

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 5—January, 1891.

I.

RECENT DOGMATIC THOUGHT AMONG THE PROTESTANTS IN AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.*

WE are not so fortunate as to be able to avail ourselves of sources lying ready at hand to obtain a correct impression of the dogmatic tendency or tendencies which have prevailed among the Protestants of Austria-Hungary since the middle of this century. Besides some scattered articles in brochures and church papers, as, for example, in Schenkel's *Allgemeine kirchliche Zeitschrift*,† there exists no treatment of the subject of any kind which can be called in any way comprehensive or exhaustive. Moreover, the isolated studies which exist, are written from very diverse standpoints, and therefore make no uniform impression. We shall endeavor to give the American theological public some information concerning the subject indicated in the title, drawn partly from experience and partly from periodicals and brochures of all kinds. If the reader will glance at a map of Austria-Hungary, he will perceive a very extensive tract. From the Russian-Turkish boundary to the Tyrol, from the northernmost part of Bohemia to the Adriatic sea, stretches the territory, and Protestant congregations are found everywhere in it. In some places they stand forth as mere ruins of former greatness and glory, as in the German-Slavic countries; in others they are more compact, as in Hungary, along the Theiss and around Debreczin.

In Hungary the gospel has never had to submit to be entirely

* [For the translation of Dr. Böhl's paper our readers are indebted to the competent hand of the Rev. Charles S. Barrett, M.A., of Baltimore, Md.—
EDITORS.]

† See for the year 1863, 4 Heft.

work by his last illness. The manuscript from which this volume is printed represents the form which the lectures ultimately assumed after they had passed through repeated and sedulous revision. They were never redelivered without being retouched, and in parts rewritten; and the whole manuscript, except a few pages at the end, was so carefully prepared as to be practically ready to go to press . . . It was not his design to produce a complete system of the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages, or to give a complete account of all recent researches and discussions, but to do through the press for a wider circle of students what he had done by the oral delivery of the lectures for his Cambridge pupils."

WILLIAM HENRY GREEN.

Princeton.

HEBREW WORD MANUAL. Etymologically Arranged. By JAMES ALEXANDER CRAIG, Ph.D., Adjunct Professor of Biblical Exegesis in Lane Theological Seminary. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co., 1890.

This *Manual* claims, as an advantage over other works of the kind, to give not merely roots but the various derivatives of the roots, classified according to an etymological method and according to the frequency of the aggregate occurrence of all the forms containing certain radical letters. The object of such a work is to be commended because, we think, its usefulness cannot be doubted. In the following lines we shall point out some defects which seem to us to detract from its perfection.

The author seems to have no clearly defined principle upon which to treat roots which are written alike, but which differ in meaning. On page 44, the words for "evening," for "plain," and for "woof," are put under 'arabh, which is defined as meaning in Assyrian "to enter." On page 75 of the *Manual* is another 'arabh, "to intertwine," under which he again puts "woof." Gesenius, we think, rightly gave three root meanings for 'arabh, one for each of the three words given above. Would it not be better to omit all derivatives which do not come from the one root 'arabh, "to enter," as is done in the case of 'adam, lun, zamar, and others; or else to give at once all the root meanings and all the derivatives, as is done in the case of 'ana and shana, and others? We notice that in many cases a full list is not given of the derivatives. This is true of roots so important as *hhaza*, *nahham*, *palal*, *sathar*, and *qara*, as well as of *sahhar*, *pasal*, *patha*, and many others. We have sought in vain to find any consistency in the omissions. Not merely are segholates frequently omitted; in three words, on pages 75 and 77, we note the omission of nouns with a short and a long vowel, with two short vowels, with Mim or Tau prefixed, with the last two consonants doubled, and with the sufformative *ân*—seven words in all, none of which are proper names. These omissions may be intentional, but we think it would have been better to insert them even if they do occur but a few times, especially since, on pages 75 to 77, there are inserted in the lists fifteen words, each of which occurs less than ten times.

