

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1948

Whether St. Luke Used the Gospel of St. Paul in the Composition of his Own

Otto Hintze Jr

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hintze, Otto Jr, "Whether St. Luke Used the Gospel of St. Paul in the Composition of his Own" (1948).

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis. 226.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/226>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

WHETHER ST. LUKE USED THE GOSPEL OF ST. MARK
IN THE COMPOSITION OF HIS OWN

A Thesis Presented to
The Faculty of Concordia Seminary
Department of New Testament Theology

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Sacred Theology

by
Otto C. Hintze, Jr.

May 1948

41,268

52295

Approved by:

W. Arndt.

Martin H. Franzmann

BV
4070
C69
M3
1948
no.1
C.2

52295

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1
The Personal Relations Between Mark and Luke 3
The Testimony of History as to the Gospels of Mark and Luke. 12
The Opinions of the Scholars as to Whether Luke Used Mark. . 29
The Various Arguments for the Priority of Mark 34
Internal Evidence to Show that Luke Used Mark. 44
The Preface of Luke's Gospel 67
Conclusion 76

WHETHER ST. LUKE USED THE GOSPEL OF ST. MARK
IN THE COMPOSITION OF HIS OWN

INTRODUCTION

The Gospel of Luke begins with these memorable words:

"Inasmuch as many already have taken in hand to arrange in due order once more a narrative concerning the deeds which have been accomplished among us...."

The many narratives of which Luke speaks have intrigued inquisitive minds no end. As a result, they have been the object of an enormous amount of research. What was the precise nature of these writings? Are they extant? Did Luke have them at his disposal and peruse them? Did he embody them in his Gospel in any way? Such are a few of the questions which arise out of the scanty information furnished by Luke's preface.

We too have been stimulated by the opening words of the third Gospel to make an investigation as to the narratives he mentions, and to seek an answer, if one is to be found, to the same questions as above. We are particularly concerned with

these questions, since some have proposed that Mark's Gospel is at least one answer to them. They say that Luke possessed the second Gospel and incorporated parts of it, or the whole, into his own composition. In other words, the Marcan account was one of Luke's source materials which served as a basis for his Gospel.

We should like to examine all the evidence concerning this hypothesis in order to determine whether it is workable or if it is more than a theory. We shall concentrate our attention on three chief areas of testimony, namely, that of history, research, and internal witness. Our approach to these centers of attention will be through a study of the personal relations of Mark and Luke, the testimony of history as to their Gospels, the opinions of scholarship as to whether Luke used Mark, the various arguments scholars propose in support of the priority of Mark, the internal evidence produced to show that allegedly Luke used Mark's Gospel, and finally, a study of the preface itself in Luke's Gospel.

I.

THE PERSONAL RELATIONS BETWEEN LUKE AND MARK

An investigation as to whether or not a certain author used the writings of another as source material would naturally raise the question of personal relations. By that we mean to ask if the two Gospel-writers were personally acquainted? Did Luke know of Mark, or did he actually know Mark? If Luke knew Mark personally, how well did he know him--as a passing acquaintance or perhaps as an intimate friend? The answer to these questions would shed considerable light on the problem before us, because any writer is more likely to use than fail to use a work with whose author he is well acquainted. Certainly a writer would want the best source material to be had. This is especially true in the case of Luke,¹ since his purpose was to achieve the greatest amount of accuracy possible (Lk. 1:4). If Mark's Gospel had been written and Luke knew Mark's background, Luke's zeal to "investigate all things from the beginning" would not let him rest until he had looked into his account.

The earliest biographical material about Luke and Mark is found in the New Testament. We must go to its pages for any evidence of a personal relationship between the two Evangelists.

Antioch

Eusebius² and Jerome³ lead us to believe that Luke was born

-
1. "...although his claim to have investigated it all carefully from the beginning, 1:3, shows that he did not proceed without making careful search for worth-while material." Goodspeed, An Introduction to the N. T., pp. 206-207.
 2. Eusebius, H. E., III, 4.
 3. Cf. Jerome's, Preface of Commentary on Matthew.

and raised in Antioch of Syria.¹ Although Scripture does not definitely attest the witness of these men, it does indicate Luke's familiarity with Antioch.² Luke seems to know a number of people who hailed from, and who had come to, Antioch. His care to name these people and his description of the events which took place there are indications that Luke lived and worked in Antioch for some time.

