Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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:

https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal   https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

be day and night in their season; then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign on his throne ; and with the Levites the priests, my ministers," (33: 7, 15, 20, 21). " Be not afraid of the king of Babylon, of whom ye are afraid ; be not afraid of him, saith the Lord; for I am with you to save you, and to deliver you from his hand," (42: 11). " Fear not thou, O my servant Jacob, and be not dismayed, O Israel ; for, behold, I will save thee from afar off, and thy seed from the land of their captivity," (46: 27).

Such is a specimen of the predictions in Jeremiah relating to the restoration of the Jews. And now taking into view the fact, that he lived in the time of the dispersion, and died leaving the people in their captive state, of which is it most reasonable to believe that he spoke, of the restoration then about to take place, glancing occasionally, as the subject was suggested, to the more important work the Messiah was to perform in the world ? or to some literal restoration now at this far distant period ? Let the prophet speak of the subject in hand, and let his glances at the far future be at the Messiah and his dispensation, that great idea ever present to the Jewish mind ; and all is natural and easy— just as we should expect. But the attempt to make out a course of prediction in reference to a literal restoration from present dispersions, overlooks the subject in hand, introduces a principle of interpretation that tends to secularize religion ; and, by depriving many passages of their spiritual import, robs them of their chief richness and glory.

[To be concluded.]

ARTICLE VII.

MEIER'S LEXICON OF HEBREW ROOTS.

Hebräisches Wurzelwörterbuch, nebst drei Anhängen über die Bildung der Quadriliern Erklärung der Fremdwörter im Hebräischen, und über das Verhältniss des Ægyptischen Sprachstammes zum Semitischen ; von Dr. Ernst Meier, Privatdocenten an der Universität zu Tübingen. pp. 783. Manheim, 1845.

By Rev. Charles A. Hay, Professor in Lutheran Theol. Sem., Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

THE consanguinity of the Semitic and Indo-European languages is now generally acknowledged. But as to the degree of

relationship that exists between them, there is still much differ-
ence of opinion.   Gesenius, in his Thesaurus and Manual Lexi-
con, was continually on the lookout for points of contact, and suc-
ceeded in finding many cases in which the apparent coincidence
was very striking.   That the Graeco-Latin branch of the great
northern family of languages derived its written characters from
the Semitic, he has shown most satisfactorily in his " Monu-
menta Phoenicia,"[1] but the connecting link that proves the origi-
nal substantial identity of the languages themselves, he believes
he has discovered in the Sanscrit, the classic language of the East.

Once fairly started in this direction and eager to find resem-
blances of this kind, we are not surprised to see him occasionally
led into error by coincidences which subsequent investigation
has proved to be merely fortuitous.   The reason of this we find
in the fact that he compared already developed grammatical
forms, in Hebrew, with the clearly ascertained *roots* of the San-
scrit, as is hinted at by his pupil and commentator Roediger,[2] who,
in allusion to these attempts of Gesenius, remarks :

" A remote connection between these languages cannot be de-
nied, and therefore a comparative investigation of them is of value
for lexicography ; but one needs great caution and a comprehen-
sive knowledge of the relations of sounds in both families, in or-
der to avoid error and deception in comparing them.   In the pres-
ent state of the investigation, there is almost as much merit in
rejecting that which does not bear all the marks of affinity, as in
discovering what at first sight may appear to agree."

Or in the words of the author whose work we propose briefly
to notice :

" This relation [of original identity between these languages],
can only then be clearly proved when we reduce the dissyllabic
stems to their simple monosyllabic original elements, and thus
trace them up to one fountain head, where the nations and lan-
guages, that subsequently so greatly diverged, formed one great
uniform whole, and had as yet no separate existence.   This prin-
ciple has as yet not been generally acknowledged.   In practice,
at least, even the most judicious philologists have sinned against
it.   For it will presently be shown, that of the analogies collected
by Gesenius, who went to work in his comparison of the Sanscrit

---

[1] See a few selections from the tables of Gesenius' splendid work in Prof.
Conant's edition of Roediger's Ges. Hebr. Gram. p. 16.

[2] Conant's ed. of Roediger's Gesenius, p. 19, and Stuart's ed. p. 3, 4, note.

without settled principles, but still with less arbitrariness and vio-
lence than others, scarcely a fourth part are genuine, and that,
consequently, the relationship of the two great families of lan-
guages, is essentially different from what this celebrated linguist
(sonst so verdienter Forscher) supposed it to be. The funda-
mental error lies in this, that he compared Hebrew verbs, which
in their present simplest form are proper *perfects*, and therefore
not *roots*, with roots in the Indo-Germanic family, without ever
starting the question as to the seat of the root in Hebrew.; much
less answering it, and thus leading back this singular phenome-
non to its source in the structure of the language. The same
fault, moreover, characterizes all past attempts at comparison and
derivation in the Semitic languages." Introd. p. 4.

" These attempts at comparison now appear to me as voyages
of discovery undertaken without compass, and in which, even
that which was intuitively correctly apprehended, could not be
conclusively proven." Preface, p. xx.

This sounds very much as though we were to expect at the
hands of our author, a sudden divorce between the Asiatic sisters
and family dissensions among their European descendants. Far
from it! Whilst, on almost every alternate page, showing, or
attempting to show, how exceedingly mistaken Gesenius was in
his supposed resemblances, he assumes far higher ground than
Gesenius ever dreamed of, and asserts, that " in general, the fun-
damental roots in the Semitic [reducible, as he subsequently
maintains to the number of *twenty-four !*] together with their sim-
ple, original meaning, occur also in the Indo-Germanic, and even
correspond to these frequently in their secondary or derived sig-
nifications." Pref. p. xl.

