

**J.J. Griesbach:
Synoptic and
text - critical studies
1776 - 1976**

Edited by

BERNARD ORCHARD

Monk of Ealing Abbey

and

THOMAS R. W. LONGSTAFF

Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Religion
Colby College, Waterville, Maine, USA

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
CAMBRIDGE
LONDON · NEW YORK · MELBOURNE

sub ipsorum nominibus circumferuntur, veros auctores non esse, sed discipulos eorum scripto consignasse, quae ex Matthaei, Marci, Lucae etc. ore olim audivissent.

VIII. Vero minime similis est, saltim quod ad Marci Evangelium attinet; eorum coniectura, qui Evangelistas e commentariis, nescio quibus, dudum *deperditis*, sive ebraicis sive graecis, libellos suos compilasse, et ea quae notatu in primis digna aut suis lectoribus utilia viderentur, decerpisse statuunt, et hinc cum miram Evangelistarum consonantiam in verbis adeo et loquendi formulis, tum etiam eorum inter se discrepantiam explicari posse autumant.

IX. Marci Evangelium integrum superest et incorruptum, si postrema ultimi capituli commata excipias, quae, ut diximus, *deperdita* et ab alia manu suppleta esse, suspicari licet.

X. Iam Marci tempore Evangelia Matthaei et Lucae eadem eodem ordine disposita continebant, quae hodie in iis leguntur, nec inde, quod Marcus nonnulla omisit, consequitur, abfuisse ea primitus ab istis Evangelistis.

XI. Qui in concinnanda Evangeliorum harmonia operam suam collocare volunt, in ea conficienda ad Marcum ne provocent, caveant. Hic enim de ordine eventuum chronologico sollicitus plane non fuit, sed nulla temporis, quo quicque eveniret, ratione habita a Matthaeo transit ad Lucam, et vicissim. Hinc etiam patet, Apostolorum aetate necessarium neutiquam visum esse, ut in narrandis rebus a Domino gestis temporis ordo servetur. Atque inde porro suspicari licet, caeteris quoque Evangelistis propositum non fuisse, annales seu diurnos scribere commentarios.

XII. Marcus de Evangeliorum scopo et usu longe aliter quam plerique posteriorum seculorum theologi iudicavit. Ac si in animum induxisset, Matthaeum iusto illustrare commentario, nae is admodum dissimilis vulgaribus commentariis exstaturus fuisset. Lessingis sine dubio placuisset iisque omnibus, qui optimarum litterarum studiis ingenium suum acuere et perpolivere, et iustum tractandarum veterum historiarum modum longo usu didicerunt; harmoniarum auctoribus et moleste sedulis commentatoribus non item.

XIII. Qui Marcum scripsisse contendunt e theopneustia, satis exillem informem necesse est.

6

A DEMONSTRATION THAT MARK WAS WRITTEN AFTER MATTHEW AND LUKE

(A translation of J. J. Griesbach's *Commentatio qua Marci Evangelium totum e Matthaei et Lucae commentariis deceptum esse monstratur*)

Bernard Orchard

[*Translator's note:* This is the first rendering into the English language of a Latin text which holds many subtleties of argumentation, but every endeavour has been made to remain faithful to the thought of the original. The translator has however deemed it necessary to introduce a certain number of sub-headings and also occasionally to insert a word to avoid ambiguity; all these additions are indicated by enclosure in square brackets. J. B. O.]

*The Dissertation of J. J. Griesbach, Doctor of Theology and Principal Professor in the University of Jena, in which he demonstrates that the entire Gospel of Mark has been extracted from the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, written in the name of the University of Jena (1789-1790), now revised and furnished with many additions.*¹

[Introduction]

It is above all important to know the sources from which historical writers have drawn the things which they have put into their own commentaries, in order to interpret correctly their books, to evaluate justly the trustworthiness of the authors, and to perceive and judge skilfully the true nature of the events that they have recorded. Hence, on an earlier occasion,² we made a Dissertation about the sources from which the narratives of the Evangelists on Christ's Resurrection were derived. But at that time we were considering only that part of the Gospels which contains the account of Jesus' Resurrection, and we treated only Matthew, Luke and John in some detail, but with regard to Mark we gave our opinion only in passing and very briefly at that. Wherefore since the debate is particularly concerned with the question whence Mark drew his own material, and not merely with the sources of his resurrection account but also with those of the whole Gospel, and since many scholars, who have even very recently discussed it, seem almost to have neglected those arguments which in our

opinion are especially suited to settle the debate, we shall now apply ourselves to clearing up this matter.

The most ancient writers, starting with Papias, have handed down, almost unanimously, that Mark committed to writing what he had heard from Peter, whose interpreter they name him. Augustine was, as we know, the first to state that Mark followed Matthew as a sort of abbreviator and close imitator.³ From that time most scholars have been accustomed to hold both opinions, viz. that Mark derived his narrative partly from the Gospel of Matthew and partly from the mouth of Peter. But more recently some have shrewdly observed that the conformity of Mark with Luke is also so great that he [Mark] would seem to have had his [Luke's] Gospel at hand. On the other hand, however, Lardner⁴ has tried to show by many arguments that Mark had not read Matthew. To these arguments J. B. Koppe⁵ added more in the effort at least to prove that Mark was not the abbreviator of Matthew. By these clearly specious arguments, even Michaelis, previously a defender of the common view, was induced in the latest edition of his introduction to the N. T. books to reconsider this opinion and to deny that the book of Matthew was available to Mark when he wrote. And though the conformity between Matthew and Mark is so great (not only in content but also in words and phrases) that nobody can deny it, those who do deny that Mark used the Gospel of Matthew have gone to great pains to explain in various ways the origin and meaning of so great a harmony.

G. S. Storr⁶ has been at pains to construct an hypothesis diametrically opposed to the accepted one: that is, that Mark wrote his Gospel during the period mentioned in Acts 11: 17-30; that after him Luke prepared his own works, carefully consulting the volume of Mark; and finally that Matthew decided to write the 'memorials' of Jesus Christ and transferred many things from the Gospel of Mark into his own. Koppe thought that there had once existed many documents now lost on the subject of Jesus, longer or shorter, written in Hebrew and Greek, documents from which Matthew, Mark and Luke compiled their own books; and hence he thought it was easy to understand not only why Mark generally agrees with Matthew, but also why one occasionally disagrees with the other in words and sentences and order, and on the one hand, why Mark omits many things worthy of note which Matthew recounts, and why on the contrary he also has some things omitted by Matthew. Obviously where they narrate the same things in the same way, they are regarded as having utilized the same source; but where by reason of additions or omissions or a different version of the matter they disagree with one another, they prove that they have used different and more ancient books. Recently, J. G. Eichhorn⁷ has cleverly

developed, refined and endeavoured to confirm and commend this theory by means of a great number of new observations drawn from a comparison of the Gospels among themselves. Indeed, this learned scholar assumes that in the very earliest times there existed a primitive Gospel, written in Hebrew or Syro-Chaldee, which comprised most of the material common to our Evangelists. And so a probable conjecture can be made about its content and nature from the sections of our Gospels that are in agreement; that it was written in Hebrew and then in various ways translated more or less accurately into Greek by several people; that these versions of the Primeval Book were quite often transcribed⁸ and glossed throughout with many and various additions by various translators, copyists and readers, and that these glosses may have found their way into the Hebrew original before it was translated into Greek; moreover the additions found in many copies were conflated into one by those who were anxious to have a copy as far as possible absolutely complete.⁹

Copies of this sort, therefore, of three versions of the Primeval Script (versions that were not untouched but already mixed in various ways and interpolated with many additions and augmentations) had then come both into the hands of our three Evangelists,¹⁰ who made fresh additions from their own store - and into the hands too of other authors of similar books about the life of Christ.

This hypothesis of Eichhorn was principally constructed on these arguments: that Matthew did not use either Mark or Luke; that Mark did not use either Matthew or Luke; and that Luke did not use either Matthew or Mark. The reason for their agreement is therefore to be sought from some common source, from which they all drew; that many indications suggest that this source was Hebraic (these will be dealt with by us later); nevertheless our Gospels, though indeed in many verses they very often agree in the Greek wording, do not seem to have issued immediately from this Hebrew text;¹¹ and therefore, before our Gospels were written the Hebrew archetype had already been translated into Greek; but there must have been many versions in existence, because the Evangelists, even when narrating the same thing in the same order, still often use different phrases; nevertheless we are forced to conclude that both the Hebrew and the Greek exemplars were carefully augmented at a later date; we may gather this from the fact that the additions which were originally lacking in the Hebrew archetype, now uniformly turn up sometimes in Matthew and Mark, sometimes in Matthew and Luke, sometimes in Luke and Mark.¹²

Finally, omitting other views, an anonymous author¹³ tried to persuade us that the Gospel of the Hebrews was the first to be written; that the Gospels of the Nazarenes and that of the Ebionites were different and less

polished recensions of the former; that next appeared the Gospel used by Marcion and the Book of Mark; that then there followed the 'reminiscences of the apostles', praised by Justin Martyr, and the Gospel of Matthew; then the Gospel of Luke was published; it was not clear whether the Gospel of John was later than all these, or prior to some of them.

We cannot but wonder at such extensive disagreement of these scholars, since in our judgement it is abundantly clear merely from the close comparison of the three Gospels with one another what degree of relationship binds them together. Now in order to make this plain to the reader we shall in Section I expound our view distinctly, in Section II prove it by a few select arguments, in Section III answer objections that can be brought against it, and in Section IV point out corollaries to be derived from our hypothesis.

