

THE
BIBLICAL REPERTORY
AND
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

APRIL, 1832.

ART. I.—REVIEW.

Book on the Soul, First part. Book on the Soul, Second part. By the Rev. T. H. Gallaudet, &c.

THERE is, perhaps, no field for benevolent enterprise, which has been more neglected, or which promises a richer harvest to the cultivator, than the preparation of suitable books for children. It is somewhat surprising that the attention of philanthropists has been so little turned to this subject, and that while so much has been published of late on the importance of education, and of commencing our efforts early, so little has been done in the way of furnishing the means of communicating knowledge to the minds of children. At first view, it seems an easy task to prepare such books as are needful for the instruction of youth; yet when we come to ponder the subject deeply, we cannot but confess, that it is a work of extreme difficulty. We do not speak of the elementary books which are needful to teach the art of reading: these, however useful, communicate no instruction to the mind; they only furnish one means of acquiring knowledge. We refer to books adapted to the minds of children in the several stages of their development, and which are calculated, especially, to train the thoughts, 'to teach the young idea how to shoot;' and by which their

VOL. IV. No. II.—T

that the writer is offended at my meddling with politics, but that I have meddled *on the wrong side*. Had the same mediocrity of talent been exerted in eulogizing the measures of ministry, his greetings would have been as loud as his invective is bitter." If the system is false, let this be made to appear,—let its errors be exposed—but until this is done, let no arrangement of divine truth be decried as injurious. In conclusion, we apprehend no evils to our rising theologians from scholastic systems, for the best of all reasons—they know nothing of them. The literature of the day has extended its influence to the domain of theology, and the weekly, monthly, and quarterly receptacles of religious discussion, consume too much of our attention, to leave opportunity for poring over the works of our ancestors.

ART. IV.—ARABIC AND PERSIAN LEXICOGRAPHY.

A Dictionary Persian, Arabic, and English, with a dissertation on the language, literature, and manners of eastern nations. By John Richardson, Esq. F. S. A., of the Middle Temple, and of Wadham College, Oxford. Revised and improved by Charles Wilkins, Esq. LL. D. F. R. S. *A new edition, considerably enlarged by Francis Johnson.* London, 1829, quarto.

A TRULY splendid specimen of British typography, and an invaluable addition to the apparatus of the Oriental scholar. Richardson's Dictionary has been long known to the public. The original form was folio. The quarto edition of 1806 was superintended by the famous Orientalist, Charles Wilkins, who added twenty thousand Persian words from native dictionaries, reformed the orthography, and had type cast under his own inspection. There can be no doubt, that the work received immense improvement by passing through his hands. Richardson was a laborious compiler—Wilkins a philological genius and a finished scholar, who takes precedence of Jones, in point of general depth and accuracy, as well as of chronological priority in Sanscrit learning. In his edition of Richardson, however, he betrayed one weakness. He applied to that vast work his awkward plan for representing

eastern words in western letters. This could not be effected, without introducing a variety of dots and points, which make confusion worse confounded. We have often wondered at the excess to which some learned men have pushed this useless labour. In a popular work, where the object is to give the reader some conception of an unknown sound, the thing is proper. It is appropriate even in more learned works, where sounds are to be distinguished which are apparently the same. But to carry out the scheme in all its minutiae, where the words of the original are also given, does to us appear wasteful and ridiculous excess. That it does not answer the intended purpose, may be learned by experiment. In Wilkins' edition of Richardson, the word *tawzif* is printed with a dot under the first letter, four dots over the fourth, and a horizontal stroke over the fifth. Now let it be recollected, that the nice distinctions thus noted are to nineteen out of twenty, who consult the book, impossible in practice. What do we learn by the dots? That such and such letters are used in the original—while the original itself is before the reader's eyes. It is surely as easy to remember the power of the Persian *za*, as that of a Roman *z* with four dots above it. This blemish Mr. Johnson has removed, retaining nothing in addition to the consonants and vowels, but the horizontal sign of lengths in prosody.

This, however, is the least of his improvements. The work is, indeed, a new one, and he the real author; and we admire his modesty in making no pretensions to the title. The slightest changes, even for the worse, are looked upon by some as a sufficient pretext for assuming authorship.

