

THE  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY, 1867.

---

No. III.

---

ART. I.—*The Hebrew word יָשַׁב Yashabh.*

LANGUAGE is not a merely arbitrary invention, but partakes of the character of thought, whose vehicle it is. Consequently, its phenomena, its words and forms and constructions, are in no case purely dependent upon accident or caprice, but have arisen under the operation of fixed causes, and contain in themselves indications more or less clear of the sources from which they sprung. The language of any people is the mind of that people made external and tangible. It exhibits their inner life in its affinities with, and specific differences from that of other peoples, reveals the compass and range of their ideas, the extent of their knowledge, the character of their sentiments and feelings, their conceptions, whether of objects of thought or objects of sense, the impressions made upon them by surrounding nature, and even shows traces of the historical experiences through which they have passed. Recent scientific investigations and popular treatises have made us all familiar with the fact, that a careful study of the words of any language in their structure, usage, history and relations, not only reveals much that was unsuspected by superficial smatterers, but much also that had escaped those who were intimately and familiarly acquainted

with it as a vehicle of thought, but who had never directed attention to it as a depository of ancient relics, the symbols of a former life, some of which put us in connection with a period of which we have no other authentic record than that which is here supplied.

We propose in this paper, by way of experiment, to examine a single word in Hebrew, and to learn from it what we can. And for this purpose, we have selected almost at random the verb *ישב* to *sit*. It has the advantage of having been in familiar use in all periods of the language, with which we are acquainted, and of possessing a plain and obvious signification, denoting, as it does, a palpable outward act, respecting which there can be no vagueness nor obscurity. While, therefore, it will have none of the interest attaching to the settlement of controverted points, or the resolution of acknowledged difficulties, we shall feel at least that we are treading upon solid ground; and enough, we may hope, will be disclosed by the investigation to redeem it from being merely common-place.

The first question which it is natural to ask respecting this word, relates to the connections in which we find it employed. The passages in which mention is made of the act of sitting will disclose to us the usages of the time and of the people in regard to it; will show us when and how the Hebrews sat. We shall thus learn the archæology of the subject.

Sitting was the ordinary posture of wakeful repose, as distinguished on the one hand from lying down, as in sleep, or standing up, the attitude of activity and exertion. Accordingly, when the lawgiver would enjoin it upon the people, that they should be continually instructing their children, he bids them do so when they sit in the house and when they walk by the way, and when they lie down and when they rise up. Deut. vi. 7, xi. 19. He means by this enumeration to include the whole of their daily life. Downsitting is (Psalm cxxxix. 2, Lam. iii. 63), combined with uprising, and (2 Kings xix. 27, Isaiah xxxvii. 28), with going out and coming in, to denote the entire period of wakefulness, its repose and its activity. It is a departure from oriental usages and modes of thought to render Psalm cxxvii. 2, as in the common English version, "It is vain for you to rise up early, to sit up late"—meaning it is of no

avail to toil early and late without the Divine blessing. The Psalmist intended to say, "It is vain to rise up early, to *sit down* late." The man, who was at work, was on his feet, when he sat, he rested. The older English translations more accurately represent the original in this place; thus, the Psalter of the Prayer Book somewhat paraphrastically, "It is but lost labour that ye haste to rise up early, and so late take rest."

Oriental usually sit, not on chairs, but on mats or carpets spread upon the floor, or on cushions laid upon divans, on the low platforms which border one or both ends of their apartments. Chairs were used in ancient Egypt, particularly by the wealthy, as is shown by frequent representations upon the monuments. (Wilkinson's *Ancient Egypt*, ch. 6). But if they had been common among the Hebrews, they would doubtless have been mentioned in Lev. ch. xv., where the law of uncleanness communicated by the act of sitting is given with minute particularity. They are not, however, once alluded to. The general expressions which are employed, "whatsoever the unclean person sitteth upon," ver. 26, or, "the thing (Heb. כִּי) whereon he sitteth," refer to the mat or cloth, or whatever it might be which was spread for this purpose. The rich are described, Judges v. 10, as sitting upon "cloths" or "carpets," where our version erroneously has "sit in judgment." The nobles riding forth on white asses, the rich sitting in luxurious ease at home, and the poor, who walk by the way, as they go to their accustomed toil, are summoned to celebrate in unison the deliverance which the Lord has wrought by the hand of Deborah and of Barak. The witch of Endor had nothing to offer King Saul to sit upon but her bed, 1 Sam. xxviii. 23, probably a mattress spread upon the divan, which thus served as a seat by day as well as a couch by night.

The only word in Hebrew for an elevated seat is כִּסֵּא, from כָּפַח to cover, which means, therefore, according to its etymology, a *covered chair*, either one surmounted by a canopy, or over which a drapery has been spread. It accordingly denotes, not an ordinary seat, but a chair of state, a seat of honour or distinction, a throne, such as was occupied only by persons in high station or of exalted dignity. And even in the few passages in which our version renders it differently, it would have

been better if the word *throne* had been retained. Thus, where Eli is said, 1 Sam. i. 9, to have "sat upon a seat by a post of the temple," he was, as the Hebrew suggests, seated "upon the throne," the high priest's throne or cathedra, at the entrance to the temple; and the blessing thence pronounced upon Hannah is thus rendered more solemn and authoritative. So too, "the seat," 1 Sam. iv. 13, on which Eli sat trembling for the ark, and from which, ver. 18, he fell when he died, was his throne, which in his anxiety he had caused to be placed by the wayside at the gate of Shiloh. The seat from which the king of Moab rose to receive the dagger of Ehud, Judg. iii. 20, is in Hebrew a throne. The seat which Solomon caused to be set at his right hand for his mother, was a throne, 1 King ii. 19; so was the seat, to which Haman was promoted by Ahasuerus, Esth. iii. 1, the monarch being enthroned in the midst of his princes, as in the sublime imagery of the Revelation, the four and twenty elders with their crowns of gold sit on thrones surrounding the throne of the infinite Majesty, who is thus represented as the King of kings. Rev. iv. 4.

In Prov. ix. 14, likewise שֹׁבֵב is not "a seat" merely, but a *throne*. Folly is represented as not only sitting at the door of her own house, but enthroned in the high places of the city. It is not only in private life that she practises her deadly arts; she is found also in conspicuous stations, high rank and lofty official positions, and prostitutes them to her own detestable ends.

2 Kings iv. 10 is by high authorities regarded as presenting an exception to this constant usage. A שֹׁבֵב in our version, a *stool* together with a bed, a table and a candlestick constitute the furniture of the chamber built for Elisha by the Shunamite woman. Yet even here it is possible that an elevated seat or throne was placed in the prophet's room in recognition of his sacred and exalted dignity.

Thrones were preëminently for kings, who sat upon them not only when exercising regal functions, in the palace or in other public places, as the gates of the city, 1 Kings xxii. 10, but also in retirement, Judges iii. 20. Princes and other attendants stood before the monarch, Jer. xxxvi. 21, 22, 1 Kings x. 8, in an attitude of readiness to execute his will. In like manner, Isaiah

vi. 2, saw the seraphim standing beside the throne of the Lord, and the apostle John saw, Rev. viii. 2, the seven angels which stood before God, and all the angels standing round about the throne. Rev. vii. 11, comp. 1 Kings xxii. 19. And Elijah announces himself as the servant of the same great King, 1 Kings xvii. 1, when he says, "As the Lord God of Israel liveth, before whom I stand."

