

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE Trustees of the British Museum are about to publish an important work in Egyptian archæology. It is a complete translation of the Theban Canon of the Book of the Dead. It will be accompanied by an introduction of some two hundred pages, dealing with the whole subject of Egyptian Eschatology, and the origin and growth of the Book of the Dead. Mr. St. Chad Boscawen has undertaken to write a full account of the work for THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, which will probably appear in the issue for April. He describes it as 'abounding in matter of the greatest importance to Christian studies.'

Dr. H. A. A. Kennedy, whose book on *The Sources of New Testament Greek* is about to be published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark, is one of the youngest and yet one of the most scholarly of the ministers of the Free Church of Scotland. After a distinguished undergraduate course, he went to Cambridge and secured a scholarship; but having there passed through a remarkable spiritual experience, he returned to Scotland, resolved to give himself to the study of divinity and the preaching of the gospel. The work which Messrs. Clark are about to issue is the Thesis with which he obtained the coveted degree of Doctor of Science at the University of Edinburgh. It has been spoken of in the very highest terms by professors who have seen it, and is unquestionably most interesting and original.

It seems probable that the whole question of the date of the Gospels will have to be reopened. Many items of evidence have been forthcoming of late. And although they are insignificant in their isolation, when brought together they reach a very considerable degree of momentum. And all in one direction, in the direction of forcing us towards an earlier date, not for the Synoptics only, but even for the Gospel according to St. John, than we have hitherto dared to assign to them.

The fresh items of evidence have partly come from the recent discoveries that have been made in early Christian literature, such as the Didache and the Gospel of St. Peter. To these, however, must be added a new study of the Epistles in their relation to the Gospels, out of which has emerged the clear conviction that even the Epistles of St. Paul betray an acquaintance with the Gospels, and that not only of their facts, but also of their very wording. This study, it is interesting to notice, has been taken up simultaneously, yet quite independently, on the Continent, in England, and in America. And the most recent result of it is a short article by Dr. Dunlop Moore of Pittsburgh, in the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for January.

Dr. Moore gives himself to the careful examination of a single passage in 1 Timothy, which in the Revised Version runs as follows: 'The scripture

saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn. And, The labourer is worthy of his hire' (1 Tim. v. 18). Now the controversy is, How much of that verse is quoted as 'scripture'? It is a controversy of very long standing. And although it may seem to be a question of pure exegesis, it is curious to observe that those who hold by the Pauline authorship of the Epistle are nearly all on one side, while those who deny it are nearly all on the other.

For the first part of this verse is quoted from the Book of Deuteronomy, the second part is found only in the Gospel according to St. Luke. If, then, the whole verse is quoted here as 'scripture,' it follows, say the critics, that this Epistle could not have been written by St. Paul, for he neither would nor could have referred to a saying in St. Luke as 'scripture.' Whereupon the supporters of the Pauline authorship reply that the whole verse is not quoted as 'scripture,' but only the first part from Deuteronomy. And the Revisers, by their punctuation, seem to have thrown themselves on that side of the conflict.

Dr. Moore undertakes to show that the whole passage is quoted as 'scripture,' and that it is so quoted by St. Paul. He holds by the Pauline authorship of 1 Timothy as heartily as any. He believes that whatever effect it may have upon the date of St. Luke to prove that a sentence from that Gospel is directly quoted in the First Epistle to Timothy, it will not weaken the argument for the Pauline authorship of that Epistle, but very perceptibly strengthen it.

For this is not the only place in which these two passages, the one from Deuteronomy, and the other from St. Luke, are found together. They are also brought together, and for the very same purpose, in the First Epistle to the Corinthians. There, in the ninth chapter, St. Paul says: 'For it is written in the law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn' (1 Cor. ix. 9). And after explaining throughout

a few verses that the New Covenant meaning of this passage is, that they who preach the gospel ought not also to be compelled to work for their daily bread, he adds: 'Even so did the Lord ordain that they which proclaim the gospel should live of the gospel' (1 Cor. ix. 14). Now Meyer holds, and nearly every responsible commentator holds with him, that the 'Lord' of this passage is the Lord Jesus Christ, and that the reference is to the words of Christ found in St. Matthew x. 10 and St. Luke x. 7. Is it probable, then, that two different writers should have hit upon the same unexpected interpretation of that simple passage in Deuteronomy, and then have added to it the same passage in St. Luke? The author of the first instance is admitted by everyone to be St. Paul; the author of the second instance, which is no mere imitation of the former, but has all the force of a clear and independent conviction, must have been St. Paul also.

