \text{I-} \)". The sign "\( \text{I-} \)" is also a common element in Babylonian names; compare "\( \text{I-} \)" the son of Nalazur," referring to the chief placed by Esar Haddon in charge of Babylonia, (British Museum, 22, 59); and the Babylonian king, "\( \text{I-} \)" Merodach, the son of "\( \text{I-} \)" who gave tribute to the Obelisk king. (See Brit. Mus., 46, 17, and 15, 29.) The name of this king has certainly a striking resemblance to the Mesoopotamica of the Canon of Ptolemy; but, on the other hand, chronologically, the identification seems impossible; and I have no authority from etymological sources for thus attributing to the sign "\( \text{I-} \)" the value of "\( \text{I-} \)."
used for the Persian *parīra*, which signifies “about,” or “regarding,” and the noun which it governs, together with the infinitive form of the verb *gabar*, “to say,” must be supposed to be lost at the commencement of line 22.

In the 6th clause, where, for “then I prayed to Oromasdes,” we have *አ למצ, ո *

*Albert, *which is usually *ti*, having here the secondary power of *as*, and *አ *

which usually stands for *ni*, having the power of *sal*. That *አ *

indeed, represents *sallay*, I am satisfied from numerous examples; (compare *

*salas*, “battle,” *salmanu*, “images,” *vusuliti*, “victorious,” &c.;), and the context requiring absolutely that the verb should be in the 1st person singular, I am obliged to supply the value of *as* for the initial syllable. *Albert*, of course, like the

---

1 *Albert* exchanges with *

as the correspondent for *hamaranam*, “battle,” throughout the Behistun Inscription.

2 (compare Hebrew *לַלּוֹ*; Arab. * משנה*), occurs in Behistun Inscription, line 106, where, however, the printed text has an erroneous reading; and for

*vealiti*, “victorious,” see the titles of Sargina, [Shalmanners] in B. M., 33. 1. 4.

*Albert* *qui* *ab* *início* *regnus* *cujus*. *vealiti* *hostes* *cujus* *non* *parebat*.

*Albert* *victor* *(in pugnā)* *innumerabilis*.

I derive *vealiti*, of course, from *לַלּוֹ*.

2 As there are several characters which thus fluctuate between the *l* and *r*, there would seem to be some phonetic law connecting the two classes. At any
the cognate forms $\text{שָׁלַח}$ yala, "worship;" $\text{שָׁלַח}$ yasu, "they worshipped," &c., is derived from a root answering to $\text{שָׁלַח}$, the doubling of the 1st radical being perhaps dialectic, as in yassabat, &c., and the second duplication indicating the Piel conjugation, as in yagabbi, yaparras, yamarru, yatsiva, &c.

There is nothing more to be noted till we come to the phrase in the next line, answering to the Persian $\text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡}$, "his chief followers." The Babylonian text is here given as $\text{纡}$, $\text{纡}$ being a monogram for "man" generically; $\text{纡}$ the determinative of "rank;" $\text{纡}$ the name of the particular rank indicated by $\text{纡}$; (Chaldee $\text{纡}$ Esth. i. 3.) and $\text{纡}$ the sign of the plural number. It is impossible of course to determine how this phrase should be pronounced, as not one of the signs composing it is phonetic. The following words, however, read $\text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡}$, "who were with him;"

$\text{纡} \text{纡}$ and $\text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡}$ interchange repeatedly: $\text{纡} \text{纡}$ is sometimes put for $\text{纡}$; $\text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡}$ seems also to have the power of $\text{纡}$, and I am half inclined to think that what I have hitherto called Liphal and Itlaphal forms, are in reality Shaphal and Istaphal (for Hiphil and Hithpael); the sign $\text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡}$ having the power of $\text{纡}$ as well as of $\text{纡}$; for amongst other examples, I observe, that $\text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡}$ in the 1st pers. seems to answer to $\text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡}$ in the 3rd; and that $\text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡}$ and $\text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡}$ belong apparently to the same tense of the same verb. All this is very puzzling, and can only yield to careful and continued research.

1 The sign $\text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡}$ or $\text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡}$ is constantly used in the Assyrian Inscriptions as determinative of "a title." Compare the word $\text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡}$, $\text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡}$, "a general," (rendered by the Hebrews as $\text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡}$;) also $\text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡}$, $\text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡}$, $\text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡}$; and perhaps, $\text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡} \text{纡}$.
TEXT AT BEHISTUN.

being equivalent to the Chaldee נ, and the suffix of the 3rd person being irregularly omitted.

After this we have the Babylonian names answering to the Persian Silk'tamutish, Nisáya, and Media, the former being preceded by א, which is the monogram for "a city," and was probably pronounced "an, (Heb. יִם,) and the two latter by ס, or mat, denoting "a country."

The two first letters of the name of Silk'tamutish are a good deal mutilated on the rock: the first, on a careful inspection of the cast, seems to be א, but the form is hardly made out with sufficient distinctness to authorize the admission of א into the Babylonian alphabet with the value of סיק: the second letter may be given with more certainty as ס; and that the value of ta appertains to this sign is shown by many other examples, such as א for Dicka, the "Tigris," א א א א א א א for "Elutai, for "Elymais," &c., &c. It is to be observed, also, that the Babylonian substitutes the letter א, in the orthography of this name for the nominatival case-ending of the Persian. There is nothing to be remarked in the names of Nisáya and Media, except the duplication of the s in the former name, and the assimilation of י and י, which, however, do not strictly belong to the same grade among the sibilants. The words answering to "Ormazd granted me the empire," in the last clause, are a mere repetition of the phrase in line 4, with the exception of the word surrat, "empire," being written as א א instead of א א.

The translation of this paragraph then will be as follows:—

"Says Darius the king: there was not any one, [not a Persian, nor a Median, nor any one of our family, who] would rescue (or vindicate) the empire from that Gomates, the Magian: the people greatly feared him: [he would slay many people who knew the other Bardes: for that reason] he would slay them 'lest it should be made public that I am not Bardes, who was the son of Cyrus.' No
one dared about [Gomates, the Magian, to say anything, until I arrived:] then I prayed to Ormazd; Ormazd brought help to me: by the grace of Ormazd, [on the 10th day of the month (——) with my confederates I slew Gomates,] the Magian, and the leaders of the people who were with (him): In the town of Siktachotes; in the country named Nisaea, which was in Media [there I slew him: I recovered the empire from him; I became king by the grace of Ormazd:] Ormazd granted me the empire.”

Par. 14.  

* Da ri ya vaş. melek (—— — —)  

ya gab bi. melk u t. sa. la. pa ni.  

l. 25  

(—— — — —) val ta kan. zi ş.  

ana ku. e ti bu su. bit i. sa. ilu i. sa.  

* Gu ma ta. ha ga su va. Ma gu su.  

l. 26  

yab bu lu. ana ku.  

(—— — — —)  

* Gu ma ta. ha ga su va. Ma gu su.  

ya ki (—— — —) su nu t. ana ku. hva ku. aş.  

as ri su. val ta kan. zi ş * Par şu.
TEXT AT BEHISTUN.

In line 24, the words *sarrut su lapani,* "imperium quod a [me]," are all sufficiently known to us; but line 25 commences with a word *vollakan,* which requires some explanation. The Persian correspondent is *avaštāyam,* and the meaning is "I established;" *vollakan,* therefore, must be the active participle of the Ilkatphal conjugation of *vāz,* a root which is of very frequent employment, both in Assyrian and Baby-
Ionian, with the sense of “making,” “appointing,” or “establishing;” and which exhibits a great variety of forms. The many instances of confusion between letters of the class l and the class s, have led me to suspect, as noticed in a preceding page, that the Liphal conjugation in Babylonian may be identical with the Shaphel (Heb. Hiphil), and the Iltaphal with the Istaphel (Heb. Hithpael); but I have not yet found sufficient evidence to satisfy all my doubts; and I continue, therefore, for the present, to regard the conjugations as distinct. At the same time, that in this particular verb, the Iltaphal conjugation is used precisely with the same causative power as the Shaphel, is shown by a comparison of the following passages from the Trilingual Inscriptions:

1. \[\text{as. s̄a ki pi. as ku n. su n. di ya ki.}\]
   \[\text{Ad cruocem feci eos occisos}\]
   Behistun, l. 63.

2. \[\text{as. s̄a ki pi. al ta kan. su. di ya ki}\]
   \[\text{ad cruocem feci eum occisum}\]
   Behistun, l. 60. And again,—

1. \[\text{akhar. a na ku. — e mi. al ta kan.}\]
   \[\text{tum ego jussum feci}\]
   \[\text{Behistun, l. 88.} \]
   \[\text{ki ma.}\]
   \[\text{ita.}\]

2. \[\text{qa b u. sa. a na ku. — e mi.}\]
   \[\text{sicut ego jussum}\]
   \[\text{Westergaard’s H. l. 20.}\]
   \[\text{as ku n nu s su n.}\]
   \[\text{feci illis.}\]
I cannot pretend, at present, to give a complete list of the derivatives from the root *kun*, but it may be interesting to put together a few of the most ordinary forms.

Participle of Kal, *ünk* or *ünk* *ünk* *ünk*.

Shaphel (Hiphil) forms, 1st per. *ünk* *ünk* or *ünk* *ünk* or *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk*; 3rd person *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* or *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk*; participle (or const. Infinitive) *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk*.

Infinitive, 1st per. *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* or *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* or *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk*; 3rd pers. *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* or *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk*; *ünk* or *ünk* or *ünk*.

Itataphal, *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* or *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk*; participle.