Paul's first contact with Luke was probably in Antioch at the time Barnabas brought Paul there from Tarsus (Acts 11:25, 26). It seems that Paul remained in Antioch one year (Acts 11:26) before he journeyed to Jerusalem at the bidding of the Church to bring aid to the needy Christians. During that year's time in Antioch, it seems that Paul converted Luke to the Christian faith. Luke's conversion may have taken place in 45 A. D.³ From the time of his conversion to the time that Luke joined Paul at Troas (Acts 16:11), during Paul's second missionary journey, Luke must have remained in Antioch doing the work of the Lord.

Meanwhile, we pick up the history of Mark in Jerusalem.

-
1. Plummer, Commentary on Luke (ICC), p. xxi, thinks that they may have derived their statements from Julius Africanus (Harnack, Texte und Unters., viii, 4, p. 39) followed by Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus and Nicephorus, but "is perhaps only an inference from the Acts." Eusebius' statement need not mean more than "that Luke had a family connection with Antioch: but it hardly 'amounts to an assertion that Luke was not an Antiochian.'"
 2. Acts 6:5, 11:19-27, 13:1-3, 14: 26-28, 15: 1, 2, 30-40, 18: 22, 23.
 3. It would be some time in 45 if we take the year 46 to be the year in which the famine (Acts 11: 28) at Jerusalem began. Valesius (Whiston, The Life and Works of Flavius Josephus, p. 587, note) says in his comments on passages in Eusebius, H. E., II, 12 that this famine foretold by Agabus happened in the 5th, 6th and 7th years of Claudius' reign. Claudius reigned from 41 to 54 A. D.

According to Acts 12: 12, Peter was freed from prison by the angel of the Lord. From there he went to the house of Mary, the mother of John Mark. There many were gathered together for prayer, and it would not be difficult to conceive of her son as being among them. Barnabas and Paul came to Jerusalem on their mercy mission in 46, and contacted Mark. It was probably in the early part of 47 when they returned to Antioch. And when they returned to Antioch, they took John Mark with them (Acts 12: 25).

So Luke and Mark must have become acquainted first in Antioch. Paul and Barnabas were their mutual friends. It was not until about six months later that Mark left in the summer, say, of 47 with Paul and Barnabas on their first missionary journey. These six months constitute the first period of acquaintance-ship between the two Gospel-writers.

There was a second period of contact in Antioch. Mark left the two missionaries at Perga in Pamphilia to return to Jerusalem. Most likely he returned to his home and mother. It was late in 48 when Paul and Barnabas returned to Antioch from their journey. They spent close to a year and a half on this journey, and it must have been a year or less before they began their second tour.¹ During this interim, Paul and Barnabas went to Jerusalem to attend the Apostolic Council. There they met Mark again, and most likely he travelled back to Antioch with them.² All of them may have arrived in Antioch early in 49. Luke was still in Antioch at that time. So from early 49 to the early summer of 49, when Mark

-
1. Acts 14: 28 and 15: 35 would seem to indicate that length of time.
 2. According to Acts 15: 38, Mark was in Antioch at the time Paul and Barnabas began their second journey. Thus we conclude that Mark went back with them from Jerusalem.

again departed from Antioch with Barnabas, Mark could have had contact with Luke. This second period may have been only for the short time of four months. However, had Luke been among "the certain other of them" (Acts 15: 2) who attended the Apostolic Council with Paul and Barnabas, he and Mark could have been together a while in Jerusalem and together on the way back to Antioch. With this additional time, the contact between Luke and Mark would have widened to approximately seven or eight months.

Ephesus

The next location where Mark and Luke must have had a good chance to spend quite some time together was in Ephesus. This was during the third missionary journey of Paul.

After Paul had spent a year and a half in the city of Corinth (Acts 18: 11) and some time in travelling and visiting at the conclusion of his second journey, he arrived in Antioch of Syria late in the fall of 51. He remained there during the winter months, and began his third missionary journey in the spring of 52. After he had visited a number of the churches in Asia Minor, travelling on foot, he came to Ephesus in the fall of 52. There he labored among the Ephesians for three years.¹

Now the 19th chapter of the Acts is Luke's report of what happened to Paul during those three years in Ephesus. It is a very meager description for three years of the type of work Paul did. We are certain that Luke omitted some very significant events which took place during that time. For instance,

1. Luke (Acts 20: 31) reports Paul as mentioning this to the Ephesian elders when Paul made a quick stop-over visit near Ephesus on his way to Jerusalem.

the fact that Paul supported himself while in Ephesus (Acts 20: 34), and that he had been imprisoned there,¹ show this to be the case.