Section I

[The thesis that Mark knew canonical Matthew and Luke]

This is a summary of the opinion we are defending: That Mark when writing his book had in front of his eyes not only Matthew but Luke as well, and that he extracted from them whatever he committed to writing of the deeds, speeches and sayings of the Saviour, in such a manner however that—

- (1) he followed Matthew as his guide very closely and as a rule, but
- (2) nevertheless at times, forsaking Matthew, he took Luke as his companion;
- (3) where he stuck closely to Matthew, he nevertheless did not lose sight of Luke but matched him together with Matthew, and *vice versa*;
- (4) he sought brevity, as one who wanted to write a book of small compass; and therefore
- (5) he not only omitted things that did not pertain to the office of Teacher, which the Lord publicly exercised, i.e., Matt. 1 and 2; Luke 1 and 2, but (6) he also passed over several of the longer sermons of Christ,¹⁴ e.g., Matt. 5; 6; and 7; 10: 16-42; 11: 20-30; 12: 33-45; 13: 37-54; 18: 10-35; 20: 1-16; 22: 1-14; 23: 2-39; 24: 37-51; 25: 1-46; Luke 6: 17-49; 19: 11-28; and indeed Luke 10: 1-18; 14, where he has omitted almost an entire third part of Luke's Gospel, since it consists almost entirely of discourses of Christ. Thus in extracting from the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, he so acted that
- (7) he took into consideration his readers, namely, men far removed from Palestine, for whom the rules and regulations of Palestinian Jews, especially of the Pharisees, were hardly known nor indeed necessary to know; and for this reason, *partly*,
- (8) he cut out some things found in Matthew or Luke that concerned Jews

A Demonstration

alone, especially Palestinian ones, or which were suited to their way of thinking,¹⁵ e.g. Matt. 16: 2, 3; 19: 28; Luke 4: 16-30; 23: 28-32, and

- (9) is more sparing in quoting O. T. texts, e.g. Matt. 4: 14; 12: 17-21; 13: 14, 15, partly,
- (10) adds, for the sake of illustration, matters which he thinks either useful or necessary for better understanding the narrative, e.g. Mark 7: 3, 4, 8; 11: 13; 12: 42,
- (11) retains very often the same formulas, phrases and constructions which Matthew and Luke have used, and among them many somewhat unusual ones, e.g. Mark 2: 10 'he says to the paralytic'; 10: 22 'for he was in possession of much wealth'; 12: 14 'you do not worry about anybody, for you do not regard the face of men'; 13: 14 'the abomination of desolation'; and that parenthetic 'let the reader understand'; and often elsewhere;
- (12) nevertheless he in no wise copies their books word for word, but in *his own way*, i.e. he narrates what he has read in them, in other formulas and phrases,
- (13) he expresses not infrequently by paraphrase and expounds more plainly and distinctly what they had handed down to him in a briefer form, though in other respects he was moved by the desire for brevity in selecting the actions and discourses of Christ that he wanted, it seems, to transplant into his own work; and clearly passed over in silence, as it seems to us, many noble passages of each Gospel (note paraphrases, for example, at Mark 6: 17-29, 30, 31; 9: 14-29, 38-50; 11: 11-26),
- (14) he adds to the stories of Matthew and Luke many special details, which he thought would please his readers, such as Mark 2: 14 'the son of Alphaeus'; 5: 42 'for she was twelve years old'; 6: 3 'the carpenter'; 6: 13 'they anointed the sick with oil'; 10: 46 'Bartimaeus son of Timaeus'; 13: 3 'Peter and James and John and Andrew'; 14: 51, 52 'and a certain young man followed him etc.'; 15: 21 'father of Alexander and Rufus'; 15: 40 and 16: 1 'and Salome'; and countless others of a similar sort;
- (15) finally, he adds some little stories, omitted by Matthew and Luke, very few and very brief (to be enumerated later), which were added by him for reasons the attentive reader can easily conjecture, provided he will go to the trouble of comparing them together.

Section II

[Three arguments for Mark's use of Matthew and Luke]

In order to confirm and justify this opinion of ours, we do not want to repeat the statements made by others who agree with us that Matthew has been used by Mark, nor shall we heap up many arguments, but we hope to carry our point with *three* observations.

The first observation

[*The argument from order*]

Mark compiled his whole work (apart from about twenty-four verses which he added from his own sources, of which we shall speak later) from the works of Matthew and Luke in such a manner that

- (A) it can be easily shown what he took from the one and what he took from the other;
- (B) he retained the order observed by Matthew in such a way, that whatever he forsakes it he sticks to the path of Luke and follows him and the order of his narrative step by step, to such an extent that
- (C) the verses and words where he passes from Matthew to Luke or returns from Luke to Matthew can not only be pointed out, but also the probable reason can generally be given why at a given time he deserted Matthew (though he had set himself to use him as his chief guide) and attached himself to Luke, and why putting away Luke he once more attached himself to Matthew; and further
- (E) it can also be understood why, precisely in *this* passage of Matthew and not in another, he again connects up the thread which he had previously broken by passing over to Luke.

Briefly, you can see, as with your own eyes, Mark having the volumes of Matthew and Luke at hand, continually consulting each, extracting from each whatever he thought would most benefit his readers, now laying aside Matthew, now Luke for a little, but always returning to the very same place of either one where he had begun to diverge from him. In order to show this more clearly, we shall show the whole thing for inspection in a table, which we will illustrate with some notes.

Matthew	Mark	Luke
(Chapters 1 and 2) ¹⁶	—	
3: 1 - 4: 22 ¹⁷	1: 1-20	
	1: 21-39	4: 31-44 ¹⁸

Matthew	Mark	Luke
	—	(5: 1-11) ¹⁹
12: 15, 16 ²⁰	1: 40 - 3: 6	5: 12 - 6: 11
(12: 17-21)	3: 7-12	
	—	6: 12-16 ²¹
12: 22, 23	3: 13-19	
12: 24-32 ²²	3: 20, 21	
(12: 33-7) ²³	3: 22-30	
(12: 38-45) ²⁴	—	
12: 46-50	—	
13: 1-23	3: 31-5	8: 16-18
	4: 1-20	
(13: 24-30) ²⁶	4: 21-5 ²⁵	
13: 31, 32	4: 26-9	
13: 34, 35 ²⁷	4: 30-2	
	4: 33, 34	
	—	(8: 19-21) ²⁸
13: 53-8 ³⁰	4: 35-41	8: 22-5
	5: 1-43 ²⁹	8: 26-56
	6: 1-6	
14: 1-2	6: 7-13	9: 1-6
14: 3-12	6: 14-16	9: 7-9
	6: 17-29	
14: 13-21	6: 30, 31	9: 10
14: 22 - 16: 12	6: 32-44	9: 11-17
	6: 45 - 8: 21	
	8: 22-6 ³¹	
16: 13 - 18: 9	8: 27 - 9: 50 ³²	9: 18-51
(18: 10-35) ³³	—	(9: 51 - 18: 14) ³⁴
	—	
19: 1-12	10: 1-12	
19: 13 - 23: 1	10: 13 - 12: 38 ³⁵	18: 15 - 20: 45
(23: 1-39) ³⁶	—	
	—	20: 45 - 21: 4 ³⁷
24: 1-36	12: 38-44	21: 5ff.
(24: 37 - 25: 46)	13: 1-32	
26: 1 - 28: 8	13: 33-6 ³⁸	
	14: 1 - 16: 8	
	16: 9 ³⁹	
(28: 9-15) ⁴⁰	—	
(28: 16-17) ⁴¹	—	

Matthew	Mark	Luke
	16: 10-13	24: 10-35
	16: 14	24: 36-43
28: 18-20	16: 15-18	
	16: 19	24: 50, 51
	16: 20	

We have now set out our theory without [depending upon] the support of numerous hypotheses devised in a highly artificial manner. And accordingly we think that we have now done what we set out to do, namely, to have clearly shown exactly why Mark has related these particular things in his book and why he has omitted others; and we have also given clear reasons why everything - without excepting a single verse - is positioned in the very place in which we read it in Mark.⁴²

But the same result can be confirmed and proved by yet another process of reasoning. We proceed therefore to our second observation.

The second observation

[*The argument from Mark being contained in Matthew and Luke*]

In the enormous number of memorable deeds performed by Jesus Christ, and in the incredible variety of the discourses given daily by the Lord, whether to the people or to his disciples and intimate circle, it surely did not happen by chance that Mark had literally nothing to put down in writing except what Matthew and Luke had recorded in a similar form or what one or the other had given him at least the occasion of noting down.