Tiphal, *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* or *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk* *ünk*; *ünk* or *ünk*; *ünk* or *ünk*, 3rd person.
Perhaps even \( \text{\textit{wusakin}} \), is a Shashaphel participle. It is, however, always difficult to identify those forms of the root *kun*, in which the letters *s* and *t* are employed as servile letters, in consequence of the orthographical resemblance of such terms to derivatives from the roots \( \text{\textit{sad}} \) and \( \text{\textit{add}} \). The use of the active participle, in Babylonian as in Arabic, instead of the verb, and without, of course, any distinction of person, is not uncommon. As *vattakan*, indeed, here stands for *avastdayam*, "I established," so in the corresponding passage of the Inscription of Nakhsh-i-Rustam \( \text{\textit{walsib}} \) (Itaphal part of \( \text{\textit{sad}} \)) is used for *niyadhdayam*. \( \text{\textit{Vasabib}} \) also, is employed throughout the Behistun Inscription, for "I seized," or "he seized," and if \( \text{\textit{wusus}} \) be a genuine term in line 19 of Westergaard's D., it must be explained as the Shashaphel participle of *chos*, used instead of the 3rd pers. of the verb.

The 4th clause, *yathā pruvamachiya, avathā adam akunavam*, "I made it as it was before," is rendered by \( \text{\textit{vusuk}} \) \( \text{\textit{u}} \) \( \text{\textit{i}} \). The first word, which, if it be phonetic, must be read *sis*, is difficult. I conjecture, however, that it is a noun or construct infinitive from a root *vasaš* or *yasaš*, which signifies "to renew" or "restore," and which is cognate both with the Hebrew \( \text{\textit{sad}} \) and the Arabic \( \text{\textit{sad}} \). There is, at any rate, a verbal form in the Nimrud Standard Inscription, line 20, which is certainly a kindred derivative with \( \text{\textit{vusuk}} \) \( \text{\textit{u}} \) \( \text{\textit{i}} \) and which suggests the above etymology. This word occurs in the phrase \( \text{\textit{vusuk}} \) \( \text{\textit{u}} \) \( \text{\textit{i}} \) \( \text{\textit{vusuk}} \) \( \text{\textit{u}} \) \( \text{\textit{i}} \), "at the four gates I restored," and I translate, accordingly, the Behistun phrase by "I made a restoration".

\[1\] The *yā* in *yasaš* may be taken as a middle form between \( \text{\textit{n}} \) and \( \text{\textit{sad}} \); at any rate, examples of the *yod* interchanging with gutturals are not uncommon; while the Babylonian *s* is known to be a frequent substitute for the dental, as in the orthography of *Barziya* for the Persian *Bardiya*.
or “a renewing of what was before”). The verb 𒈗𒆠𒉗𒆠, ettēnu, is of course an Ifta'āl form of ēnas, the servile letter 𒈗 being introduced between the 1st and 2nd radical as a conjugational characteristic.

For the 5th clause, “the temples which Gomates the Magian had destroyed, I rebuilt,” we have 𒈗𒈗𒈗𒈗 for “the houses of the gods,” 𒈗𒈗 for “a house,” with the phonetic power of bit, and 𒈗 for “a god,” with the phonetic value of ilu. The verb 𒈗𒈗𒈗, yabbulu, “he destroyed,” is also an interesting word, as it explains a passage of very frequent occurrence in the Historical Inscriptions of Assyria. This passage is usually written 𒈗𒈗ylon. Aškarr, asl kīš (i) asrup, “I destroyed; I undermined; I burnt with fire;” but the first word is sometimes written 𒈗𒈗𒈗 abul, without the duplication of the 1st radical, and we thus see that the derivation is from 𒈗𒈗 “to confound,” rather than from 𒈗𒈗 “to wither.” The double form, indeed, of abul and abbul, like adduk and adeluk, attur and aturu, determinately includes the root in the class of verbs 𒈗, and the significations, moreover, of “destroying” and “confounding” are very nearly allied. The word answering to 𒈗𒈗𒈗 is unfortunately lost, as indeed is the passage which translates the very difficult commencement of the 6th clause in the Persian text. In that clause the name of Gomates the Magian is perfect, but the verb again, replacing the Persian adina, is also mutilated. If, however, it be restored to 𒈗𒈗𒈗 after the analogy of the correspondent to adina in the 2nd clause of the last paragraph, it will show that the Babylonian root signifying “to take away” or “dispossess,” must be kamam, rather than nakam—that it is allied in
fact to the Hebrew שֵׁדוּ הָעָדֶד probably, instead of being identical, as I have before conjectured, with שָׁמוֹ הָעָדֶד "to avenge." The last word of the clause יְהִי מִצָּאַב sunut, is the masculine plural of the pronoun of the 3rd person, and it agrees with the correspondent to the Persian בֵּית, whether that term signify "houses" or "families."1

The 7th clause, "I established the state in its place," (or "firmly") is perfect. The Babylonian phrase is יְהִי מִצָּאַבע. כָּלָה כָּלָה, and the only words that have not been previously examined are יְהִי מִצָּאַבע. כָּלָה, כָּלָה aș asirisu, answering to the Persian gâthuō. Now there is the same uncertainty about the signification of the Babylonian asrī, that has been felt in regard to the Persian gâthuō, the verb גָּתָה from which גָּתָּה.

1 I may here add a few words on the pronoun of the 3rd person. The masc. singular is יְהִי מִצָּאַבע (שֵׁדוּם): the feminine יְהִי מִצָּאַבע (שֵׁדוּמ). The masc. plural is יְהִי מִצָּאַבע, sunut; the fem. plural, יְהִי מִצָּאַבע, sunut. The abbreviated forms used as suffixes are, masculine יְהִי מִצָּאַבע or יְהִי מִצָּאַבע, singular; יְהִי מִצָּאַבע, sun, plural; feminine יְהִי מִצָּאַבע, singular; יְהִי מִצָּאַבע, sun, plural. Sunut and sinut are used also for the oblique cases of the plural pronoun, and sunu and sina frequently take the place of sun and sin, for the plural suffix, without involving, I think, any grammatical distinction. With regard to the distinction between us and at, for the masculine and feminine gender of plural, I may observe that a kindred rule of orthography seems to pervade the whole structure of the Babylonian grammar; we have thus, masculine יְהִי מִצָּאַבע, fem. יְהִי מִצָּאַבע; masc. יְהִי מִצָּאַבע, "many, t"—masc. יְהִי מִצָּאַבע, fem. יְהִי מִצָּאַבע; masc. יְהִי מִצָּאַבע, "these;"—masc. יְהִי מִצָּאַבע, fem. יְהִי מִצָּאַבע; masc. יְהִי מִצָּאַבע, "those;"—masc. יְהִי מִצָּאַבע, fem. יְהִי מִצָּאַבע; masc. יְהִי מִצָּאַבע, "goddesses," &c. &c.
may very well be derived, having on the one side the sense of “being
firm,” like the Sanscrit रण, whilst on the other, from the context of
several independent passages, I should be disposed to prefer trans-
lating ṣāṣ asrīvau by “in loco ejus,” precisely as Mons. Oppert trans-
lates gathvau, comparing it with the Persian شا. We have thus

min asrī sun aṣukha sumit, “a loco eorum ejici eos.” Brit. Mus.
17, 1, 13.— दोषस औषधि। द्रोष | द्रोष क। क। क। क।\n
“Tabulam quam reges patres mei in sedes eorum erexere.” British
Museum, 76, 30.; and I think even that the word द्रोष क। क।, which
is of such very common occurrence in the Inscriptions of Assyria, is
the noun asèr, signifying “a place,” as in the title taken by the
Khursabad king:—

वृषक निस ॐ यह लु दु. सा. सा सु।

Brit. Mus., 33, 8.

“He who possesses Judea, of which the place is afar off,” or
“master of the remote Judea.” There can at any rate be no doubt
but that द्रोष क। क। is the oblique case of a noun asèr, governed
by the particle ṣāṣ and attached to the suffix of the 3rd person mascu-
line singular.

It is probable that the word द्रोष क। क।, of which I have already
hazarded an explanation, and which follows vallakan, belongs to the
8th clause, the signification being, “I restored to their former state
Persia, Media, and the other provinces; that which had been taken
away I brought back.”

The 9th clause, containing the translation of “I did this by the
grace of Ormazd,” requires no explanation, but in the 10th, which
answers to “I arranged so that I established our family in its place,”
there are a few words to be noticed. In the first place, for the Persian verb *hamatakbekhita*, we have a term of doubtful orthography; it seems to be written $\text{̣}{\text{̣}}\text{̣}$, and ought, I think, to represent an Ifta'āl participle. In its present form, however, it will require to be referred to a quadrilateral root, of which very few examples indeed are to be found in Babylonian, and I am strongly inclined, therefore, to question the genuineness of the second letter. There is certainly a space for one letter on the rock, and there are the remains apparently of the sign $\text{̣}$, but this may have been originally an error of the sculptor. Unless indeed the term be read *vaŋtikit*, and referred to the Ifta'āl conjugation of $\text{̣}$, "to look after," I can suggest no possible explanation.

$\text{̣}{\text{̣}}$, *adi eli se*, "until that," or "so that," is already known to us, but the possessive pronoun of the 1st person plural $\text{̣}$, which is attached to $\text{̣}$. *biṭ*, "a family," is a new word. As *attus* seems to stand for *antu*, so must *attu* stand for *antu*, the only difference being that the singular pronoun terminates in $\text{̣}$, equivalent to the Hebrew suffix in $\text{̣}$, while the plural termination is in *ni*, which is absolutely the same as the Hebrew suffix in *ni*, a relic of $\text{̣}$.

The Babylonian version of the last clause is opposed, I think, to the reading of Mons. Oppert, who translates *yathā Gumātā hya Magnah višam tyām anākham niyā parābarā*, by "before that Gomates the Magian had usurped our country." $\text{̣}$, *a*, *a*, certainly means in other passages "so as" or "according as" (compare the examples quoted in page vi.), and $\text{̣}$ $\text{̣}$ $\text{̣}$ *yassu* (Hebrew $\text{̣}$, from $\text{̣}$) is the exact equivalent of the Persian *parābarā*, "he took away." The meaning, therefore, of the last clause must be, I think, "so that our family was not superseded by Gomates the Magian," and the entire paragraph may be translated as follows:—
"Says Darius the king: the empire which from [our family had been taken away, that I recovered: in its place] I established it: I restored it (or, made it as it was before): the houses of the gods which Gomates the Magian had destroyed, I [rebuilt; I again entrusted the sacred rites, the chanting, and the sacrifice, to the parties whom] Gomates the Magian had deprived of their holy offices: I established the State in its place (or, I put it in order). By the grace of Ormazd I made as they were before, Persia, Media, [and the other provinces: I restored to them that which had been taken away:] by the grace of Ormazd I did this: I made arrangements until that our family in its place I established: [as it was before, so I arranged matters] by the grace of Ormazd, that our family was not displaced by Gomates the Magian."

