

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

August Dillmann.

BY PRINCIPAL THE REV. T. WITTON DAVIES, B.A., M.R.A.S., NOTTINGHAM.

III.

DILLMANN'S TEACHING.

IT is impossible in this article to give more than a bare outline of the principles advocated by this great scholar, and this outline will be expository and not critical.

What he thought in other departments than his own: his opinion regarding inspiration, the person and work of Christ, it would be impossible from his writings to say. German commentators are in the habit of separating criticism from theology, and even from religion. It is not hard, nay, it is easy, in the writings of the late Drs. Delitzsch, W. Robertson Smith, and of Canon Cheyne to trace the Christian theologian, and they profess religion on nearly every page. But one can read whole volumes of German Commentaries without coming across a line that might not as well have been written by an atheist, though there may not be a line or a syllable to suggest that the writer is not an orthodox Christian. This remark applies to Dr. Dillmann. But whoever argued from Dillmann's silence that he was a mere heartless critic, or that he was wanting in piety or faith, would make a great mistake, as those who knew the man can say. The strong feeling put into the delivery of his lectures, and the spirit in which he read the Scriptures, told of strong conviction and profound reverence. This all but disappears from the printed page.

It is my purpose to give a brief statement of Dillmann's views regarding the Old Testament. Be it remembered that the *statement* is mine, the *views* are Dillmann's, not necessarily mine.

It will be well to begin with the Pentateuch, or rather, since the Book of Joshua, which shows similar marks of composition, is added, the Hexateuch. It is around the Hexateuch that the battle of Old Testament criticism has concentrated itself.

My references to Dillmann's writings will be to his Commentaries, and in each case to the latest editions. Dillmann's views on the 'Hexateuch' question are gathered together at the end of his *Commentary on Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua*, in a chapter entitled 'Ueber die

Composition des Hexateuch,' pp. 593 to end. It is unfortunate that none of Dillmann's writings have been put into English with the exception of a few fragments of articles found in Dr. Schaff's American edition of Herzog's *Encyclopædia*. Thanks to Messrs. T. & T. Clark, who have rendered such splendid service to biblical science, there is some probability of Dillmann's Commentaries appearing in an English dress.

In the first place, let it be seen in what the bulk of Old Testament critics now agree. There is no discussion between Dillmann and Delitzsch on the one hand, and Graf and Wellhausen on the other, as to the fact that our existing Hexateuch presupposes older documents, out of which they have been compiled. They are equally at one with the exception of trifling details, as to the analysis made and as to the parts referred to the different documents.

Indeed, conservative critics themselves admit that the Hexateuch, as separated by the majority of modern Bible scholars, exhibits differences of vocabulary and phrasing, and also duplicates of narratives and laws, only they have another solution for these phenomena. It is easy for the careful reader who has no knowledge of Hebrew to test this analysis by examining books like the following, where the different portions are graphically represented and their sources indicated:—

Genesis of Genesis, by B. W. Bacon. Hartford, 1892.

Genesis printed in Colours, by E. C. Bissell (the late). Hartford, 1892.

The Composition of the Book of Genesis, by Edgar Innes Fripp. London: David Nutt, 1892.

Die Heilige Schrift, von E. Kautzsch und andern. Freiburg i. B., 1892.

The last is the only work dealing with the entire Bible.

Addis's *Hexateuch* will, when completed, be our best work for reading together the contents of the various documents. Vol. i. (London: David Nutt,

1892)¹ embraces the whole of the Jehovistic narrative, the combination and redaction of J and E. The author has just informed me that he has about half finished the second (concluding) volume, and he hopes that in a few months the complete work will be before the public. It would be unjust to the memory of the late Professor Bissell of Hartford, U.S.A., not to make it perfectly clear that he stoutly opposed the critical theory of the Hexateuch. See the preface to the above work, and especially his able book, *The Pentateuch: its Origin and Structure*. (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1885.)

The results indicated in the Bible, edited by Kautzsch and his collaborators, are in all essential points accepted by Delitzsch, Dillmann, Baudissin (Dillmann's successor),² and Driver, on the one side; and by Reuss, Graf, Wellhausen, Kuenen, W. Robertson Smith, Cheyne, and Addis, on the other.