Here we have a vast stride in comparative philology, *if our au-
thor's theory be correct.* We hear Roediger whilst treading in his
master's footsteps and perpetuating his fame, warning against his
enthusiastic advances in this direction, as follows : (l. c.) " It is
already an established result *that these two families of languages
do not stand in a sisterly or any close relationship to each other*, and
that the characteristic structure of both must be dissected before
we can find the original parts which they possess in common."
And at once we hear the response from a pupil of the rival
school, ' I have dissected the characteristic structure of both, and
have proven them to be twin-sisters.'

The comparison of these languages, however, was of course

not our author's main design in the preparation of his "*Lexicon of Hebrew Roots.*" His object was to arrange scientifically all the materials of the classic Hebrew. Here the great question would naturally be ' where lies the original root?' And it was in prosecuting this investigation that he was led to the result to which we have just alluded. Others have proposed this question before, but no one has satisfactorily answered it. None of the recent grammarians, indeed, have been content to regard the trilit-eral verbal forms *in their present state* as the original roots.[1]

Ewald (l. c.) suggests, that " in the internal vocalization [of the triliteral root] there lies the original difference between the verb and the noun ; so that we can no longer pronounce the *root,* i. e. the three consonantal sounds, as a pure root, without making this distinction, but [must pronounce it] either as a *verb* כָּתַב or as a noun כָּתֵב. In the present development of the language the root is therefore merely a learned *abstractum,* as an invisible root of which we see only the stems and branches that have grown forth from it." The roots, then, in his view, consisted originally of three consonants, at present unpronounceable, except as verbs or nouns.

Gesenius already, in the Lehrgebäude, had thrown out some hints in regard to the probable nature of these original roots. Af-ter describing the present simplest forms (which he nevertheless calls *wurzellaute, radical forms*) and commenting upon their uni-formity, he proceeds (§ 53, 3): " However universal this uniformity may now be, we nevertheless meet with several phenomena that clearly prove it not to have been equally universal in the begin-ning, but brought about at a later day, although no doubt in the youthful period of the language, by a sort of grammatical system-atizing (grammatischer Reflexion)." These phenomena are:

a) The numerous series of verbs that have two radical letters in common, and differ either by the repetition of one of these or the addition of a semi-vowel ; e. g. יָטַב and טוֹב *to be good,* נָפַק and פּוּחַ *to blow,* דּוּךְ, דָּכַךְ, דָּכָה and דָּכָא, *to strike ;*

b) The original monosyllabic substantive forms אָב *father,* אֵם *mother,* הַר *mountain,* עִיר *city,* יוֹם *day,* יָד *hand,* דָּם *blood,* etc. ; and

c) The classes of verbs which have two consonants in com-mon, but vary greatly in the third one, and yet agree at least fun-damentally in signification ; e. g. לָצַץ, לָצָה, לָצַם, לָצַם, לָצַח, לָצַב, לָצַע,

<hr>

[1] Gesenius' Lehrgebäude, § 53, 2. Ewald, Gram der Hebr. Sprache (3rd edition) §§ 204, 205. Stuart's or Conant's Roediger's Gesenius, § 1, 3, b. and § 30, 1 and 2. And yet the unfortunate habit still remains almost universal, of calling these forms the *roots* of the language.

לָעַק, in the different dialects, with the signification *to lick;* רָעָה,

דָּחַם, דָּחַר, דָּחַב, רָהַם, רָהַה, *to push;* etc.

These 'phenomena' or facts have been the theme of much speculation. It was no doubt these that led *Neuman* more than a century ago,[1] not merely to assert the original monosyllabic character of all Hebrew roots, but also, after endeavoring to ascertain the ultimate signification and power of the original elements of the language from their name, form, etc., to attempt with these a reconstruction of the radical forms, or, what is almost equivalent to this, a deduction of the meaning of the biconsonantal term from the united significations of its constituent parts. Even then, however, this theory was not new, for *Rave* had published it in his Deliniatio Analogiae Hebraicae, Amst. 1647.

In the work before us we recognize a theorist of the same class, who introduces however an additional feature, to us entirely new, and which he makes the ground-work of his whole performance.

Before proceeding to sketch the author's theory of the original character and the development of the Semitic dialects, and indeed of language in general, we will state the usually entertained opinion on this subject as expressed by Nordheimer, (p. 7 of the Pref. to his Hebr. Gram.) : "Since the external sound belongs entirely to the material and the idea which it represents as exclusively to the immaterial world, the two stand at a distance so remote from each other, that the connection between them has hitherto been a complete *res occulta;* and such doubtless it will continue, so long as we shall remain ignorant of the nature of the union existing between the body and the soul. For the present, therefore, we must rest content, with the ability to trace the connection of such of these representatives of ideas with their originals, as are rather imitations of natural sounds than the immediate production of the operations of the mind, viz. *onomatopees;* while that which exists between those words and their primary cause, whose origin lies in the activity of the soul, whether excited by sensation or reflection, is likely to remain forever an impenetrable mystery."

