

. . . . The place of burial of Jeremiah is still shown in Jerusalem, in a cave which passes by the name of Jeremiah's Grotto. This grotto lies in the southern part of the conspicuous hill to the north of the city, which is supposed by many persons to be the place called Calvary. . . . And it is said that this hill is the Tarpeian Rock of ancient Jerusalem, the Beth-hassagelah, or 'Place of Stoning,' of the Talmud. It seems, then, that there is some connection between the death which Jeremiah met, according to tradition, and the place where he is said to be buried. And the tradition concerning this stoning in Jerusalem must be early; for the uniform church tradition of *later* days, as we find it in the life of Jeremiah, attributed falsely to Epiphanius, or the life that is given on his commemoration day in the Greek Church (*see* Menaem, for May 1), is that he was stoned, indeed, but at Tahpanhes in Egypt, and not, as the Jerusalem tradition and the Christian Baruch say, in Jerusalem. Can we be wrong in affirming the antiquity of the tradition which we find in our authority. The opinion of the first and second centuries seems to be that Jeremiah was stoned in Jerusalem," pp. 23, 24. In a foot-note to the above, the same recognised authority on Patristic literature remarks, "I do not forget that an attempt might have been made to bring the legends into harmony with Our Lord's words, 'O, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee,' but such a tendency would not have produced an earlier tradition, but a later one. It is more reasonable, though the hypothesis is not necessary, and might even be fanciful, to understand our Lord as saying this in allusion to the legends. When He said it He was in view of the place of supposed martyrdom of Isaiah on the south of the city, and of Jeremiah on the north."

I have quoted the above, because it strikes me that it contains a valuable addition to the already considerable mass of cumulative evidence we possess in favour of "Gordon's Calvary." Whilst, in my opinion, it is much to be regretted that, going to extremes, a good many Protestant tourists show an inclination to make a fetish of the mediæval tomb called "Gordon's," it is, most satisfactory to find that we have so many different and independent lines of evidence in favour of Major Conder's identification of the "Place of a Skull."

NOTES BY MAJOR CONDER, R.E.

I.

DUSRATTA'S HITTITE LETTER.

I HAVE already, in a short paper in the *Quarterly Statement*, called attention to the Hittite letter of Dusratta (*see* "Altaic letter from Tell Amarna," *Quarterly Statement*, 1891, p. 245) and have communicated to

the Royal Asiatic Society a detailed account of this important text, of 512 lines of the Hittite language, including about 400 different words. As the *Quarterly Statement* could not contain all that should be said on the subject, I have sent a brief summary of results.

Dusratta, who lived about 1,500 to 1,450 B.C., was King of Mitani in Southern Armenia, son of Suttarna and grandson of Sitatama. His sister Thi was the queen of Amenophis III of Egypt, and his daughter Tadukhepa of Amenophis IV, her first cousin. The latter was thus half Hittite by birth, with a Hittite wife, and these unions, preceded by more than a century the marriage of Rameses II to the daughter of Kheta Sar the Hittite prince, who is called after her marriage (*Brugsch, Egt. II, p. 75*) *Ur-ma nofiru-ru*. The letter of Dusratta, in his native language, refers to the embassy sent from Egypt, to ask for his daughter's hand, and to the offer of recognition of his conquests in Phœnicia. He sends a gift or tribute to the King of Egypt, and requests a written decree on papyrus to confirm the verbal message of Menes. He sends his own relative Gilias to conduct negotiations, and interpreters and scribes to translate and read his letter, which was written on both sides of a clay tablet in the cuneiform characters.

The most important parts of the letter are those which refer to his religion and to his kingdom. He worshipped the Akkadian god Ea, and a god Tessub, who was the local representative of Rimmon. His father's name Sut-tarna ("Set judges"), shows that the Hittite deity, Sut or Set, was also adored in Armenia; and we thus find that the religion of Hittites, Armenians, and Akkadians was probably the same, as well as their language, and their very pronounced Mongol type of face and of dress. The language, it may be remarked was more nearly akin to pure Turkish than to any other branch of the Mongol speech. It has nothing in common with the Aryan dialect, which was spoken 700 years later in the region near Lake Van, and which superseded the old Mongol dialect after the time of the advance of the Medes from the Caucasus against Assyria. The present inscription at last renders these points indisputable.

Dusratta was a Minyan (*see* Jeremiah li, 27), and his capital was at Ikhbin, which may be the modern Kaban Maden; but it appears that he had extended his conquests westwards, to the country which was then ruled by Egypt—the Hittite region of Northern Syria. The Minyans, or *Men*, had ruled for centuries over the Delta in the Hyksos period, but had been driven back to their home some 200 years before Dusratta's time, by the first kings of the 18th Dynasty. They seem to have been the chief power in Armenia at this time, bordering on the Assyrians on the south, and on the dominions of the Semitic prince of Elishah to the west. The following passage in the letter is of special interest.