Of the 15th paragraph, which reads "Says Darius the king: this is what was done by me after that I became king," nothing is preserved in the Babylonian but the name of Darius.
In the second clause, which reads “when I slew Gomates the Magian, then a man,” &c., 𒇸𒇸𒇶𒇸𒇶, 𒇸 allasa for gathâ, with the sense of “when,” is a new expression. Perhaps it signifies literally, “at the time that,” 𒇶𒇶𒇸𒇶 being the preposition denoting time, and 𒇸 being equivalent to 𒇶. As I have never met, however, with any other examples of this compound adverb, I cannot be sure that I have analysed it correctly; or even that it is intended to be read phonetically. 𒇶𒇶𒇶 aduku, is also to be remarked as a variant form of 𒇶𒇶𒇶 aduku, the root 𒇶 as I have already observed, forming its future
either with or without the daykesh. Another novelty is the employment of דם, the monogram for "a man," to connect Gomata and Msysn, instead of the pronoun hayaswya. The sign in question is here used simply as a non-phonetic determinative before בָּיְבָא. At the end of the line, דם answers to the Persian marteys, and is to be read probably as בָּיְבָא or בָּיְבָא. The last word of the 2nd clause, which is udapata in the Persian, and which signifies "he arose," is rendered in the Babylonian by בָּיְבָא בָּיְבָא בָּיְבָא בָּיְבָא יָעַבָּב, a kindred form with the term yahab, which I had occasion to examine in line 15. I suppose it to be the 3rd person singular masculine of the Tiphal future of יָעַב, the duplication of the second radical being characteristic of this as well as of the Piel conjugation, and the sense being modified by the change of conjugation from "coming," to "arising." (Compare the Hebrew noun יָעַב, "produces," or "that which springs up from the earth.")

In the 3rd clause the Persian term awadda, "thus," is rendered by בָּיְבָא בָּיְבָא, which, in accordance with Semitic analogies, I would propose to read as kima, comparing it with the Hebrew adverb בָּיְבָא. The letter בָּיְבָא, at any rate, although representing primarily the sound of m or v after w, belongs certainly, in its secondary use, to the guttural class, for it constantly interchanges with ב and ב, and I believe, moreover, that we constantly meet, in the Inscriptions of Assyria, with the Babylonian בָּיְבָא בָּיְבָא, signifying "so" or "like," under the form of ב or ב.

The name of בָּיְבָא בָּיְבָא בָּיְבָא, which is usually applied to

---

1 If it were possible to obtain for the letter י the secondary power of ד, I should of course prefer reading this word as yathemna, and deriving it from יותה; but I have met with no other authority for such a phonetic value, and I cannot venture to adopt it on a single example.
Susiana, and which is, I feel tolerably sure, composed of ideographs, has been remarked on in my notes to the 6th paragraph. It is worth while, however, to observe the form of for "the people of Susiana," the addition of the plural sign to the proper name of the country being held to be sufficient to indicate the gentile epithet.

In line 31 we first meet with the orthography of —

\[\text{for the Persian } N\text{aditabira, and are thus enabled to attach to the sign } \text{ (incorrectly printed in the text as } \text{) the power of } d, \text{ and to identify the compound character } \text{ (contraction of } \text{ as the monogram for the god } \text{. The name seems to have been commonly used among the Babylonians, as it is found repeated several times on a cylinder published by } G\text{rotefend (Zoitschrift, Tom. iii. p. 179), and it may be interpreted as "the gift of Bel," } \text{ being equivalent to the Hebrew } \text{, "a liberal gift." Ezek. 16. 23.}]

The name of the father of Naditabelus, which is lost both in the Persian and Scythic versions, is preserved in the Babylonian, as

\[\text{for } \text{. The only other word to be noticed in line 31 is } \text{, the 3rd person masculine singular of the Piel future of } \text{, "to lie," a root from which we have already met with another derivative in the plural noun } \text{, "lies."}

In line 32 the first word is doubtful. The analogy of line 16, where we have the two verbs } y\text{attirik}u' \text{ and } y\text{attikru'} \text{ in immediate juxtaposition, would lead us to expect that } y\text{attikir} \text{ would in this place be preceded by } y\text{attirik}, \text{ the 3rd person singular masculine of the Ifta'el form of } \text{, and it is very possible that the 3rd character in the line may be } \text{, which seems in Assyrian to have the power of } r\text{ik. At any rate, the term which follows the name of Babylon is to be read } y\text{attikir for } y\text{antikir, and is to be}
explained as the 3rd person singular masculine of the Hifa'al form of ḫ̄aš, "to rebel." There seems to be no fixed rule in Babylonian with regard to the employment or suppression of the final vowel in many of the future forms. The 3rd person plural, both of the masculine and feminine gender, is marked by the letter ḫ̄aš, which replaces a primitive ū, but in the 1st and 3rd persons singular we sometimes meet with a final ū or a final ū, and sometimes the vowel is elided. I propose accordingly, pending further research, to designate the latter form as apocopate.

For an explanation of ḫ̄aš ḫ̄aš ḫ̄aš, yapṭabat, "he seized," see line 17.

The paragraph accordingly reads as follows:—

"Says Darius the king. When I had slain Gomates the Magian, then a man [named Atrines, the son of Opadarmes, he in Susiana] arose; he said thus: I am the king of Susiana; then the people of Susiana rebelled against me: [they went over to that Atrines: he became king of Susiana: afterwards a man of Babylon] named Niditabelus, the son of Aines, he arose in Babylonia; he thus falsely declared to the people: "I [am Nabochodrossor, the son of Naboridus;" then the whole state of Babylon to Niditabelus] went over; Babylon rebelled: he seized the kingdom of Babylon."

Of the 17th paragraph the Babylonian has preserved nothing but the words answering to "Darius the king says," and the final clause ḫ̄aš ḫ̄aš ḫ̄aš, anakū addukus, "I slew him." The last word, which is the apocopate form of the 1st person singular of the Kal future of ḫ̄aš, is of some interest from its affording a good example of the phonetic power of ḫ̄aš, which is otherwise of rare occurrence. The intermediate phrases, "then I sent to Susiana," and "Atrines was brought bound before me," are entirely lost.
Par. 18. l. 33 [L. EKL] EKL EKL EKL * Da ri ya vaš.

melek (— — —). ya gab bi. akhar. ana ku.

l. 34. [L. EKL] EKL EKL EKL EKL EKL EKL

(— — — — — —) hva ku. sa.

1. 34. [L. EKL] EKL EKL EKL EKL EKL EKL EKL

* Ni di ta bil. aš. eli. di k ta(!).

hva su z zn. a ba. ku l lu '.

1. 35. [L. EKL] EKL EKL EKL EKL EKL EKL EKL

* * * Tig gar. ma li. akhar. ana ku.

hva ku. l. 35 (— — — — — —)

1. 35. [L. EKL] EKL EKL EKL EKL EKL EKL EKL

* Hu ri mi š da. yaš ši. da nu. aš.


Di k ta. ni ti bi r. ad du ku.

l. 36 [L. EKL] EKL EKL EKL EKL EKL EKL

(— — — — — —) yom. XXVI. (—) sa.

hodesh. kan. ši l ta. ni ti bu su.
In the second clause, "I went" is rendered by 𒀜𒄘𒄏𒆳, the 1st person singular of the future of the root 𒄀, "to go."

This verb is used very frequently in the Inscriptions, and seems to be conjugated more regularly than its Hebrew correspondent. In the future forms, at any rate, where the first radical as a weak letter falls away, its loss is compensated by the doubling of the second radical; (compare 𒊬𒆳𒄏𒄏 or 𒊬𒄂𒄏𒄏 𒄀 allaku, for the 1st person, and 𒄀𒆳𒄏𒄏, or 𒊬𒆳𒄂𒄏𒄏, or 𒀜𒆳𒄂𒄏𒄏 𒄀 yallaku or yalliku for the 3rd person;) whilst in the participial forms 𒊬𒄏 kilu, 𒊬𒆳 kilu, 𒀜 kilu, kaliku, &c., and in the imperative 𒊬𒄏 kilu, the initial stem letter, which in Babylonian must have been 𒊬, rather than 𒀜, is reproduced. The 𒄀 can only be used, it would seem at the end of the word kilu, to express the vowel termination in u. This verb is followed by the compound preposition kilu 𒊬, ana eli, which merely signifies "to."

