

Dr. Winckler¹ considers the Muşur, which is here mentioned with Meluḥḥa as coming to the help of the Ekronites, to be the so-called North Arabian country, and not Egypt. But Egypt was the natural ally of Palestine, and there is no reason to suppose that the Muşur here mentioned is anything else but Egypt, especially as the scene of the battle was Eltekeh, which is either in or near Philistia.

(5) Dr. Winckler finds support for his Arabian Muşri² in a Himyaritic text (Glaser, 1155 = Halévy, 535) which mentions *Mşr*, *'Aşr*, *'ēbr nhrn*,³ and *Mdi*. *'Aşr* is mentioned elsewhere in the Himyaritic inscriptions (Glaser, 1083). The former of these inscriptions was assigned by Hartmann⁴ to the year of the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses (525 B.C.), and there is little doubt that this dating is correct. *Mşr* undoubtedly refers to Egypt; *Mdi*, of which Dr. Winckler gives no explanation, is, as far as we can judge at present, Media; while the identification of *Aşr* is as yet uncertain. Hartmann has shown that the speculations of Hommel as to the possibility of this inscription dating back to the time of the eighteenth Egyptian dynasty (c. 1500 B.C.) are without foundation, and the same may be said for the theory promulgated by Dr. Winckler, according to whom this text gives a hint of the wars of the people of Ma'in (= Meluḥḥa) and its supposed northern dependency, his imaginary Muşri, against the Assyrians in Southern Palestine in the eighth century B.C.⁵ The explanation of Hartmann is entirely sufficient; and no proof of the existence of an Arabian Muşri can be found in the Minæan inscriptions. It may be noted that Dr. Winckler does not accept the obvious meaning of the term *'ēbr nhrn*, "across the river," i.e. in the eyes of the Arabs Persia, an explanation which entirely fits in with Hartmann's chronological theory.

(6) Dr. Winckler, however, has finally brought forward evidence which, on the face of it, seems good. He maintains that the small fragment of Assyrian tablet 83-1-18, 836 (which mentions Esarhaddon) proves the existence of Muşri as distinct from Mişri, i.e. Egypt. It "wird durch seine nebeneinanderennung von Muşri und Mişri d.h. von unserem Musri und Ägypten," he says, "ja wol wenigstens die auseinanderhaltung beider länder von nun an bewirken,"

and he has attached such importance to it that he has published it in full.⁶ Unfortunately, besides one or two other bad blunders⁷ in a small text of six fragmentary lines, he has misread the one sign which was of importance to his theory.

In the fourth line Dr. Winckler reads, . . . mā]tu Mu-uş-ri u mātu Mi-iş-[ri . . . , thus proving to his own satisfaction that Muşri and Mişri were two distinct countries. But the *iş* in Mi-iş-[ri] ends at the break in the clay, and even from the very slight traces that remain, it is certain that the character is not *iş*. Taking into consideration the common conjunction of the country *Miluhha* with Muşri, so well known to Assyriologists,

¹ *Allor. Forsch.*, i. 27.

² *Musri, Meluḥḥa, Ma'in*, p. 20.

³ = 'ēber ha-nahar (Winckler) [? hannahar].

⁴ *Zeits. für Assyriol.*, x., 32.

⁵ *Musri, Meluḥḥa, Ma'in*, 18.

⁶ *Muşri, Meluḥḥa, Ma'in*, p. 2.

⁷ For *pa-na* read [DINGIR].ALAD (l. 3), and add a determinative prefix to the proper name in l. 5. Read *ina lib-bi* after *ša* in l. 3.

there can be no possible doubt that the sign was originally *luḥ*, and not *iş*, and the slight traces that remain (the traces of the top of another vertical wedge) make this hypothesis a certainty. Thus Dr. Winckler's attempted proof of a mention in Assyrian literature of a Muşri side by side with Mişri (Egypt) falls to the ground.

Dr. Winckler has therefore furnished no proof whatever of the existence of a North Arabian Muşri, and until he does so, it is impossible to believe in the existence of a Muşri other than Egypt and the well-known country in Northern Syria.

Apart from these matters, Dr. Paton has evidently spent much time and trouble on his book, and although he has been influenced in too great a degree by the school of Hommel, his compilation will probably be found useful. Both Dr. Paton and Dr. Duff have added an excellent index to their books, and if only they had had a wider acquaintance with the languages of Assyria and Egypt, they would probably have been able to speak in less uncertain tones of the results obtained from the study of cuneiform and hieroglyphic texts.

R. C. T.

OUR BOOK SHELF.

The Elementary Principles of Chemistry. By A. V. E. Young. Pp. xiv + 252 + 106. (London: Hirschfeld Brothers, Ltd., 1902.) Price 5s. net.

THIS book, which is of American authorship, provides an elementary course of inorganic chemistry based upon the quantitative system. There is a theoretical part, an experimental part, and an appendix giving hints on manipulation. The student is to perform the experiments, make notes, and then to turn to the theoretical part for fuller information on the topic of his experiments, the teacher supervising each portion of the work.

The author expresses the hope that his book will contribute "to making practicable and serviceable that which he enthusiastically believes is both scientifically and pedagogically an improvement on the older and still largely prevailing method." An examination of the book leads to the belief that this hope will be fulfilled, for there can be no doubt that the author is imbued with real educational zeal, and that he has bestowed much care and thought upon the arrangement of an excellent sequence of experiments illustrative of the main principles of chemistry.

A. S.

P.O.P. (The Use of Silver Printing-out Papers). By A. Horsley Hinton. Pp. 134. (London: Hazell, Watson and Viney, Ltd., 1902.) Price 1s. net.

SILVER printing-out papers are now so extensively used that a small volume like this cannot fail to be useful to a large number of those who practise photography. There is nothing particularly original in it, but a practical and successful photographer like the author cannot set down a series of instructions without giving many a useful hint. Current photographic literature and manufacturers' "instructions" furnish an almost endless variety of formulæ for the treatment of printing-out papers; it will therefore be distinctly advantageous to those whose experience of such papers is not large to have a small collection of selected formulæ such as is here given. The illustrations that show the extent of over printing necessary to compensate for the loss by toning and fixing, and the kind of negative best suited for these processes, will be very welcome to the beginner. It would have been but little trouble to provide an index, the advantage of which in a book of practical instructions it is not necessary to point out.