

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expository-times\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

as if it were a fresh revelation. The setting out of our ideas for the market requires us to place them in a clear light. This is a great part of the problem with every exhibitor of truth. *Virtutem videant. Voir, c'est avoir.* Many a gospel-hearer is like the chained man in Plato's Bunyan—in the allegory of the cave. His back is to the cave's mouth, and his light is from a fire behind him, which throws upon the floor in front of him the quivering shadows which he mistakes for substances. The cave has an echo, which is the only sound the bond-slave hears. The preacher wishes to have these chains knocked off, so that he may guide his pupil from cave-light to starlight, from starlight to moonlight, and from moonlight to sunlight at noon, so that, no longer the dupe of appearances or opinion, he may walk at liberty amid sunlit realities, far from the pale realm of illusions and shows.

Plato says that his cave-dweller, upon beholding the sun, would fall down and praise God for having made so glorious an object. He expects him to be mastered at once by its self-evidencing light. All this appeals directly to the preacher who strives to exhibit Christ as the Light and Life of men. Plato also tells us that the truth-seeker, emerging from his dim cave, would be dazzled and bewildered. His weak eyes at first would be able to look upon only the shadows in the water; but by and by they would gather

strength, and become strong enough, eagle-like, to welcome all the direct splendours of noon. Here the allegory fails. The Word has been made flesh, and thus the divine light has been softened and attempered to our weak vision. Moreover, the Spirit who reveals the object, at the same time ennobles the organ. Light and eyesight are His twin gifts.

As *Exegesis* suggests the matter, and *Exposition* the manner, so *Hermeneutics* suggests the aim of preaching. It used to be a favourite word, but it has now grown old-fashioned. It is worth our while to get back to its root. It is derived from the Greek Hermes, who was often identified with the Roman Mercury. He was the swift-winged messenger or herald of Jupiter. He was very friendly to men, and he bore a sacred branch as the emblem of peace. The word hermeneutics thus reminds us that the preacher is to play the part of a sacred Hermes. He is clothed upon with an authority greater than his own, and sent on an errand of divine mercy. He has to do with God's truth as a definite message to individuals. He is concerned with persons as well as with propositions. He is an ambassador who beseeches men to be reconciled to God. Tholuck, as his biographer informs us, in poor health, for fifty years did his work joyfully, like Mercury, the celestial messenger, with wings to his feet.

---

## The Still Undeciphered Hittite Inscriptions.

IN REPLY TO PROFESSOR JENSEN.

BY PROFESSOR FRITZ HOMMEL, PH.D., LL.D., MUNICH.

FOR years I have followed most carefully the attempts of Professor Jensen to decipher the Hittite inscriptions, and have gone into the details of these more thoroughly perhaps than any other Orientalist, even Professor Reckendorf included. And from the very first it was clear to me that even if Professor Jensen was right with his Syennesis key, yet the Indo-Germanic Armenian hypothesis was out of the question. But even before the appearance of Leopold Messerschmidt's 'Bemerkungen zu den hethitischen Inschriften' (in the *Mittheilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesell-*

*schaft*, Berlin, 3 Jahrg., 1898, No. 5),—a pamphlet which, strangely enough, is not mentioned by Professor Jensen,—it was for me an established fact that even the Cilician personal name Syennesis (which as a mere title is nowhere demonstrable) cannot be the key. At least Professor Jensen's reading of the group, which he rightly recognizes as a title, x-y-z-x (and nominative ending), as S<sup>2</sup>-n-s- (*i.e.* *Syennesis*), is merely a still undemonstrable possibility so long as there are other possibilities whose conceivability Professor Jensen in his certainty of victory has plainly not taken

into account. I go still further, however, and maintain that *Syennesis* is an absolutely impossible reading in the case before us, for in the first place, and above all, it is no title, but an Asia Minor personal name derived from *Zua*, and in the next place, in all probability the -es- (*Syennes*) which stands before the Greek termination -is is itself merely the Asia Minor nominative ending (as this appears perhaps in ἀρβασις, originally *arva-s*). Hence this name had properly sounded only *Syenne-s* (*Zuarna?*), while in the above group the second x is not an ending, but belongs to the root; or if one does not accept this, the cuneiform *Zualzas*<sup>1</sup> would be identical with *Syennesis*.


