

WILHELM LAGUS: A PIONEER OF CUNEIFORM RESEARCH IN FINLAND

Tapani Harviainen

Jakob Johan Wilhelm Lagus (1821–1909) was Professor of Oriental Literature (i.e. Semitic studies) at the University of Helsinki in 1857–1866; later he served his University as Professor of Greek Literature (1866–1886) and Rector of the University (1878–1884).¹

Lagus matriculated at the University of Helsinki in 1839 and after studies in Arabic, Hebrew, history, literature and aesthetics he took his M.A. degree in 1844. After two years he was named *Dozent* of Greek Literature. In 1850–1854 Lagus travelled in the Crimea, Athens and Vienna conducting studies of the so-called Scythian antiquities, Turkish, modern Greek and Arabic.

1. PROFESSOR OF ORIENTAL LITERATURE

For the Professorship of Oriental Literature, which after Georg August Wallin's death in 1852 was vacant, Lagus published a Latin dissertation *Seïd Locmani ex libro Turcico qui Oghuzname inscribitur excerpta* (52 + 16 pages) in 1854; it remained his only output in the field of Turkish studies.

Linguarum orientalium professio, also known by the names *linguarum sacrarum professio* and *linguarum professio* was established at the first university in Finland, Academia Aboensis, in the city of Turku (Åbo in Swedish, Aboa in Latin) among the eleven first professorships in 1640. Originally Hebrew, other Semitic languages and Greek were included in the *professio*; in 1811 Greek was detached to enjoy an independent position as the chair of Greek Literature and in 1852–1856 Hebrew was located in the Faculty of Theology. Instead of Lagus, A. H. Kellgren was named Professor of Oriental Literature in 1854. However, Kellgren died only two years later, and Lagus received the professorship in 1857.

The instruction of Lagus consisted of courses in the principal languages of the chair in that period, i.e. Arabic, Persian and Turkish, selected texts in these languages, history of Asian cultures and comparative linguistics.

¹ For his life and activities, see Karttunen 1997, Aalto 1971: 41–45, 1980: 87–92, and Carpelan & Tuder 1925: 506–509.

2. “A COURSE IN THE ARABIC LANGUAGE”

Lagus’ interest in Semitic studies continued throughout his later career,² and his *magnum opus* in Swedish *Lärokurs i Arabiska Språket till Universitets-Ungdomens tjänst* (“A Course in the Arabic Language to be Employed by the University Youth”) appeared in Helsinki in three volumes in 1869, 1874 and 1878.³ The work was based on the *Grammatica critica linguae Arabicae* by Heinrich Ewald.⁴ Since it was also intended for private studies, a chrestomathy and vocabulary were necessary, too. The etymological viewpoint enjoyed special attention in the work. By modern standards, the complicated typography with a great number of different writing systems looks confusing. Simultaneously, however, it conceals a pedagogical aid for the student: while the grammar contains 376 pages, only 110 pages printed in the biggest type were intended to be “swotted up”;⁵ the rest was to be learned in connection with the numerous examples in the grammar, the texts in the chrestomathy and the vocabulary.

The Course by Lagus was written in Swedish; nevertheless, it did not come into use at the universities in Sweden, to say nothing about other Scandinavian countries in which a study book in Swedish would have been very usable. No second edition appeared in Finland, either. Obviously the fashion in the field of Oriental studies offers an explanation of Lagus’ failure: after his time it turned from Arabic, Persian and Turkish to Syriac, Aramaic, Hebrew, Assyriology and the archaeology of the Near East, not only in Finland and Scandinavia but also at Central European universities. A new boom of Arabic studies did not take place until the 1960s and 1970s.⁶

² In contrast, Lagus published nothing of Greek themes during his professorship of Greek Literature.

³ The first volume consists of two parts *Arabisk och allmän Semitisk Språkhistorie* (“Arabic and a General History of Semitic Languages”; IX + 43 pages) and *Arabisk Grammatik* (“An Arabic Grammar”; IV + 399 pages); the second volume is *Arabisk Krestomati* (“An Arabic Chrestomathy”; III + 117 pages) and the third one *Arabisk Ordbok* (“An Arabic Vocabulary”; 239 pages); in total 814 pages. According to the introduction by Lagus, his series was intended to serve the most recent demands of the research and “the needs of our students”; simultaneously it was a reaction to the attacks on the Chair of Oriental Literature which was accused of being “a useless luxury article at our University”.