The critics named are quite as much at one in regard to the outstanding features of the Hexateuch documents. This is indeed the reason why they are at one in the separation of the documents. It is because J, E (or, at any rate, JE combined), D, P, P¹, P², etc., have each of them literary, historical, and religious characteristics, that it is possible to mark off, and, in a rough way, to date them. Dillmann does stand apart from his brother critics as to the age and mutual dependence of some of the documents, but this is not because he differs from them in the separation and characterisation of these documents, but because he interprets the same data in a different fashion. The premises are identical though the conclusions are different.

Critics are no less unanimous in their contention that J, the Jahvist, and E, the Elohist, must have written before B.C. 750, and that they were combined by the so-called Jehovist into the *Book of Jehovah* (JE) prior to B.C. 720. This early work, the *Oldest Book of Hebrew History*, as Mr. Addis terms it, includes the book of the Covenant (Ex.

xx.—xxiv.), and therefore the Decalogue, and also Ex. xxxii.—xxxiv., where the Covenant is reaffirmed.

There is no important difference regarding the date of D, the Deuteronomist. Dillmann (see *Composition des Hexateuch*, p. 613) holds it as proven that the 'book of the Covenant' (2 Kings xxiii. 2), found in B.C. 621, when Josiah was king, was no other than the work of the Deuteronomist. At pp. 611, 612, and 613 he gives his reasons for concluding that D could not be older than the seventh century before Christ, and that it probably belongs, as said above, to B.C. 621. He bases the conclusion to which he comes upon linguistic and historical grounds. The style and the religious notions implied—one central sanctuary, one priestly tribe, etc.—belong to the close of the seventh century B.C. It is on grounds exactly similar that the Graf-Wellhausen school defends the late date of the Priestly document or documents, and Kuenen is not backward in pointing this out. In his *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, translated by Dr. Budde (Freiburg i. B. und. Leipzig, 1894, p. 409), the late Leyden scholar claims to be using Dillmann's reasoning anent D to confound Dillmann's conclusion anent P. This refers, however, specially to the arguments from religious history. On the other hand, I think Dr. Dillmann shows his great fairness by allowing weight to the argumentation of his opponents when he thinks it has any, and the fact that such a careful observer failed to see in P (A) proofs of late origin is evidence that such proofs are wanting, or that, at the least, they are hard to find.

Common ground is likewise taken by the critics in regard to the belief that Moses was the founder of the Israelitish nation with its legislation and religion. Stade, in his *Geschichte*, denies, but Wellhausen, in his *History of Israel* ('Prolegomena,' etc., 1885, p. 430), and in his German expansion of this work, *Israelitische und Judäische Geschichte* (Berlin, 1894, p. 11), affirms the residence of Moses in Egypt. Both, however, look upon Moses as humanly the creator of the nationality, law, and religion of the people. No doubt is thrown upon the historicity and unique personality of the Jewish lawgiver.

From what has been said it will be seen that the principal Old Testament authorities have no difference of consequence as far as concerns three out of the four most important documents, namely, E, J, and D.

¹ It is singular that all the books named above were issued in 1892. Kautzsch's work, as issued in 1892, reached the end of 2 Kings. It has been completed for the whole Bible since then.

² Since writing the above, Baudissin of Marburg has withdrawn the call which was virtually accepted. A private letter from a well-known Professor at Berlin informs me that Bæthgen of Greifswald has accepted the post.

But when we come to the Priestly codex, Dr. Dillmann parts company with the rest, for according to him and his illustrious teacher, Ewald, P as this codex is called since Kuenen so designated it, is older than D. Ewald calls this document the 'Book of Origins' (see *History of Israel*, vol. i. p. 74, etc.; German edition, p. 94), and pushes back its date to the time of Saul and Samuel, while Dillmann says it belongs to about B.C. 800, or nearly two hundred years before the writing of D. Vatke, whose genealogy of the documents so much resembles Dillmann's, fixed P at B.C. 722, almost synchronising it with E (see his *Historisch-Kritische Einleitung*, published at Bonn in 1886, but written long before his death in 1882, p. 383, etc.). In his earlier unfinished work, *Die Religion des Alten Testaments*, Vatke advocated on Hegelian *à priori* grounds the Wellhausen date and genealogy of P.

