Egypt Exploration Society

Meroitic Studies II

Author(s): F. Ll. Griffith

Source: *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, Vol. 3, No. 2/3 (Apr. – Jul., 1916), pp. 111–124

Published by: [Egypt Exploration Society](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3853742>

Accessed: 17/07/2013 18:31

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Egypt Exploration Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

MEROITIC STUDIES

BY F. LL. GRIFFITH

(Continued from p. 30)

II. PROGRESS OF DECIPHERMENT.

I NOW take the opportunity afforded by the *Journal* to lay before its readers a review of progress in the subject since 1912, when the commission given to me by the Fund to collect and publish Meroitic inscriptions was finally discharged. The materials published down to that moment were all included, discussed and indexed in the following volumes, to which constant reference is made in these Studies either by pages or by the numbered inscriptions in each memoir:—

Meroë 1909–1910, by Garstang, Sayce and Griffith. Oxford 1911 (*Mer.*).

Karanòg, the Meroitic inscriptions of Shablûl and Karanòg (with three introductory chapters on the Meroitic writing and language) by Griffith. Philadelphia 1911 (*Kar.* and *Sh.*).

Meroitic Inscriptions by Griffith (E.E.F. Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey), Part I, London 1911; Part II, 1912 (*Inscr.*).

A review of these three memoirs by the comparative philologist Schuchardt of Graz¹ contains especially valuable remarks on the verbal(?) prefixes shown in the benedictions of the funerary texts.

The fifth volume of text of Lepsius' *Denkmäler* (L. D. v *Text*), prepared by Wreszinski from the note-books of the expedition in Nubia, gives valuable information about the finding of Meroitic inscriptions and occasional corrections or variations of copy.

Further material has been published as follows:—

(1) A slab engraved with a hymn(?) TURAEFF, *Nieskolko Egipetskikh nadpisiei* in the *Zapiski* of the Imperial Russian Archaeological Society, Tome VII, 1912.

(2) An inscription of Akinizaz at Dakka, already noted as *Inscr.* 93 but reserved for Dr Roeder's publication of the temple, is now given in his *Tempel von Dakke*, II, pls. 16, 23.

(3) A stela set up by Akinizaz in a small temple at Meroë found by Garstang in 1914 and published with index of words by Phythian-Adams and brief comment by Sayce in the *Liverpool Annals of Archaeology*, vol. VII. It is the longest Meroitic text yet known and is practically complete.

¹ WZKM. xxvii, 163.

I have also in my hands for publication over forty funerary inscriptions from Faras and a number of ostraca from Faras and Bohon. Among Prof. Garstang's inscriptions are considerable fragments of a four-sided stela or obelisk found by him in 1911, of which Prof. Sayce has most kindly communicated to me his copy. Numerals extracted from these unpublished texts were quoted in the previous instalment of *Studies*.

The most convenient method of registering the advances made will be to follow the account of the writing and language given in the Introduction to the *Karanòg* memoir, supplementing each section in order. The first objects aimed at there were to distinguish clearly the different letters of the hieroglyphic and cursive¹ alphabets, fix the correspondence of the hieroglyphic and the cursive forms, and ascertain the sound which each letter represented. The resulting table of the alphabet was printed for reference at the beginning of each volume in the E.E.F. memoir on *Meroitic Inscriptions* and is here reproduced.

ⲉⲗ	initial aleph or a		ω	r
ⲉ	e		ⲥ	l
/	é		ⲥ	h (kh) ²
ⲥ	i		ⲥ	h (kh)
ⲥ	y		ⲥ	s
ⲥ	w		ⲥ	š
ⲥ	b		ⲥ	k
ⲥ	p		ⲥ	q
ⲥ	m		ⲥ	t
ⲥ	n		ⲥ	te
ⲥ	ñ		ⲥ	té
ⲥ			ⲥ	z

Also :: stop to separate words.

It may be remarked that some of the items noted in the following pages have been already stated, mostly in *Meroitic Inscriptions*, Part II, while others have come to light since.

Kar. pp. 3—4. We can see definitely in Meroitic writing, besides (1) the signs of the alphabet and (2) the group of dots commonly used as a divider of words—which alone constitute the bulk of the inscriptions—some other rarer classes of signs, namely

¹ For convenience I have reverted to the term 'cursive' instead of 'demotic' which was used in *Karanòg* for the non-pictorial form of the writing, thus confining 'demotic' to its usual employment for the latest forms of cursive Egyptian.

² Altered to *ch* in these *Studies*.

