

were delivered, two years after Harnack's famous course, in the University of Berlin to students of all faculties: Dr. Seeberg is fully sensible of the difficulties encountered by present-day seekers after truth, but he shows with great force that it is impossible to exclude Christ Himself from the gospel He brought to men. Rogge is disposed to minimize the differences which separate Harnack from such defenders of the older Lutheran teaching as Cremer. He is doubtless right in saying that Harnack's book—*The Essence of Christianity*—has a title far too high-sounding and quite misleading; it would more correctly be described as *An Introduction to Christianity*, and in Rogge's judgment it may commend Christian modes of thought to many who are now altogether estranged from Christianity.

During 1902 several German theologians have expressed their views on a subject of far-reaching significance. 'Ought not the study of Christian theology to be one branch of the study of the science of religion?' is the much-debated question. Professor Tröltzsch of Heidelberg is the leader of the school that answers this question in the affirmative, arguing that Christianity should be historically and scientifically studied as one of many religions. Harnack and Heinrici have been the foremost advocates of the opposite view; amongst minor reasons given for answering the question in the negative are the wide extent

of the domain which the student of Christian theology would be compelled to traverse, and the danger of fostering an unhealthy dilettantism; but the main reason is that Christianity is to so great an extent *the* religion, and the Bible so far surpasses all other religious literature in value, that it would be doing violence to history, and would involve the adoption of a false method, if the true state of the case were not frankly recognized at the outset of the inquiry. Rogge expresses hearty approval of these views, but regards it as a very hopeful sign that commercial intercourse with foreign nations and the spread of Christian missions are leading to a more thorough study of non-Christian religions. 'Christianity cannot but gain from comparison with other religions.'

It may be taken as an indication of the widespread interest in the problems raised by modern criticism of the Gospels that the position of honour is assigned to an article by Rogge, entitled 'What do we know of Jesus?' in a high-class German annual mainly concerned with art and general literature, and including in its table of contents a novel, poetry, an illustrated article on Max Klinger, the painter and sculptor, etc. With one striking exception—the politics of Great Britain—the outlook of all the contributors to the *Türmer-Jahrbuch* is broad, their opinions are liberal and their judgments fair.

Handsworth College.

J. G. TASKER.

Recent Biblical and Oriental Archaeology.

BY A. H. SAYCE, D.D., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY, OXFORD.

DR. KNUDTZON has again rendered Oriental research an important service.¹ Among the Tel el-Amarna tablets are two of peculiar philological interest, as they are in a new language. The longest and best preserved of them, now in the Cairo Museum, was written by or to the king of a country named Arzawa; the second, which is in a less perfect condition, is at Berlin. The only edition of the Berlin tablet hitherto available left much to be desired, and it is therefore a matter of

congratulation that Dr. Knudtzon has devoted his accuracy of eye and unrivalled powers of deciphering half-obliterated characters to a revision of it. He has at the same time published a revised text of the Cairo tablet.

I, too, have spent a considerable time in re-examining the latter. For the most part our revised readings agree; where they differ he is certainly right in some cases, though not in all. In line 24, for instance, what he makes *ú-it* is really the ideograph *bit*, 'house,' with the phonetic complement *it*. In line 22, again, the character which he makes *ú* is *má*, *ú* being formed differ-

¹ *Die zwei Arzawa-briefe, die ältesten Urkunden in indo-germanischer Sprache.* By J. A. Knudtzon. With notes by Sophus Bugge and Alf Torp. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902. 5s.

ently. The last character of the previous line seems to me to be *ta* rather than *sa*, and in the next line I should transcribe *du-zu-un* instead of *ba-as-su-un*. In line 28, what he makes doubtfully *up-pa* . . . should be *li*, and the first two characters of line 19 can hardly be *na-as*; they look to me like *pal*. Nor am I satisfied that the last syllable in the name of the king is *ba*.¹

But Dr. Knudtson has not only improved our copies of the texts, he has also introduced important corrections into the transliteration of them, and has furthermore made a discovery of extraordinary interest. This is nothing less than the fact that *estu* signifies 'may there be'! Somewhat naturally he has concluded from this that the language of Arzawa must be Indo-European, more especially as its resemblances to Greek had already been pointed out by myself and others in its possession of a nominative in *-s* and an accusative in *-n* and of the possessive pronouns *mi*, 'mine,' and *ti*, 'thine.' Dr. Knudtson's conclusions have been further worked out by the eminent philologists, Professors Bugge and Torp, and the result is, not only a complete translation of the Cairo tablet, based upon the assumption that the language of it is Indo-European, but also a comparison of the language with those of the Lycian and Etruscan inscriptions, which are likewise assumed to belong to the Indo-European family of speech.