Our author, on the other hand, after denying that the language contains a single example of onomatopy (see p. 35), maintains that there was a kind of linguistic instinct originally active in the

---

[1] Gesenius, Geschichte der Hebr. Sprache u. Schrift, S. 125.

formation of the Semitic dialects, and indeed of all languages, by which certain sounds were felt to be proper representations of certain classes of ideas, and hence were originally employed in all languages to express those ideas. Further, that the original combinations of these elementary sounds were all monosyllabic, consisting in every case of two consonants of different organs, and deriving their significations from that of the final consonant.[1] Alas, that these *roots of the language* no longer occur in their original form, (or at least very rarely and then as *petrifactions*, for so he somewhere designates the monosyllabic particles whose derivation is not apparent) but in a developed state, having undergone certain changes and " representing an idea either as an *act* or *deed*, operative and growing into being, or as quiescent, completed *existence*, i. e. they represent either verbs or nouns, therefore developed stems." Intr. p. 5.

Assuming, then, the original embodiment of the prominent ideas of the language in some twenty-four monosyllabic roots, with their modifications, (classified and presented in a tabular form on page 747,) he next proceeds to inquire, upon what principle their development into the simple verbal stems we are now in the habit of calling *roots* was regulated. And here he comes forward with his theory, which, he predicts is to effect an entire reformation in this department of philology! See Pref. p. xx. " Die ganze Art der Semitischen Sprachvergleichung wird künftig eine wesentlich andere werden."

And what is this theory? *That the verbal stems*, (i. e. the simplest form of the verb, *the perfects*) *have been formed just as in the Sanscrit, Gothic, Greek and Latin*, by the REDUPLICATION OF THE RADICAL SYLLABLE. " The essential nature of the *perfect* in Sanscrit, as well as in Gothic, Greek and Latin, consists in the reduplication of the radical syllable ; e. g. Sanscr. *tan* = extend, *perf. tatana*, I or he extended. In like manner γέγραφα, τέτευχα, cecidi, cucurri, momordi, etc. Gothic, *skaiskaid*, I or he separated, *haihait*, I or he called, *staistant*, I or he pushed." Intr. p. 5.

---

[1] Those ending in a *labial* letter, whatever the first consonant may be, all growing out of the idea of *drawing together, filling, joining*, etc. with secondary meanings easily deducible from these ; e. g. קם , חם , רם , etc.

Those, on the other hand, that end in a *dental* or *lingual* all express originally the idea of *separation, splitting, dividing* ; e. g. בה ,רח ,קד, חׁ, etc.

And the *gutturals* and *palatals* give to the root the signification of *making dense or firm* ; e. g. שׁב, סׁך, לׁק, םׁק, etc.

" Instead of the whole root, however, in Sanscrit, (to go no fur-
ther for the present,) only the first radical sound, or of two initial
consonants only the stronger is repeated, as of γράφω, γέγραφα.
And then in place of a guttural the corresponding palatal is re-
peated, e. g. *gam* to go, perf. *gagama*, and in place of an aspirate
the corresponding tenuis; e. g. *dhâ*, perf. *dadhâ* (τίθημι) as in
Greek *θύω τέθυκα ; φιλέω, πεφίληκα.* Similar substitutions, but
not according to any regular system, occur also in Hebrew. . . . . .
The reduplicated syllable is, moreover, always abbreviated in
Sanscrit as also in Greek, so that the tone usually falls upon the
second syllable, in which the radical vowel, if it had been short,
is almost always lengthened, or if it had been long, remains so ;
tatând, beside *tátáná.*" p. 6.

" I hope, in what follows, to prove to a demonstration, that the
Hebrew perfect had its origin in the reduplication of the radical syl-
lable and herein agrees with the Sanscrit and its cognates.   Only
it may be proper for me at once to remark, and cursorily to prove,
that the repetition and augmentation of the simple, radical sylla-
ble in the Semitic dialects, takes place in a greater variety of
forms than in those languages, and hence has maintained a char-
acter peculiar to itself." p. 7.

Here he stumbles upon the great difficulty of his undertaking.
It may not require much skill to discover at least a semblance of
reduplication in such forms as אָרַל, חָנַב, פָּחַד, חָכַם, etc.; but it is
notorious, that in the vast majority of Hebrew perfects the simi-
larity lies between the *last two* radicals, e. g. חָשַׁשׁ, סָבַב, and the
whole class of עע verbs, together with such forms as, צָוָה, סָכַח,
פָּקַד, בָּעָה, לָחַץ, דָּנָה, etc. or between the *first and third*, e. g. נָתַן,
שָׁרַשׁ, צָלַל, סָרַס, etc. where these are identical, together with such
as, פָּעַם, יָרַד, אָרַח, כָּלַה, עָנָה, חָקַק, etc.

But this mountain is a molehill before our author; he clears
it with a leap.   For what is the object of reduplication ?   It is to
represent " *an extension of the verbal idea.*"   That is, we may com-
pare the developed, *perfect* verbal form to the stem of a tree or
horn of an ox, where the concentric circles prove the past devel-
opment of the object.   Now in the Indo-European family of lan-
guages, this extension of the verbal idea is represented in all ca-
ses, by *prefixing* to the root the root itself in a modified form ;
that is, the root has developed itself into a stem in a certain di-
rection.   The Hebrew roots, however, whether from greater fer-
tility in the mental glebe of patriarchal times, or for some other
cause unknown, shot forth in various directions.   The Semitic

languages exhibit not merely a *prae-reduplication*, (Vorn-verdop-
pelung) as in the Indo-European family, but also a *post-redupli-
cation*, (Hinten-verdoppelung). In the words of our author, " This
reduplication can occur:

I. *In the beginning of the word*, by the repetition of the first
radical; e. g. חָכַל, חָכַר, חָכַם, from the roots כל, שׂי, and מם.[1]

II. *In the end of the word*; either 1. By the repetition of the
first radical, as נבן, חָרַח, נָחַן, etc. or 2. By the repetition of the
second, as חָלַל, עָיַח, etc.