ⲁ

 Meroe 2 = 774 1432

𐎧𐎥𐎢𐎵 (𐎧𐎥) 𐎶𐎵𐎥𐎢𐎵

,

Inscr.

Inscr. 34, 84 = Inscr. 75/3,

een

tion

² The groups of dots above pp. 22—23, Pl. VI lower edge right-hand end.

⁴ Pl. VI at the extreme right-hand

Cf. Karz. p. 26 (1) and p. 27 for the form; = 1900.

(pp) The divine name $\Sigma \text{ } \text{ } \text{ } (\text{ } \text{ } \text{ })$ *Kar.* p. 55 and passim, *St. Akin.* ll. 19, 20, 39 =

dem. 'Mn-*h*tp, *Αμενωθης*, *Αμενωφης*, seen in Coptic (Π) *ΑΜΗΡΑΤΗ*. The Meroitic has dropped the *t* before *p*¹.

Kar. pp. 10, 11. For ascertaining the sounds likely to be represented in Meroitic, the names of earlier "Ethiopians," yielding the list of nineteen sounds on p. 10, are of much less importance than the Nubian names of the Meroitic period written in Egyptian hieroglyphic and demotic. The brief note of the components of these on p. 11 needs expansion.

I. Meroitic names and titles written in Egyptian hieroglyphs. These fall into three series marked by differences of spelling—

(α) the early royal names *Εργαμενης* and *Azhlamani*, spelt in good Egyptian style on the temples which they built in the northern border-land called the Dodecaschoenus.

(β) royal names, etc., including *Εργαμενης* from Meroe and other sites in the south, generally in very corrupt spelling.

(γ) the personal names *Wyky* *Wayekiye* and *Qrny* *Qêreñ* in a very late hieroglyphic graffito at Dakka.

Most of the groups can be found in the Index on pp. 75–6 of *Inscr.* II; the *Text* of Lepsius' *Denkmäler* gives some confirmations of or variation from other copies. It should be noted that the Meroitic name-element *Mqêl*, *Meqêl*, *Inscr.* 88/3, 89/4 (*Mqêl*-temeye and *Mqêl*-temze, cf. above pp. 25–27), *Kar.* 110 (*T?qêle*) *Sh.* 9 *M[e]qelali* (?) appears to be recognisable in the cartouches *Amani-meqêl-bz* (?) LEPS. *Königsbuch* no. 942, *L. D. Text* v 335 and *Meqêl-tk* *L. D.* v 39 (ending *ib.* 36) cf. *L. D. Text* v 303.

Apart from the groups for Egyptian elements like the following letters are employed in spelling these names:

generally initial as in *Εργαμενης*; final in *Brtrre* above (y) and in the other cartouches of *Pyr. B.* 10 at Meroe.

final (=e?) in *Κανδακη*, etc.; later (γ) = y in *Wyky* (*Wayekiye*), *Qrny* (*Qêreñ*).

see (γ) and (β).

in *Mry-Amn-asrw* and *Amani-asrw* (?); NB. later (γ) = Wa in *Wayekiye*.

in *Brtrre* above (y).

in *Pkrtr* above (x).

¹ To equate Amanap with the god Amenopi, Amenapi, *Αμενωφης*, Eg. (cf. BLACKMAN above p. 33 and references there), dem. 'Mn-*py* is less satisfactory; and Prof. Sayce evidently prefers the above interpretation of the name, *Liverpool Annals of Archaeology*, VII 24. The king Amenhotp II was widely worshipped in Nubia.

in *Psmry Inscr.* I p. 87; (?) in *Mql-tk*.

in *Kavδακη*, etc.

in Qêreñ (?) *Inscr.* II p. 76 (I p. 87); later (γ) in Qêreñ.

in Amani-têre, *Εργαμενης* (a), etc.; in *Εργαμενης* (Meroe), *Ariknhrér Inscr.* I p. 78, Qêreñ (γ).

in *Ariknhrér*; in ...]th-Amani *Inscr.* I p. 78.

in *Azhl-Amni Inscr.* II p. 32.

doubtful in *Inscr.* I p. 85, cf. *L. D. Text* v p. 319 where is given instead of .

, in *Kavδακη*; , in *Ntk-Amani*; later in *Wyky*.

Δ in *Εργαμενης* (a); @, @I in *Εργαμενης* (Meroe) and *Mql-tk* [in Egyptian @ occurs for q frequently in *Qysrs* at Kalabshe as was noted by Lepsius, *L. D. Text* v 25, cf. GAUTHIER, *Kalabsha*, Pls. II—LX. @I may be written by the Meroites on account of the form of *I* q]; in Qêreñ *Inscr.* II p. 76; in Qêreñ (γ).

