tion of money? Self-accumulation is an act of self-preservation. 'No man liveth to himself' is both a statement of fact and a precept of obligation.

1. A statement of Fact. Each of us is an appreciable factor in the history of humanity. A reckless word, a careless gesture, sets in motion pulsations which vibrate to the boundary of the universe. Sin may be repented of, forgiven, even forgotten, but not undone. We carry about with us a certain moral atmosphere which is made up of frequent unobtrusive thoughts, successive trivial acts.

2. A precept of Obligation. If you have wronged, will you not make amends? Not to God—there no amend is possible. But to man. Open the floodgates of your sympathy; give freely as you have freely received; pour out the treasures of your intellect and of your heart. This giving is twice blessed.

Illustrations.

There are great attractive forces in creation—the attraction of gravitation, of cohesion, of chemical affinity, of electricity, and capillary attractions; but the mightiest attractive force and centre is 'the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ,' and the superlative uniting power is vital Christianity. —J. O. Keen.

The beauty of early Christian life has never, perhaps, been more touchingly brought home to the modern mind than in Count Tolstoi's powerful story, *Work while it is called To-day*. But in one respect that great artist has done scant justice to the lesson which the life of the primitive Church has still to teach us. It was not merely (as he appears to suggest) by the wide diffusion of an enthusiastic spirit of brotherhood, not merely by a sort of extension to a wider society of the instructive communism of the home, that the Christian Church did so much to expel from its midst alike the material and moral evils of extreme inequalities of wealth. Without this enthusiasm of self-sacrifice, mere machinery would, of course, have availed nought: but still we must not forget that it was by deliberate organization, and vigorous discipline, and statesmanlike administration, that the Christian Church succeeded to so large an extent in exorcising the twin demons of squalid poverty and selfish luxury.—Hastings Rashdall.

To love one's neighbour in the Christian sense is to love what is best and highest in him, to promote the best and noblest life for him, so far as it is consistent with the equal claims of every other neighbour, to a share in the best and noblest that life affords.—Hastings Rashdall.

The great work which lies before the Church of our day is to revive among Christians, not what I believe to be the completely imaginary and unhistorical communism sometimes attributed to the infant Church of Jerusalem, but some approach to that relative community of goods which enabled the early apologists, all through the first age of the Church, to boast that Christians still, in a real sense, had all things common.—Hastings Rashdall.

Those who have learnt to realize the spirit of the early followers of Francis of Assisi, both such as remained at their early avocations but lived 'in great charity,' and such as sold all and became regular 'Brothers Minor,' will have but little difficulty in conceiving the situation.—J. Vernon Bartlet.

The heinousness of Dives' sin in the parable consisted in this, that Lazarus lay at his very gates; that as he went in and out he could not choose but see him; and that thus the want, and the duty of relieving the want, were pressed upon his notice. Is it not so with you? The neediest are the nearest. You go in and out among them.—J. B. Lightfoot.

For Reference.

Butler (G.), Cheltenham College Sermons, 371.
Eyton (R.), Glory of the Lord, 52.
Keen (J. C.), Emphasis of Belief, 139.
Lightfoot (J. B.), Ordination Addresses, 283.
Paget (F.), Faculties and Difficulties, 47.
Rashdall (H.), Doctrine and Development, 190.
Religion in Common Life, 32 (Acheson).

The Disuse of the Marcan Source in St. Luke ix. 51–xviii. 14.

By the Rev. Canon Sir John C. Hawkins, Bart., M.A., Oxford.

Rather more than three-fourths of St. Matthew's Gospel, viz. 816 verses out of 1068, and rather more than two-thirds of St. Luke's Gospel, viz. 798 verses out of 1149, may be taken as generally supporting the now prevailing opinion that the compilers of those two Gospels used the Gospel of St. Mark—pretty nearly, if not quite, as we have it—not only as one of their most important sources, but as a framework. It is true that even in these major portions of their works they make many

additions to the Marcan narrative in the way of introductions, conclusions, and both long and short insertions. They also make a few omissions from it, and St. Luke makes an occasional substitution of more or less parallel matter. But they do not desert its arrangement and order, with the exception of some brief transpositions which occur chiefly in Luke 22–23, and which I hope to collect and notice on another occasion.

