

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 Quadrilätern Erklärung der Fremdwörter im Hebräischen, und über das Verhältniss des Ägyptischen Sprachstammes zum Semitischen; von Dr. Ernst Meier, Privatdocenten an der Universität zu Tübingen. pp. 783. Mannheim, 1846.

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 difference of opinion. Gesenius, in his *Thesaurus and Manual Lexicon*, was continually on the lookout for points of contact, and succeeded 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 "*Monumenta Phoenicia*,"¹ but the connecting link that proves the original 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 resemblances 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 Sanscrit, 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 denied, and therefore a comparative investigation of them is of value for lexicography ; but one needs great caution and a comprehensive knowledge of the relations of sounds in both families, in order to avoid error and deception in comparing them. In the present 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 languages, that subsequently so greatly diverged, formed one great uniform whole, and had as yet no separate existence. This principle 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 violence than others, scarcely a fourth part are genuine, and that, consequently, the relationship of the two great families of languages, is essentially different from what this celebrated linguist (sonst so verdienter Forscher) supposed it to be. The fundamental 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 phenomenon 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." *Intro.* 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 fundamental roots in the Semitic [reducible, as he subsequently maintains to the number of *twenty-four*!] together with their simple, original meaning, occur also in the Indo-Germanic, and even correspond to these frequently in their secondary or derived significations." *Pref.* p. xl.

Here we have a vast stride in comparative philology, *if our author'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 trilateral verbal forms *in their present state* as the original roots.¹

Ewald (l. c.) suggests, that "in the internal vocalization [of the trilateral 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 קָרַב or as a noun קָרַב. 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. After describing the present simplest forms (which he nevertheless calls *wurzellaute, radical forms*) and commenting upon their uniformity, 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 beginning, but brought about at a later day, although no doubt in the youthful period of the language, by a sort of grammatical systematizing (*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*, נָפַח and פָּחַח *to blow*, דָּבַח and דָּבַח, דָּבַח and דָּבַח, *to strike*;

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

c) The classes of verbs which have two consonants in common, but vary greatly in the third one, and yet agree at least fundamentally in signification; e. g. לָעַד, לָעַב, לָעַט, לָעַה, לָעַם, לָעַץ, לָעַץ.

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.

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 *petrifications*, 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 künftiglich 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 *τέτυχα*, *τέτυχα*, cecidi, cucurri, momordi, etc. Gothic, *skaiskaid*, I or he separated, *hahait*, I or he called, *staitant*, 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, fitting, joining*, etc. with secondary meanings easily deducible from these; e. g. קס, חס, רס, etc.

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

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

"Instead of the whole root, however, in Sanscrit, (to go no further for the present,) only the first radical sound, or of two initial consonants only the stronger is repeated, as of *γράφω*, *γράφω*. And then in place of a guttural the corresponding palatal is repeated, e. g. *gam* to go, perf. *gagama*, and in place of an aspirate the corresponding tenuis; e. g. *dhá*, perf. *dadhá* (*τίθημι*) as in Greek *θύω τίθηκα*; *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; *τάτανε*, beside *τάτανε*." 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 syllable 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 syllable in the Semitic dialects, takes place in a greater variety of forms than in those languages, and hence has maintained a character 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 *קָרַח*, *קָרַח*, *קָרַח*, *קָרַח*, etc.; but it is notorious, that in the vast majority of Hebrew perfects the similarity lies between the *last two* radicals, e. g. *קָרַח*, *קָרַח*, and the whole class of *על* verbs, together with such forms as, *קָרַח*, *קָרַח*, *קָרַח*, *קָרַח*, etc. or between the *first and third*, e. g. *קָרַח*, *קָרַח*, *קָרַח*, etc. where these are identical, together with such as, *קָרַח*, *קָרַח*, *קָרַח*, *קָרַח*, 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 compare the developed, *perfect* verbal form to the stem of a tree or horn of an ox, where the concentric circles prove the past development of the object. Now in the Indo-European family of languages, this extension of the verbal idea is represented in all cases, 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 direction. The Hebrew roots, however, whether from greater fertility 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-verdopplung) as in the Indo-European family, but also a *post-reduplication*, (Hinten-verdopplung). 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. חָקַר, חָקַר, חָקַר, from the roots כָּל, קָ, and כָּס.¹

II. *In the end of the word*; either 1. By the repetition of the first radical, as נָקַח, נָקַח, נָקַח, etc. or 2. By the repetition of the second, as חָקַל, חָקַל, etc.