It appears to me that the first question one has to ask is this: Was there not in Asia Minor any royal title (not royal name) that satisfies the above conditions (first of its letters the same as the fourth)? Even if there was, still, in view of the slender materials at our disposal, and the complicated character of the writing, we should be face to face with a mere possibility whose exact demonstration could be furnished only by a larger number of inscriptions, or, better still, by a fuller bilingual. Till then, to speak of an actual decipherment is presumption springing from an overrating of the human faculty of knowledge.

Now, we know various Asia Minor terms which served for 'king' or 'ruler,' of which, however, no one at first appears to suit our x-y-z-x. These are such as the Lydian κοαλδδειν (perhaps accusative of κοαλδδι, *gvaldi*), the Lycian κηβιδα (*gvid* for *gvild?*), the Carian γελαν, the Phrygian βαλην, the Alarodian *yanzu* (cf. the Scythian Ἰανδυσος?), and finally the Lydian πάλμυς. If one notes that the Lydian royal name *Alyattes* (in which -αττης is the well-known divine name Ἥγυ, 'Ate, cuneiform *Khattu-* in *Khattu-shar*, Egyp. *Kheta-sar*) is properly ΦαλΦεατης, *Valveiates*, and that elsewhere too in Asia Minor personal names we meet with the element βαλβι (e.g. in Βαλβιόας, cf. Ὀβρα-μόςας, or in Βανβα, i.e. *Vanva*), it may not be too bold to assume a title *valvi* answering to what has come down to us only in the Grecised form πάλμυς, and even tentatively to represent our x-y-z-x by this in the form *vi-a-l-vi* or (with the nominative ending s, recognized by Professor Sayce) *vi-a-l-vi-s*.

<sup>1</sup> Likewise P.-N., cf. Bit-Zualzas (of Tiglath-Pileser III.) in Media, and other local names beginning with Bit; e.g. the well-known Bit-Khumri = Samaria.

It is not my intention here to pursue further the consequences which flow from this, in the first instance, yet hypothetical identification. I would only remark, that, if Professor Jensen has correctly determined the values *r* and *m* (cf. for *m* the Cypriote sign *mo* which had been noted even before Jensen), in that case the word which he interprets 'great' should be read not *m-s* but *m-vi* (cf. -μοος of the Asia Minor proper names), 'I am' should be not *s-mi* but *vi-mi* (cf. the Vannic -ubi, the ending of the 1st pers. sing.), and 'king' should be not *s-r* (*sira*) but *vi-r* (*vir*, *ivr*, cf. Vannic *curi*, 'lord,' Mitannic *ibri*). On the other hand, I would suggest that in the inscription of Bor the name which Professor Jensen reads *Tar-s* (*Tarsus*) should rather be *Ka-vi* or *K-vi*, i.e. the land of Kuī in Cilicia, well-known from the cuneiform inscriptions, for I take the first sign in this word to be a variant of the second sign in *Kark-k-mi*, which latter name Professor Jensen has probably deduced correctly.

As to this name (*Karchemis*), I may at the same time add a remark which is not without importance for the future deciphering of the Hittite inscriptions. This name (assuming that it is correctly read), be it observed, has no determinative, although, according to Jensen, there is a frequently recurring determinative for 'land' and another almost identical with it, which he takes to mean 'god.' That the two are simply variants of one and the same sign is plain; and even before Professor Jensen this was generally recognized. It is the hieroglyph representing a circle with a perpendicular stroke, ⊕, frequently with two perpendicular strokes (whereas the sign which Professor Jensen reads *m*, and which must not be confused with this, is ⊙). According to Professor Sayce, this sign was used everywhere as the determinative for 'god'; according to Thomas Tyler (1892), everywhere for 'city,' even in the notes to the inscriptions of Boghazkiöi (there = 'city gods'). That Sayce was right in this is now clearly proved by a seal cylinder published by Mr. Ward, in which the supreme god of the Hittites is portrayed and mentioned along with another divinity, probably his wife (see below). The legend on this seal would read, according to Jensen: Land of Kilik (Cilicia) -rk (or -lk as phonetic complement); Land of Arzip; *ar-s* (= *arats*, 'guardian,' 'shepherd'); ideogram for 'brave' (a knife); and ⊔ (= *dsario*, 'king'). The whole would amount to something like this: 'Of