But as soon as the apologetic difficulty is removed, we return to the verse to see if it may be fairly considered that the passage from St. Luke is quoted as 'scripture,' as well as the passage from Deuteronomy. And at once we perceive that the argument from 1 Corinthians tells on this also. In quoting the passage from Deuteronomy in 1 Corinthians, the apostle used the phrase: 'It is written in the law of Moses.' In quoting the words found in St. Luke, he said: 'Even so did the Lord ordain.' Here his words simply are: 'For the scripture saith,' after which follow both passages. It seems very natural, then, to suppose that the special expression 'the law of Moses' is here dropped in order to allow the two passages to be quoted together as 'scripture.' And it was a quite common custom for the writers of the New Testament, as well as for the Jews before them and the early Christians who succeeded them, to take two or more texts from different places, and make them read almost as if they were one continuous quotation. Look at Acts i. 20, Romans ix. 33, or James ii. 23. And it cannot well be denied that the two passages which St. Paul quotes

in 1 Timothy v. 18 read most naturally when they are both brought under the one designation of 'scripture': 'For the scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn; and, The labourer is worthy of his hire.'

The 'Statement' for the current quarter of the Palestine Exploration Fund contains the third report by Dr. Bliss of his excavations in Jerusalem; the first part of Mr. Ewing's narrative of a journey in the Hauran, together with a careful reproduction of Greek and other inscriptions collected by him, and various contributions and comments by other archæologists, especially seven Notes by Herr Baurath von Schick.

Herr von Schick's Notes are characterised by that combination of shrewdness and simplicity which always gives them a flavour of most unusual piquancy. Moreover, whether we find his conclusions acceptable or not, we always find the reasons for them worth considering. In the present series of Notes two are of especial interest, the one on the Pool of Siloam, the other on the city of Bethzur.

Bethzur is a name which the mind of the average Bible reader does not catch hold of. Yet it was an important place, and has had an interesting history. It is first mentioned in the Book of Joshua (xv. 58) as a royal city lying between Halhul and Gedor. Next we are told (in 2 Chron. xi. 7) that it was one of the cities which Rehoboam built 'for defence in Judah,' after the disruption of his kingdom,—where 'built' means fortified, no doubt. Once more it is said (Neh. iii. 16) that the inhabitants of Bethzur came to the help of the Jews of Jerusalem in their struggles to rebuild the walls of the Holy City after the return from the Captivity. These are the references to Bethzur in canonical Scripture. In the Apocrypha it appears more frequently and reaches much greater consequence.

Indeed, it may be said that in the Maccabæan wars it was, next to Jerusalem, the most important place in the land. In and around it some of the most decisive fighting took place. For Bethzur—the 'Rock House'—blocked the highway to Jerusalem from the south, and commanded the frontier of Edom. At Bethzur, Judas Maccabæus gained a brilliant victory over the Syrian General Lysias, and then strengthened the fortifications of the place. By and by want of supplies compelled the Maccabæan garrison to surrender to Antiochus; but again it was recaptured by Judas' brother Simon, and more strongly fortified than before. Is not all this written in the book of the wars of the Maccabees, and matter of common history? But, besides these references in the Apocrypha, there is a tradition which touches the Apostolic history in the New Testament. It is said that it was while his chariot was passing Bethzur that the Ethiopian Eunuch caught sight of the water, now known as the fountain of Dhirweh, and asked 'What doth hinder me to be baptized?' Modern travellers will have none of that tradition, for no chariot, they say, could ever have passed along those stony mountain paths, and the road to Gaza was farther down in the plain below. But there is no question at least that the ancient Bethzur, the Bethzur of Joshua and of Judas, is still existent four miles from Hebron and still called by its ancient name.