⁴ Ewald 1831–1833. According to Lagus (1869: VI) the employment of the Arabic grammarian tradition and Silvestre de Sacy’s works based on this would imply a return to the Middle Ages, from research to Scholasticism.

⁵ Of these, 40 pages (plus 20 pages of paradigms) deal with the morphology and 50 pages with syntax. In contrast, Ewald’s *Grammatica* contains only few examples but a great number of rules to be memorized.

⁶ The first textbook of Arabic in Finnish, *Arabiaa ilman kyyneliä – Nykyarabian oppikirja* (“Arabic without Tears – a Text Book of Modern Arabic”) was published by Professor Jussi Aro in 1980.

3. TURANIAN-FINNISH AFFINITY OF CUNEIFORM LANGUAGES

A look at Lagus' bibliography⁷ indicates clearly that a new branch of Middle Eastern studies, i.e. the research of the cuneiform texts, was the central theme of his scholarly interest during fifteen years in 1861–1876.⁸

Lagus did not study cuneiform or languages written in it; in this sense he was no Assyriologist. In contrast, he attended the achievements of this research by actively following the publications on cuneiform in journals and monographs, and in his Swedish articles he reviewed the topics which seemed to be of interest for the culturally oriented audience in Finland and Scandinavia. In this respect Lagus can be endowed with the honour of being a pioneer of cuneiform studies in Finland and a predecessor of the meritorious traditions of this research in our country.

In the following review I summarise the articles written by Lagus (see his bibliography at the end of the article) regarding the research of Assyriology in his era. As a consequence, the following references to the great scholars of early Assyriology are based on Lagus' texts, not on their original publications.

In Persia and Mesopotamia the discoveries of Rawlinson, Botta and Layard in the 1830s and 1840s had revealed a great number of formerly unknown antiquities written in cuneiform scripts. The Persian text in the Bisitun (Behistun) inscription of King Darius I offered an initial key for the decipherment of cuneiform in the same decades (see the works of Grotefend, Rawlinson, Norris, Hincks, Oppert, etc.). The same principles were applied to the texts found in Mesopotamia which led to a breakthrough in the 1850s and 1860s (especially by Rawlinson, Oppert, Hincks, Smith, etc.). Besides Persian and Semitic Akkadian (originally called "Assyrian") the texts included other languages that could be classified as neither Indo-European, Semitic nor Hamitic. In the 1850s two of these languages, nowadays called Elamite⁹ and Sumerian¹⁰, were interpreted by Niels Ludwig Westergaard, Henry Rawlinson and Edwin Norris to be related to the Scythian or Turanian languages. In that period these terms were employed to refer to a rather vaguely defined group of languages which roughly corresponded to the notion of the Altaic family,¹¹ i.e. Turkic, Finno-Ugric and Mongolian languages, in which even Tungusic, the Gypsy language(s), Manchu and Basque¹² could be included. It is important to observe the fact that the affinity was not introduced by Turkish, Finnish or Hungarian scholars inspired

⁷ Carpelan & Tudér 1925: 507–509 and Karttunen 1997: 69–77.

⁸ Numismatics and the history of students, professors and other prominent persons were other favourite topics of Lagus, see Carpelan & Tudér 1925: 507–509 and Karttunen 1997: 69–77.

⁹ Originally called "Median" among the early researchers.

¹⁰ Originally called "Akkadian" by several scholars; the name "Sumerian" was coined by Oppert.

¹¹ Called by Rask and Lönnrot the Scythian, by Castrén the Altaic, by Schott the Finno-Tatarian and by Bunsen and M. Müller the Turanian language group (Lagus 1861: 114).

¹² Cf. *La langue Basque et les idioms de l'Oural* by De Charency (Paris 1862), referred to by Lagus 1864: 24–25.

by nationalistic attitudes; it was a result based on linguistic observations made by leading experts in this field of research.

