

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY, 1855.

No. III.

John W. Alden

ART. I.—*The Zurich Letters; or, the Correspondence of several English Bishops, and others, with some of the Helvetican Reformers, during the reign of Queen Elizabeth.* Chiefly from the Archives of Zurich. Translated from authenticated copies of the autographs, and edited for the Parker Society, by the Rev. Hastings Robinson, D. D., F. A. S., Rector of Great Warley, Essex, and formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. Second edition, chronologically arranged in one series.

WHAT will be the ultimate destiny of the established Church of England, it is perhaps impossible to foretell, and therefore, vain to conjecture. We know of no book, however, which throws so much light upon its origin, genesis, growth and complicated structure, as the one before us. It completely exposes the hypothesis lately put forth by D'Aubigné, that the English Reformation proceeded primarily from the people, and was a purely religious Revolution. It is equally at variance with the opposite sentiment, that it was nothing more than a political change dictated by the pride or the policy of her rulers. The truth is, as usual, to be found in the mean between the two extremes. The circumstances of the times were, unquestionably, favourable to the progress of the Reform-

the Decalogue with comparative impunity. The Puseyites consign to perdition all who renounce the jurisdiction of prelates, but they are latitudinarians in matters of doctrine. Churches which excommunicate a member for singing hymns, often admit drunkards to their communion. We need not deceive ourselves. If men assume the authority of God, they will drive themselves and those who submit to them to destruction. If they teach for doctrine, the commandments of men, they will make the word of God of no effect. While, therefore, we hold firmly to the authority of the Scriptures, and submit gladly to all that it enjoins; and while we believe that the great principles of Church polity are clearly revealed, and should be universally adopted, it is no less important that we should resist all high-church assumptions, and refuse to regard as divine that which is merely human.

G. Addison Alexander.
 ART. II.—*The Coptic Language.*

THERE are some kinds of knowledge which a bad custom has too much restricted to the class by courtesy called *learned*, and withheld from many quite as able to appreciate their value, and in multitudes of cases far more curious and inquisitive respecting them. Among the kinds of knowledge here referred to is the knowledge of strange languages, not in their philological minutiae, much less in their metaphysical principles, but in their general history and structure, with reference to which one dialect may differ from another just as faces do, and yet have just as real a generic likeness. The observation and enjoyment of this lingual physiognomy requires no extraordinary gifts or training, as a previous preparation, no abstruse or transcendental processes and methods in the actual process of investigation. The plainest and least educated traveller in foreign lands, if possessed of any natural shrewdness and propensity to observation, may derive enjoyment from variety of looks and manners, forms and institutions, without caring to philosophize about their causes. In like manner we have often

met with persons who made no pretensions to a learned education, but who felt a lively interest in diversities of language, and a wish to know wherein they differed from each other; a kind of curiosity which, no doubt, has been much increased by the missionary movements of our own day, and which ought to be encouraged, beside other reasons, on account of its reflexive influence upon that great and glorious enterprise. However necessary it may be to cherish higher motives for promoting it, the cause must be a gainer by the use of every new incentive to exertion or to liberality, however trivial or unimportant in itself considered.

To that particular indulgence and encouragement of public curiosity, of which we have been speaking, there can be no objection on the score of pedantry, or incongruity; because the information to be given is the most elementary and superficial, and requires a mere smattering in him who gives it, and who differs from his pupils only in the accidental circumstance of knowing what they happen not to know, but are as capable of understanding as he is himself.

To exemplify these obvious and perhaps superfluous suggestions, we assume that there are some of our readers who would like to have some definite, though general idea of that ancient idiom, which they often read or hear of, as the sacred language of the Copts or hereditary Christians of Egypt, and shall undertake to gratify this wish, without the least regard to the wants or the opinions of those readers, who already know more about the subject than ourselves.

The Coptic language is a mixture of Greek and old Egyptian. This compound character is evident even in the alphabet. While most of the letters retain their Greek names and forms with little alteration, there are several added to express sounds unknown to the Greeks, such as our *j*, and *sh*, and those peculiar modifications of *h*, *s*, *t*, which are found in several Semitic dialects, but are equally unknown in Greek and English. The additional characters by which these sounds are represented, are derived from the Egyptian hieroglyphics. According to Plutarch, the old Egyptian alphabet consisted of twenty-five letters, of which eighteen were consonants and seven vowels. In the sounds given to these characters, there were no doubt

dialectic variations, not expressed to the eye, as the hieroglyphic symbols always represented the initial letter of the corresponding word, which was not invariably the same in all the dialects.

