

THE  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1857.

---

No. I.

---

ARTICLE I.—*A Familiar Treatise on Christian Baptism.*  
Illustrated with Engravings. Designed for Young Christians  
and Baptized Children. By JAMES WOOD, D. D. New  
Albany: John B. Anderson.

*Plain Words to a Young Communicant.* By JAMES W. ALEX-  
ANDER, D. D. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph. 1855.

THESE excellent little books, by two of our eminent and judicious divines, are among the pleasing proofs that our Church, while, with all true Protestants, it recoils from "condensing the sacraments into idols," also refuses to join the rationalists in evaporating them into airy nothing. That of Dr. Wood is well fitted to fortify our people against the plausible attacks which our principles, as to the mode and subjects of baptism, suffer from the Baptists, while it affords much valuable instruction to Christian parents and their baptized children, as to the significance and importance of infant baptism, and the privileges and duties which result from it. It maintains and develops the doctrine of our standards as to such children being members of the Church, and under its inspection and government.

Dr. Alexander's little manual is a model of its kind. While it does not undertake to supersede such larger works as Mat-

By Symon  
Awater

tion, more successful in winning souls to Christ and in edifying saints, than are those who adhere to the old faith of Augustin, Calvin, and the Puritans? Our exhausted limits forbid our giving an extended reply to these questions, and we shall only say, that the Annals of the Pulpit in our own and other lands authorize us to return for answer a decisive No.

We again heartily commend these delightful volumes to all our readers, who, if they adopt our advice, will become as impatient as ourselves for the early appearance of those which remain behind.

---

ART. VII.—*Grammatik der Huzvâresch-Sprache, von FR. SPIEGEL.* 8vo. pp. 194. Wien, 1856.

THIS grammar of the Huzvaresh or Pehlevi language is the first of a series to be issued under the general title of Introduction to the traditional writings of the Parsis. The second, whose preparation is already far advanced, is to contain a discussion of the Huzvaresh literature, and of the literature of the later Parsis generally. A glossary will conclude the whole. Spiegel's aim in bringing out these volumes now, before concluding the translation of the Avesta which he has begun, is to justify the principles of interpretation which he has adopted, and the deference paid in his version to traditional authority. In order to do this, it was necessary to furnish the facilities for an acquaintance with what have hitherto been sealed books and an unknown tongue.

The Huzvaresh is one of the Iranic, or old Persian languages, succeeding the Zend and preceding the Parsi and the modern Persian. One of its most marked characteristics as distinguished from both the antecedent and subsequent forms of the language, is the extensive introduction of Semitic words. These have evidently come from the Aramean, and, as is shown by the frequent confounding of the gutturals and other indications, from some corrupt form of the Aramean like that which was in use among the Zabians or Nabatheans. The contiguity and even political connection of Iranic and Aramean nations under

the Persian dominion, then under the Syrian, and finally under the Bactrian, affords a ready explanation of the mixture which this tongue exhibits. The Scythian words, which were once supposed to form a part of it, prove upon closer examination to be not really such. That the Iranic is the basis of the language, and the Aramæic a foreign admixture, is plain from the relation in which these two constitutive elements stand to each other. The structure and flexion of the language show this. The adopted nouns and verbs are compelled to bend to a native standard in their changes of number and tense. The compounding of words, and especially of verbs with prepositions, of which Semitic tongues know nothing, is of constant occurrence. Not only may this union of verb and preposition take place when both are Iranic, but also where one or the other, or even both are Semitic. What is likewise very remarkable, for almost every Semitic word employed there is a corresponding native equivalent in actual use; although the converse is not true. These answering terms are used interchangeably in the same phrases; they even occur together in the same sentence, and not infrequently they constitute a difference of reading in different manuscripts. This interchange is more readily explicable, if the statement of an Arabic writer be true, that even where the Persians wrote an Aramæic word, they always in reading pronounced its native equivalent. A still more remarkable circumstance is, that the Aramæic term is regulated in its meaning, and has its usage and construction determined, by that of the native word whose representative it has become. It is often necessary to ascertain the Iranic equivalent of Semitic words before the manner of their employment can be understood. There are even cases in which the Semitic equivalent of one root is used in the sense of another which in certain flexions is identical with it in form. From considerations such as these, Spiegel is led to the conclusion that the language was never popularly spoken in this form, and that the foreign elements found in it never constituted any real part of it, but that their introduction was by a conscious act on the part of the writer, and with a view to what was esteemed a learned or elegant style. They are not analogous, therefore, to words of Latin or Greek origin in English, which have become amalgamated with it and

form part of its proper stock, but rather to the employment of actual Greek and Latin words in the body of an English sentence.