To be seated with a king, or at his right hand, was not only a mark of honour, as in the case of Solomon's mother, 1 Kings ii. 19, and the queen of Artaxerxes, Neh. ii. 6, but of association in dignity and power, as Mèssiah at God's right hand, Ps. cx. 1, and the position solicited for James and John, that they might sit at the right hand of Jesus, and at his left hand in his kingdom, Matt. xx. 21; comp. Rev. iii. 21.

The throne was thus the symbol of royalty, Gen. xli. 40, and "to sit upon the throne" is the constant phrase for succeeding to the kingdom, 1 Kings i. 20, 35, ii. 12. And "to sit," in this eminent sense, is to be enthroned. So God is described as "sitting in the heavens," Ps. ii. 4, or "sitting on the circle of the earth," Isaiah xl. 22, or "upon the flood," Ps. xxix. 10; or is said to be enthroned in his earthly temple, as Ps. xcix. 1, "The LORD reigneth, let the people tremble; *he sitteth between the cherubims*, let the earth be moved." This phrase elsewhere translated, "dwelleth between the cherubims," 2 Kings xix. 15, denotes not simply residence, but sitting enthroned as king. In Hebrew, the word for *temple*, הֵיכָל, is identical with that for *palace*. It is not only God's dwelling-place, but his royal abode, the place of his throne, where he sits the monarch of Israel to give audience to his people, and the Lord of hosts attended by the cherubim, symbolical representatives of the heavenly host. Hence we find these titles repeatedly combined, "the LORD of hosts, which dwelleth," or sitteth "between the cherubims," 1 Sam. iv. 4, 2 Sam. vi. 2, Isa. xxxvii. 16, or rather as the prayer-book version has it, Ps. lxxx. 1, and as the LXX and Vulgate uniformly translate it, "sitteth *upon* the cherubim." "Between" is not in the original, and is erroneously supplied. The ark with its golden cover was not itself the throne, but only the visible base of an invisible throne. The invisible monarch was seated not between, but above the

cherubim, as is distinctly shown in Ezekiel's vision, i. 26, x. 1, and as is implied in the language of the psalmist, xviii. 10, "He rode upon a cherub and did fly."

There is more frequent allusion to the kingship of Jehovah under this figure in the Old Testament than the English reader would suppose, as it is often obscured in our common translation. Thus, Ps. ix. 7, "The Lord shall endure for ever," means rather, "the Lord shall sit for ever;" verse 11, "The Lord which dwelleth in Zion," should be, "which sitteth in Zion;" and Ps. xxii. 3, "Thou art holy, O thou that inhabitest the praises of Israel," converted in the LXX and Vulgate by a change of construction into "Thou inhabitest a holy place, O thou praise of Israel," means rather, "thou that art enthroned amidst or upon the praises of Israel."

Similar language is used of monarchs aspiring to be gods. The prince of Tyre says, Ezek. xxviii. 2, "I sit in the seat of God." And the king of Babylon, Isa. xiv. 13, "I will sit upon the mount of the congregation," *i. e.*, I will be enthroned upon the sacred temple mount, as some understand it, or, according to others, upon some fabled mountain of the gods. Imperial cities are also personified as reigning. Jerusalem is bidden, Isa. lii. 2, to shake herself from the dust, to arise and sit, *i. e.*, upon her queenly throne. So Babylon, Rev. xviii. 7, "I sit a queen."

This usage further illustrates two striking incidents in Old Testament history. When Moses was on the hill during the battle with Amalek, Ex. xvii. 12, the stone on which he sat was a rude throne, and the rod in his hand was a sceptre extended to command victory for Israel. The posture is not that of supplication, which his outstretched hands have often been understood to signify. Again, when Elijah sat on the top of the hill, 2 Kings i. 9, and bid fire come down from heaven upon those who were sent to take him, he was on his throne as the representative of God, bidding defiance to the impotent hostility of a human sovereign.

Thrones or chairs of state were also used by governors, Neh. iii. 7; princes, 1 Sam. ii. 8; generals, Jer. i. 15, xxxix. 3; and judges, Ps. cxxii. 5. Moses sat to judge the people, while the litigants stood, Exod. xviii. 13, 14. "I stand," said Paul,

“at Cesar’s judgment-seat,” Acts xxv. 10. Hence, *to sit*, and especially “to sit in the gate” of a city, 2 Sam. xix. 8, Jer. xxxviii. 7, where judicial business was commonly transacted, is sometimes equivalent to acting as judge. In this sense Deborah *sat* (LXX and Vulgate), not *dwelt* (E. V.) under the palm-tree of Deborah, Judges iv. 5. Perhaps, also, Mal. iii. 3, Messiah “shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver,” *i. e.*, shall exercise the office of a judge with a view to refine and purify.

The rabbins were mistaken, however, in inferring from Gen. xix. 1, “Lot sat in the gate of Sodom,” that he was promoted to the office of judge, or, as they affirm, of chief-justice in that wicked city; since the phrase is also used of those who frequented that place of public concourse for other purposes, Ruth iv. 1, Ps. lxxix. 12, Prov. xxxi. 23. We learn from the case of Naboth, 1 Kings xxi. 9–13, that in criminal trials the accused was placed in a conspicuous seat, and the witnesses were seated opposite to him.

Those who consulted a prophet, sat before him, Ezek. iii. 15, viii. 1, xiv. 1, xx. 1, xxxiii. 31; 2 Kings iv. 38, vi. 32, awaiting the communication to be made to them. And as he was upon a higher seat, and thus elevated above them, they sat at his feet; so the healed demoniac, Luke viii. 35, and Mary, x. 39, at the feet of Jesus, and Paul at the feet of Gamaliel, Acts xxii. 3. Our Lord was accustomed to sit when teaching; so in the synagogue at Nazareth, Luke iv. 20; on the mount, Matt. v. 1; in the ship, Luke v. 3, and in the temple, John viii. 2, Matt. xxvi. 55. This, too, as is well known, was the usage of the synagogue, Matt. xxiii. 2, and of the early Christian preachers, whose hearers sometimes, though not invariably, stood.

In contrast both with this official sitting on an elevated throne, and the ordinary sitting upon mats or carpets laid upon the floor, mourners sat upon the ground in the inactivity and negligence of grief, Job ii. 13, Isa. iii. 26, Lam. ii. 10, Judges xx. 26, Ezra ix. 3–5, Neh. i. 4, Ps. cxxxvii. 1, Ezek. viii. 14; or in ashes, Job ii. 8, and sackcloth, Jonah iii. 6; in solitude, Lam. iii. 28; in darkness and silence, Isa. xlvii. 5, Mic. vii. 8, Lam. iii. 6, Ps. cxliii. 3. Degradation is expressed by being obliged to leave the throne, and sit upon the ground, Isa.

xlvii. 1, Jer. xiii. 18, xlvi. 18, Ezek. xxvi. 16, comp. Eccles. x. 6, and exaltation by the reverse, rising from the dust to sit upon a throne, Isa. lii. 2.