III. The deficient reduplication can be compensated for by a
kind of *guna-formation*,[2] e. g. רַם, בַד, מַר, comp. lego, legi; moveo,
movi; lavo, lavi, etc. This prolongation takes the place of redu-
plication and corresponds precisely to the lengthening of the rad-
ical syllable, some traces of which we find already in the San-
scrit, e. g. *mene*, I meant." Ib.

Taking it now for granted that this method of *prae* and *post*
reduplication was followed in the development of the original
roots, the next question would be, whence the almost infinite va-
riety in the verbal consonants? This difficulty also vanishes at
the magic touch of our author, for " In general, it is to be observed,
that the language endeavors, both in the first and second of these
classes, to avoid the repetition of the same consonant both in the
beginning and end of the word, and hence changes the redupli-
cated letter into one nearly related to it. This gives rise to great
variety in the development of the stems and in the secondary
significations, *which same end is attained in the Indo-European
family by composition with prepositions*;[3] e. g. חָמַק, for חָמַח, perf. of

---

[1] The root is, by the theory, doubled, כבכל; the first ב is then omitted, as
in *cucurri* for *cu(r)curri*; and finally the first כ for the sake of euphony,
changed into ח, of the same organ. This is in few words, the author's theory,
applied equally at the beginning or end of the root and carried out consistently
through the whole work.

[2] " *Guna* consists in the prefixing of a short *a* and Vriddhi in that of a long
one; but in both cases the prefixed *a* sound, according to settled laws of eu-
phony, forms a diphthong with the radical vowel." *Bopp.* Vergleichende
Gram. des Sanscr., etc. I. § 26.

[3] Take the following from page 8, as an illustration : " From the stem בָּתַח
[cut], which is to be looked upon as a new ground-form or original stem, we find
the following sub-stems have grown forth. בָּתַשׁ=בָּתַח *to strike, hammer,* pr. *split,
break in pieces;* further, with a change of *s* into *r* בָּתַר, *to keep off,* pr, *attack;* בְּתֵרֶת
section, end, point; hence, the *head of a pillar, chapter.* From this stem there is
further derived, by a change of *r* into ל, בָּתַל, *to separate, divide;* hence בֹּתֶל *a
wall,* pr. that which shuts out, separates; comp. מָטַל *to separate, pierce through,
hew down, kill.* Also, with a change of ל into ן, בָּתַן *to separate, keep off, cover;*

the root חזן; פֵּצָה, from the root כן, *to separate, bend*, softened from כֵּנָה; also גֵּרַע, instead of גָּרַע, from the root גד, *to separate* ; קָרַע for קָרַץ; etc.   Especially frequent is the change of the T into the S sounds, and the reverse, according to established and well-known laws; e. g. צָמַד instead of צָמַץ from the root צם, *to bind together*; חָטַשׁ to seize, for חָטַף from חם, etc.

This subject of changes and substitutions among the similar and related sounds, the author takes up *in extenso* and makes indeed the system of transmutations the subsidiary basis of his whole arrangement, to the utter disregard of all alphabetic order.   The want of this (though in some measure atoned for by full indexes at the end), together with the fact that sufficient prominence is not given in the unbroken paragraphs, either to the "stems" or "branches," renders the work unnecessarily heavy.

In the arrangement of the materials, he has collected, in the first place, all the PRAE-REDUPLICATED VERBAL STEMS[1] and classified them in the following way:

I. Those in which the first radical is, as in Sanscrit, repeated

---

hence, *clothes*, comp. كَنَم, *to separate, keep off, conceal* ; كَظِيم, *close, compact*, of a seam; كَتَن, *to surround*. The under-garment, מִתְגָּר , is purely Semitic and passed hence to the Greek χιτών, κιτών, and by transposition *tunica*."

It may interest the reader, to see, in juxtaposition with this description of the supposed development of the root בם (cut), the Indo-Germanic method of indicating the various modifications of the same idea, as presented by the author, p. 86.   The stem appears in German, as *Schneiden*, assuming, by the prefixing of prepositions, among others, the following variety of forms and shades of meaning.   *Schneiden*, to cut; *beschneiden*, to circumcise ; *ver-schneiden*, to cut up, castrate ; *an-schneiden*, to carve ; *zu-schneiden*, to cut out, as cloth for a coat ; *aus-schneiden*, cut out ; *auf-schneiden*, to cut open ; *vor-schneiden*, lead in cutting ; *zer-schneiden*, to cut to pieces ; *ab-schneiden*, to cut off; *ein-schneiden*, to cut in ; *durch-schneiden*, to cut through ; etc.