The 3rd and 4th clauses are both important and difficult. The construction of the Persian seems to be, "the forces of Naditabirus held the Tigris: there they were in position, supported by their boats." But the order of the phrases must be reversed in the Babylonian. The only explanation, indeed, that I can give of line 34 is as follows. "The forces of Niditabel" kilu 𒊬, ana eli kilu, "to their ships having fled;" kilu 𒊬, aba, "there;" kilu 𒊬, kilu, kilu. kilu 𒋜𒆳 kilu 𒆳 kilu, "Tiggar, "held [or guarded] the Tigris." kilu 𒋜 kilu, "completely." There are many doubtful points, however, in this rendering. kilu 𒋜 kilu is orthographically identical with a word which is repeated over and over again in
the Inscriptions of Assyria, and which cannot possibly, I think, signify "ships," though I am still doubtful as to its real signification. Of the many readings that have been suggested for this word, the most probable, I think, is "walls of defence;" and the question accordingly arises, whether the Persian navīy dēkan also have this meaning, or whether there can be such entirely different significations as "ships" and "walls" appertaining to the same noun 𒈗𒈠𒈲. Leaving this point to be decided by more competent inquirers, I go on to suggest that 𒈗𒈠𒈲 𒈝𒈠𒈳 𒈬𒈲 𒈲 𒈯 kvasuzu, which governs dikta, may be the plural participle of a root answering to 𒀭, "to take refuge," a sibilant, as is so often the case, being substituted for the Hebrew 𐤀. The next word, 𐤀, however it be pronounced, undoubtedly stands for the Persian avadā, "there," for we have, in a subsequent passage 𐤀, 𐤀 answering to amnathā, "from thence;" and 𐤀 𐤀 with equal certainty may be identified as the 3rd person plural präterite of a verb which corresponds with נח in Hebrew, and 𐐾 in Arabic, and which signifies "to hold or

1 The phrase to which I allude is 𒈗𒈠𒈲 𒈲, the first word being often written phonetically, as 𒈬𒈲 𒈬𒈲 𒈬𒈲 or 𒈬𒈲 𒈬 𒈬 𒈬 𒈬 𒈬 𒈬 𒈬 dikta or dikut, and thus admitting of explanation either as a correspondent for the Chaldee ܐܒܠܐ, "a palm-tree," or as a kindred derivative with ܒ ܒ ܒ ܒ ܒ ܒ ܒ ܒ ܒ ܒ ܒ "a wall," or "tower." The latter is, I think, however, the most probable explanation, for it is impossible to suppose that all the cities to which this phrase refers had either "ships" to be destroyed, or "palm-trees" to be cut down; whereas, there were undoubtedly "walls and towers" in every instance to be levelled by the Assyrian conqueror. I think, also, that 𒈬𒈲 𒈬𒈲 and 𒈬𒈲 IMPLIED must be plural forms, the theme being dikā, which would nearly resemble נח.
guard." The term which follows may be taken for the determinative of water, as it not only precedes the names of rivers, but is also usually prefixed to the noun varrat, which signifies the sea. It was probably non-phonetic. After \[\text{\textit{w}}\] occurs one of the names of the Tigris. It is written \[\text{\textit{y}}\] \[\text{\textit{E}}\] \[\text{\textit{Q}}\], and was, I think, pronounced Tiggar, the 1st sign being perhaps a non-phonetic determinative, while the two others have the respective powers of \(t\)\(ik\) and \(gar\).\(^2\) This name, in the Inscriptions of Assyria, is written \[\text{\textit{y}}\] \[\text{\textit{E}}\] \[\text{\textit{Q}}\], and interchanges with a still more ancient designation of the river in question expressed by \[\text{\textit{}}\] \[\text{\textit{}}\]. In the succeeding line will be found a third name for the Tigris, which is the

---

\(^1\) This verb is constantly used in the Insc. of Assyria, with the sense of "withholding;" comp. \[\text{\textit{I}}\] \[\text{\textit{E}}\] \[\text{\textit{Q}}\] \[\text{\textit{I}}\] \[\text{\textit{E}}\] \[\text{\textit{Q}}\]. mudattannu yahku, "they withheld their tribute." \[\text{\textit{I}}\] \[\text{\textit{E}}\] \[\text{\textit{Q}}\] \[\text{\textit{I}}\] \[\text{\textit{E}}\] \[\text{\textit{Q}}\]. yahku tamarku, "they withheld allegiance," &c. &c.

\(^2\) Possibly the initial sign of this name, \[\text{\textit{t}}\], which is properly \(b\)ur, may here have the secondary power of \(hi\) or \(hid\), answering to the first syllable of the Hebrew title בֶּן‎. In Assyrian, at any rate, it often interchanges phonetically with \(\text{\textit{y}}\) before \(t\); compare Khorsabad, 38, 65 and 16, 113, &c.

The second sign \[\text{\textit{y}}\] has several values, but \(t\)\(ik\) is that most usually employed, and that the last character \[\text{\textit{E}}\] \[\text{\textit{Q}}\] or \[\text{\textit{E}}\] \[\text{\textit{Q}}\], of which \(par\) seems to be the normal power, may also be pronounced \(gar\), I infer from the forms \[\text{\textit{y}}\] \[\text{\textit{E}}\] \[\text{\textit{Q}}\] \[\text{\textit{E}}\] \[\text{\textit{Q}}\] aggar and attagar, which are the Kal and Nithpael (?) futures of the same root, answering to the Hebrew בֶּן‎ or בֶּן‎.

\(^3\) I should wish to read \[\text{\textit{}}\] \[\text{\textit{}}\] as [khal]khal, or supposing the word to be a plural form, as [khal]li; and would thus compare with the title, the name of the river Haly, together with the geographical appellations of Calah, Calahene, Calneh, &c.; but this is, after all, little more than a conjecture; for the evidence which would attach to the letter \[\text{\textit{}}\] \[\text{\textit{}}\] the power of khal, is exceedingly slight.
original form, I think, of the modern ד"ג דיסלב, and which, singularly enough, corresponds in sound with the noun dikta, "ships" or "walls," that I have been just endeavouring to explain. The last word of this difficult clause, בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי המ, I suppose to be a derivative from the root סְבִּב, "to fill," regarding it either as the plural form of the Kal active participle, or, which is more probable, identifying it with the adverb סְבִּב, "fully." Many kindred forms at any rate are met with of this term, and in all of them we may, I think, detect a collective sense: avashankiga, "each of these," or "all these," is thus rendered by בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי, gabi mala; see Westergaard's E., 1. 9: vithopatiga, "such as were at home" (Behistun, l. 43), is translated by בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי, mala aš bit; and on Michaux's stone, side 2, l. 21, we have בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי, which means perhaps "the great gods," each (or all) of them, on this tablet "their forms have been represented." 1 בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי הבית סה, or

---

1 It may be convenient, also, to mention in this place, that I have at length decided in referring to the same root, סְבִּב, the terms בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי סה, which occur so often in the trilingual Inscriptions, and which have hitherto resisted all explanation. I am satisfied, indeed, from comparing Bel. Cyl., side 2, l. 6; with East India Insc., Col. 6, l. 26, that the letter בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי סה, which is usually but, has also the power of mal, and in the same way, therefore, that בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי סה סה סה סה, mala aš bit, answers to vithopatiga, so will בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי סה סה סה סה diyahu va malu, answer to uzstupatigga, the signification being "slain one and all." The phrase, also, בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי בֵּי סה סה סה סה maliut va gassbit, which occurs everywhere at Behistun, in the numerical notice of the slain and prisoners, must
again, which occurs so frequently in the Assyrian Inscriptions, seems to be merely a collective pronoun; and the participle ḥramallu, which is also a well-known word, may be referred, I think, to the root ʼilla “to fill.” At the same time, having thus rendered a plausible explanation of each word contained in line 34, I am bound to say that I place no great dependence on the translation of the whole phrase, and that I am not even quite satisfied that the Persian text has been correctly rendered. The remaining words of line 34 signify “then I some troops,” and refer, of course, to the manœuvre executed by Darius in order to force the enemy’s position, and obtain command of the passage of the river.

In the 9th clause, “we crossed over the Tigris” is rendered by ʼālāba. ʾālāba, Dikta niḥbir. The employment of the name of Dikta to designate the Tigris in immediate contact with the more usual appellation of Tiggar is remarkable, for it proves that the titles were independent of each other, instead of Digla, as has been generally supposed, being a corrupted form of Tigra; while the use of the latter term, as early as the age of the North-West Palace at Nimrud (about 1000 B.C.), throws considerable doubt upon the etymology which the Greeks, in accordance with the tradition of the country, assigned to the name. It seems indeed impossible to believe that an Aryan dialect in which tigra, as a derivative from ṭīr, “to be sharp,” signified “an arrow,” and was thus applied to the river in question to indicate its velocity, could have prevailed in Mesopotamia at any period of the Assyrian monarchy. ¹

¹ If we could suppose, however, that a root dik existed in Babylonian, of cognate origin with the Sanscrit ṭiṅśa and having the same meaning, we should
I am not able, it is true, from Semitic sources, to explain the etymology either of Dikta or Tiggar, nor can I determinately trace the connection between Dikta and נֶּבֶר (that is, I cannot say whether Diglet and Dikta are both feminine nouns, the one being an amplification of the other, or whether Dikta is not rather the same form as Dikta, the original dental having subsided into a liquid by a mere natural orthographical degradation); but I can at any rate sustain the reading of Dikta which I have adopted for לֶּבֶר נֵבֶר, and which, owing to the discrepant phonetic value of the sign נב, might otherwise be doubted, by pointing to the variant orthography of לֶּבֶר נֵבֶר נָבָר, which is applied to the same river in the British Museum series, pl. 63, l. 14.

לֶּבֶר נֵבֶר nitibir, answering to vigatarayáma, “we crossed over,” is the 1st person plural of the Ifta’al form of לָבָר “to cross over,” a root which supplies us with a large number of derivatives in the Inscriptions of Assyria. Compare 1st person singular Kal לָבָר ebar; ditto Ifta’al לָבָר etibar: לָבָר for לָבָר, Niphal part. לָבָר for לָבָר, &c. In the conjugation of this verb and, in fact, of all Babylonian roots of which the Hebrew correspondents commence with ל, we remark that the letter ל especially represents the guttural preceded by נ. In all other positions the guttural falls

resolve most of the difficulties connected with the Cuneiform לֶּּבֶר נֵבֶר נָבָר and לֶּּבֶר נֵבֶר נָבָר. Dikta, as a feminine noun, would signify “the sharp,” or “the rapid,” and might thus be appropriately used as a name for the river Tigris; while dikat or dikut (plural forms) would also designate “boats” or “canoes,” from the rapidity of their movement, precisely as we have in Persian the cognate forms of دَیْکَت, “sharp” or “rapid,” and دَیْکَت, “a boat” or “canoe,” and in the same way as the skiffs used at the present day upon the Tigris and Euphrates, are named tarádeh, to indicate their lightness and velocity.
away, and it was thus evidently regarded as a very weak aspiration, assimilating, however, to the ק perhaps, rather than to the נ, so that עי, as the preformative of the 1st person singular, could be appropriately rendered by עיī.