Luke and John handed on a number of things which Matthew had not touched at all, and the Evangelists themselves in several places hint that in their books they have passed over many wonderful and illustrious deeds of Christ and omitted numerous discourses of his which the brevity of the Gospels would not allow. How then did it happen that out of the enormous quantity of these omissions Mark in fact does not relate at least a few of them, but obviously relates the same items that Matthew and Luke took from the same ample source? Mark, I insist, was able to learn many things that could not have been known to everyone, because his mother lived in a house in Jerusalem, in which the apostles and other Christians used to hold their meetings (Acts 12: 12); moreover he had at one time been the servant and companion of both Peter and Paul and had without doubt learnt from them and their intimate friends many deeds and sayings of the Lord well worth relating; and lastly, it was Mark too who enriched the narratives of Matthew and Luke with so many special details (see above

Section I (13) and (14)), so that it was clear to all that he knew the story of Christ very well and could have told us a great many more anecdotes about him, if he had wished. Why is it then, I ask, that this same Mark added nothing new (except those details) to the books written by Matthew and Luke? If indeed you agree with us that Mark's purpose was to select from the Gospels of Matthew and Luke the items most useful for his intended readers, and to narrate them in the manner appropriate to them; then everything is clear and simple. If on the contrary you hold that Mark wrote without the aid of anyone and solely by his own efforts, it is almost a miracle that, in selecting the matter for his book from the enormous mass of material, he took over for treatment by himself the very same things that Matthew and Luke had treated. Finally, should you contend that he had other guides (or more guides) than these two Evangelists already mentioned, we should like to know how it happened that these persons suggested to him nothing other than what he could equally well have borrowed from Matthew and Luke, excepting only about twenty-four verses. *Nothing, I say, except twenty-four verses.*

For we cannot here add to this list either mere paraphrastic amplifications of items found in Matthew and Luke or some additional items consisting of a few words, such as we have pointed out in Section I (10), (13), and (14). Wherefore, it would be a waste of time for anyone who wished to attack our thesis, to appeal to Mark 1: 2, 33; 2: 2, 3, 4, 27,⁴³ 3: 20, 21,⁴⁴ 10: 10, 11, 12; 12: 32, 33, 34 and other similar passages. There are only *three short stories* of miracles wrought by Christ, 3: 7-12; 7: 32-7; 8: 22-6, and *two parables*, 4: 26-9, 13: 33-6, which can perhaps be seen to be so special to Mark as to appear to be real objections.

With respect to these parables [Seed Growing Secretly, Mark 4: 26-9, and the Householder on a Journey, Mark 13: 33-6], we have already shown⁴⁵ that both have been substituted for longer parables with similar content which are found in Matthew in the same context of the discourse, and we thus saw the reason why Mark considered his own parables preferable to Matthew's. So far, therefore, are we from being able to argue from these parables that Mark did not use anyone for a guide (or used someone other than Matthew), that on the contrary it is clear that Mark has accepted from Matthew the opportunity of interposing these parables.

Almost the same reasoning applies to Mark 3: 7-12. For Mark writes: (3: 7) 'And Jesus withdrew with his disciples to the sea, and a great multitude from Galilee followed... (3: 10) for he healed many... (3: 12) and he strictly ordered them not to make him known.' While Matthew (12: 15-16) has: 'Jesus, aware of this, withdrew from there. And many followed him, and he healed them all, and ordered them not to make him known.'

Who then does not see that Mark paraphrases the text of Matthew, and only amplifies the latter's story with some additional details. For it is clear from the table given above and an earlier note,⁴⁶ that Mark had this very passage of Matthew in front of his eyes while he was writing. Therefore this passage, far from weakening our view, gives it strong support.

The same applies to the other unit, Mark 7: 32-7; for again Matthew gave him the opportunity of inserting it in this place. That is to say, Matthew (15: 30, 31) relates that many sick were healed by Christ; but Mark describes with greater care the healing of one man out of this crowd, adding some details which seemed to him especially worth noting. Matthew (15: 30-1): 'And great crowds came to him, bringing with them... the dumb... and they cast them at Jesus' feet, and he healed them, so that the crowds wondered, when they saw the dumb speaking... and they glorified the God of Israel.' Mark (7: 32, 35, 37): 'And they bring to him a deaf-mute: and they beg him to lay his hand upon him... (verse 35) and immediately his ears were opened... (verse 37) And they were astonished beyond measure, saying, "He has done all things well."'

Thus there remains *only* the third little story, Mark 8: 22-6. We concede that this has been added by Mark, nor do we find anything in Matthew or Luke which can explain why this addition is found in this place. As it is, if we compare this unit more carefully with the two we have just been discussing, we discover a surprising agreement between them. Thus, by a likely conjecture, we ascertain not only the reason why this cure of a certain blind man seemed so important to Mark that, in narrating it, he departed from the rule he had made for himself, a rule that he kept consistently but for this single exception; but we are also able to understand why he thought that these two other instances already given (Matt. 12: 15, 16 and 15: 30, 31) ought to be illustrated by a fuller account of the surrounding circumstances. For it is common to these three units that Jesus wished to remain out of the public eye and that he forbade those he had healed to reveal what he had done. So in Mark 3: 12 we read: 'he rebuked the [demons] that they should not make him manifest', and in Mark 7: 33, 36: 'and taking him [the deaf mute] away from the crowd privately... and he ordered them to tell nobody.' Finally in Mark 8: 23, 26: 'And he led the [blind] man out of the village... saying, "Do not go into the village, and do not tell anyone in the village."'

To these three Marcan passages we add two more, notable for an addition of almost the same sort. Mark 7: 24 takes from Matthew that Jesus went into the district of Tyre and Sidon and *adds*: 'He did not want anybody to know, and he could not be hidden.' And in Mark 9: 30, again

following Matthew, he relates that Christ made a journey through Galilee, and likewise *adds*: 'And he did not want anyone to know.' Therefore it is clear that *everywhere* else Mark follows either Matthew or Luke step by step nor does he add in anything of his own (apart from a certain number of details), *except* perhaps when he found in Matthew or Luke a short anecdote, which taught that Jesus did not seek popular acclaim, but often withdrew from the people and sometimes even hid himself carefully lest his deeds should give him away to the multitude; and that he had not been guided by a desire for vain glory, and that he had not worked miracles for the purpose of presenting a spectacle to a gaping and idle people. Mark has the habit of emphasizing more fully such details of the history of Jesus, and he takes care to supply them wherever he notes that Matthew and Luke have omitted something of this kind. But it is not clear why he considered this kind of story to be more important than all others and why it would be specially useful for his intended readers. Perhaps one might be able to conjecture with some probability, that teachers of those regions, possessing the gift of healing (I Cor. 12: 9), had sometimes abused it almost in the same way that we know some Corinthians used 'tongues' without discretion. Perhaps Mark wished to correct them, by putting forward the Lord's example.

The third observation

[The argument from Mark's alternating agreement with Matthew and Luke]

When Mark has closely adhered to either Matthew or Luke for a long stretch, he often passes with a sudden leap from one to the other, but soon returns to his former guide; and this could not have been done unless he had simultaneously seen and compared the works of each. Thus Mark 3: 1-5 is taken from Luke; Mark 3: 6, however, which pertains to the same story, is from Matthew.

Moreover in Mark 5: 25, 26, 27 he uses Luke as his guide; in verse 28, he uses Matthew; and again uses Luke in verses 29 and following.

Again, Mark 8: 37 has been culled from Matthew and is absent from Luke; verse 38 is owed to Luke and is missing in Matthew; Mark 9: 2 ('after six days') is again derived from Matthew.

Again, Mark 10: 22, 26, 27 imitates Matthew; in verses 28, 29a he agrees with Luke and omits material proper to Matthew; but in verse 29b he transcribes a sentence from Matthew that he alone has.

Finally, in Mark 13: 24, 25 he adheres strictly to Matthew; in verse 26 he omits what is peculiar to Matthew and follows Luke; but in verses 27-32 he agrees with Matthew almost word for word. Enough said!

Section III

[Objections to the thesis with replies]

[Introduction]

Having now explained, and as we hope, sufficiently proved our thesis, we turn to examine the objections which scholars have either brought forward publicly to overthrow it or which they perhaps could bring forward. There is no good reason why we should attempt to refute the arguments of those scholars who have tried to show that Mark is not the epitomizer of Matthew. For though we freely grant that Mark has passed over many things that Matthew has, and we ourselves maintain that he has aimed at brevity in writing his book, yet so far are we from thinking (as Augustine does) that he was the abbreviator of Matthew that we may rather assert that he has amplified, with greater abundance of detail and even at times with circumlocutions, much material taken from the Gospel of Luke, material spaced between the narrative of Matthew, and also a good deal that he has transferred from Matthew into his own treatise. Nor do we fear the arguments launched against our hypothesis, because the order of Mark very often forsakes the order of Matthew and Luke, arguments recently used by Eichhorn.⁴⁷ For we have amply explained the reasons for Mark's order in Section II. But the other objections, besides these, which have been put forward, we must deal with here.

[Specific objections and replies]

(1) [Historical objections]

[Objection:] 'If Mark owes almost everything to Matthew and Luke, it is untrue that he wrote "as Peter dictated to him", since almost nothing is left of the material which Peter might have supplied. But on the contrary the historical arguments used by those who maintain that Mark took Peter as his guide have not yet been disproved and this ancient testimony is rejected simply because it disagrees with the hypothesis put forward without any necessity or evidence, solely from the comparison of the book of Mark with Matthew and Luke.'⁴⁸

[Reply:] Our answer is: (a) Whether our hypothesis, built up on the comparison of the three Gospels, lacks proof and compelling force, is a matter we gladly leave to the judgement of those who are not blinded by prejudice. For the scholars who, prior to us, had publicly propounded with regard to the Gospel of Mark other hypotheses which collapsed of their own accord when ours was put forward, though they are exceedingly clever and estimable persons, hardly seem to be unbiased judges.

(b) We candidly confess that this very ancient testimony about Mark

producing his Gospel under the patronage of Peter is attributed by us to those fabrications of which many instances are found among ancient writers, and which are today rejected by most scholars.⁴⁹

For, (c) the first to relate that Mark wrote under the guidance of Peter was Papias, universally recognized as a man of very little authority in historical matters. Irenaeus, as usual, followed him; others repeated his account.