[1] He asserts that there are no original substantives, or nominal roots, in Hebrew, but that our present nouns, without exception, are an after-growth from the verbal stems, p. XLV. Pref. He admits, however, a second class of roots in the demonstrative and personal pronouns (which in fact appear to be common to almost all known languages, cf. Nordheimer's Heb. Gr. § 125 sq., and p. XVIII. Pref.) but denies the simple interjections, ah, O, ha! etc., a place in the sphere of rational language (cf. Ewald l. c. § 201), inasmuch as "they are merely mechanical expirations which involuntarily escape from the lungs in gaping or sighing."   The language of irrational animals consists of interjections.   In the present work he leaves out of view the pronouns and interjections, and confines himself mainly to the discussion of the verbal roots, with their development into perfects, nouns substantive and adjective, etc.

32*

and usually softened; as חָמַם from כם, *to bring together;* יָקַר from קר *to separate.*

II. Those in which the gutturals and palatals ק, כ, ג, ה and ע, have been changed in the reduplicated syllable into י or א; as

<div align="center">

יָקַץ , יָחַל , יָחַם , יָעַד , etc.

אָכַל , אָחַל , אָגַד , etc.

</div>

All the stems, or developed perfects, thus formed, (between seventy and eighty in number,) he believes himself able to trace up distinctly to *six principal roots,* whence he accounts for their striking similarity of signification. He thus arranges them:

<div align="center">

1. קָד , כד, גד , חד , עד , עט .

2. קָץ , עס , עץ , עז , חז , גז , סס ;
further, אש , עש , חס , כם , קש .

3. קָר , חר , עֿר , חר , גר , פר .

4. קָל , אל , חל , על , חל , גל , כל , כל .

5. כן , יֿן , וֿן , יֿן , חֿן , גן .

6. כם , — יב , חב , גב , קב , כף , חף , קף , כף ;
which are related to גם , חֿם , עם , (יֿם) .

</div>

He next proceeds to the discussion of the POST-REDUPLICATED STEMS, which embrace by far the greater number.

The first class here includes *such as repeat the first radical,* either unchanged, as סָרַס for סרסר , נֵנֵן , נָחַן , etc.; or with some modifications, rarely euphonic, but generally according to strict principles based upon the nature of the sounds themselves, e. g.

1. Gutturals are exchanged for each other and the palatals; הָקַ from חן , where the reduplicated ח has been supplanted by the ק; עָנָה for עָנַע ; חָלַךְ for חָלַח ; etc.

2. Dentals and linguals interchanged; as צָפַר , סָבַל , סָבַל , שָׁלַט , דָּבַר , etc.

3. Labials interchanged; as בָּזַן , פָּחַם , etc.

4. Consonants of different organs;

    a) Gutturals into *s* and *t* sounds; as יָבֵשׁ , אָמַד , עָמַץ , פָּבַד , etc.

    b) Dentals and linguals into gutturals; as שָׁלַח , צָבָא , שָׁמַע , שָׂנָא , etc.

    c) Gutturals and palatals into labials; as חָלַם , יָשֵׁב , אָרַם .

The second class includes *such as repeat the second radical.*

1. Those that begin with a *guttural;* as חח , קץ , קש , etc.
From these are formed אָמַד , חָתַה , קָשַׁשׁ , etc.

2. Those beginning with *s* and *t* sounds; פֹּח, פֹֿם, etc.
   From these we have שָׁקַק, שָׁבָא, חָצַע, etc.
3. Those beginning with *labials*; as פֹּם, רֹם, etc.
   From these are formed פָּקַק, מָרָה, בָּרָה, מָשַׁשׁ, etc.
4. Those beginning with *liquids*; as רִין, לֹב, נֹ, etc.

   רָתַח, דָּצַע, רָצַם, רָקַם, etc.
   לָבַב, לָחַח, לָנַע, לָקַק, etc.
   נָטַס, נָכַח, נָקַק.

The third class embraces the *Monosyllabic Perfects*, formed by contraction. The author, in order to be consistent, has here to assume, at an early period of the history of the language, a development of some of the original roots into triliterals and their subsequent contraction into the forms in which we now find them. Such are שׁוּב from the root שׁוּב, contracted from שׁוּב; שֹׁם for מָם, from מם; חַק for פַּק, אוֹר for אַם, מאס for מָאַם, etc.

Among the most attractive portions of this interesting work are the *Appendices*, in the first of which the author discusses the Quadriliterals and finds in the manifold and manifest reduplications of simple roots a powerful argument in favor of his theory of the formation of the perfect.

In the second appendix he treats of the foreign words which at various periods were introduced into the Hebrew. Many that have been commonly held to be such, the flexibility of the language, according to his theory of its development, enables him to account for on the supposition of their Semitic origin.

In the third, he discusses the relation of the language of Egypt to the Semitic dialects. He regards them as essentially different, notwithstanding their similarity in the pronoun, in the want of a neuter gender, in the method of forming the comparative, etc., "which may be accounted for sufficiently, by the simplicity and antiquity of both families." The items of difference are of much greater importance, affecting their original development and organic structure, e. g. the affixes to the verbs are separable and the root usually remains unchanged; the original roots in the Egyptian frequently terminate in a vowel; compound substantives, aside from proper names, here frequently occur, etc. On the other hand, such facts as the following, viz: 1. "That the names of the country, of the principal river, and of the inhabitants are nearly all of Semitic origin; p. 728. 2. That many Egyptian designations of arts, vessels, measures, buildings, and

even of indigenous animals and other familiar objects are of
Semitic origin; p. 732.   3. That the principal deities of the
Egyptians, as well as their designations, are Semitic, p. 737," led
him to infer "with some degree of certainty that the de-
scendants of Shem, especially the Babylonians and Phoenicians
not only in general, had frequent intercourse with the Egyptians,
and introduced from Babylon the division of the year into twelve
months, the week of seven days, measures and weights, many
implements, etc., but that already in the infancy of the Egyptian
people a very considerable commingling of both must have taken
place, out of which and under the mighty influence of the
Egyptian soil [climate, etc.], the peculiar character of Egyptian
mind and life was developed.   The general similarity of religious
belief, and the propably more advanced culture of the Semitic
nations, secured for them the powerful religious influence which
the extensive intermixture of their language, and especially the
introduction of the names of their deities before alluded to, clear-
ly proves them to have exerted.