Sitting is the attitude of inactivity, as an erect position is for motion or labour. Those sit who have nothing to do, or are in fact doing nothing, Num. xxxii. 6, 2 Sam. ii. 13, 2 Kings vii. 3, Jer. viii. 14, Zech. i. 11, or are waiting to see what will happen, Gen. xxi. 16, Exod. ii. 15, Judges xix. 15, or to meet with some one, Ruth iv. 1, Jer. iii. 2, it may be with evil intent, in ambush (comp. Lat. *insidiæ* from *sedeo*), Ps. x. 8, xvii. 12, or awaiting orders from a superior, as Mordecai sitting in the king's gate, Esth. ii. 19, 21, v. 13, vi. 10, or as soldiers guarding the wall of a besieged city, 2 Kings xviii. 27, Isa. xxxvi. 12. Whence the phrases, "to sit under one's own vine and fig-tree," 1 Kings iv. 25, Mic. iv. 4, denoting the enjoyment of undisturbed repose and peaceful security; "to sit under any one's shadow," Cant. ii. 3, Hos. xiv. 7, Ezek. xxxi. 17, to share his protection or the refreshment he affords; "to sit in darkness," Ps. cvii. 10, Isa. xlii. 7, to be confined in a prison or a dungeon.

Sitting was the ordinary posture of the Hebrews in eating from the days of the patriarchs to the end of the Old Testament, as appears from numerous allusions to the subject, Gen. xxvii. 19, xxxvii. 25, Ex. xxxii. 6, Judges xix. 6, Ruth ii. 14, 1 Sam. xx. 5, 24, Prov. xxiii. 1, 1 Kings xiii. 20, Jer. xvi. 8, Ezek. xlv. 3. The use of beds or couches for sitting or for reclining at meals is spoken of by Amos iii. 12, vi. 4, and by Ezekiel, xxiii. 41, as belonging to the luxury and effeminacy of a degenerate period. This latter had, as is well known, become the uniform custom in the times of the New Testament, where we never read, except in our version, of sitting at meat; the original invariably speaks of reclining.

In Egypt they sat, as we learn not only from native sources, ancient and modern, but from the brethren of Joseph when feasted at his house, Gen. xliii. 33, and from the children of Israel beside the flesh-pots, Exod. xvi. 3. But in Persia, at the grand festival of Ahasuerus, Esth. i. 6, and at the more private entertainment of queen Esther, the guests reclined, Esth. vii. 8.

The table of shew-bread was a cubit and a half in height, or about 2 feet 4 inches, which is nearly as high as our dining-tables. This was, of course, much higher than those in ordinary use, as it represented the table of the great King. The table in the temple of Herod was not much above a foot in height, as it is represented on the arch of Titus in Rome. King Saul at table sat upon his seat by the wall, 1 Sam. xx. 25, that is, upon the raised divan at the side or end of the apartment, which would admit of his having a higher table than those required who sat upon the floor. Lane thus describes the tables in use in modern Egypt, vol. i. p. 24. "For meals a round tray is brought in and placed upon a low stool, and the company sit round it on the ground." Dr. Robinson found the same in Palestine, vol. ii. p. 635. A simpler affair still is in use among the Arabs; a round leather or mat is laid upon the floor, provided with rings on its outer edge, so that after the meal is finished it can be drawn together like a bag, and suspended on a nail. Winer *Realw.* ii. p. 48, (note 10). Rœdiger finds in this an illustration of Psalm lxix. 22: "Let their table become a snare before them." If the psalmist had such a table as this in mind, the figure of the feet becoming entangled in it, would not be a violent one.

Sitting was further customary in such acts as required no exertion, and could therefore be as easily performed in this as in any other posture. Thus men sat to talk, Psalm i. 1, l. 20, cxix. 23, Jer. xv. 17, to consult together, Jer. xxxvi. 12, 2 Kings ix. 5, to read, Jer. xxxvi. 15, to warm themselves at a fire, Isaiah xlvii. 14, Jer. xxxvi. 22, &c.

We have now reviewed with, we fear, a wearisome particularity the various connections in which the word  $\text{ישב}$  to sit occurs in the Old Testament; and have ascertained as far as possible the usages of the Hebrews in this respect, the various modes in which different classes of the people sat, and the occasions upon which they sat. We may next inquire into the different meanings of this word  $\text{ישב}$ . We shall learn something about Hebrew association of ideas by discovering the bond which connects its secondary or derived senses with its primary signification. Language is not an incoherent mass of individual words, each of which is arbitrarily linked to its own separate

and distinct idea. Kindred ideas are attached to the same word, or to the several primary words which spring alike directly from one common root, or to the derivatives formed from the same primary. And thus the whole body of ideas expressed in any given language is grouped and arranged in a way peculiarly its own, affording often welcome glimpses into the habits of thought of the particular people by which it was spoken, or the character of the associations which they formed.

The word יָשַׁב has three clearly distinguishable meanings, *to sit*, *to remain*, and *to dwell*. Thus, when it is said that Joseph's brethren *sat* before him at the table, Gen. xliii. 33, and when Judah asked that he might be suffered *to remain* as a bondman instead of Benjamin, Gen. xlv. 33, and when Joseph gave his father and brethren permission *to dwell* in the land of Goshen, Gen. xlv. 10, the original word is the same in each case. He who sat down, indicated a purpose to remain, and he who dwelt in any place remained there continuously.

In this association of ideas there lurks, if we mistake not, a reminiscence of the early nomadic condition of the Hebrews. Their forefathers wandered about with no fixed or permanent habitation. They had no special attachment to one spot rather than to another. Wherever they sat down, that was for the time their home; and they moved their dwelling as they changed their seat.

With the Greek and the Roman, on the other hand, the associations were entirely different. In Greek *to dwell* is οἰκέω, or κατοικέω from αἶχος, *house*. A house, a fixed abode, a structure for his habitation, is fundamental to the conception. To have and occupy a house, to be domiciled, is the notion of dwelling here suggested. In Latin again, *to dwell* is *inhabito* from *habeo* to hold or possess, or *incolo* from *colo* to cultivate. A man is conceived of as dwelling where he has permanent possession, or where he cultivates the soil. The wandering patriarch did not require the ownership of the soil with the Roman, ever bent on sovereignty and control, nor with the more domestic Greek did he need to build his house in order to dwell. He had his home wherever he sat down.

Our words "reside" and "dwell" so far resemble the cor-

responding Hebrew term, that they point to the roving disposition of those who first employed them, but with an additional indication of their fierce and warlike character, which stands in marked contrast with the peaceful and pastoral life of the patriarchs. In the mouth of the Romans *resideo* was to sit behind, or to remain behind sitting after others had risen from that posture; we have from it our word *residue*. As caught up by the invading barbarians it stigmatized those who remained idly at home, while the able-bodied and the courageous went forth to war, or those who continued in their old settlements while the body of the advancing horde proceeded in quest of new seats. Continuous occupancy of one's home, was in the conception of migratory tribes "to reside," to stay behind in idleness. We do not lead a migratory life, but we retain the word in a sense which was first suggested by habits of migration. So "to dwell" is by the best etymologists associated with "dull," and is in its radical sense indicative of inactivity or want of energy. When the active and the enterprising were accustomed to rove freely for the sake of the chase, or for war, or to satisfy a restless disposition, it seemed a dull inactive life to dwell in one spot.