"Brother, thy border in the land over against Egypt is . . . and to proceed, I being empowered to extend myself thereto, command thou the people to take me as prince and master: their duty . . . being made known by interpretation made, is not the owning of the land thus made

clear? Proclaim thou for me that, whatever I have conquered of the land of Chalcis, the land of Chalcis in Phœnicia west of the Minyan Kingdom, is made subject. Brother, thy word is enough; none henceforth will dispute my right to be the people's master. As to the going forth thereof, is it not thus that it shall be?

"To proceed, let my brother send his order to me alone, as to that which I desire to have extended. The order received, I go forth. Brother an order, if thou favourest me, is to be all clearly written. Thereby this region being ruled united by me, I being Suzerain of the people of the Hittite country, taking to me all the conquered people. Let it reach to the city of Harran."

Turning to the map we find Harran (*Harrân*) not far from the Taurus on the edge of the southern desert, and Chalcis (*Kinnesrin*) south of Aleppo—being the Khalka conquered by Thothmes III a century earlier (No. 140 of the Karnak list). Thus Dusratta was to receive a large slice of Phœnicia and Northern Syria, including the important towns of Merash, Aleppo, and Carchemish, and was to rule these apparently, together with Militene or Mitani, and the Minyan country to Lake Van, as a tributary of Amenophis III. The Egyptian boundary proper would then extend not far north of Hamath. All this Hittite region revolted from Amenophis IV a generation later, and in a later letter we hear of the Hittite King flying for protection to Mitani itself, while Egyptian vassals were striving to maintain the decaying power of the husband of Tadukhepa—perhaps during the lifetime of Dusratta, who survived Amenophis III.

The latter part of this very important political document refers to the marriage of Tadukhepa, who was to be conducted by Menes to the land of Zoan and to Egypt, and married in Thebes (*No*) "before the image" to the Egyptian heir. This arrangement was duly carried out. The last paragraph of the letter appears to read somewhat as follows:—

"Assuring you that all that prince and people can do will be done speedily, it is hoped that the Minyan will be commanded to the fullest extent. Brother my subject acting for me as thought best, the subject having received fully written what is to be graciously conveyed to me in the Minyan land, the princes (Khakhans) ruling the whole race of the Minyans having agreed: this people which my brother makes subject to me seeing that what I do is beneficial to their land, ready as subjects to trust what I do: a decree being made: my brother and the princes ruling Minyan land being agreed, and the people being submissive; and all I had to speak about being written, an increased renewal of friendship (is produced) the Minyan Kingdom being increased, and I too if the subject race are not obedient levying war if obliged . . . therefore again make thou the people to be (ruled?) by a prince."

The importance of this text, in connection with the decipherment of the Hittite inscriptions, is evident. Together with the letter of Tarkondara, Hittite prince of Rezeph, near Palmyra, it is written in the Hittite language; and we thus obtain with certitude the forms of that language

and its grammar, and a vocabulary of 400 words. By grammar and vocabulary alike it is clearly shown to be a Mongol language closely connected with the yet older Akkadian, and with the pure Turkic speech of Central Asia, which is completely known to us, in the case of the Yakut dialect, through the labours of Böhlingk (published at St. Petersburg in 1851), although very little studied in England. It will henceforth, I think, be agreed to abandon the erroneous comparisons with Hebrew, Armenian, Georgian, Vannic, Aryan speech, and Chinese, which various scholars have proposed, in favour of the comparison with languages of the same age in which the Hittite texts were written, and of the countries more immediately adjacent.

II.

THE TELL EL HESI TEXT.

The newly proposed reading לְהִסֵךְ for this text, seems much more probable than those before suggested, inasmuch as it recognises that the second letter is ה, and because it avoids the improbability of the word being a personal name, to which I have referred in a previous note. The opinion of M. Renan on such a question is also of considerable authority. Still, there remain difficulties in such a reading, which should not be overlooked.

It is the case that on the Carpentras stone the *Samech* has a shape somewhat like that of what I have supposed to be *Vau*; but this monument (which is said to be of the first century B.C.) does not give the proper forms for the other letters; and I cannot find any earlier example

Lachish.	Aramean 7th cent. B.C.	Carpentras stone.
ל	ל ל	ל ל
א	א א	א א
י	י י	י י
ו	ו ו	ו ו
ז	ז ז	ז ז
ח	ח ח	ח ח

of an Aramean *Samech* of suitable shape. The comparative table will show what I mean. The proposed reading might perhaps mean "for anointing oneself"; but the forms of the other letters seem to me to

show that the text is about the seventh century B.C., when the *Samech* had not assumed the supposed form. For these reasons I regard לִהְנוֹךְ as still a probable reading.