Hence we feel constrained entirely to dissent from the opinion
formerly so generally held, and still occasionally advocated, of the
positive influence of the Egyptians upon the religious and politi-
cal culture of the Hebrews.   What they have in common, e. g.
circumcision, was manifestly transplanted from Semitic to Egyp-
tian soil;" comp. p. 401 sq. and 744.

It now remains for us to give some specimens of the Author's
method of discussing the individual roots and tracing out the
derived meanings.

Whatever may be thought of his theory of reduplication and of
deducing the signification from the organs of speech employed
in the enunciation of the original root; his laborious industry in
the comparison and ingenious collocation of the Semitic dialects
cannot but awaken increased interest in the lovers of oriental
philology, and set forth with still greater clearness their intimate
relationship, and the consequent necessity of an acquaintance
with all of them to a *thorough* study of the Old Testament.

We select an illustration or two from each of his three great
classes, choosing such words as are of frequent occurrence and
endeavoring, by breaking up his paragraphs, to render him some-
what more lucid.

Among the *Prae-reduplicated Stems* we find for instance the
following:

"אָכַל, (p. 59) from the root כל, *to separate, divide,* hence *destroy, devour,* in various senses, said of fire, pestilence, war,—especially also of food; hence in general, *eat, eat up.*

Post-reduplicated, the stem appears as כָּלָה, *to be all gone, disappear,* Pi. *complete;* כָּלָא, *to separate = keep off, include.*   Comp. أَكَلَ, *fricuit, scabit, edit;* أُكُلّ, *rex, tyrannus,* pr. the *decider* = فَاعِل *imperator.*

חָכַם (p. 26) from the root כם, *to bring together.*   Cf. كَمَّ *to draw together, come together,* hence also *to cover;* كَمْكَام = κάγκαμον *something drawn together,* hence a) *gummi,* κόμμι, gum of trees = جَمْع. b) *Of a contracted, small form.* Harsher, as لَمْقَم, *to grasp.*

The significations of חָכַם are, therefore:

1. In the Arabic, حَكَم, *to bring together = make fast* (= حَكَم *to bind together*) *hem, keep off, defend, restrain.*

2. To MAKE FAST = *fix firmly, appoint,* and more particularly in a legal sense, *to prepare or resolve upon a firm, specific decision;* hence, in general, *decide, decide a contest, judge,* with which the idea of power and sovereignty is naturally connected.   The simple, related stem حَمّ also signifies *to firmly determine, distinctly specify.*   In like manner, the related جَمَّع IV.

3. *To make something fast, mentally,* i. e. *grasp, comprehend, perceive, understand;* hence Aram. and Arab. حَكَم, *discern, know,* Heb. חָכַם intrans., *to be wise, intelligent, sensible.*

From the same root the post-reduplicated perfect كَمْكَم = كَمَّ is formed, with the signification of *drawing together, holding back,* hence *to put on the reins;* in which case the repeated ك is softened to ح just as it appears *prae*-duplicated and softened in حَكَم.

Radically related is also the stem حَمَا, *to hem, keep off, defend;* חָמָה, which corresponds precisely to the Sanscr. *jam* = hem.   For the Germ *hemmen,* Eng. *hem,* signifies strictly, *draw together,* whence also *grasp, catch, hold back;* hence (Germ.) *Hamen,* purse-net, *hamus,* hook.

From the first signification we easily deduce that of *drawing*

over, covering, as in كَمٌ ,كَمَى ,عَمٌ ; hence (Germ.) *Hemd* shirt; comp. Swedish *ham,* cover, garment, (as كُمّ an upper male garment) Germ. *Himmel,* heaven, i. e. the aerial covering; comp. Germ. *Bett-himmel, Thron-himmel,* canopy of a bed or throne. From the signification of *drawn together* there is further derived that of *firm, strong, hard,* especially in several Arabic forms, as also the related old High Germ. *hamar,* Slavonic *Kamen,* stone, rock, whence (a stone-axe) an instrument for beating, *hammer.*

By means of the fundamental signification we can also explain that of *weakening, destroying,* comp. כָּמַהּ, قَمَّ, *to contract one's self = shrink up, waste away, grow poor,* etc. Somewhat different is the derivation of the Swedish *hamla,* Eng. *hamble,* properly to *hem* or *lame* by cutting the tendons of the knee. Comp. كَمَعَ *amputavit pedes.* And further, to obstruct or weaken the power of the male, hence to *unman, lame, cripple* ; comp. Germ. *Hämmling,* one castrated, *Hammel* the castrated male sheep. Finally, *drawing together* is often used in the sense of *collecting, heaping together,* e. g. جَمَعَ , עם , etc.

