

enabled the Rabbis, who fought out, as it were, in their discussions every handbreadth of measurement and every detail of structure, to furnish an accurate account of almost every part of the holy and beloved house, around which so many hallowed memories clung.

The neglect with which these carefully-guarded traditions have been treated is one of the curiosities of literature. Even after scholars like Lightfoot had spent years in arranging and commenting on them, they were still regarded as of little worth. In endeavouring to estimate their real value, a careful distinction must be made between the statements of the Mishnas and those of the Gamara, the latter being for the most part rather opinions than reliable traditions, except in so far as they are a repetition of passages from the Mishnas themselves. The commentaries of the later Rabbis have still less authority, and however valuable as aids to a true understanding of the ancient records, must not be received as anything more than the personal views of the writers. It is certain that Maimonides himself misunderstood the account of the Temple steps; Rashi also has shown that he could stumble; and the only sure guide to a proper understanding of the Temple, as it stood in the time of our Lord, is the text of the Mishnas carefully studied and interpreted without bias from preconceived opinions.

Two points which have been often in dispute may be considered as settled if the authority of these ancient writings is recognised. One is that the rock under the existing Dome of the Rock marks the site of the Holy of Holies, and the other that the roof of the Temple was flat and constructed in a manner exactly similar to those of many houses at Damascus at the present day.

THOMAS CHAPLIN, M.D.

18, *Anerley Park, S.E.*,
April 28th, 1887.

THE HITTITES.

THE criticism of "Altaic Hieroglyphs" is very encouraging. So much has met with approval that there is every chance of more progress being made in time.

1st. It is admitted that the language of the texts is agglutinative. Professor Sayce approves the idea of "packets," but I cannot find this idea in previous writings. It will perhaps be admitted that it is therefore wrong to look for the verb at the beginning of inscriptions.

2nd. There is a disposition to think that the language is Altaic. I have ventured to hold this view for three years. The comparison with

Georgian has as yet led to no result, Georgian being an inflexional language not agglutinative.

3rd. Only one Cypriote comparison is challenged out of thirty, viz. : *Zu*. It is by no means certain that this should be read *Nos* as *Nos* has another shape. The emblem in question is not controlled by a bilingual. I am reproached with a sudden conversion to the Cypriote, but the reason for my previous scepticism was that I thought five out of the eight comparisons previously put forward doubtful, whereas I have now found thirty comparisons which I think are more closely similar.

4th. Nothing has been said as yet against the cuneiform comparison ; and indeed as the idea is not new it is only in detail that this is likely to be criticised.

5th. The distinction which I have drawn between the roots and the grammatical forms is approved by Professor Sayce.

These admissions seem to show that there is no initial fallacy of method in my decipherment.

The arguments brought against me are equally satisfactory to me, because I think they show how weak the opposition case must be considered, so far as general principles are concerned.

1st. As regards an Egyptian comparison, I have, I hope, strengthened my position by aid of the discoveries of Professor de Lacouperie, and by Dr. Isaac Taylor's discovery of Finnic words in Egyptian. All that I have had to reconsider is the phonetic question, and in cases where the Egyptian word is Finnic the phonetic value also may be sustained. The Egyptian comparison is most valuable ideographically, and will I believe be much used in the future.

2nd. Exception is taken to the *subject* of texts. This also is I think an objection which may be met. If "pious addresses to the deity" are unknown "before the Muhammedan period," what becomes of the Bible? I have shown that my readings recall in subject certain known Akkadian texts, but as the necessary books are not generally available I here give one text for comparison. It may be noted that the magical chapters of the ancient Egyptian Ritual are of a somewhat similar character and were inscribed on sarcophagi.

"Talisman, talisman limit not to be passed, limit which the gods may not pass . . . whether it be an evil utug, an evil alal, an evil gigim, an evil god, an evil maskim, a fantom, a spectre, a vampire, an incubus, a succuba, an imp or the evil plague, the grievous fever, the evil sickness, which raises its head against the good waters of Ea, may the barrier of Ea stay it . . . may the pillar and the capital stay its way . . . like water may it make them run, like leaves may it make them tremble, like fat may it roast them, &c." (W. A. I, iv, 16 I, Magie p. 44.) This magic text is too long to give entire, and it is only one out of a large number.

As the texts under consideration are accompanied by winged figures and others recognised as figures of deities ; as such talismans are of general occurrence among early Altaic tribes ; and as the so called *historical*

renderings are simply "Says A. the son of B. the king of C.," followed by the said hypothetical person *saying nothing*, I submit that my suggestions are not of necessity anachronisms, but contain a possible explanation.