The present writer is in agreement with the highly probable hypothesis² that Paul wrote the so-called captivity letters in Ephesus. Those letters would include Philemon, Colossians, Ephesians and Philippians. And in these captivity letters of Paul we find Luke and Mark mentioned together.³

The last we heard of Luke in Acts was at Philippi, where it seems that he remained behind while Paul continued his journey.⁴ Then Luke came to Paul in Ephesus, because, being his intimate friend and physician, he no doubt would come to minister to him in his tribulation. However, we think that Luke did not make the trip to Ephesus until after Paul wrote to the Philippians.⁵ According to Duncan,⁶ Paul wrote to the Philippians during his first imprisonment in Ephesus. This first imprisonment came early in the three-year stay at Ephesus. Therefore, Luke must have arrived in Ephesus late in 53. Apparently, Paul left Ephesus

-
1. 1 Cor. 15: 32. We hold that some of the other imprisonments of which Paul speaks (2 Cor. 11: 23) took place in Ephesus (cf. 2 Cor. 1: 8-10 and Rom. 16: 3, 7).
 2. G. S. Duncan seems to be the foremost advocate of this hypothesis at present. For a very cogent presentation of the arguments of the Ephesian origin of these letters, see his book, St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry.
 3. Cf. Col. 4: 10 with Col. 4: 14. Philemon 24.
 4. Acts 16: 40 seems to indicate that Paul went on without Luke. Also the "we" section ends here.
 5. Surely Paul would have included Luke's greetings to the Philippians had Luke been with him at the time. And if Luke had been in Philippi, Paul would have sent him greetings from Ephesus.
 6. Duncan, Op. Cit., p. 154 ff.

in the spring of 55,¹ and Luke either left with Paul or he must have gone shortly after him.² Then it was probably close to two years that Luke spent in Ephesus.

We know nothing of the travels of Mark from the time he left Antioch with Barnabas to the time when we meet him in Ephesus with Paul (Col. 4:10 and Philemon 24). The greetings which Paul conveys in these letters seem to imply that Mark had been with Paul some time before he wrote them, Mark having become acquainted with those people and the circumstances which provoked the letters. We think that these two letters were written during a later imprisonment in Ephesus.³ So Mark may have come to Ephesus in the spring of 54. There he stayed, seemingly, working in and around Ephesus,⁴ until he travelled to Rome.

From the spring of 54 to the spring of 55 Luke and Mark were together in Ephesus. This gave them a year to renew their friendship, and come to know each other that much better as co-workers with the Lord.

Rome

There are hints in the Scriptures as to the possibility of Luke and Mark meeting one another in Rome.

We can readily see from the use of the first person plural pronoun in the description of Paul's journey to Rome that Luke

-
1. So argues Dr. Arndt (Notes on the New Testament, p. 26), since Paul wanted to leave Ephesus after Pentecost (1 Cor. 16:8), but was forced to leave earlier because of the riot of the silver-smiths. The Artemisia were held in May. Paul must have left in April or early in May.
 2. Acts 20: 6. Here we find Luke joining Paul at Philippi as Paul returned from Corinth. Luke had gone back to Philippi.
 3. Duncan, Op. Cit., pp. 124-143.
 4. We know for sure that Mark was in Rome with Peter when Peter wrote his first epistle (1 Pet. 5: 13). But we think that Mark and Peter were together in Rome before that time, as we shall show later.

accompanied Paul to Rome. Later, also, Paul specifically mentions that Luke is with him there.¹ They must have come to Rome in the spring of 59.² Although it may have been only a few years, Luke may have remained in Rome the rest of his life.

From Rome Paul writes thus to Timothy at Ephesus, "Only Luke is with me. Take Mark, and bring him with thee...." (2 Tim. 4: 11a). We see from the contents³ of this second epistle to Timothy that Paul was very close to his death when he wrote it. And we hold that Paul's death came in 64 as a result of the persecution which arose from Nero's accusing the Christians of burning Rome.⁴ Then Mark was in Ephesus in 64.

Obviously, Mark had left Rome and travelled to Ephesus. Since his greetings are not included in Peter's second Epistle, which we think was written shortly after the first, and the first late in 62, we can guess that Mark left Rome sometime in 63. If Mark had come to Rome earlier and was there at the time Paul and Luke came in 59,⁵ it seems that he and Luke might have been together from 59 to 63. But we learn from Eusebius⁶ that Mark was in Alexandria in the eighth year of the reign of Nero, and was succeeded by a

