

was right. Where the law failed the gospel succeeded. Men of violence, who could not be reformed by punishment, were regenerated by mercy.

The last moment in the history of this word

came when Jesus stood and spoke to the Pharisees, who were still trying the method of the law, and told them that the publicans and harlots were entering the Kingdom before them. 'The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence,' said He, 'and men of violence take it by force.'

New Light on the Hittite Problem.

BY PROFESSOR JAMES HOPE MOULTON, D.LIT., D.D., D.C.L.

I WONDER whether English scholars have got hold of the *Mitteilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft zu Berlin* for December 1915 (No. 56). My copy came to me from Professor Geissmann some months ago, through a mutual friend in Groningen, Professor de Zwaan. I value it as a token of what will, I trust, survive this fearful strain on friendship, though my friend's eyes are still, I fear, as darkened as the rest.

The fifty-page monograph which I describe is one of first-rate importance for the solution of a very old problem. Boghaz-Keui in Cappadocia is a site the exploration of which we missed by one day—so I was told in Oxford a few years ago—and the Kaiser got his firman and sent Hugo Winckler to work. He dug out an immense number of cuneiform texts, and published many. The most sensational of them was that in which the Vedic gods Indra, Mitra, Varuna, and the Nāsatyau (Dioscuri) appeared: the mystery of their appearance so far away is not yet really cleared up. The rest of the inscriptions were sent to Constantinople to await Winckler's lucid intervals in a distressing and long-continued mental affliction. Their Turkish custodians would allow no one else to get at them, and thoughtfully kept them in a damp cellar. So at least I was told, and one can only feel thankful that fear of German masters preserved the antiquities from more drastic treatment. Winckler died in April 1913, and the Oriental Society made arrangements for a systematic examination of the stones. There are, Dr. Otto Weber tells us in the present number of its *Transactions*, some twenty thousand fragments in the Osman Museum in Constantinople; Berlin has a good many as well. In April 1914 Dr. Figulla from Berlin and Professor Hrozný from Vienna went to Constantinople and

copied inscriptions 'until the war recalled them.' This is, by the way, the only allusion to that event, if I remember rightly: the information may be convenient for any censor into whose hands the pamphlet may fall.

The society promises the following publications, which, I gather, may be out already: (1) Accadian texts, by Weidner and Figulla; (2) other texts, especially those in the 'Ḫatti and Ḫarri dialects,' by Figulla; (3) Ḫatti texts by Dr. Figulla, only half printed. All these are transcribed, so as to be available for those who are not Assyriologists. A special journal called *Boghazköi-Studien* (Hinnichs) is to be devoted to the researches. The bibliographical information is continued with a list of Hugo Winckler's own contributions, which will naturally be known to our specialists. His friends hoped to find among his papers some indications of his conclusions as to the riddle of the 'Ḫatti-Sprache,' but they found none. 'Wahrscheinlich hat er in einer bitteren Stunde, wie so vieles andere, auch diese Aufzeichnungen vernichtet.'

Professor Hrozný takes up the dead savant's work, and in this paper gives a long and careful study with very startling results. He gives us an outline of the phonology and accidence of the Hittite language, as shown by words from the inscriptions presented in roman script. And the result, in a sentence, is that Hittite was an *Indo-European language, and one belonging to the Western half of the family*, the 'centum-languages,' of which Greek, Italic, Keltic, and Germanic are the great representatives.

A dozen pages by Professor Eduard Meyer of Berlin sketch the history of the decipherment of Hittite, by way of adequately introducing Hrozný's

notable essay—Who were the Hittites? Nearly thirty years ago the Tell-el-Amarna documents showed us that their home was not in Syria, but in eastern Asia Minor. Hugo Winckler's excavations at Boghaz-Keui began in 1906, and proved that it was the site of the Hittite capital, and the home of conquerors who were pushing further into Asia from the end of the fifteenth century. Innumerable inscriptions in cuneiform script, and therefore easily read, brought us, however, hardly any new light on the hieroglyphic Hittite on which so much ingenious labour has been spent.

