

# 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 *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_bib-sacra\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php)

## ARTICLE III.

## REMARKS UPON THE LANGUAGES OF THE ARABS AND THE TURKS.

BY PROF. H. S. OSBORN, OXFORD, OHIO.

THE language of Syria and Palestine is the Arabic. This is the most ancient and at the same time the best preserved of all living languages. We have good reasons to believe that it is at the present time spoken in the deserts of Arabia in the same state in which it existed five thousand years ago, having in those far distant and almost inaccessible places never undergone any modifications by contact with foreign elements, nor been acted upon by the least literary influences to which other languages owe their successive changes and transformations. Arabic is also the most far-extended language of the globe. It is spoken or understood wherever Mohammedans are found, from Morocco to the eastern confines of Hindustan, and therefore is most valuable and important for the traveller in the Orient. It is, moreover, the richest of all known languages; and as an illustration it is sufficient here to mention that there exist over one thousand words for *horse*, about eleven hundred synonymous expressions for *lion*, twelve hundred for *camel*, five hundred for *sword*, etc. The Arabic offers an interest also to the biblical scholar and to the theologian, as it is the only really living remnant of that family of ancient languages to which the Hebrew belongs; and as many expressions and forms of words occur but once in the sacred text (the so-called *ἀπαξ λεγόμενα* in the Old Testament) Arabic throws an inestimable light on the Hebrew language, and becomes thereby a great help in explaining the difficulties and apparent obscurities of the Bible.

Thus the language of the Arabs is, on account of its an-

tiquity, its intimate relationship to the Hebrew, and its extensive use, at the same time one of the most valuable, interesting, and useful languages that exist. Arabic is to the other languages of Asia where Mohammedanism prevails what Latin is to the study of the various modern tongues of Europe; that is to say, the lexical treasures of the Arabic language have been appropriated in various proportions by many of the often quite heterogeneous languages spoken by nations of the Orient which profess Mohammedanism. Thus a very considerable amount of Arabic words have entered as a component part into Turkish, Persian, Hindustani, Malayan, etc. Even in our modern languages, in Spanish, French, and English, words are to be found which can only be explained by the Arabic from which they derive their origin. This applies not only to scientific expressions, such as alchemy, almanac, alembic, alcohol, alkali, azimuth, nadir, etc. [thus, for instance, in *algebra*, *al* is the article *the*, and *gebra*, *finding* or *investigation*, from *gebr*, *to find out*; *alcoran*, *al*, *the*, *coran*, *reading*, related to the Hebrew אָרָץ, *to name, call*, or *say*, which corresponds with the Arabic word of the same root, and in the same relation as the Greek λέγω, *to speak, to say*, to the Latin *lego, to read, to speak* (from the book or writing), and as the Saxon and German *reden, to speak, to say* corresponds with the English *read*, etc.], but also to words of very common use, such as the French *mesquin* (*poor, wretched*), the English *tarif* (*t-aref thou shalt know*), are pure Arabic.

There are two kinds of Arabic which deserve to be noticed: 1. The literary Arabic, often erroneously called the ancient Arabic. This is a dead language, or, more properly, style, which took rise in the process of time, and became a peculiar language of the scholars and poets. The Koran, or Alkoran, the Moallakah, and the various scientific and Mohammedan theological works are in this language. Hamása, Haríri, Beidhávi's celebrated commentaries, etc., are written in literary Arabic. 2. The vulgar or common Arabic, often erroneously termed the modern Arabic, as it is

really the oldest, especially where it has been preserved in its purity and genuineness, and kept free from any kind of admixture and adulteration by foreign or literary influence, as among the Bedouins of the deserts. This is the Arabic which stands nearest to the Hebrew, and has on this account to attract our more special interest and attention. It is divided into two great branches: the eastern, or *Múshrak*, and the western, or *Mógrab*, which latter is less pure than the former. Each of these two branches of the vulgar or genuine Arabic is divided into various dialects, such as the Syrian, Egyptian, the dialect of Tripoli and Tunis, the Algerian, and Moroccan-Arabic, or *Merakeshee*.