3rd. Exception is taken to the words *Ma* and *Ku* which I assign to characters on the bilingual. This also may yet be sustained. *Ma* is acknowledged by Lenormant, Delitzsch, Taylor, and others, to have been an Akkadian word for country, and it is the common and ancient word for country in all Finnic dialects.¹ *Ku* is said by Fox Talbot to have been an Akkadian word for king; Lenormant gives it as a Proto-Medic word, and words clearly connected therewith are found in many Altaic dialects. It will be admitted by all cuneiform scholars that it is as yet quite impossible to dogmatise about the monosyllabic emblems used in Akkadian. They are known to have been polyphones, that is to say that being originally pictures the reader might apply to them more than one word, just as on seeing a king's head on a coin we might call it king or monarch or sovereign or head or face. That the emblem used for king had the sound *Ku* is beyond dispute. The question is how did the emblem get this sound?

4th. It is urged that we have so many Altaic dialects to consider.² This is perfectly true, but that Proto-Medic and Akkadian, Sumerian, Cassite and Susian, are Altaic languages of one class cannot be denied; their affinity to Turkic and Finnic dialects is admitted by all. Of course in our own time the dialects have diverged and increased in number, and even in the time of Darius the known dialects of western Asia had diverged. Nevertheless a large vocabulary is common to Finnish, Etruscan, Akkadian, Proto-Medic, and even to Susian and Cassite. We are dealing with a period 2,000 to 4,000 B.C.; had I made use of modern Turkish or modern Tamil I might well have been reprovèd; but I have made use of the *most ancient* known Altaic dialects and of the dialects spoken in countries *nearest* to those where the Hittites dwelt.

It is impossible to my mind that the words Tar, Sar, Lar, Nazi, Senna, Ku, Tas, Kha, and Essebu should occur in names of Hittite kings, and represent the words for king and prince in Akkadian and in Etruscan, if there was no linguistic connection, and the fact that the words in the geographical texts are also similar to geographical sounds in Akkadian

¹ Finnic, *Ma*; Etruscan, *Ma*; Akkadian, *Ma*. *Ma* = country. See Sayce, "Assyrian Grammar," No. 291, p. 25; No. 399, p. 34. Also in T.B.A., IV, p. 305, &c., &c. Chossat, p. 129, quotes Delitzsch.

² Prof. Sayce himself, speaking of the dialects of Elam and Media, has said of Akkadian, that it "may be called the Sanskrit of the Turanian family," and of the Elamite he says that it belongs "both grammatically and lexically to the Finnic division of the Ugrian group," while Akkadian he compares with Wogul—a Finnic dialect. (T.B.A., IV, pp. 466, 468). These statements, in which he was preceded by Lenormant, may be set against the known differences between Proto-Medic and Akkadian.

(though better scholars may modify many of my renderings) is also a very strong argument.

I now desire to state the points which seem safe.

1. That the Hittites were an Ugro-Altaic people whose language was nearest to those of the Finnic group.
2. That their language was agglutinative.
3. That "packets" occur on the texts.
4. That the ideographic values are the same in some cases as in Egyptian.
5. That certain comparisons are possible with the earliest known cuneiform.
6. That the inscriptions are possibly Talismans in several cases if not in all.

What is now needful is the verification of the roots by careful comparative study, which will require some time and labour to accomplish. To this I hope to devote spare time in the future.

C. R. CONDER.

HITTITES AND ETRUSCANS.

THE work which Dr. Isaac Taylor published in 1874, called "Etruscan Researches," was the foundation of a true knowledge of Etruscan language. He found that, like the Akkadian—which has been called the Sanskrit of the Turanian languages—Etruscan was an Ugro-Altaic language, closely akin to the Finnic dialects. It is therefore clear that it will assist us in studying what is popularly called Hittite. The Etruscans were akin to the Pelasgi, the Lydians, Lycians and Carians, and the syllabaries of Lycia and Caria are closely related to the Cypriote, which preserves for us the sounds of the Hittite language. The following notes I have put down in reading Dr. Isaac Taylor's book.

Page 12. The conflicting statements of classic authors as to the populations of Asia Minor are due clearly to difference of date. The earlier tribes were Altaic, but Aryan and Semitic tribes pushed in later. The older writers, such as Homer, refer a₁ parently to the Altaic tribes. Herodotus (I, 57) says the Pelasgic language was barbarous; Homer (Il. v, 867) says the Carians spoke a barbarous tongue. Professor Sayce has just published an important paper on the Aryan Carians.

Page 14. Etruscans and Lycians both traced descent from the mother, indicating the original polyandry, which I believe distinguishes Turanian from Semitic peoples. Page 21. The Tuscans of Italy, the Tusci of Asiatic Sarmatia, the Thuschi, an Ugric existing tribe in the south of the Caucasus, may perhaps be named from the word Tas or Tassak, which means "hero" in Akkadian and in other dialects. Page 23. The Etruscans or Tursci may derive their name from Tur-Sak "tent-son," Tur meaning a