Meyer introduces Hrozný's work with the necessary caveat that independent testing of his results, 'so epoch-making and of such far-reaching significance,' is at present impossible. He proceeds to give a history of the problem. As early as 1902 the Norwegian scholar Knudtzon, with Bugge and Zorp to back him, proposed to regard Hittite as Indo-European. His thesis, based on necessarily imperfect data, was generally set aside; and the denial seemed to be supported by new texts, published by Winckler, and especially a great ritual tablet by Sayce and Pinches. 'Now Hrozný undertakes to prove that the Hittite verb-flexion and declension is genuinely Indo-European, and that the vocabulary of the inscriptions, and especially the pronouns and adverbs contain numerous elements closely connected with Indo-European words.' Meyer thinks he has proved his case in general, and that the Indo-European character of Hittite may be at least tentatively accepted. In that case we have for the second time within a few years a new ancient language of our family emerging from discoveries in Asia. Tokharian, discovered in the Turfan documents, is like Hittite in that it raises at present as many questions as it solves. One common feature of Tokharian and Hittite, to which Meyer does not allude, is the affinity with the western half of our Indo-European language area. This, if established, is very suggestive when we begin to speculate on the prehistoric migrations involved. The dialectic differences included in this separation of East and West are deep-seated, and point to the greater primitiveness of the West. From the original home in Europe, it would seem, there were migrations from the western side, long after the eastern speech-division had differentiated itself and moved into its new home in Asia.

Meyer goes on to point out how complex our new problem is, in that everything else we know about the Hittites separates them from all Indo-European peoples. The general impression of the vocabulary is decidedly foreign: for all the identity of flexion and the smaller words, we are dealing with a thoroughly mixed language—one very much like English in that respect, as we might add. This answers to what we know of Hittite civilization. Their religion was thoroughly Anatolian, and closely akin to that of Crete. It is not in Asia Minor, but in Syria and Mesopotamia, that we have an Indo-European element of an Aryan (*i.e.* Indo-Iranian) type in the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries. The Hittite physiognomy was figured for us on Egyptian monuments, some of which Meyer reproduces, and it is characteristically Anatolian-Armenian. Their proper names are not of our style, nor are their gods' names. Material has been gathered of late years for the study of other Anatolian languages, Lycian, Eteocretan, Carian, Cyprian, and other pre-Indo-European languages of eastern Asia Minor: some of the present-day Caucasus dialects may give us similar features when scientifically worked out.

The discoveries of Hrozný point, Meyer notes, to an influx of Indo-European elements into Asia Minor early in the second millennium, or at latest in the middle of it, quite distinct from the Indo-Iranian that have made their way into the Mitanni. The advent of the Indo-Europeans was a momentous epoch in the history of civilization, and the problems opening before us are as important as they are difficult. In the case of the Hittites, too, this epoch is seen to lie early in that second millennium B.C. Meyer thinks we can recognize some traits of Indo-European enterprise in the story of the Hittites. Thus in these inscriptions we find a Hittite prince aspiring to the throne of Egypt—the second successor of the Reformer Amenophis IV. Meyer closes with an interesting point bearing on the route by which the Indo-Europeans came into eastern Asia Minor. He thinks he can trace birch-bast found in an Egyptian tomb to Hittite origin: it must be allowed that he gives no evidence, and marks it as quite tentative. The birch is an Indo-European tree, and foreign to Asia. The road through the north of the Black Sea is the most probable, however, on other grounds, whatever be said of this one. Hrozný prefers to believe that the Hittites came across

the Bosphorus, while the Aryans came round the north of the Black Sea.

