

the original root. The Assyrian BILU consists undoubtedly of the well-known ILU, the name of the supreme god of Babylonia, and thus of all deities, and a softened form of the Coptic article. The analogy of EIT and BIT would aid in coming to this conclusion; but stronger evidence for the truth of it is furnished by the Hebrew. In that language the name of the Most High God is AL, while the word corresponding to BILU, meaning *lord*, and applied to neighbouring gods, is BAAL. In parts of Arabia, strange to say, the article seems to have been, at least for a time, knowingly retained, although the Arabic *al* or Himyaritic *ka* were at hand to supplant it. Thus, we find Pliny, about the 70th year of the Christian era, mentioning the Thimanei,²⁸ an inland people of the peninsula; while Agatharchides, who wrote more than two hundred years earlier, described them as the Buthemanei.²⁹ Still, it is to the Indo-European languages that we must chiefly look for traces of this venerable prefix. A Semitic root meaning strong, and, in a secondary sense, fortified, is SHADAD, SHEDID. Hence came the Hebrew, or rather Philistine, word ASHDOD, which is the same as the name given to Egyptian Babylon, FOSTAT. Although the Pishdadian line of Persia has been supposed by many to owe its name to a root of similar form denoting *justice*, there is much reason to believe that "the good old rule" of their time may have developed justice out of strength. At any rate there is little doubt that the Coptic article is as much part of the name Pishdad, which Hushang first bore, as it is of his other Persian name Pushang, which the Arabs harden into Fushang. Old Greek dropped the reduplicated *t* of the Egyptian FOSTAT in *Fastu*, the Homeric form of *Astu*, the city, which we have the authority of Didorus Siculus for connecting with the Egyptian town.²⁹ From this old word, originally meaning *the strong* or *the fortified*, and thence, by syntactical convertibility *the strong and fortified place*, such as all cities were in ancient times, have come, through different channels, our English words *state* and *city*. The former we owe, not to the Latin *status*, but to the German *Stadt*; and the latter comes doubtless from a simpler form of the Latin *civitas* such as we find in the Spanish *ciudad*, or better still the Portuguese *Cidade*, a word as like the old ASHDOD as we may reasonably expect so modern a term to resemble so ancient a one. It is interesting to note that

²⁷ Id. vi., 32.

²⁸ Agatharchides, de Mare Rubro, Hudson, 57, &c.

²⁹ Didod. Sic. i., 16. Vide et. Strab. i., ix., 15.