

MISCELLANEOUS.

HEINRICH JULIUS HOLTZMANN.

OBITUARY.

We are just in receipt of the announcement of the demise of Dr. Heinrich Julius Holtzmann, Professor Emeritus of the theological faculty of the University of Strassburg, who, on August 4, 1910, passed away in Baden-Baden at the advanced age of seventy-eight years.

Some years ago we published an article on the life and career of Professor Holtzmann in *The Open Court* (XVI, 257) referring to him as a typical example of a modern theologian who, coming from the orthodox camp, had gradually broadened out under the influence of scientific inquiry, and without breaking with the past has developed into a man of science, sharing with his colleagues of other faculties, among them also the naturalists, an adhesion to the scientific world-conception which is fast becoming the common property of all educated people.

Professor Holtzmann was born May 17, 1832, in Carlsruhe, Baden. He studied theology at Heidelberg in 1861 and in 1874 was called to the University of Strassburg, where he remained until 1904, when he retired to Baden-Baden. But the period of retirement did not mean leisure to him, for he continued his literary, especially his editorial, work of the *Theologische Jahresberichte* most diligently up to the very last.

His speciality was the New Testament, and his several works are counted as most comprehensive and reliable expositions of the present state of inquiry. We mention here as the most important ones his books on "The Synoptic Gospels" (1863), "Critique of the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians" (1872), "The Pastoral Epistles" (1880); while his "Textbook (*Lehrbuch*) of the Historico-critical Introduction to the New Testament" (1885) as well as his "Commentary (*Hand-Commentar*) on the New Testament" have passed through several editions, and are still indispensable works of reference. He further published a "Textbook of New Testament Theology," "The Messianic Consciousness of Jesus," and a great many smaller works and essays. Not the least part of his activity consisted in editing the *Theologische Jahresberichte*, the scientific standing of which is unquestioned in both orthodox and liberal circles.

SEMITIC AND SUMERIAN; A STUDY IN ORIGINS.

BY ALAN S. HAWKESWORTH.

This is the title of the contribution of the Rev. C. J. Ball, M.A. of Oxford, to the *Hilprecht Anniversary Volume*. He clearly shows that there exists a

close similarity between the Sumerian of archaic Babylonia and the root stems of the Semitic group of languages—Hebrew, Arabic, Syriac, Assyrian and Ethiopic. He even brings forward some analogies in archaic Chinese and Japanese, although Sumerian, like Chinese, is an agglutinative tongue almost devoid of any inflections; while the Semitic languages, as we well know, possess elaborate grammatical machinery, Arabic and Assyrian, in particular, as every weary student is aware, being rather overburdened in this respect.

Indeed, as I myself have pointed out in my essay on "The Identity of Hebrew and Aryan Roots," over 95% of the Semitic roots occur also in our Greek and Latin lexicons. The truth is in fact that *roots*, in every language, are necessarily inherited and should then, *prima facie*, be the same among all people of an original common ancestry; while, on the other hand, grammar, or inflection, and to a still greater degree, syntax and "style," must vary not merely with every racial "family"—Aryan or Semitic, or Mongolian—but also with every nation, every age, and even every social class and individual. In truth, no two of us have precisely identical grammars, nor do we even agree with ourselves, as boy, youth, and man. So here we can repeat in the philological domain the philosophical dictum of Leibnitz, that no two things can ever be identical.

Dr. Ball gives a lengthy and impressive list of such roots common to Sumerian and the various Semitic tongues. He further shows that the familiar triliteralism of our Semitic lexicons was almost certainly built up from more primitive monosyllabic roots, the various pre-, in-, or suffixes used to complete the triliteral form, having, in a great number of cases, quite obvious values—a fact also elaborated by myself in a hitherto unpublished essay, "Upon the Formation of Hebrew Verbal Stems."

For example, the prefix *shin* to a root gives it a *causative* value, making it a Shaphel form of the original root. Thus *Batha*, "to cut off," "cease," becomes *shabath*, "to cause to cease," "keep Sabbath," while *Tur*, *Dur*, *Atar*, *Ng'atar* = *τηρέω*, "tour," "tower," etc., etc., in its Shaphel form is *Shatar*, "oversee," "guard," whereas *Natar*, "watch," "guard," is plainly the Niphal form of the same stem. Yet again, *Ur*, "become light" and *Ara*, *ὀράω*, "to see," become *Nur*, *Nahar*, "to shine"; and *shur*, "see," *Zahar*, *Tsahal*, "shine," *Tsohar*, "light," etc. etc. Preformative *nun* then appears to impart a passive sense, as befits its Niphal origin, while roots beginning with *mim* are probably remains of the rare Maphel formation with perhaps the sense of "instrumentation." The frequent duplication of final consonants seems to lend an intensive force to the root, but prefixing, inserting, or postfixing one of the five vowels appears to have little or no modifying value since the one biliteral root is frequently found triliteralized by any or all of the five, with little or no shade of meaning. This fact brings into still greater prominence the essential artificiality of that insistence upon triliteralism, and avoidance of all biliteral or multiliteral stems, that was one of the many obsessions of the Semitic mind.

THE CHERRY MINE SETTLEMENT.

The settlement which has been arrived at between the owners of the Cherry mine and the families of the victims is very satisfactory all around.