(d) From the words of Papias (Euseb. *H.E.* III. 39) it appears that either he or John the presbyter (whom he quotes as a witness of his account) had been guided by two factors to this conjecture about Peter. First, there was the question of how Mark, who had never followed the Lord during his life on earth, had come to know about the actions and words of Christ. Papias replies that he had been the disciple and interpreter of Peter; and that Peter, throughout his discourses, which Mark would have heard, had recalled matters pertaining to the history of Jesus. Next, there was a doubt about why the actions and discourses of the Lord were read in Mark in an order different from the other books. Papias, trying to excuse Mark, declares that in his discourses Peter did not narrate the story of the Lord in accurate order, but as occasion required; and that Mark wrote them down just as he had heard them from Peter and as he now remembered them when writing them down. The purpose that Papias' fabrication was meant to serve is clear enough. But for this very reason it is rightly suspect for us.

(e) The conjecture of Papias is in itself exceedingly improbable. For who can be persuaded that Peter related in his discourses little stories about Christ such as we read in Mark (see 4: 35, 36; 5: 1, 18, 21; 10: 46-52; 11: 4, 11-22), that is to say, ones with most minute details? Or who would believe that Peter never related to his audience anything more about the resurrection of the Lord than what is found in Mark? This indeed we have to believe, if Papias is to be trusted. For he is our sole witness that Mark's purpose was *not to omit anything he had heard* (from Peter), and not to include anything untrue in his narratives.

(f) According to Papias, Mark had gathered the material he used for constructing his Gospel from the discourses of Peter, but Peter was not at hand when he wrote and did not offer his help. Papias therefore convicts of falsehood those who argue that Mark wrote at Peter's dictation.

(g) In this instance he (Papias) has the support of Irenaeus, who (*De Haeres.* III. 1) only has this to say: 'After the *exodos* [death] of Peter and Paul, Mark the disciple and interpreter of Peter also handed down to us in writing *what Peter had preached*.' But in the same passage Irenaeus himself makes an almost identical statement about Luke: 'Luke, the follower of Paul, wrote in a book *the Gospel preached by the latter*.' Subsequently,

almost all agree that this is false and inconsistent.⁵⁰ Why therefore should we allow ourselves to be persuaded by the earlier statement of Irenaeus?

(h) Tertullian (*Adv. Marcion* IV, 5) likewise recorded each story. He says: 'The Gospel produced by Mark is said to be Peter's, whose interpreter Mark was; while the Gospel of Luke is customarily ascribed to Paul.' What the disciples published seems to be attributed to their teachers. Who can not see that these assertions rely not on clear witnesses and reliable documents, but on vague rumours and arguments with little foundation? Since what the disciples publish can be attributed to the teachers, therefore the Gospel of Mark was customarily attributed to Peter and the book of Luke to Paul, evidently to make sure that the commentaries of Mark and Luke would not seem to lack apostolic authority.

(i) Justin Martyr (*Dial. Tryph.* § 106) quotes from 'the reminiscences of Peter', that Jesus imposed the surname 'Boanerges, that is Sons of Thunder', on the sons of Zebedee; and since this is found only in Mark 3: 17, Justin seems to ascribe this book to Peter. But in the first place, the authority of Justin in purely historical matters amounts to nothing. Secondly, it is not clear what and how much he has taken from our Gospels. At least he never used Mark elsewhere, nor did he elsewhere ever record 'the reminiscences of Peter' but either quoted simply 'the reminiscences' or 'the reminiscences of the apostles'; it would therefore be strange if in this one passage he had spoken of the 'reminiscences of Peter' as though they were a separate thing from 'the reminiscences of the apostles'. Moreover the passage is too obscure for us to draw anything certain from it. 'His reminiscences' could be 'the reminiscences of Christ'. Or instead of 'his', one could read 'their', i.e. 'of the apostles', as Justin usually writes elsewhere. Finally, even if one went so far as to concede that the Gospel of Mark is indicated in this passage and that 'the reminiscences of Peter' are intended, a doubt still remains over why they are said to be Peter's. Indeed that vague and unsubstantiated rumour about Mark being Peter's interpreter could have reached the ears of Justin as it did others; but the book, which this apostle was believed to have commended to several Churches, could also be quoted under the name of Peter, seeing that what are elsewhere referred to as 'the reminiscences of the apostles' could be named 'the reminiscences of Peter', because in this very place Peter is named *first* among the apostles. However it may be, Justin is not the man to give us more reliable and truthful information about the Gospel of Mark.

(k) Clement of Alexandria repeats the accounts of the others, elaborated with new details. For he related (*Eus. H. E.* II, 15, and VI, 14) that 'Mark, as one who had long followed Peter and remembered the words of his

teacher, had been asked by the Romans, to put into writing the teaching which the apostle had publicly expounded to them,⁵¹ and that the Romans did not desist until by their entreaties they had persuaded Mark to write his Gospel; that Peter, being informed of this by a special revelation of the Spirit, was delighted by the keen enthusiasm of the Romans, and approved the book on his own authority for reading in the churches.⁵² But Clement is not quite consistent with himself. For according to *H. E.* II, 15, he relates that Peter was pleased with 'the desire' of the Romans and approved the Gospel of Mark; but on the other hand, according to *H. E.* VI, 14, he says that the apostle did not restrain the disciple from his purpose, nor did he urge him to carry it out.

(l) The writers whom we have considered so far maintain that Mark has taken the subject-matter of his book from the discourses that Peter had given in public. But Origen (*Eus. H. E.*, VI, 25) claims that he learnt from tradition that the Gospel second in order was written by Mark (whom the apostle in I Pet. 5: 12 calls his son) 'as Peter dictated to him'.

(m) Finally all these short narratives have been capped by those who, like the author of the Synopsis of Holy Scripture, related of our Gospel 'that it was publicly proclaimed by Peter in Rome, published by Mark, and proclaimed by him at Alexandria'!

(n) When you compare all these things with one another, it is clear indeed that even the more ancient and simple accounts of Papias, Irenaeus and Tertullian must be reckoned as mere conjectures. We have pointed out in many places already (see (d) and (h)) the reason for their being composed. Besides, the title 'interpreter of Peter' with which Mark is endowed by Papias, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Jerome and others, gave an opportunity for fashioning various falsehoods. Originally indeed, unless we are mistaken, the title only indicated that Mark had been Peter's companion, servant, assistant (*ὑπηρετῆς* Acts 13: 5), go-between, whom he had used, when required, to carry out his orders.⁵³ But others subsequently understood it in a different way; namely, that if Peter wanted to speak with Greeks or write to them, as he was not sufficiently versed in the language itself, he used Mark as his interpreter. And so others inferred from this that Mark had also been Peter's interpreter when he wrote his Gospel. Thus Jerome (*Letter to Hedibia*, chapter 2) writes,

'Paul was unable to explain the majesty of the divine meaning in discourse worthy of Greek eloquence. He therefore got Titus to be his interpreter, just as the blessed Peter had got Mark, whose Gospel was composed by Peter narrating and Mark writing. And further, the two epistles attributed to Peter also disagree with each other in style and character; from which we assume that he used different interpreters

according to circumstances.'

(c) We do not wish to weary our readers by weighing the internal evidence drawn from Mark's Gospel, evidence by which scholars thought that the ancient tradition about Peter could be confirmed. For if some facts pertaining to Peter occur in Mark but not in Matthew or Luke, they assert that these have resulted from Peter's dictation. On the other hand, if some matters of this kind are found in the other Gospels but not in Mark, they think this omission must be attributed to the modesty of Peter. But in our judgement all these things are to be regarded as wishful thinking, and are of no value in proving the point for which they are alleged.

(2) [*Is Mark's Gospel unnecessary on this hypothesis?*]

[Objection:] 'There seems to be no reason for Mark to write a new account of the deeds of Christ, if, apart from the slim total of twenty-four verses, he has simply copied the Gospels of Matthew and Luke.'⁵⁴

[Reply:] We reply: (a) Undoubtedly the reason was based on the need or desire of some Christians who had known Mark more intimately than Matthew or Luke. He wished to serve the requirements of these people, as the other Gospels had tried to benefit the Christians of other regions.

(b) Neither of the previous Evangelists had covered all the matters which Mark considered to be useful for his readers. Hence, he selected from both the things that he thought most suitable for his friends.

(c) The Gospels of both the other Evangelists contained many things which had been written for another audience and which Mark therefore considered to be unnecessary for his own friends. By omitting them Mark presented his friends with a much shorter outline of the Lord's actions, and consequently one realizable by correspondingly less effort and expense than by the Gospels of Matthew and Luke bound together in one volume.

(3) [*If Mark were totally dependent on Matthew and Luke, it could never have acquired full Gospel status.*]

[Objection:] 'It suited the nature of the times and the ardent zeal of the new Christians, in learning about the origin of their religion, to possess the richest and fullest accounts possible of the life of Jesus; and it was fitting that fragmentary accounts of his deeds, which had been narrated by various persons and were being circulated everywhere in written form, should be collected together; and it was fitting that such collections should be gathered into a single corpus and that this corpus itself should be increased and enriched by new stories as they came to hand and were deemed to be true. But it was not fitting that the assembled information, which had thus been collected by the apostle, should again be cut up and that an abridgement

of a book, instead of the book itself, should be handed over and intrusted not just to individual Christians but to some universal Church.'⁵⁵

[Reply:] We reply: (a) Such forms of reasoning will have little effect on those who are aware how ambiguous it is to judge what is fitting for a given age, place, or person. Why? Because we do not know whether Mark destined his book for individual Christians or for some universal Church, and we are still more ignorant of which church he handed it over to. For any pronouncements of the ancients on this matter are mere conjectures and unreliable traditions. Who therefore has dared to define what would have been fitting for a situation unknown to us of some unknown church and what would not? Mark could judge this accurately; but we cannot.