III.

RECENT HITTITE DISCOVERIES.

12th May, 1892.

Among other valuable texts published by Professor Ramsay and Mr. D. G. Hogarth, are those discovered by Sir Charles Wilson, at Gurun, which are specially interesting because they are the first on which it seems clear that numerals are represented, and they serve to confirm my conjecture as to the sign for *ten*. The numerals which occur include nine vertical strokes for "nine," and eight for "eight," and the following groups also occur (Figs. 1, 2, 3):—

FIG. 1.



FIG. 2.



FIG. 3.



FIG. 4.



The first of these appears to stand for "twenty-seven," and the second for "eighteen," while the third is "twenty." The Hittite numeral for "ten" has thus the same form which is used both in Egyptian and also in Cuneiform, and its probable sound would be *un*, as in Akkadian and in Turkic speech for "ten."

There is a seal in the Ashmolean (Fig. 4) which Dr. Sayce regards as a new Hittite bilingual, having a text of three lines in ancient Cuneiform of about 1800 B.C. Dr. Sayce reads it, "Indisilim, son of Serdamu, worshipper of the deity *Iskhara*." The four Hittite emblems are as shown in the sketch, and according to my system of reading may stand for *Isgar Raba*, "Slave of *Isgar*." The first sign is not a deer's head, but clearly that of the ass.

IV.

NOTES ON THE "QUARTERLY STATEMENT."

P. 115. The tombs found on the hill west of the Montefiore cottages belong to the class of Roman and Byzantine tombs which are particularly numerous east of Jordan, dating from about the second to the fourth centuries, A.D. But it is not impossible that the new tombs may belong to the first century A.D.

When Josephus speaks of "Herod's monuments," which Herod does he mean? Herod the Great was not buried at Jerusalem, but at Herodium. Herod Archelaus died in Gaul; Herod Antipas died in Spain; Herod Philip II was buried at Bethsaida in Galilee; Herod Agrippa I (A.D. 37-44) died at Cæsarea, but may have been buried at Jerusalem, and seems to be most probably the Herod intended ("Wars," v. 12-2.) The monument lay west of Jerusalem, but the indication of site is very vague. The masonry of the new tombs is not unlike that of Herodium, and the mouldings might in Palestine be as early as 44 A.D. The supposition that "Herod's Monuments" have been discovered is, therefore, not unreasonable.

P. 120. The tomb at the Rock of the Skull was not a new discovery, even when General Gordon was in Jerusalem. It is described in the memoirs, but there is no reason for regarding it as a Jewish tomb. When I first entered it it was full of human bones. It belongs to the middle ages, and was used by Latin Christians of the twelfth century. On this point I have written more fully in "Good Words" for April, 1892. I do not think, therefore, that "everyone may choose as he likes" in such a question, when the tombs which are proposed for the Holy Sepulchre belong to much later times.

The tracings received of the crosses and letters found in this tomb, and mentioned in the memoirs, show that the cross is that of a Latin patriarch, and, consequently, not older than the 12th century. The accompanying letters are often found in similar cases, as, for instance, in the 12th century monastery of Kasr Hajlah in the Jordan Valley.

Mr. Bliss's report on his excavations shows how much is to be found by digging in Palestine. Unfortunately, the indications of date at Tell Hesi are at present very meagre, but it cannot be doubted that the town existed in the times preceding the captivity. The most distinctive indications as yet are a wall showing the usual features of the Byzantine masonry of the fifth century A.D., a Greek inscription, not very early, but found low down, and a Hebrew or Aramaic jar text, which at earliest is of the seventh or eighth century B.C. The fragments (p. 109) described as "Amorite pottery," bear marks which resemble Hebrew or Aramaic letters in some cases of late date (about the second or third centuries B.C.), though a few may be older; but as the Phœnician alphabet is not supposed to have been invented till after 1400 B.C., it seems clear that these remains cannot be dated very early, even in the earliest examples, nor unfortunately do the Egyptian scarabs give very clear indications of date.

P. 115. I am unable to find in any of the published Tell Amarna letters, or elsewhere, any indication of the use of cuneiform in Egypt. The supposed "waste scraps of the cuneiform: scribe who wrote answers to the celebrated tablets from Babylonia," are not stated to be of unbaked clay, and if unbaked would hardly have lasted 2300 years. If they are baked they would not be "waste scraps," but rather fragments of the letters already known. King Dusratta in writing to Amenophis III

speaks of the reply as being on "papyrus," and no doubt in Egyptian characters as are the dockets on the letters received. These letters also show that interpreters were sent to Egypt to decipher and explain them, since neither character nor language were familiar to Egyptians. None are written, as far as known, by Egyptians, and it seems that Egyptians were also sent to the Asiatic princes to explain the letters sent in return.

