

conscious enjoyment of the Father's presence. The one is gained through the Son, the other in the Son. The one is by the Son's going away, the other by His coming back. The disciples are not to be troubled, therefore, that Jesus has to go away. It may look like breaking up their mansion—the only mansion they know or care to know. But there are many mansions. This is not really a mansion at all. The mansion cannot be till the

place has been first secured. When the place has been secured, He will come again and receive them unto Himself, making His mansion with them.

That is a suggestion: the passage is very difficult.

The word 'mansion' comes from the Vulgate. It is the same as the word 'manse.' Both are formed from *maneo*, to stay.

EDITOR.

The Undeciphered Hittite Inscriptions.

IN REPLY TO PROFESSOR SAYCE.

BY PROFESSOR P. JENSEN, PH.D., MARBURG.

IN a recent issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (December 1898, p. 115 f.), Professor Sayce published a short article on 'New Cuneiform Inscriptions,' which appears to me to fail of correctness in not a few essential points. Above all, I must enter my protest against the last line on p. 115, where he speaks of the 'still undeciphered Hittite texts,' and the concluding sentence of the article (p. 116), in which he expresses the opinion that through the new cuneiform fragments discovered in Cappadocia, written in a dialect perhaps partially non-Assyrian,—dating, as it seems, from the time of Sargon, king of Assyria, or later,—'the decipherment of the Hittite inscriptions has at last been brought within measurable distance.'

The words quoted are, on the one hand, very gratifying, containing as they do an open confession by Professor Sayce that his own attempts at deciphering the inscriptions have been fruitless. And yet up to a few years ago he considered himself as their decipherer, and was regarded in that light by not a few! As far as I know, the appearance of my first paper on the Hittite monuments marks the point of time since which Professor Sayce has offered no further remarks on the interpretation of these, and so I suppose I have the credit of having led him to acknowledge his mistake. This, too, is very gratifying.

Less gratifying, however, at least to me, is the circumstance that Professor Sayce has not pursued further the path of confession,—an unpleasant one to be sure,—and at least tried to bring himself to

confess that another has been more successful than himself. Since for a long time doubt on this point has been no longer possible, I would enter a protest on behalf of this other against Professor Sayce, and take this opportunity to put the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES in possession of the facts of the case.

Six years ago the present writer began to familiarize himself with the so-called Hittite inscriptions. In essential distinction from former attempts at decipherment, he first of all pursued the toilsome course of analysing the inscriptions, thus acting on the principle that only the Hittite inscriptions and sculptures themselves, and only the most painstaking and minute comparison of the whole of them with one another, could lay the foundation for their interpretation. This method was not fruitless. First of all he succeeded in determining their system of writing, which in its main features follows the model of the Egyptian. But in this way he was able also to recognize the main subject of almost all the inscriptions. He could perceive that they recorded nothing very wonderful, but were rather made up, at least in the main, of titles and attributes with all kinds of variations. He discovered the expressions for a considerable number of kings' names. He perceived that the bearers of these used certain expressions to indicate themselves as kings of certain lands, others to designate themselves as servants or the like of certain divinities, and others still to mark themselves as the son of such and such a one.

He identified the symbols or groups of signs for 'land,' 'I,' 'am,' 'this,' as well as for a series of boastful adjectives, etc.

He discovered, further, that the kings of Hamāt and Karkemish in Syria, of Mar'ash in the north of it, of Bor and Bulgarmaden to the west of, or lying on the north-western declivity of, the Taurus, ruled over distinct kingdoms. He perceived, with approximate certainty, that the majority of the inscriptions, including those found in the localities above-named, emanated from a period between 1000 and 500 B.C., and that consequently the inscriptions refuse their support to those who, upon the ground of their diffusion over Syria and a great part of Asia Minor, conclude that at one time there was a great empire of the Hittites extending from the Lebanon to the Ægean Sea, about the year 1400 B.C. or later.