It is well known that the study of the Persian language owes its extent, if not its origin, in England, to commercial and political relations. That strange phenomenon in history, the conquest of Hindostan by the East India Company, created a demand for English functionaries in the Eastern Empire. To these a knowledge of the Persian language was soon found to be absolutely necessary. For though it is in no part of the peninsula the vernacular tongue of the mass of the people, a previous revolution,* also very singular, had rendered it the language of politeness, diplomacy, and legal process. After a short experience of the perfidy of native agents, the Company insists on a knowledge of this language

* The conquest of Northern India by the Persians and Moguls.

in all their civil servants. It was to meet the case of these that Richardson projected and performed his task. His work was therefore meant to be, and was in fact, a *Persian* dictionary. But another revolution, still further back,* had brought the languages of Persia and Arabia into so singular a relation to each other, that although a man might study Arabic, and study it successfully, without a tincture of Persian, no man could possibly peruse a Persian book without a smattering of Arabic.

By this concatenation of remote occurrences, we obtain an explanation of the mongrel character of Richardson's great work. What we have said will also explain the disproportionate attention paid to Persian by the English literati, both at home, and in the East. Arabic has seldom been with them an object of critical attention. For the most part, their acquaintance with it has been superficial, and has arisen out of its relations to Persian lexicography and grammar. To those who are acquainted with both tongues, we need not say, that such a mode of study could avail but little, there being, perhaps, no two living languages, more radically different in genius and essential structure.

Richardson did nothing to advance the study of Arabic apart from Persian. Even his Arabic grammar was designed to aid the Persian student, and to all others it is useless. It ought never to be used by any one who wishes to obtain a thorough knowledge of the subject. The simple circumstance, that he has treated the punctuation as a thing of minor import, if it does not fasten upon him the charge of ignorance, fastens upon his grammar that of gross deficiency. His Dictionary, as we have already hinted, gives, or rather aims to give, just Arabic enough to master the Persian, and gives it in such a form, that to the careful student of the former language it is absolutely useless. The Arabic words, which are introduced at all, are introduced as Persian words, and only so far as they are such, without regard to the forms of Arabic grammar. No finite verbs are given, and the infinitives are uniformly set down as nouns substantive, the form which they assume as Persian vocables.

It is *a priori* evident, that such a Dictionary can afford no aid to one who studies Arabic for its own sake; a truth which has been confirmed by fair experiment. But even this was

* The conquest of Persia by the Caliph Omar.

not all. As a Persian lexicon, the work of Richardson, as might, indeed, have been expected from the author's opportunities and aids, was imperfect. It was, in fact, as Mr. Johnson well observes, a limited translation from the *Treasury of Meninski*. It was liable, therefore, to be wanting in two points, accuracy and copiousness. Mistakes in translation were almost inevitable in so large a work; and the translator was left to guess whether certain Arabic words were likely to occur in any Persian writers. That he frequently guessed amiss, is no discredit to his scholarship, though a great disadvantage to the student who consults his work. As a Persian lexicon, it was much improved by Wilkins, agreeably to what we have already stated. The Arabic department, we believe, underwent no considerable change. It was reserved for the present editor, not only to enhance its value to the Persian student, but to give it a place among authorities in Arabic philology. It is now, in fact, an Arabic lexicon of no small value—not for beginners, but for those who are somewhat advanced. A firm foundation cannot possibly be laid, in Arabic philology, without the careful use of systematic works like that of Golius. An attempt to learn the rudiments by means of Richardson's Grammar, and to commence a course of reading with the help of his Dictionary, even in its most improved condition, would be worse than unsuccessful; for it could hardly fail to generate a superficial scholarship, more contemptible than unassuming ignorance. But to those who have already learned to grope their way, with some success, through the mazes of the most intricate and scientific grammar in the world—and especially to those who have their eye upon the Persian, as a collateral or ulterior object—Mr. Johnson has presented an expensive, but a very welcome aid.