But the difference between Dillmann and his critics is not so great as at first blush it seems, for though he places P (A as he calls it, because earliest in date) so far into the past as B.C. 800, he admits that it was altered and added to continuously until the time of Ezra (B.C. 444), when it took on its final shape. On the contrary, the Graf-Wellhausen school agree that much of the Priestly codex existed long before the Exile. And it is important and but fair to recollect that the origin of the writing is not held to be contemporary with the facts and laws embedded in the writing. Wellhausen and Kuenen allow this, and they say that in the later legislation there is but the legitimate development of what Moses himself taught and wrote. Thus the late Professor W. Robertson Smith—a close follower of Wellhausen—writes at p. 313 of the last edition of his *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*: 'The development into explicitness of what Moses gave in principle is the work of continuous divine teaching in connection with new historical situations.'

Dillmann vigorously contends that D supposes the existence of P, for it borrows P's language, and shows an acquaintance with the regulations in P; as, for example, those dealing with leprosy, clean and unclean animals, etc. (see *Die Composition des Hexateuch*, pp. 554-667). Addis (*Hexateuch*, vol. i. p. xci) answers Dillmann by saying that 'certain technical terms were commonly used in priestly circles, and adopted both by the Deuteronomist and the priestly writer' (see answer by Wellhausen, 'Prolegomena,' p. 369, English edition).

Now if Dillmann's *Priesterschrift* has pre-Exilic and also post-Exilic elements, and if the same is true of Wellhausen's *Priester-codex*, the divergence between these two critics is for the most part one of degree.

It should be remembered that while it is learnedly maintained by Dillmann that the greater part of P is pre-Exilic, yet this pre-Exilic portion was before the Exile inoperative. This, he admits, is made clear by the historical books, except those of late date, such as Chronicles. P was in fact an ideal sketch unknown to the great mass of the people and unenforced by the state; a kind of esoteric teaching kept by the priests among themselves as a goal to be worked to. Their opportunity came after the Exile, and it was not lost (*Die Composition*, etc., p. 666).

This is likewise the opinion held by Dillmann's successor, Baudissin¹ (*A. T. Priesterthum*, p. 289, etc.). Kuenen (*Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, p. 402) thinks such an existence of P exceedingly unnatural and unlikely. The rise of P among the priests has been compared to the gradual formation of the Mishnah among the Sopherim or scribes.

In the foregoing, Kuenen's designation of the sources has been employed as being, on the whole, best known. Dillmann uses the letters of the alphabet, making the chronological order agree with the order of the letters—though he subsequently modified his judgment somewhat as to the exact order of production.

Dillmann's A is Kuenen's P and Wellhausen's P C. His B and C stand for the commoner E (Elohists) and J (Jahvists). D is so called by Dillmann because it is fourth in order of time; by Kuenen, D stands for Deuteronomist. This letter has, therefore, the same value for all.

Dillmann makes E (his B) older than J (his C).

Wellhausen and his school make J the older.

Thus, according to Dillmann, E belongs to B.C. 850; J to 750.

Stade exactly reverses the date.

Vatke's genealogy of the documents, which is much like Dillmann's, is as follows: E: P²: J: P¹: D. Dr. Dillmann puts P¹ before P² and both before J. Formerly he put them before E also.

As regards the order and dates of the combination of the codes, the following formula sums up Dillmann's view:—

E + P + J existed separately up to about B.C. 630.

E + P + J united into one later than B.C. 621.

¹ See note on p. 346.

Soon after D was written it was united to E+P+J.

After the Exile, P¹ (Dillmann's S because representing Sinaic legislation) was added to the rest, and in the time of Ezra (B.C. 444) our present Hexateuch was completed.

Dillmann believed in the general truthfulness of the patriarchal histories gathered together in the Book of Genesis. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were to him men of flesh and blood, and not mere myths. Stade (*Geschichte*, vol. i. p. 406) tells us that these patriarchs were primitive deities. Dillmann demands proof of this—he knows of none (*Die Genesis*, p. 219). Goldziher, Professor at Vienna (a Jew), in his *Mythology of the Hebrews* (English translation, 1877, pp. 32, 91), says that Abraham was first a name for the sky and then the name of a mythical hero.

Reuss, the real founder of the Graf-Wellhausen school, in his *Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften Altes Testaments* (Braunschweig, 1881), puts Abraham back into the prehistoric or heroic age. Wellhausen begins his *History of Israel* with Moses. There is, Dillmann says, much in the histories of these early times that is purely legendary. Every nation has its eponymous heroes, and Israel was not behind the rest in this. But legend is based on fact, and in the main the accounts we have in the earliest book of the Bible are true. For a full and clear exposition of Dillmann's views on this question, see his *Genesis*, pp. 217–219. Compare also Delitzsch's *Commentary on Genesis*, the last English edition (T. & T. Clark, 1888, vol. i. pp. 373–376), where views akin to Dillmann's are advocated.