To offer a general view of this division of Arabic we recapitulate thus:

- I. The literary Arabic, which probably was never spoken, but only used in books during a certain period of the past ages.
- II. The vulgar or really spoken Arabic, divided into
  1. Eastern branch, or *Múshrak*,  
Subdivided into dialects of Syria, Egypt, etc.
  2. The western branch, or *Mógrab*,  
Subdivided into dialects of Tunis, Tripoli, Algeria, Morocco, etc.

The best Arabic is spoken in Belad-ul-Hedjaz, or the Petrean Arabia, and also in Syria, especially in Aleppo and Damascus; the worst is spoken in Algiers and Morocco.

Notwithstanding the properly so-called literary Arabic, the vulgar or colloquial Arabic in its various dialects has also a literature to itself, only not so vast as that of the former. The Arabian Nights' Entertainment may in some respects be counted rather in the latter than in the rigidly literary style. The Bible translations and various publications of the missionaries in Syria, Palestine, Egypt, Arabia, and various points of northern Africa are altogether in vulgar Arabic, as the only Arabic in actual use and of really practical importance. The greatest modern Arabic poet is the Syrian Benna (a name which in English would be Builder, Archi-

fect, somewhat like Mr. Mason). His numerous poems, most of which are lyric strains and panegyric of illustrious personages and powerful monarchs, are of a very high order, of an exquisite taste, elegant in their form, and most admirably combined. The initials of the lines, as well as the final letters of the same, form not only names and words to which a poem has reference, but often even a complete and beautifully connected sense, in elegant rhymes. And besides, as every Arabic letter has also a numerical value, all the letters of every line of B enna's poems, when added together, form a sum which is the year in which the piece was written. It is true this latter mode, called *tartkh* in Arabic, is now and then used by Arabic poets, and imitated by the Turks and Persians; also acrostics are not unknown to the Orientals, but nowhere do we find these peculiarities in oriental poetry so skilfully employed, and so abundantly and magnificently displayed as by the Syrian poet B enna. His poems were published in part, with translations and commentaries, by Dr. Roehrig, who had for several years entertained an intimate and uninterrupted personal intercourse with the aged poet.

As already remarked, Arabic is nearest to the Hebrew. Both belong to that remarkable family of languages which is called Shemitic (a name which alludes to Shem, a son of Noah). To the Shemitic languages belong, besides Hebrew and Arabic, the Chaldee, Syriac, Samaritan, Ethiopic, and in some measure the Amharic and Gheez, as well as the language of the isle of Malta. We have also to count the Phoenician language among the most ancient tongues of this Shemitic family. It is true that there remains but little of the Phoenician. However, the Phoenician (in its Phoenic or Punic form, as we may suppose) has been exhibited in Plautus. Some more or less successful interpretations of the Punic, or so-called Phoenician, text in Plautus have been attempted.

It seems well to mention that in the Loffoden Islands at the Northern coast of Norway, more especially on the

islands of Hindoen, Senjen, and Tromoe, about the sixty-eighth or sixty-ninth degree of northern latitude, we meet among the inhabitants in the midst of the Norwegian and floating Laponian population a peculiar tribe of fishermen, who are entirely different from the surrounding nations. While the Norwegians are of a white and fresh complexion, sandy hair, and light-blue eyes, these fishermen are dark-colored, with black hair, black, piercing eyes, and prominent aquiline noses; and, while the Laplanders are short and dwarfish, these fishermen are of a tall and noble stature and athletic forms. They are a distinct people also as regards their manners and ways, their habits and customs, their usages, legends, and traditions. Their language is said to be altogether different from any Northern tongue, and resembles the Hebrew. Several words which are purely Shemitic, some almost Arabic, others nearest to Hebrew, which are now found in the language of the Laplanders of that region, seem to have been borrowed from these fishermen. The first mention we find of this interesting tribe is in a work published at the beginning of this century, and written in German, entitled, *Account of a Journey from Emden to Archangel around the North Cape*. We are almost ready to suppose that this tribe of fishermen are Phoenicians, who in by-gone ages, going out with their frail ships, sailing along the coasts of northern Africa and the continent of Europe, arrived at the tin-islands, and then, either losing their paths in the open sea, and driven by storms or prompted by commercial enterprise, were brought to this high northern latitude, where, without any hope of being restored to their former homes, they settled, and formed a colony.