Herr von Schick visited the place recently. He was astonished and greatly disappointed at its insignificance. 'I had expected extensive ruins of such an important place.' But there is nothing left except a stony hill with a ruined tower on the top. So Herr von Schick became convinced that the Bethzur of the Maccabees enclosed not only this hill but a tract of country round, especially running east towards the village of Halhul, so that the springs, including the Eunuch's Dhirweh, were *inside* its fortifications. In this way only could Bethzur command the road to Jerusalem, and reach its undoubted consequence. And Herr von

Schick became convinced of a much more important matter than that.

Besides the references to Bethzur in the First Book of Maccabees which have already been touched on, there is a statement in the Second Book, and that statement is not easily reconciled with the rest. For in 2 Maccabees xi. 5 it is said that Lysias, the Syrian captain, 'came to Judea, and drew near to Bethsura, which was a strong town but distant from Jerusalem about five furlongs, and he laid sore siege unto it.' Now, there is no doubt that this word Bethsura is another form of the familiar Bethzur. But that the place is one and the same it is very difficult to believe.

Herr von Schick does not believe it. For, to mention no other difficulty, what can you do with these 'five furlongs'? Schwarz says you will have to read fifteen miles instead of five. But it is five *furlongs*, not five miles. And, after all, the well-known Bethzur is not fifteen miles from Jerusalem, but according to the Onomasticon twenty miles, and according to modern measuring just fourteen English miles, or a hundred and twelve furlongs. So Herr von Schick believes that there were two places that went by the name of Bethzur in the days of the Maccabees. And why not? There were two Bethlehems, two Bethanys, two Gilgals, two Mizpehs, two Ramas, and many more besides these. There were two Bethzurs; and the one we know; where was the other?

Herr von Schick searched in many directions. All the mountains that are round about Jerusalem were considered, but they are all too far or all too low, except one well-remembered mountain on the east, the Mount of Olives. The Mount of Olives is, according to Josephus, just five furlongs from the city. Moreover, it had a place on it once where soldiers were quartered. 'So I come to the conclusion that the Bethzur near Jerusalem was situated on the Mount of Olives, and on its middle top, where now stands the village of Kefr et Tôr.'

And once made, many things seem to rise up and confirm the identification. Kefr et Tôr is itself the exact Aramaic equivalent of the Hebrew Bethzur. There always was some town or village on the Mount of Olives, for it was a Bama or High Place, where David used to pray (2 Sam. xv. 32). Akra, the Temple, and Bethzur are repeatedly given together as the three strong places of the Holy City (1 Macc. vi. 26, xiv. 7). A Bethzur so near the city seems to suit the demands of the narrative. And finally, Herr von Schick has discovered at the present village on the Mount of Olives the ruins of many rock-hewn cisterns, 'which were of course once *inside* the fortifications.'

In the rapture over the new discovery of the Syriac Gospels, we are in danger of losing sight of the Gospel of Peter. This may be partly a just retribution. For in some circles there was an unmistakable tendency to exaggerate its importance. Dr. Martineau certainly made too much of it in his famous article in *The Nineteenth Century*; and the reaction began when Professor Rendel Harris answered that amazing article in *The Contemporary Review*. Nevertheless, the Gospel according to Peter, even that fragment of it which has been recovered, is far too precious to be forgotten yet.

The literature around it has accumulated with extraordinary rapidity. It must now be many times the bulk of the original writing itself. For that reason it has become difficult to follow the discussion of its disputed questions. And the difficulty is increased by the rapid change of view which at least one distinguished critic has made and openly avowed. We are therefore thankful for the clear and authoritative account of the present state of the controversy which we find in an article in the current issue of *The New World*, by Professor Armitage Robinson of Cambridge.

From the very beginning, says Professor Robinson, there have really been but two questions at issue—where this so-called 'Peter' got his in-

formation, and when he wrote it down. Now, the first of these questions resolves itself into this: Did he use the canonical Gospels, or did they use him? And here the authorities fall asunder in a most interesting manner. No one would suggest either dullness or dishonesty on either side. Yet it is curious to see that those who had already committed themselves to the late date of our Gospels find that 'Peter' was used by them, and therefore wrote before them; while they who hold by the apostolic origin of the Gospels find them the earlier, and 'Peter' a cunning copyist.