Dillmann denied the contention of the Assyriologists, Friedrich Delitzsch (son of the commentator) and Paul Haupt (of America), that the biblical accounts of Creation and of the Flood originated during the Babylonian exile, and that they were derived from Babylonian sources.

He was strongly convinced that the Old Testament religion had its root and support in God. It was divine as no other religion was except Christianity. I remember once speaking to him about the younger Old Testament scholars of Germany, when he said that unfortunately many of them make the Bible a mere natural growth. 'I believe the ten words,' he said, 'to be of God and not of man; but that is not the belief of the prevailing

school. The younger scholars rush at conclusions without well considering the grounds. Time will prove them wrong, of that I am sure, and once more German scholarship will acknowledge the Old Testament revelation to be from heaven.' These words were uttered with a pathos which showed that they came from the heart.

Professor Dillmann's attitude and spirit are well indicated in a private letter to Professor Nathaniel Schmidt of America, a former pupil. I quote from the Baptist *Examiner* for July 26, 1894: 'Es erregt in mir besonders lebhaften Dank dass sie mein ernstliches Bemühen vollen Glauben und strenge Wissenschaft gusammenaufrecht zu erhalten, herausgeföhlt haben' ('It awakens in me specially deep gratitude that you have learnt to appreciate my earnest endeavour to maintain together fulness of faith and strict scientific method'). It is reassuring to some who are alarmed that men like Delitzsch and Dillmann see no necessary conflict between the most recent findings of biblical criticism and a strong Christian faith. The faith and intense devoutness of the late Robertson Smith are by this time a by-word, and even Wellhausen and Stade are reported of as pious and believing, Stade specially so. And so far as I am aware, neither of these last denies the supernatural origin of the Decalogue or of the Old Testament religion in general.

Briefly let me name Dr. Dillmann's opinions regarding other important books of the Old Testament. Here I am indebted to his published writings, or to those lectures which I had the privilege of attending in the summer semester of 1892. I wish also to express obligations to an article by Rev. G. L. Robinson in the *Biblical World* for October 1894.

The *Book of Job*, he says, belongs to the poetical books, and therefore is placed in the third division of the Hebrew Bible, and in connexion with Psalms and Proverbs, the other poetical books.

The subject of this book is 'the suffering of the righteous considered in connexion with the whole question of the meaning of evil for man's moral life and in the divine government of the world' (*Job*, p. ix).

He considers the book to be a unity with the exception of the speeches of Elihu, which, for reasons similar to those given by Dr. A. B. Davidson in his excellent *Commentary* (Cambridge Bible), he regards as an interpolation. There are other additions by later hands (such as ch. xxviii. 15–20),

but they are negligible in number and moment. He rejects the supposition of Canon Cheyne that the book was one of gradual growth, to be in this regard compared with the Psalms, Proverbs, Genesis, Homer, etc. Dr. Budde of Strassburg thinks that Dr. Dillmann, as against Canon Cheyne, is undoubtedly right (see *Literaturzeitung*, 1892, p. 400).

The date of the book he fixes at between B.C. 596 and 585, *i.e.* during the Babylonian exile. But while in the fifth edition he considered that the Elihu speeches were written in the sixth century B.C., in the sixth and last edition (1891) he places those speeches a century later. He says that the book—*i.e.* its framework, all indeed except the Elihu speeches and paltry insertions—cannot be post-Exilic, and still less can it belong to the Greek period as Canon Cheyne, following Kuenen, is inclined to believe (*Job and Solomon*, p. 75).

Dr. Dillmann was very pronounced in his view that none of the Psalms belong to the Maccabæan period. He told us in class that the question is one to be answered by exegesis, and his exegesis excluded the possibility that any of the Psalms were written in the Maccabæan age. The twenty-seven considered by Canon Cheyne (*Bampton Lectures*, p. 457) to belong to that period could not, Dr. Dillmann thought, have been so late, and Canon Cheyne had in his opinion advanced no proof to the contrary. In his Psalms class, Dr. Dillmann often referred to the 'Origin of the Psalter'; but though he generally differed from the author when discussing the dates and occasions of the Psalms, his references were always respectful. It is surely very much to the credit of Dr. Dillmann that an English work which had only been issued a few months previously should have been carefully studied and be constantly referred to in his lectures. Dr. Dillmann, while, on the one hand, denying the existence of Maccabæan Psalms, was equally sure that many of the Psalms were the work of David. In this matter he was preceded by his great master, Ewald.