(b) It is wrong to assert that Mark should not have omitted anything about the history of Jesus that he himself knew, but that he himself would have been under an obligation to have filled up the narratives of others with new material. Certainly he did not produce even a single word on the nativity of Jesus, although it would have been impossible for him not to have known some details at least about this matter, since he had lived both in Jerusalem in his mother's house and then elsewhere in the company of Peter and Paul with so many acquaintances of the Lord. But he passed over in silence many things of this sort, things which could not have escaped him even if he had never by any chance read Matthew or Luke.

(4) [*Need the shorter Gospel be earlier than the longer?*]

[Objection:] 'It is more likely that the shorter Gospel was chronologically earlier; but the longer ones, in which the Evangelists supplied and amplified matters that had been either omitted or else related too concisely in the former, were composed at a later date.'

[Reply:] We reply: It depends entirely on the intention of the author whether it is preferable to add to, or to subtract from, what others wrote before him.

(5) [*Is the use of Mark by Matthew and Luke easier to account for?*]

[Objection:] 'If Mark - this is the opinion of Storr - wrote first and was both read and used by Matthew and Luke, it is very easy to account for those things which cannot but seem surprising to someone carefully comparing the three Gospels with one another, and which have given rise to so many hypotheses about the Gospel of Mark. For Matthew and Luke (a) often use the same words as Mark, because they had his book before their eyes; (b) varied the phraseology here and there and narrated much material, each one in his own individual way (i.e. differently from Mark); because their plan was to create, not a fuller edition of Mark, but new commentaries

on matters pertaining to the life of Christ; (c) very frequently, it is true, they recorded the very same things that Mark had written; nevertheless, as one would rightly expect in view of the limitless amount of unrecorded material, they also added much that was new (each one something different from his own source), in order not to repeat what had been done before.⁵⁶

[Reply:] We reply: Many things seem to oppose this hypothesis, which assumes that Matthew and Luke used the Gospel of Mark; but we shall only deal with those that closely concern the justification of our hypothesis, and which on account of our previous discussion can be understood without any difficulty and which do not require a lengthy explanation.

Now (a) it is inconceivable that Matthew, an eyewitness, chose as his guide for handing on the story of Christ a writer who had not been present at the events themselves.

(b) Mark surpasses Matthew in the clear and definite exposition of events; indeed he is sometimes more accurate (as we shall later show by examples) and comes closer to the truth of the events. Why therefore has Matthew receded from him in these passages, if he usually follows him closely elsewhere?

(c) Mark contains not only many details of events but also some complete short stories, that have been omitted either by Matthew or Luke or by both. Why have these two personages rejected them, if they did not refrain from turning the rest to their own uses?

Storr indeed considers⁵⁷ 'that in order to make room for new additions Matthew and Luke took pains in many places to cut down and abbreviate the story of Mark, especially since they were adding from their own sources stories similar to those left out'. But indeed in neither Matthew's nor Luke's Gospel does such a love of brevity betray itself as might have been able to deter these writers from retaining those details of Mark, which would have added little bulk to their books had they preserved them together with other matters. And moreover we are permitted to wonder why it is that each has omitted, or at least abbreviated, short stories on no less than five occasions (as we have noted above), from which we learn that Jesus did not want to make known his amazing deeds. No good reason exists why these [details] should be so carefully pruned on so many occasions; and so it is far more likely that these things were added by Mark for good reasons to the narratives of Matthew and Luke than rashly pruned by the latter.

(d) As Storr himself admits, Matthew, not esteeming chronological order, often arranged the materials he wished to hand on to posterity so as to connect them up with one another in a certain relationship. If he were the first to write the story of Christ, such a method could have been quite satisfactory for him. But if he had been guided by Mark, for whom this

more complicated arrangement was foreign, there was hardly any reason why he should bother to create a new order unless he wanted to reduce everything more diligently according to the laws of time; and this certainly was not his purpose.

(e) We have previously observed the order in which Mark's stories follow one another, as well as his sudden and frequent transitions from Matthew to Luke and *vice versa*. These factors fully indicate that Mark wrote after Matthew and Luke and that he had studied both their books. On our hypothesis, it is entirely clear why Mark ceased to follow Matthew at Matt. 5: 1, Luke at Luke 6: 20, and Matthew again at Matt. 13: 36; and equally clear why Mark passed from Matt. 4: 22 to Luke 4: 31, from Luke 6: 11 to Matt. 12: 15; and from Matt. 13: 35 to Luke 8: 22. But if you say that Matthew and Luke used Mark, it remains obscure why Matthew for example partly omitted Mark 1: 21 - 3: 6 and partly transferred it to another sequence. But we do not want to repeat matters which can be found above in Section II. For we are not trying to overthrow the hypotheses of others, but to establish our own and overcome objections to it.

(6) [Why not a common source or archetype?]

[Objection:] 'Not only in Matthew but also in Mark and Luke there are many indications suggesting that these three books have all emerged from one source, namely a *Hebrew* and not a Greek one. For there exist in our Gospels some discrepancies in the narratives, arising from errors due to the ambiguity of Hebrew words or the interchange of sounds in Hebrew speech that are similar and easily confused. Besides, the whole nature of each Evangelist's narration in pericopes common to two or three has clearly been constructed so that each version is related to other versions of the same archetype. Hence a comparison of the three Evangelists together reveals for example on almost every page words, phrases and speech-structures which in spite of diversity mean the same and correspond to one and the same formula of Hebrew speech. The only likely explanation of this phenomenon is that the three Evangelists have used the same Hebrew archetype, which each in his own way has turned into Greek speech, and into which, at various junctures, each has scattered some material from his own store. Granted this, all difficulties vanish. But on the other hand, if you hold that the work of one Evangelist has been used and copied in detail by another, you will have to concede, *either* that later Evangelists deliberately wanted to conceal the source they had used and therefore substituted similar phrases for those which the earlier writer had used - a thing incompatible with the simplicity and integrity of these authors - *or* that they altered the phrases in a puerile fashion, which

hardly seems worthy of a responsible person.⁵⁸

[Reply:] To which we reply: (a) We know of no certain instance from which it can be proved that the translators have gone astray in converting the Hebrew archetype into Greek; but all the alleged instances can be explained without this hypothesis and freed from the supposed difficulty. We would demonstrate this by taking each instance in turn, if the limits of this essay would permit. Let it suffice to point out that many learned scholars have thought they saw various errors of the Greek translator in the Epistle to the Hebrews. But it is now generally agreed that these suspicions are groundless and that the Epistle was written by the author in Greek.

(b) Most of the examples of error mentioned, at least the more important ones, have been drawn from Matthew. Those selected from Mark and Luke are both fewer and less significant. But without damaging our hypothesis, we could grant that Matthew wrote in Hebrew. What then prevents Mark from having read the Hebrew work of Matthew and the Greek of Luke, and converted them for his own use? And if perchance you wish to take account of the frequent agreement between our Matthew and Mark even in the Greek text, you are entitled to hold that both the Hebrew archetype of Matthew and the Greek version of the same were available to Mark and that he consulted now the one, now the other and now both, in addition to the work of Luke. We would clearly prefer (unless there appeared some other way of freeing ourselves from these complexities) to add our own condemnation of this conjecture, which is entirely artificial and to be regarded as a repugnant hypothesis (both for chronological reasons and for the reasons given in Section II), because it proposes several archetypal recensions, each of them variously mixed up together, not to mention several Greek versions of them.

(c) From the permutations of parallel phrases and grammatical structure occurring in the three Gospels, nothing can be adduced against our hypothesis. We freely grant that the Evangelists neither wished to camouflage the source from which they drew, nor attempted to vary the phraseology in a puerile fashion; but we would not throw our hypothesis away willingly, should one or the other have necessarily to be conceded. However, we are not bound to admit either of them, because as the logicians would say, *there is a third way*. Who does not know that a writer can repeat in *his own way* and in *his own words* what he reads in another writer? And who is so strict and so lacking in human insight as to accuse such an author of deliberate dissimulation or to assert that he has indulged in a childish game of wordplay, unless there are other grounds for suspicion? For historians, when drawing material from the writings of others as if it were from the sources of their own narratives, do not make it a rule to

bind themselves rigidly to the same words and formulas which they note the others have used. And so, in the same way, Mark too could surely have consulted the writings of Matthew and Luke without being obliged to copy out their narratives *word for word*. Undoubtedly, after reading any given pericope of Matthew or Luke or of both, he set about writing and recorded what he had read in them, just as he retained it in his memory. Wherever he remembered the actual words of Matthew and Luke, he retained them out, was he at pains to vary the phraseology; but where he had cut them out, he substituted others in their place. Sometimes, while he was writing, he may have taken perhaps a further look at the writings of Matthew and Luke; nevertheless, he need not always have thought this necessary, because his aim was to compose with their guidance a *new* narrative adapted to the needs of his own readers, and not to copy their books nor make a summary of them. This being so, it is understandable why some diversity may have arisen not only in words and phrases but also in the entire shaping of certain stories, e.g. Mark 7: 6-13, cf. Matt. 15: 3-9; 19: 3-8. Every now and then indeed, Mark seems to have changed something deliberately; but generally discrepancies of this sort are due to chance.