III. The deficient reduplication can be compensated for by a kind of *guna-formation*,² e. g. רָם, רָם, רָם, comp. Ṛgo, ṛgi; móveo, móvi; lávo, lávi, etc. This prolongation takes the place of reduplication and corresponds precisely to the lengthening of the radical syllable, some traces of which we find already in the Sanscrit, e. g. *niene*, 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 variety 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 reduplicated 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. חָקַח, for חָקַח, perf. of

¹ The root *is*, by the theory, doubled, כָּלכָּל; the first כָּ is then omitted, as in *cucurri* for *cu(r)curri*; and finally the first כָּ 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 euphony, 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 חָקַח [cut], which is to be looked upon as a new ground-form or original stem, we find the following sub-stems have grown forth. חָקַח=חָקַח to *strike, hammer*, pr. *split, break in pieces*; further, with a change of *s* into *r* חָקַח, to *keep off*, pr. *attack*; חָקַח *section, end, point*; hence, the *head of a pillar, chapter*. From this stem there is further derived, by a change of *r* into *l*, חָקַח, to *separate, divide*; hence חָקַח *a wall*, pr. that which *shuts out, separates*; comp. חָקַח to *separate, pierce through, hew down, kill*. Also, with a change of *l* into *q*, חָקַח to *separate, keep off, cover*;

the root קָנַע , קָנַע , from the root כָּן , to separate, bend, softened from קָנַע ; also קָנַע , instead of קָנַע , from the root גָּר , to separate; קָנַע for קָנַע ; 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. קָנַע instead of קָנַע from the root צָב , to bind together; קָנַע to seize, for קָנַע from רָחַק , 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 PRÆ-REDUPLICATED VERBAL STEMS¹ and classified them in the following way:

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

hence, clothes, comp. קָנַע , to separate, keep off, conceal; קָנַע , close, compact,

of a seam; קָנַע , to surround. The under-garment, קָנַע , is purely Semitic and passed hence to the Greek $\chiιτῶν$, $κιτῶν$, and by transposition *tunica*."

It may interest the reader, to see, in juxtaposition with this description of the supposed development of the root כָּן (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.

2. Those beginning with *s* and *t* sounds; st , st , etc.
From these we have stt , stt , stt , etc.
3. Those beginning with *labials*; as pt , st , etc.
From these are formed stt , stt , stt , etc.
4. Those beginning with *liquids*; as st , st , st , etc.
 stt , stt , stt , etc.
 stt , stt , stt , etc.
 stt , stt , stt .

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 trilaterals and their subsequent contraction into the forms in which we now find them. Such are stt from the root stt , contracted from stt ; stt for stt , from stt ; stt for stt , stt for stt , stt for stt , etc.

Among the most attractive portions of this interesting work are the *Appendices*, in the first of which the author discusses the *Quadrilaterals* 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 descendants 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 probably 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, clearly 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 political culture of the Hebrews. What they have in common, e. g. circumcision, was manifestly transplanted from Semitic to Egyptian 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 somewhat more lucid.

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

“אָפֿן” (p. 59) from the root כּל, 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 כּלל, to be all gone, disappear, Pi. complete; כּלל, to separate = keep off, include. Comp. אָכּל, fricuat, scabit, edit; אָכּל, rex, tyrannus, pr. the decider = האָפּן imperator.

קִבֵּץ (p. 26) from the root כּב, to bring together. Cf. קָם to draw together, come together, hence also to cover; קִבְּצָם = κάταραπτο something drawn together, hence a) gummi, κόμμι, gum of trees = جمع. b) Of a contracted, small form. Harsher, as למִקֵּץ, to grasp.

The significations of קִבֵּץ are, therefore :

1. In the Arabic, هَكَم, to bring together = make fast (= هَكَم 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 حَم also signifies to firmly determine, distinctly specify. In like manner, the related جمع IV.