But in spite of *estu* and the authority of the sponsors for the Indo-European character of the Arzawan language, the result is very far from being proved. In the first place, no notice is taken of the tablets of Boghaz Keui, the Hittite capital in Cappadocia, which are in the same or an allied language and form of cuneiform script. Secondly, as we have seen, the readings of Dr. Knudtson are not always to be accepted, a fact which vitiates several of the supposed Indo-European analogies. Then, thirdly, though I willingly admit that there may be a relationship between the language of Arzawa and that of Lycia, Kretschmer, Thomsen, and other scholars are certainly right in denying the Indo-European character of Lycian: as for Etruscan, Professor Bugge stands almost alone nowadays in believing it to be Indo-European.

On the other hand, it is undeniable that between Arzawan and Greek, as also between Lycian and

¹ At the beginning of line 2 I question the reading [*a*]na, as the second character is *ut* rather than *na*.

Greek, there are striking points of resemblance. It will be remembered that in describing my recent decipherment of the Hittite inscriptions, which turn out to be in a language closely allied to that of Arzawa, I mentioned that I had been puzzled by the same fact. But it is a fact which admits of another explanation than that which would transform the languages of Asia Minor into Indo-European dialects. The Javan of Genesis belongs to Cilicia, from whence also the Lycians seem to have originally come, and he was the brother of the Asianic nations of Meshech and Tubal. The language of the Vannic inscriptions, which no scientific philologist would dream of including in the Indo-European family, displays some of the same resemblances to Greek as Arzawan or Lycian; so, too, does the language of Mitanni, though to a lesser degree. The fact is that the Asianic group of languages form an intermediate geographical link between Vannic and Indo-European as represented by Greek, the philological relationship between them having a geographical and not a genetic origin. Where languages are in contact with one another, grammatical forms as well as words are apt to be borrowed. One of the most striking points of resemblance, moreover, would be lost, if Dr. Knudtson and his coadjutors are right in thinking that the Arzawan suffix *-s* denotes, not the nominative singular, but the genitive. This, however, is questionable.

It goes without saying that the translations proposed by the three northern scholars are tentative only. With some of the explanations of words and forms upon which their Indo-European theory rests I should entirely disagree. The first person of the verb is denoted, not by *-n*, but by *-i*; that is proved by the position of the word *assul-i* at the end of the Cairo tablet after the list of presents sent by one of the kings to the other, and which here and elsewhere where it occurs can mean only 'I have sent.'² The suffix of *uppakhu-n*

² Other instances of the form are *auman-i*, 'I have despatched'; *likhuw-i*, 'I have given'; *ubb-i*, 'I have written (?)'. The third paragraph of the Cairo letter will be *Kāsmā-ta uienum Irsappa* D.P. *khalugatallan-min aumani TUR-SAL-ti AN UT-mi kuin DAM-anni uwadanāi nī-si likhuwē NI-an SAK-DU-si kdsma-ta uppakhuen I 'sukhalaliya AZAG-GI-as DAMQU-an-ta*, 'For thee now Irsappa, my messenger, I have despatched, thy daughter, the consort (?) of the sun-god, for a wife to ask; to her I have given oil for her head; for thee as a present I *sukhalaliya* of gold for thy

is not that of the first person of the verb, but of the accusative, as in other cases; the word, which occurs also at Boghaz Keui, means 'as a present.'

In the Berlin tablet Dr. Knudtson has found the proper name, which may be read Labbaya, though the first character in it has the values of *rib* and *kal* as well as *lab*. Labbaia reminds us of the Canaanitish chieftain Labai, who plays an important part in the Tel el-Amarna correspondence, and, like Dr. Knudtson, I am inclined to identify the two. If so, Labai, if not himself a Hittite, would have been in communication with Hittites in southern Palestine.