These dialects are three in number, the Theban or Sahidic, the Memphitic, and the Basmuric, the last being distinguished from the other two by its superior softness, the Memphitic by its aspirations, and its fondness for the vowel *i*.

The words *Copt* and *Coptic* are derived from the old name of the country, the radicals of which are still distinctly traceable in the Greek modification or corruption, from which we borrow the word *Egypt*.

Most of the indigenous Egyptian words still extant in the Coptic are reduced by grammarians to monosyllabic roots, such as *pe* (heaven), *kah* (earth), *so* (to drink). With these are mingled, especially in the versions of the New Testament, a multitude of Greek words in their crude form; not only nouns (as *χώρα*, *λαός*), but particles (as *ὁ*, *ἄρ*, *κατά*), all which are treated as Egyptian vocables.

Besides the usual modes of derivation, by vowel changes, and by the addition or reduplication of consonants, the Coptic, like the old hieroglyphic language, has unambiguous instances of composition, properly so called; a striking point of difference between it and the great Semitic family, to which, in some respects, it bears a strong resemblance. Besides the combination of two radicals, the Coptic language also exhibits that of radicals with intensive, negative, and other qualifying particles. Thus, from *na* (pity) and *nau* (to see), are formed the derivatives or compounds *atna* (pitiless) and *atnau* (invisible); from *sōnt* (to create) and *er* (to make), *rephsōnt* (a creator) and *repher* (a maker); from *nau* (to see), and *moushi* (to walk), *sinnau* (a sight) and *jinmoushi* (a walk.) These few examples will suffice to show the capabilities of the language for the expression even of nice distinctions, if its actual advantages and capabilities of form and structure had been duly improved by use and cultivation.

Coptic nouns are of two genders, for the most part not distinguished by their form. But masculines become feminine by adding the vowel *e* or *i* in different dialects, as *shōm*, *shome*,

father and mother-in-law; *hieb*, *hiebi*, male and female lamb. Sometimes, by a simple prolongation of the vowel, as *ouro*, *ourō*, king and queen. Sometimes, both changes take place at once, as *son*, *sōne*, brother and sister. In the absence of distinctive forms, the gender is distinguished by the article; or by the addition of *male* and *female*.

The Copts have an article, indefinite and definite. The former consists in the prefix *ou*, as *rōmi*, man, *ourōmi*, a man. The plural form is altogether different, consisting in the prefix *han* or *hen*. This is prefixed even to Greek singulars, as *hen-apostolos*, apostles. The definite article distinguishes both gender and number. The singular masculine is *pe* or *pi*, the feminine *te* or *ti*; the plural, common to both genders, *nei*, *ne*, or *ni*. The alternative forms here given belong, for the most part, to the different dialects. Corresponding to these forms in the hieroglyphic writing, are the three initials, *p*, *t*, *n*.

Not unfrequently the vowels of the Coptic article are omitted, and the consonant prefixed directly to the noun. Before certain other letters, these are sometimes changed to *ph* or *th*. An interesting example of this change is that afforded by the word *ouro*, king; with the article, *phouro*, the king, by the Greeks written *Φαραῶ*, and in English *Pharaoh*. That this was not a personal but an official designation, is expressly affirmed by Eusebius,* and abundantly clear otherwise. This coincidence of forms demonstrates, at the same time, the truth of the Mosaic narrative, and the antiquity of the native element in the Coptic language.

By adding to the article the vowel *a*, representing the verb *to have*, is formed what may be called a possessive article, as *pa*, corresponding to the Greek *ὁ τοῦ*, *τα τοῦ*, *ἡ τοῦ*, *να τοῦ* and *αἱ τοῦ*. Thus, in Matt. xxii. 21, *τῷ Καίσαρος* is rendered by *napouro*, which consists of the noun *ouro* (king), with the article, *pouro* (the king), and the possessive prefix, *napouro*, the things of (or belonging to) the king. The possessive article, thus formed, is then combined with suffix pronouns, *pa* (mine), *pek* (thine), *pen* (ours), &c. In the old sacred dialect, these pronominal suffixes are joined directly to the noun itself, precisely as in Hebrew.