-
1. 2 Tim. 4: 11a.
 2. Paul's trip to Jerusalem (Acts 20: 1--21:15), his two years in prison in Caesarea (Acts 24:27), and his trip to Rome (Acts 27--28:16) would account for this date of arrival.
 3. 2 Tim. 2: 11 and 4: 6-9.
 4. For the arguments which conclude that the date of Paul's death was at this time, see Arndt, *Op. Cit.*, p. 46-47.
 5. This we infer from the remarks of Eusebius, *H. E.*, II, 24, "When Nero was in the eighth year of his reign, Annianus succeeded Mark the Evangelist in the administration of the parish of Alexandria," and from those made by Epiphanius, *Against Heretics*, line 6, "In Rome St. Peter permitted Mark to write out the Gospel, and having written it, he was sent by St. Peter to the land of Egypt.", and from Clement of Alexandria, who testifies that Mark wrote after Peter preached the Gospel in Rome (*Hypotyposes VI*). Cf. part II of this paper for the original text of these authors.
 6. Cf. above note.

certain Annianus in the administration of the parish there. Since Nero reigned from 54 to 68, it would have been sometime in 62 when Annianus succeeded Mark. If we take into consideration the time it would take to reach Alexandria from Rome and possibly two years to found congregations there, it could have been early in 60 that Mark left Rome. Then he returned to Rome to be with Peter when he wrote his first Epistle (1 Pet. 5:13), spent a few months there with him, and departed for Ephesus. Therefore Luke and Mark were probably together in Rome from 59 to 60 and from late in 62 to early 63, which totals a little more than a year.

It is not impossible that Mark reached Rome, coming from Ephesus, shortly before Paul's death. There he and Luke would have been together for another period of time. But the length of this later period cannot be determined, since we know nothing of the place and time of Luke's and Mark's death.

- - - - -

In conclusion, we see that the friendship between Luke and Mark was extended over a period of some 17 years or more. It began in Antioch sometime in 47 A. D., and continued on through the times they were together in Rome and elsewhere before Paul's death. Interspersed among these 17 years or more were various times of personal contact between the two men. All told, they spent about a year together in Antioch, a year in Ephesus, and a year or so in Rome. During these three years, they labored together in the Lord's Kingdom, perhaps lived together, and no doubt had to face many of the same hardships. They had many a chance to discuss with one another the events in the life of Jesus and His teachings. Together Luke and Mark must have learned

and recapitulated the truths of Christianity with Paul and other Apostles. Together they, too, must have continued in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in the breaking of bread, and in prayers. So they worked, lived, learned and taught, worshipped, and lived the Christian life together. Surely out of all this there must have developed a deep and lasting friendship between the two.

Granted that a deep and lasting friendship existed between the two Evangelists, we must conclude that such a relation would have a definite bearing upon the attitude of each toward the other's product of the pen. Each would have endeavored to obtain and investigate what the other had written. They would have trusted one another explicitly. Because of this mutual trust, the probability of their using various parts of the other's narrative would be that much greater.

Before we can proceed any further, we must endeavor to establish which of the two Evangelists wrote first.

THE TESTIMONY OF HISTORY AS TO THE GOSPELS
OF LUKE AND MARK

In this section we are interested in the testimony of history as to which of the two Gospel-writers wrote first, and if the one used the other's Gospel.

The history with which we shall concern ourselves is the early period of the Christian Church, from the first to the fifth centuries, inclusively. It is quite obvious that the evidence from these centuries bears the most weight in consideration of the problem before us. The period has been extended to the fifth century so as to include official pronouncements of the Church at large, the various lists of the canonical books of the New Testament, and evidence from different parts of the world.

It will be seen very readily that this period of history is not lacking in discussion of the first of the two questions above, namely, the sequence of the two Gospels. But concerning the latter, this period of history has nothing to say.

With the absence of any testimony of history at this particular time whether one of the writers used the Gospel of the other, we shall direct our attention to their sequence. A consideration of the sequence of the Gospels of Luke and Mark finally arrives at a presentation and examination of what has been said about the order of the four Gospels and the time of their composition.

Papias

At present, the very earliest (c. 100 A. D.) information we

have on the Gospels is from Papias. His testimony comes to us¹ in fragmentary form and indirectly. Eusebius quotes Papias as having said the following about the Gospel of Mark:

Κκι τούθ' ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἔλεγεν·
Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γεγόμενος,
ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν, ἰκριθῶς ἔγραψεν,
οὐ μέντοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου
ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα.

Οὔτε γὰρ ἤκουσε τοῦ κυρίου οὔτε
παρακολούθησεν αὐτῷ, ὅσκιον δὲ ὡς
ἔφην Πέτρῳ, ὅς πρὸς τὰς χρείας
ἐποιεῖτο τὰς λέκασκαλίας ἀλλ' οὐκ
ὡσπερ οὐκτι δὲ τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος
λογίων· ὡσκι οὐδὲν ἤμαρτεν Μάρκος
οὔτως ἑνια δράψας ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν·
ἐνὸς γὰρ ἐποίησατο πρόνκιαν, τοῦ μηδὲν ὦν
ἤκουσε παραλιπεῖν ἢ ψεύσασθκι τι ἐν κῦτοις.