We have said that Arabic is the only living remnant of the Shemitic languages, but it is also true that Chaldee, as well as Syriac, is still spoken in some small localities in Syria, in Mesopotamia, around Mossul and Diarbekir, and then also on the northern boundaries of Persia, as in the village of Khósrooa, etc. However, so few in number are the

people that speak the Neo-Syriac and Neo-Chaldaic languages, and so few also are the Jews who make an actual use in the every-day life and common intercourse of the real Hebrew that we can scarcely count those languages among the living daughters of the Shemitic family, and compare them in this respect with Arabic. The words of the Arabic language are very similar, and often even the same, as in its sister-language, the Hebrew. The same striking similarity exists between the grammatical forms and syntactical structure of Arabic and Hebrew. The mode of writing in all the Shemitic languages, with the only exception of the Ethiopic, is from the right to the left hand, primitively (as tradition informs us) in imitation of the direction in which the sun moves, from east to west, the writer having his right side or arm turned toward the east, which region is in several of the oriental languages designated by the very name: the right side or right hand. But not the Arabs alone write from the right to the left, and begin their books where we end ours, so that their title-page would be with us the last page, but also all other non-Shemitic nations who use the Arabic alphabet for writing their own languages write in the same manner. Indeed, the Arabic alphabet, with some very few and insignificant modifications (where it became necessary to express sounds or letters peculiar to those languages, and which the Arabic does not possess), has got into use in the languages of all those nations who embraced Mohammedanism; and then it gradually superseded the alphabets that were peculiar to their languages. Thus the Turks, the Tartars of the Russian empire, the Kurds, the Persians, the Afghans, the Hindus, the Malays, and the Madegasses use the Arabic alphabet, although their respective native tongues to which they apply it are as completely different from the Arabic as they are from each other. But do we not observe something analogous in our own languages? Is, for instance, the Latin alphabet not used for writing a number of other languages, not only the French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, but also the English, Holländic,

Swedish, Polish, Illyrian, Hungarian, and Finlandic? Is not the Greek alphabet equally used for Greek, ancient and modern, as well as for Albanese or Skipetarish, and has it not even been adopted by the missionaries in behalf of the non-Mohammedan inhabitants of Turkey and Asia Minor (many of which are of Greek origin) in writing and printing Turkish? Is not also the German alphabet equally applied to the German as well as to the Danish and Bohemian languages?

Now the language of the Turks, although very different from the Arabic and from all the Shemitic languages, is nevertheless written with the Arabic alphabet, as the Turks are devoted professors of Islam, or the Mohammedan religion. The primitive Turkish, as far as we can trace it back, was written with a different alphabet, in columns from the top to the bottom, which columns succeeded each other from the left to the right hand. This writing of the earliest Turkish, or the *Uigooric*, is very similar and most intimately connected with the writing used by the Mongolians and the Mandchoos. The nature and essence of the Turkish language, instead of being Shemitic like the Arabic, is purely Tartar. The whole Turkish grammar in every particular is Tartar. As to the Arabic and Persian which we find in Turkish, we may say that only Arabic and Persian *words*, although in a very large proportion, are found in it. But words do by no means affect the grammar, that is, the grammatical forms and syntactical structure of a language. Just in the same way we have in the English language, whose grammar is purely Germanic, a great number of words of Roman origin (French and Latin). In the same manner, also, the Spanish contains a good deal of Mauro-Arabic words; and the Moldavian, which is likewise a Romanic or Neo-Latin tongue, contains a great amount of Slavonian words without their truly Romanic nature being thereby affected in the slightest degree. The Turks as zealous Mohammedans are diligent readers of the Koran (or Alcoran) from their early youth; and as this, their sacred text-