These different significations of יָשַׁב to sit, remain, and dwell, shade off into each other almost imperceptibly, so that it is sometimes difficult to tell which was intended by the writer. Or rather there are passages in which either meaning might seem appropriate, according to the aspect in which they are contemplated and in regard to which translators may be in doubt, or where authorities may differ from one another, or even from themselves in the rendering which they adopt. Many narrative passages gain new vividness and force by the substitution of the more specific sense to sit for the more vague or general remain or dwell, to which the common English version has accustomed us. Thus Gen. xix. 30, "Lot went up out of Zoar and dwelt in the mountain, and his two daughters with him; for he feared to dwell in Zoar; and he dwelt in a cave (Heb. *the cave*) he and his two daughters." The verb יָשַׁב occurs three times in this verse, and is in each instance represented in our version by the word *dwell*. The Vulgate followed by Luther render it with equal uniformity *remain*, (*manere*,

*bleiben*). But the LXX picture the scene far more vividly and perhaps more faithfully by translating it *sat* (ἐκάθητο) in the first clause, though adhering to *dwelt* (κατοικῆσαι, κατόκησεν) in the other two. "Lot went up out of Zoar, and sat on the mountain, he and his two daughters with him." We can almost see the father and his daughters, who had not dared to pause in their flight until they reached the mountain side, sitting down at length in their exhaustion and fright to recover breath and to collect their thoughts, to gaze back on the awful scene from which they had barely escaped with their lives, and to consider what was next to be done or whither they should go.

Again, in the account of the purchase of the cave of Machpelah, Gen. xxiii. 10, where our version follows the Vulgate and Luther in reading, "Ephron dwelt among the children of Heth," the LXX render more graphically and with a truer regard to the context "sat." Abraham first expressed to the children of Heth his desire to possess the cave, and asked their kindly offices with Ephron on his behalf. But Ephron, who was himself sitting among them, did not wait for further solicitation, but promptly and courteously acceded to his wishes.

So in the language of Boaz to Elimelech's next kinsman, Ruth iv. 4, "Buy it before the inhabitants," or as Luther phrases it, "before the citizens or burghers," (Bürgern,) is neither so graphic nor so suitable as the rendering of the LXX and the Vulgate "before those sitting here," (καθημένων, *sedentibus*), *i. e.*, the ten who had just been selected and asked to sit down to arbitrate or witness the case, and others who were there present.

During the seven days allotted to the consecration of Aaron and his sons, they were directed, as it is in the LXX, Levit. viii. 35, *to sit* at the door of the tabernacle day and night; our version has it more vaguely *to abide*. The ambush set by Joshua viii. 9, according to our version, "abode between Bethel and Ai;" the LXX and Vulgate have "sat," referring to their crouching posture in concealment. The promise, Zech. viii. 4, is thus given in our version, "old men and old women shall  *dwell*  in the streets of Jerusalem," which might seem to imply that they should be houseless and unsheltered; the LXX have "shall  *sit*  in the streets of Jerusalem." Jer. xlix. 30, The

inhabitants of Hazor are bidden to "dwell deep," *i. e.*, take up their abode in the deepest and most inaccessible solitudes of the desert in their flight from Nebuchadnezzar's invading host; the LXX phrase it, ἐμβαθύνετε εἰς χάθισον, *deepen in sitting, i. e.*, sit low, or sit in the depths, referring rather to the posture of mourners. In Ps. ci. 6, where David says, "Mine eyes shall be upon the faithful of the land, that they may *dwell* with me," the LXX has "*sit* (συγκαθίσθαι) *with me*," be my assessors, act as my judges and officers, assist me in the government.

Again, in sundry passages the English version adopts the more graphic and preferable rendering, where others are more vague. Thus Ps. ii. 4, "He that sitteth in the heavens," is seated, that is, upon the throne of the heavens, is better than the bare "dwelleth in the heavens" of the LXX, Vulgate, and Luther. Angels and the glorified just dwell in heaven, but God alone is seated on the heavenly throne. The language of the prince of Tyre, Ezek. xxviii. 2, "I sit in the seat of God," is a stronger assertion of his fancied divine prerogatives, than "I dwell in the dwelling of God," LXX (κατοικίαν θεοῦ κατοίχισα). "A young lion *lurking* in secret places," Ps. xvii. 13, is a more lively figure of an enemy watching his opportunity, than one *dwelling* in secret places, as the LXX and Vulgate render it. "All the earth sitteth still," as the English version and Luther render Zech. i. 11, as a poetical description of the prevailing peace and security, is superior to the bald and prosaic rendering of the LXX and Vulgate, "All the earth is inhabited" (κατοικεῖται, habitatur).

Sometimes, on the other hand, one or more of the versions render שָׁבַת by *sit* where this is too specific, and *dwell* would be preferable. Thus the LXX, Vulgate, Luther, and English versions, prior to that of king James, translate 1 Chron. xvii. 1, "when David dwelt in his house," though for the identical expression in the parallel passage, 2 Sam. vii. 1, they have "sat in his house," which the authorized English version has in both passages. But the sacred writer does not mean to describe the posture in which David was when he proposed to Nathan to build a temple for the Lord; nor does his meaning seem to be fully given by using "*sit*" in a figurative sense, to suggest the repose and quiet which he enjoyed, now that his

active campaigns were terminated, "and the Lord had given him rest round about from all his enemies." There is evidently a designed contrast between the king securely dwelling in his house and the Lord dwelling in a mere tent. "I dwell," says he, in the immediately following verse, "in a house of cedar, but the ark of God dwelleth within curtains;" *dwell*, and not *sit*, would consequently seem to be the proper rendering in the preceding verse.

In a subsequent part of the same narrative it is said, ver. 18, "Then went king David in (*i. e.*, into the court of the tabernacle), and *sat* before the Lord," and offered a prayer there recorded. As sitting is nowhere else spoken of in the Old Testament or in the New as the posture of prayer, this has given no small trouble to commentators. The rabbins allege, on the basis of this passage, that this was allowable in kings alone; others have imagined that the king first sat down on entering the tabernacle court, but afterwards arose and offered his prayer; and others still render *remained* instead of *sat*, "he went in and remained before the Lord."

Again, it is said of king Uzziah, after he was smitten with leprosy for his impiety, 2 Chron. xxvi. 21, that "he *dwelt* in a several house." The LXX render this *he sat* (ἐκάθητο), meaning that he sat upon his throne, as is shown by their paraphrasing the very same expression in the parallel passage, 2 Kings xv. 5, "*reigned*" (ἐβασίλευσεν), where Aquila has ἐκάθητο *sat*, and Symmachus ἄξει *dwelt*. But the exercise of regal functions by a leper is quite incredible, even if it were not explicitly stated that the regency was conferred upon Jotham during his father's disability.

The few experimental citations thus far made from some of the leading versions, have been applied to matters lying within the domain of lexicography, exegesis, and hermeneutics. In these several fields they are capable of rendering eminent service, whether as aids in ascertaining the meaning of difficult or doubtful words, in determining the sense of obscure and perplexed passages, or in revealing the principles and methods of interpretation which prevailed when the version was made.

It may not be amiss to indicate further, as this same word will enable us to do, the use to which the ancient versions may

be put in the way of textual criticism. They may be regarded not only as renderings of the sacred text, which may help us to understand it, or show us at least how it has been understood in the different ages and the various regions in which these versions originated, but they may likewise be viewed as so many different forms of the text, and summoned to testify respecting its purity and correctness. If a version be translated back again into the language from which it was made, it ought to yield us the original text as the translators had it before them, or at least to enable us to conclude with a measure of certainty, and within given limits, upon the form of that text.

If in any given passage different manuscripts of equal value sustain different readings, and other considerations *pro* and *con* appear to be evenly balanced, that which has the sanction of the early versions is entitled to the preference. Great caution is requisite, however, in the critical employment of versions which in injudicious hands has been productive of more harm than profit, and has tended rather to the multiplication than the correction of errors.