Δ in *Brtré*; in *Amanitêre*, etc.; in *Kavδακη*; in *Amanitêre Inscr.* I p. 79.

in *Azhl-Amani*, in *Knrz* (?) *Inscr.* I p. 86.

II. Non-Egyptian names and titles written in very late demotic graffiti in the temples of the Dodecaschoenus. Indexed likewise in *Inscr.* II pp. 75–6. Here we find

' in 'krre, 'rbt(n)gye, etc.

y in *Wygy* above (ee).

w in *Wygy*.

b in 'rbt(n)gye.

p in *Snpte Inscr.* II p. 25.

m in *Bkmty Inscr.* II p. 38.

n in *Snpte*.

ny in Qêreñ.

r in Qêreñ.

l in *Abl...*, *Slwa*.

s in *Slwa*, *Snpte*.

š (?) in *Šltln Inscr.* II 25, which might however be read *Mltln*, see the facsimile *L. D.* VI Bl. 66 no. 154.

k, g in 'krre, *Bkmty*, 'rbtgye, *Wygy*.

q in *qrny*, *Qysne* BRUGSCH, *Thes.* 1003.

t in 'rbtgye.

These two lists agree well enough with the results previously obtained as to the composition of the Meroitic alphabet, although neither is complete for every sound in the latter. The most notable fact is that š in both the demotic list and the hieroglyphic is doubtful, as this has a bearing on a subsequent discussion. Also it must be observed that amongst the names in the Pyramids of Meroe there is

Inscr. I p. 76, *L. D. Text* v p. 303; unless there is a mistake in

the copy we have here the letter $\square h$ which sound is not otherwise traceable in Meroitic. It seems as if the name were non-Meroitic and must be either old or else a survival into Meroitic times from the older state language and Ethiopian dynasty of Taharqa. I have therefore not utilised it for the above alphabet.

The only consonantal sign in the Meroitic alphabet for which no equation could be found to prove its value was 𐎢 , 𐎣 . The others, however, having been sufficiently settled, it seemed by their elimination that 𐎣 must be the equivalent of Eg. 𐎢 or 𐎣 , and there were some arguments besides for making it a dental (*Kar.* p. 16). The value z was therefore assigned to it, a sound which is also a prominent element in the Eg. word $wz't$, the name of the sacred eye 𐎢 . Its equivalence with 𐎣 is now further indicated by the probable equation (aa) and it seems impossible to doubt its correctness. The transliteration z is of course only an approximation for a sound more like the Coptic 𐎢 , 𐎣 , i.e. ǵ (dj), č (tch).

As to the other consonants the most important new equations are perhaps (aa) (hh) for $\text{𐎢} = h$, confirming this value for it, whereas 𐎣 is 𐎣 .

The value of each consonantal sign in Meroitic is now well established within close limits, although there is still room for discussion as to precise values and the most suitable transliterations.

All the new material confirms the observation that 𐎢 may be followed in writing by 𐎣 or by 𐎤 though not by 𐎥 , whereas 𐎦 (which commonly varies with 𐎢) is never followed by a vowel sign. The natural conclusion is that $\text{𐎦} = \text{𐎢}$ followed by 𐎥 , and I do not see any cogent objection to this on other grounds.

It will be seen from the equations (i) (j) (m) (n) (cc) (dd) (gg) (kk) (ll) (nn) that 𐎢 (𐎢) and 𐎣 (𐎣) are hopelessly intermingled in the uses of 𐎢 (which is derived from an Egyptian character for 𐎢) and 𐎣 (derived from an Egyptian 𐎣); and 𐎢 varies with 𐎣 especially in 𐎢𐎣𐎢𐎣 𐎢𐎣𐎢𐎣 . While 𐎣 is never followed by a vowel sign, 𐎢 is commonly followed by 𐎣 and 𐎤 , but by 𐎥 apparently only in three cases amongst my inscriptions:—In *Kar.* 84 𐎢𐎣𐎢𐎣𐎢𐎣 the 𐎢𐎣 seems fairly certain, and in the great stela of Akinizaz apparently we have 𐎢𐎣𐎢𐎣 in l. 7 and 𐎢𐎣𐎢𐎣𐎢𐎣𐎢𐎣 in l. 11; whereas in *Kar.* 131 we should read 𐎢𐎣𐎢 instead of 𐎢𐎣𐎢 , and in *Inscr.* 92/17 for 𐎢𐎣𐎢 probably 𐎢𐎣𐎢 or 𐎢𐎣𐎢 . There is no clear case of 𐎢 occurring in Egyptian transcripts of Meroitic names in either hieroglyphic or demotic. It would therefore seem probable that Meroitic made no distinction between s and 𐎢 , at least in writing, and that $\text{𐎢} = \text{𐎢}$ followed by 𐎥 .