book, is written in Arabic it furnishes them with a considerable supply of Arabic words, which gradually pass into their language, and come into common use, till at last they supersede the genuine Tartar-Turkish words, just as we see that in the English language of the present day many a Latin or French word has come into use, while in the older English the pure and genuine English word still appears, and fell only gradually into oblivion in consequence of the substitution of the Roman intruder. Now the better a Turk is educated, or the higher he stands in dignity and rank, the more frequent and ostentatious a use he makes of Arabic and Persian words instead of the common but true Turkish expressions used by the illiterate; just as it is the case in our Western lands, which derive their civilization originally from the Romans and Greeks instead of the Arabs and Persians, that the learned use the most frequently Latin and Greek expressions where the uneducated use the words of the common, every-day language. Thus, while the grammar and structure of Turkish is purely Tartar, its dictionary is swelled with the three-fold treasure of Tartar, Arabic, and Persian; the latter two languages being, however, as different from Turkish, and, moreover, as different from each other, too, as, for instance, English is from Hebrew, — Arabic being a Shemitic language, and the Persian belonging to the great Indo-European family of languages, which embraces the Sanscrit, Pracrit, Hindi, Hinduee, Hindustani, Bengalee, Mahratta, Guzeratee, Tamil, and other languages of Hindustan, also the Zend, Pehlvic, Parsi, Persian, Armenian, Grusimian, Ossetic, Greek, Latin, Lithuanian, together with the Slavonic, the Romanic, and Germanic classes of languages, and the Celtic.

Turning now our attention again to Turkish, it is a link in the great and extended family of the Tartar-Finnish languages, to which belong also the Mongolian, the Tungoose (with its principal dialect, the Mandchoo), the Hungarian, Finlandic, and all the numerous languages of the wide-spread Finnish tribes, such as the Wogoólians, the Wotyákes, Mest-

cheryákes, the Mordoóins, Tcheremisses, Zyranes, Laplanders, whereby it then even gradually connects with the Samoyedic and also to some extent with the Greenlandic and the Esquimaux and the numerous languages of the Indians of our American continent. This subject has been treated at large in Dr. Roehrig's *Researches on the Languages of Central Asia*, a work which in 1848 was crowned with the great premium of the Imperial Institute of France, and obtained the prize "Volney." The same is also amply illustrated in Dr. Roehrig's various other publications on the subject, especially his treatise on the Tartar-Finnish Languages, published in Paris, 1845; his work entitled, *Idioms of the Turkish Language*, published in 1843; his book entitled, "*De Turcarum Linguae Indole ac Natura*" (*On the Genius and Characteristics of the Language of the Turks*), etc.

Turkish, together with the other languages of this class, has this peculiar feature, that words offer two distinct groups of vowels: the one, *a, o, u* (to be taken in the pronunciation of the continental languages of Europe); the other, *e, i*. These two sorts of vowels can never stand in one and the same word. Another peculiarity is that words in those Tartar-Finnish languages do never increase before, but always after, the root-syllable, which is the first in a word. Hence all syllables added for grammatical purposes ought in regard to their vowels to conform invariably to the root-syllable, and thus be homogeneous with the first vowel of the word. This first vowel of the word is in those languages somewhat like the signature in a piece of music; and the two vowel-classes in their harmonious and well regulated succession may in some measure be compared to the major and minor scales of music. These two distinct sorts of words may be illustrated by examples like these:

1st Class (*a, o, u*): *Odalardan, bakamamakdán*, etc.

2nd Class (*e, i*): *Dedikleriné, sevememekdén*, etc.