The preformative עי for the 1st person plural exactly answers to the Hebrew עי, but with regard to the terminal vowel, there was apparently no fixed rule in Babylonian: for although in the term עיī עיעעעע nitišu (Westergaard’s D., I. 16), the vowel is elided, as in Hebrew, it appears again in the orthography of עי עיעעעע nitišu, which we shall meet with in the next line as an Ifta'āl form of אבש.

The last word of line 35, עי עי עי addiku, “I smote,” is already well known.

The date in line 36 is sufficiently legible, and supplies us with the form of עי for the Persian month Atriyatiya, the same form occurring repeatedly in other Assyrian and Babylonian documents, but no means existing, that I know, of ascertaining how the name was pronounced.

The paragraph ends with עי עי עי עי עי עי עי עי Unaynitibus, “we did battle,” or “fought.” The word for “battle,” which is written indifferently עי עי עי עי עי and עי עי עי עי, and which must be a feminine noun, is derived probably from a root corresponding with the Hebrew עב, the sense of “moving to and fro,” which appertains to the Hebrew verb, being somewhat analogous to the meaning which belongs etymologically to the Persian correspondent kamarana. There are so many terms,

1 That the letter עי must have represented a sound more nearly resembling i than עי, is shown by its being always preceded by a consonant of the i class, when it is included with such a consonant in a single articulation.
however, used in the Inscriptions, of which the initial syllable is
$\text{sal}$ (usually written $\text{םל}$), and which are respectively derived from
$\text{nlt}$, “to rest;” $\text{nlt}$, “to flourish,” or “prosper;” $\text{נפע}$, “to pray;”
$\text{nlt}$, “to fight(1);” $\text{גס}$, “to spoil;” $\text{נפע}$, “to send;” $\text{לָל}$ or
$\text{לָל}$, “to shadow,” or “be like,” &c., that I find it extremely difficult
to identify them with any certainty, and I abstain, therefore, from
quoting what I suppose to be cognate forms of $\text{nlt}$ or
$\text{nlt}$.

$\text{Nitiibus, for “we did,” is the 1st person plural of the}$
$Ifta'al conjugation of $\text{ebas}, and being precisely similar in formation to$
the term nitibir, which has been recently examined, it does not require any special explanation.

I give the following translation then for the 18th paragraph.

"Darius the king says: then I went to Babylon; against [that Niditabelus who was called Nabochoodrossor]; the troops of Niditabelus having betaken themselves to their boats, there held (their position), filling (or guarding) the Tigris: then I a detachment [pushed across in rafts. I brought the enemy into difficulty, and carried his position]; Ormazd brought help to me: by the grace of Ormazd we crossed over the Tigris: I slew [many of the troops of Niditabelus.]

On the 26th day of the month ḫay, we fought the battle."

Par. 19.

( — — — — — ) ya gab bi. akhar.

ana ku. ana. * Babel * at ta lik. ana. *

Babel *. la. ka ša du. aš. ir. Za za n nu.

sum su. sa. (—) * ø. * Kip rat ².

I. 37

( — — — — — ) ya gab bu. ki ma. ana ku.

* * Nabu kuduru šur. (— —) akhar. ša l ta.

ni ti bu su. * Hu ri mi ša da. yaq ši.
The verb אֲחָיָאָא which terminates the 2nd clause, and which answers to the Persian ašiyavan, I am unable to read determinately, owing to the many different powers which seem to attach to the sign א. I propose, however, in this word to give to the character in question the value of lik, and to regard attalik as the 1st person singular of the Ifta‘al form of א, the conjugational characteristic being doubled in order to compensate for the loss of the 1st radical, which has fallen out as a weak letter.1

In the 3rd clause, for “when I reached Babylon,” we have anus Babel la kawadu, the two last words being the infinitive of a root

---

* As this sheet of the Analysis is passing through the press, I think I have discovered that the sign א has the power of khas, as well as of ku, and this discovery has led to the identification of א or harkhas, as a participial noun derived from א, “to do,” and immediately cognate with א, which, indeed, exactly answers both in sense and etymology to the Persian kara. The equivalent of the Babylonian kha with the Hebrew י, is proved by a multitude of examples.

1 In many cases, the power of lik answers sufficiently well for א, compare the orthography of קִלְיָא קִלְיִא קִלָּא Khiliiku, for Cilicia, and the constant union of א with a preceding k; but I do not consider the value to be by any means established. The Hieratic form, however, of this letter is, I think, א, and that sign has certainly the phonetic power of lik or lâ.
kasad (allied perhaps to ُستص), preceded by the particle 𒈨Š, which must here be identical with 𐐟. In line 57 we shall find "on arriving" expressed by 䒗راجع. 𒈨Š Š 𒈨Š 𒈨Š 𒈨Š ana kasadi; and "they arrived," in line 66, is rendered by 𒈨Š 𒈨Š 𒈨Š 𒈨Š yaksudu, so that there can be no doubt as to the signification of kasad in Babylonian, although no immediate correspondent is to be recognized in the Hebrew, and although in the Inscriptions of Assyria aksut and yaksut, or aksuda and yaksuda, are generally used to indicate "taking" or "capturing."

In continuation of this clause we find anuwa Ufratawaa, "upon the Euphrates, rendered by 𒈨Š 𒈨Š 𒈨Š 𒈨Š 𒈨Š 𒈨Š, which I really cannot venture to read phonetically. The particle 𒈨Š or 𒈨Š is constantly used in Assyrian to denote vicinity to "a river," or "the sea," and in such positions it interchanges with 𒈨Š 𒈨Š or 𒈨Š 𒈨Š 𒈨Š, but I doubt if any of these forms are phonetic: at any rate the normal power of tīk, which attaches to the character 𒈨Š is manifestly inapplicable, and I have not yet been able to assign to it any other determinate value. The name of the Euphrates also which follows the particle 𒈨Š and is distinguished by the determinative 𒈨Š is equally difficult of explanation. The title of this river in the Inscriptions of Assyria is commonly written 𒈨Š 𒈨Š or 𒈨Š 𒈨Š for Burat, but the other name, such as we have it in the text, and as it is found generally on all Babylonian monuments, was not unknown to the kings of Nineveh, for the very same orthography is employed in the British Museum series, pl. 18, l. 32. The term indeed of 𒈨Š 𒈨Š 𒈨Š 𒈨Š may possibly have been read Burat, like 𒈨Š 𒈨Š, for the initial and concluding signs were, it would seem, non-phonetic, and of the two essential characters 𒈨Š or 𒈨Š and 𒈨Š, the latter, a mere variant form of 𒈨Š, had
cii
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certainly the power of rat. As we find, however, that this term שׁיר or שׁיר שׁיר, or שׁיר שׁיר is used everywhere in the Inscriptions of Assyria as a generic term, whilst the orthography of שׁיר or שׁיר is applied exclusively to the river, it is certainly safer to regard them as distinct titles, the one being the original of the Hebrew נֵבֶר, and the other a qualifying epithet, referring to some particular property of the river. 1

In line 37 the first letter that can be traced is צ, and we

1 It certainly appears to me as if the term שׁיר without being a geographical title, was still expressly employed to denote the valley of the Euphrates, or perhaps the Mesopotamian plains. In almost all cases where the king of Assyria takes the title of king of שׁיר, שׁיר, that epithet supersedes the title of king of Babylon. (Compare British Museum, 12. 4; 10. 6, 17. 1; 33. 1; Obelisk, side 1, l. 16.) In the Khorsabad Inscriptions again, the epithets שׁיר שׁיר שׁיר שׁיר שׁיר שׁיר שׁיר שׁיר שׁיר שׁיר שׁיר שׁי and שׁיר שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי are always associated (see everywhere in commencement of Inscriptions of Sargina), and in the same way the שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי Sh

a phrase which I doubtfully translate by "the strong ruler who, walking in the service of Assar, his lord, overcame innumerable kings of the foreign countries," or perhaps "of the plains of Mesopotamia." It should also be observed, that this term שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי שׁי Sh is rendered in the East India Inscription, col. 10, l. 9, by שׁי שׁי Sh and on Bel. Cyl., side 3, l. 31, by שׁי Sh,
thus see that the verb *gabak* used for its 3rd person the form of *yagabbu*, as well as *yagabbē*, agreeing in this respect with the 1st and 2nd persons singular, which are respectively *agabbu* and *tagabbu*.

The name of Nabochodrossor, which follows in that line, is now so well known that it hardly requires to be analyzed. It is formed of three elements:—1. The god Nabo, whose name, preceded by to the determinative of a god, is expressed by the monograms or or phonetically by . 2. A term *kuduru*, written phonetically as (or with some equivalent orthography), or ideographically as . and—3. The word *sur*, which is sometimes represented syllabically by (the monogram for “a brother”), or and sometimes literally by . I am not prepared at present to explain the etymology of the title, although it may be presumed that *kuduru* is connected with “power,” and *sur*, with “a refuge.”

There are no other words in this paragraph requiring to be noticed, except the variant forms of *saltu*, and *salti*, for the word “battle.”

as if the sign had the phonetic value of *kēp*, *kiprāt* being the masc. plur. and *kiprat* the fem. sing. of an adjective, signifying “great,” and allied to the root which is in Hebrew, and in Arabic. The signification, too, of “the great river” (the of Gen. xv. 18), would apply perfectly to the Euphrates, but it would be difficult to account for the employment of *kiprāt*, so explained in other passages, unless we supposed the title to have been used with an express reference to the river, geographically, rather than in its primitive and indefinite sense of “great.”
Translation.

[Darius the king] says: then I went to Babylon. On arriving at Babylon, in the city named Zazannu, which was upon the river Euphrates [there that Niditabelus who] said thus, "I am Nabochod-rossor" [came before me to fight]: then we joined battle: Ormazd brought help to me: by the grace of Ormazd, the troops of Niditabelus [I entirely defeated]: we fought the battle upon the second day [of the month ——."