Who are the authorities on either side? Well, on the one side we have Professor Swete, Professor Rendel Harris, and Professor Armitage Robinson himself, together with two strong scholars on the Continent—Dr. Zahn of Erlangen and Dr. H. von Schubert of Kiel. On the other side—Dr. Martineau, as already hinted; the mysterious Author of 'Supernatural Religion'; and, at one time, Professor Harnack of Berlin.

'At one time Professor Harnack.' Here is the difficulty, and it appears the weakness of that side. When Professor Harnack first wrote on the Gospel of Peter, which he did very soon after its publication, he stated the belief that 'Peter' was earlier than the Gospels, and had been used by them. Whereupon Dr. Martineau—'an honoured master in his own domain of religious philosophy'—rushed into print in *The Nineteenth Century* with a most popular and much-mistaken reproduction of Professor Harnack's view. But the article was scarce in type when Professor Harnack had changed his view. And we were all reading Dr. Martineau's plausible sentences when Professor Harnack's frank avowal came that he now held the Gospels to be the earlier, and that 'Peter' had made use of them for his own not very creditable purposes. So on that side of the controversy the Author of 'Supernatural Religion' has the distinction of being left alone.

The other question is about the date. And that is more difficult to settle. Professor Swete is con-

vinced that it cannot be earlier than 150 A.D., and would place it at 165 A.D., with some confidence. But if 'Peter' was used by the authors of the canonical Gospels this date is somewhat late, so there are two sides here again. And with one exception, the same scholars are found on either side. The exception is Dr. Harnack. For Dr. Harnack expressed the opinion at the beginning that the Gospel of Peter had been read and quoted by Justin Martyr, and must therefore be earlier than his day; and although he has given up his other early opinion, he holds by that still. This, then, is really the only remaining controversy over the Gospel of Peter: Is it quoted by Justin Martyr, or is it not? And Professor Armitage Robinson, after a careful scrutiny of the evidence in this article, comes to the conclusion that it is not. 'The evidence adduced to prove that Justin quoted from the Gospel of Peter'—these are his words—'is wholly insufficient to prove the assertion, and rather points to the existence of some document, the earliest form of which has been lost to us, from which both Justin and the Pseudo-Peter drew such materials or expressions as they have in common.'

Although there are already 'more than four hundred interpretations' of the passage, students of Galatians iii. 19, 20, will be glad to hear that another has been proposed. For the words must have a meaning; and as long as another attempt is made to find it, there is hope that it will yet be found. The latest effort is contained in an interesting volume of biblical essays by the late Dean of Dromore, which has been noticed in another place (*Studies in Biblical and Ecclesiastic Subjects*. Elliot Stock, 8vo).

The rendering of this much-vexed scripture is almost identical in both our English versions. The Authorised Version says: 'And it (*i.e.* the law) was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator'; for which the Revisers have given us: 'And it was ordained through angels by the hand of a mediator'—possibly more literal, but really an

insignificant alteration. And the twentieth verse is exactly the same in both: 'Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one,' except that the Revisers have put a semicolon after 'one,' in place of the Authorized comma.

What, then, is the objection to this translation? There are three objections. First, it makes barely intelligible English. Next, it has little, if any, connexion with its context. And, thirdly, it does not translate the Greek. Why St. Paul should say here that a mediator cannot mediate between a single party but needs two, and even why he says it so clumsily, may perhaps be cleverly explained, for clever expositors can explain anything. But the expositor has not yet come who could tell us why he wished to say that, and then used language which does not say it at all.

Not that it would have required a great revolution in his language to say that. It would only have required the omission of a single little word. But the omission of a single little word often makes a great difference. Here the little word is the definite article. And as long as it is here, Dean Campbell holds that the apostle's language cannot be translated: 'Now a mediator is not a mediator of one'; but must be rendered, 'Now the (or *this*) mediator is not a mediator of one,'—let us make of that rendering what we will.