(7) [The omissions of Mark]

[Objection:] 'Mark has omitted many important and notable matters, which have been retained by either Matthew or Luke. But who would have neglected such important actions of Christ and the most useful and appealing discourses of the Lord, all put into writing by Matthew and Luke, if, as he wrote, he had had the benefit of these Gospels before his very eyes, and had actually copied a great deal from them including even things of lesser importance? Who could have so frequently passed over in silence certain details about matters he himself had narrated, details recorded by Matthew and Luke, and adding not a little light to what he himself had related - how, I ask, could he have disdained them if he had had the books of those two personages in his possession? You will scarcely be able to excuse such omissions as these, which make the narrative awkward and imperfect, unless you argue that no Evangelist had the work of the others at hand or claim that Mark was finished before the others. At least, as Storr would conclude, it is much easier to understand why Matthew and Luke narrated so many things not found in Mark, if Mark wrote earlier, than if Mark had Matthew and Luke at hand. For later writers are bound to augment and amplify the work of an earlier writer in order to justify writing at all.'⁵⁹

[Reply:] We reply as follows: From what we have pointed out above in Section I (4), (5), (6), (8), (9) and in the notes thereto, and especially in note 1.5, we trust that it is clear enough that most of the things omitted by

Mark were left out on purpose. Besides there could not fail to be absent from Mark's book material which is found either in those passages of Matthew which Mark passed over when using Luke, or in those chapters of Luke which he had hardly consulted when following Matthew. See for example the passages cited in note 22. However it can easily happen in practice that the real reasons why Mark has omitted some things escape us, since we know so little about the author of the book, about the readers for whom he wrote and about their circumstances; and since we are able to arrive at very few conclusions when conjecturing the purpose of the writer.⁶⁰ On any fair judgement of the evidence one must admit that our hypothesis would remain unshaken, even if Mark had left out even more. However, some scholars think that so much weight is to be attached to certain omissions that, in their judgement, we would be failing to attribute as much importance to them as is right and proper, if we were to pass them over in silence and fail to explain why they are not strong enough to overthrow our thesis. From the cases we shall now consider, it will be possible to judge the remainder.

(a)

[Objection:] 'Mark omitted the dialogue of Jesus with John about his being baptized by him (Matt. 3: 14, 15), although Mark agrees with Matthew in what goes before and after.'

[Reply:] Two things are contained in these verses: first, that John acknowledged that he and his baptism were inferior to the person and baptism of the Lord; secondly, that Jesus willed to be baptized by John, because 'it was fitting to fulfil all righteousness'. The former could be omitted because in Mark (1: 7, 8) it is immediately preceded by another testimony of the Baptist about Jesus' worthiness far exceeding his own. As to the second, Mark thought that in view of the heated controversy then raging about the continuing value of the Mosaic Law, it ought perhaps to be passed over in silence; in this way he would prevent the Judaizers from misusing this saying of the Lord by insisting on Christians observing Jewish rites, as if such were a principal part of the 'righteousness' that they had to 'fulfil'. Moreover Luke also omits them. But in the pericopes common to Matthew and Luke, Mark has a habit of leaving out those details of Matthew's text which he found absent from Luke.

(b)

[Objection:] 'In the narrative of the Temptations (Matt. 4: 1-11 // Luke 4: 1-13) Mark only gives a brief summary of them (Mark 1: 12, 13) but remains silent on the ways in which the Lord resisted and overcame them. But since it is out of character for Mark to abbreviate a longer narrative and to omit circumstantial details known to him, one would have thought

that he was not aware of the fuller description found both in Matthew and Luke.'

[Reply:] There were two reasons which might have deterred Mark from including the longer narrative in his book: (i) the form of the narrative, redolent of the Jewish mode of thought and expression, seemed unsuitable for the type of reader to whom Mark's Gospel was addressed; (ii) in the dialogue of the Saviour with the Tempter *four* Old Testament sayings of the Lord are mentioned. Mark however usually cuts out quotations of this sort. See Section I (9). Now if he thought he ought to omit these four sayings, without passing over the whole thing, he had either to change the entire narrative, or to give only a summary of it, omitting all details. Mark preferred the latter course.

(c)

[Objection:] 'According to the opinion of Storr,⁶¹ what we said above in Section II, notes 17, 21, 22, about Mark's omission of the Sermon on the Mount, seems to be void of all appearance of truth. It seems incredible to this great scholar that Mark should have avoided this wonderful Sermon in such a manner that he not only set aside the Gospel of Matthew at the very moment he reached this passage in Matt. 5, but that he should likewise desert Luke, whom he had taken as his new guide. As soon as he came across Luke's version of the Sermon (Luke 6: 20-49, a shorter version it is true, and adapted by Luke himself for non-Palestinians), he deserted him in the same way and betook himself to Matthew, again rejecting from his Gospel even those few little verses, Matt. 12: 33-7, solely because he had read sayings similar to these in the Sermon on the Mount.'

[Reply:] (i) The Great Sermon in Luke is shorter than that in Matthew; but taken by itself, it is long enough and extends to *thirty* verses. Mark almost always omits such long discourses. Nor can it be proved that he was really *bound* to retain this discourse, even if he knew of it.

(ii) As regards Matt. 12: 33-7, we will add here to what we said above (see note 23), namely that in Matthew these verses are preceded by another discourse, viz. Matt. 12: 25-32, which is also found in the Gospel of Mark, and that again another one follows it at Matt. 12: 39-45. Since therefore Mark saw that Matthew had collected up many of the Lord's discourses, he retained only that part of the Sermon we find in Matt. 12: 25-32 in order to avoid his Gospel becoming too bulky; he then jumps at once from verse 32 to verse 46, omitting not only verses 33-7 (now quoted against us) but also verses 38-45.

(d)

[Objection:] 'Mark omits Matt. 8: 5-13 // Luke 7: 1-10, the story of the Healing of the Centurion's Servant at Capernaum - an event that some

people regard as especially worthy of mention, both as an example of the unique faith of the Centurion in Christ and also as an instance of Jesus' power to restore the sick to health in their absence.'

[Reply:] (i) Mark 7: 29-30 gives another instance of the Lord healing at a distance; his readers could therefore easily do without this one.

(ii) The table which we gave our readers in Section II shows that Mark passed from Matt. 4: 21 to Matt. 12: 15 and from Luke 6: 16 to Luke 8: 16. Now since this pericope of the Centurion's Servant is read in Matt. 8 and Luke 7, it was passed over by Mark, together with other matters in each Gospel, both preceding and following it.

(e)

As regards the omission of Matt. 11: 2-19 // Luke 7: 18-35, the Lord's answer to the messengers of John the Baptist, when they asked him if he really was 'He who is to come', was passed over by Mark for the very reason we have just given. For Matthew relates the anecdote in another sequence and place from Luke. Now Mark was following Luke at the point where Matthew related it, but on the contrary at the point where Luke relates it, he is again using Matthew, not Luke, as his guide, as is clear from the previously mentioned table. Hence Mark omitted it in both places.

(f)

[Objection:] 'Matt. 14: 28-31 relates how Peter walked upon the storm-tossed waters of Lake Gennesaret. Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, clearly agrees with Matthew in the passages that both precede and follow; nevertheless he passes over in silence these very verses which relate such a unique and unparalleled event that happened to Peter.'

[Reply:] We confess we do not know the reasons - they could be manifold and complicated - why Mark decided to omit this part of the story from his Gospel. But since Mark has passed over so many other things found in Matthew, this particular omission will only cause concern to, or provide an alleged argument for, those who think that the Evangelist Mark composed his book, if not at the dictation of Peter, at least under his guidance. But we do not hesitate to declare the complete falsehood of such a view, which, ancient though it be, is repugnant to everything which we seem to have proved in the preceding pages.

(g)

[Objection:] 'In Matt. 19: 27 Jesus promises the apostles that they will sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel, and in 20: 1-16 the parable of the Workers sent off at different times to the Vineyard illustrates the saying: "Many that are first shall be last and the last first" (Matt. 19: 30). Now both the promise and the saying with the parable were occasioned by Peter's question: "We have left all things and followed you; what then

shall we have?" This question ("What then shall we have?" is absent [from Mark 10: 28], but the sense remains the same) together with the saying and that part of the answer found in Matt. 19: 29, are also read in Mark, but he lacks both the promise contained in verse 28 and the parable.'

[Reply:] Both are also lacking in Luke 18: 28-30. Mark therefore sticks very closely to Luke in this passage, and has borrowed from Matthew only that very brief saying and paradox. But the parable, added [in Matthew] for the sake of illustration, seemed far too wordy for Mark, who generally omits longer speeches in the interest of brevity. And for the same reason he has also passed over Matt. 22: 1-14; 23: 2-39; and chapter 25. And all these are also missing from Luke.

(h)

[Objection:] 'Mark 14: 28 and 16: 7 each mentions the promise that the disciples will see Christ risen from the dead in Galilee. Matt. 28: 16, 17 narrates its fulfilment. But Mark gives his readers no hint of a journey into Galilee nor of Christ being seen there by the disciples, but leaves them uncertain whether the twice-mentioned promise was or was not fulfilled. But how can anyone properly explain this lapse if the Gospel of Matthew was really in front of his eyes?'

[Reply:] (i) If the last twelve verses of Mark (16: 9-20) were genuine, or if Mark had ended his Gospel at verse 8, it would be difficult to offer a feasible explanation for the omission. But we know that these verses are missing in the important Codex Vaticanus and were formerly lacking in many other ancient manuscripts. Nevertheless, it is very unlikely indeed that Mark ended his book at verse 8 with 'for they were afraid'. It is therefore reasonable to conjecture that the real ending of the Gospel (one that undoubtedly mentioned the journey into Galilee) was accidentally lost, and that another ending was supplied either at the end of the first century or at the beginning of the second century by some unknown person; and if this be so, there is surely no need to worry about this omission. Moreover, in our opinion, the following observation adds some new weight to this conjecture about Mark's omission of the Journey to Galilee.