The two equations in (kk) are of great interest. In the first place they show how the Egyptian form of the name of 𐎢𐎣𐎢𐎣 𐎢𐎣 was rendered in Meroitic writing, and so confirm the exceptional use of the Egyptian name (rendered 𐎢𐎣) as shown in (ll); otherwise one would suspect the latter of being merely an error of the scribe in this rather faulty text (*Inscr.* I p. 73), since the customary form Wêshi occurs in the parallel phrase at the beginning of the inscription. In the second place the equations in (kk) show the treatment of the hiatus in Pa-êsi , Ta-êsi . That vowel should follow

vowel was a thing not endurable in Meroitic; the difficulty was got over by the insertion of *y*.

The vowels. The notation of vowels in Meroitic, especially of the *o—u* vowel group, and the actual values of the vowel signs are questions which still bristle with difficulties. Egyptian hieroglyphic and demotic equations, being consonantal, give no help in themselves, but only through Coptic equivalents or Greek transcriptions. Again, the vowels in Coptic varied according to dialect; no one can say precisely how the Egyptians in the Syene district and the Dodecaschoenus pronounced their vowels in the first four centuries A.D. Greek transcriptions too are more or less vague. Even after allowing for the imperfection of the evidence, the uses of the vowel signs in Meroitic seem curiously elusive and capricious. Perhaps the difficulties lie partly in the mixture of evidence from different ages.

The vowel signs are fully discussed in *Kar.* pp. 12, 13, q.v. One only, , */*, is solely vocalic, the other three partake of a consonantal character.

, *ſ* apparently derived from Eg. . It is only used for the initial vowel and can be omitted at pleasure. It may be looked upon like initial aleph as a kind of consonant, a breathing followed by a vowel.

, *ſ* derived from Eg. , which serves both for aleph and for *y*. In early writing *ſ* stands often for *ſ///* and is then consonantal or syllabic; but usually it is only a vowel.

Syllabics with the terminal vowel *ſ* :

- (1) , *ſ* with *y*.
- (2) Apparently , *ſ* with *n*.
- (3) Apparently , *ſ///* with *s*.
- (4) , */* with *t*, the sign derived from the group *t+h* or perhaps more probably from Eg. *ty*, *tau*.

, */* derived from Eg. *h ege* "ox"; or perhaps from , an Ethiopian substitute for *hr go* "face." It occurs only as a vowel.

Syllabic with the terminal vowel */* : , with *t*.

, derived from Eg. *ns* "ho!" In early writing , stands often for *ſ///* and is then syllabic; but usually it is only a vowel.

Syllabic with the terminal vowel , with *y*.

The syllabic uses of *ſ* and survive sporadically in later writing.

Amongst the equations (*a—ll*) are many which can be utilised as evidence for the vocalisation of Meroitic:

, (*ſ*), equation (c). One of the first rays of light that was obtained was furnished by the name of Ammon. Here Coptic gives *αμμων*, traditional Greek *Αμμων*, Ptolemaic papyri in compound names *-αμωννις*. By a rare chance, however, the Greek version of a Meroitic name containing it, viz. *Εργ-αμενης*, has been preserved by Diodorus; most fortunately too a similar form is found for the Ethiopian time in the records of Assurbanipal, where the name of the Ethiopian king

Urd-amanē can be contrasted with that of an Egyptian princeling Un-amūnu. It was the Pharaohs of the New Kingdom that introduced Ammon into Nubia and established his worship in temples throughout the country from Debod to Napata, and it is easy to trace the origin of the Ethiopian form in the New Kingdom pronunciation which is rendered Amānu, Amāna in the cuneiform of the Amarna tablets¹. The Meroitic-Greek -αμενης and the Ethiopian-Assyrian -amanē indicate for 𐎠𐎢𐎥 (S2) the pronunciation Amānē or Amānē.

It appears then that corresponding to $\bar{o}$ or $\bar{u}$ in Egyptian we may expect $\check{a}$ in Meroitic. This explains (f) 𐎠𐎢𐎥 Ar for Egyptian 𐎠𐎢 Hōr. In Amarna and Boghaz-keui cuneiform Horus is Ḫāra², so that the case is entirely consistent with Amāne.

(v) For Eg. 𐎠𐎢𐎥, Atar is accordingly to be expected. We have actually 𐎠𐎢𐎥, where we are at liberty to supply (S2) before the 𐎠, giving At-ar 𐎠.