END OF THE FIRST COLUMN.
MEMOIR
ON THE
BABYLONIAN AND ASSYRIAN INSCRIPTIONS.

CHAPTER I.

ALPHABET.
In laying before the Royal Asiatic Society the portions which remain of the Babylonian translation of the Great Behistun Inscription, it becomes indispensable that I should consider the general character of the Alphabet in which this Inscription is written, and should further endeavour to explain, in some degree, the grammatical structure of the language, and point out its affinities with other languages of the same family. I undertake this task, however, with the utmost diffidence, for the more that I have extended my investigations,—the more that I have studied the Inscriptions of Assyria and Babylonia, and sought to verify previous conclusions, by testing their general applicability—the more reason have I found to mistrust that which before seemed plain; the more alive, indeed, have I become to the sad conviction that in the present stage of the inquiry, as regards materials, no amount of labour will suffice for the complete resolution of difficulties; no ingenuity, however boldly or happily exerted, can furnish readings of such exactitude as to lead at once to positive results.

There are certain inherent difficulties in the construction of the Assyrian alphabet, which meet us on the very threshold of the inquiry, and envelope all our subsequent labours in obscurity and doubt. The same classification may apply to the Cuneatic signs, which Bunsen has applied to the Hieroglyphic. They are divided into ideographs, determinatives, phonetics, and mixed signs; but there are two sources of confusion in the Assyrian alphabet, from which the Egyptian is altogether free. 1stly, There are no direct means of distinguishing between the various classes of Cuneiform signs; and 2dly, in the phonetic branch of the subject, which is of course the most extensive and important, there is no clue, so far as the alphabet is concerned, to the determination of one out of the many powers which may belong to a single character. The first impediment is not of a very formidable nature, familiarity with the current collocation of the signs enabling a student usually to detect their generic employment irrespectively of the sense, or even of the sound; but the other diffi-
ulty is so great that, after years of laborious research, I have overcome it but to a limited extent.

It can be shown beyond all possibility of dispute, that a very large proportion of the Assyrian signs are Polyphones—that is, they represent more than one sound; and strange as this irregularity may at first sight appear, it does not, I think, altogether defy explanation. The analogy of Egyptian writing would lead us to suspect that the Cuneatic signs were originally mere pictures, rude representatives of natural objects, which expressed in the first instance the actual object that was figured, but which came in process of time, and by a gradual transition from the representative to the symbolical system, to express ideas. The formation of a phonetic alphabet, and the application of such an alphabet to the ordinary purposes of inscription, would then be a third step in advance, and might have taken place in the following manner:—each sign may have been employed phonetically to express the name, or names, of the object to which it was previously appropriated as an ideograph, and without any reference whatever to the sense; and when such names were polysyllabic, by a last but most important refinement, the character may have been specially devoted to the initial sound. Now in this proposed transition from picture-writing to a phonetic system, there is nothing at variance with the recognized development of the Egyptian alphabet, but the retention of signs with Polyphone powers, corresponding to the original Polynonymous ideas. That such a peculiarity, at the same time, existed in the Assyrian alphabet, I shall have abundant means of proving in the course of the present Memoir, and I am fain, therefore, to regard it as a mere excrescence on the Egyptian system.

But although I can thus show the probable reason of the employment of Cuneatic Polyphones—although I can explain the fact of the character 𒂑, the ideograph for a “country,” being invested with such discrepant phonetic values as 𒂑 and 𒂍, by referring to the Semitic synonyms, 𒂑 in Chaldee, and 𒂍 in Arab., (cognate with 𒂍,)—the practical inconvenience of such a variableness of power is excessive. The meaning, for instance, of an Assyrian or Babylonian word may be ascertained determinately, either from the key of the trilingual Inscriptions, or from its occurring in a great variety of passages with only one signification that is generally applicable; but unless its correspondent can be recognized in some Semitic tongue, it is often impossible, owing to the employment in it of a Polyphone character, to fix its orthography. In the multitudinous inscriptions
again, of Nimroud, of Khursabad, of Koyunjik, and of Babylon, of which (although their general application can be detected without much difficulty) the details require for their elaboration a minute philological analysis, this orthographical uncertainty presses on the student with almost crushing severity. On the one side, in working out his readings, he can only employ philological aid,—that is, he can only compare Hebrew or Chaldee correspondents, after being assured of the true sound of the Assyrian and Babylonian word; while, on the other, he must depend on his acquaintance with Semitic vocables to fix the fluctuating Cuneiform powers.

I do not despair but that ultimately a severe and extensive comparison of all available materials, combined with the fertility of invention, which is an essential element in the art of the decipherer, will render the Assyrian legends at least as intelligible as the Egyptian; but at the present moment, I do not pretend to be able to do more than give a general outline of the subject, and thus pave the way to further discovery.

Deferring then, for the present, any more detailed explanation of the nature or consequences of the employment of Polyphone characters, I now pass on to the consideration of certain other peculiarities that attach to the Assyrian alphabet. Much of the laxity which I at one time attributed to the Assyrian system of expression, has either disappeared under a more rigid examination, or has yielded to the solution of one character being qualified to represent several dissimilar sounds. I do not now find that there is in Assyrian more tendency to interchange among the letters which compose each class of the alphabet, than is to be traced in Hebrew, Chaldee, and other cognate dialects. In one remarkable particular, there is indeed, in the Inscriptions of Babylon and Assyria, a semblance of phonetic refinement, as connected with the graphic art, to which no parallel can be produced in any other system of Semitic writing. A series of characters can be put together, forming a sort of syllabarium, and arranged apparently on the most scientific principles of alphabetical expression. Taking the guttural class for an example, it will thus be found that there are six forms for the sound $k$, three in which the vowels, $a$, $i$, and $u$, precede the consonant, and three in which they follow it; for the aspirated $kh$, four forms can be recognized; one, which may be used after any of the three vowels indifferently, and three appropriated each to its own vowel; while for the sonant $g$ there are only three forms in all; the employment of a hard letter ($g$, $d$, or $b$) as a complementary sound being apparently adverse to the Assyrian organs of speech; and the characters of this grade being thus restricted to the
expression of the syllables ga, gi, and gu. It is not pretended that
this arrangement of numbers will admit of rigid application to
all the various classes of the alphabet, but a sanguine philologist
might, nevertheless, feel disposed to adopt it as the normal type of
Assyrian expression, and to regard all deviations from it as
exceptional. In real fact, however, the existence of such a syllab-
barium depends, as it appears to me, on mere accident. The majority
of the signs composing it are Polyphones, and could not possibly,
therefore, have been invented to give utterance to a preconceived
and exclusive phonetic system. They were rather, I should think,
ideographs, representing objects of which the names, (or at any rate
the initial sounds of the names,) were, ak, ik, uk, kt, ki, ku, &c.
They may have been used phonetically merely to suit the necessities
of the language; and the irregularity perceptible in the distribution
might then be explained as arising from the accident of there
being no objects, requiring ideographs to express them, of which the
Assyrian names were identical, or commenced, with the wanting
phonetic powers. There is at the same time an undeniable evidence
of artificial structure in the degradation of these syllable values to
simple letters, such as to all intents and purposes they become when
two of them of the same vocalic grade are combined in a single arti-
culation, and when the inherent vowel of either one character or the
other must thus necessarily lapse. In the articulation, kat, for
example, which commences the name of Katpatuka (for Cappa-
docia), and which is composed of the two characters 𒈴𒈠 来 来
kt, and 𒈴𒈠 𒈠 at, either one or the other of these signs must represent a
simple letter rather than a syllable; and as this peculiarity of expres-
sion pervades the whole Assyrian alphabet, I think I am justified in
still adhering to the statement which I announced last year, that the
Phonetic signs were in some cases syllabic, and in others literal.

It may be understood from what has been already said, that an
attempt at present to classify the entire number of the Assyrian signs,
or to reduce the system of writing to which they belong to certain
definite and constant rules, would be almost hopeless. It would be
trying to run before we are well able to walk, and would be opposed
to all principles of sound criticism. Although, therefore, it may be dis-
appointing to the curious, who care only for results, and tedious even
to those pains-taking scholars, who know and appreciate the value in
scientific inquiries of the “pièces justificatives,” I shall resist the
temptation of heading the present Memoir with a tabulated Assyrian
Alphabet, and in lieu thereof, proceed to examine the Cuneatic signs, “literatim et seriatum,” giving examples of the different modes in which each character is employed, and frankly stating the degree of confidence that may be attached to its phonetic, or ideographic, identification. Such inferences as may be legitimately drawn from the materials subjected to analysis, either in regard to general principles of language, or details of alphabetical expression, will then follow in due course, and a path will be gradually opened up to a more comprehensive, as well as critical, treatment of the question of Cuneiform decipherment. It is true, that in thus dealing with the Assyrian Alphabet, without previously laying down any fixed rule of classification, the order of arrangement in which the signs may present themselves for examination, must be to a certain extent arbitrary; but it is hoped that any inconvenience or difficulty of reference, arising from so motley an assortment, will be obviated by the discriminative lists of ideographs, determinatives, phonetics, and mixed signs, that will be given as soon as the preliminary branch of the inquiry may be fairly exhausted.

1. Ἐ or a. As a phonetic sign it answers to the Semitic Aleph, Κ, being a light aspiration, the “piritus lenis” of the Greeks, and also serving in the interior of a word to represent the long a.

In the following names, which occur at Behistun, it corresponds as an initial, both with the Persian Ḥa and Ḥa-

\[\begin{align*}
\text{A} & \quad \text{ra} & \quad \text{b}i \quad \text{A} \quad \text{ra} & \quad \text{b}i & \quad \text{A} & \quad \text{ra} & \quad \text{b}i \\
\text{H} & \quad \text{a} & \quad \text{r} \quad \text{e} & \quad \text{v} & \quad \text{u} & \quad \text{H} & \quad \text{a} & \quad \text{r} \quad \text{e} & \quad \text{v} & \quad \text{u} & \quad \text{H} & \quad \text{a} & \quad \text{r} \quad \text{e} & \quad \text{v} & \quad \text{u} \\
\end{align*}\]

1 = Persian Arabaya. Arabia. (B. I., l. 5.)
2 = Persian Hariva. Aria. (do. l. 6.; N. R. l. 12.)