Upon careful examination of what Papias has to say, he himself quoting the Presbyter John and adding a short commentary, we find that he gives no information whatever on the order of the Gospels. We also find that he gives us no definite information on the time when Mark wrote. However, since Papias is the very first one to say anything closely associated with our problem, his testimony is worth mentioning because of his description of the situation.

1. H. E., III, 39.

Mark, whom Peter called his son (1 Pet. 5: 13), became the ¹ ἐρμηνεύτης of Peter. He recorded accurately, without error and without intention to falsify or purposely omit, as much as he remembered. The chief source material for his Gospel, then, was the oral Gospel as he had heard it from Peter. His writing this from memory does not exclude any perusal of written material which he could have seen or had in his possession. ² His writing from memory, however, does indicate that he was not Peter's private scribe.

We would like to know if Peter was living at the time when Mark wrote his Gospel, but Papias gives us no clue. Mark's writing from memory could be taken to mean either that he wrote after Peter's death, or that Peter was living at that time but not living with Mark. Papias only leaves us in a quandary and with a strong desire to search further for the facts.

Irenaeus

Irenaeus (c. 100-150 A. D.), in his work, Contra Haereses, III, 1, has this to say about the Gospels:

Ita Matthaeus in Hebraeis ipsorum lingua Scripturam edidit evangelii, quum Petrus et Paulus Romae evangelizarent, et fundarent ecclesiam. Post vero horum excessum Marcus, discipulus et interpres Petri, et ipse, quae a Petro annuntiata erant, per scripta nobis tradidit. Et Lucas autem, sectator Pauli, quod ab illo praedicabatur evangelium in libro condidit. Postea et Ioannes discipulus Domini qui et supra pectus eius recumbebat, et ipse edidit evangelium, Ephesi Asiae commorans.

1. This word is not a synonym for "translator." It simply means, "one who explains in words, or one who expounds."
2. There are those who think Mark actually had written materials before him. Moffatt is one: "...Mark's Gospel is plainly a composition, not in the sense in which Mt. and Lk. are, but still in a noticeable degree of its own. It is not an artless transcript of oral reminiscences. The author has had before him various materials, not only oral but also written sources, which he has occasionally re-arranged." (An Introduction to the Literature of the N. T., p. 226.) Loisy and Wendland agree with Moffatt, Ibid., p. 226.

Irenaeus refers to the four Gospels in the order, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. It is evident from a certain time element and from the particle (postea) he uses that he is giving a chronological sequence. Irenaeus speaks of the Gospels in other places in his writings, but there he does not give them in chronological order.¹

Some have taken Irenaeus to mean that Mark wrote his Gospel after the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, which, according to our reckoning, would be in 64.² The term excessus may mean either "departure" in a wider and more general sense, or it may be used as "a departure from life," in a special sense. Those who hold that Mark wrote after the death of Peter and Paul base their conclusions largely upon the special usage of excessus.

Apparently, Irenaeus meant "departure from life"³ when he used the word. But to conclude that Mark wrote after the death of the two Apostles is a misinterpretation of what he said. Irenaeus says that "after the death of these men, Mark, a disciple and interpreter of Peter handed down (tradidit) to us in writing

1. Cf. Contra Haereses, III, 9 and III, 11, 7. Here Irenaeus discusses the Gospels in the order, Matthew, Luke, Mark, John, but he is trying to emphasize the two Gospels in which Jesus apparently took a more affirmative attitude toward the O. T. The order in III, 11, 8, John, Luke, Matthew, Mark, cannot be taken in a chronological sense, because Irenaeus here is influenced entirely by the arrangement of the four living-creatures in Rev. 4: 6-8, as tradition labeled them.
2. Dionysius of Corinth says in so many words that Peter and Paul were martyred at the same time. In his letter to the Romans and the bishop, Soter, then in office, he writes: ... ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν οὐκ ἴσως διδάσκατος ἐμαρτύρησαν (Peter + Paul) κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν. Since Paul, we think, was martyred in 64, Peter must have died at that time.
3. Cf. Zahn, Introduction to the N. T., II, p. 398, for his decided stand that this word must be taken in the sense of death. Also, Moffatt, Op. Cit., p. 211, and Thiessen, Introduction to the N. T., p. 141.

those things which were preached by Peter." The verb trado is not the same as scribere. Irenaeus does not say that Mark "wrote" after the death of these men, but simply "handed down to us in writing."