The 90th Psalm was not the work of Moses, notwithstanding the fact that in the title it is ascribed to him. The thought pervading this Psalm is similar to that running through Deuteronomy xxxii., and probably both compositions belonged to the same date.¹

¹ For Dillmann's views regarding the 90th Psalm, and for a specimen of his method in class, see article by the present

We have his views as to the Book of Isaiah printed in his *Commentary on Isaiah* (5th ed. 1890). Besides denying the Isaianic authorship of the last twenty-seven chapters, there are portions of the first thirty-nine chapters the genuineness of which he doubted or denied. In the main his results agree, as will be seen, with the findings of the most recent criticism.

He is strongly inclined to regard the two Psalms, of which ch. xii. is composed, as the work of one living long after Isaiah's time. The style is similar, he thinks, to that of the later Psalms.

Chapters xiii. 2–xiv. 23 belong to the later years of the Exile, as, he thinks, is evidenced by the allusions to Babylon, and by the literary style. He gives similar arguments and comes to the same conclusions as Gesenius, Rosenmüller, de Wette, Hitzig, Knobel, Duhm, Kautzsch (*Heilige Schrift*), and Cheyne. Delitzsch and von Orelli contend for the Isaianic authorship of the passage.

Chapter xxi. 1–10 describes the fall of Babylon, and was written about B.C. 549, when the combined Persian and Median armies brought Babylon to the ground. Cheyne, in his forthcoming *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah* (see *Expositor*, February 1895), but not in his *Commentary*, supports Dillmann's view.

Chapter xxiii. he thinks, judging from the references in vers. 13–15, must belong to the time of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Cheyne (*Commentary*, 3rd ed.) and Delitzsch and von Orelli defend the Isaianicity of the whole chapter.

Chapters xxiv.–xxvii. Dillmann has no hesitation on internal grounds in fixing at the early or post-Exilic period—say B.C. 480–470. He is supported in this view by nearly all the leading authorities from Ewald to Driver.

Chapters xxxiv.–xxxv. originated, Dillmann thinks, during the closing years of the Exile—say B.C. 540. He is supported by Driver and Kautzsch and Cheyne (*Commentary*).

The historical section, chs. xxxvi.–xxxix., which agrees almost word for word with 2 Kings xviii. 13–xviii. 17–20, xix. except that Hezekiah's thanksgiving song is added, Dillmann thinks to be the work of a prophet of the Deuteronomist school who flourished about B.C. 600.

As regards the large portion of Isaiah, chs. xl.–writer in the *Freeman*, September 2, 1892. In this article I reproduce the substance of his lectures on this Psalm just as I heard them in the classroom.

lxvi., Dillmann agrees with nearly all modern critics (even Delitzsch, Oehler, von Orelli, and Bredenkamp, taking this ground), that Isaiah could not be the author. The time of the composition of this part was shortly before the return from Babylon. He is inclined to think that all these twenty-seven chapters are the work of one man, though he has his doubts about chs. lii. 13–liii. 12 and lvi. 9–lvii. 15a. This last portion likely enough, he thinks, is the work of Jeremiah. Eichhorn, Bleek, and Ewald advocate the same view as to this portion.

The former of these passages is the great Messianic one. The suffering servant is with him, in the first instance, the ideal Israel purified by suffering, and made a blessing thereby to mankind. This is likewise the opinion of Wellhausen and Cheyne.

At page 11 of his *Commentary on Isaiah* he meets the allegation of Wellhausen and his school, that the apparent condemnation of sacrifices, feasts, in ch. i. 11–14, shows the P code not to have been in existence by referring to ver. 15 where prayer is equally condemned, from which it would follow from the same reasoning that the duty of prayer was not up to this known, enjoined, or practised. This instance is given to show how Dillmann stocks his Commentaries with arguments in behalf of his critical opinions concerning the Hexateuch.

The book of *Joel* he put first of all the prophetic books, a little earlier than Hosea, though belonging to the same period, *i.e.* between B.C. 884 and B.C. 722 (or, taking the other chronology, between 842 and 680). From this early date of Joel he argued the early date of the P code. Later scholars generally maintain the post-Exilic date of Joel and so escape Dillmann's 'conclusions,' though Professor James Robertson, D.D., of Glasgow, in a series of able lectures delivered at Oxford in July 1894, pleaded strongly for the early date.