This peculiarity is in its last analysis reducible to one of the most curious and important laws of human language,

namely, the universal antagonism which exists between the two classes of vowel-sounds (taken in the continental pronunciation of Europe, of course), *a, o, u*, and *e, i*. This vowel-antagonism seems to have more particularly prevailed in the ancient and comparatively primitive languages, and is still more or less preserved in its purity in the so-called Tartar languages, and in part, also, in the Finnish tongues. It prevails especially in Hungarian, in Turkish, in Mongolian, and to some extent in Mantchoo-Finlandic, and in several of the numerous tongues of the wide-spread Finnish tribes. Where this antagonism exists unimpaired we find two distinct kinds of words: those with *a, o, u*, and the other with *e, i*, often even opposed or correlative to each other in their meanings. Thus in Mantchoo: *ama, father, eme, mother; amkha, father-in-law, emk(h)e, mother-in-law; kaka, rooster, cock, keke, hen; gangan, strong spirit, gengen, weak spirit; rasomǒ, to ascend, resime, to descend; fusokhǒn, vile, abject, fesikǔn and resikon, elevate, noble, precious, etc.*

This applied to the language of the Turks, we see that, for instance, *av* means the outside of the house, out-doors, hunting-ground, etc., and *ev* means the inside of the house, the house; *olmak, to become, to be, elmek, to perish, to die; durmak, to remain, dirmek, to move on; galmak, to remain, gelmek, to come, etc.* Somewhat similarly we have in English, to stop, and to step. Vestiges of this principle in Greek are *makr-os, long, and mikr-os, small, short; Ares, god of war or discord, Eris, goddess of discord, etc.* In Latin, *calid-us, warm, and gelid-us, cold, etc.;* in English, *tip and top, gloom and gleam, doom and deem, to rouse and to rise, to lay and to lie, etc.,* may come under this head. Even in our modern languages, such as French, Italian, etc., the difference of these two vowel-classes still appears in part in the peculiar influence they exert on the pronunciation of the guttural letters *c* and *g*; as *Cato, Ceres, Cicero, garnir, gener, etc.*

The language of the Turks is the most regular and simple of all languages. Its grammar does not offer one real excep-

tion. It has no article. It has no gender expressed. It has no terminations for the adjectives in declension. It has but one declension and but one conjugation, different only according to the two vowel-classes. Example:

<i>ev, house;</i>	<i>adam, man.</i>
<i>eve, to the house;</i>	<i>adama, to the man.</i>
<i>evdén, from the house;</i>	<i>adamdán, from the man.</i>
<i>evlér, houses;</i>	<i>adamlár, men.</i>

The best and most scholarly elaborated grammar of the Turkish language is the one published by Dubeux, imperial professor of Turkish and the Tartar languages in Paris. As the author, Professor Dubeux, states in the preface, his grammar is entirely conformed and altogether founded on Dr. Roehrig's new system and theories laid down in his *Researches on the Languages of Central Asia*.

The oldest Turkish that is known is the so-called *Uigoor* or *Uigooric*. It was spoken in Tartary, and written in columns, the words succeeding each other from the top to the bottom, while the columns, as already observed, moved from the left hand to the right. The oldest literary monument extant in *Uigooric* is the so-called *Káoo-dátkoo-bilk* or *Kandatkubilk*. The others in *Uigooric* are the *Ba-boor-naméh* and the *Tezkeré-é-evilé-ya*.

Another ancient form of Turkish is the *Djaghatdee* or *Djaghatdyan*, still spoken at the present day in Khiva, Bokhara, and Samarkand. Two literary productions of some importance exist in *Djaghatdyan*, viz. a history of the Turks, by Abul Ghazi, the sultan of Khoaresm. It is a large work, bearing the title, *Shedjeréi Turki*, which means "Genealogical Tree of the Turks." It is a rather curious work. The writer begins his book with the creation of the world and Adam. The other *Djaghatdyan* production we alluded to is a poetical work of Neváí.