In Finland in the same decades the linguistic journeys of exploration of Matthias Alexander Castrén and his followers as well as the publication of the national epos *Kalevala* had awakened an extensive interest in questions of ethnic and linguistic relations with other peoples in Europe and Asia. Thus it is self-evident that Lagus, Professor of Oriental Literature, tried to delve into the newly introduced branch of oriental research which up till that moment “even the most courageous imaginative faculty had not been able to put in a smallest connection with the wanderings of our unforgettable fellow countryman [i.e. Castrén]”.¹³

In 1861 Lagus published a public lecture “Kilskriften och Finnarne” (“Cuneiform Writing and Finns”) in which he referred to the achievements of Grotefend, Burnouf, Lassen, Benfey, De Saulcy, Westergaard, Rawlinson, Hincks and Norris. Among them Westergaard had been the first scholar to pronounce in 1844 the conclusion that the second language of the Bisitun text “seems to be more in agreement with the nature of the Scythian languages than that of other languages”.¹⁴ Other researchers referred to, Rawlinson, De Saulcy, Norris and Oppert, in particular, followed his footsteps. As evidence offered by them Lagus enumerates the employment of pronominal and other suffixes, the use of postpositions instead of prepositions, resemblances in the general system of declension, comparison, conjugations and endings as well as in the sound system of words in its entirety.¹⁵

According to Lagus’ report, Jules Oppert on his part was the first scholar to delve into the clay tablets found in the palace of king Sardanapal. These documents, written in cuneiform too, contain linguistic treatises, vocabularies etc. that deal with two languages, i.e., a Scythian language and Assyrian [i.e. Akkadian, TH]. The texts indicate that another civilisation preceded “the Assyrians” and cuneiform writing was invented in the midst of that. Without defining his written source (“in a number of journal articles”) Lagus quotes Oppert:

After finding its original form [i.e. the principles of the syllabic writing, TH], I have been able to complete the decipherment of the Tatarian or

¹³ Lagus 1861: 111. The affinity between Sumerian, Elamite and the so-called Altaic languages has also aroused the interest of my friend, Professor Simo Parpola, whom I wish to congratulate on his 65th birthday in the form of this small article.

¹⁴ Lagus 1861: 113–114.

¹⁵ “I wish to quote a number of readily understandable proofs. De Saulcy compares the cuneiform *-dena* with the Turkish ablative suffix *-den* (Finnish *ta, tä* in the suffix *-lta, -ltä*); possessive suffix of the cuneiform *-maz* with Turkish *-muz* ‘our’ (in Mordvin *mek* ‘our’, *mis* ‘us’; in Finnish *-mme*); cuneiform *hagruo* and Mongolian *agar* ‘whole creation, universe’; cuneiform *akuk* (*an-kik?*) and Turkish *kük, gök* ‘sky’ (Hungarian *ég* ‘sky’); cuneiform *habis, hapis* or *hapisyn* and Turkish *hep, hepisy* ‘all’; cuneiform *kutisch* ‘fetched, collected’ and the Turkish base *ghetur*; cuneiform *tanayti* and Turkish *tany(mak)* ‘to know’ (Hungarian *tanu-it*, Finnish *tunnen, [tun]-tea*)” (Lagus 1861: 114). Numerous comparisons with the vocabulary of Turkish, Lappish, Hungarian, etc., obviously invented by Lagus himself (e.g. 1861: 127–129, or 1864: 162–163), do not offer a very convincing picture of his knowledge of etymological studies.