---

1 The initial letters which I use in quoting refer to the following authorities:
B. I. Behistun Inscription.
B. M. British Museum Series of Assyrian Inscriptions, published in 1891.
N. R. Nakhsh-i-Rustam Inscription attached to the present Memoir.
E. I. East India House Inscription of Nebuchadnezzar.
C. C. Bellino’s (or the Nebuchadnezzar) Cylinder, published by Grotenheer.
W. Westergaard’s Plates.
M. Micheaux’s stone, (cast of it in the British Museum.)
C. C. Callimache’s Cylinders, published by Syro-Egyptian Society.
MEMOIR.
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Persian Arakadorish.
Aracordes. (B. I., l. 15.)

Persian Hara'matish. Arahochotia. (B. I., l. 79.)

Pers. Arakhha. Aracus. (do. l. 88 and 94.)

Ha kha ma n ni s si 'a
Pers. Hakhamani-
shiya. The Acha-
menian. (passim.)

Pers. Ahuramazdā.
Oromasdes. (passim.)

Persian Hagmatānu.
Agbatana or Ecbatana.
(B. I., l. 60.)

In several other names, where its position is medial, it answers to
the long a: compare the orthography of—

Dāri yā vāsq Da ri ya vaq¹
for Darius.

Gomates. (B. I., passim.)

Hu vi ś dā ta
for Veilsates, (do. l. 82, &c.)

There is the same tendency, also, to interchange between the 
and a harder guttural, which is observable in the Hebrew š passing
over into n; the Hamathite, (see Gen. x. 18), appearing in
the inscriptions under the different forms of—

Ha mat ai
B. M., Pl. 90, l. 60.

Ha ma ta ai

¹ Observe, that although in the printed text of Behistun Inscription, I give
to the sign its normal power of šar, I now suppose it in this name to
represent as a secondary value the syllable vaq.
1. **ALPHABET.**

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Kh., Pl. 145, No. 2, l. 9.} \\
&\text{B. M., 33, l. 8.}
\end{align*}
\]

The name of the Armenian king at Khursabad is also written \(\text{H} \text{a} \text{m} \text{a} \text{t} \text{t} \text{i} \) or \(\text{K} \text{h} \text{a} \text{m} \text{a} \text{t} \text{i} \), and many other examples occur of the interchange of the breathing and the guttural.\(^3\)

The \(\text{H} \) is of great importance in Assyrian, in marking grammatical distinctions. It is the special characteristic of the 1st person sing., denoting that person in verbs as a prefix, where it answers to the preformative of the Hebrew future; (compare the Achaemenian forms, \(\text{H} \text{a} \text{t} \text{u} \text{r} \text{u} \text{r} \), “I was or became;” \(\text{H} \text{a} \text{d} \text{u} \text{k} \text{u} \), “I smote;” \(\text{H} \text{a} \text{g} \text{a} \text{b} \text{a} \text{a} \), “I said,”\(^9\)) and fulfilling the same function as a suffix after nouns and adjectives; (compare \(\text{H} \text{a} \text{b} \text{a} \text{t} \text{a} \), at Behistun, answering to the Persian \(\text{m} \text{a} \text{n} \text{a} \text{b} \text{a} \text{d} \text{a} \text{k} \text{a} \text{s} \), “bound to me,” or “my servant;” and the numerous Assyrian

\(^1\) \(\text{H} \text{a} \text{m} \text{a} \text{t} \text{t} \text{i} \) and \(\text{H} \text{a} \text{m} \text{a} \text{t} \text{t} \text{i} \) represent the proper name of the country, however, rather than the ethnic title, the nouns being apparently in the oblique case. That these two forms, moreover, denote the same place, notwithstanding the discrepant orthography, is proved by the name of the king of Hamath, \(\text{H} \text{a} \text{m} \text{a} \text{t} \text{t} \text{i} \text{m} \text{a} \text{t} \text{t} \text{a} \text{m} \text{a} \text{t} \text{t} \text{i} \), who was one of the chief antagonists of the Assyrian monarch that founded Khursabad.

\(^2\) It would be hazardous to give the pronunciation of this name, as the character \(\text{H} \) represents two distinct powers, and there are no means of ascertaining which of the two sounds it may be here intended to convey. I should propose, however, to read the name Likušāba.

\(^3\) It would be more precise to say, that the Cuneiform \(\text{H} \) answers to the Hebrew preformative of the 1st person singular, wherever the consonant which follows it opens on a vowel. In all conjugational forms where the 1st radical is \(\text{jes} \text{n} \text{a} \text{t} \text{a} \text{t} \text{o} \text{l} \), the personal characteristic is of course included in the sign which represents the initial syllable.

It is further to be observed, that although, in quoting verbal examples, I rarely make a distinction of tense, the forms employed do in reality belong to the \(\text{Aorist} \) of the Arabic and Hebrew. The Präterite tense was not, of course, altogether unknown to the Assyrian and Babylonian languages, but it was seldom used,
forms,  "my kingdom;"  "my empire," or "rule;"  "my country;"  "my city," &c.). As the suffix of the 1st person,  very commonly interchanges with  or  i or ya. In some cases this is a mere alphabetical variety;  for example, being equally expressed by  or  ; but in other instances there must, I think, be a phonetic confusion between the a and i, the plural fem. of the demonstrative pronoun being thus indifferently written  (N. R. line 8.) and  (B. I., line 40); and the termination of the ethnic plural, which in such cases must apparently stand for the unusual Hebrew ending in , being optionally expressed by  and  . Compare the famous notice of the Phoenician nations in one of the earliest Assyrian Inscriptions that we possess, where the orthography of the different copies is—

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See B. M., Plate 43, l. 10, with foot notes.)

I must now consider the employment of  as an ideograph, and make my first attack on the obscurities of Assyrian expression. The

1 There may, perhaps, however, be a grammatical distinction between  and  , the former being the nominative and the latter the oblique case, and to the phonetic position in the form  , to harmonize with the inflexional ending.

2 On further examination, I prefer considering the  in these names to be everywhere a single letter with the power of ai, the effect of its junction with the preceding sign being to develop a long vowel sound; and I no longer therefore, insist on any phonetic confusion between the vowels i and a.
1. \( \text{ALPHABET.} \)

sign in question is commonly used to express the idea of "son," interchanging in such a position with other ideographs, \( \text{edelta} \) or \( \text{edelta} \), which means simply, "young, new, or small," and \( \text{edelta} \), where the idea of "young" is qualified by the sign of the masculine gender. Sometimes, however, the ideograph \( \text{edelta} \) is replaced by the simple relative \( \text{edelta} \) or \( \text{edelta} \) as, which here denotes the genitive case, and thus exactly accords with the Greek idiom for expressing filiation; in other cases, we have both the ideograph and relative \( \text{edelta} \), \( \text{edelta} \); and at Behistun the construction even occurs of \( \text{edelta} \), \( \text{edelta} \), as in the phrase—

\[ \text{edelta} \quad \text{edelta} \quad \text{edelta} \quad \text{edelta} \quad \text{edelta} \quad \text{edelta} \]

which must read, "Nab-u-kudur-ussur, his son, Nab-u-nit's," for "Nabochofoodrosor the son of Nabonidus." These comparisons, at the same time, furnish us with no clue to the phonetic value of \( \text{edelta} \), when

---

1 This is the ordinary method of expressing filiation in the cursive Babylonian documents. There are, indeed, many hundred examples of the group \( \text{edelta} \), \( \text{edelta} \) on the clay cakes in the British Museum.

2 The alphabetical machinery which is used to express these names, will be given in detail hereafter. For the title of Nabochodoososor three ideographic elements will be found to be employed. 1. The god Nabu, denoted by the letters \( \text{edelta} \) or \( \text{edelta} \); preceded by the determinative \( \text{edelta} \); 2. a compound ideograph \( \text{edelta} \), sometimes phonetically rendered by \( \text{edelta} \); 3. a sign \( \text{edelta} \), which is also used as an ideograph for "brother," and which, being sometimes replaced by \( \text{edelta} \), must be pronounced \( \text{word} \). The name of Nabonit in the same manner is expressed by two ideographs; firstly, \( \text{edelta} \) or \( \text{edelta} \) with the determin. \( \text{edelta} \) for Nabu, and secondly, the letter \( \text{edelta} \), of which I know not the meaning, but which must apply to some object named in Babylonian \( \text{word} \). It further appears probable that the group \( \text{edelta} \), \( \text{edelta} \) in the second element being used as a determinative, and the letter \( \text{edelta} \), \( \text{word} \) standing as an abbreviation for \( \text{word} \). I have also found \( \text{word} \) in this name expressed phonetically by \( \text{edelta} \).
used to express the sound which in Assyrian means "a son." We can only hope to arrive at the determination of that value by applying to the proper names where the sign occurs, the term denoting a son in other Semitic dialects; but any doubt, of course, which may attach to the identification of the names, will here again impede our progress. There are thus several royal names in Assyrian and Babylonian, which offer themselves for examination; the builder, for instance, of the N.W. Palace at Nimrud, $\text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.}$, the final character of whose name is frequently given as $\text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.}$, (see B. M. Ser., Pl. 2, l. 1; Pl. 33, l. 13, and Pl. 76, l. 7,) and the father of the Babylonian king, Nabochodrossor,—

$\text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.}$, in whose name the $\text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.}$ and $\text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.}$ are seen to interchange.¹

Now to obtain for these two names the reading of Assur-adon-pal or Sardanapalus, and Nóβoβoλάλανγος, according to the orthography of Polybius, I have hitherto proposed to read $\text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.}$ or $\text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.}$, as pal or pal, and have even sought to compare this term with the Syriac and Chaldee $\text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.}$, and Arabic $\text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.}$; but the identification was never anything more than a conjecture, and must, I fear, on further consideration, be pronounced inadmissible. From the orthography, indeed, of one of the names of the Euphrates, which is written indifferently $\text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.}$ and $\text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.}$, and with inflexional endings—