(r)(s) The second $\check{a}$ in Amāne is not written. Unwritten a appears to be common and is conspicuous in 𐎠𐎢𐎥 NptS 𐎠𐎢𐎥, 𐎠𐎢𐎥 KtkS 𐎠𐎢𐎥. As to the last, n is frequently omitted in Meroitic.

(q) 𐎠𐎢𐎥 Eg. Harentyōtf, Harentyatf is 𐎠𐎢𐎥 ArStatS. The group of consonants nty was no doubt slurred in the Egyptian. a varies with o in Coptic dialectically, and the o was certainly short in this word.

(h) The name of the queen of Amenhotp III is rendered Teie, i.e. Teye, in the Amarna tablets. The name of the city dedicated to her in Nubia was therefore pronounced Ha-Teye and appears in Meroitic as 𐎠𐎢𐎥 At4yS.

Transcripts by Meroitic scribes in the third century A.D. of Egyptian names borne by their familiar contemporaries ought to furnish particularly reliable guides to the values of the vowel signs, especially as Coptic equivalents and Greek versions give a very good idea of what the vocalisation of the names must have been at that time.

(gg) (T-)shapshi (in Old Coptic *ÄZ.* xxxviii 92 infra) or (T)shepshe, Mer. 𐎠𐎢𐎥 (yS).

(hh) Pakhôm Mer. *Ph/mS* and perhaps *PhSmS*.

(ii) (P-)Bêk Mer. *BSkS*.

(jj) T-beke(?) Mer. *TSb4k4*.

(kk) Pa-Êse, Ta-Êse Mer. *PySš4*, *TySš4*.

With these may be associated the transcript of the following Egyptian word:

(i) t-washte or t-weshte Mer. *tSw4sS(?)t4*.

As to S (1) in the first syllable of the words the feminine article τ - which in Coptic has only the faintest vocalisation is rendered by *tS* in (jj) and (i). In the only other case (gg) the τ is suppressed before $\check{s}$. It is unfortunate that the masculine article π - is suppressed in (ii) and followed by a full vowel in (hh), so that we cannot quote an example with it.

(2) Similarly in the middle of the words the unvocalised π of (gg) and π of (i) are both written with S.

¹ See RANKE, *Keilschriftliches Material zur Altägyptischen Vokalisation* (Berl. Abh. 1910).

² RANKE, *op. cit.* p. 10.

(3) At the end of the words the unvocalised μ of (hh) and σ k of (ii) are written with $\mathfrak{S}$.

It seems then that $\mathfrak{S}$ is added to a consonant to mark the absence of vocalisation. But

(4) There are important exceptions. In (ii) (kk) it represents the long vowel $\acute{e}$. In one instance in (hh) it may represent $\acute{o}$, but it appears to have been corrected on the original to $/$.

$/$ stands for $\acute{o}$ in (hh).

$\leftarrow$ stands for the short ϵ or ι of the Egyptian feminine termination (gg), (jj) (kk), (ii); also for short e in the accented syllable (jj) and for short a or e in the accented syllable (gg) (ii).

Lastly, the vowel α in the unaccented syllable is denoted by leaving the preceding consonant bare (hh) (kk).

The above seem to be the rules applicable to the transcription by Meroitic scribes in Lower Nubia of foreign names in the third century A.D. One Greek transcript of a Meroitic name is known from about the same period:

(z) $A\beta\rho\alpha\tau\omicron\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ Mer. $Brt/y\mathfrak{S}$ which according to the above rules would give the pronunciation Baratoy, assuming that $/$ can represent $\acute{o}$ (as indicated by the Greek) as well as $\acute{o}$. The spelling of the name of this important person, who occurs also at Faras, does not vary; but one may suppose either that $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{Z}$ properly preceded the name but was omitted in writing it, or better that Abra-, Bara- were alternative pronunciations, especially when a foreigner was concerned.

We must be cautious, however, in applying the rules to early Meroitic writing or to ordinary Meroitic groups where traditional spelling from early days would more or less hold sway. Changes in the pronunciation of the language or the predominance of a different dialect might affect the spelling, and the scribal conventions would almost certainly show some change in the course of two or three centuries.