It seem hardly necessary for a beginner to learn that *kadama* means, in Arabic, "to be pointed," or 'anisa, "to be accustomed to" (as a root for 'esh, "fire"); or to learn such possible Hebrew roots as *ra'ash*, "to be firm," *shakar*, "to close," *hhaza*, "to divide;" since no light is thrown by them upon the Hebrew derivatives, nor upon the exegesis of the Old Testament. Is it well to have students learn that words come from roots between which and themselves the existence of an etymological nexus is conjectural at best? We refer to such words as *baddim*, "lies," and *badh*, "linen," 'ol, "yoke," 'olel, "child," *tsir*, "messenger," *b_eri*, "fat," and *hharutz*, "gold."

The author makes frequent and, in general, a profitable use of the Assyrian and Arabic cognates and an occasional happy reference to the Æthiopic; we notice with some surprise that no analogies are drawn from any of the Aramaic dialects.

ROBERT DICK WILSON.

Allegheny.

The following works in Shemitic Philology are also on our table :

Thesaurus Syriacus, collegerunt Stephanus M. Quatremere, Georgius Henricus Bernsteni, S. W. Lorsbach, Albertus Jac. Arnoldi, Carolus M. Agrell, F. Field, Æmilius Roediger. Auxit, Digessit, Exposuit, Edidit R. Payne Smith, S.T.D., Ecclesiæ Christi Cathedralis Cantuariensis Decanus. Fasciculus VIII. Ê. & Piê. (Oxonii: E. Typo. Clar., MDCCCXC.) No one who has never undertaken a work of this kind can appreciate the labor which must be expended in its production. When the great scholar Étienne-Marc Quatremère sent out his prospectus, he calculated that the whole work contemplated by him would contain sixteen hundred pages quarto, and that it would all be published in four years. When Dean R. Payne Smith was called to take up the work from which death had summoned his illustrious predecessor, he estimated that the dictionary would fill two thousand pages folio, and would require ten years for publication. The eighth fascicle, which has just been published by the University Press, ends with the 3348th page quarto, and has just seen the light after twenty years. The best dictionaries hitherto published were those of Schaaf for the New Testament, of Castell for the Syriac of Walton's Polyglot, and that for Bernstein's Chrestomathy. The *Thesaurus Syriacus* is an attempt to meet the wants of scholars by supplying a dictionary which will contain not merely all the words in the language but all the significations of each word, every signification being justified by citations taken from published or manuscript Syriac texts, or by the native Syriac dictionaries such as Bar Ali and Bar Baklûl. The way for such a dictionary, which fifty years ago was an impossibility, has been prepared and rendered possible: (1) by the many small dictionaries previously published; (2) by the collections of Lorsbach, Arnold, Bernstein, Agrell, Field, Roediger, and especially of Quatremère; (3) by the possession by the British Museum and the Bodleian libraries of Syriac manuscripts, and, especially, by the accessibility to manuscript copies of the Syriac dictionaries of Bar Ali, Bar Baklûl, Elias and George Karmsedinoyo; (4) by the editions published by Bickell, Cureton, Lagarde, Land, Martin, Nöldeke, Overbeck, Phillips, Wright and others. To the dictionary as originally designed by Quatremère, Dean Smith, rightly we think, has added the great multitude of Greek words that are found in Syriac authors. These words and definitions might not be of much use to scholars like the eminent authors of the *Thesaurus*, but they certainly make the dictionary more valuable to the thousands who will use it as a *vade mecum* in the reading of Syriac. On many pages half the words defined are from the Greek. For the *Thesaurus*, as far as published, there can be naught but most unstinted praise. We do not see how it could be improved in its general plan; and no man has ability and means to criticise it thoroughly in detail. In frequent reference to it we have come across but one word where neither meaning nor citation was satisfactory, and we have found a desideratum for practical purposes in but two particulars. In the first place, manuscripts in my possession frequently give vowel-pointing for nouns differing from the pointing given in the *Thesaurus*. They are dialectic differences such as *ã* instead of *ê* or *â*, *ê* instead of *î*, etc. We think that these differences should have been noted either in the Preface or under every such word. In the second place it would have been of advantage to us and, we think, to many, if the discussion of each letter of the