the lands of Cilicia and Arzip, the guardian, the brave king.' That this cannot be correct is clear. In accordance with general analogy, one expects either the proper name of the owner of the cylinder, or it may chance the name of the god portrayed upon it. Now, since the determinative with which the first and the second items of the legend commence will have meant either 'god' or 'city,' it is plain that here it can be only the determinative for 'god,' and that thus, as a matter of course, wherever Professor Jensen has read 'the land of Cilicia,' we ought rather to substitute the name of this supreme god. It can surely be no accident that the hieroglyph for this god represents a serpent, , and that on the above-named seal cylinder the image of the divinity is 'a serpent or dragon raised on a pole.' I would suggest the pronunciation *Tark*, and do not consider it impossible even that *δράκων* is a primitive Asia Minor loan-word from the name of this very Hittite serpent-god. Upon the cylinder this serpent has a goat's head, which gives the best explanation of why it is that on the 'silver boss' an antelope's head corresponds to the name-element *Tarku*; the legend, in spite of Professor Jensen's impossible reading *Silkuashemi*, is clear and distinct—*Tarku-u-dim* (written *MU*, but having also the phonetic value *dim*) -*me sharru mât alu Me-tan*.

In close connexion with this dragon-god there is found, alike on Mr. Ward's cylinder, in the inscription of Bulgarmaden, the bowl of Babylon, and (standing alone) in the inscriptions of Jerâbis (Karchemish), another divinity (ideogram: rhomb and bird), which I take accordingly to be the wife of Tarkhu, because in the inscriptions of Jerâbis the sign is followed by the appellative *kark-mi-o* + 'queen' (Jerâbis, i. lines 2, 4, 5). In this way, too, we can best explain why, whenever she is named at all, she comes almost always directly after the dragon-god. The bird sacred to her is probably rather the dove than an eagle.

Along with the possibility of reading x-y-z-x (+nominative ending *s*) otherwise than as *Syennesis* (cf. above the much more probable *vi-a-l-vi-s*), and the certainty that the serpent ideogram designates not a land (Cilicia) but the supreme god of the Hittites (probably *Tarkhu*), the greatest part of Professor Jensen's book, *Hittiter und Armenier*, of course crumbles to pieces. When in that book he says (p. xxii) that his opponents have to show why the ordinary rules of logic do not apply to

the Hittites, I would remark, by way of making the position plain, that from a false starting-point further conclusions of a most ingenious and captivating character may be drawn in accordance with the strict rules of logic, and yet the main result must be false just because the premises were wholly or partially false. It is also much to be regretted that Professor Jensen always treats opposition to his views as a personal injury, and that he seeks to depreciate as much as possible any correct results that have been reached by others before him. If Professor Sayce, for instance, has recognized, through the intuitive perception of genius, any truth for which it demands no great skill to adduce further more exact proofs, we are told that he simply 'had a presentiment' of it, or, like the blind hen, hit upon the right thing 'by accident,' whereas Professor Jensen himself has 'proved' it. This is a disagreeable trait which disturbs one's enjoyment even of the many truly creative strokes of this writer, amongst which, e.g., I unreservedly count the discovery of x-y-z-x as a title in which the first letter and the fourth must have the same value. It is thus characteristically only the 'victory of a cause' about which Professor Jensen is primarily concerned, and any one who ventures to hold a different opinion is assigned to the category of arrogant or envious 'opponents'; whereas to every scholar the main thing ought to be the victory of the truth, whether Sayce or Jensen or Hommel or others have a larger or a smaller share in it.

But now let us return to the alleged Armenianism of the language of the Hittite inscriptions. Even if it were granted that *Syennesis* is the true key, how much does Professor Jensen thereby learn of the character of this language, whose inscriptions, according to him, contain only titles? *Es*, we are told, means 'I,' and *mi*, 'I am,' and in Armenian *es* (from *eso*) is 'I,' and *em* (from *esmi*), 'I am.' But even in pre-Indo-Germanic Armenian, the so-called Vannic, which lies much nearer and yet is left entirely out of view by Professor Jensen, 'I' is *ies*, and there too the form 'I am' appears to have contained a labial (cf. 1st sing. *-ubi*), just as, for instance, also in Sumerian 'to be' was expressed by *mi*. Further, according to Professor Jensen, the genitive plural ended in *-m* (which is disputed by others, such as Reckendorf and Messerschmidt), and it so happens precisely that in Armenian the ancient Indo-Germanic gen. plur. end-