Hrozný's essay itself is not one that can be summarized. He describes the Boghaz-Keui archives, which belong mainly to the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries. Their language (where not Accadian) is identical with that of Arzawa, as known from two of the Amarna letters. One or two of his indications of Indo-European character may be quoted. The participle *da-a-an*, 'giving,' plur. *da-an-te-eš*, is striking: the cases, gen. *andaš*, dat. *anti*, acc. *andan*, abl. *anti(ā)*, are excellent, also assuming correct reading. Most surprising is the flexion of *wa-a-tar* (or *wa-a-dar*, which I am glad to see is a possible reading—Grimm's Law is satisfied). It seems to drop the *r* in the genitive and take *n*, which links it at once with a most characteristic flexion of our languages (cf. Latin, *femur*, *feminis*, etc.). The list of pronouns is also most remarkable. Pronouns are the part of the stock of a language which least suffers from foreign invasion; and no one can miss the identity of Hittite pronouns with our own. The person-endings of the verb are equally clear; there are close parallels among the prepositions; and words like *da-an-na*, 'gift,' and *e-eš-mi*, 'I am,' are unmistakable. Dr. Hrozný gives a number of specimens, promising full treatment in his book. There follows his demonstration that Hittite, like Tokharian, belongs to the Western group, not the Eastern. The point is so important that I should explain it for those who are not philologists. Draw a line from the middle of the Baltic due south to the Adriatic. West of that line lie Italic, Keltic, and our own group of languages: Greek must be linked with them. East are Lithuanian and Slavonic, Albanian, Phrygian and Thracian, Armenian, and Indo-Iranian. The former we call *centum* languages, the latter *satem*, from the Latin and the Iranian words for 'hunted.' In the West, the primitive *k* sound is kept: the East has turned it into a sibilant. And at the same time in the West another kind of guttural retains its parasitic *w*, which the East loses: thus Latin *quod*, our *what*, Sanskrit *kad*. Hittite *ug(a)*, 'I,' Latin, *ego*, as against Avestan *azem*; Hittite *kāš*, 'this,' against Slavonic *sū*, prove one side of the affinity; *kuiš* *kuit(ā)*, Latin *quis* *quid*, satisfies the other. Hrozný tells us he has other proofs. He regards Hittite as standing between Latin and Tokharian. Tokharian, by the way, is to be compared with Keltic, the nearest neighbour of Latin on the other

side. It may not be irrelevant to recall the roving propensities of the Kelts in later ages, and compare this immigration to the Keltic raids which stopped short in the middle of the country beyond which the Hittites had penetrated, leaving the name Galatia behind. I would note also the question of affinities with Greek as one on which we should be glad of some light. If there prove to be no such affinities, the fact will be significant.¹

But let us return to Professor Hrozný, who goes on to note that Hittite has manifestly suffered considerably from the languages surrounding it in Asia. The Lycian of a millennium later, originally perhaps very near to it, has been altered almost past recognition by forces which even in the time of our very oldest Indo-European monuments—coeval with the older parts of the Rigveda—had made Hittite anything but an example of pure Indo-European speech.

I must pass by the pages in which Hrozný gives us some examples of his methods of decipherment. There are a large number of ideograms. The interpretation of the text is exhibited as a series of very clever guesses by means of comparative philology, which justify themselves ultimately by cumulative probability. The inscriptions he gives are interesting in themselves; and we are told that the collection is so varied in its subject-matter that we have excellent materials for reconstructing the grammar. Historical texts give us preterites, legal texts futures and presents, and so on.

So we come to the languages which most seriously contaminate the Indo-European quality. We find that in religious texts there is a tendency to drop into the 'Ḫarri' language (the Horites of the O.T.). There are large contacts with the likewise indigenous and nearly identical Mitanni. On this side there are links with Chaldee. The Aryan gods found among the Mitanni are not to be connected with these pre-Aryan Ḫarri. The Medes were the Hittites' nearest neighbours, and we expect to find contacts there.

