

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

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.

hold back from it, and perhaps, as Dr. Budde suggests (*Theologische Literaturzeitung*, p. 399, 1892), he more frequently adopted corrections of the text as time went on; but he often described the emendations of others as *nicht Hebräisch*, and instead of the not-Hebrew, showed the original to be good Hebrew and good sense.

Dillmann used the Jewish writings far less than Delitzsch. He was no doubt also less acquainted with them. But on the other hand he was a far better Semitic scholar than Delitzsch, and he never descended to the vagueness or to the rabbinical quibbling too often seen in the writings of the justly celebrated Leipzig expositor.

One day I asked his opinion of the relative usefulness for Old Testament study of post-biblical Hebrew writings and of the languages cognate to Hebrew. His answer was at once on his lips: 'The Mishnas, Talmuds, Midrashes, and the like, are almost useless; the exegesis in them is nonsense (*unsinn* was the word he used); keep on with your Arabic, etc.; they will pay you best.' I could not help thinking at the time, and it is my opinion still, that Dillmann was somewhat prejudiced in the matter; and I fear that his prejudice arose from ignorance. I say this with the profoundest deference to the learning of this great and good man. But that his advice was *in the main* sound most competent judges will agree.

As to the value of Dillmann's Commentaries, Dr. Budde, in the number already quoted from—the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*—says truly that they are 'the most perfect form of the *Commentarius perpetuus* to the Old Testament which the nineteenth century has produced.' This testimony has greater weight when it is remembered that Dr. Budde belongs to the extreme left on Old Testament subjects, though a fairer and more genial critic is not to be found.

Dr. Driver, in his valuable *Introduction*, on p. 2, names the following as the most important works for studying the 'Hexateuch':—

1. Wellhausen's *On the Composition of the Hexateuch*.
2. The writings of Dillmann, Delitzsch, and Kuenen. Dillmann's Commentaries are named as specially helpful.

I myself, as a teacher of Hebrew and the Old Testament, have no hesitation in saying that Dillmann's Commentaries are, for the books expounded, the most useful on my shelves; and

I have heard Professor Halévy of Paris, my dear friend Professor Marshall of Manchester, and many others give the same experience.

On the 25th of April 1893, Dr. Dillmann reached the 'three score years and ten,' and many were the congratulations he received. The professors of all the faculties invited him to a banquet, at which eloquent testimony was borne to the magnificent work accomplished by the guest. A few days later the students of every faculty invited him to a *Fest Commerz* held in his honour, and it was a sight to be remembered, to see the grand old man surrounded by so many of his youthful admirers, working most of them under other teachers, but all united in desiring to honour the first Ethiopic scholar, and one of the first Hebraists of his day.

The last time he was seen in the university was on Saturday morning, the 23rd of June last. For two hours he discussed in seminar the first six verses of the last chapter of Malachi, laying special stress upon the words, 'The Lord shall *suddenly* come to His temple.' His final words were such as his students have often heard, 'das Weitere das nächste Mal'—'More next time.' He looked unusually wearied and pale, but no one suspected that his end was so near. He was taken so ill on returning to his home in Schill Street, that he was compelled to retire to bed. Here he remained most of the following eleven days, suffering from inflammation of the lungs. On the 4th of July he peacefully passed away. In Berlin there was such deep and widespread grief as has been rarely known. See the papers for the next day, one of which, the *National Zeitung*, lies before me as I write.

In class Dr. Dillmann was quiet, and kept closely to his paper. His voice was weak, but it was very distinct. He read quickly, and at times it was almost impossible to follow him, especially to write down the constant references he gave. But in his delivery there was no hesitation, and in its way the elocution was perfect. He had a very sweet voice, and a strikingly earnest, intellectual face. But what impressed me most was the intense conviction that rang out in the delivery: every word came from the heart. If one knew the man he could be traced in every utterance. The teacher whom, in this respect, I consider most like Dillmann is Dr. Martineau. When a student in London fifteen years ago, it was my privilege to attend the lectures, now published in two volumes,

with the title *A Study of Religion*, and the remembrance of Dr. Martineau's beautiful face revealing a beautiful character, and of his very subdued but heart-charged delivery, remain with me unto this present time. But Dr. Dillmann had more 'go' than Dr. Martineau, and at times one could hear from the great Hebraist specimens of rich, dry humour. One morning, in seminar, I had the rare treat of seeing Dr. Dillmann smile: that smile was called forth by the ridiculous blunder of a student. Some of the students told me when the class was over that such an incident was unprecedented: they had never seen and never heard of Dillmann smiling in class before that day. They said I was highly favoured in being able to witness such a sight.

If a student came to class late, it was the doctor's habit to raise his glasses and to fix his eyes upon him until he got to his place. All this time the other students stamped and hissed, so that we had strong inducements to be in time.

In the weekly 'Seminar,' where he got students to read and answer questions, he was very severe if he saw signs of laziness. Never have I heard any teacher use such invective and sarcasm as he did. Yet so great was his hold on the men, that no one thought of answering him or of resenting his treatment.

In the *Old and New Testament Student* for June 1892, Dr. Rubinkam of Basel, writing of Professors Duhm and von Orelli, the Old Testament teachers at Basel University, adds these words: 'Their geniality and courtesy in the seminar are in great contrast to the denunciations for ignorance which the students in Berlin seminar weekly accept from Dr. Dillmann.' I attended Dr. Dillmann's seminar for four months without a single absence; but where he used strong language it was deserved. It was currently reported in Berlin that the laziest students were those of theology. Certainly, some of the students who belonged to Dillmann's classes cared little, if only they got their licence to preach. Dr. Dillmann was a lifelong worker: in session or

in holidays, at home or abroad, he had always some work in hand. Tradition has it that during the forty-eight years of his career as teacher, he never missed a single class. Surely such a teacher might be excused if he showed scant pity for idle and careless students.

It may be well to add Dr. Dillmann's opinions on one or two things of interest. These I gathered from conversations with him, and they were recorded in my diary at the time.

Speaking to him about Hebrew grammars, he said that Böttcher's was good as a thesaurus. König's was valuable as giving the views of Kimchi and others; and its treatment of the forms was excellent. Ewald's grammar was the best existing: it was much more satisfactory than even the last edition of Kautsch's *Gesenius*. Harper's books he knew nothing of, but he had not much faith in the inductive method. (It should be stated that elementary Hebrew is not taught in the German universities. It is the gymnasiums which give the grounding in the classical languages and in Hebrew.)

The best lexicon is still Gesenius's *Thesaurus*—so he considered. Mühlau and Volck's *Gesenius*, and also the new English and American *Gesenius*, edited by Professor Francis Brown (the first part had been sent him for review), were too fanciful in their etymologies. But he added, 'I make my own lexicon as I go on; and that is what every student of the Old Testament should aim at doing.' Of the work *Nominalbildung in den Semitischen Sprachen*, by my kind friend and teacher Dr. Barth, and of the similar work by Lagarde (or 'blagard' (blackguard), as in this work he appears), Dr. Dillmann answered, 'Ganz Theorie'—'all theory.'

He told me one afternoon that, in his opinion, the final settlement of Old Testament questions would come from England. He looked with thankfulness upon the growing band of careful Bible scholars to be found in this country. Of Dr. Driver he spoke in very high praise.

(To be continued.)