Two years ago M. Legrain uncovered at Karnak for the first time the concluding portion of the famous list of Palestinian towns and districts conquered by Shishak. Several of them are destroyed, but among those that remain is 'the country of the Jordan.' It is at the extreme end of the left-hand side of the last line of the list which begins with the names of Zurham (Jerahme-el) and 'Annin, 'the two springs,' a locality also mentioned in the travels of the Mohar. The fourth name from that of 'Annin is a Migdol. On the right side the list concludes with the following names:—Sh-r-d-d, R-p-ḥa, L-b-u-n (or L-b-n-u), 'A-n-p-r-n, and H-a-m. The second is Raphia, the last the Hum of the Palestinian list of Thothmes III. The third is a Libnah, but it is the fourth which possesses the greatest interest. It is evidently 'An-Paran, 'the Spring of Paran,' the site of which is thus fixed in conformity with the geographical notices of the Old Testament. This 'Spring of Paran' must have been an important place, and the question rises, therefore, whether it was not the spring 'in the wilderness of Beer-sheba' where Hagar found water for Ishmael, who, as he grew up, 'dwelt in the wilderness of Paran.'

But this is not all. The 'Spring of Paran' prosperity.' Dr. Knudtson has shown that I was wrong in transliterating *kalatta*, instead of *kasmatta*, and in making *laliya* the first person of a verb. In the next paragraph but one we have *uwanzi mādansi*; the last word is found at Boghaz Keui along with the borrowed Assyrian *madatum*, 'tribute.' The word *essar*, *essaras*, which occurs in both the Arzawan letters, I believe to mean 'bronze' or 'copper.' Line 28 of the Cairo tablet is *ni-ta kāsma bibbi essar uppakhun assuli*, 'to thee bronze for a chariot as a gift I have sent.'

must have been on the high road from Raphia to Seir, and consequently would seem to be that 'En-Mishpat, which is Kadesh,' reached by Chedorlaomer and his allies as soon as they had smitten 'the Horites in their mount Seir, unto El-Paran, which is by the wilderness' (Gn 14^{6,7}). Now, it was at Kadesh (now 'Ain Qadīs) in the wilderness of Paran that the Israelites encamped, according to Nu 12¹⁶ 13²⁶, after leaving Hazeroth and Kibroth-hattaavah, or Taberah, the latter being only three days' distance, or between fifty and sixty miles, from Mount Sinai (Nu 10³⁸).¹ In Dt 9²² Taberah is distinguished from Kibroth-hattaavah, and Massah is interpolated between them. According to Ex 17⁷, however, Massah was visited before Sinai, and that the account given in the Book of Numbers is the more correct is shown by the itinerary in Nu 33¹⁶, where Kibroth-hattaavah is the next station to Sinai. In the itinerary Rithmah, 'The Brooms,' and Rimmon-parez take the place of Kadesh, and then comes Libnah, in which we may see the Libnu of Shishak's list. In Dt 1¹ Laban is similarly coupled with Paran and Hazeroth. That Sinai was a 'mount of Paran' is indicated in one of the oldest fragments of Hebrew literature (Dt 33²), 'The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; he shined forth from mount Paran, and he came with ten thousands of saints.' The district in one form or another must have been handed down from the earliest days of Israelitish history, as we not only find a variant in Habakkuk (3⁸, 'God came from Teman, and the Holy One from mount Paran'), but also in the Song of Deborah (Jg 5^{4,5}, 'Lord, when Thou wentest out of Seir, when Thou marchedst out of the field of Edom, the earth trembled, and the heavens dropped, the clouds also dropped water. The mountains melted from before the Lord, even that Sinai from before the Lord God of Israel'). The three variants mark out the position of Mount Sinai pretty clearly; it was on the borders of Seir and Paran towards Teman, the southern part of Edom.

¹ In the itinerary, however, the camp is transported at once from Sinai to Kibroth-hattaavah (Nu 33¹⁶), so that the three days of Nu 10³⁸ may mean the three stages Taberah, Kibroth-hattaavah, and Hazeroth, or Kibroth-hattaavah, Hazeroth, and Kadesh, if Taberah and Kibroth-hattaavah are one and the same.