The third method of developing the perfect, viz. by the prolongation of the radical vowel, also occurs with this root, and those related to it, in several formations, which however all proceed from the fundamental signification already given, and only by its means are they susceptible of a satisfactory explanation ; e. g.

כַם *to bring together, heap up,* كَامَ II. Hence כִּימָה (كُومَة = cumulus) pr. *heap, group,* further, *the Pleiades.* Also,

قَامَ , קַם *to draw together,* draw in the feet, *obstruct one's way, detain;* hence, in the Arabic *to continue standing, delay, stand,* etc. ; in the Hebrew *to stand, maintain a position* in a place, insist upon something, etc. Then also *to come to pass* (Germ. zu Stande kommen), *to gain a firm footing;* when, *to come into vogue, arise,* in various senses.

The stem צָמַד , *to remain standing,* from the root עם = קם is related to the one under consideration, as will subsequently be shown. Gesenius, in his Man. Lex. compares חָבַם with חָקַק, as though חק were the root, which is altogether a mistake.

From the *Post-reduplicated Stems* we select the following:

דֶּבֶר from the root דב , comp. שָׁבַב through which it is derived.[1]

1. *To press together, drive together ;* hence,

דֶּבֶר , that which hurries away, sweeps off, *the pestilence ;* comp.

دَمَر *perdidit.* دَصَار *interitus,* دَبَار *id.* Kindred with דֶּבֶר is the Arab. دَبْل *pestis.*

דְּבוֹרָה *the bee,* pr. that which presses, sharply attacks, = *stings,* injures.

דְּבִיר the pressed together, *closed up ;* hence the most retired part of the temple.

דֹּבְרוֹת *the drifts, rafts,* 1 Kings 5: 23.

The Hiph. with תַּחַת signifies *to drive under something, suppress, subject,* Ps. 18: 48. 47: 4.

2. In general, *to drive together,* especially *drive and lead cattle,* hence, מִדְבָּר , pasture.

3. In the Piel, *to bring together* or *order words,* i. e. *to speak* דִּבֵּר. Comp. ἐρεῖν, *sermo,* etc.

שָׁמַר from the root שׁם = *hold together, hold firmly, keep.*

שָׁמִיר that which is dense, firm, hard; hence, a) *A thorn.* b) *A precious stone,* named from its hardness. Hence also the names of several cities = *fortress.*

שֶׁמֶר *Lees.* Originally, that which is drawn together, drawn off, i. e. the sediment deposited in the fermentation. Com. Engl. *sediment, lees,* French *lie* (pr. that which settles) kindred with the German *legen,* to lay. Since wine is improved, if after several tappings the lees are entirely separated from it, *Hefen-wein* שְׁמָרִים Is. 25: 6 [Engl vs. wines *on* the lees] signifies wine cleansed from the lees = excellent wine ; which expression was selected here on account of the play upon words with שְׁמָנִים fat, juicy meats. We might thus render it : " Ein Mahl von Mast-fleische, ein Mahl von Most-flaschen ; von markigem Mast-fleische, von geläuterten Most-flaschen."

The expression " settled on their lees" i. e. grown thick upon them, Zeph. 1: 12, (stiff or stupid with what one has gained and hoarded up,) confirms the original signification here given. Comp.

---

[1] That is, according to the theory of the author, in the regular series of mutations the reduplicated stem דבב would assume the form שָׁבַב (the lingual being changed into a sibilant) rather than דָּבַב , so that the presence of the form דָּבַר presupposes the other, which however nowhere occurs as a verb, though we find it in several derivations, viz. דְּבַשׁ , *honey,* דַּבֶּשֶׁת , *hump.*

Amos 5: 11. The figure alludes to the fact that wine which stands too long upon the lees easily spoils and becomes thick. Comp. Jer. 48: 11. " Moab lies thickened upon his lees, was not poured from our vessel into another, etc." The common idea that *lees* are so named from their quality of preserving, is altogether erroneous.

The word שֶׁמֶר has been adopted in the Coptic, *Shemer = fermentum*, because many kinds of lees, e. g. those of beer, cause other substances to ferment; hence in upper Germany *Hefel* (Hefe) for *leaven*.

גָּרַח from the root גרי signifies originally not *to be rough*, according to Gesenius, but, as the kindred stems, *to separate, split, break through;* hence Piel, *set loose, arouse*, especially a contest, Prov. 15: 18. Hithp. *arouse one's self, be zealous;* hence also, *to quarrel, contend.*

גָּרוֹן the substantive also, does not, (as Gesenius supposes,) derive its signification, viz. *throat*, from the idea of a *rough tone*, but means simply, a *split*, a *hollow place ;* hence, *throat, windpipe*, Ps. 5: 10 : " Their throat is an open sepulchre." Compare in German *Kehle* = gula, Persian كلو *gula*, and *glutus*, throat, with the low German, *Kuhle*, hole, ditch, as *rumen* and *rima*. The passage cited by Gesenius, Ps. 69: 4, proves anything else than that the throat has its name from roughness; for נִחַר is Niph. part. of חָרַר, *to cease glowing, dry up*, as Ps. 102: 4 : " I am exhausted by my crying, my throat is parched." On the other hand, where it signifies *to call with or out of the throat*, the strict sense is *to speak with a loud, full voice ;* cf. Is. 58: 1. Ps. 115: 7. 149: 6.

