

In addition to these, the sacred tree, the scarab, the winged horse, the gryphon, the man-bull, the sphynx, the cross, the *ankh*, and the lion-headed demons with eagle's feet and long ears, all appear to be common to the Babylonians, Phœnicians, Cyprians, Hittites, and other dwellers in Chaldea, Syria, and Asia Minor, and, in most cases, these symbols occur also in Etruria.

C. R. C.

CHINESE AND HITTITE.

THE supposition that Chinese civilisation is connected with the old Turanian civilisation of Western Asia is by no means a recent theory. Lenormant in his "Manual" in 1868 (French edit. vol. i, p. 401), suggested that Chinese writing was derived from Akkadian hieroglyphics, and others have endeavoured to trace the connection.

The Rev. J. Edkins has written, since 1871 onwards, on the comparison of China and Babylonia, in writing, in astronomy, in the erection of observatories, in government, and in certain superstitions. In 1868, the Rev. J. Chalmers wrote on the same subject, and Professor R. K. Douglas has compared Chinese and Western myths. Mr. Hyde Clarke and Professor T. de Lacouperie have added to these comparisons, and the similarities of legend, language, religion and custom, dress and graphic ideas, must indeed strike any student of the Chinese who is acquainted with the west of Asia.

Nor is there any difficulty in accounting for such points of contact considering what is known of the early history of the Chinese.¹

The Bak tribes (commonly called the "hundred families") came from the north-west, and entered the "flowery land," it is supposed, as early as 2300 B.C. Their language, in both grammar and words, presents numerous affinities to the Akkadian; and even in the modern Cantonese, which, according to Chalmers, preserves archaic terminations, I find about 100 words almost identical with Akkadian monosyllabic words, which agrees with Professor Max Muller's views as to Chinese.

The traditional number of hieroglyphics possessed by these immigrants from Central Asia was 540, including the secondary signs, or combinations of two, or even three, symbols (Lacouperie, "Chinese Civilisation," a lecture published 1880, p. 18). It has been said that this system was directly borrowed from Babylonia, but there are several objections to such a theory. The Chinese numerals are not like those of the cuneiform system (above three), the writing is in vertical lines, not from left to right as among Semitic writers of cuneiform; the compound emblems bear no relation to the compounds of the cuneiform.

The comparisons of Chinese and cuneiform, which I find possible in fifty or sixty cases, connect the Chinese with the very oldest Akkadian symbols which stand erect, and are written vertically for the word, and from right to left for the text. The sound, as well as the sense, is often

¹ See Professor T. de Lacouperie's new volume, "Languages of China before the Chinese," 1887.

the same, but since Chinese is a language of roots, not an agglutinative tongue, the comparison remains chiefly ideographic, and only serves to indicate a common (and very remotely common) origin rather than a direct literary borrowing. Some of the resemblances, such as the emblems for king, for fire, for white, for measure, for field, for twins, for storm, for bush, for wind, and for bondage, are, however, very remarkable, and can hardly be supposed due to independent origin. In all, I have noted sixty cases, comparing the Shwoh-wan with the oldest Turanian emblems of Tell Loh.

The great difficulty in such study lies in the corruption of both Chinese and cuneiform emblems through long use and graphic decay. Thus the Shwoh-wan (*see* Chalmer's translation) only dates back to about the Christian era; and even the earlier Ku-wen writing is said not to be traceable before 900 B.C.—a time when the cuneiform was already a decadent system.

The Chinese having ceased to remember the original derivation of the majority of their emblems, introduced fanciful explanations, like those once supposed to explain the origin of square Hebrew; and it seems that they even modified their forms according to their theories. A large proportion of emblems have thus become unrecognisable. Many, like the ape, the horse, the tortoise, the elephant, did not belong to the systems of Western Asia. Some which have retained their form yet, in recognisable outline, are, however, of great interest as showing the graphic ideas of Turanian picture writing; and thus serving to throw light on the ideographic value of older emblems.

Comparing the commoner Altaic—or so-called Hittite—with the Chinese emblems of which the antiquity and meaning is undoubted, I find, in all, some fifty possible comparisons, some of which serve to throw light on the values of the Hittite. Thus the Hittite *Zi* or *Zo* is very like the Chinese common phonetic for air or vapour, agreeing with the value which I have proposed from the Akkadian for the Hittite. The *jar* which in Hittite appears to have the value *Pa* or *Be*, comparing the Cypriote *Pe* and the Akkadian *Bi*, for a liquid receptacle, is like the Chinese *fū*, a jar, used both as a radical (or ideogram) and as a phonetic. It seems to me, indeed, that the two classes of Chinese emblems called keys and phonetics (that is, emblems used in one case for picture value, in the other for sound value) answer in each of the fifty cases to the corresponding two classes of the Hittite, viz., the larger emblems used as pictures, and the smaller attached emblems used for sound only, as phonetics. Several of the comparisons may be erroneous, but they are numerous enough to make it appear probable that the Chinese and Hittite systems sprang from a common original system, which is, of course, more closely represented by the archaic Hittite than by the Chinese, even of 2,000 years ago.¹

¹ See "Structure of Chinese Characters," by John Chalmers, M.A., LL.D., 1882, a copy of which translation of the Shwoh-Wan has kindly been lent to me by Lieutenant Mills, R.E.

