§ v1] IN WHAT LANGUAGE WRITTEN. [introptcrion.   
   
 traditions (see above, § ii.), and the Gospel itself affords us no clue   
 whatever.   
 2. One thing only we may gather from the contents of the three first   
 Gospels,—that none of them could have been originally written after   
 the destruction of Jerusalem. Had they been, the omission of all   
 allusion to so signal a fulfilment of our Lord’s prophecies would be   
 inexplicable. In the case indeed of Luke, we can approximate nearer   
 than this (see below, ch. iv. § 4); but in those of Matthew and Mark,   
 this is all which can be safely assumed as to the time of their first   
 publication ;—that it was after the dispersion or even the death of most   
 of the Apostles, and before the investment of Jerusalem by the Roman   
 armies under Titus in the year 70,   
   
   
   
   
   
 SECTION V.   
 AT WHAT PLACE IT WAS WRITTEN.   
   
   
 Of this we have no trustworthy evidence. Most ancient writers   
 (Clement, Eusebius, Jerome, Epiphanius, &c.) mention Rome; but   
 apparently in connexion with the idea of Mark having written under   
 the superintendence of Peter. Chrysostom mentions Alexandria ; but no   
 Alexandrine writer confirms the statement. In modern times, Storr has   
 advanced an hypothesis that Mark wrote at Antioch, which he grounds,   
 but insufficiently, on a comparison of ch. xv. 21, with Acts xi. 20.   
   
   
   
   
 SECTION VI.   
   
 IN WHAT LANGUAGE IT WAS WRITTEN.   
   
 1, There has never been any reasonable doubt that Mark wrote in   
 Greek. The two Syriac versions contain a marginal note, that Mark   
 preached in Rome in Latin: and four of the later manuscripts of the   
 Gospel append a notice to the same effect. This statement, however, is   
 destitute of probability from any external or internal evidence, and is   
 only one more assumption from the hypothetical publication in Rome   
 under the superintendence of Peter, and for Roman converts.   
 2. Many writers of the Romish Church have defended the hypothesis   
 of a Latin original, being biassed by a wish to maintain the authority   
 of the Vulgate : and a pretended part of the original autograph of the   
 Evangelist is still in the Library of St. Mark’s church at Venice ;   
 which, however, has been detected to be merely part of an ancient Latin   
 MS. of the four gospels.   
 8. If Mark wrote in Latin, it is almost inconceivable that the original   
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