All the above conclusions, and more, could be deduced from the inscriptions without one's being able to read a single hieroglyph.

After the present writer had succeeded in determining what expressions stood for the dominions of the kings who figure in the inscriptions of Hamāt, of Jerabis, of Mar'ash, of Bor, and of Bulgarmaden, and, further, what kind of names we must expect for these, he could go a step beyond, and read the groups of signs that stand for them. Thus he was able to read a group for Hamāt in an inscription of Hamāt, one for Karkemish in a series of inscriptions from Jerabis, in the territory or on the site of the ancient Karkemish, and one in an inscription of a late king of Cilicia, who, according to the inscription of Bulgarmaden, ruled also over the district of Karkemish. He was able to read a group for Markash or Gurgum in an inscription of Mar'ash = the ancient Markash, the capital of Gurgum; and, finally, to read groups for Cilicia and Tarsus in inscriptions of kings who must have reigned over Cilicia, with its capital Tarsus. He succeeded, too, in the early stages of his attempts at decipherment, in reading another group, which was quite sufficient of itself to prove to any unprejudiced mind that he was following the right path. In the inscriptions of Ivritz, Bulgarmaden, Bor, and Andaval, to the west of, or lying on the north-western declivity of, the Taurus, is to be found, and there only, a royal title, whose radical form consists of four signs, of which the first and the last are identical. This sign, on account of

the extraordinary frequency of its occurrence, could represent only a simple sound. The inscriptions in question emanated from kings of Cilicia. But now we happen to know that the title of the later Cilician kings was $\Sigma\upsilon\epsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\text{-}s$, having *s* for its first and also its last consonant. Hence the above-named group of signs in the so-called Hittite inscriptions was to be read *Sy(u)ennesi-s*.

The test of the correctness of our readings and implicitly for that of all the deciphering results we had reached up to this point, had now to be sought by observing whether the same signs in these name-groups had the same or similar sounds corresponding to them in the names which we read for them. But this turned out to be quite the case. Thus, the *m* of Hamāt was expressed by the same sign as that of Karkemish; the second *k* of the latter by the same sign as the second of Khilik(i)ā (Cilicia); the first and the third *s* of Syennesi-s by the same sign as the sibilant in Tars-us, etc. The test had thus succeeded completely, and the proof was thereby given that the decipherment and reading of the inscriptions had been really inaugurated.

From the name-groups that had been read with certainty, I could thus identify the signs for *m*, for a sibilant, for *r*, for *t(a)r*, etc., and could thus to a small extent read even the appellatives in the inscriptions.

And now came a surprising discovery. It was the very same evening upon which I had succeeded in reading the group for *Syennesi-s*, and immediately thereafter in connection with it the group for Tars-us, which involved the identification of the sign for a sibilant, it was that same evening that the following conclusion was reached as a consequence of the immediately preceding one. This sign for the sibilant is also the sign for the consonant of the word for 'I.' The latter then must contain a sibilant. From a group standing for the genitive of Karkemish (and from the small bilingual of the so-called 'Tarkondemos') we had deduced the pronunciation of the sign for *mi* and *me*, and '(I) am' was written in the inscriptions with this sign. Now vowels need not be written in the inscriptions, and in modern Armenian 'I' is *es*, from an older *eso*, while 'I am' is *em*, from an older *emi* or *mi*. Hence, so it struck me all at once, the so-called Hittite must be allied to the modern Armenian; nay more, in view of the cir-

cumstance that 'one from the land of Hati' (and the 'Hittites' dwelt in part there) could be called in prehistoric Armenian *Hatio*, and that the modern national name of the Armenians, namely, *Hay*, may go back to *Hatio*—in view of this, the further conclusion already lay very near to hand, *that the so-called Hittites are the ancestors of the modern Armenians.*