Turanian cuneiform system which for our knowledge of Asia in the future will receive a weight and significance that we have been even far from dreaming of. [...]. The people which invented the cuneiform writing are a part of the extensive Uralic branch. [...]. The seniority of the Scythian style (before all other styles) can be substantiated by most satisfactory means. The language in itself does resemble neither the Arian nor the Semitic but – as Norris has realised – the Uralic idiom in Russia. [...]. Though I cannot agree with all the comparisons made by the English scholar [i.e. Norris, TH], I acknowledge his principle and do repeat that it is in Russia, this side of the Ural, where we have to search for the descendants of the people which the Persian kings considered to be worth of the glory to have their language immortalised on the rocks in Bisitun and Ectabana.¹⁶

As a seal on these statements Lagus adds: “Indeed, words often are only words; seldom they are facts hard as stone. Here it is the case.”¹⁷

Here (and in other articles, too) Lagus, in spite of his enthusiasm, paid attention to contrary opinions also presented in Finland, tried to keep a critical mind and to avoid a too straightforward conviction by himself or his audience; in several instances he warns his readers against “listening to the siren voices of the similarities of sounds too willingly”. Similarly it is an error to consider that the Finnish tongues present the closest counterpart of the recently discovered language; Turkish (Turkic) dialects and Mongolian play an important role in the search for proofs. Oppert concludes that the language of the clay syllabaries of Sardanapal [i.e. Sumerian, TH] most strongly inclines to Finnish but that the Achaemenid version of the language inclines to the Tatarian idiom. Thus he calls the first one Kasdo-Scythian and the second Medo-Scythian. The existence of Turanian or Finnish-Tatarian literature and Turanian/Finnish-Tatarian people or culture are postulates of these discoveries, Lagus concludes.¹⁸

Further, Lagus referred to the Hebrew term *Kasdim*, Chaldeans, the well-known astrologers, prognosticators and sorcerers whom M. Niebuhr and Oppert considered to be Turanians. Chaldeans and other Scythians, whose southernmost settlements were located in Mesopotamia, transmitted parts of their magic and mysterious wisdom to other inhabitants of those regions; at the same time their language(s) left vestiges in the Middle East. Numerous linguistic features have been pinpointed by earlier scholars which indicate the affinity of Finnish and Hungarian to Hebrew; formerly these links were interpreted to testify in favour of a genetic relationship.¹⁹ However, Lagus wrote, it is more probable that the speakers of Hebrew had borrowed the structural, morphological and lexical parallels from the Turanian Chaldeans, Scythians and Elamites. Because of these loans the Chaldean language

¹⁶ Lagus 1861: 115–116.

¹⁷ Lagus 1861: 115–116.

¹⁸ Lagus 1861: 118–122.

¹⁹ For the various types of similarities maintained to exist between Finnish, Hungarian, other Finno-Ugric languages and Hebrew (and Aramaic), see Lagus 1861: 123–124 and notes 17 and 18, and Harviainen 2005/2006.

caused difficulties to students with a Semitic native language as told in the Old Testament!²⁰

The great achievements of the Turanian peoples in the spiritual fields of astrology, prognosis, star cults, shamanism, *Kalevala* and other epic poetry abolish “the insolent *fetwa*” expressed by Ernest Renan who does not accept the Turanian theory: “la race touranienne (tartare) n’a couru le monde que pour détruire.” In this respect, however, Lagus admits that the lack of literary traditions among the Finno-Ugric peoples constitutes “the most infirm point in the Turanian question”.²¹

Having lost their leading position in the Middle East to the Semitic peoples, the Scythians and other Turanians retreated to their central regions east of the Persian Gulf and Caspian Sea where they embraced nomadic civilisation. In part they moved to the steppes of Turan in Eastern Europe and Western and Central Asia whence they furiously under various designations like Huns, Turks and Mongols broke out during the period of the Great Migration – giving grounds for the judgement of Ernest Renan. Another group made its way to the most remote “silent snow fields” in the North to wait for their awakening from the winter sleep of a bear.²²

In his subsequent article “Om Kilskriften och Finnarne” (“On the Cuneiform Writing and Finns”, 1863), Lagus is glad to announce that “a completely competent judge” now has expressed his opinion in support of the Turanian origin of the cuneiform writings. He refers to the review of Ménant’s book *Les écritures cunéiformes* (1860) by Theodor Bentley²³ who – according to Lagus – writes “dass wir vielmehr nur eine der sogenannten turanischen Sprachen in diesen Inschriften vor uns haben”. At that time Lagus was waiting for a statement of Ewald, his great idol, who in 1862 had started studies of the Turanian languages on the basis of Castrén’s previous achievements.