Viewing the above statement of Irenaeus in the light of its context, it seems that Harnack¹ has understood him correctly when he said, "Irenaeus simply wished to prove that the teaching of the four chief Apostles did not perish with their death, but that it has come down to us in writing." Harnack paraphrases what Irenaeus said as follows:²

Among the Hebrews, Matthew also published in their own tongue a written Gospel (besides his oral teaching), while in Rome Peter and Paul proclaimed (orally, not in writing) the Gospel, and founded the Church. But (although they died without leaving behind them a written Gospel, their teaching has not perished, for) after their death Mark also (like Matthew), the disciple and interpreter of Peter, handed down to us in writing the teaching of Peter; and Luke, the follower of Paul, gathered together in a book the Gospel preached by the latter apostle. Thereupon John, the disciple of the Lord, who also lay in His bosom, he also published the Gospel while he was dwelling at Ephesus.

In all probability, Irenaeus did not set the terminus a quo for the date of Mark's Gospel at the decease of Peter and Paul.

Muratorian Fragment

The next testimony of history (c. 180-200 A. D.) is that of the Muratorian Fragment. The first few lines of the Fragment³ emphasize the order of the Gospels:

1. The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels, p. 130.
2. Ibid., pp. 131-2. This is Harnack's paraphrasing, but he gives credit to Chapman (Journal of Theological Studies, 1905, July, pp. 563 ff.) as the first one to have correctly interpreted this passage in the light of its context. The underlined portions were in italics. The parentheses are also Harnack's.
3. This is the unaltered text found in Westcott, Canon of the N. T., Appendix C.

...quibus tamen interfuit, et ita posuit. Tertio euangelii librum secundo Lucan....Quarti euangeliorum Iohannes ex decipolis....

The text places Luke's Gospel third and John's fourth. Undoubtedly, previous mention of the remaining Gospels had been made. Quibus must have referred to one of the other Evangelists, but because of the mutilated text we cannot determine which. Westcott¹ believes that "the Fragment commences with the last words of a sentence which evidently referred to the Gospel of St. Mark."

Clement of Alexandria

2

Eusebius speaks of Clement of Alexandria (150-220 A. D.) as giving the tradition of the earliest presbyters about the order³ of the Gospels:

Αὐθις δ' ἐν τοῖς κύτοις ὁ Κλήμης βιβλίους περὶ τῆς τάξεως τῶν εὐαγγελίων περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων πρεσβυτέρων τέθεικε, τοῦτον ἔχουσαν τὸν πρότον, προγεγράφαι τῶν εὐαγγελίων τὰ περιέχοντα τῆς γενεαλογίας. Τὸ δὲ κατὰ Μάρκου τέτυκον ἐσχηκέναι τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ Πέτρου δημοσίᾳ ἐν Ῥώμῃ κηρύσσοντας τὸν λόγον καὶ πνεύματι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐδιδόντας, τοὺς πρότερος πολλοὺς ὄντας, περὶ τὸν Μάρκον ὡς ἐν ἀκαλουθίοντα κύτῳ πρόρωθεν καὶ μεμνημένον τῶν λεχθέντων, ἀναγράφαι τὰ εἰρημένα· ποιήσαντα δὲ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, μετὰ τοῦτ' αὖτε τοῖς θεομένοις αὐτοῦ ὅπερ ἐπιγίνονται τὸν Πέτρον προτρεπτικῶς μίτε κωλύσαι μίτε προτρεψάσθαι.

Clement says that the Gospels containing the genealogies

-
1. Op. Cit., p. 193.
 2. Op. Cit., VI, 14.
 3. Clement of Alexandria, Hypotyposes, VI.

were written first, namely, Matthew and Luke. Because Eusebius quotes Clement as giving the order of the Gospels and the fact that Clement states that John wrote last, it would seem that he meant to give an historical account of the composition of the writings in chronological order. Then on the face of it, Clement puts Matthew and Luke before the other two.

There remains, however, something to be said for a less literal interpretation of Clement's statement. We note that Eusebius does not quote Clement directly. Therefore, it is conceivable that he reported an isolated statement which Clement, in summary, made about the two Gospels with the genealogies. Then Clement interjected a description of the origin of Mark's Gospel, and ended by saying that John wrote last. The beginning words would not mean that Matthew and Luke were in absolute first position, but, relatively speaking, they were the first to be written with respect to Mark and John, that is, Matthew was written before
¹
 Mark and Luke before John.