It may here be proper to state the amount of the improvements, as asserted by their author, and partially confirmed by a limited inspection of the work itself. As to the Persian—many thousand words of purely Persian origin have been inserted from the celebrated work *Burhani Kati*, and from a manuscript dictionary compiled by a learned native of the East, from twenty-four native writers, under the inspection of Mr. Haughton, late Professor of Hindu Literature in the East India College, Hertfordshire. This work, in which the definitions are sustained by copious citations from the classics of the language, commands the student's confidence in the results which it has furnished. As to the Arabic—Richardson's

definitions have been carefully collated with those of Meninski, and the errors rectified. Many thousands of words given by the latter, though omitted by Richardson, have been inserted. In all cases of doubt, an appeal has been made from Meninski and Golius to the Camus; from which source likewise thousands of words are added, which were overlooked by Golius. What we have mentioned would be quite enough to set the work immeasurably above the first edition. But the half is not yet told. The whole of Willmet's excellent lexicon, adapted to the Koran, Hariri, and the Life of Timur, is incorporated here. And as only a small portion of Hariri had been published, when that work appeared, the definitions given in the Arabic Scholia to Hariri, contained in De Sacy's beautiful edition, (1 vol. fol. Paris, 1822,) have been translated and inserted in their places.

A slight comparison convinced us, that the original work had undergone surprising changes; but we must confess that we were somewhat startled by the assertion of such large improvements, especially the incorporation of so great a mass of valuable matter—even of whole books. To satisfy our scruples, we have resorted to experiment, trying the dictionary upon certain passages taken promiscuously from the Koran and Hariri. Though we dare not vouch for the perfection of so large a work, we freely say, that so far as we have gone, the editor's pretensions have been fully verified.

Besides the improvements which have been already mentioned, there is another of considerable moment. Regard has been had in this edition to the forms of Arabic grammar. Roots are given and defined as such, and in various minor points, an effort has been made to render the book subservient to the study of that language, independently of the Persian. Add to this, that many medical, rhetorical, botanical and legal terms, and the peculiar local signification of many others, have been supplied, and we are ready for the Editor's assertion, that "from various and authentic sources he has been enabled to enrich the present work by the addition of more than thirty-eight thousand words, Persian and Arabic; also to arrange and supply numerous important meanings that had been overlooked, or purposely omitted, in more than half the words contained in the second edition."

The confidence of the scholar is further increased by a knowledge of the fact, that this third edition comes forth with

the sanction of the celebrated scholar who prepared the second; Dr. Wilkins having examined every sheet before the final impression.

We have said thus much about this sumptuous and colossal book, because the increasing taste and zeal for Oriental studies give an interest to every thing adapted to facilitate and forward them. We have no idea that it will find its way into many private libraries; but we do think that it should have place upon the shelves and tables of those public institutions, where the taste for such pursuits is generally fostered, and sometimes created, by accidental contact with a work like this. A larger supply of philological appliances, and a freer access to them, on the part of students, would, we think, without constraint, or even formal exhortation, do a great deal for the benefit of biblical, classical, and oriental learning. Many scholars, both in Europe and America, can, no doubt, trace their relish for the course of study which they have pursued, to incidents almost too trivial for remembrance; the opening of a book, a casual conversation, or an item of intelligence. Philological reading-rooms have done much good, not so much by direct operation on the intellect, as by their indirect influence upon the taste. Why may they not be multiplied?

ART. V.—HISTORICAL STATEMENTS OF THE KORAN.*

THE Mohammedan imposture is, in some respects, the most remarkable of all false religions. The specious simplicity of its essential doctrines, and its perfect freedom from idolatry, distinguish it forever from the gross mythology of classical and oriental paganism. But besides these characteristics, it displays a third, more interesting still. We mean the peculiar relation which it bears to Christianity. Whether it happened from a happy accident or a sagacious policy, we think it clear that Islam owes a vast proportion of its vast success, to the fact that Mohammed built upon another man's foundation. Assuming the correctness of the common doc-

* The citations in this article are chiefly in the words of Sale, with occasional departures from his phraseology, too minute to need specification. Where there is more than a verbal difference, the reader is apprized of it.