In his next reports in 1864a and 1870 Lagus rejoiced at the progress of the decipherment of the cuneiform script and the publication of grammar books of Old Persian by Fr. Spiegel and Assyrian [i.e. Akkadian] by Oppert which have established these studies on a firm basis and refuted the arrogant but non-scholarly critic; Holtzmann is mentioned by him as the principal opponent whose arguments Oppert has disproved, however.²⁴ A recent series of important evidence was offered by A. D. Mordtmann who in his *Erklärung der Keilinschriften zweiter Gattung*,²⁵ dealing with the second [i.e. Elamite, TH] text of the Bisitun inscription, concluded:

²⁰ Lagus 1861: 126–127.

²¹ Lagus 1861: 127–131.

²² Here Lagus (1861: 133) refers to the Finnish national awakening which enjoyed a rapid progress in the 1860s–1880s, in particular. In part, the great interest of Lagus in Elamite-Sumerian-Finnic connections was incited by this nationalistic spirit for whose support a great past was extremely welcome.

²³ Published in *Orient und Occident*, I, 3 (Göttingen 1861).

²⁴ In an apparently humoristic tone the Jewish background of Oppert was mentioned among the critical arguments by Holtzmann (Lagus 1864a: 158).

²⁵ Mordtmann 1862.

“Was das Neupersische für die Keilschrift erster Gattung leistet, das leistet das Türkische für die Keilschrift zweiter Gattung.”²⁶ This conclusion was offered by previous scholars, too, while Oppert considered the Casdo-Scythian [i.e. Sumerian, TH] to be much closer to the Uralic idiom and Hungarian in particular. In 1870 Lagus refers again to a new testimony, *Über Wesen und Aufgabe der Sprachwissenschaft* by Jülg,²⁷ according to whom an original picture writing invented by a Scythian or Turanian people preceded the “Assyrian” cuneiform script; thus it is impossible that the inventors had been speakers of a Semitic language: “Die Erfindung der Schreibkunst verdanken wir daher höchst wahrscheinlich einem turanischen, weder einem arischen noch semitischen Volke.”²⁸

In 1873 Fr. Lenormant, a student of Oppert, published in Paris his great *Études Accadiennes* which was a complete grammar of the “Akkadian” [i.e. Sumerian, TH] language. Lagus reviewed this work thoroughly in *Öfversigt* XV the same year. In the first and last paragraphs Lagus was able to state that the book of Lenormant in every respect shared his opinion that the “Akkadian” language, which recently was renamed Sumerian by Oppert, was a member of the Turanian family; not a single one of the statements of Lenormant concerning the “Akkadian” language was in conflict with the reviews and appraisals expressed by Lagus in his first article in 1861.

According to Lenormant the affinity could be corroborated on the level of the grammar where no radical novelties were to be expected in the future. However, since the phonetic interpretation of the syllabic signs still was problematic, the completion of a lexicon was a more complex task.²⁹ For the most peculiar features of the morphology, even the “Akkadian” prefix (*pro* suffix) position of the subject pronoun in active verbs etc., the Turanian languages offer counterparts. Phonetic changes (“Lautverschiebungen”) between various languages of the family still were in particular need of further elaboration. Nevertheless, “once when studied well, in the comparative philology of the agglutinative tongues in the extensive Turanian family, Akkadian will receive a similar role which Sanskrit of the Vedas has among

²⁶ Lagus 1864a: 161–163; Lagus (*idem*: 163–164) criticized Mordtmann for comparisons solely with the Ottoman Turkish while other Turkish [i.e. Turkic] dialects and languages would offer purer variants of a genuine Turanian. In 1864b: 26–31 Lagus also criticizes the former research of Finnish and Hungarian scholars for a very limited interest to Ugric, Uralic or Turanic studies; similarly the comparison with Turkish has been neglected (since Turkology demands knowledge of Arabic and Persian!), and under the heading of Turkish the Central and Eastern Turkish [Turkic] languages inclusive of Tatar have remained without sufficient attention.

²⁷ Jülg 1868.

²⁸ Jülg 1868: 34 quoted by Lagus 1870: 10.