Clement's report points to certain facts which are connected with the date of our second Gospel. Mark wrote while Peter was still living, although Peter, evidently, was not living with Mark at the time (*ὅπερ ἐπιγινόντα τὸν Πέτρον προτερεπτικῶς μίτε κωλύσκει*

1. Zahn has brought this supposition to our attention. "If, in consideration of the general currency of the tradition that the order was Matthew, Mark, Luke, John (n. 8), one may assume that it was known to Clement's teachers and to himself, it is noteworthy that their divergent statement is given without any hint of its opposition to the common view. It is not impossible, then, that the presbyters simply meant that Matthew was written before Mark and Luke before John." I. N. T., II, p. 400, note 9.

μῦθε προτρεψκοθαί). Also, Mark must have written after Peter had done a considerable amount of preaching in Rome, because Clement speaks of the "many" who petitioned Mark.

Origen

In the first book of his Commentary on Matthew, Origen (c. 185-254 A. D.) records the tradition of his day concerning the order of the Gospels as they were written:

Ὡς ἐν παραδόσει μαθὼν περὶ τεσσάρων
 εὐαγγελίων, ἃ καὶ μόνῃ ἀναντίρρητά ἐστὶν ἐν
 τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ· ὅτι
 πρῶτον μὲν γέγραπται, τὸ κατὰ τὸν ποτὲ
 τελώνην, ἕστερον δὲ ἀπόστολον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
 Μαρκοῦ, ἐκδεδωκότα αὐτὸ τοῖς ἀπὸ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ
 πιστεύουσι, γράμμασιν Ἑβραϊκοῖς συντεταγμένον
 δεύτερον δὲ τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον, ὡς Πέτρος ὑφήγηκε
 αὐτῷ ποιήσαντα... Καὶ τρίτον τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν, τὸ
 ὑπὸ Πάυλον ἐπαινούμενον εὐαγγέλιον τοῖς ἀπὸ
 τῶν ἔθνῶν πεποικότα ἐπὶ πάνσι τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην.

Apparently, the tradition which Origen recorded had become crystalized at that time, and he could say clearly and unhesitatingly that Matthew wrote first, Mark second, Luke third, and John fourth.

As for the time when the Gospels were composed, Origen, with reference to Mark, is ambiguous. With regard to Luke's Gospel, he errs in thinking that Paul referred especially to our third Gospel in 2 Cor. 8: 18.¹

Eusebius

Eusebius (260-341 A. D.), the church historian, adopts the

1. Paul does not refer to any of our four Gospels in this passage, but he means the Gospel in a wider sense as the Glad Tidings of salvation through Christ.

same tradition as to the order of the Gospels which was reported by Origen.

Μαρκῆος μὲν γὰρ... πκτρίω γλώττῃ γερφῆ πκράδου τὸ κκτ' κύτον Εὐαγγέλιον.... Ἦν δὲ Μάρκου κκι Δουκῆ τῶν κατ' κύτους Εὐαγγελίων τὴν ἔνοσιν πεποιημένων, Ἰωκνήν φασι,... γέδος κκι ἐπὶ γερφὴν ἐλθεῖν τοῖσδε χάριν κκιτίκς. (III, 24)

Also, in the 15th chapter of the second book of his Church History, Eusebius follows the tradition which Clement of Alexandria and Papias report about the manner in which the Gospel of Mark came to be written.

... τοσοῦτο δὲ ἐπέλαμψεν ταῖς τῶν ἀκοατῶν τοῦ Πέτρου δίκνοίας εὐσεβεῖκε φέγγος, ὡς μὴ τῇ ἀγράφῃ τοῦ θεοῦ κκερῦμκτος κκκασκκλία πκκακλήσεσι δὲ πκντοῖκς Μάρκον, οὐ τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον φέρεται, ἀκόλουθον ὄντα Πέτρου λιπκρήσκι, ὡς ἂν κκι κκι γερφῆς ὑπόμνημα τῆς διὰ λόγου παραδοθεῖσης αὐτοῖς κκκκλίσκι κκκασκκλίας, μὴ πρότερον τε ἀνεῖναι, ἢ κκτεργασκθεκὶ τὸν ἔνκτρα, κκι ταύτη κκτιτίκς γενέσθαι τῆς τοῦ λεγομένου κκκα Μάρκον εὐαγγελίου γραφῆς. Γνοντα δὲ τὸ πκκαχθέν φασι τὸν ἀπόστολον ἀποκκλύφαντος κύτῳ τοῦ πνεύμκτος ἡσθῆναι τῇ τῶν κκκνρῶν προθυμίᾳ κκκρῶσκι τε τὴν γερφὴν εἰς ἔντευσιν τῆς ἐκκλήσοίας. Κκκίμκς ἐν ἔκτων τῶν ὑποτυπώσεων πκκκτέθειται τὴν ἱστορίαν, συνεπικκκτυρεῖ δὲ κύτῳ κκι Ἰερκπολίτις ἐπίσκοπος ὀνόμκτι Πκπίας.