(ii) However this may be explained (and there is no room here for a more accurate examination of the authenticity of Mark's last twelve verses), the omission of a mention of the Galilean journey cannot destroy our hypothesis. For whatever theory you hold about Mark's sources, the silence over this journey remains a problem. Let us suppose that the conclusion of the Gospel is genuine, and let us allow for the moment that the Gospel of Matthew had not been seen by Mark; all the same we should still be wondering why he remains silent over whether and in what manner the Lord had stood by the promises which Mark had earlier recorded to have been given to the

disciples on two separate occasions. Certainly with Matthew as a reminder, Mark would not have any need to be silent, since he could not have forgotten what he had written about it only a few verses previously.

(i) However scholars have noted that Mark has omitted many important stories of the Lord's deeds and not a few discourses that are found in Luke, and they have consequently thought Mark did not use Luke at all when composing his Gospel. However we think that what we argued in Section II and said in the notes to our table on each passage are sufficient to answer this objection. See particularly reference to Luke 7: 35 - 8: 9 (notes 21, 22) re the omitted pericope, and note 35 re Luke 19: 1-27.

All the same we add a few things here relating to the beginning of Mark's Gospel. Now Luke commences the history of Jesus' public ministry at Luke 3: 1ff. with a careful note of the time when the Lord began to teach, Mark however omits all this and begins his narrative without any chronological determination. But he could afford to omit all these as being of little importance to his readership. For men far distant from Palestine (Section I (7)) were not likely to know the names of the tetrarchs who had been ruling over Galilee, Iturea, Trachonitis, and Abilene twenty or thirty years before, or the succession of the Jewish high priests; indeed one may doubt whether they knew the exact sequence and chronology of the procurators of Judea. Thus there remained only the date taken from the years of Tiberius. But Mark omitted this *along with the others*, because at the time when our Gospel appeared every Christian knew that Jesus had lived in the reign of Tiberius; and it did not seem to him to be important to indicate in what year of this Emperor Jesus began his ministry as teacher. For us, however, Luke's accuracy is exceedingly gratifying; but the first readers of the Gospels did not demand such accuracy, nor was it necessary for the purpose which Mark seems to have had.

(8) [Discrepancies that might argue for Marcan priority]

[Objection:] 'In a number of places the Gospel of Mark seems to conflict openly with the stories of Matthew and Luke. Hence it would seem that he has consulted neither of them. For he could have avoided such discrepancies, and would certainly have done so if he had had the power to unroll the books of the earlier Evangelists.'

[Reply:] (i) Mark did not foresee that critics would carefully compare his Gospel with the other two, that they would diligently note passages which seemed to conflict with one another, that they would labour to settle these discrepancies of the Evangelists, and be at pains to harmonize one book out of three or four. For if he had foreseen it even a little, he

could easily have harmonized his Gospel with the others, or pointed out the reasons for his disagreement by adding a single word. But he thought that he could dispense with exercising such minute care. We say 'minute' because the disagreement is never in the general drift but only in particular details of particular incidents. Our author, unfamiliar with the principles of scholarship and writing a book intended for popular consumption, did not regard discrepancies of this sort as important.

(ii) Mark sometimes diverges from Matthew because in that place he is following Luke instead.

(iii) Sometimes he deliberately departs a little from the earlier Evangelists, and takes pains to relate events of which he had a better knowledge more accurately than the others had done. But come, let us set before our readers' eyes the true nature of these discrepancies by giving some examples, though lack of space must limit their number:

(a) [Objection:] 'Mark 2: 14 names the tax-collector summoned by Jesus from his place of work Levi, but Matt. 9: 9 says his name is Matthew.' [Reply:] Luke 5: 27 agrees here with Mark. Mark indeed knew more about this Levi than Luke, for he relates that he was the son of Alphaeus. And hence it is perhaps legitimate to infer that either Levi or Alphaeus was more familiar to the readers of Mark, and that for this reason Mark followed the example of Luke in recording the calling of Levi rather than Matthew, who was perhaps unknown to them. However, it is probable that both Matthew and Levi were enrolled as disciples of Christ at the same time.

(b) [Objection:] 'At Mark 2: 23-7 Mark omits some sentences of Matthew, namely Matt. 12: 5, 6, 7, and in their place substitutes another: "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath", by which addition the meaning of the following sentence ("The Son of Man is also Lord of the Sabbath") is completely altered in comparison with Matthew.'

[Reply:] (i) Matthew's words are omitted because at this point Mark had turned from Matthew to Luke; this is clear from our table in Section II and from their agreement over the formula: 'and he said to them'.

(ii) The addition made by Mark to Luke's text in no way alters the meaning of the following sentence, which is: If the Sabbath has been instituted for man's benefit, and if nobody is so bound by the Sabbath-laws that he is prevented by them from promoting his own or another's happiness, it follows *a fortiori* that the Messiah cannot be so restricted by them that he cannot abstain from them or free his disciples from them.

(c) [Objection:] 'If the selection of the Twelve Apostles happened at the time when Mark 3: 7-19 speaks of it, it took place before the Sermon on the Mount; but this conflicts with Matthew, in so far as it was the occasion of the calumny of the Pharisees who accused Jesus of forming an

alliance with Beelzebub.

[Reply:] See in this connection Section II, note 22, where we have stated the reasons why Mark has both these pericopes at the same place in his Gospel. The discrepancy vanishes if you note what we observed there.

(d) [Objection:] 'Mark 4: 35 (cf. 1: 35) conflicts so much with Matt. 8: 18 (cf. 13: 54; 14: 22) that it scarcely seems possible for both writers to be telling the truth, but the one seems to prove the other's error; and this surely would not have happened if Mark had had the Gospel of Matthew at hand when composing his own Gospel. For according to Matthew, after the choosing of Peter, Andrew, James and John (4: 18-22) and after the Sermon on the Mount (chapters 5, 6, 7), Christ immediately heals a leper (8: 1-2), whom he sends off to the priests; then he enters Capernaum where he cures the Centurion's slave (8: 5) and Peter's mother-in-law (8: 14) of their illness; then when a great crowd of people gathers, he crosses Lake Gennesaret (verse 23); and after enduring the storm and stilling it with a word (verses 23-7), he comes to the Gergesene region (verse 28). Then at another time he heals a blind and dumb demoniac (12: 22f.), and as a result of this admirable deed the excited people begin to ask him if he is the Messiah (verse 23). Some of the Pharisees accused him of casting out devils with the aid of Beelzebub (verse 24), others demanded a sign from heaven (verse 38). And while he was still answering them, his mother and relations arrived wanting to speak with him (12: 46). 'On that very day' (13: 1), he left the house and got into the boat, and taught the people standing on the shore about the nature of the heavenly kingdom, which he illustrated vividly and at length with many parables (13: 3-52). Then he preached in the synagogue of his own city, to the wonder of his audience (13: 53-8). Then, 'at that time' (14: 1), fearing the machinations of Herod, who had already killed the Baptist (14: 3), he sailed to a deserted place (verse 13), where he fed the five thousand (14: 15-22). The following night, when the disciples, returning in the boat, were being tossed about by the winds and waves, he came to their assistance, walking on the water (14: 23-37) ...

Now let us compare Mark's sequence with Matthew's. With Mark: After the calling of Peter, Andrew, James and John (1: 16 // Matt. 4: 18-22),⁶² Christ entered Capernaum (1: 21 // Luke 4: 31), and having healed the demoniac in the synagogue (verse 23 // Luke 4: 33), cured Peter's mother-in-law on the same day (verse 29 // Luke 4: 38); and when the whole township came to the door, at eventide (verse 32 // Luke 4: 40), he withdrew early in the morning to a deserted place (verse 35 // Luke 4: 42); then he made a tour of Galilee (verse 39 // Luke 4: 44),⁶³ and healed the leper, commanding him to go to the priests (verse 40 // Luke 5: 12). Then at

another time he went up the mountain (3: 13 // Luke 6: 12) and chose the Twelve Apostles (verse 14 // Luke 6: 13). At this point Luke inserted his Sermon on the Mount.⁶⁴ Returning home (Mark 3: 20), he was so fatigued by the bustling crowds that 'those with him' went out 'to seize him', saying that 'he was beside himself' (verse 21).⁶⁵ Then the Scribes from Jerusalem falsely accused him of casting out devils with the help of Beelzebub (Mark 3: 22 // Matt. 12: 24).⁶⁶ While he was refuting them, his mother and brethren came up and stood outside wanting to be admitted (verse 31 // Matt. 12: 46). Then Jesus went down to the Lake of Gennesaret and explained to the people standing on the shore the nature of the heavenly Kingdom, using various parables (Mark 4: 1ff. // Matt. 13: 1ff.). After this discourse, 'as he was in the boat', he crossed the Lake of Gennesaret (verses 35, 36 // Luke 8: 22),⁶⁷ and after he and his disciples had been tossed by the storm and he had stilled it by a word, he landed in the region of the Gadarenes (Mark 5: 1 // Luke 8: 26) ...

In the above, the whole sequence of Mark not only differs from that of Matthew but also seems to conflict with it. For according to Matthew, after the Sermon on the Mount and the healing of Peter's mother-in-law, Jesus crossed the lake stirred by the storm, and entered the district of the Gergesenes (or Gadarenes); then after relating the parables on the Kingdom of God he withdrew to a deserted place. But on the other hand, according to Mark, Jesus went to the desert immediately after curing Peter's mother-in-law; but he crossed the Lake of Gennesaret, stirred by the storm, and came to the Gadarene region only after he had delivered the parables on the heavenly kingdom ...