What may be said in favour of this view I have brought forward in the same larger work referred to above (see *ZDMG*, xlviii. pp. 235-352 and pp. 429-485), where I gave the first detailed account of my deciphering. Besides the two above-named coincidences between so-called Hittite and Armenian, I was able to adduce a great variety of others which, in my opinion, afforded quite sufficient proof of the correctness of my hypothesis. Thus, for instance, the circumstance that the genitive in the inscriptions is formed only by vowel endings, or that there is an ending *-m*, as I now know for certain, for the genitive plural (now replaced in Armenian by *ts*, but once unquestionably found in that language), or that 'this' is expressed by *a-i-s*, or the like (in Armenian *ais*), 'great,' or the like, by *m-s* (in Armenian *mets*), and that a word for 'child' or 'son' begins with a sibilant, while the Armenian term is *zaw-ak*, etc. I could, further, lay stress upon the fact that the domain of the ancient Hittites partly corresponded to that of the modern Armenians; that the type of the latter is akin to that of the Hittites; that a series of Hittite kings bear animal names; and that the personal names of the ancient Armenians belong to a very considerable extent to this last category, etc.

I had the hope, then, that my Armenian hypothesis might be accepted, but the fullest confidence that at least my deciphering results would be adopted without reserve. This expectation was not realized. A single individual (Professor Reckendorf), undeterred by the toilsome nature of the task, took the trouble to go over and test my work, with the result that he pronounced my deciphering to have succeeded in the main, and the Armenianism of the inscriptions to be at least an unobjectionable hypothesis. Not a few others expressed a conviction, or an opinion based upon purely subjective grounds or upon common-sense, that I was right. But at the same time, there were not wanting those who, in an equally subjective fashion, denied all value to my work, and destroyed

its influence through judgments at once inconsiderate and superficial in the highest degree. Amongst others, Professor Sayce (in the *Academy*) gave an account of my work. What I think of his criticism I would rather not say here, and I need to do so all the less because I have already replied to him in the *Academy*. He attempted, so far as I know, no answer, and I can well believe that a reply would have been no agreeable task to him.

The above treatment, then, had succeeded in killing the work for a time. But I was right all the same, and *because* I was right, of which this was the most striking proof, in the course of my continued studies of the problem I found myself always deviating more and more from my predecessors (Sayce included), who, after the first start, plunged into a *cul de sac*, from which there was no outlet for further progress. Always lighter grew the darkness, always more were difficulties solved, small and great alike, which had appeared insuperable, ever more clearly did the Armenianism of the inscriptions become manifest. Thus, about a year ago, I was able to publish a book, entitled *Hittiter und Armenier*, in which, upon the ground of my results, I could decline to offer formal proof of the correctness of my decipherings, for the results themselves were the proof. Nor was my book written for such a purpose. Its aim was rather simply to justify the conclusion that the Hittites as a matter of fact were the ancestors of the modern Armenians. The evidence for this was drawn from—

1. The discovery made, meanwhile, in the inscriptions, and, indeed, in a great number of these, of the native name of the Hittites, which, as I had already supposed, turned out to be *Hatio*, while that of the Armenians, namely, *Hay*, may go back to an earlier *Hatio*.

2. The language of the inscriptions, whose forms correspond to an ancient prehistoric form of Armenian, which can be recovered by attending to the laws of Armenian phonetics.

3. The personal names of the people of our inscriptions, which, altered in accordance with the same laws, are to be found again to a large extent amongst Armenian proper names.

4. The sound values of the hieroglyphs, which, in so far as their original form is yet recoverable and their reading assured, are identical, at least for the consonants, with older forms of Armenian

words or the beginnings of these, which express the ideas represented by the hieroglyphs.

5. Finally—although this was only a half proof—the mythology of the Hittites, which, in so far as it can be deduced from the inscriptions and sculptures, may very readily be identified with the relics that have survived of the pre-Parthian Armenian religion.