That general statement, however, does not apply to what forms nearly a quarter of the First Gospel, viz. Mt 8–13, containing 252 verses, nor to what forms nearly one-third of the Third Gospel, viz. Lk 9^{51}–18^{14}, containing 351 verses. Of neither of those two large departments of the Gospels bearing the names of Matthew and Luke can it be said that much account is there taken of the Marcan arrangement and order.

But though in that respect those two lengthy sections may be classed together, there is also an essential difference between them. On the one hand, it can hardly be doubted that in Mt 8–13 the compiler had our Mark, or its general equivalent, before him, for there at least 108 verses, being more than two-fifths of the 252, are substantially parallel to Mark, and as a rule it is the latter which exhibits the chief signs of originality. In those chapters of Matthew, therefore, as the pages of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES have lately shown (see Rev. W. C. Allen in vol. xi. p. 279 ff.; and as to chaps. 8–9, the present writer in vols. xii. p. 471 ff., and xiii. p. 20 ff.), the chief aim of students of the Synoptic Problem is to discover the reasons which induced Matthew (meaning the compiler of the First Gospel) here, and here only, to break up his Marcan source, and to rearrange it among other materials, instead of merely inserting those materials into it as it stood. On the other hand, when we begin to examine Lk 9^{51}–18^{14} in connexion with its parallels, the question soon arises whether the Marcan source is used there at all; and it is the chief object of this article to show that the answer to that question must almost certainly be in the negative. For out of the 351 verses there are but 35—or about one-tenth—which contain any parallels to Mark either in substance or in phraseology. And it will also be found that, with the exceptions of a few brief phrases, which shall be carefully noticed and scrupulously weighed as we proceed, the whole of the Lucan matter in these 35 verses, or parts of verses, which is parallel to Mark is also parallel to the First Gospel, between which and the Third Gospel there was undoubtedly some communion of sources. Is it not, then, very unlikely that Luke made such very slight use here of the Marcan source which he elsewhere uses so abundantly? Is it not more reasonable to suppose that, for whatever reason, he made no use of it at all, so that these 351 verses—including even the 35—were drawn up in complete independence of it, except, of course, so far as echoes of its doubtless familiar phraseology may have lingered in the memory?

Before entering upon the arguments for this view which this 'great interpolation' of Luke's—as it has well been termed from its relation to the Marcan order—itself supplies, it will be worth while to observe the analogy of that one of the insertions in the previous part of the Gospel which is so much longer and so much more varied in its contents than the others, that it has sometimes been distinguished from them by being called Luke's 'lesser interpolation.' Certainly that analogy, so far as it goes, gives support to the hypothesis that Luke in his great interpolation wrote quite independently of Mark. For there is very strong evidence that he did so in his lesser interpolation. That section of the Gospel extends from chap. 6^{20} to 8^{3} (it seems to be sometimes taken as commencing at 6^{12}, but surely vv.$^{12\text{-}19}$ are to be taken as parallel to Mk $3^{7\text{-}19}$, although there is an inversion of order for the purpose of providing an introduction to Luke's Sermon on the Plain), and thus contains 83 verses. Now in the whole of it there is nothing at all, either in words or substance, which is also found in Mark without Matthew, and only three short passages in which there is anything parallel to both Mark and Matthew. And as to two of these passages, we find that the 'setting' is completely different in Luke and Matthew from what it is in Mark. (1) The first of them is a very interesting and instructive case. We find that the five words, ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν, are identical in Mk 4^{24}, Mt 7^{2}, Lk 6^{38}, except that Luke, with his customary preference for verbs compounded with prepositions, has ἀντιμετρηθήσεται. But then we further find as to the contexts of those words and the purposes for which they are introduced, that while, like the words themselves, these are identical in Matthew and Luke, they are com-