* Οὕτω γὰρ οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι τοὺς βασιλεῖς ἱρμηνεύουσι.

A large proportion of the Coptic nouns remain unaltered in the plural number, and can only be distinguished from their singulars by the article prefixed, or the construction. The extension of this practice to words borrowed from the Greek, produces a curious grammatical phenomenon, as in the forms *apostolos*, *piapostolos* (the apostle), *niapōstolos* (the apostles). Some nouns, however, form a plural by the change or addition of a vowel, and some are as anomalous as the "broken plurals" of Arabic grammar: e. g. *sea* is *iom*, but *seas*, *amaiōou*.

Coptic nouns are not declined in the proper sense of the expression, the distinction of cases being supplied by particles prefixed, especially by *ente*, *en*, *em*, *e*.

Other prefixes form adjectives from verbs, or add an intensive force to those already in existence. The degrees of comparison are expressed, as in French, by prefixing the word *more* (*houo*, *houe*, *houa*), or other words suggestive of the same relation.

In nothing is the language more unlike most others than in its numerals, which bear little or no resemblance either to the Greek or Hebrew. The simple cardinals, with some dialectic variations, which we need not notice, are as follows. 1. *oua*. 2. *snau*. 3. *shoment*. 4. *phtouo*. 5. *tiou*. 6. *soou*. 7. *sashph*. 8. *shmoun*. 9. *psit*. 10. *mēt*. The tens are not formed from the units, but are mostly independent forms, e. g. 20, *jouōt*. 30, *mab*. 60, *se*. 90, *pestaïou*. The same is true of the higher numbers: e. g. 100, *she*. 200, *shēt*. 1000, *sho*.

There is more resemblance to Semitic forms in the Coptic pronouns: e. g. *anok*, *anak*, *ank*, suggests at once the Hebrew *J* (אֲנִי). *Entak* is sufficiently like אַתָּה to betray a common origin, while the final *k*, which has been lost, both in Arabic and Hebrew, reappears in the suffixes of both. The same general resemblance may be traced in the pronoun of the first person plural, *anon*, *anan* (אֲנֵינוּ), and some others. It is very curious, that even where the likeness seems to disappear in Coptic, it may still be traced in the old hieroglyphic notation. For example, in the third person singular, the forms *entoph*, *enthoph*, might seem wholly unconnected with the Hebrew (הוּא), till we trace them back to their original in the hieroglyphic *u*. Besides the suffix pronouns, which the Coptic has in common with the Hebrew

and its cognate tongues, it exhibits the peculiar feature of pronominal prefixes, answering the same purpose.

Fragments of pronouns are also used to distinguish the persons of the verb. Thus, *peja*, to speak, is inflected: *pejai*, *pejak*, *peje*, *pejaph*, *pejas*, *pejan*, *pejoten*, *pejau*. The tenses are distinguished by auxiliary verbs prefixed to the root: to form the present, *ei* (sum) and its inflections; to form the perfect, *ai* (fui); the imperfect, *nei* or *nai* (eram); the future, *eie* (ero) &c. The imperative and infinitive are expressed by the unaugmented root, the participle by the same with the relative pronoun (*e*, *et*) prefixed to it.

The Coptic passive is sometimes formed by internal changes of the root—as *shat* (to cut), *shent* (to be cut), *tôt* (to persuade), *têt* (to be persuaded); but much more frequently by the addition of a syllable (*ēu*, *ēout*),—as *talo* (to impose), *talēu*, *talēout*; *tako* (to corrupt), *takēu*, *takēout*. The second and longer of these affixes belongs to the Memphitic dialect. The impersonal use of the third person plural as a substitute for the passive, belongs rather to the syntax, and is probably peculiar to no language. The only things peculiar in the Coptic particles are the frequent use of the asseverative adverb *je*, where it would seem to be superfluous in other languages, and the coexistence of an absolute and construct form in prepositions—those in *a* changing it to *ō*, and those in *e* taking the terminations *au*, *ēt*, *ēti*, when combined with suffix pronouns. In the Coptic Scriptures many Greek particles are retained without change, such as *ὁ*, *τὸ*, *ἀλλὰ*, *οὖν*, *ἔτι*, *ἀνὰ*, *κατὰ*, *ἵνα*, *ὅπως*, *ὥστε*.