Where two words agree in their letters and differ only in the vowel points, which had not yet been introduced when the oldest versions were made, it is not surprising if they sometimes depart in such cases from the received text; and yet these very departures are of such a nature as to indicate the source from which they sprang. Thus, שָׁבַת the infinitive of יָשַׁב *to sit* or  *dwell*, and שָׁבַת that of שָׁבַת *to rest* (the root of our word *Sabbath*) have precisely the same consonants; so long, therefore, as no signs were in use for the vowels, they were identical in their written form. Hence it happens that in Isaiah lviii. 12 “the restorer of paths to dwell in,” both the LXX and Vulgate substitute *rest* for *dwell*; and in Num. xxi. 15 for “the dwelling of Ar,” the Vulgate has “rest in Ar.”

In Zech. x. 6 there is an anomalous grammatical form הוֹשִׁבוּהֶם. The first part of the word gives it the appearance of being derived from יָשַׁב *to dwell*, and the latter part looks as though it came from שָׁבַת *to return*. And eminent scholars have actually maintained that the word is in reality formed by a fusion of these two words, and that the prophet designed by this singular compound to suggest the ideas of both; an opinion

which appears to have been shared by our translators, who have combined both meanings in the phrase which they have given as its equivalent, "I will bring them again to place them." Now that this word stood in the text anciently just as it does now, presenting the same remarkable structure and suggesting the same combination in itself, appears from the fact that the LXX translate it as though it were from one of these words, *κατοικιῶ αὐτούς* "I will cause them to dwell," while the Vulgate gives the other, *convertam eos* "I will bring them back."

In Ruth ii. 7 the reapers inform Boaz that Ruth has been labouring in the field ever since morning, "tarrying but little in the house." This last clause is omitted entirely in the Peshito or old Syriac version. But that it nevertheless belongs properly to the text and is not a spurious addition, appears from the fact that it is found in the Vulgate, which, however, renders it "she has not even for a moment returned to the house," or returned home, introducing a negative and substituting "return" for "tarry," as though the verb were not *שָׁבַר* but *שָׁבַח*, from which a form may be derived closely approximating that in the text, though not precisely identical with it even in its consonants. That the verbal form is not to be modified, however, into conformity with the rendering of the Vulgate, appears from the LXX, which likewise has the clause but differently worded still. In the Greek the verb is neither "return" as in the Vulgate, nor "tarry" as in the Hebrew, but "rested," implying an original with the identical letters which now appear in the text, and differing only in the vowel points, (*שָׁבַחָהּ*, *שָׁבַחָהּ*). And now that even this is not the genuine reading, sanctioned by an early and steadfast tradition, but one born of the caprice of the translators, appears from the fact that the Chaldee Targum in this passage sanctions the existing Hebrew text in every particular, in the meaning yielded by its vowel points as well as by its letters. The conclusion to which we are inevitably driven by a survey of the entire case, is that the current text of the passage is the true one, and to this the Chaldee has faithfully adhered. Since, however, the construction of the original is somewhat embarrassed and perplexed, the Syriac cut the knot and relieved itself from all difficulty by dropping the troublesome clause; while the LXX and the Vulgate have for the same

reason given a paraphrase each in its own way, instead of an exact translation, preserving the general sense but not the identical expressions of the original, and yet each so serving to correct the other as to show that the text as we now have it was the common source of both.

Such paraphrastic explanations frequently occur, in which the translators depart intentionally, or at least knowingly, from the exact language of the original, content with preserving the general sense or perhaps even desirous of making the meaning clearer than a precise word-for-word translation would make it. Thus in Micah iv. 4, instead of "they shall *sit* every man under his vine and under his fig tree," the LXX have "each shall *rest* under his vine, &c." In 2 Kings xv. 5 for "Uzziah dwelt" or sat "in a several house," they substitute "reigned," showing that they understood it to mean sitting upon a throne. Esther ii. 19, vi. 10, for "Mordecai sat in the king's gate," the LXX have ἐθξρόπνευσεν, *served* or *waited*, indicating that the posture was that of a servant or attendant awaiting orders. Hag. i. 4, for "is it time for you to  *dwell* in your ceiled houses," the LXX substitute without a material change of sense, "to build your ceiled houses."

This disposition to modify the text for the sake of elucidation is no doubt the occasion of that remarkable alteration upon which they have ventured in Exod. xii. 40. Overlooking the fact that the genealogies of the period were abbreviated by the omission of unimportant names and misunderstanding the statement that the seed of Abraham should return to Canaan in the fourth generation, they concluded that four hundred and thirty years was too long a period for the residence in Egypt, and that it must include the preceding residence in Canaan likewise. They accordingly inserted a clause in the verse to this effect, making it read, "the sojourning of the children of Israel which they sojourned in the land of Egypt *and in the land of Canaan* was four hundred and thirty years." Our translators sought to compass the same end, while retaining the common text, by rendering "the sojourning of the children of Israel, *who dwelt* in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years." In this they were doubtless influenced by the statement of the apostle Paul, Gal. iii. 17, that the giving of the law was four hundred and

thirty years subsequent to the covenant with Abraham. But he does not say that this interval was only four hundred and thirty years; and his general reference to it no more binds us to believe that he was aiming at chronological exactness, than the statement of the same apostle Acts xiii. 20, that God gave to Israel judges about the space of four hundred and fifty years until Samuel the prophet, settles the vexed chronology of the book of Judges. The correctness of the existing text is, moreover, vouched for, and its true rendering given by the Vulgate, which is followed by Luther and by English versions prior to that of King James, "So the dwelling of the children of Israel, while they dwelled in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years."

It would be superfluous in any of these or similar cases to assume that the peculiar rendering of the version implies a various reading in the original. Much less is this the case where the apparent variance between the version and the original is due to an error not in the latter, but in the text of the version itself, as in Jer. xxx. 18, "the palace shall remain," or sit, where some copies of the LXX have *καθελθούσιν*, "shall sleep," though the true reading is unquestionably as it is in other copies, *καθελθούσιν*, "shall sit."

By such textual comparisons of the versions with one another, and with the original from which they have been made, we may further gain a more intimate acquaintance with the versions themselves, and with the relation in which they stand to the original, the ability and accuracy with which they are made, the degree of closeness with which they adhere to the original, or the liberties they allow themselves in departing from it. It may also lead to a better insight into the mutual relations between the versions themselves and the measure of their dependence one upon the other. It might be possible, for example, by an extended and careful induction of particulars, to trace the genesis of the authorized English version, to show how far its familiar renderings were influenced by preëxisting versions, and these by others still, and so on back to that earliest of all, the grand old Septuagint, which, though far from faultless, is yet, considering the period in which it was prepared, and the influence which it has exerted, worthy of a very

high degree of veneration and regard. The power it has wielded in fact approaches the awful, when we reflect to what extent it has controlled the entire body of translators from that date to this, and given shape to expressions which we read in our English Bibles at this present day, and even made itself felt by the inspired writers of the New Testament. Is it strange that early superstition fancied that it must have been itself inspired, and that such power could have been suffered only in the immediate organs of the Holy Ghost? an opinion which has been revived by a distinguished scholar of our own day.

One sort of influence belonging to this version, which the word that we are examining may serve to exhibit in one of its minor traces, is that which was exerted upon the Greek language itself, and which contributed to form the dialect of the New Testament, those lively oracles of the Christian faith. The modifications to which Greek was subjected, as spoken and written by Jews, naturally reach their maximum in this version made directly from the Hebrew Scriptures, which was itself one of the most powerful agents in their production. This phenomenon may likewise illustrate the general law, that two languages when brought into contact never fail to influence and modify each other.