For traditional and early spelling we have first:

(z) The late Greek transcript of the ancient title held by Abratoy, viz. $\psi\epsilon\nu\tau\eta\varsigma$, Mer. $p\mathfrak{S}s\mathfrak{S}t/$, $p\mathfrak{S}\acute{s}t/$, rarely $p\acute{s}t/$ ($Kar.$); ancient $p\mathfrak{S}\acute{s}t/$, $p\acute{s}t/$, $p\mathfrak{S}\acute{s}t\leftarrow$ (St. Akinizaz), $p\mathfrak{S}\acute{s}t/$ Far. 43. The transcript ought to show at least how the title sounded in the days of Abratoy. The predominant spellings $p\mathfrak{S}\acute{s}t/$, $p\mathfrak{S}s\mathfrak{S}t/$ ought to give $psat\acute{o}$, $ps\acute{e}to$ according to the above rules, but the omission of n is a constant phenomenon in Meroitic writing. The terminal vowel is therefore the only serious difficulty. Curiously enough the ancient spelling $p\mathfrak{S}\acute{s}t\leftarrow$, occurring only in one instance on the stela of Akinizaz (l. 28), would actually give $psa(n)te$, an excellent equivalent of the Greek.

Also first-century Greek literary transcripts of an ancient Meroitic king's name, the queen's title and the name of one of the capitals:—

(c) $(E\pi\rho\gamma)\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma$ Mer. $Mn\leftarrow$, $Amn\leftarrow$. The Greek version unfortunately makes a normal Greek proper name and therefore may be suspected of adaptation, but it is well confirmed by the Ethiopic-Assyrian Amanē, see above. On the analogy of Abratoy one might conjecture that the spellings $Mn\leftarrow$, $Amn\leftarrow$ indicated two pronunciations, Mane and Amne; but, as in Egyptian the long vowel and stress preceded the n , it is better for the present to vocalise the word as Amane.

(r) *Κανδακη* Mer. *Ktkṣ*.

(s) *Ναπατα* Mer. *Nptṣ*.

In these the *ṣ* seems to represent a final vowel, short or long.

The vocalisation of other groups can be compared with Egyptian spellings:—

(d) *W/š* archaic, etc., rarely *Wṯ-š* late. Eg. *Êse*. Probably *Wîs*, *Wis*.

(e) *Aš/rṯ* archaic, etc. Eg. *Usiri* (or *e*). Probably *Asîri*.

(f) *Ar* late writing. Eg. *Hôr*, but *Ar* is likely in Meroitic, see p. 119.

(g) *Pṯ-lṣqṣ*, rarer *Pṯ-lqṣ*. Eg. *πῖλακ*. The name has not yet been found earlier than about the third century A.D. in Meroitic, and the spelling seems to agree with this, giving *Pilêq*, *Pilâq*.

(h) *Atṯ-yṣ* late writing. Eg. *Ha-Teye*. Probably *Atey(e?)*, modern *Adai*.

(j) *pṣlm/š* late writing. Eg. *plemeeše*. Probably *plamêš*.

(k) *pṣrṯ-tṣ* late writing. Eg. *prit(?)*. Probably *prit*.

(m) *Phrsṣ?* late writing. Eg. *παχωρασ*, but once *πῶρασ* if Krall's copy is correct¹. Probably *Paḥaras*, Arabic probably *Bakharâs*².

(n) *Šyṣ*, *Šṯ-yṣ* late writing. Eg. *Šaê*. Probably *Say(e?)*, modern *Sai*, see (h).

(q) *Arṣttṣ* late writing. Eg. *Harentyotf*. Probably *Arentat*.

(u) *Armṯ*, *Armṣ(?)* archaic, *Ar/mṣ* late writing. Eg. *Hrôme*, *Ῥωμη*. Probably *Arâmi*, late *Arôme*. Cf. early *Mkṣzkṣ*, late *Mkṣz/kṣ* p. 113.

(v) *Atr(ṯ?)* archaic(?). Eg. *Hat-hôr*. Probably *Atar*.

(ff) *Ṣṣ(?)lṣlṣ* late. Greek *Τελληλις*. Probably *Sellél* (cf. *Shellâl*).

(ll) *Ašṯ* archaic. Eg. *Êse*, *Êsi*. Probably *Êsi*.

(nn) *plšn* late writing. Eg. *pleshone*. Perhaps *palasân*.

It seems impossible to make any consistent scheme for the vowels. If the vocalisation of a word is known some kind of explanation of the reasons for the use of the vowel signs in writing it can be given, but it is impossible to judge how a word was vocalised from the evidence of the Meroitic writing alone.

The value *é* assigned to / is supported by (j) *Ṣ/Ṣṣṣ* *πλεμνησε* and (z) *ṢṢṢ* *ψεντης*; but there is cogent evidence also for an *o*, *u* value.

(u) */ṣ/ṣṣ* seems to correspond to *uputi* in Amarna cuneiform.

