

included in that strophe must take account of the law which has been ascertained. But it is necessary to be very careful. Duhm himself, who seems to be an adherent of what Dr. Driver¹ calls Professor Briggs' system of measurement by *accents* or rhythmical beats, does not expect that all his conclusions in this sphere will be accepted. One is inclined to think that Dr. Driver's remark on the serious objection to Bickell's theory, arising from the numerous alterations in the text of the metrical licences it requires, applies in some measure to the modified form adopted by Professor Briggs. But his articles in *Hebraica* and Duhm's procedure here are both worthy of study.

Most of us fall an easy prey to the seductions of an apt phrase. Duhm renders a real service by warning us against the seductions of that useful title which has been given to the Psalter, 'The Hymn-Book of the Congregation.' It is a useful title. It has relieved many minds from the ethical difficulty of believing that certain Psalms were the expression of an individual's feelings towards his enemies. But there was no congregation, in our modern sense of the word, at the temple service. When laymen took part in sacrificial worship they were not provided with voluminous hymn-books. Many of the Psalms were probably never sung at the temple. Many were not intended to be sung at all. 'It is therefore more correct to say that those who arranged and published the collection proposed to themselves to make a book which should promote the religious life of the people, a book supplying indeed the means of meeting certain requirements of the temple ritual (the Vow Songs), but especially destined to serve as a book of devotion and of reading, keeping the people in the discipline of the prescribed religion, stirring them up to study and follow the law. And this was the view of the author of the prologue, Ps 1.'²

Duhm's *Die Psalmen* will awaken the response for which he asks in the closing words of his Preface: 'In this work also I have had chiefly at heart the History of Religion. I reckon on readers who perceive that true objectivity consists, not in the adherence to what is ancient or to the opinions which prevail at present, not in "circumspect" rejection of new hypotheses, but in

¹ *Literature of the O. T.*, p. 362.

² P. xxiv.

incessant striving after that truth which is usually obscure and frequently heterogeneous.'

JOHN TAYLOR.

Winchcombe.

Among the Periodicals.

The Hittite Inscriptions.

IN view of the controversy on this subject carried on by Professors Jensen and Hommel in *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*, it will be of interest to our readers to have some account of the attitude assumed by one whose competency to pronounce a judgment will be conceded by both parties—namely, PROFESSOR ZIMMERN. In the *Z.D.M.G.* (liii. pp. 168 ff.) the latter reviews Jensen's *Hittiter und Armenier*, and also makes reference to some of his more recent contributions to the solution of the Hittite problem, although he has been unable to take account (owing to the date of the publication of the *Z.D.M.G.*) of the articles in *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*, with the exception of that contributed by Jensen to the April number, to which there are some references in footnotes.

Zimmern considers that up till the time of the publication of Jensen's book no serious attempt had been made to meet the positions contended for by Jensen in his original article in the *Z.D.M.G.* of 1894. 'The objections founded upon by a Sayce or a Halévy were so superficial that Jensen was quite right to pass them over in the way he did in his Preface.' Since then Messerschmidt's criticism has appeared, but of this, too, Zimmern entertains anything but a high idea. Nor does he content himself with a vague condemnation, but, as readers of the *Z.D.M.G.* may discover for themselves, instances arguments and conclusions of Messerschmidt which show that he has worked his way very slightly into the inscriptions. Zimmern, who is perfectly discriminating and impartial in his criticism, makes an important confession at the outset. For a long time, he tells us, he was rather sceptical about Jensen's Hittite investigations. A mere surface reading of the original article, and even of the work *Hittiter und Armenier*, left upon his mind at most the impression 'it is possible' but not 'it is certain.' Even the specimens of translation put forward by Jensen

did not, by the mere reading of them, carry conviction to his mind. *But from the moment when he turned to the inscriptions themselves and examined Jensen's views alongside of these, he recognized, with growing certainty, that in Jensen's deciphering work one has to do with incontestable facts discovered by him, and not with mere possibilities, of a more or less certain character.*

Zimmern proceeds to ask and to answer three questions:—

1. Has Jensen really discovered the *meaning* of the inscriptions? From the circumstances of the case, it is of course quite conceivable that one might get at the contents of a Hittite inscription without being able to say what was the *pronunciation* of a single one of the signs employed. This last is a distinct question altogether, to which we will return presently. Well, Zimmern brings forward instances where he considers Jensen to have reached results as to the interpretation of certain signs, which may be said to be now out of the region of controversy. Zimmern's exposition is rendered perfectly clear by the reproduction of the Hittite symbols, a practice which unfortunately we cannot follow here. The first instance he takes is that of a group of signs which Jensen reads as the name and title of a king (in the nominative), followed by a group which is taken to be the name and title of the king's father (in the genitive), which, again, is followed by a symbol which is interpreted as 'son.' The result reached in this instance Zimmern cannot think will be long in gaining universal adoption. Not less worthy of acceptance he considers the conclusions of Jensen regarding the meaning of the hand and fist hieroglyphs, conclusions reached in the first instance from the texts themselves, but afterwards strikingly confirmed by the legends accompanying the figures of gods at Boghazköi. But, admitting the hand (and foot) symbols to be god hieroglyphs, the sense of a very large proportion of the inscriptions is practically determined. What they express will be the relation of the author of the inscriptions to the gods named in these, and the group of signs at

the beginning or the end will stand for the name and title of the particular king, the country over which he reigned, his genealogy, and the like. No doubt it is a matter of regret that we get so little historical information from the inscriptions, but it is quite illegitimate to speak of its being 'inconceivable' that in most instances their contents may be reduced to something like this: 'I am So-and-so, king of such and such a land, son of such and such a king, servant of such and such a god, minister of such and such a goddess, worshipper of such and such another god.'

2. How far has Jensen succeeded in *reading* correctly the signs? Here again, in many instances, Zimmern thinks, final results have been reached. Pre-eminent amongst these are the readings of certain groups as = *Syennesis, Kar-chemish, Hamāt, Tarsus*, yielding the phonetic values for *s, ', n, k, mi, i (k), m, t, tr*. These and similar results are confirmed by the fact that readings arrived at sometimes quite independently of one another, serve to check one another admirably, and never come into collision.

3. Is Jensen right in holding that the *language* of the 'Hittite' inscriptions is cognate to the *modern Armenian*, or rather is actually the mother of the latter? Without being an Armenian scholar, Zimmern feels himself competent to judge of the degree of certainty which attaches to those words and endings which Jensen first obtains directly from the inscriptions, and then compares with the Armenian. When these are found to tally very closely with those of a language spoken to-day in a region partially identical with that where the inscriptions were composed between 1000 and 600 B.C., when indications are not wanting that the authors of our inscriptions were of Indo-Germanic descent, and when a specially competent Armenian scholar like Brockelmann (*G.G.A.*, 1899, No. 1) has declared himself so completely in favour of Jensen's identification of Hittite with Indo-Germanic Armenian, Zimmern cannot hesitate to give his suffrage in favour of the same conclusion.

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter.