



Staats- und  
Universitätsbibliothek  
Bremen



## **Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Bremen**

**DFG-Projekt "Digitalisierung und Erschließung des Nachlasses des  
Ägyptologen Adolf Erman (1854-1937)"**

### **Brief von Francis LI. Griffith an Adolf Erman**

**Griffith, Francis LI.**

**o. O. [London], 23.08.1893**

---

Nachweis dieses Dokuments im [Kalliope-Verbund](#)

[urn:nbn:de:gbv:46:1-82029](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:gbv:46:1-82029)

Beaman

579

32 Torrington Sq. W.C.  
23 Aug. 1893.

Dear Professor Egan,

I fear I cannot get to Berlin this year, much though I should like it. Who is Breasted? is he the American student of whom I have heard some encouraging rumours? if so, I congratulate you on having so good a scholar to translate the Grammar.

Max Müller asked me to review his *Asien und Europa*, and in an evil moment I undertook to do so: the book is exceedingly valuable but I am a perfect ignoramus on the subject and very much want to see a good review before writing my own! If you are writing one will you be so very kind as to let me know when it appears?

There has been rather an outcry against our transliteration in ~~the~~ *Banihasan I*. English people take up a study in a very amateurish

way and as we depend on ~~the~~ British  
and American public we must make  
concessions. Many would have liked a return  
to the old system, pure and simple, but  
we have done rather better than that. It  
appears that the symbols  $\text{š}$ ,  $\text{t}$ ,  $\text{k}$  for aspirates  
are a great stumbling-block to the amateurs  
and Petrie's suggestion of linked letters  
 $\text{ʃ}$  sh,  $\text{tʰ}$  th,  $\text{kʰ}$  kh approves itself mightily to  
them: they also want vowels so we have  
provided them with  $\text{a}$ ,  $\text{ä}$  and  $\text{ä}$  for  $\text{ā}$ ,  $\text{ā}$ ,  $\text{ā}$   
as well as  $\text{e}$  written between consonants, where necessary:  
and we have adopted Steindorff's  $\text{z}$  (for  $\text{z}$ )  
and  $\text{t}$ : also  $\text{k}$  for  $\text{kw}$  +  $\text{q}$  for  $\text{q}$  as in the old  
system.

It is thought that this will be largely  
adopted in English publications: I am not  
hopeful about it personally — it is more  
likely that every scholar (and every amateur)  
will have his own system!

And now for a few notes on Kahun.

Pl. I. 3, 4 have restored  $\Delta$  I ~~III~~ <sup>III</sup> as in III. 7.

5. The fragment with ~~III~~ is very doubtful as to position: possibly  $\Delta$  ~~III~~ alone should be read.

~~7. I do not read~~

1. 8 (et passim)  $\Delta$   $\Delta$  it is difficult to know what to do where one hieratic sign may stand for several hieroglyphs: but I am inclined to follow hieroglyphic usage and transcribe them differently.

~~is not the dot under  $\Delta$ : constant and necessary to the hieratic sign for  $\Delta$ ?~~

l. 9. The dash after  $\Delta$  in ~~III~~  $\Delta$  is due only to a fault in the facsimile.

II. 5 I have written  $\Delta$   $\Delta$  but (?)  $\Delta$   $\Delta$  ?

9. pht<sup>i</sup>  $\Delta$  not  $\Delta$ ,  $\Delta$  almost as in nrw-k (l. 6)

11. you propose  $\Delta$   $\Delta$  but how would you translate it?  $\Delta$  does not occur as possessive with  $\Delta$  (?)

14, 19.  $\Delta$  must be II

18.  $\Delta$   $\Delta$   $\Delta$  not I