The first eight chapters of Zechariah were the work of him whose name the book bears. Chapters ix.–xi. and xiii. 7–9 were by a contemporary of Isaiah. Chapters xii. 1–xiii. 6 and xiv. belong to B.C. 536, *i.e.* just before the return from Babylon. *Jonah* he fixed in the Persian period, B.C. 536–333. He could not fix it more definitely than this. *Ecclesiastes* he assigned to the end of the rule of the Persian satraps. *Chronicles*, *Ezra*, and *Nehemiah* were the work of a single author, who

lived in the Greek period, B.C. 333–167. *Daniel* was composed just before the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, *i.e.* between B.C. 175 and 168. *Esther* is the latest of all the books of the Old Testament.

As to the value of the LXX. as a witness to the text, he spoke very guardedly. 'The question,' he said, 'is a very complicated one, and it is wrong to commit oneself to a preference for one text over another. Each case is to be considered in all its bearings.'

In his lectures on Old Testament Theology he answered the question, 'What is Revelation?' in some such words as these:—

Revelation comes not through speculation, but is a knowledge of God got from actual experience of His working. Thus Revelation is strictly religious; there can be no revelation of scientific truth. Revelation, as derived through experience, must be a long historical process carried on in the past. To the idea of Revelation belongs originality, so that Revelation ceases as soon as the perfect religion is reached.

Though men do not find God by their own strength, it must be borne in mind that this manifestation of God in man is connected with human historical conditions. Besides the general sense of the need of God there are other conditions, two especially. 1. *On the human side* a certain cultivation of man's sense of the divine, a deep straining of the spirit after God. 2. *On the divine side* extraordinary acts and signs and events due to God, such as special men, prophets, etc., which were intended in an unusual degree to awaken the human spirit. Periods in which such interventions occurred might well be called 'Offenbarungszeiten' ('Revelation-periods').

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

For this list I am indebted to the kindness of Dr. Theodore Dillmann, son of the Professor. It is an exact copy of a list made by the late author and left in his own writing. I beg also to express my thanks to Dr. Driver for valuable aid in my endeavour to construct a complete bibliography. When I received the list from the family on the 12th of October 1894, nothing remained to be done but to translate, correct, and, where necessary, add.

I. INDEPENDENT WORKS.

1. *Catalogus codicum MSS. Orientalium qui in Museo Britannico asservantur.* Pars. iii. *Codices Æthiopiici.* Lond. impensis Musei Brit. 1847, fol., pp. 79.
2. *Catalogus codicum MSS. Bibliothecæ Bodleianæ Oxoniensis.* Pars. vii. *Codices Æthiopiici, digessit A. Dillmann.* Oxon. 1848, 4to, pp. 87.

3. Liber Henoch Æthiopice. Lips. Vogel, 1851, 4to, pp. 91 and 38.
4. Das Buch Henoch, übersetzt u erklärt. Leipz. Vogel, 1853, 8vo, pp. 331.
5. Octateuchus Æthiopicus. Lips. Vogel, 1853-55, 4to, pp. 486 and 220.
6. Grammatik der æthiop. Sprache. Leipz. Weigel, 1857, 8vo, pp. 435.
7. Liber Jubilacorum Æthiopice. Kiliae, 1859, 4to, pp. 167.
8. Lexicon linguae Æthiopicæ. Lips. Weigel, 1865, hoch 4to, 1522 columns.
9. Chrestomathia Æthiopice. Leipz. Weigel, 1866, 8vo, pp. 290.
10. Erklärung des Buchs Hiob. Leipz. Hirzel, 1869, 8vo, pp. 370.
Ibid. 4th Edition, 1891.
11. Libri Regum, Æthiopice, 2 Hefte, 1871, 4to, pp. 169 and 137.
12. Die Genesis erklärt. Leipz. Hirzel, 8vo, 1875, pp. 495.
4th Edition, 1882, 8vo, pp. 457.
5th „ 1886, 8vo, pp. 472.
6th „ 1892, 8vo, pp. 479.
13. Ascensio Isaia, Æthiopice et Latine, cum prolegomins. Lips. (Brockhaus), 1877, 8vo, pp. 86.
14. Exodus und Leviticus erklärt. Leipz. Hirzel, 8vo, 1880, pp. 639.
15. Numeri, Deuteronomium, Josua erklärt. Leipz. Hirzel, 8vo, 1886, pp. 690.
16. Die abessinischen Handschriften der K. Bibliothek zu Berlin, mit 3 Tafeln. Berl. 4to, 1878, pp. 85.
17. Der Prophet Jesaias erklärt von A. Dillmann. Leipz. Hirzel, 1890, 8vo, pp. 544.
18. Veteris Testamenti Æthiopici, Libri Apocryphi, 4to, pp. 221. 1894. Prostat ad Asher u. Co., Berlin u. London.

II. ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS.

1. Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenländ. Gesellschaft. Bd. vii., 1853, Zur Geschichte des abessyn. Reichs, Königsverzeichnisse und Inschriften, pp. 338-364.
2. In Ewald's Jahrbüchern der bibl. Wissenschaft.
 - (a) Jahrb. iii., 1849, pp. 230-256; u. iv., 1850-51, pp. 1-96: Das Buch der Jubiläen.
 - (b) Jahrb. v., 1852-53, pp. 1-144: Das christliche Adam-buch des Morgenlands.
 - (c) *Ibid.* pp. 144-151: Über den Umfang des Bibelcanons der abessyn. Kirche.
3. In den Göttinger gelehrten Nachrichten. 1858, Nro. 17, pp. 185-226: Bericht über das Æthiopische Buch Clementinischer Schriften.
4. In den Jahrbüchern für deutsche Theologie. Bd. iii., 1858, pp. 419-491: Über die Bildung der Sammlung heiliger Schriften des Alt Test.
5. 'Im neuen Reich.' Leipz. Hirzel, 1875, Nro. 20, pp. 778-786: Heinrich Ewald.

The following appear among the published papers of the Berlin Academy of Science:—

- A. In the Monatsberichten. 8vo.
1. 1878, pp. 413-429: Abfassungszeit des Periplus maris erythrai.

2. 1881, pp. 429-433: Eine neuentdeckte punische Inschrift zu Sulci.
3. 1881, pp. 601-620: Über Baal mit dem weiblichen Artikel.
4. 1881, pp. 914-935: Kalenderwesen der Israeliten vor dem babylon. Exil.

B. In the Sitzungsberichten. 8vo. (A continuation of the preceding.)

1. 1882, pp. 427-440: Die Herkunft der ungeschichtlichen Sagen der Hebräer.
2. 1883, pp. 323-340: Beiträge aus dem Buch der Jubiläen zur Kritik der Pentateuchtextes.
3. 1884, pp. 1007-1038: Die Kriegsthaten des Königs Amda Sion gegen die Muslim.
4. 1885, pp. 889-898: Über Pithom, Hero, Klysmo nach Naville.
5. 1887, pp. 339-356: Über die apokryphen Märtyrergeschichten des Cyriacus mit Julitta und des Georgius.
6. 1888, pp. 215-237: Über das Adlergesicht in der Apocalypse des Esra.
7. 1890, pp. 3-17: Bemerkungen zur Grammatik des Geez u. zur alten Geschichte Abessyniens.
8. 1890, pp. 1345-1373: Textkritisches zum Buch Hiob.
9. 1892, pp. 3-16: Über die griechische Übersetzung des Qoheleth.
10. 1892: Über der neugefundenen griechischen Text des Henoch-Buches, 1037, pp. 1039-1054.
Zweite Mittheilung, pp. 1069, 1079-1092.
11. 1894: Über die geschichtlichen Ergebnisse der Th. Bentschen Reisen in Ostafrika, pp. 1-19.

C. Among the Transactions of the Academy the following are found:—

1. 1879, pp. 61, etc.: 'Ueber die Anfänge des Axumitischen Reichs.'
2. 1880, pp. 51, etc.: 'Zur Geschichte des Axumitischen Reichs im 4th und 6th Jahrh.'
3. 1884, pp. 79, etc.: 'Die Regierung insbesondere die Kirchenverfassung des Königs Zara' Jacob.'
4. 1885, pp. 24, etc.: 'Gedächtnissrede auf Richard Lepsius.'