The words *sit* and  *dwell* are no more distinct in their meaning and incapable of interchange than are their equivalents in classic Greek, *κάθημαι* and *κατοικέω*. And yet a Hebrew accustomed to associate these ideas together, and express them by one word, would insensibly come to use the corresponding Greek term with a like latitude. Hence it has happened that *κάθημαι*, though properly meaning to sit, has in repeated instances been employed by the LXX to represent *שָׁבַת*, where the sense clearly is *to remain* or *to dwell*, and must have been so intended by the translators. It is used of the Levite dwelling with Micah, Judges xvii. 10; of the ark abiding in the cities of the Philistines, 1 Sam. v. 7; of Abiathar abiding with David, 1 Sam. xxii. 23; of David dwelling with Achish, 1 Sam. xxvii. 5; of Absalom in Geshur, 2 Sam. xv. 8; of Shimei in Jerusalem, 1 Kings ii. 36; of Solomon in his royal house, 1 Kings vii. 8; Jeroboam in Egypt, 1 Kings xii. 2; Canaanites dwelling in the land of Israel, Exod. xxiii. 33; Jews dwelling in Egypt, Jer.

xliv. 1; the inhabitants of Samaria, Isa. ix. 9; the inhabitants of the land, Exod. xxiii. 31; the inhabitants of the earth, Jer. xxv. 29, 30. And one of its derivatives, ἐγκαθήμεαι, is, with two or three exceptions, invariably used in the sense of dwelling.

We find this idiomatic usage of "sit" for "dwell" occasionally, likewise, in the Greek of the New Testament; as Rev. xiv. 6, "them that dwell on the earth," and Luke xxi. 35, "them that dwell on the face of the whole earth," where the original is καθήμενους, literally "sitting on the earth." Both of these may be reminiscences of the language of the LXX. Such Hebraisms may be admitted wherever there is an evident necessity, but they are not to be gratuitously assumed, nor the cases indefinitely and needlessly multiplied. The meaning "to dwell" is not to be forced upon κάθημαι, whenever it is possible, even though "sit" would suit the context as well, or perhaps better. Thus when the impotent man is said, Acts xiv. 8, to have *sat* at Lystra, there is no reason why this should be converted into *dwelt* at Lystra. Still less is *dwelt* to be substituted for *sat*, Matt. iv. 16, comp. Luke i. 79, "them which sat in the region and shadow of death," where the evangelist has expressly changed the (κατοιχοῦντες) *dwell* of the LXX into (καθήμενοις) *sit*, for the sake of more vividly and accurately expressing the prophet's meaning.

Our knowledge of the word which we have under examination, cannot be considered complete until we have compared it with its synonyms, and adjusted its signification with theirs. The slight and often subtle distinctions which obtain between words, the discriminations made between such as at first sight seem to be promiscuously used, indicate various shades of thought or different aspects under which the same idea may be contemplated.

The number of such synonyms, compared with their equivalents in other languages, may give some hint of the relative copiousness of different tongues; in one of which a word may be used vaguely to cover a wide extent of meaning, which in other tongues is with more precision and definiteness parcelled among a number. Thus we find that the *kal*, or simple form of כָּשַׁבַּ, answering to the active voice in other languages, is in our common version variously rendered in different connections by the words *sit*, *sit down*, *sit still*, *sit up*, *be set*, *be situate*, *lurk*,

*remain, tarry, continue, endure, dwell, haunt, inhabit, be inhabited*; and in the LXX it is rendered in twice as many different ways. This may give some idea of the number of terms in Greek and English which have a measure of correspondence under one aspect or another with this single Hebrew term, and show how far one language is from being able to offer an exact equivalent in all its phases to any given word in another. It may also suggest the comparative poverty of the Hebrew, which cannot muster anything like such an array of terms for these related ideas.

Of the synonyms of יָשַׁב it will be sufficient to notice briefly שָׁבַט and יָשַׁב, *to sit*, and יָשַׁב, *to dwell*, which are most nearly akin to it in its two leading significations. Others, which are more remotely related, need not be examined. And some terms which, according to our style of thinking or speaking, would belong to the same category with *sit*, or are intimately connected with it, as the *sitting* of birds upon their eggs, or the *setting* of the sun, are here absolutely excluded, for they pertain to an entirely different class of ideas in the mind of a Hebrew.

שָׁבַט is the ordinary word in Arabia for *sitting*, and as adopted into the Hebrew, it owes its peculiar character entirely to this, that it belongs not to the native stock of words in current and familiar use like יָשַׁב, but has been introduced from a foreign though kindred dialect. The distinction may find an illustration, though not an exact parallel, in the Saxon and Roman words of like signification in our own language, one the household term, in free familiar use, cherished by the masses; the other more stately, savouring of the ornate, and restrained to educated ears. In the case before us, as in most others of like nature, the foreign word is not admitted to the simple and easy style of prose, but belongs exclusively to the more ornate and artificial diction of poetry, to which it is all the better adapted from the strangeness of its aspect and the rarity of its employment. שָׁבַט in fact occurs but twice, and that in the highly wrought and imaginative Song of Solomon, iv. 1, vi. 5, which more than almost any other book of the Old Testament delights in foreign words. It is there poetically applied to a flock of goats *sitting* or reeling on Mount Gilcad.

יָשָׁבוּ, the reciprocal form of יָשַׁב, corresponding to a certain extent with the Greek middle voice, is used in the sense of sitting, but always with special application to persons sitting together for the purpose of deliberation or consultation. It is so used in Ps. ii. 2, which is rendered in our version, "the kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together," literally, they stand up and they sit down "against the Lord and against his anointed." Standing and sitting they are engaged in impotent hostility against this divinely established empire. The one posture is indicative of active resistance, the other of quietly concocting their rebellious schemes.

This word יָשַׁב is particularly interesting to us from the probability that it is from the same root with our own familiar word *to sit*. Comparisons between Semitic and Indo-European roots or themes are, it is true, somewhat precarious in the present state of our knowledge. But the highest authority in Hebrew lexicography is of opinion that the syllable *שַׁב* at the basis of יָשַׁב reappears in the Sanscrit *sad* with its causative *sāday*, whence the Gothic *sat* and *satja*, the German *sitzen* and *setzen*, and our own *sit* and *set*. The Latin also has its *sido* or *sedeo* and *sedo*, and the Greek in which the sibilant has sunk to an aspirate *ἕζομαι*, *ἕδομαι*. The same root appears likewise in the Celtic and the Slavonic. Every time that we use this familiar word "to sit" we touch a link in the great chain that not only unites us with all the Indo-European races, but connects us likewise with the Hebrews and all the affiliated Semitic populations. Moses, and David, and the prophets, and doubtless even our Lord himself, made use of this very same word, or one at least fundamentally identical in sound and in signification, and whose connection can be historically traced. It was transmitted to them as it has travelled down to us, the heirloom from a remote antiquity which we have no means of reckoning, a relic of that more ancient tongue which existed before the Indo-European or the Semitic dialects were born, the parent alike of both; before the nations or races speaking any of the historical tongues had as yet a separate existence, it was the medium of intercourse for the common ancestry of the whole. "Sit" is a veritable patriarch among words, whether we regard its own venerable age or the numbers of its descendants.