ṣṣ/ωṣṣ *Ῥωμη*.

(z) *ṣṣṣ/ωṣ* *Αβρατοεις*.

(hh) *ṣṣ/ṣṣ* *Παχουμης*, *Παῤωμ*.

Also the common termination *ω/ω* or the word *ω/ωṣ* is probably seen in the proper name *Πλωχ-καρουρ*, perhaps also in *Πετησις-καρουρ* at *Dakka*³, though this last is susceptible of another interpretation as *Peteesis* son of *Krûr* (i.e. 'Frog').

Moreover, the sign *≡*, *←* which is *t* followed by / corresponds in the queen's cartouche (b) to *≡* and perhaps *≡* in a variant⁴, which last is *το* 'land' in Coptic.

¹ KRALL, *Wiener Zeits. f. d. K. des Morgenlandes* XIV, p. 237.

² See the memoirs to appear on *Faras*.

³ Cf. above p. 27.

⁴ See *Kar.* p. 6.

Comparative philologists like the late Prof. Sweet have told me that it is almost inconceivable that a language should have existed without the *o—u* vowel¹.

If / really represents both *o—u* and *ē* we can cite from Old Nubian an illustrative mixture of *o* and *e*, for **opwce** 'hymn' 'praise' has the variant **opese**, i.e. probably *orése*; and **opn** 'wine' corresponding to Coptic **npn**² suggests that **nlēmnhwē** might appear in Meroitic as *pelemóshe*.

With regard to the origin of the value *o* for /, i.e. **℥**, we may perhaps seek it in the **℥**, **℥** of the Ethiopian-Egyptian inscriptions. Schäfer long ago suggested³ that this **℥** might have been substituted for **⦿** the 'face,' which in Coptic would be **zo** (*ho*). If so, the Meroites, who could not pronounce *h*, would convert **zo** into *o* and so the ox's face or head would naturally represent to them the vowel *o*. Likewise **to** for **u** can be explained as has been done by Prof. Maspero, who well suggests that **u**, var. **◁**, represents **▷**, the determinative of 'land' **to**⁴.

There are plenty of cases in which an unwritten vowel corresponds to an *o* or *ō* in Coptic, Arendōtes, **zaowp**, **naχwpac**, etc., but these can generally be explained as due to the substitution of *a* for *o* or *ō* in the Ethiopian-Meroitic names⁵. Also the initial **sz** might represent other vowels than *a*, as when it corresponds to **or** in the Meroitic **4w/3sz** for Coptic **orcipe** and to *u* in cuneiform *uputi*.

Until more certainty is arrived at it seems best to keep to the transcriptions both of vowel-signs and of **///**, **℥** which have been used in all the memoirs from *Meroe* onwards, although they must be looked upon as conventional to some extent.

Kar. ch. II p. 17 et seqq. The age of the Meroitic inscriptions.

Professor Sayce's recognition of the name of Rome on the great stela of Akinizaz can hardly be gainsaid; it is then practically certain that Egypt was already under Roman rule. Presumably the Dakka texts of Akinizaz and the graffiti in the same style of writing on the rocks west of Dakka⁶ were all engraved before the great defeat of the troops of Candace at the hands of Petronius. This took place in the neighbourhood of Dakka about 23 B.C., less than ten years after the occupation of Egypt by Augustus. The age of these semi-archaic inscriptions, nearly as early in style as any that are known, is therefore practically fixed to the brief period 30—23 B.C. On the great stela a queen was figured in front of the king, doubtless the one-eyed Candace herself. The name or title Candace is not found in the inscription, but it occurs in a cartouche in Egyptian writing on the pyramid of Amanitère at Meroe, and follows the name of that queen in her Meroitic cartouche on one pylon of the Lion temple at Naga precisely as *qére* 'king' follows the name of her lord and husband Natakamani on

¹ See also Schuchardt's review, *l.c.* p. 167.

² See GRIFFITH, *Nubian Texts of the Christian Period*, Glossary p. 110.

³ *Die Aethiopische Königsinschrift*, p. 59.

⁴ Cf. *Kar.* p. 16.

⁵ See above p. 19. On p. 16 of *Karandg* **menhe** quoted as a word corresponding to a Meroitic vowelless group is wrong, but unfortunately was allowed to pass in the proof-correcting. The word which I at first read as **Manp menhe**, i.e. Memphis, is really **Amanap** (*Kar.* p. 55, above p. 115) and no equivalent of Memphis has yet appeared.