²⁹ Thus the various lexical references to Basque, Hungarian, Finnish, Votyak, Zyrian-Komi, Permian, Cheremiss, Mordvin etc. presented e.g. by Sayce in his article “On an Accadian Seal” (*Journal of Philology* 1870) were not always reliable (Lagus 1873: 84–85).

the Aryan”.³⁰ In this consideration the Turanian family solely refers to its Northern branch, i.e., the Finno-Ugric languages.³¹

In the same review (1873) Lagus gives a description of the whole grammar starting with the phonetics, vowel harmony and principles of word structure. Various parts of speech are presented starting from nouns and their case endings via numerals and pronouns to verbs and their “genera verbi”; moods and tenses are also described by an extensive paradigm of the verb *se* “to give”; postpositions, prepositions and other particles as well as notes of syntax complete the description. In fact this summary could be designated the earliest grammar of Sumerian written in Swedish.

Lagus’ last contribution to cuneiform studies appeared in 1876; it is a review of *La magie chez les Chaldéens* by Fr. Lenormant.³² First Lagus is able to tell that the German Eberhard Schrader had joined the proponents of the most probable Turkish-Tatarian or Ural-Altai affinity of Sumerian. The extensive new book *La langue primitive de la Chaldée et les idiomes Touraniens* by Lenormant³³ was also welcomed by Lagus as a reliable refutation of the critique presented by the proponents of an Aryan origin of Elamite and/or Sumerian and those who still considered the decipherment of cuneiform totally erroneous.³⁴

The article mainly deals with the magical texts written in Sumerian, their cultural contacts with the Turanian peoples and the counterparts in their folklore and magic. In Lenormant’s view these connections were obvious and the innate dissimilarity of the Egyptian magic corroborated this view. However, Lagus notes the limited familiarity of Lenormant with the mythology of the Central Asian Turkic peoples; as for the ancient Finnish magic, Lenormant was aware of the *Kalevala* epics in the French translation by Léouzou-Leduc and he had read studies of mythology by Ganander, Castrén, Lönnrot, etc. which he quoted in his work. However, a great number of other themes, derived, e.g., from shamanistic ideas, could be added from these sources in favour of his reasoning. All these observations of creative cultural and spiritual ability reduce the value of the criticism which has been directed by Ernst Renan and others towards the imaginary destructive nature of the Turanian peoples.

In the same volume XVIII of *Öfversigt*, Lagus’ last article is followed by another article “Akkadiskan (Sumeriskan) och de Altaiska språken” (“Akkadian / Sumerian

³⁰ Quoted in Swedish in Lagus 1873: 85.

³¹ According to Lagus (1873: 85, 95) this is also the view of Max Müller. See also Müller 1855: 86–95, 114–123.

³² Lenormant 1874.

³³ Lenormant 1875.

³⁴ Lagus does not mention any names of his opponents in Finland; however, August Ahlqvist, Professor of Finnish Language and Literature in 1863–1888 and a permanent antagonist of Lagus, was evidently the leading person of this group. For Ahlqvist, see Aalto 1971: 88–91.

and the Altaic languages”) by Otto Donner (1876: 27–41).³⁵ Donner’s contribution is a careful analysis of the Sumerian studies of Lenormant and Schrader augmented with serious attempts to define the constant phonetic and morphological relations between Sumerian and Turanian languages. In the article Donner defends the affinity of Sumerian to the Turanian languages in the same tone as Lagus; according to him Ostyak offers the closest counterparts of Sumerian and “Median” (Elamite) among the Finno-Ugric languages.

However, six years later in 1882 Donner reviewed Oppert’s *Le peuple et la langue des Mèdes* (1879) in *Öfversigt* XXIV (1882: 5–24). In the same article he referred to the new readings of Sumerian cuneiform signs presented by Paul Haupt in particular and concluded that on the basis of this radical change in the interpretation of Sumerian and Elamite the earlier attempts to argue in favour of an affinity between these and the Altaic languages had lost their reliability. In Donner’s view both Sumerian and Elamite were isolated languages.