III. CONTRIBUTIONS TO ENCYCLOPÆDIAS.

1. To Herzog's Realencyclopædia, both editions (1854 to 1866, and 1876 to 1888), he contributed articles on the following subjects:—(a) 'Æthiop. Bibel übersetzung.' (b) 'Bibel text des A.T.' (c) 'Chronik.' (d) 'Pseudopigraphen des A.T.'
2. To Schenkel's Bibel-Lexicon (1869-75) he contributed the following articles:—
Vol. i. Æthiopien and Kusch, Bund, Cherubim, and David.
Vol. ii. Eden, Elam, Feste, Gesetz, and Gesetzbegen.
Vol. iii. Henoch, Jebusiter, Kanaan, Kanaaniter, and Kirchweihfest.
Vol. iv. Laub-hüttenfest, Michal, Nabal, Naphtuchin, Nasiräer, Nathan, Noah, Paradies, Passah, Peresiton, Perez, Perser, Persien, Pfingsten, and Propheten.

- Vol. v. Purimfest, Rephaim, Salomo, Saul, Sirach, Seraphim, Suchim, Sündflut, and Thirsaka,—35 articles in all.
3. He supplied Brockhaus's Conversations lexicon—the 11th, 12th, and 13th editions, with a large number of articles.
 4. From 1875 to 1878 he was joint-editor of the *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*.
 5. He was editor of the *Transactions* of the Fifth International Oriental Congress. 2 vols. Berlin, 1881–82.
- IV. PAPERS OR ADDRESSES DELIVERED IN CONNECTION WITH UNIVERSITIES.
1. Inaugural address at Giessen: 'Über den Ursprung des Alttestament Religion.' Giessen Rickert, 1865, 8vo.
 2. Rectoral address at Giessen: 'Über die Propheten des alten Bundes nach ihrer politischen Wirksamkeit,' 1868, 4to.
 3. Do.: 'Über die Kleinen Universitäten,' 1869, 4to.
 4. Rectoral address at Berlin: 'Über die Theologie als Universitäts Wissenschaft,' 1875, 4to.
 5. Do.: 'Über den Verfall des Islam,' 1876, 4to.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF II. CORINTHIANS.

2 COR. vii. 10.

'For godly sorrow worketh repentance unto salvation, a repentance which bringeth no regret: but the sorrow of the world worketh death' (R.V.).

EXPOSITION.

'For.'—The 'for' depends on the last words of the previous verse, 'that ye might suffer loss by us in nothing.' It explains the effect of godly sorrow in producing positive advantage.—WEBSTER AND WILKINSON.

'Godly sorrow.'—'Godly sorrow' is, literally rendered, 'sorrow according to God,' which may either mean sorrow which has reference to God, or sorrow which is in accordance with His will; that is to say, which is pleasing to Him. If it is the former, it will be the latter. I prefer to suppose that it is the former—that is, sorrow which has reference to God.—MACLAREN.

'Worketh repentance.'—What is repentance? No doubt many would answer that it is 'sorrow for sin,' but clearly this text of ours draws a distinction between the two. There are very few of the great key words of Christianity which have suffered more violent and unkind treatment, and have been more obscured by misunderstandings, than this great word. It has been weakened down into penitence, which in the ordinary acceptance, means simply regretful sense of my own evil. And it has been still further doctored and degraded, both in the syllables and in its substance, into *penance*. But the 'repentance' of the New Testament and of the Old Testament—one of

the twin conditions of salvation—is neither sorrow for sin nor works of restitution and satisfaction, but it is, as the word distinctly expresses, a change of purpose in regard to the sin for which a man mourns.—MACLAREN.

'A repentance which bringeth no regret.'—There is nothing in the Greek to show whether the phrase 'which bringeth no regret' belongs to 'repentance' or to 'salvation.' The translators of the Authorized Version by playing upon the word repentance—'repentance . . . not to be repented of'—make it clear that they understood it to refer to that word. It must be observed, however, that there is no such play upon the words in the Greek. The apostle might easily have used an adjective from the same root as the noun, but he deliberately chooses a different adjective, as if he meant to avoid the reference to repentance. The Revisers make that reference still more pointed, however, than it is in the Authorized Version, by repeating the word 'repentance'—'a repentance which bringeth no regret.' And on the whole it seems the more probable, when the sense and the balance of construction are taken into account.

'The sorrow of the world.'—Here sorrow for the loss, or disappointment, or shame, or ruin, or sickness caused by sin; such as the false repentance of Cain, Saul, Ahithophel, Judas, etc.—FARRAR.

'Worketh death.'—Death in its fullest sense, *i.e.* of body and soul in Gehenna. All mere worldly sorrow tends to deaden spiritual sensibility, and to make us impervious to the divine influences which alone save from death. Such