pletely different in Mark. It seems then that, either in one of those two connexions or the other, the words can only be what I have above called an echo of familiar phraseology lingering in the memory, and applied to a matter to which it did not originally belong. And here, as sometimes elsewhere in reports of *discourse*, it is the Marcan connexion that gives the impression of being the less original; which happens to be the case also with the three other words, καὶ προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν, which Mark subjoins to the five words just quoted, but which have a more suitable environment and a clearer meaning in Mt 6^{33} and Lk 12^{31}. (2) The second passage is the quotation from Mal 3^{1} ἰδοὺ (Mt and Mk ἐγὼ) ἀποστέλλω, κ.τ.λ., which is recorded in Mt 11^{10}, Lk 7^{27} as spoken by Jesus after the message from John in prison, but which Mark (1^{2}) uses as an introduction to his account of the Baptist's preaching in the wilderness. And it is remarkable that the verb κατασκευάσει is used by all three writers, instead of the ἐπιβλέψεται of the LXX. (3) The third case of parallelism between all three Synoptists is of a different kind, for here Matthew and Mark agree generally against Luke. It consists in the use of a few words, of which ἀλάβαστρον μύρου and the name Σίμων are the only distinctive and important ones, both in Luke's account of the anointing by the sinful woman in the house of the Pharisee ($7^{36ff.}$), and in Matthew's and Mark's accounts of the anointing by Mary at Bethany (Mt $26^{6ff.}$, Mk $14^{3ff.}$). But these resemblances between the two narratives are so very largely outweighed by the differences between them as to the time and place of the action and the teaching founded upon it, as to make it clear that any influence of the one upon the other can only have been very indirect. It may safely be concluded then, from an examination of these three passages, that though the first and second of them may prove, and apparently do prove, some real community of sources between Luke and Matthew, there are no signs of any such community between Luke and Mark in the 83 verses extending from Lk 6^{20} to 8^{3}.

It may be taken then as morally certain that in Luke's previous and shorter interpolation into the Marcan order he laid aside entirely his usual Marcan source. And if so, we shall be to some extent predisposed to find the same independence of Mark in the later and much longer interpolation made by the same evangelist. But here the circumstances of the case are considerably more complicated. For in Lk 9^{51}–18^{14} there are, as has been said, no less than 35 verses or parts of verses which show more or less likeness to our Second Gospel, and which therefore might conceivably be derived from it; and it has been admitted that these verses contain a few words and short phrases found in Mark and Luke exclusively, which was not once the case in the lesser interpolation. But, nevertheless, I think it can be shown, by a close and careful examination of these verses, that the evidence which they supply is very decidedly against any derivation from Mark. Since making such an examination for myself, I have noticed that the Rev. F. H. Woods, in *Studia Biblica*, ii. pp. 75–78, has made some similar observations in support of the same conclusion; but as my investigation of the passages has been more minute and detailed than his could be in his general and comprehensive essay, I think it may be of some use even to students of the subject who are well acquainted with that extremely valuable contribution to the literature of the Synoptic Problem.

The 35 verses or parts of verses in question may be most conveniently considered in three classes:—I. Doublets (occupying 13 verses or parts of verses). II. Brief sayings of a similar kind to those found as doublets (9 verses). III. Three important passages of other kinds (13 verses).

I.

Doublets are almost always of primary importance in the investigation of sources. And the fact that nine of Luke's ten or eleven doublets[1] have one of their members in this division of his Gospel, though it is less than one-third of the length of the whole Gospel, is perhaps in itself somewhat significant: it seems to suggest that Luke was here for some reason adopting a different procedure as to the use of sources from that which he adopted elsewhere. One of these nine, indeed, has both its members (Lk 14^{11} 18^{14}) in this same division, so it has no bearing upon our present inquiry.

[1] I have displayed and discussed the ten in *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 81 ff.; and perhaps Lk 9^{46} with 22^{24}—though not, like the rest, a saying—may be added as an eleventh. But, like one of the ten, viz. Lk 8^{18} with 19^{26}, it has neither of its members in the great interpolation.

The remaining *eight Lucan doublets* are as follows:—

No. 1 Lk $10^{4.5.7.10.11}$	form doublets with the following passages respectively,	Lk $9^{3.4.5}$	which passages are respectively parallel in position to	Mk 6^{6-11}
No. 2 ,, 11^{33}		,, 8^{16}		,, 4^{21}
No. 3 ,, 11^{43}		,, 20^{46}		,, $12^{38.39}$
No. 4 ,, 12^{2}		,, 8^{17}		,, 4^{22}
No. 5 ,, 12^{9}		,, 9^{26}		,, 8^{38}
No. 6 ,, $12^{11.12}$		,, $21^{14.15}$		,, 13^{11}
No. 7 ,, 14^{27}		,, 9^{23}		,, 8^{34}
No. 8 ,, 17^{33}		,, 9^{24}		,, 8^{35}

No. 1 has been entered because it is technically a doublet, but I should not attach very much weight to it as evidence for a plurality of sources. For the two occasions referred to are so similar in nature, and the earlier of them had been put into writing so shortly before the latter (if the parts of the Gospel which include chaps. 9^{1-5} and 10^{1-11} were composed at the same time, which we shall afterwards see to be by no means certain), that Luke might easily reproduce in chap. 10 forms of expression which he remembered from having transcribed them in chap. 9. How closely connected these two discourses were in his mind seems to come out in chap. 22^{35}, where the words *βαλλάντιον* and *ὑποδήματα* are referred to as belonging to the charge to the Twelve, whereas he had only recorded them as addressed to the Seventy.