Of the four hundred and more interpretations that have been offered, there is one that in these days, has outstripped all the rest, and got very freely accepted. And no wonder. For it is both attractive in itself, and it is associated with very great names. Dean Campbell gives it in the words of Professor Sanday of Oxford: 'The Law had a mediator: therefore the Law involves two parties. In other words, it is a covenant. On the other hand, God, the giver of the promise, stands alone, therefore the promise is not a contract, and resting on God is indefeasible.' These are not Dr. Sanday's very words, so far as can be discovered, but they express his meaning. And

that meaning seems to be, that the Law which was given to the Israelites by the hand of Moses as mediator, was inferior to the Promise already given to Abraham; for the Law being a covenant, required that the Israelites should keep their side of it, as well as that God should keep His, which they were not able to do; but the Promise had only the one side, God's, and there was little fear that it would not be fulfilled. Professor Sanday has the expositor's issues far too finely touched in him to express himself dogmatically on this interpretation. He simply says: 'At the present moment there is a tendency to acquiesce in that given above, which, it is hoped, will be thought satisfactory.' But it is not quite satisfactory. To Dean Campbell, at least, it is quite otherwise.

For the definite article stands in the way, and the definite article cannot be ignored. It was not 'a mediator' that St. Paul wrote down; it was 'the mediator,' and we must gather his meaning accordingly. Dr. Campbell holds that his interpretation gives the article its place, and has other advantages to boot. This is how he translates the passage: 'It (the Law) was ordained (or *administered*) through angels by the hand of a mediator. Now this mediator is not a mediator of one (covenant); but God is one.'

Accordingly, Dean Campbell's mediator is not Moses but Christ, and it must be confessed that Moses cannot without some straining be represented as the administrator of the Law, and its mediator between God and man, as Bishop Lightfoot clearly saw. Dean Campbell's mediator is Christ. And he understands the Apostle to say that the Law was administered through angels, but by the hand or power of a mediator; and that this mediator, being Christ Himself, was thus the mediator not of the Promise only, but of the Law also. For the Law and the Promise are not antagonistic; neither is the Law antagonistic to the better Covenant that is to follow. Christ is the Mediator or Intercessor between God and man under the Law as under the Promise and under

the Gospel. There is but one Person with whom man has ever to do. There is but one Mediator between them. And as it is the same God always, so also is it always the same Mediator. Or, as the apostle again, and very plainly, puts it to Timothy: 'For there is one God, one mediator also between God and men, Himself man, Christ Jesus' (1 Tim. ii. 5, R.V.).

Such is the interpretation of the late Dean of Dromore, put into fewest words. That it will brush aside all the four hundred and more interpretations that have gone before it, would be to claim for it more than he claimed himself. But it is brought out with a full knowledge of all that may be said for contrary views (as that the article is used generically), and also of its own superficial obstacles (as the gender of the adjective 'one'), though these things are omitted here; and if it only sends us to a fresh and hopeful consideration of the apostle's words, it will not have been published in vain.

The Critical Review for the current quarter contains, among other things, a review by Professor Marshall of Resch's new work, *Parallel Texts to Matthew and Mark*. The volume belongs to Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen* series, and is the third contribution to that series by Dr. Resch. The three books are all in one line of investigation. The *Agrapha*, which came first, contained a collection and examination, more thorough than had ever before been attempted, of the utterances attributed to Christ in early Christian literature, but not contained in the Gospels. The second promised a collection and criticism of the texts in early Church literature that are parallel to those found in the canonical Gospels, and was itself an introduction to that collection. The present volume is the first of the two thus introduced, its companions on Luke and John being announced to appear shortly. It is occupied therefore with the passages from (or parallel to) Matthew and Mark that are found in the earliest literature of Christianity. It quotes

more than two hundred of such passages, and offers remarks, sometimes lengthy and very valuable, on the divergences between them and the form in which they are found in the text of our canonical Gospels. To some of these 'remarks' Professor Marshall directs attention. There are two of special consequence. One of them may be considered at another time; the other may be touched on now.

It is the trinitarian baptismal formula of Matthew xxviii. 19: 'Baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' Dr. Resch is well aware that 'it is a settled axiom in some theological circles that these cannot be the literal words of the Lord Jesus, but that they are "a comparatively late product of the dogmatic development of the Church."' But he finds that the 'axiom' needs verifying. The evidence runs strongly the other way.