יָשַׁב accordingly is the ordinary Hebrew word for *sitting*, and is used exclusively, or almost so, of persons: while its Arabic equivalent يَجْلِس is rare and poetic, and applied to the recumbency of animals. יָשַׁב is the word for sitting in general, while יָשַׁב, which has passed likewise into the Indo-European languages, is employed only of sitting together for council or deliberation.

The verb יָשַׁב, like יָשַׁב, means *to dwell*, but with a difference of usage based on their respective primary significations. The original sense of יָשַׁב is *to sit*, an act distinctively human; hence in its derived sense of *dwelling* it is limited to the residence of men. יָשַׁב, which primarily means *to sink* or *settle down*, has no such inherent limitation, and is used not only of the abode of men, but also of irrational animals, cattle, wild beasts, fishes, birds, and even of inanimate objects, as the cloud on the tabernacle, Exod. xl. 35 (comp. Job iii. 5), and the tabernacle in the promised land, Josh. xxii. 19. Hence when a participle is to be used substantively to denote the human inhabitants of a city, or land, or the world, it is from יָשַׁב; but when Job speaks (xxvi. 5) of the waters and the inhabitants thereof, the participle is from יָשַׁב.

It is further a natural sequence that יָשַׁב was preferred in those cases in which the double meaning of יָשַׁב would have occasioned ambiguity. Thus when Isaiah (xxvi. 19) speaks of the dead as them "that dwell in dust," he uses the word יָשַׁב; יָשַׁב would simply have suggested the idea of "sitting in the dust" in humiliation or grief, as Isa. xlvi. 1. Again, when (Isa. lvii. 15) God is spoken of as *inhabiting* eternity, or *dwelling* in the high and holy place, the verb is יָשַׁב; יָשַׁב would have meant, as in Ps. ix. 7, Lam. v. 19, sitting for ever, and Ps. cxliii. 5, sitting on high, *i. e.*, on his eternal and heavenly throne. This distinction is maintained in their derivative nouns, מִשְׁבַּת from יָשַׁב, meaning both *a seat* and *a dwelling place*, while מִשְׁבָּת from יָשַׁב has only the latter sense, and was especially appropriated to the tabernacle as God's earthly dwelling place. This reacted upon the verb, and we accordingly find יָשַׁב employed with specific allusion to this sacred structure, when mention is made of God dwelling among his people, or causing his name to dwell among them, a usage reflected in a word

borrowed by our own language from the later Hebrew  $\text{שְׁכִינָה}$ , *shekinah*, the brilliancy betokening and symbolizing God's residence in the tabernacle and the temple.

This has also had its influence upon the language of the New Testament. The verb  $\sigma\chi\iota\nu\acute{o}\omega$  occurs in it five times, and only in the writings of the apostle John, the most Hebraic of the New Testament writers, and each time with designed allusion to  $\text{שְׁכִינָה}$ , which it not only aptly represents in sense, but so nearly approaches in sound, that it would at once suggest it to a Hebrew ear, although in spite of this resemblance the roots are quite distinct. This association was likewise furthered by the LXX, which regularly renders  $\text{שְׁכִינָה}$  the sacred tabernacle by  $\sigma\chi\iota\nu\acute{\eta}$  or  $\sigma\chi\iota\nu\acute{o}\mu\alpha$ , and  $\text{שְׁכִינָה}$  itself at times by a derivative verb,  $\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\chi\iota\nu\acute{o}\omega$ , 2 Chron. vi. 1, Neh. i. 9. Hence when it is said, Rev. xxi. 3, "the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell ( $\sigma\chi\iota\nu\acute{o}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota$ ) with them," and Rev. vii. 15, "He that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them," the very sound of the verb, as well as the connection, suggests an allusion to the ancient tabernacle, in which God had dwelt among his people by a symbol, that is now to find its highest and most glorious realization. So John, i. 14, "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt ( $\xi\sigma\chi\iota\nu\acute{o}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\nu$ ) among us." He who once dwelt in the tabernacle had now come to tabernacle among men in a tenement of flesh. And so, Rev. xii. 12, xiii. 6, "God's name and his tabernacle, and them that dwell ( $\sigma\chi\iota\nu\acute{o}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$ ) in heaven." God had once fixed his dwelling in the midst of human habitations here on earth to signify that the habitation of men should one day be with him in his own dwelling-place in heaven.

The word  $\text{שָׁבַת}$ , which we are examining, may moreover afford us an indication of the measure of affinity subsisting between the various Semitic dialects, in all of which it occurs. It may naturally be expected that those tongues which are most closely allied with the Hebrew will most nearly accord with it in the form and meaning of this particular word; while those which are more remote in general character will here too present a greater divergence.

Few remains have been preserved of the language of Phœnicia. But fortunately among these we find the word of which

we are in quest; and although it reaches us by a strangely circuitous route, it yields a clear and satisfactory testimony to the point before us. The Phœnicians founded the city of Carthage, and transplanted their language thither, as is evidenced by its very name, קרת הרשה, equivalent to Neapolis or Newtown: the first member of the compound being the same as in the familiar names of Scripture, Kirjath- (or Kiryath-) Arba, Kirjath-jearim, Kirjath-sepher.

The literary treasures of Carthage, as of Phœnicia, have all perished. But happily the Roman comic poet Plautus, in his play entitled *Pœnulus*, introduces a Carthaginian speaking for a few lines in his native tongue. In this precious fragment occurs the word *lasibit*, which is the Hebrew לָשַׁבַּת as nearly as the Latin alphabet could represent it, and corresponds in Plautus' own translation to the word "habitare," to  *dwell*. Notwithstanding the disadvantage of the foreign character, in which it is written, this word manifests its identity with the Hebrew in the letters of the root, in its signification, and in its peculiar grammatical form; this last is the more remarkable, since the other Semitic tongues depart more or less from the Hebrew in the formation of the infinitive. We accordingly reach, through the medium of this word, a conclusion which a more extended examination would but justify and confirm, that the Phœnician, which was in all likelihood identical with the language of the Canaanitish tribes, bears the closest affinity to the Hebrew of any of the Semitic tongues.

In the Phœnician, as we have seen, the verb לָשַׁבַּת reappears without change either of form or of signification. Next to this is the Aramean, including the Chaldee and Syriac, together with the mongrel Samaritan. Here the signification is preserved unchanged, both in the primary and derivative senses. The verb means still precisely as in Hebrew, to  *sit*,  *remain* and  *dwell*. But the form of the root is slightly varied. The sibilant, as is very commonly the case in these dialects, has been changed into a dental; just as the Hebrew name of the city צור became in Aramean טור or Tyre, and as שור a bull became הור the Greek ταῦρος, so לָשַׁבַּת was hardened into רָהַב.

In Arabic and Ethiopic, which are still farther removed from the Hebrew, we find this verb not only different in form, but

changed in signification. The Ethiopic has the sibilant of the Hebrew, and the Arabic the aspirated dental of the Aramean, but both have a different semivowel as the initial letter, the Arabic being *wathaba* and the Ethiopic *vasaba* instead of  $\text{וַשְׁבַּח}$ . In this they have retained the more primitive form, which, though lost or changed alike in Hebrew and Aramean is still presupposed in some of their grammatical inflexions.

While, however, the southern dialects have in this instance preserved the older form with greater tenacity, the Hebrew and the Aramean have alone adhered to the original signification. The Arabic has diverged upon one side and the Ethiopic upon another, until there might seem to be no relationship between the thoughts which they respectively suggest and that of the source from which they were derived; and nevertheless the links of connection can still be distinctly traced, each having seized upon one particular application of the root, and confined its signification to that.

