being Peter’s interpreter wrote exactly whatever he remembered, not indeed in the order wherein things were ſpoken and done by the Lord; for he was not himſelf a hearer or follower of our Lord; but he after­wards, as I ſaid, followed Peter who gave inſtructions as ſuited the occaſions, but not as a regular hiſtory of our Lord’s teaching. Mark, however, committed no miſtake in writing ſuch things as occurred to his me­mory: for of this one thing he was careful, to omit nothing which he had heard, and to insert no falsehood into his narrative.” Such is the teſtimony of Papias, which is the more to be regarded as he aſſigns his au­thority. He ſpake not from hearsay, but from the in­formation which he had received from a moſt credible witneſs, John the elder, or preſbyter, a disciple of Jesus, and a companion of the apoſtles.

Irenæus, after telling us that Matthew publiſhed his goſpel whilſt Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome, adds@@: “After their departure (εΕοδον), Mark alſo, the diſciple and interpreter of Peter, delivered to us in writing the things which had been preached by Peter.” The Greek εΣοδος, like the Engliſh word *departure,* may either denote death, which is a departure out of the world, or mean a departure out of the city. It is probably in the former of theſe senses it is here uſed. Yet by the accounts given by ſome others, Mark’s goſpel was publiſhed in Peter’s lifetime, and had his approbation. The goſpel of Mark is ſuppoſed to be but two years poſterior in date to that of Matthew. The preciſe year, however, cannot be determined with certainty; and it is a matter of no importance, ſince we have aſcertained the author and the time in which he lived.

Mark has generally been ſuppoſed to be the ſame perſon who is mentioned in the acts and ſome of Paul’s epiſtles, who is called John, and was the nephew of Bar­nabas. But as this perſon was the attendant of Paul and Barnabas, and is nowhere in ſcripture ſaid to have accompanied Peter in his apoſtolical mission, which ancient writers inform us the author of the goſpel did, Dr Campbell has justly concluded that theſe were dif­ferent perſons@@. The author of the goſpel is certainly meant by Peter when he ſays *Marcus my son ſaluteth you @@‖.*

That Mark wrote his goſpel in Greek, is as evident­ly conformable to the teſtimony of antiquity, as that Matthew wrote his in Hebrew or Syro Chaldaic. The cardinals Baronins and Bellarmine, anxious to exalt the language in which the vulgate was written, have main­tained that this Evangeliſt publiſhed his work in Latin. The only appearance of teſtimony which has been pro­duced in ſupport of this opinion is the inſcription subjoined to this goſpel in Syriac, and in some other ori­ental verfloss. But theſe poſtſcripts are not the teſtimonies of the tranſlators: they proceed from the con­jecture of ſome tranſcriber but when written, or by whom, is equally unknown. Againſt poſitive teſtimony therefore they are entitled to no credit.

From the Hebraiſms in the ſtyle, we ſhould readily conclude that the author was by birth and education a Jew. There are alſo expreſſions wſhich ſhow that he had lived for ſome time among the Latins, as χεντυριαν, “centurion,” and σπεχϭλατωρ, “ſentinel;” words which do not occur in the other goſpels. There are other internal evidences that this goſpel was written be­yond the confines of Judea, The firſt time the Jordan is mentioned, ποταυος, “river,” is added to the name for explanation@@; for though no perſon in Judea needed to be informed that Jordan was a river, the caſe was different in diſtant countries. The word *Gehenna,* which is tranſlated *Hell* in the New Teſtament, origi­nally ſignified the V*alley of Hinnom,* where infants had been ſacriſiced by fire to Moloch, and where a conti­nual fire was afterwards kept up to conſume the filth of Jeruſalem. As this word could not have been understood by a foreigner, the Evangeliſt adds, by way of explanation, πυρ το ασβεςον, “the unquenchable fire.” Instead of the word *Mammon,* he uſes the common term “riches.” When he employs the oriental word *Corbοn,* he ſubjoins the interpretation ό εςι δωρον, that is, “a gift.” Theſe peculiarities will corroborate the historical evidence that has been already mentioned, that Mark intended his goſpel for the uſe of the Gen­tiles.

It has been affirmed that this evangeliſt is the abridger of Matthew. It is true that Mark ſometimes copies the expreſſions uſed by Matthew; but he is not to be considered as a mere abridger, for he omits altogether ſeveral things related by Matthew, viz. our Lord’s pe­digree, his birth, the viſit of the Magians, Joſeph's flight into Egypt, and the cruelty of Herod. Dr Lardner has given a list of thirty-three paſſages, where­in circumſtances are related which are omitted by the other evangeliſts. There is one parable, and an account of two miracles peculiar to Mark. The parable or similitude is mentioned in chap. iv. 26. One of theſe mi­racles was the curing of a deaf and dumb man, chap, vii. 31, 37. The other was the giving fight to a blind man at Bethſaida, chap, viii. 22, 26. The ſtyle of Mark, inſtead of being more conciſe than that of Mat­thew, is more diffuſe. That he had read Matthew’s goſpel cannot be doubted, but that he abridged it, is a miſtake.

According to the teſtimony which has been already produced, Mark derived his information from the apoſtle Peter. It would be improper, therefore, not to remark, that this evangeliſt has omitted many things tending to Peter’s honour, wſhich are related in the other goſpels, and has given the moſt particular account of Peter’s fall. This goſpel is ſeven times cited by Ire­næus, and nine times by Tertullian.

That the author of the gospel which is the third in order was Luke, the companion of the apoſtle Paul, is evident from the teſtimonies of Irenæus, Clemens of Alexandria, Origen, Tertullian, and many succeeding writers. But it has been diſputed whether he was a Jew or a Gentile. That Luke was a Jew by birth, or at leaſt by religion, may be argued from his being a constant companion of Paul. If he had been an un- circumciſed Gentile, exceptions would have been made to him, eſpecially at Jeruſalem; but nothing of that kind appears. It is alſo rendered highly probable, from his mode of computing time by the Jewi*‖*h feſtivals, and from his frequent uſe of the Hebrew idiom. It has been ſuppoſed that Luke was one of the 70 diſciples; but he does not pretend to have been a witneſs of our Lord’s miracles and teaching; on the contrary, be tells us in his introduction, that he received his information from others.

The deſign of Luke in writing his goſpel was to ſu-
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