[Reply:] All difficulties disappear if - putting away all prejudices about the chronological order adopted by the Evangelists - we pay attention to where and why Mark passes from Matthew to Luke, then returns from him to Matthew, and then leaves him again for Luke. And since this matter was fully dealt with in Section II (whither we directed our readers in the notes attached to the foregoing pages), there is no reason to add any more here. For we think it quite clear that all the discrepancies arise because Mark, who is in no wise worried about the chronological order of events, has followed now one and now the other, but never the same guide all the time. Therefore, the question comes back to this: how did it happen that Luke arranged parts of his narrative otherwise than Matthew? This is not the place for examining the question, since we are dealing with Mark. We shall only permit ourselves to note that Luke has departed less than Matthew from the true sequence of events. At least what Matthew has got in 14: 1, 3, and 14: 13, 14 does not seem to have happened in that order at all.

(e) [Objection:] 'Mark 5: 23 relates the synagogue official as saying:

"My daughter is in extremity", whereas Matthew says (9: 18) the girl "has just died"; Luke seems to agree with this (8: 42) when he says "she was dying".

[Reply:] If Mark here took Matthew as his guide, it should not appear strange that the later writer narrated the whole incident more fully, more accurately and more correctly than the earlier writer treated it. But Mark has taken all these things out of Luke (note 29). Now Luke (verse 42) reads: 'she was dying'. But from verse 49 it is clear that the girl was not yet dead. Mark therefore having compared the authentic interpretation furnished by Luke at verse 49, changed the ambiguous phrase of verse 42 for a clearer one in perfect conformity with Luke's thinking. And hence it is clear at the same time that there is no basis at all for the view of those who add this passage to those from which they think it can be proved that the three Evangelists used a Hebrew archetype and deceived by its ambiguity rendered the same Hebrew phrase in different ways not easily reconciled. There is perfect agreement between Mark and Luke provided Luke's verse 42 is explained by verse 49. Nor does Matthew disagree. For, since he omitted what we find in Luke's verse 49 about the death of the girl, Matthew had to refer to her as dead from the very start of his shorter narrative, where Luke and Mark relate that the spirit of the girl was still alive.

(f) [Objection:] 'Mark 10: 46-52 relates certain things about the blind man healed near Jericho which fail to agree with the narratives both of Matthew and Luke (Matt. 20: 29-34 // Luke 18: 35-43).'

[Reply:] Whoever compares the three Evangelists with each other, and notes the special details recorded only by Mark, will realize that Mark was very well informed about this event. Where therefore he departs from the others, he must be reckoned to have wanted to correct them unobtrusively.

(g) [Objection:] 'Mark 11: 11-27 corresponds to Matt. 21: 10-23. But the parts of the Matthean narrative follow one another in a different and more probable order than in Mark. For according to Matthew, Christ cast the buyers and sellers out of the Temple that they had profaned on the same day as he entered Jerusalem surrounded by a great crowd of enthusiastic people. For after they were driven out, there still remained children crying "Hosanna to the Son of David" (Matt. 21: 15), who had undoubtedly entered the Temple with the rest of the crowd hosanna-ing Jesus inauspiciously. According to Mark, however, Christ expelled the profaners of the Temple on the next day after he entered the city. But, since nothing is more fickle than popular favour, it is more likely that Christ, being a most prudent man, took this dangerous course immediately after his entry into the city, on the very day that the people had so clearly shown their feeling for him, rather than put it off to another time, nor is it credible

that those who sold the oxen and sheep together with the money changers would so easily have given way unless they feared the anger of the people bringing Jesus in triumph into the Temple. Moreover, according to Matthew, Christ cursed the barren fig-tree on the next day after he had expelled the profaners from the Temple, and the tree withered at once; and when the disciples saw it, they immediately approached the master in amazement, and were instructed by him about the great power of "faith". But on the contrary, in Mark, Christ cursed the tree early in the morning of the day on which he later cleansed the Temple; and the disciples observed the tree withered to the root on the following day and gave the Lord the opportunity to instruct them on the power of faith.

[Reply:] We are fully persuaded that the whole series of events happened in the order and time in which Mark has arranged them in his Gospel. He has deliberately chosen to differ from Matthew because he had acquired for himself from another source more accurate information about the whole affair than Matthew had. Thus he was able to expand in his verses 11-14 and 20-6 matters which Matthew had noted only briefly, and to add in verse 16 some details omitted by Matthew. He had especially noted the moments and intervals of time at which each event occurred, and then clearly recorded them with quite remarkable care. See verses 11, 12, 15, 19, 20, 27. But though in treating this part of the story, Mark handled the matter more correctly and carefully than Matthew, yet he in no way accuses him of ignorance or error. For (i) Matthew nowhere asserts in clear terms that Christ cast the profaning crowd out of the Temple on the same day that he entered the city; nor can this be affirmed from the acclamation of the children, who were simply repeating on another occasion (Matt. 21: 14) what they had heard said by the crowd who had accompanied Christ the day before. (ii) Matthew did not want to divide the story of the fig-tree up into several sections, but deliberately postponed the mention of its cursing for a few verses in order to narrate the result of the cursing at the same time.

Section IV

[Conclusions]

There remains for us to point out the correct corollaries that flow from the acceptance of our hypothesis concerning the origin of the Gospel of Mark. The more important are these:

I. Mark wrote his Gospel after Matthew and Luke had finished their respective works. False therefore are the ascriptions commonly attached to each Gospel which assert that Matthew was written in the eighth, Mark in the tenth or twelfth, and Luke in the fifteenth year after the Ascension of

Christ into heaven. Nor can we agree with Storr, who recently wanted to persuade us that Mark is the first Gospel of all.

II. The things that Papias (Eusebius *H. E.* III. 39) records about the Gospel of Mark are figments very far from the truth, although he produces the Presbyter John as a witness.

III. The most ancient Fathers, who recorded that Mark wrote the life of the Lord under the auspices of Peter, either narrated their own conjectures (not history drawn from trustworthy documents), or were deceived by false rumours. Furthermore, all those conclusions built up by scholars on this supposition also collapse, no matter how ingeniously conceived or elaborated.⁶⁸ This one thing can perhaps be conceded, namely that Mark received from Peter the circumstantial details, with which he enriched throughout the narratives of Luke and Matthew; although even this is not quite certain, for they could also be derived from another source.

IV. Augustine too in his *De Consens. Evang.* book 1, chapter 2, was wrong in holding that Mark was the abreviator and copier of Matthew.

V. In general none of the Fathers seem to have known anything certain about the books of the New Testament, except that from very ancient times this or that book was received and publicly read in this or that church, and attributed to this or that author. All the rest that the Fathers record about the time and place of writing, the occasion for writing, the author's plan, the sources he used, and so on, remain quite uncertain.

VI. Although our judgement about the Gospel of Mark does not entirely exclude the hypothesis of those who think Matthew was written in Hebrew, yet, if you accept that view, this position will be found to be highly improbable. At all events Mark seems to have used the Greek exemplar of Matthew exclusively. For the same Greek formulae are very often found in both; and if Mark, writing in Greek, had compiled his Gospel partly from a Hebrew Matthew and partly from a Greek Luke he would undoubtedly have preferred Luke to Matthew and would surely have followed his guidance. But we have seen above that this is not the case at all. Recently indeed the learned C. A. Wahl suggested that Mark put together a Coptic [Gospel] from the Hebrew Matthew and the Greek Luke. But this conjecture which assumes that our [Mark] wrote in the Egyptian language, has very little foundation and cannot be easily reconciled with what we have already related about the origin and character of Mark.

VII. Very far from the truth is the opinion of some who think that the Evangelists are not the true authors of the books that are circulated under their names, but that their disciples consigned to writing what they at a former time had heard from the mouth of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and so on.

VIII. Also very unlikely is the conjecture (at least as regards the Gospel

of Mark) of those who declare that the Evangelists compiled their Gospels from hypothetical documents either Greek or Hebrew, and now *lost*, and that they have culled from them the things that seemed particularly interesting or useful to their readers; and thus they think they are able to account both for the wonderful agreement of the Evangelists in words and formulas of speech, and for their disagreements with one another.

IX. The Gospel of Mark survives entire and uncorrupt, save for the last verses of the final chapter, which, as we have said, one can justly conjecture to have been lost and then supplied by another hand.

X. Already in the time of Mark, the Gospels of Matthew and Luke contained the same things as are read in them today, and were arranged in the same order; nor does it follow that because Mark omitted some things they were originally lacking from these Gospels.

XI. Let those who wish to devote themselves to making a harmony of the Gospels, take care not to call upon Mark in constructing it. For he was clearly not interested in the chronological order of events, but passes from Matthew to Luke and back again, taking no account of the time at which each event occurred. Hence it is also clear that in the age of the apostles it seemed in no wise necessary to keep chronological order in narrating the deeds of the Lord. And thus one is entitled further to conjecture that it did not occur to the other Evangelists to write either annals or diaries.

XII. Mark understood the purpose and use of the Gospels quite differently from most theologians of later times. And if he had intended to illustrate Matthew by an accurate commentary, he would indeed have produced one quite unlike any of the customary commentaries. Undoubtedly such a work would have pleased the followers of Lessing and those who, by their study of *belles lettres*, have sharpened and polished their natural disposition and have learnt by long practice the right method of dealing with ancient literature; but it would not have pleased the authors of harmonies and tiresomely industrious commentators.

XIII. Those who argue that Mark wrote under the influence of divine inspiration must surely regard it as being a pretty meagre one!