Similarly derived meanings grow out of the stem גָּרַר [i. e. from the root when reduplicated by the repetition of the last letter] = *to split, separate, divide*, hence 1. *To take away, hurry off*, Hab. 1: 15, Prov. 27: 7, as the Arabic جرّ . 2. *To divide, separate*, hence *saw*, as the German *sägen* is kindred with *secare ;* and also Poel, *to be sawed in pieces*, 1 Kings 7: 9. Finally 3. *To split, divide*, also means *to crush with the teeth ;* hence גֵּרָה a) That which has been made small, crushed, chewed; hence, *that which was eaten.* Thus we can explain the phrase הֶעֱלָה־גֵרָה to bring up what was chewed, i. e. *to ruminate*, Lev. 11: 3—6. Deut. 14: 6, 7. Once it occurs as גֵּרָה נָרַר , Lev. 11: 7 : " To chew the chewed," i. e. to chew the second time, *ruminate*. b) That which has been made small, separated, signifies also a *piece, a single one ;* hence, *grain*, as a small object, thus also a small weight, the twentieth part of a

shekel, as the German *Gran* (grain) from *granum*. In like manner also is explained גַּרְגַּר, the *small, single, little piece;* hence berry, Is. 17: 6. Further, גַּרְגְּרֹת *Fauces*, pr. the splits, holes, i. e. windpipe and throat; whence in general, *throat*, neck; always used of the outside of the neck, whilst גָּרוֹן usually signifies the inside, although not in all cases, vid. Is. 3: 16, where it designates the outside and front of the neck. Cf. جَرّ, hole, hollow. These significations are used interchangeably. Even צַוָּאר, *neck*, from צָאַר strictly means *split, cleft, opening*, cf. *fauces* with χαῦνος, *split, gaping*, German *gähnen*, hence *throat; gula* = throat and neck.

Gesenius confusedly and arbitrarily develops the whole series of words derived from גָּרַר from the imitation of a natural sound which corresponds to the German *gurgeln, s-charren*, etc. The *Gurgel* [the upper part of the throat] is not so named in German from *gurgeln*, [to gurgle] any more than *Kopf*, head from *köpfen*, to behead or to grow into a head, or *Nase*, nose, from *näseln*, to nose, as a dog, or to speak through the nose, ... but on the contrary the Latin *gurges* depth, abyss, (cf. Sanscrit *gri*, to swallow down) shows the original signification of the reduplicated root in *gurgulio*, windpipe, German *Gurgel*. The Icelandic still has *Kuerkur*. As a secondary signification we have " *to utter guttural sounds, chirp*," in Sanscrit, *gri* = *to utter a sound*, in general, γηρύω, to sound, sing, speak; *garrire*, prate, gabble. Then, more specifically, the picturesque reduplication غَرْغَرَ, *gargarizare*, γαργαρίζω, gurgle. Gurgling is, moreover, not the principal function of the throat, so that it is difficult to conceive how any one could have supposed it to have derived its name from that operation.

From the *Monosyllabic Stems* we select a single example, viz. בּוֹא, (p. 639) from the root בא = בה = בק, pr. *push* = penetrate

بَكَبَمَ a) penetravit in medium, b) firmiter mansit in loco;

بَى importune institit;

בָּא 1) Penetrate, = *enter, enter into;* then in general, *go*. 2) *Come*. Arab. بَاءَ II. inivit feminam; venit in locum, ubi commoratus fuit. بَاءَ coitus conjugialis.

בְּ, the preposition, also belongs unquestionably to the stem בּוֹא. Ethiop. *ba*, Arab. بِ, Aram. בֵּי (instead of בָּא, as בֵּי instead of גָּא) prop. a *status constructus* which signifies *introduction*, and hence,

as preposition, *in.* Comp. the kindred, simply-reduplicated stem in the substantive بَاب , באב , entrance, *door, gate,* بِيب , *canal,* (pr. way). Hence the opinion of the old grammarians is not so utterly groundless, who regarded בְּ as nearly related to בַּיִה , if we have correctly derived this latter word, p. 524, which will scarcely be doubted. Ewald (Ausführl. Lehrb. ٤ 217, 9) compares בְּ with בֵּן , *between,* which appears, however, inappropriate both for the form and signification. The etymology of the Arab. فِي , *in,* is precisely similar, which is a derivative from فُو mouth = aperture, entrance, variously applied, as فُوهَة , *os,* ingressus plateae, viae, vallis; principium rei; so that the preposition has nothing to do with בְּ .

ARTICLE VIII.

NEANDER'S CHURCH HISTORY.

General History of the Christian Religion and Church; from the German of Dr. Augustus Neander. Translated from the second and improved edition, by Joseph Torrey, Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy in the University of Vermont. Volume First comprising the first Great Division of the History. pp. 723. Boston: published by Crocker and Brewster. London: Wiley and Putnam. 1847.

By Rev. Dr. Sears, President of Theological Institution, Newton, Mass.

At length a part of the long-expected translation of Neander's church history by Professor Torrey has appeared. For ten long years, the theological student has been rejoicing, with some little abatement towards the end, in the near prospect of possessing this truly Christian and philosophical history of the church. The unskilful and repulsive translation of a part of the work by Rose, only increased the general desire for the expected American translation, which, it was believed, would be more worthy of the original. Indeed, it may be said that Professor Torrey, from his known scholarship and the force of peculiar circumstances, enjoyed a good reputation, as a translator of Neander, even before the work was executed. Winer has, for the same length of time,