The Huzvaresh is destitute of that richness of forms and flexions which marks the Zend. It is in this respect reduced almost to the same level with the modern Persian. There are no case endings, unless the *i*, a relic of the pronoun which formerly stood between the governing and governed noun, and which is now appended, as in modern Persian, to the first of two nouns in regimen, be so regarded. There are no terminations distinctive of gender in either number, none distinguishing adverbs from the corresponding nouns and adjectives, no dual, no middle nor passive voice except as made by auxiliaries; auxiliary verbs and particles are also needed to make up the tenses. The numerals are commonly expressed by signs to the almost entire exclusion of the fully written word. This mode of representation is adopted to such an extent, that while a complete exhibition of the system of numerical signs can readily be made out, some even of the units or elementary numerals never appear in their separate state; their forms can only be inferred from the compounds, into which they have entered. No Semitic numeral has yet been found of a higher denomination than ten; Iranic numerals are found of all grades.

This language is, like the Zend and Parsi, written from right to left, but with an alphabet which, though related to that in which they are commonly written, differs from it in both the shape and the number of its characters. It has one letter *l* which they have not; but it is poorer than they in having no distinction of long and short vowels, no aspirated mutes, and no such variety of nasals. While the Zend alphabet has forty-two letters, the Huzvaresh has but twenty-two; and several of these are either not distinguishable at all, or only made so by diacritical signs, which are for the most part not written. The vowels *a*, *i*, *u*, are, as in unpointed Hebrew, represented by the *matres lectionis* *kh*, *y*, and *v*, and the same license exists as to the *scriptio plena* and *defectiva*. *V* and *n* are represented by the same character; so are *y*, *g*, *j*, and *d*. What renders this yet more perplexing is the great number of ligatures, some of which depart considerably from the uncompounded forms of the

letters, and by all of which the ambiguity already attaching to individual letters is of course still further involved. The only clue in most of these doubtful cases is furnished by corresponding roots or forms in other languages; and in many instances it is impossible to disentangle the puzzle, or suggest even by way of conjecture any pronunciation for words whose meanings may nevertheless be known. For this among other reasons, it is impossible for a person to take any effectual steps in this language who is not already well grounded in its cognates, and particularly in the modern Persian. The elegant printing of this novel and difficult character is an achievement of the imperial press at Vienna, where the art of typography has reached a perfection that is rivalled no where else in the world.

The period when the Huzvaresh flourished, can be definitely fixed by means of monuments whose date is known with absolute certainty. The monuments referred to, consist of public inscriptions, coins and engraved gems belonging to the period of the Sassanides. There is much that remains obscure in these, but there is enough that is intelligible to identify the language they contain with the Huzvaresh of Parsi literature; although the exclusively secular character of the former and the exclusively religious character of the latter makes the points of contact in regard to the words employed fewer than might otherwise be expected. The gems have been investigated the least, although the legends upon a number have been satisfactorily made out. The celebrated inscriptions at Nakshi Rustam, Kerinan Shah, Hajiabad, and Persepolis, were first deciphered by De Sacy in 1793, with such learning and skill, that no material progress has been made since. He explained them to the full extent to which they were accompanied by Greek translations; and all the labour bestowed upon them by others has not issued in anything satisfactory beyond that point. The coins, some of which he explained, others of which were deciphered by Olshausen in 1843, and of which the most complete and satisfactory exhibition was given by Mordtmann in 1854, represent the same language; but they are attended with these additional points of interest, that the precise dates of their coinage can be ascertained, and that they form in a graphic point of view the connecting links between the monuments pre-

vously referred to and the Huzvaresh manuscripts. In this respect they are divisible into three classes. In the first and oldest, the alphabet upon the coins is identical with that of the monumental inscriptions: this embraces the coins of Ardeshir I. and his successors down to Nersi, when a transition begins, which can scarcely be said to be fairly set on foot, however, even in the reign of Hormuzd II. Under his son Shahpur II. begins the second class, extending to the beginning of the reign of Chusrav II.; the alphabet of the coins is now intermediate between that of the old inscriptions and of the existing manuscripts; the finest specimens of this class are found in the reign of Bahram IV. All after the time of Chusrav II. belong to the third class, in which, with unimportant exceptions during a few reigns which reverted to the more ancient forms, there is an entire agreement between the letters of the coins and the present Pehlevi alphabet.

---

## SHORT NOTICES.

---

*Biblical Researches in Palestine, and in the adjacent Regions.* A Journal of Travels in the year 1838. By E. Robinson and E. Smith. Drawn up from the original Diaries, with historical Illustrations. By Edward Robinson, D. D., LL.D., Professor of Biblical Literature in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. With new maps and plans, in 2 vols. Boston: Crocker & Brewster, 47 Washington street. London: John Murray. 1856. pp. 614 and 600.

*Later Biblical Researches in Palestine, and in the adjacent Regions.* A Journal of Travels in the year 1852. By E. Robinson and E. Smith and others. Drawn up from the original Diaries, with historical Illustrations. By Edward Robinson, D. D., LL. D., Professor, &c. With new maps and plans. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. London: John Murray. Berlin: G. Reimer. 1856. pp. 664.

We seldom take up any German book, relating to the geography or antiquities of Palestine, in which the Researches of Dr. Robinson are not referred to as a standard authority. The first and second volumes, containing the results of his first journey, were published soon after his return. A new edition of that portion of the work has recently been issued by Crocker