

It may not be out of place to add a few observations to the preceding communication from a very promising young scholar. Champollion understood the hieroglyphic name on the monument at Karnak as signifying "Kingdom of Judah." His brother, M. Champollion Figeac, describes the Egyptian king as dragging before the gods of Thebes "the chiefs of more than thirty conquered nations, among which there figures very distinctly *Joudahamalek*, the kingdom of Judah or the Jews *personified*. This figure of the kingdom of Judah," he goes on to say,\* "may be considered as a type of the Jewish people of the 10th century before the Christian era, and perhaps as a portrait of Rehoboam himself." Rosellini,† who at first approved of this interpretation, was led by philological scruples into another equally untenable. "L'aspirazione *hori* è un necessario complemento della prima voce *Jeudah*, e non appartiene alla seconda parola, la quale, ridotta alla pronunzia *hamalek* o *amalek*, non ha senso in ebraico, e molto meno in egiziano. Leggo adunque  $\text{IOYAZG-REAK}$ , che è precisamente l'ebraico  $\text{מלך יהודה}$ , *Melck-Jeudah*, *re di Giuda*." Lepsius in his *Letters from Egypt*,‡ published in 1852, reverts to Champollion's first interpretation. "Among the names of the prisoners,"

---

\* *Egypte Ancienne*, p. 151.

† *Monumenti Storici*, iv, p. 158.

‡ Page 275.

he says, "befindet sich einer, den man nicht ohne Grund für eine Bezeichnung des Reiches Judä hält."

Six years later the condition of Egyptian philology had greatly improved, and Brugsch, in his *Geography*,\* gave the death-blow to these interpretations, for which, as he says, there is not the slightest plausibility. Why should the "Kingdom of Juda" hold an undistinguished place in a list of towns, some of them belonging to the kingdom of Judah and others to the kingdom of Israel? In the next place, *Judahmalek* cannot possibly mean either 'King' or 'Kingdom' of Judah. Where has one ever seen an instance, either in Hebrew or Egyptian, of a genitive placed before a nominative? We have surely here only the name of a town like all the others on the list, the name of it being "*Judh-malk*."

Brugsch still recognised *Judah* as the first constituent of the name. He did not overlook the objection that the first *h* of *Jehudah* is missing, but did not attach sufficient importance to it. The objection, as Herr Müller justly thinks, is absolutely fatal. The first *h* is so essential a part of the name that it is never omitted in Assyrian, Syriac, or Arabic, and it is only omitted in Greek (from which we have borrowed our forms) because there is nothing in Greek corresponding to *h* when that letter occurs elsewhere than at the beginning of a word.

So far then Herr Müller's main contention is unassailable.

I believe that the interpretation which he puts upon the Egyptian form of the name is equally sound, though it may at first sight present some difficulty. Why, it may be asked, should  $\overline{\text{𓂏}}$  be transcribed  $\text{𓂏} \text{𓂏} \text{𓂏} \text{𓂏}$  *int*, and why should  $\text{𓂏}$  *ā*, which often answers to the Hebrew  $\text{א}$ , be introduced into the transcription of  $\text{𓂏} \text{𓂏} \text{𓂏}$ ? What does Herr Müller mean by saying that "as the  $\text{𓂏}$  after *m* is a mere determinative, we must suppress also the  $\text{𓂏}$  *u* after  $\text{𓂏} \text{𓂏}$  *i* in transcription?"

The answer lies in "the usual Egyptian way of writing Semitic names." Dr. Hincks was the first scholar who paid attention to this subject. He noticed the fact that in their transcriptions the Egyptians employed a larger number of vowel letters than the Hebrews, so much so, that a Hebrew word of one syllable would be expressed in hieroglyphics by a word of two or three syllables, and a Hebrew noun of three syllables by a word of five syllables. Some

\* *Geographische Inschriften*, II, 62.

of the Egyptian vowel letters therefore were not to be sounded, and he observed that each of these letters appeared regularly to be the concomitant of a certain consonant. The theory which he built upon these observations he enunciated as follows: "The phonoglyphs which compose the proper Egyptian alphabet had names which consisted of *themselves with the addition of certain expletive characters*;" and these names might be, and often were, used in place of certain phonoglyphs. If then a phonoglyph belonging to the alphabet be followed by the expletive character which appertains to it, that expletive *may be*, and for the most part *should be, altogether neglected*.\*

This theory was unfortunately applied by its author to native Egyptian words as well as to transcriptions of Semitic words. It was modified by Brugsch, and still more by the late M. de Rougé. The rule laid down by the last named scholar with reference to the vowels is as follows:† "Les voyelles vagues, employées comme lettres de prolongation ou comme *mater lectionis*, n'étaient pas en usage dans l'ancien système sémitique . . . les Egyptiens les employaient au contraire, et souvent à profusion; les formes sémitiques des mots transcrits prouvent qu'il faut alors leur reconnaître un vague absolu, et qu'elles correspondent aussi bien au simple *scheva* ou *e* muet qu'aux autres sons voyelles."

This peculiar method of transcription has led more than one Egyptologist astray in his theorizing, but the facts are not to be denied. And as the Hebrew ים 'the sea' is hieroglyphically written being what Dr. Hincks called the subsidiary letter to 𓂏𓂏, there is no reason why 𓂏𓂏𓂏𓂏𓂏 should not stand for יד.

What would be the meaning of יד המלך, 'King's hand,' as the name of a place? A reference to the Lexicon will show that יד has a good many metaphorical senses. Besides those of possession, power, strength, and the like, it frequently is used with local acceptations: coast, place, memorial, waymark, &c. There can therefore be no objection to its occurrence in a proper name, even though we may not be able to point out its actual occurrence anywhere.

\* "On the Number, Names, and Powers of the Letters of the Hieroglyphic Alphabet," p. 10.

† *Rev. Archéologique*, 1861, p. 353.

The monument which Absalom reared up for himself in the King's Dale, and which to this day is called 'Absalom's Place,' יַד אֲבִשָׁלוֹם,\* may perhaps have obtained its name from causes which do not apply to the name of a town. Dr. Paul Schroeder in his Phœnician Grammar explains the name of Idalion, as יַד אֱלֹהִים, 'God's Hand,' and compares with it the Biblical name Idalah יַד אֱלֹהִים.† The Phœnician inscriptions, however, found in Cyprus since the publication of Dr. Schroeder's book regularly give אֲדִיל as the native name of Idalium.