The inscriptions are deciphered, then, and the so-called Hittites are the ancestors of the modern Armenians. Of this my book furnishes evidence enough. Surely it is unknown to Professor Sayce, who is otherwise so well informed about recent literature and discoveries. Else without doubt he would not have kept from telling the readers of *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*, that, in view of the material contained in that book, it is a strong step any longer simply to ignore my labours on the inscriptions and to brush aside the weight of their evidence by the bare assertion that the inscriptions are still undeciphered. But if, in spite of all this, Professor Sayce does know my book, I should like to ask him this question, What evidence would induce him to admit that the problem has been solved by me? And yet the claims which he formerly made on behalf of his own attempts at decipherment were certainly not high.

But one must be just, and admit that for Professor Sayce to concede that I am right and he wrong must be a very hard task. For my decipherment has a totally different aspect from the one abandoned by him. Of all his combinations there remain established only a few which anyone could make who was not completely blind, and a few which he made *by accident*, with the help of the small bilingual of 'Tarkondemos' = Shilkuashemi (?). Of his deeper-reaching speculations every one has turned out a failure, and on the two points regarding which at the close of his article he thinks he is on firm ground, he is certainly wrong. The 'yoke' is not, as he supposes, a sign for the nominative ending while it is to be pronounced (*ε*)s, but a determinative for the nominative without any regard to its ending, and s is not a nominative ending. Nor is the 'gloved hand' (*i.e.* what Professor Sayce calls such) an expression for an accusative ending *-ni*, for this reason, to begin with,—I can give Professor Sayce the most positive assurance on this point,—that in the inscriptions there is no such thing as the 'gloved hand' at all. They

certainly contain numerous instances of 'hand hieroglyphs,' of which one—probably that which Professor Sayce has in view, which at a later period coincides with a sign for *ar* or *or*—is used to express the syllable *ia* or *io*, and hence serves on the one hand as the sign for the ending of adjectives in *-io*, and on the other hand indicates the ending of genitives in *-io* (*-ia*) and *-oio*, from nominatives in *-i* (from *-is*) and *-o* (from *-os*).

Special prominence deserves, however, to be given to a certain class of hand hieroglyphs. Already in my first work I suggested that certain hand signs—which, however, partly in consequence of the faultiness of copies at my disposal, I treated in a mass—might be 'god hieroglyphs.' To this supposition I was led by the following considerations:—(1) These signs frequently have over and under them a certain sign of separation, which elsewhere is found in this fashion only in a single—and analogous—instance, and must thus point to something deserving of special prominence; (2) these signs are not names of countries or of kings, but yet to all appearance something to which the king stands in a certain relation; (3) one of these signs is found also in the epitaph of a private person in combination with the same word which indicates the relation of the king to it; (4) these signs can be detected in almost all well-preserved inscriptions; (5) the mention of gods in the inscriptions is a thing we might expect.

Farther than this I did not get in my first work, a circumstance for which the bad editing of the inscriptions was in no small measure responsible. It now happens that at Boghazkai we have a long train of gods, which is being met by a train of goddesses, with the lover of the great goddess amongst them, and before each individual divinity in these we have his or her name in Hittite hieroglyphs. What more natural than to examine these in detail, and to search among them for hand hieroglyphs, in order thereby to prove the correctness of my supposition? But the extant copies did not justify the latter; they furnished no instance of hand hieroglyphs. It was not until I had procured from Berlin casts of the hieroglyphs before the god at the head of the procession of gods and before the two goddesses as well as before the god who stands behind the first of the goddesses, that I immediately recognized that a clenched fist is inscribed before

the first goddess and another hand hieroglyph before the second. I had been right, then, and could now say more specifically that a clenched fist was the, or a, hieroglyph for the great goddess of the so-called Hittites.