A survey of the Sumerian language was read by Haupt at the Fifth Congress of Orientalists in Berlin in September 1881; in 1883 this lecture was published³⁶ supplemented with a number of texts and an appendix by Otto Donner. In the appendix Donner dealt with the affinity of Sumerian to Ural-Altaic languages and his conclusions were in the negative.

After these statements the Turanian affinity commenced to become a part of the history of research instead of being a focus of the actual discussion of the affinities of Sumerian and Elamite. Up till now no candidate has been granted the position of a true member of their families and because of the lack of joint vocabulary the Altaic hypothesis has also lost its reliability.

One more melancholy note. In his last cuneiform article Lagus blames Finnish scholars for inactivity in the participation in the Turanian studies. He writes that a number of them could combine their native knowledge of “the sounds and laws” of Finnish with studies of general history, general linguistics, Turanian (especially Turkic), and Semitic languages; thus they would not have to wait for everything in this field “from a foreigner”. At the time, however, Lagus is glad to inform his audience that in December 1874 a young Finnish philologist has travelled to Paris to start cuneiform studies there with Oppert; in his letter quoted by Lagus, Oppert tells of the excellent progress of this gentleman.³⁷

Lagus does not mention the name of the young student of Sumerian; it is evident that he refers to Karl Fredrik Eneberg (1841–1876) who was to become the first Finnish Assyriologist.³⁸ In 1874 he travelled from Paris to Mosul in order

³⁵ Extraordinary Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Indo-European Philology, 1875–1905, see Aalto 1971: 72–76.

³⁶ Haupt 1883.

³⁷ Lagus 1876: 2–3.

³⁸ Already in 1864 Lagus had expressed his wish to find “a young philologically qualified Finn, who *pro gloria patriae*, would go to the Master [i.e. Oppert, TH] to assist him and to be initiated

to participate in the excavations led by the British Assyriologist George Smith. Waiting for Smith in Mosul Eneberg died under unclear circumstances. Therefore, Knut Tallqvist (1865–1949, Professor of Oriental Literature, 1899–1933) was to be the first specialist of Assyriology in Finland.³⁹

4. PUBLICATIONS BY WILHELM LAGUS WITH REFERENCE TO CUNEIFORM STUDIES

1861. Kilskriften och Finnarne. *Litteraturblad för allmän medborgerlig bildning* 15 (“Journal of Literature for General Civic Instruction”): 111–133.
1863. Om Kilskriften och Finnarne. *Öfversigt af Finska Vetenskaps-Societetens förhandlingar – Comptes-rendus des séances de Societas Scientiarum Fennica* 5: 274–275. Helsingfors.
- 1864a. Mera kilskrift. *Öfversigt af ...* 6: 153–164.
- 1864b. Om och i anledning af Vambéryrs resor. *Öfversigt af ...* 7: 23–33.
- 1864c. Iliaden och Assyrien. *Öfversigt af ...* 7: 116–129.
1870. Resultat i kilskriftsforskningen. *Öfversigt af ...* 12 (1869–1870): 7–10.
1872. Finnarne i förhållande till Indogermanerne, enligt J.G. Cuno. *Öfversigt af ...* 14 (1871–1872): 59–63.
1873. I kilskriftsfrågan. Anmälan af hr Fr. Lenormants “Études Accadiennes.” Paris 1873. *Öfversigt af ...* 15 (1872–1873): 83–98.
1876. Ännu en gång i Kilskriftsfrågan. Anmälan af hr Lenormants “La magie chez les Chaldéens.” Paris 1874. *Öfversigt af ...* 18 (1875–1876): 1–26.

by him in the subject” (Lagus 1864a: 160–161, footnote). In 1870 he deplors the indifference of “our younger Orientalist and *Fennomaner* [i.e. passionate proponents of the Finnish-speaking national culture, TH] among whom no one has wanted to penetrate into this study which from both the patriotic and scholarly viewpoint is equally rewarding” (Lagus 1870: 9). For Eneberg, see Kantokorpi 1982 and Aro & Mattila 2007: 7–9.

³⁹ For Tallqvist, see Aalto 1971: 50–54, and Aro & Mattila 2007: 9–11.