The third form of old Turkish we meet in the so-called *Kyptchak*, which is the common mother of all the various dialects of the Tartars of the Russian empire. These dialects of the Tartars are very numerous and exceedingly curious to study.

Professor Dubeux of Paris in his review of Dr. Boehrig's researches on the subject gives us a long list of those Tartar-Turkish or Turco-Tartar dialects derived from the *Kyptchak*. Thus the Tartars of Crimea, who inhabit Sebastopol and other adjacent places, speak a Turkish dialect derived from *Kyptchak*. The most cultivated and refined dialect of the *Kyptchak* branch of old Turkish is the Turco-Tartar language of the Tartars of Kasan and Tobolsk. We have in this dialect a set of very interesting poems printed in Kasan in the year 1822, and especially an old history of Djingiz-Khan (Gengis Khan) and Timur, entitled, *Ahvdi Djingiz we Aksak Timur*. In the dialects of Astrakhan and Orenburg, also derived from the *Kyptchak* Turkish, we have a translation of the Bible printed in Astrakhan by John Mitchell, printer. Another translation of the Bible was made by the American and English missionaries in the dialect of the Karatchái Tartars, who inhabit the Caucasus mountains. It was published in Karras, their chief village, by the missionary Rev. Henry Brunton in 1820.

The Ottoman Turkish, also called Osmanic or Osmanly, is the dialect of Constantinople, Smyrna, etc. It is the most modern Turkish, and contains a large literature. We find in it a far greater proportion of Arabic and Persian words than in any of the dialects spoken of by the so-called Tartars. In this respect the Osmanic Turkish is the most impure. The other Turkish dialects vary more or less from it; the one that is farthest from it is the dialect of the Yacootes or Jacutes of Siberia, which has lately been investigated and philologically treated.

From what has been said it may be easily understood that the Turkish in its various ramifications and dialects is a very far-extended language. For Turks or Turco-Tartars are found from Wilna, in Russia, spread throughout the whole length of the Russian empire, extending far into Siberia, from the north of Persia even to the borders of the Arctic Sea, and in another direction from the banks of the Danube extending in an uninterrupted chain into the Chinese empire.

The Turkish language itself, as already said, is simple and easy, but the style, especially that of the Osmanic Turkish, is exceedingly involved, complicated, and obscure. The order in which the words are placed is often in every particular the very reverse of that in ours and other languages generally. The pronunciation of the Turkish is by no means disagreeable to the ear; it is majestic, noble, and harmonious, while the Arabic is extremely coarse and harsh.

In conclusion we offer the following sentiment as characteristic of the Turkish language, proverb, and moral. The proverb is written as it would be pronounced to the English ear. "Eyee-lík étt, denezéy bráck, báhlik bilméss isséy, Kháh-lik bileer;" which means, "Do good [or act well], and throw it into the sea; if the fishes ignore it, the Creator will know it." The beauty of this proverb consists especially in the parallelism of the words *báhlik*, *the fish*, and *Kháh-lik*, *the Creator*.

---

#### ARTICLE IV.

#### THE LANGUAGE OF ISAIAH XL.—LXVI.

BY REV. WM. HENRY COBB, UXBRIDGE, MASS.

HOWEVER convenient it may be in a discussion to shift the burden of proof upon one's adversary, it is a great gain to be able to assume the burden, and carry it successfully. If those who deny the unity of the Book of Isaiah are willing to stake the question on the actual phenomena in respect of diction which the sixty-six chapters present, those who defend the integrity of the book may abandon a merely apologetic attitude. They need no longer assert that the two main portions of this book cannot be proved to be the work of separate authors; they should undertake to prove the contrary. In a previous Article<sup>1</sup> the attempt was made to show that the vocabulary of the last twenty-seven chapters presents feat-

<sup>1</sup> Two Isaiahs or One? — Bibliotheca Sacra, April 1861.