In Arabic, the verb usually means *to spring*, or *rush* upon any one. In Ethiopic its causative alone survives, and this has the sense of *marrying*. How such meanings as *rush* or *marry* could be attached to a verb, originally signifying *to sit*, may not at first be very obvious; and yet the Hebrew verb is itself used in such connections as suggest a ready explanation.

The consciousness of the original sense of the Arabic *wathaba* was so far preserved, that in the Himyaritic dialect it meant *to sit*, and a derivative noun signified *a seat*. Moreover, such phrases as Jer. iii. 2, "in the ways hast thou *sat* for them as the Arabian in the wilderness;" Psalm x. 8, "he sitteth in the lurking places of the villages;" Psalm xvii. 12 "a young lion sitting (or lurking) in secret-places" and the like, show how *sitting* may easily pass into *lying in wait* with hostile intent, as in Latin *insidiæ*, and our *insidious* from *sedeo*. From this the transition to springing or rushing upon one thus way-laid is not very difficult.

The Ethiopic couples together the significations *sit*, *remain*, and  *dwell*, showing the same association of ideas with the Hebrew; but it has attached them to a different root, viz., the word *nabara*. The root  $\text{נָבַח}$  or in its Ethiopic form *vasaba*, is only retained in the causative with the meaning "to marry."

But here again we find the Hebrew word employed in a manner, which may explain this singular application of the term. When after the captivity several of the Jews contracted alliances with foreign women, Ezra and Nehemiah did their utmost to break up this forbidden and dangerous practice. They accordingly refused to sanction such illegal connections, or to dignify them by the name of marriages, or to call them anything but *cohabitation*. In speaking of them they use not the proper Hebrew phrase for marrying, *i. e.*, *taking a wife*, but adopt a form of expression, which conveys a censure that is lost in our common English version. In Ezra x. 2, 10, 14, 17, 18, the phrase rendered by our translators "taken strange wives," and in Neh. xiii. 27 that rendered "marrying strange wives," is in the original uniformly "causing foreign women to dwell" with them. In the Ethiopic usage the reproach conveyed by the term has fallen away, and he who has a woman to live with him is presumed to be lawfully married.

When we pass beyond the limits of the Semitic tongues and enter those of the Indo-european family, it becomes more difficult to identify the root before us; and it is in fact quite doubtful whether it can be traced, or anything properly cognate to it be found. As a prerequisite to any safe or satisfactory identification, it would be necessary to determine the primal form of the Hebrew root itself. The Semitic trilaterals, as is well known, are not in every case independent and ultimate roots. Groups of trilaterals, more or less numerous, often sustain such a relation to each other in form and signification, as to compel the conclusion that they have a common origin, and are to be referred to one source or one primal root. Where two strong consonants are associated with one of weaker sound, the latter is not infrequently an unessential or secondary addition, as is shown by the fact that other weak consonants may be substituted for it in connection with the same biliteral, merely modifying the fundamental signification which runs through the whole. We cannot thus reduce  $\text{יָשַׁב}$ , however, by rejecting the initial semivowel, and assuming that the biliteral  $\text{יָש}$  is its real base; for, although we find such words as  $\text{יָשַׁב}$ ,  $\text{יָשַׁב}$ ,  $\text{יָשַׁב}$ ,  $\text{יָשַׁב}$ ,  $\text{יָשַׁב}$ ,  $\text{יָשַׁב}$ , there is no such connection in the meanings, *sit, return, lead captive, draw water, break, blow, think*, as to

justify us in deducing them from a single theme. If any reduction is possible it is more likely that the first two letters form the primitive theme, and that the final **ב** is a subsequent addition. **בַּשֵּׁב** *to sit*, is doubtless cognate to **בָּשַׁב** or **בָּשַׁבַּ** *to set or place*, which represents the transitive side of the same idea; and it is not improbably connected more remotely with **שָׁבַב**, **שָׁבַבַּ**, **שָׁבַבַּ** and thus with the particle **שָׁבַב** denoting *existence*. Sitting or dwelling, which is a mode of being, is not far removed from the idea of simple existence. And the readiness with which the transition may be made, appears from the fact that the LXX in their renderings have in several instances substituted one for the other. Thus, in Gen. xxix. 14 “he *abode* with him the space of a month,” Joshua xxiv. 7, “ye *dwelt* in the wilderness a long season,” and Jer. xxxviii. 7, “the king *was sitting* in the gate of Benjamin,” the Septuagint has  $\eta\gamma$  *was*, or  $\eta\gamma\tau\epsilon$  *were* in place of the exact translation of the original verb. And Psalm lv. 19, “he that abideth of old,” is in the same version  $\acute{o}$   $\delta\pi\delta\rho\chi\omega\nu$   $\pi\rho\delta$   $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$   $\alpha\iota\acute{\omega}\nu\omega\nu$ , *existing before the ages*. The intimate relationship in thought has also expressed itself in other tongues, as in the Gothic *visan*, *to dwell, remain, or be*, and the Spanish *ser, to be*, abbreviated from *sedere* (Diez, *Wörterbuch der Romanischen Sprachen*, i. p. 166), as its synonym *estar*, like the Latin *existo*, is based upon the idea of standing, which is another modification of being. If a nexus actually obtains between the Hebrew roots above named, as there appears to be some reason to believe, though it cannot be certainly affirmed, they may be compared with the Indo-European substantive verb as Sanscrit,  $\acute{e}\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}$  Greek, *esse* Latin, *is* English.

This terminates our long and wearisome march. We have been endeavouring to study the Hebrew word **בַּשֵּׁב**. We have looked at the phrases in which it occurs in the Old Testament, in order to learn the usages of the ancient Hebrews in this matter. We have traced the association of ideas involved in its several significations back to the nomadic life of the patriarchs. We have followed it through some of the principal versions for purposes of exegesis and of criticism; and have noticed its influence upon the Hellenistic dialect and New Testament Greek. We have examined its synonyms. We have pursued it through the different Semitic tongues, and have endeavoured

to get a glimpse of it in Indo-european territory, until it finally disappeared in a fog. We shall be only too happy if this nebulous termination shall not be thought to fitly represent the cloudy character of the entire discussion.

---

ART. II.—*The Aim of Christianity, for those who accept it.*

An Address delivered before the Religious Contribution Society of the Princeton Theological Seminary, April 22, 1867; by RICHARD S. STORRS, JR., D. D., of Brooklyn, New York.

IT is an immediate impulse of the educated moral nature in man—to which every system of practical philosophy, or of religion, under our civilization, makes its appeal—to estimate that system, in the first instance, by the end which it proposes to accomplish for those who accept it; the spiritual result, of attainment and character, to which its agencies are designed to conduct them. The question of the fitness and the competence of the system to accomplish this end must come up afterward, to assist us in ascertaining its practical value. But this is secondary. The other precedes; and the later question is never in order till the former has been answered. For no matter how admirable the adaptation of the system to produce its result, if that result be essentially a mean one we at once dismiss the whole from our thoughts. It is only when the aim proposed to be realized shows itself a grand one—in which our higher desires will be gratified, and our nobler powers will find at once their use and rest—that we turn with interest to consider the means by which it is sought to be accomplished.

We thus at once repulse from our minds all systems of heathenism, no matter how ancient, how widely extended, how profusely adorned with a lavish art, how rich in an engaging and a various literature; we repel them from our thoughts, and do not take the trouble even to examine their interior mechanism, because they profess only to establish men in normal relations with the gods through some outward contrivance, or some