The father of modern Coptic learning in Europe seems to have been Athanasius Kircher, whose *Prodromus Ægyptiacus*, published at Rome, in 1636, and his *Lingua Ægyptiaca Restituta*, eight years later, furnished the first valuable helps in the study of the language. Something was done to promote it by Walton, in his Introduction to the Oriental languages, (London, 1653), and also by Lelong, Vinding, and Bonjour. The grammatical work of Blumberg, did not appear till 1716, and in the same year David Wilkins published the Coptic version of the New Testament, from manuscripts in the Bodleian library, collated with those of Paris and the Vatican, and accompanied by a

Latin version. Fifteen years later this was followed by a similar edition of the Pentateuch. Towards the middle of the century, Tuki began, at Rome, his series of liturgical publications, which continued to appear at intervals for twenty years, concluding with the Pontifical and Ritual, (1764.) The same writer published a grammar in 1778. That of Scholtz appeared about the same time, edited by Woide. The vocabulary of the same writer came out five years later.

In the early part of the present century, the most distinguished names are those of Rossi in Italy, Quatremère in France, and Münter in Denmark. Still later, England takes its turn. In 1830, Henry Tattam published his *Compendious Grammar*, followed in a few years by his *Lexicon*. In 1836, he edited the Coptic version of the *Minor Prophets*, and after an interval of sixteen years, the *Major Prophets*, the book of *Job* having appeared in the meantime. During the same interval, two editions of the Coptic *Psalter* had been published; one by Ideler, (1837), and the other by Schwartz, (1843.)

Valuable additions to the philological apparatus of the Coptic scholar have been made within the last few years. Among these are the *Lexicon* of Amadeus Peyron, (1835), and his *Grammar* (1841)—the *Vocabulary* of Parthey, compiled from Tattam and Peyron, (Berlin, 1844); the *Coptic Grammar* of Schwartz, edited after his death by Steinthal, (1850), and that of Uhlemann, with a *chrestomathy* and *glossary*, intended for the use of students, (1853.) To these may be added Bötticher's editions of the *Acts* and *Epistles*, (1852), and the *Pistis Sophia*, a Gnostic work, copied and translated into Latin by Schwartz, and posthumously edited by Petermann, (1851.)

The interest attaching to this ancient tongue is twofold, and connected partly with biblical learning and partly with church history. The general use of Greek in Egypt might have seemed to make a vernacular version of the Scriptures superfluous; but on the contrary they were translated into two distinct dialects, if not into three. Though much later than the Syriac, these Egyptian versions are highly interesting to the learned.

The historical interest belonging to the Copts arises from their having, as early as the third, if not the second century,

received Christianity from the Greek colonists in Egypt; in the sixth century adhered to the Monophysite opinions, and refused submission to the Council of Chalcedon; in the seventh century encouraged the Mahometan invasion of their country, and enjoyed the favour of the conquerors for ages, to the exclusion of the orthodox or Greek Church. They are still governed by a Patriarch of Alexandria, but in a very low condition, retaining the Coptic as their sacred language, although the Arabic is their vernacular. Of late years they have become more prominent as objects of missionary labour and research.

Essex H. Stearns.

ART. III.—*The Principles of Metaphysical and Ethical Science applied to the Evidences of Religion.* A new edition, revised and annotated for the use of Colleges. By Francis Bowen, A. M., Alford Professor of Natural Religion, Moral Philosophy, and Civil Polity, in Harvard College. Boston: Hickling, Swan and Brown, 1855.

ACCORDING to the purpose intimated in a brief notice of this work in our last number, we have given this book considerable attention. On closer scrutiny, it has not depreciated in our estimation. Nor can we say that certain radical defects, which seemed patent to us on a first cursory glance, disappear on a more thorough examination. Yet, on the whole, our respect for the intellectual and moral qualities of the work and its author has been enhanced by a more intimate knowledge.

The hearty and even intense theism of the book presents a warm side to the sympathies of good men, not excepting those who may think that the author has pushed some of his speculations on the Will, Power, and Causality, to an extravagant length, in his eagerness, not only to vanquish the atheist and sceptic, but to disarm them of their only practicable weapons. It indicates a degree of learning, of acquaintance with the literature of the subject, a power of metaphysical discrimination and analysis, a classic neatness and elegance of style,