ing is no longer discoverable. Again, in the Hittite inscriptions there is a nominative sing. ending in *-s* still in vigorous use, although perhaps in certain cases (for reasons as yet unknown to us) it has been dropped, and just here once more Armenian wants all trace of an original nominative in *-s*. Professor Jensen tells us that *mes* means 'great' (Armenian *mets*), but, assuming that his reading is correct, we might have here equally well an Iranian (Scythian) *maz*, for the presence of Iranians in these regions at least subsequent to c. 1400 B.C. has been shown (cf. Hommel, *Hethiter und Skythen*, Prag, 1898). According to Professor Jensen, the ancient name of the Armenians, *Hay*, originated from *Hatio*. But, according to P. de Lagarde, in Armenian *ati* became *ay* only immediately before a consonant, e.g. *hair* = 'father,' from *pater*. Moreover, the name of the country *Hani* may be the prototype of *Hay*, not to speak of the possibility that *Hay* = *Hatio* might simply have been taken over from the aboriginal Vannic inhabitants, like so much else in the speech of the Armenians who migrated in the sixth century from Phrygia (or, earliest of all, from Thracia), i.e. the speech of the ancient Alarodians, who were gradually Indo-Germanized by the Armenians. But perhaps Professor August Fick is right in deriving *Hay* from *Pai* in Paionia (cf. Kata-onia, Lyka-onia).

Strangest of all, however, are the further proofs offered by Professor Jensen of the Armenianism of the Hittite inscriptions, namely, the acrophonic derivation of a number of phonetic values from Armenian words. The figure of the pointed shoe he reads (rightly or wrongly) *z*, and compares the rare Armenian word *trekh* (a kind of peasant's shoe), although the Lesgian *tapi*, *dabri*, *tipir* = 'shoe,' lay equally near to his hand, provided this method of procedure is to be approved at all. A semi-circle in this position C he holds (perhaps rightly) to be *r*; but in this Professor Jensen by a great stretch of imagination sees the figure of the 'worm,' although this would certainly have been depicted as coiled, and compares the Armenian *ordn*, 'worm.' The figure of a long beak denotes, we are told, *ar*, and with this the Armenian *aragil* (from *varagil*, cf. *πελαργός*, Russian *zherabl* = 'crane,' hence orig. *gharagil*), 'stork,' is compared. The bird in the above described divine ideogram, which, however, Jensen reads *Arzavi*, is held to be an eagle, on account of the Armenian *artsiv* = 'eagle.' This last, however, is an ancient Iranian

loan-word in Armenian (Zend, *ereziyya*), and, if Jensen's reading were correct, might witness equally well in favour of a Scythian origin for the Hittites. The sign for *a* is preceded by the figure of a jar; now it is no wonder, in view of the manifold names for 'jar,' 'vase,' or 'pitcher,' to find one beginning with *a*; Jensen finds two names for one of these vessels, namely, *aman* and *anoth*. Unfortunately, however, both are loan-words, the first Iranian (cf. Persian *mân*, and hence also the Syrian *mân*), and the second Semitic. A calf's head is held to indicate the sound of P, which, however, is extremely questionable; now, we are reminded, 'calf' in Armenian is *orth* (New Armenian *horth*), which perhaps arose from an older *porth* (cf. *πόρτις*), whereas *ordn*, 'worm,' for instance, is offered as proof for *r*. But who can guarantee us that both *orth* and *ordn* were not in the most ancient Armenian pronounced *vorth* (or *forth*) and *vordn* (*fördn*)? The ram's head has perhaps the phonetic value *k* or *g*, hence Jensen compares the Armenian *khoy* = 'ram,' whereas, e.g. the Lesgian *ke*, *kha*, *kheb* = 'sheep,' might as well (only from a different standpoint) have been compared; nay, it may be that even the Armenian *khoy* comes from the Caucasian languages, and was thus of Alarodian origin. But the largest demand is made upon us in connexion with the words *hat* = 'cut' (infin. *hatanel*), *trtsak* = 'bundle,' and *mtruk* = 'foal.' A hand with a gimlet or a style (not a knife) is said to have the phonetic value *khat*, with which *hatanel* = 'cut' (properly *κόπτειν*) is compared; a real knife, on the other hand, indicates a word-separator (as the cutting agent)! Again, a tied up wine-skin (cf. a quite similar looking Egyptian hieroglyph) is intended to represent *tar*, of which *trtsak*, 'bundle (of clothes?)' is supposed to furnish the explanation. Finally, a sign which might as well represent a vase tapering to a point at the bottom as a foal's head, is held, on the ground of the Armenian *mtruk* = 'foal,' to be an ideogram for the royal name *Mutallu*, a name which was spread over the whole of Asia Minor and reached even as far as Etruria, as is proved by the Lycian *Motala*, *Motlis*, the Cilician *Motales*, the Hittite *Mutanlu* (not *Motanar*), the Carian *Motylos*, the Latin (originally Etruscan) *Metellus*. From the names *Obri-motes*, *Arsa-motes*, *Ma-motasis*, *Motatsurgis* one sees that we have here an Alarodian root *mot* enlarged by *l* and employed as a proper

name, which of course can have no connexion with the Armenian *mtruk*, unless the latter word is derived from the pre-Indo-Germanic Armenian. Such a method of argument may impose upon whom it will, it does not support the Armenianism of the Hittite inscriptions, but discredits it in the highest degree.