Bearing in mind this qualification as to one of the eight doublets, let us try to estimate their evidence, and the amount of weight that should be attached to it. Now doublets *prima facie* suggest the use of two sources, and they do so with a force which increases largely with their frequency; for it is very unlikely that a compiler—especially one who laid claim to accuracy and orderliness (*ἀκριβῶς καθεξῆς γράψαι*, Lk 1^{3})—would repeatedly let himself use twice over materials derived from a single source, though he might inadvertently do so once in a way. He would be much more likely to draw similar materials, or in the case of short sayings admitting of different applications it might even be identical materials, from two distinct authorities. So the obvious inference from the occurrence of so many doublets in this department of Luke's Gospel is that he was using at least two sources. And from the uniformity with which that member of the doublets which does not occur in the great interpolation agrees in position with a similar passage in Mark there result the two further probabilities as to one of these sources—(*a*) that it corresponded closely with our Second Gospel, and (*b*) that it was not made use of by Luke in this division of his Gospel. And these probabilities are confirmed and strengthened by the two following observations upon the doublets:—

(i.) In five out of the eight cases, viz. in Nos. 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, the member of the Lucan doublet which corresponds to Mark in position is also considerably more similar to Mark in wording than is the member of it which occurs in the interpolation. The same is the case in the more complicated but (as has been pointed out) less certainly significant No. 1. In No. 2 the Marcan passage has about an equal resemblance to the two Lucan passages, the agreement as to *κλίνη* in one case being balanced by that as to *μόδιος* in the other. As to No. 6—which next to No. 1 has the weakest claim to rank as a doublet—the preponderance of agreement is undoubtedly on the other side; but, after making full allowance for that one case, there is on the whole a very large balance of evidence in favour of connecting with Mark, on the ground of language as well as on the ground of order and position, that half of the eight Lucan doublets which occurs elsewhere than in Lk 9^{51}–18^{14}.

(ii.) It is further to be observed that in the 13 verses or parts of verses which have come under our consideration as forming these members of doublets, there is hardly anything which belongs to Mark and Luke without having a parallel in Matthew, and which therefore suggests a Marcan source. I can find only two items of this kind. (*a*) There is a slight difference which nearly all MSS keep up in No. 1, where Luke in 10^{7} (and so in 9^{4} except in ℵ) has *μένετε* as in Mk 6^{10}, whereas in Mt 10^{11} we find *μείνατε*. (*b*) And in No. 6 the *τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον* of Mark 13^{11} and the *το ἅγιον πνεῦμα* of Luke 12^{12} agree against the *τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν* of Mt 10^{20}. But such a reference to God as the 'Father of' men is a predominantly and almost exclusively Matthæan habitude (Matthew 20 times, Mark 1, Luke 3). And the coincidence of Mark and Luke in the employment of the usual epithet of the Divine Spirit (it occurs 3 times elsewhere in Mark and 12 times elsewhere in Luke, besides 41 times in Acts, and it had doubtless grown to be a familiar religious expression since its use in Ps 50 (51)[13] and Is $63^{10.11}$ LXX as the adjectival rendering of the Hebrew genitives קָדְשְׁךָ and קָדְשׁוֹ) cannot count for much as an indication of a direct Marcan origin of Lk $12^{11.12}$. Those verses may be ascribed with far greater confidence to the collection of

discourses which Matthew and Luke so often use in common.

II.

Our examination of these doublets, all of which have occurred in sayings of Jesus, seems to show that the members of each of them which are found in Lk 9^{51}–18^{14} came to Luke quite independently of the Marcan source. In whatever degree that view is accepted as probable, it will lend probability to the further supposition that the same account is to be given of *certain other sayings of a like brief kind*, which also are found in this division of Luke, and which also are there placed in a totally different position from that which is assigned to them in Mark, but which do not happen to have such parallels in other parts of Luke as would qualify them to be classed as doublets.