Hrozný sketches briefly the historical importance of this new line of research. He believes they had a large part in destroying the Hammurapi dynasty, so that the beginning of our knowledge of them dates from 1930 B.C. They reached their

¹ In connexion with speculations on these prehistoric migrations, I might refer to my paper in *Essays and Studies presented to William Ridgeway* (Cambridge, 1913), entitled 'Notes on Iranian Ethnography.'

climax of power in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries, from which most of these inscriptions come. They were powerful throughout Asia Minor, Syria, and Palestine. It is interesting to find an Indo-European element in the pre-Israelite population of Palestine! The Hittites are to be regarded as prehistoric intermediaries between Europe and Asia. What we read of them in historical times comes from a time when they had long passed their prime.

I refrain from commenting upon this most important work, preferring merely to report. Clearly the work must undergo severe testing; and in happier days the Orientalists of all nations will be busy with a very new field, which takes us back to the very earliest period of our language group. Its bearing on Old Testament studies, if not very profound, is clear enough perhaps to justify me in offering the report to the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

In the Study.

Resignation.

TOWARDS AN ANTHOLOGY.

CHARLES LAMB and DANTE.—There is a beautiful little sentence in the works of Charles Lamb concerning one who had been afflicted: 'He gave his heart to the Purifier, and his will to the Sovereign Will of the Universe.'¹ But there is a speech in the third canto of the *Paradiso* of Dante, spoken by a certain Piccarda, which is a rare gem. I will only quote this one line: '*In la sua volontade è nostra pace.*'² The words are few and simple, and yet they appear to me to have an inexpressible majesty of truth about them, to be almost as if they were spoken from the very mouth of God.—Morley's *Life of Gladstone*, i. 215.

W. E. GLADSTONE.—A summary of Mr. Gladstone's interpretation of it is perhaps found in a few words used by him of Blanco White, a heterodox writer whose strange spiritual fortunes painfully interested and perplexed him. 'He cherished,' says Mr. Gladstone, 'with whatever associations, the love of God, and maintained resignation to His will even when it appears almost impossible to see how he could have had a dogmatic belief in the existence of a divine will at all. There was, in short [in Blanco White], a disposition to resist the tyranny of self; to recognise the rule of duty; to

¹ *Rosamund Gray*, chap. xi.

² Mr. Gladstone's rendering of the speech of Piccarda (*Paradiso*, iii. 70) is in the volume of collected translations (p. 165), under the date of 1835:

In His Will is our peace. To this all things
By Him created, or by Nature made,
As to a central Sea, self-motion brings.

maintain the supremacy of the higher over the lower parts of our nature.' This very disposition might with truth no less assured have been assigned to the writer himself. These three bright crystal laws of life were to him like pointer stars guiding a traveller's eye to the celestial pole by which he steers.—Morley's *Life of Gladstone*, i. 217.

JACOB BOEHME.—The *Will* of the *Desire* must bow itself down to the Earth, and bring itself into the deepest *Humility* and most simple *Ignorance*, and say, 'Thou art foolish, and hast nothing but the Grace of God.' Thou must wrap thyself up in *that Belief* with great *Humility*, and become *nothing* at all *in thyself*, and neither know nor love *thyself*. All that thou hast, or is in thee, must esteem itself as *nothing* but a mere *Instrument* of GOD; and thou must bring thy *Desire* only into GOD'S Mercy, and go forth from all *thy own* knowing and willing, and esteem it as nothing at all, nor even entertain any *Will* to enter into it again.—*Of True Resignation*, chap. ii.

GEORGE ELIOT.—Joy and peace are not resignation: resignation is the willing endurance of a pain that is not allayed—that you don't expect to be allayed. Stupefaction is not resignation: and it is stupefaction to remain in ignorance—to shut up all the avenues by which the life of your fellow-men might become known to you.—Philip Wakem, in *The Mill on the Floss*.

GOETHE.—The two great fundamental ideas running through *Die Wanderjahre* are work and resignation. Resignation means much. It means