More attractive appear such contentions as that for an Armenian *te* = 'lord' (from an older *deo*, 'god'), deduced from *ter*, 'lord' (*te* + *ari* 'man'), and *tekin*, 'mistress' (*te* + *kin*, 'woman'). But even here we may have to do with simply an old Scythian loan-word or an Alarodian and not a genuine Armenian term (genuine Armenian in the sense of Phrygio-Armenian), for the same *te*, 'lord,' appears as early as the second millennium B.C. in the divine names *Teshub* (cf. *Tishpak* and *Shipak*) and *Tekhip* (cf. *Khipa*). Here we may remark that the ethnological inferences drawn by Jensen (*Hittiter und Armenier*, p. 202 f., and earlier in the *ZDMG*, 48, 434 ff.) from the different position of the divine name in proper names are fundamentally wrong. He there distinguishes, apart from his *Hatio* Armenians, two non-Indo-Germanic populations of W. Asia, one Aegeo-Armenian (or Lycian), in whose proper names the divine name always stands first (e.g. *Tarkhu-nazi*, *Tarkhu-lara*), and another Aegeo-Zagrian (Mitanni, Vannic, and Elamite), in whose proper names the divine name appears only in

the second place (e.g. *Kili-Teshup*). That this division is radically wrong I have already shown in my *Assyriological Notes*, § 24 and 25 (*Proc. Bib. Arch. Soc.* xix. pp. 79 ff.), consequently the whole treatment of the subject in Jensen's book (pp. 202-206) belongs to the region of airy speculation. The circumstance that a certain *Sadi-Teshup* (cf. the Lydian *Sady-attes* = *Sadi-Khati*), is the son of *Khattu-sir* (i.e. *Khati-sir*, *Kheta-sir* = 'the god *Khati*, is exalted' or the like), and other similar cases, shatter all these hyperingenious combinations. With reference to the god *Khati* compare, by the way, also the name of the well-known goddess 'Atar-ati, *Atar-gatis*, *Der-keto*, in which Jensen (p. 157 f.) strangely believes that the divine name *Tarkhu* (with Semitic feminine ending) is concealed, being unaware of the Armenian form for this, *Thar-hatay*, *Thar-hat* (P. de Lagarde, *Mitth.* i. 78), which would at the same time have shown him that a Hittite word *Khati* becomes in Armenian *Hatay*, not *Hay*.

I might go on for pages enumerating further absurdities, but what has been adduced will suffice, I hope, to leave the impression that there is nothing in the Armenian hypothesis, and that in spite of the assenting voices of some friends of Professor Jensen, Professor Sayce is perfectly justified in speaking of the Hittite inscriptions as—still undeciphered.

## At the Literary Table.

### THE BOOKS OF THE MONTH.

MESSRS. BLACKWOOD & SONS have published a new edition of Professor Campbell Fraser's Gifford Lectures on the *Philosophy of Theism*. The two volumes of the original issue have been reduced to one. The result is an immense gain in terseness and clearness. Now the argument which runs through the lectures is followed without distraction, and its weight is increased by the introduction into the volume, here and there, of new paragraphs, and especially by the lucid retrospect at the close.

From the office of *The Christian Pictorial* comes the twelfth handsome volume, which contains the

weekly numbers from September 1898 to February 1899. We rejoice greatly in the prosperity of this paper. Its tone is always good, its contents are always stimulating. It avoids the hard and narrow on the one side and the worldly godless on the other. The continued stories are its only weakness.

ANECDOTES AND MORALS. BY THE REV. LOUIS ALBERT BANKS, D.D. (*Funk & Wagnalls*, Crown 8vo, pp. xlvi, 47s. 6s.)

Dr. Banks has gathered his anecdotes from the newspapers, and has gathered well. He gives them in the briefest form, and he never fails to