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

From the same root the post-reduplicated perfect كَمَح = كَمَح 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; חָמָא, 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 **כֶּמֶר**, **כִּמְיָ**, **עֵמָּ**; hence (Germ.) *Hemd* shirt; comp. Swedish *ham*, cover, garment, (as **כִּמְעָ** 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. **חָמַם**, **חָמָה**, 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. **כָּעַע** *amputavit pedes*. And further, to obstruct or weaken the power of the male, hence to *unman, lame, cripple*; comp. Germ. *Hämmeling*, one castrated, *Hammel* the castrated male sheep. Finally, *drawing together* is often used in the sense of *collecting, heaping together*, e. g. **جَمَعَ**, **צָבַע**, 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.

צָבַע to bring together, heap up, **קָמַם** II. Hence **קָמוֹס** (= *culmulus*) pr. *heap, group*, further, *the Pleiades*. Also,

קָמַם, **צָבַע** 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 **צָבַע**, to remain standing, from the root **צָבַע** = **צָבַע** is related to the one under consideration, as will subsequently be shown. Gesenius, in his *Man. Lex.* compares **צָבַע** with **צָבַע**, as though **צָבַע** were the root, which is altogether a mistake.

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

דָּבַר from the root דב, comp. דָּבַר through which it is derived.¹

1. To press together, drive together; hence,

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

פָּרַדַּד *perdidit*. דָּבַר *interitus*, דָּבַר id. Kindred with דָּבַר is the Arab. دَبَل *pestis*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

שָׁמַר from the root שם = hold together, hold firmly, keep.

שָׁמַר 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.

שָׁמַר 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* שָׁמַר 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 שָׁמַר 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 דבב (the lingual being changed into a sibilant) rather than דבב, so that the presence of the form דבב presupposes the other, which however nowhere occurs as a verb, though we find it in several derivations, viz. דבב, honey, דבב, 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 *שָׁמֵר* 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*.

נָרַץ from the root *נָרַץ* 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.

נִירָץ 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. 6: 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 *נִירָץ* is Niph. part. of *נִירָץ*, 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 *נָרַץ* [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 *حَرَّ*. 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 *נָרַץ* a) That which has been made small, crushed, chewed; hence, that which was eaten. Thus we can explain the phrase *וַיִּנְרָץ נִירָץ* to bring up what was chewed, i. e. to ruminate, Lev. 11: 3—6. Deut. 14: 6, 7. Once it occurs as *נָרַץ נִירָץ*, 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 גְּרִיטָה, the *small, single, little piece*; hence berry, Is. 17: 6. Further, גְּרִיטוֹת *Fauces*, pr. the splits, holes, i. e. windpipe and throat; whence in general, *throat, neck*; always used of the outside of the neck, whilst גְּרוֹן usually signifies the inside, although not in all cases, vid. Is. 3: 16, where it designates the outside and front of the neck. Cf. חֶרֶץ, hole, hollow. These significations are used interchangeably. Even גְּנוּזָה, *neck*, from גָּז strictly means *split, cleft, opening*, cf. *fauces* with γένος, *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 *gurgis* 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 *Kuertur*. As a secondary signification we have "to utter guttural sounds, chirp," in Sanscrit, *gri* = to utter a sound, in general, γηγῶσ, to sound, sing, speak; *garrere*, prate, gabble. Then, more specifically, the picturesque reduplication غَرَّغَرَّ, *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.

בָּוֵא, (p. 639) from the root בא = בה, בק, pr. *push* = penetrate
 بَتَّعِمَ a) penetravit in medium, b) firmiter mansit in loco;

بَتَّعِمَ importune instilit;

בָּא 1) Penetrate, = *enter, enter into*; then in general, *go*. 2) *Come*. Arab. بَاء IL inivit feminam; venit in locum, ubi comoratus fuit. بَاو coitus conjugalis.

בָּ, the preposition, also belongs unquestionably to the stem בָּוֵא. Ethiop. *ba*, Arab. ب, Aram. בִּי (instead of בָּא, as בִּי instead of בָּא) prop. a *status constructus* which signifies *introduction*, and hence,

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

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,