P. 164. The fragment of inscription from Rukhleh seems to be new. Waddington gives two (2557 C and D), and I copied a third one in 1873. One of those first known has the date 1st October 82 A.D. (404 of the Seleucidæ), being one of the best indications of the dates of these Hermon Temples.

V.

MURRAY'S GUIDE.—PROPOSED IDENTIFICATIONS.

In the new "Murray's Guide" there is a list of "Identifications suggested for the first time," which should be regarded with caution. There are 15 in all, as follows:—

1. *Mahanaim* at *es Salt*. In Heth and Moab I pointed out, nine years ago, that this was the vicinity in which to seek; but the identification with *Mukhmah*, N.E. of Es Salt, has escaped the author's notice.

2. *Mizpah Galeed* at *Sâf*. This I suggested some time ago, and it appears with a query (which I think perhaps not necessary) in "Names and Places," p. 131. See "Heth and Moab," New Edition, p. 181.

3. *Ramoth Gilead* at *'Ajlun* seems to me less probable than the proposed site at *Reimân*.

4. *Kattath* at *Khashâsh* is objectionable because the two names do not present a letter in common.

5. *Misheal* at *Rushmia* is not possible topographically, and the names have nothing in common. I regard my proposed identification at *M'aisleh* as more probable.

6. *Dabbasheth* is probably the present *Dabsheh*. The name *Zebdah* has nothing in common with the Hebrew, and the site appears not to fit.

7. *Ittah Kazin* at *Kefr Kenna* is not a new suggestion at all; and the word *Ittah* only means "as far as." *Kazin* should in Arabic appear as *Kadîn* not as *Kenna*, which is written with *Kaf* and not with *Koph*. On account of these objections the old proposal has been dropped, and now reappears as a new one.

8. *Remmon Methoor Neah* means "Rimmon extending to Neah." It is difficult to understand how this can be regarded as a new identification. *Neah* is unknown, and *Rimmon* has always been placed at *Rummaneh*.

9. *Hannathon* at *el Khalladiyeh* is quite impossible topographically, and only the first letter is common to the two words. No difficulty arises in the usual identification of *Hannathon* at *Kefr 'Andn*.

10. *Valley of Jiphtah-el* at *W. el Melek* is much too far south. The names have no connection.

11. *Bethsaida* at *el Mes'aidieh* I proposed with hesitation some time ago. The idea is, therefore, not new ; but further consideration induced me to look for the true site further north.

12. *Beten* at *Tibuin* is inappropriate topographically, and the argument which places *Beten* at *el Baneh* is overlooked by the author.

13. *Helkath* at *Yerka* is also not new. Vandevelde proposed it a long time ago, and it appears in "Names and Places," p. 84, with a query.

14. *Achshaph* at *Kala't esh Shukif* is not satisfactory as regards philology, since the *Caph* and the *Qaf* are confused. The site also is a Crusading Castle ("Castle of the Cliff," as the name implies) : the position is not that in which *Achshaph* can be supposed to have lain, and the identification which I proposed at *Kefr Yasif* seems to me more probable.

15. *Janoah* at *Huntn* is not in any way to be preferred to the old identification at *Yanith* which presents exactly the Hebrew word, whereas *Huntn* has no connection at all with the Hebrew root.

It would seem, therefore, that out of these 15 new identifications there is not one of any real value. Several of the proposals introduce great confusion into the topography, and in a third of the cases the proposals are not new, while several others suggest that the author is not familiar with the words in the original languages and characters.

ESSAYS ON THE SECTS AND NATIONALITIES OF SYRIA AND PALESTINE.

(Continued from April "Quarterly Statement," p. 153.)

THE MARONITES.

By FREDERICK JONES BLISS, B.A.

IV.

THE RITUAL.

The Maronite service books contain two languages, the Syriac and the Arabic. In general, it may be said that the portions relating to the direct worship of God are in Syriac, and those looking towards the edification of the people are in Arabic. For example, the mass, the seven daily hours of prayer, and the funeral services are in Syriac, while the rites of baptism and marriage are largely in Arabic, including some of the prayers. The scriptures are always in the people's language. The Arabic, however, is written in the Syriac character, and spoken of as *Karshuni*. Some parts of the ritual are chanted to tunes containing minor intervals, melancholy yet pleasing in effect. In churches which do not have regular singers, the men and boys often join in the chanting.