This state of things I was able to take account of in my book. There I was able to signalize another hand hieroglyph, perhaps representing the father or the mother of the king of the gods, because the latter at Ivriz seems to be called the son (*s-t-r*; *i.e.* Armenian *ustr*) of the deity designated by the sign in question. In the same book I could point to a hieroglyph for the king of the gods himself, which is used at Ivriz to designate him. The surprising circumstance now disclosed itself that this sign, beyond that one occurrence—and perhaps one other elsewhere—does not appear to occur in the inscriptions. It was hardly a compensation for this that the king of the gods appears elsewhere, namely, at Gurun, east of the Taurus, and there upon a seal, indicated by a different sign, namely, the trident. For it seemed as if he were not mentioned, at least by name, in any of the inscriptions of Jerabis, Mar'ash, etc., although other gods, at times a whole series of them, are named there.

But now this puzzle also has solved itself in a surprisingly simple fashion. One has only to look at the later cursive form of the fist hieroglyph to see at once that the hieroglyph for the king of the gods at Ivriz can be nothing else than the cursive form for the open hand, which now, to be sure, is found quite plainly, with all five fingers, in three inscriptions, two of them from Jerabis and one from Mar'ash (the Lion inscription), and there can be no doubt that a cursive form of the same is present in a number of other inscriptions. The king of the gods, then, appears, as was to be expected, in a long series of inscriptions.—Now observe, there is quite a number of hand hieroglyphs for divine names, with two, three, four, and five fingers visible, and with these in all possible (at times very unusual) positions. In ways altogether independent of one another, I have been led to see in the open hand the, or rather a, symbol of the father of the gods, and in the clenched fist the, or a, symbol of the mother of the gods, and so in the two hand hieroglyphs with the five fingers in a natural position, the pair of supreme divinities who at Boghazkai walk at the head of the two processions of gods. This is im-

PLICITLY a proof of the correctness of my combinations.

But further still, the king bears as a high title or attribute a word whose ideogram (*i.e.* sign for the notion expressed by it) is an upright narrow triangle, with two intersecting strokes, one perpendicular and one horizontal, drawn through it. So we find it, after the originals, in Hamât (!), Jerabis (!), Mar'ash, Bulgarmaden, Bor (!), so upon the pommel of the 'Tarkondemos.' With this alternate, as phonetic forms of writing it, a sign composed of three perpendicular parallel strokes, followed or not by the signs for *i* and *e*, or we may have two such signs, and the sign for the dental, followed or not by the same signs. That is to say, this attribute must have some such pronunciation as this: *T* sound + *i* or *e* + *i* or *e*, and since it certainly survives in the Armenian *tîr* = 'lord' (from *dei* + *aro* = 'man') as well as the Armenian *tikîn* = 'mistress' (from *dei* + *ginâ* = 'woman'), we may set it down specifically as *dei*. Now the ideogram for this attribute is found also at Fraktin (on the north-western declivity of the Taurus) as the symbol for an attribute of the king of the gods. But in two inscriptions from Jerabis we find it written phonetically, with the three perpendicular parallel strokes and the above-mentioned sign for the dental, to express an attribute of the god represented by the open hand! My conclusion has thus been confirmed in the most satisfactory way.

Further, this king of the gods of the 'Hittites' was encountered by the Greeks in Asia Minor under the name *Sandâ*. The king of the gods is also the weather-god, and one of his symbols is the trident, which represents the lightning. But in Armenian 'lightning' is called not only *shand*, *shant*, but also *shandi* or *shanti*, *i.e.* 'the Shandian.' Instead of *Sandâ*, Eusebius gives the name in the form *Desandâ*. Now *Sandâ* was called by the Hittites *dei*, and from this earlier form, namely, *dei*, must have arisen, according to the laws of Armenian phonetics, *de!* There can be no doubt, then, that *Desandâ* is to be broken up into this *de* (for *dei*) and *Sandâ* (*Shandas*). Further, it will be impossible to deny that this *Desandâ* of Eusebius is another witness in our favour.