Pur rat Bu rat

$\text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.}$; and $\text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.}$; or $\text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.}$; or $\text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.}$

Bu rat tu; Bu rat ti; Bu rat ti;

¹ This name is found on all the documents, both cursive and hieratic, of the time of Nabochodrossor, and is also usually expressed by ideographs. The elements are: 1, the god Nabu, represented by the letters $\text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.}$; or $\text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.}$, preceded by the determinative for "god" $\text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.}$; 2, the word for "son," denoted by the letter $\text{I.} \text{I.}$, or the mixed sign $\text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.}$; and 3, the term sur, which is either ideographically expressed by $\text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.}$, the sign for "a brother," or is phonetically written $\text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.} \text{I.}$.
see B. M. Ser., Pl. 8, L. 43; Pl. 45, L. 36; Kh. Pl. 66, No. 2, l. 7; and Ob. Ins. passim,) pur would seem a preferable value to pot or pal, and there is an old Persian word, signifying "a son," of this exact orthography. Pur, also, might be altered into pot, and even pal, by the Greeks, without any great violence, and the explanation now proposed would thus still lead to the identification of and as Sardanapalus and Nabopolassar. At the same time, it seems hardly probable that a term like pur, abbreviated from the Sans. putra, and preserved under the same form in the Persian Inscriptions of Darius, could have been known in the Assyrian language, as early as the time of the Nimrud Palace; and I still, therefore, consider the phonetic value of the monogram for "son" to be involved in much uncertainty.

There are probably, too, other meanings and powers attaching to the sign ᵃ. In one instance, certainly, and perhaps in others, ᵃ is used for "mankind," and the ᵃ may be conjectured, therefore, to have the variant value of the Babylonian word which signifies "a man." In several mixed signs, also, and in the names of the gods, which appear to be rarely or ever expressed phonetically, the power of the ᵃ has yet to be discovered. I may thus cite ᵃ; "a river," ᵃ "warriors," or "an army;" and the names of the Assyrian gods ᵃ or ᵃ, (Babylonian ᵃ) and ᵃ or ᵃ. In the name of Nineveh, of which the normal form is ᵃ, the ᵃ probably retains its primitive power of a, the true pronunciation of the title being Ninua; but it would be very hazardous to attempt to fix the reading of such names as the following: ᵃ; or ᵃ; of which the former belongs to a Chaldean king contemporary with the builders of Khursabad and Koyunjik, and the second to the royal family of Assyria.

1 See Westergaard's H., line 2, and Nichol's copy of the same Inscription.

2 In the first of these names the middle element ᵃ is often replaced by
2. אָמ, א. I propose to represent this character by e, not as in any way indicating its connexion with the Hebrew Tseri or Seghol, but for mere convenience of distinction from the a and i. There can be no doubt but that אָמ, the Assyrian form of the sign in question, corresponded in that language with the Hebrew י. The following examples are conclusive on this point:—

אָמ אָמ = אָמ, from the root אָמ, "to cross over."
אָמ אָמ = אָמ, from אָמ, "to serve, or "make serve."

thus showing that the phonetic power is the word signifying "a son." The same interchange takes place in the orthography of the third name; (comp. B. M. 86, ls. 2 and 16); and it may be inferred even that in the second name (B. M., 17, 1), the י represents the sound for "son," from comparing the nearly similar title of אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ אָמ ...
from *ēdm*, perhaps answering to the Chaldee
רַבּ, "to make," or "do."

elʾ, "upon," "over;" and the same,
answering to the root רַבּ or נָא,
"to go up," or "ascend."

At the same time, it is evident that the Assyrians and Babylonians did not regard the א as a strong guttural, resembling the Arabic ē or ʾ. It was rather, perhaps, a breathing appropriated to the і, as the י was to the a, and may thus be compared with the Hebrew י, in such names as יְלִי; יְנָא; יְנָא; יְנָא; יְנָא; יְנָא;

At Behistun, indeed, we find the א often answering to the simple vowel і, in the orthography of proper names. Compare—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persian Harīva</th>
<th>for Aria.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harēvū</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Persian Khashārti | for Xathrites. |
| Khashārti | |

| Persian Imanish | for Imanes. |
| Imanes | |

And it is further important to remark, that in the conjugation of verbs the radical א is frequently elided, as if the sign in question were

---

1 This is the orthography used in the detached Insc. of Behistun, No. 4. In the great Insc., the name is written יְנָא Khasārtiti.

2 In the same way the א is often used for the oblique case of nouns, answering to the і in Arabic; comp. the royal titles in the Standard Inscription at Nimrud, which are either written in the nom. יְנָא, or in the oblique יְנָא, יְנָא, יְנָא, יְנָא, יְנָא. Compare also the orthography of יְנָא haganēta, for feminine oblique plural of haga, "this." (B. I., l. 8 and 9.)
in the category of the Hebrew feeble letters מ, and the roots containing it might be classed with the "verba quiescentia" of the grammarians. Compare the following forms from the root םב, which in the Hebrew would be of the "Pe guttural" class, and would preserve the מ intact.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ya bu s} & \quad \text{3d pers. sing.} \\
\text{Ya bu s su} & \quad \text{3d pers. plur. of Kal.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ya ti bu s} & \quad \text{3d pers. sing.} \\
\text{Ni ti bu s} & \quad \text{1st per. plur. of Itaal conjugat.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Yab bu s su} & \quad \text{3rd pers. plur. of Niphal.} \\
\text{Al ta bu s} & \quad \text{1st per. sing. of Itaphal.}
\end{align*}
\]

From מב מבר, in the same way, we have 1st pers. plur. of Itaal conj. מב מבר מבר nisibar.

The forms מבר מבר and מבר מבר מבר again show that the מ will interchange with the מ as the second radical; and there are also instances where the sign in question is elided as the third radical; as sometimes happens with the Hebrew verbs מ and ממ.

The sign מ is further used, especially to denote the dual number.

---

1 I am not quite satisfied, however, that these two forms come from the same root.

2 As for instance, in the orthography of עה or עה, "I worshipped," or "made adoration," from עה עה, in the phrase—

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Yb} & \quad \text{Yb} \\
\text{Yb} & \quad \text{Yb}
\end{align*}
\]

"The god Assar, the great lord, and the gods inhabiting Assyria, to them I made adoration," the last word being very often written מבר מבר מבר with the מ suppressed. Compare Khur. 8, 2, 20, and corresponding phrases in the Standard Inscription, with B. M., 28, 27; 34, 9, and many other passages, where although different gods may be named, the construction is precisely similar.
We have thus upon the Nimrud Obelisk 𒌷 kkkk kk kk, "in my second year," where the kkkk is merely introduced to qualify the numeral II; again, on the Koyunjik Cylinder there is the same expression 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹, for "in my second year;" and on the Nebuchadnezzar Cylinder, wherever the gods are paired, they are followed by the epithet Bāṣl, in the dual number, which is expressed in the same manner. See

1 See B. M., 82. 32 and 63. 31. There are many difficulties, however, connected with the Assyrian system of yearly notation which I am not yet able to explain. "Year" is expressed by 𒌷 𒈹 or 𒌷 𒈹, or 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹, and the number is sometimes indicated by figures, and sometimes by words or signs. Thus, for "in my first year," we have 𒌷 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹 in the Obelisk (B. M., 82. 26); but 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹, on Col. Taylor's Cyl. and 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹, on the B. M., Cylinder, 63. 1. 18. "Second," is always expressed by 𒈹 𒈹; but for "third," Colonel Taylor's Cyl. gives 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹 or 𒈹 𒈹  ), instead of 𒈹 𒈹, which is found on all the other documents; while for "fourth," we have not only the regular 𒈹, but, on Colonel Taylor's Cyl., the same sign with the addition of 𒈹 𒈹; and upon the Obelisk, "in the fourth year" is rendered by 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹. (B. M., 89. 45.)

2 As the god 𒈹 𒈹 𒈹 was the chief divinity of the Babylonians, and was in particular the special object of the worship of the great Nebuchadnezzar, the name, I think, must needs indicate the same deity, who was called
If we trusted to Hebrew analogy, we should of course assign the phonic power of im to the בט, when used for the characteristic of the dual number, and there are also other indications, which in certain positions seem to connect the sign in question with the letter מ.

Jupiter Belus by the Greeks. בט, I suspect, also, to be the Succoth Benoth of Scripture. In the Insc. of Khorsabad the title is applied as an epithet to the Babylonian Bel, בט (see Khur., 66, three from end; 67. 8; 132. 11, &c.), and the same relation is observed in the Insc. of בט (B. M., 17. 15.), where the second god to whom altars were erected, is named בט. בט בט בט בט; but in the Inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar (E. L, Col. 4. 16.), the name is applied to a distinct deity. The gods mentioned in the second example are, Nabo and Nana, (or Venus,) and the third pair, where the epithet Bel, "a lord," is expressed phonetically, are "the sun and the moon."

1 I am inclined, indeed, to read the dual forms quoted in these examples, as Belina, "my gods." At any rate, the dual characteristic must end in a consonant, or otherwise the suffix of the 1st person, which is attached to the noun, would be represented by ב or ב bel; compare ב abua, "my father;" ב ב ב ב Belina, "my gods," in the plural. In the variant orthography, also, of the Babylonian term, which in the trilingual Inscriptions, answers to the Persic frankatam, "a law giver," and which is almost certainly a Piel participle cognate with the Chaldee ב, "judgment of the king," the letter ב must needs, I think, have the power of im. Compare the following forms:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ב</th>
<th>ב</th>
<th>י</th>
<th>מ</th>
<th>מ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>ה</td>
<td>י</td>
<td>י</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first of these forms, all of which it must be remembered are in the Plural number, the final מ would seem to be superfluous (it coalesced, perhaps, in pro-