INTRODUCTION. ] MARK’S GOSPEL. (cn. m1.   
   
 (a) Eusebius quotes from Papias, as a testimony of John the pres-   
 byter, ‘‘ Mark was the interpreter of Peter, and wrote down accurately   
 whatever he recollected.”   
 (6) The same author says, “Mark, the disciple and interpreter of   
 Peter, has delivered down to us in writing the things preached by Peter.”   
 This he quotes from Ireneus ; and further that this took place after the   
 deaths of Peter and Paul.   
 (c) The same author relates, on the authority of Clement and Papias,   
 that the hearers of Peter at Rome, unwilling that his teaching should be   
 lost to them, besought Mark, who was a follower of Peter, to commit to   
 writing the substance of that teaching ; that the Apostle, being informed   
 supernaturally of the work in which Mark was engaged, “was pleased   
 with the earnestness of the man, and authorized the writing according to   
 the request of the Church.” This account is manifestly inconsistent   
 with the former.   
 (d) Eusebius gives yet another account, citing the very passage of   
 Clement above referred to: that Peter, knowing of Mark’s work when it   
 ‘was completed and published, “neither forbade it nor encouraged it.”   
 (e) The same author elsewhere says, “ Thus says Peter concerning   
 himself: for all things found in Mark are said to have been memorials of   
 the discourses of Peter.”   
 (f) Tertullian relates: “The Gospel which Mark put forth is   
 affirmed to be Peter’s, whose interpreter Mark was.”   
 (g) Jerome writes : “Paul then had Titus for his interpreter, as also   
 St. Peter had Mark, whose Gospel was composed by him writing at   
 Peter’s dictation.”   
 2. The above testimonies must now be examined as to how far we are   
 bound to receive them as decisive. We may observe that the matter   
 to which they refer is one which could, from its nature, have been known   
 to very few persons; viz. the private and unavowed influence of an   
 Apostle over the writer. (For I reject at once the account which   
 makes Peter authorize the Gospel, from no such authorization being   
 apparent, which it certainly would have been, had it ever existed.)   
 Again, the accounts cited are most vague and inconsistent as to the   
 extent and nature of this influence,—some stating it to have been no   
 more than that Peter preached, and Mark, after his death, collected the   
 substance of his testimony from memory ; others making it extend even   
 to the dictation of the words by the Apostle.   
 3. It is obvious that all such accounts must be judged according to   
 the phenomena presented by the Gospel itself. Now we find, in the   
 title of the Gospel, a presumption that no such testimony of Peter is   
 here presented to us, as we have of Matthew in the former Gospel.   
 Had such been the case, we should have found it called the Gospel   
 according to Peter, not according to Mark.   
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