

who was put to death in 587 A.H., whereas Shahristānī died in 548 A.H.

When I was in India I made many inquiries about Shahristānī's work, but failed to find it, though Shahrazūrī's was not uncommon.

The probability is that Shahristānī never wrote "Lives of Philosophers," and that the mistake originated with Hājī Khalfa, who mixed up the two names Shahristānī and Shahrazūrī. In his reference to the former (Fluegel, ii, p. 125) he gives no details, which seems to imply that he had never seen the book, whereas in his account of Shahrazūrī's work (Fluegel, vi, 321) he describes the contents and gives the exordium.

H. BEVERIDGE.

June 7, 1900.

6. AKKADIAN AND SUMERIAN.

DEAR SIR, — Probably I was wrong in making such a loose translation of *Akkadā* and *Šu[merā?]* in my paper "Sumerian or Cryptography" in the January Part of the Journal (p. 94). Instead of Akkad and Sumer, I ought to have said "the Akkadian" and "the Sumerian."

I was thinking of the passage in K. 2,619, where we have *Elamā Elamū, Kaššā Kaššū, Sutā Sutū, Qutā Qutū, Lullubā Lullubū* (accusative and nominative), and *Akkadū* (nom.), all occurring with the meanings of Elamite, Kassite, Sutite, Qutite, Lullubite, and Akkadian, each of these adjectives standing for the nation it represents, though there is no prefix for country.

Akkadā means, therefore, 'Akkadian,' and is to all appearance accusative. But did somebody "place the Akkadian" above, or did he "write Akkadian" above? I have said in my paper that this fragment of an inscription (K. 14,013) "raises the question whether the position of the two districts is referred to." Few, in all probability, will say that this phrase requires amending, for this question would in any case still remain.

That *Akkadā* and *Šu[merā]* may refer to the languages is not only possible, but probable. That the position of the writing on the tablet is referred to, however, one may be allowed to doubt. Supposing that the upper line were Akkadian and the lower line Sumerian, a man who could read would know this without being told, and to one who could not read such information would be useless.

Perhaps K. 14,013 is a parallel text to K. 11,856, where, after references to $\equiv\equiv\equiv\equiv$ $\equiv\equiv\equiv\equiv$ $\rightarrow\rightarrow$ $\rightarrow\rightarrow$ $\rightarrow\rightarrow$, *é-dub-ba-gu-la*, "the house of the great tablet," or better, "the great tablet-house," the words \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow , *ina šal-ši Ak-k[ada-a?]* occur. This would seem to refer to the rooms, or shelves, or receptacles, where the various classes of tablets were kept, for it means "in the third the Akkadian"; and that the language is referred to here, is proved by the non-Semitic line, which has \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow , *eme Uri*, "tongue of Akkad."

But this, like the others, is tantalizingly incomplete.

I am glad to have Professor Tiele's criticism, as it proves that my language, notwithstanding my desire to be cautious, was not sufficiently guarded and precise.

THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES.

7. NOTE ON INDIAN COINS AND INSCRIPTIONS.

Naini Tal, N.W.P.

May 28, 1900.

DEAR PROFESSOR RHYS DAVIDS,—At pp. 115 and 116 of the *Journal* for January, 1900, Mr. Rapson discusses the coins of Virasena and refers to the question whether they should be classed with the so-called Muttra coins. There cannot be the slightest doubt that they are found most commonly in the places where the Muttra coins are found, but they are also found further to the west and south. Most of my Muttra coins (I have ten of those figured in plate viii, Cunningham's "Coins of Ancient India," besides a number