First of all, the trinitarian formula is traceable even in the preaching of John the Baptist: 'God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham'; '*He that cometh after me, is mightier than I*'; and, 'He shall baptize you in *the Holy Spirit*.' Next would come the parallels to this text in the Apostolic writings, a large subject which Dr. Resch reserves for a separate volume. But, in the third place, there are not a few appropriate quotations from the oldest Patristic literature. Clement of Rome has three palpably trinitarian passages, of which one is: 'We have one God, and one Christ, and one Spirit of Grace who was shed upon us.' Ignatius has four. Then comes the Didache, which gives us the earliest citation of the baptismal formula outside the Canon. 'Baptize ye into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, in running water' (ἐν ῥδανι ζῶντι). And there are many more that follow.

But the strongest proof that the words of the baptismal formula are the veritable words of Jesus Himself, is the fourth and last in Dr. Resch's list. It is the prevalence of the formula amongst all the

heretical sects. Some of these sects were heretical on this very subject of the Trinity, but even they retain these tell-tale words. The Jewish Christians, who were so reluctantly drawn to the trinitarian conception of God, used the formula constantly. See the Clementine Homilies, for example. Even the perverse Gnostics adopted it for their sacrament of initiation, 'manifestly,' says Dr. Resch, 'in

order that they might not altogether lose connexion with the common consciousness of the Church and the right of the Christian name.' In short, it was the bond of union between all who claimed the Christian name; the one thing which, amid a thousand divergences of creed and practice, never changed; the one thing *common* among all so-called Christians, orthodox and heterodox alike.

August Dillmann.

BY THE REV. T. WITTON DAVIES, B.A., M.R.A.S., PRINCIPAL OF THE MIDLAND
BAPTIST COLLEGE, NOTTINGHAM.

II.

THOUGH for many years widely known as an Ethiopic scholar, Dr. Dillmann had, up to the year of his settling at Berlin (being then forty-six years of age), produced no book outside his special line of study, and, as the bibliography will show, but few articles. In 1869 the first edition of his *Commentary on the Book of Job* was published. The fourth and last edition of this Commentary was issued in 1891, with many changes and improvements. If time failed him to make the necessary alterations, the reissue was delayed: he would never countenance a mere reprint.¹ In the preface to the last edition of his 'Job' he accounts for the delay by his inability to find time to revise the work. All Dr. Dillmann's Commentaries appeared in the *Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch* series, and were based upon earlier volumes in this series. The first edition of 'Job' followed largely Hirzel's as amended by Justin Olshausen. 'Genesis,' based in the first instance on Knobel, made its appearance in 1875. He brought out the sixth and last edition in 1892. I remember asking him, in July of that year, whether he was coming to the London Oriental Congress

to be held in September. He replied that he intended spending his holiday in correcting the proof of the new edition of his 'Genesis.' This was the way in which he spent most of his holidays. How hard he worked during semester his students knew well. Yet whether term time or holiday he was always glad to welcome pupils who called to see him.

For a complete list of his Commentaries and for a list of his other writings, see the appended bibliography.

In learning, sound judgment, carefulness, and fairness, Dillmann's Commentaries are unexcelled if not unequalled. He puts aside all theological or religious applications; there is in him none of the unctuousness which one expects to see in Delitzsch's and even in Canon Cheyne's Commentaries; he aims directly and solely at the elucidation of the text before him, and whatever aid philology, grammar, history, and archæology—though he is less strong in this last—can give, is used.

In the interpretation of single words, their meaning, as settled or suggested by usage or by the cognate languages, was fully dealt with. Parallel passages were adduced in such abundance and with such quickness as to make it hard for the student to write them down. It is always easier to correct a hard text than to explain it, but this frequent resource of a shallow or hasty exegesis was seldom employed by Dillmann. When necessity was laid upon him he did not

¹ The late deservedly famous English scholar, Dr. W. Wright of Cambridge, had a similar scruple. On the only occasion when I had the privilege of meeting him—it was just before his death—I asked him if, as the second edition of his Arabic Grammar was out of print, he intended issuing a third. He replied No, for since he published the second edition many native Arabic Grammars had appeared, and he would have to carefully study these before producing a third edition of his Grammar.