Yet later in entering China from the north and north-west, were the Khitai from Mongolia, whose name originates the mediæval term Cathay. The Chinese travellers of the 13th century speak of the Khitai as formerly inhabiting the country east of the Aral Sea. Mr. Howarth's interesting account of the Khitai (J. R. A. S. xiii, 2) shows that this Tartar-Mongol people were in many respects very like the Kheta of the Egyptian monuments. Some words of their language preserve almost unchanged the old Akkadian sounds. They were great charioteers and bowmen, and they adored earth, sky, sun, and moon, and the sacred mountain, as the Hunns and the Etruscans did also, and as the Hittites are shown to have done from their treaty with Rameses. Like other Mongolian and Tartar peoples, they had a rich mythology. They were able to work metals as the Akkadians did from the earliest times, and as even the Turkomans still do; and they had cities and palaces.

The royal names and titles of the Khitai also recall those of the inhabitants of Asia Minor and Syria mentioned on the monuments. The King was called *Kha-Khan* (as among Persians and Khozars)—perhaps the real rendering of the Medic double emblem for King. *Khopi*, *Kuku* (compare the Medic *Khupa* and the common Turanian word *Kuk*, for "superior"); *Tulai* (compare *Tulia*, chief of the *Kue*); *Taishi* (from a Tartar root, meaning "to fight," whence *Tis Tassi* and *Tassak*, "hero," in Akkadian), are interesting names of Khitan chiefs. The meaning of the name Khitai is unfortunately obscure.

A great deal of light may be obtained from a study of the Turkic and Mongol history in illustrating the scattered fragments of information which we possess concerning the early Turanians of Chaldea and of Syria. In the folk lore of the Kirghiz, the Kalmuks,¹ and the Mongols, many of the old myths of the cuneiform tablets and Greek mythology remain but little changed.

The remaining words of the Carian language are easily explained by comparison with Turko-Tartar or Ugrian living words.

The curious non-Aryan inscriptions of Lemnos, which serve to connect the Etruscans with the shores of Greece and of Asia Minor, present us with a language evidently of the same class. Even among the Scythian Amazons of Herodotus we recognise the roots of the Akkadian language in words of which he gives the translation, and the similarities of Egyptian fairy stories written in the 14th century B.C., when they are compared with the legends of Central Asia, are so striking as to leave very little doubt as to their Turanian derivation.

The same study also enables us to understand Phœnician antiquity

¹ Take, for instance, the legend of King Midas, who had asses' ears. It occurs in a collection of Mongol tales, and the Kirghiz relate it in connection with Lake Issyk Kul. According to Herodotus, Midas was the first Phrygian King, and the Phrygians were apparently Turanians. Mita, King of the Moschi, is mentioned in a cuneiform text. On the Hittite monument a cap with ears like that invented for Midas is represented.

much more completely, as I have attempted to show elsewhere,¹ and without doubt some of those names of Greek deities and heroes which are not explicable as either Aryan or Semitic, may be easily understood if regarded as of Pelasgic or Turanian origin. Among these I would reckon Herakles, or Hercle (Etruscan), a word not explained by any Aryan etymology, but probably the Akkadian Er-gal (mentioned on a tablet), or "great man." The name Amazon may also be supposed to mean Ama-zun, or "female warrior;" while Eshmun and Silek, the Phœnician deities, may be Es-mun, "the good deity," and Sil-ik, "the bright one."²

The names of chiefs of various Asia Minor tribes from 1130 to 650 B.C., which have been found on the monuments and collected by Professor Sayce, present us with many clearly Turkic words, and with names or terminations also found in the Greco-Carian inscriptions. Thus Uricci, chief of the Kue, has a name comparable with the Tartar *örögi*, or "high." Burunate, the Yazbukian, may be compared with the Usbek word *Baranta*, for a "foray" or "raid." Menuas, King of Van, recalls the mythical giant *Manias*, the ancestor of the Kirghiz. Kalabôtēs, the Carian, has a name meaning "great hero" in Tartar dialects, where the word *Batis* survives, and is, perhaps, the Akkadian *Patesi*.

These are but a few instances out of very many in which the Akkadian and the living Turko-Tartar languages give a simple explanation of local and personal names. The Carian word *Kōs* (*Kōn*), for sheep, recalls the Turkish *قوزی* "lamb," and *قویون* "sheep," which among the Kirghiz becomes *Koi*; and the Carian *rāna* for a rock is clearly the Turkish *تپه* and the Turkoman *Tapā*, a well-known word for a hill. I believe that every known Carian word can be so explained, and the Carians are connected with the Hittites (by their syllabary) and with the Etruscans, according to classic tradition. The explanation of local names in Asia Minor occurring in Greek literature is equally satisfactory when comparison is made with the common geographical names of Central Asia. Thus, the termination *Der*, or *Dar*, in river names, is evidently illustrated by the Turkish *دره* "valley," and the Central Asian *Daria*, for "river." The importance of a study of Altaic languages for the elucidation of the antiquities of West Asia, Greece, and Italy, as well as of Egypt, can hardly be overstated.

C. R. C.

¹ "Archæological Review," April, 1888.

² The name, Centaur (or Gandharva, according to Kuhn's comparison), has no good Aryan explanation. As a Turanian (Ugric) word it would mean "man-beast" (*Gan-tōra*). The word Gorgon in like manner comes from a root meaning "terror."

ERRATUM.

In *Quarterly Statement*, July, 1888, p. 163, I see the words "The beech is found all over the north of Asia." The word *Minor* is omitted by error. The beech grows on Mount Parnassus and in the Caucasus.

C. R. C.