There are nine such sayings, each of them occupying a single verse—

No. 1	Lk 12^{1}	are re-	Mk 8^{15}	which	Mt 16^{6}
No. 2	,, 12^{10}	spectively	,, $3^{28.\ 29}$	respect-	,, $12^{31.\ 32}$
No. 3	,, 13^{30}	placed	,, 10^{31}	ively are	,, 19^{30}
No. 4	,, 14^{34}	quite	,, 9^{50}	exactly	,,
No. 5	,, 16^{18}	differently	,, 10^{11}	parallel	,, 19^{9}
No. 6	,, 17^{2}	from the	,, 9^{42}	in position	,, 18^{6}
No. 7	,, 17^{6}	similar	,, 11^{23}	to the very	,, 21^{21}
No. 8	,, 17^{23}	sayings	,, 13^{21}	similar	,, 24^{23}
No. 9	,, 17^{31}	in	,, $13^{15.\ 16}$	sayings in	,, $24^{17.\ 18}$

In No. 4 the last column had to be left empty; for, although this saying is also given by Matthew (v.[13]), he places it in a third—and seemingly the best—connexion. Between that connexion and Luke's it may be possible to trace some amount of parallelism, since the duties entailed by Christian discipleship were the general subject on both occasions; but Mark's setting is totally different, the saying being attached by him to the mysterious *πυρὶ ἁλισθήσεται* in a discourse which had taken an eschatological turn.

The above list of passages, like the previous list of doublets, gives a *prima facie* impression of Luke's independence of Mark, which an examination of the verses in detail confirms and strengthens in two respects—

(i.) We find here, again, that the verbal similarities are in a large majority of cases greater between the Marcan and Matthæan than between the Marcan and Lucan versions of the sayings. This preponderance is very decided in Nos. 1, 3, 5, 7; it also exists, though to a smaller extent, in Nos. 2, 8, 9. In the remaining two cases, Nos. 4 and 6, something considerable will have to be said on the other side; but in No. 6 the exclusively Marco-Lucan correspondences which will presently be noticed are balanced, if they are not outbalanced, by the exclusively Marco-Matthæan correspondences *τῶν πιστευόντων* and *ὀνικός* (a word found nowhere else); so that No. 4, the only entry which does not show the sayings in Mark and Matthew as parallel to one another in position, is the only one which shows them as less like to one another in phraseology than the sayings in Mark and Luke.

(ii.) It happens that the two verses of Matthew referred to as parallels in Nos. 5 and 7 are members of doublets in Matthew. And an examination of these Matthæan doublets lends support—in the first case very strong support—to the view that there had been some community of sources between Luke and Matthew, but none between Luke and Mark. (*a*) In No 5 the passage named as both parallel and very similar to Mk 10^{11} is Mt 19^{9}, which forms a doublet with Mt 5^{32}. Now the verse which immediately precedes Lk 16^{18} enforces the permanence of the law in words closely corresponding (note especially *κερέα*) with the like enforcement near the commencement (Mt 5^{18}) of the section of the Sermon on the Mount which contains Mt 5^{32}. This fact very strongly suggests that Mt 5^{32} and Lk 16^{18} have the same (presumably Logian) origin, while Mt 19^{9} came separately from the other (presumably Petrine) source which lies before in Mark. And this is only one of several Matthæan doublets as to which the same two distinct lines of descent can be traced with very considerable probability. (*b*) The case connected with our No. 7 is not one of the strongest of these, but it deserves mention. The words of Matthew (21^{21}) there entered as parallel with Mk 11^{23} form a doublet with Mt 17^{20}; and the occurrence of *ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως* in Mt 17^{20} and Lk 17^{6} exclusively cannot but suggest here again a common origin for these two passages, while Mt 21^{21} and Mk 11^{33} seem to be accounted for by the Marcan source. But Luke's substitution of the 'sycamine tree' (cf. *οὐ μόνον τὸ τῆς συκῆς*, Mt 21^{21}) for the 'mountain' which forms the illustration in the other three passages, makes the inference less clear and certain than in the case of No. 5.

