§ 11.J ITS ORIGIN, {zrrropuction.   
   
 4. If again we examine the contents of the Gospel, we are eertainly   
 not justified in concluding that Peter’s hand has been directly employed   
 in its compilation in its present form. The various mentions, and   
 omissions of mention, of incidents in which that Apostle is directly   
 concerned, are such as to be in no way consistently accounted for on   
 this hypothesis. For let it be allowed that a natural modesty might   
 have occasionally led him to omit matters tending to his honour,—yet   
 how are we to account for his omitting to give an exact detail of other   
 things at which he was present, and of which he might have rendered   
 the most precise and circumstantial account? This has been especially   
 the case in the narrative of the day of the Resurrection, not to mention   
 numerous other instances which will be noticed in the Commentary.   
 Besides, the above hypothesis regarding his suppressions cannot be con-   
 sistently carried out. A remarkable instance to the contrary may be   
 seen, ch. xvi. 7, where “ tell his disciples and Peter” stands for “ tell his   
 disciples” in Matthew.   
 5. Weare led to the same conclusion by a careful comparison of the   
 contents of this Gospel with those of Matthew and Luke. We find that   
 it follows the same great cycle of apostolic teaching ;—that its narra-   
 tives are derived in many cases from the same sources ;—that it is im-   
 probable that any individual Apostle should have moulded and fashioned   
 a record which keeps so much to the beaten track of the generally-   
 received Evangelic history. His own individual remembrances must   
 unavoidably have introduced additions of so considerable an amount as   
 to have given to the Gospel more original matter than it at present   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 6. But while unable to conceive any influence directly exerted by.   
 Peter over the compilation of the Gospel, I would by no means deny   
 the possibility of the derivation of some narratives in it from that   
 Apostle, and recognize in such derivation the ground of the above tes-   
 timonies. The peculiarly minute and graphic precision (presently, § viii.   
 to be further spoken of) which distinguishes this Evangelist, seems to   
 claim for him access in many cases to the testimony of some eye-witness   
 where the other two Evangelists have not had that advantage. I have   
 pointed out these cases where they occur, in the Commentary; and   
 have not hesitated in some of them to refer conjecturally to Peter as   
 the source of the narration.   
 7. The inference to be drawn from what has preceded is, that,—the   
 general tradition of the ancients, which ascribed to Mark a connexion   
 with Peter as his secretary or interpreter, being adopted, as likely to be   
 founded on fact,—yet the idea of any considerable or direct influence of   
 Peter over the writing of the Gospel is not borne out by the work itself.   
 We may so far recognize in it one form of the probable truth ;—it is   
 likely that Mark, from continual intercourse with and listening to Peter,   
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