Once more, wherever several gods are named, there appears the open hand or an equivalent in the first place—this in quite a series of inscriptions at Hamât, Jerabis, Mar'ash, Ordasu near Malatiyeh,

Bulgarmaden, Bor,—and so in the same whole group of inscriptions the fist appears in the second place, following the open hand or its equivalent in the first, or at all events following it or its equivalent. Nay, in two inscriptions, one from Jerabis and one from Ordasu, the divine names marked by these two signs depend upon a *single* substantive, which marks the relation of the king to them. And in an inscription of Jerabis the one divinity is called 'male,' the other 'woman'! In the same inscription, as well as at Mar'ash, the king calls himself 'the young ox' of these very two divinities, and the king of the gods is worshipped under the form of a steer, and *Sanda's* wife is called the *δάμαλις*, i.e. 'young cow.' Surely no more proofs are needed to establish irrefutably that the open hand and the clenched fist really point to the pair of supreme divinities.

Yet there remains something much more striking and at the same time more important.

When I published my book, I was already aware that there was a god with the name or the attribute *papa* or *baba* or *wawa* (in these words *o* may also be read instead of *a*). I was aware that the 'king' calls himself his *s-t-r*, i.e. 'son,' and necessarily inferred that the king of the gods is meant thereby. Therefore already at that stage I read the word *papa* or *baba*, and saw in it a term of endearment used in the cultus for 'father.' And, inasmuch as the Armenians are supposed to be allied to the Phrygians, I could recall the fact that the Bithynian Zeus is called *Παπα-s*, as well as recall the Armenian names, *Bab*, *Babik*, *Babots*, in which *Bab* corresponds to *Tēr* in the Armenian names *Tēr*, *Tirik*, *Tirots*, while *tēr* means 'lord,' and *dai* with the same or a similar meaning is an attribute of the 'Hittite' king of the gods. And now it is certain that *papa* or *baba* is precisely an attribute of the god marked by the open hand!

In the inscriptions there is a word written *mi* (or *me*) + *o* (or *a*). It was in the very earliest stages of my deciphering that it occurred to me to identify this with the Armenian *mi* (= 'one'), which goes back to an earlier *mio*. But a circumstance that need not be mentioned here finally deterred me from adopting this identification, and I took it into my head to see in the word an adjective, meaning 'powerful,' 'great,' or the like, and the circumstance referred to above compelled me to read *emio* for *mio*—all to the harm of my deciphering and not to the advantage of the Armenian

hypothesis either. For a word *emio* with the above meaning could not be discovered in Armenian. But now there is nothing in the way of the reading *mio* with the meaning 'one,' and the Armenian indefinite article *mi* is now to be recovered in this very form from the Hittite inscriptions, as the definite article *n* in the form (*i*)*no*.

Now, and of this also I could take cognisance in my book, the great goddess at Boghazkai and Fraktin has the attribute *m-* and at Bor the attribute *m-a* (or *o*). So long as I held to *emio* = 'great,' 'powerful,' or the like, I read these groups as derivatives from this word, and had to read them so. But now that *emio* is replaced by *mio* = 'one,' this will not answer, and we must look in another direction. What then? If the king of the gods was called *papa* or *baba* as the 'father,' the idea obtrudes itself upon one that in *m-* or *m-a* (perhaps read *ma-a*), an attribute of the queen of the gods, we ought to see a term of endearment used in the cultus for 'mother.' Now at Bor *m-a* occurs twice in clear parallelism with this very term, *papa*. Yes, and for a long time past it has been inferred from a note of Strabo's that at Komana in the Taurus, in 'Hittite' territory, *Ma* was the cultus-name of the great queen of the gods!

With this I conclude my reply.

I think I have no reason to fear that any unprejudiced person will deny that a deciphering which has such results to show has hit the mark. And even Professor Sayce will not protest, but rather silently content himself with the glory of having been one of the first, and for long the most zealous of all, to popularize the Hittites. The inscriptions are deciphered. The problem is solved.¹

As an appendage I submit a specimen of translation with a transcription, of course only approximately correct, as the result of my deciphering. In the latter I give only the written signs that were actually read, without the determinatives and other auxiliary signs which were not meant to be read. Anyone, even Professor Sayce, will concede to me that a system of decipherment from which the following can be gathered as the contents of an

¹ See now especially the reviews of my book in the *GG.A* (1899, No. 1) by Dr. Brockelmann, and in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung* (1899, No. 3) by Dr. Schwally. A third review, by Professor Zimmern, also completely accepting my results, including the Armenianism of the language, will appear very soon in the *ZD.M.G.*

inscription, must be correct,—in short, that the inscriptions are deciphered.