We have now to notice in these nine verses the verbal coincidences between Mark and Luke only which can be quoted against the latter's complete

disuse of the former as a source. Three of them are of real importance. In No. 4 it may be called practically impossible that Mark (9^{50}) and Luke (14^{34}) can accidentally and independently both (α) have prefaced the saying with καλὸν (Luke καλὸν οὖν) τὸ ἅλας, and also (β) have introduced into it the verb ἀρτύειν, which only occurs once besides in the New Testament (Col 4^{6} ἅλατι ἠρτυμένος). And (γ) though it is not so near to being impossible, it is very highly improbable, that in No. 6 the use of περικεῖται in Mk 9^{42}, Lk 17^{2} against κρεμασθῇ in Mt 18^{6} was a mere accidental coincidence.

The four other verbal coincidences which follow seem to me to be 'negligible quantities,' as being such expressions as writers, using the freedom which generally characterizes the Synoptists, might be expected to introduce anywhere. But it may be well to add them, if only to show that they have not been forgotten. (δ) It is true that in No. 2 Mark and Luke have εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα as against Matthew's κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος (Mk 3^{29}, Lk 12^{10}, Mt 12^{32}); but the significance of that coincidence almost or quite disappears when we remember (a) that κατά in the sense of against is a favourite usage with Matthew, being employed by him 14 times against 6 times in Mark and 3 times in Luke; and (b) that Matthew alone of the three had not been using the verb βλασφημεῖν, which carries after it the preposition εἰς in Dan 3^{26} (^{29}) LXX, and in Bel ^{9} Theod., as well as in Mark and Luke here, but which is never followed by κατά either in the Greek O.T. or N.T. (ϵ) In No. 6, again, we have (besides the really important περικεῖται already noted) the change of preposition from Mark's and Luke's εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν to Matthew's ἐν τῷ πελάγει τῆς θαλάσσης; but that is merely the result of the requirements of the three different verbs that had been used (Mk βέβληται, Lk ἔῤῥιπται, Mt καταποντισθῇ). And similarly πελάγει is a rhetorical amplification suitable to the forcible καταποντισθῇ. (ζ) In No. 8, again, there is a trifling, and doubtless a fortuitous, agreement between Mark and Luke only, in that Mark has ὧδε followed by ἐκεῖ (13^{21}) and Luke has ἐκεῖ followed by ὧδε (17^{23}), whereas Matthew has ὧδε both times (24^{23}; cf. Ex. 2^{12} LXX). (η) Once more, in No. 9 Mark and Luke, unlike Matthew, insert εἰς τά before ὀπίσω. But in doing so they were only adopting a fairly common usage which is employed again by Luke himself in 9^{62}, and which is found also in Jn 6^{66} 18^{6} 20^{14}, and at least 15 times in LXX, exclusive of 5 places in which the reading is doubtful.

In examining then (13+9=) 22 of the 35 verses in which the three evangelists have any common subject-matter (there being none in which Mark and Luke stand alone), we have found only three really uncommon and outstanding expressions in which Mark and Luke agree against Matthew; and two more will have to be added to them from the remaining 13 verses.

(To be continued.)

Recent Foreign Theology.

A Nestorian Commentary on the Old Testament.[1]

DR. DIETTRICH has struck a good vein and is working it well. It was a pleasure to notice his former contribution to the Beihefte of the *Z.A.T.W.*,[2] and the monograph which he now adds to the same series is equally worthy of welcome.

Isho'dadh of Merv was the most learned Nestorian bishop of his day. He occupied the see of Ḥĕdathâ on the Tigris. Scarcely anything is known about his life beyond the fact that in the year 852 he missed the great post of Catholicus for which he had been recommended to the Caliph, as a greater scholar, Jerome, failed to obtain the greater post of bishop of Rome. In a famous catalogue of Syrian writers it is stated that he wrote an exposition of the New Testament and of the Bêth Mauthbê, the latter being that division of the Old Testament which includes Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Proverbs, Sirach, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Ruth, and Job. But the writer of the catalogue did not know everything. Diettrich has here

[1] *Iśō'dādh's Stellung in der Auslegungsgeschichte des Alten Testamentes an seinen Commentaren zu Hosea, Joel, Jona, Sacharja 9–14 u. einigen angehängten Psalmen.* Veranschaulicht von Lic. Dr. G. Diettrich. Giessen: J. Ricker'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.

[2] THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, vol. xii. p. 544.