⁶ *Inscr.* 91—93.

the other pylon¹. Candace is therefore, as Pliny implies, a title 'queen' (?) rather than a name. The style of the cursive inscription of Natakamani and Amanitêre² is much the same as those of Akinizaz.

At the other end of the series, among the latest inscriptions another chronological point has been gained by the probable identification of Wayekiye, whose graffito is dated in A.D. 229, with the man whose tombstone in the late style of Meroitic was found at Aqêba³. This would date the tombstone to about 250 A.D. One may fairly doubt whether the Meroitic writings known at present reach beyond the first century B.C. and the third century A.D., the period of Diocletian. Traces of the Meroitic writing, however, seem to survive in two letters of the alphabet of Old Nubian⁴.

Kar. ch. III. The Meroitic language.

It must be confessed that, in spite of new material and of some hard work on my part, progress in the understanding of the Meroitic language itself has been nearly at a standstill. Such advance as has been made has been almost entirely on the fringes of the subject.

Kar. p. 22. As to Phonology the avoidance of vowel following vowel by the insertion of *y* is seen not only in the spelling Pa-yeshi for $\pi\alpha\eta\varsigma\iota$ above pp. 117-8, but also in the vocative of the name of Osiris, viz. (A)shêreyi for (A)shêri + i, *Kar.* p. 23.

Kar. p. 23, note 1. It was observed that no Egyptian or Greek personal names had been recognised in the Meroitic inscriptions. We are now however able to point to several Egyptian names of persons, above p. 119.

No Greek or Latin importations have been identified. Arbat(e) = $\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\alpha}\beta\eta$ (above p. 23) was of course Egyptian *ertab*, *ertob* long before it was Greek.

It has been proposed to identify several Meroitic words—*atê* 'water,' *wayeki* 'star,' *qaban* 'star'?, Sothis?, *zemi* (?) 'year'?, *šêr* 'book'?—with Nubian⁵. From Schäfer's analyses of Ethiopian names preserved by classical writers there can be no doubt that Nubian was spoken in some part of the Nile valley; borrowing of individual words may therefore have gone on freely between Nubians (Nobatae?) and Meroites, but so far the language of the Meroitic inscriptions does not appear to have been the ancestor of the Nubian dialect.

The list of five native words of which the meaning is clear, these being of far more importance than any loan words, can now be increased by two, viz.

𐎓𐎓𐎓 *kazi* 'woman,' cf. perhaps Nub. Mah. *kissi*, Dong. *fassa*, pudendum mulieb.

𐎓𐎓𐎓𐎓 Stela of Akinizaz, *Inscr.* 92/6, 12, 𐎓𐎓 *Inscr.* 94/14, 20, 28, 29 *abr* 'man.'

These valuable additions were pointed out by Professor Sayce in his note on the stela of Akinizaz. It is worth while to give the grounds for the meaning, which can leave no doubt. The stela pictures a row of bound captives below the scene of adoration. In the text occur the two words followed by numerals.

l. 5 *abr* 32, *kzi* 135. l. 10 *abr* 100, *kzi* 1[.]2. l. 12 *abr* 58 (?), *kzi* 223.

¹ *Inscr.* 3, 4, see *Inscr.* I p. 55, also *ib.* p. 79.

² *Inscr.* 126.

³ Above pp. 26-8.

⁴ *Kar.* pp. 14, 15, *Nubian Texts of the Christian Period*, p. 73.

⁵ See above pp. 27, 28, 30.

It had already been shown in *Kar.* p. 39 that *kzi* was a characteristic element in the names of women and in their epithets, and it was assumed to mean woman, harim, etc. in translating; *r* on the other hand is a characteristic termination of masculine names. It is thus evident that the figures refer to the number of men and women respectively taken captive on different occasions; the women captives naturally outnumber the men, most of whom would either be killed or escape.

Other words which are fairly certain are

𐎓𐎠𐎢𐎡 *qére* 'king.'

𐎓𐎢𐎡 *at* 'bread.'

𐎓𐎠𐎢 *hare* 'north,' but this is possibly Egyptian, derived from *hr.t* = *κάτω* in the geographical sense, see BRUGSCH, *Wtb.* 1121.

𐎓𐎢𐎓𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎢 *yereqe* 'south.'

𐎓𐎢𐎢𐎓𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎢 *yerewake* 'east.'

𐎓𐎢𐎢𐎢𐎢𐎢𐎢 *teñake* 'west.'

It should be noted too that the *l* in the adjective *lah* 'great' 'chief' is probably only connective; like the connective elsewhere it is absorbed by the genitive(?) *s* which then becomes *t*, e.g. *wémanis*, *wémanit-ah*.