THE INSCRIPTION OF BOR.¹

Suennesi Tarz(oi)io dzar(i)o dzar(i)o dei g(u)r- (or m(a)r-) Mudl- ario . . . Sanda- arbats(i)o eso papa-arwaio (?) usdar Pharnā (?) aro aro maā eso a- ? Tarz(oi)io ? -oio papa- dēwā (?) maā medziā ?

¹ Upon a stele, above the figure of a king.

Tarz(oi)io Suenneszio (?) Kh(i)l(i)kioio dzar(i)ioio deio deio medzio zawa(i)- ino ai-

'The Syennesis, the king of Tarsus, the king (and) lord, the . . . Mudl-, the valiant, . . . the servant (?) of Sanda, I, the 'Father's,' the prince's (?) son, the man of Pharna (?), the man of the 'Mother,' I, the . . . man (?) of the mighty Father of Tarsus (and) of the goddess the great Mother, of ? the Syennesis (?) of Tarsus, the Cilician, the king (and) lord, the great lord child- the (is) this.'

At the Literary Table.

THE BOOKS OF THE MONTH.

THE STUDY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE. By C. A. BRIGGS, D.D. (*T. & T. Clark.* 8vo, pp. xxii, 688. 12s. net.)

ORTHODOX books do not sell. When a book is written in open defence of some traditional position, it rarely reaches a second edition, it rarely pays its way. The orthodox count it obvious, the heterodox absurd. But when a strong book appears attacking a tradition, both orthodox and heterodox buy it. This is perhaps God's providence, in line with the activity of childhood, which is wearing out restlessness to the invalid mother, but the condition of progress in the race. *Lex Mosaica* was still-born, Driver's *Introduction* and Briggs' *Biblical Study* have run into numerous editions.

Briggs' *Biblical Study* has run into ten editions. When the ninth was exhausted, Dr. Briggs resolved to make it a new book, and give it a new title. He used the old book as nucleus of new material, he doubled its size, and called it a *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture*. To the old book many of us owe an immense debt. The new is greater and more serviceable.

It is an American book. Now in America there is a great gulf fixed between the old position and the new. The majority of American theologians refuse even to look at the new methods of studying the Old Testament. The minority accept them with a thoroughness as sweeping. In this country criticism moves more slowly, but it carries more volume of scholarship with it. This is enough

to explain a certain feeling which the English reader has, and which he would not describe as critical swagger if he could find an inoffensive word to convey it. But we have now learned so much of the new methods from our own teachers, that the very difference here will be its best recommendation.

The whole field of the study of the Bible is covered. Textual and historical criticism, poetry, theology, archæology, all find a place, and the volume is large enough to afford them all a sufficient place. The references to literature are numerous, and neither biassed by friendship nor misleading through ignorance. The range and accuracy of the scholarship combine to produce one of its chief surprises. And there is no forgetfulness of higher claims. The last three chapters discuss the Credibility of Holy Scripture, the Truthfulness of Holy Scripture, and Holy Scripture as a means of Grace. They should be read first by those who have a prejudice against Professor Briggs the Higher Critic.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. By A. B. BRUCE, D.D. (*T. & T. Clark.* Post 8vo, pp. xii, 451. 7s. 6d.)

Professor Bruce's books are all educative. It may be to agree, it may be to disagree, but they draw one out. There is no folding of the hands to slumber. And this is a most characteristic book, as it is in fact the favourite book. This is the subject Dr. Bruce has given himself to most and on which he feels he has most to say. Now