He says that Clement and Papias are agreed in their accounts concerning this matter of Mark's Gospel. Then he adds a few other points, such as Mark's Gospel being extant at his time (οὐ τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον φέρεται), the strong pleadings (πκκακλήσεσι) of Peter's hearers for Mark to write out Peter's oral Gospel,

that the Spirit revealed to Peter what had been done (ἀποκαλύφντοί
 κυτῶ τοῦ πνεύματος), and that Mark's Gospel was validated
 for use in the churches (κυρῶσαί τε τὴν γραφὴν εἰς ἑνταυθὶν ταῖς
 ἐκκλησίας).

Furthermore, the historian has the following to say in
 connection with the Evangelist Mark:

Τούτου δὲ Μάρκον πρῶτον φασὶν ἐπὶ τῆς Αἰγύπτου
 στείλλεσθαι, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον δ' ἤν καὶ συνεγράψατο
 κηρύξαι, ἐκκλησίας τε πρῶτον ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας
 συστήσασθαι. (II, 16)

and

Νέωνος δὲ ὄψον ἄγοντος τῆς βασιλείας ἔτος, πρῶτος μετὰ
 Μάρκον τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν τῆς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ παροικίας
 Ἀννικῶς τὴν λειτουργίαν διαδέχεται. (II, 24)

When we combine these statements with what we already know

about Mark, it is possible to arrive at some sort of date for
 the origin of his Gospel. Mark had written (ὅ δὲ καὶ συνεγράψατο)
 his Gospel before he was sent to Egypt. There in Alexandria, we
 are told, he was the first to establish churches. It is possible
 that he became the first bishop of Alexandria. Later he was
 relieved of the administration of the parish there by Annianus in
 the eighth year of the reign of Nero, i. e., 62 A. D. ¹ Since,
 as we have previously pointed out in Part I, it must have taken
 some time to travel from Rome to Alexandria and to establish
 churches there, Mark probably left Rome early in 60. Therefore,
 because Mark had already written his Gospel and this was after
 he and Peter had been laboring in Rome for a few years, Mark
 may have written in 58-59.

1. Nero reigned from 54 to 68.

Catalogus Claromontanus

An old Latin codex (c. 300 A. D.) from Africa, written in stichometrical form, catalogues the Gospels in the following order:¹

Euangelia	iiii	
Mattheum ver.	IIDC	(2600 lines)
Iohannes ver.	II	(2000 lines)
Marcus ver.	IDC	(1600 lines)
Lucam ver.	IIDCCCC	(2900 lines)

Cheltenham List

This listing of the New Testament Scripture was discovered by Mommsen in 1885 in a manuscript then at Cheltenham, England. It is believed to represent the North African usage around 360 A. D.²

Euangelia IIII	Mattheum	IIDCC
	Marcum	MDCC
	Iohannem	MDCCC
	Lucam	IIICCC

Epiphanius

Epiphanius (c. 310-403 A. D.), the bishop of Salamis in Cyprus, wrote the following about the Gospels in his treatise, Against Heretics:³

- line 4 Ματθαῖος πρῶτος ἀρχεται εὐαγγελίσεισαι:
 line 6 εὐθὺς δὲ μετὰ τὸν Ματθαῖον ἐκόλουθος γενόμενος ὁ Μάρκος τῷ ἁγίῳ Πέτρῳ ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐπιτρέπεται τὸ εὐκγγέλιον ἐκθεῖσθαι καὶ γράψαι ἀποστέλλεται ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Πέτρου εἰς τὴν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων χώραν.
 line 7 Luke wrote an account of misinterpretations of Mark. XIII, 19 finally, John, when more than 90 years old.

1. Westcott, Canon of the N. T., Appendix D.
 2. Souter, The Text and Canon of the N. T., (Selected documents), p. 212.
 3. Cf. Zahn, I. N. T., II, p. 399, note 8.

According to the account which Epiphanius gives, the Evangelists wrote in this order: Matthew, Mark, Luke and John.

As for any evidence of the time when they wrote, Epiphanius testifies that Mark had already written his Gospel before Peter sent him to the land of Egypt. This concurs with the tradition given by Eusebius, and supports an early date for the writing of Mark's Gospel.

Athanasius

Athanasius, in his 39th Festal Letter, lists the four Gospels in this order:

*Εὐκγγέλια τέσσαρα· κατὰ Ματθαῖον, κατὰ
Μάρκον, κατὰ Λουκᾶν, κατὰ Ἰωάννην.*

When he treats of the four Gospels in his Synopsis of the
¹Holy Scriptures, he places them in the same order as above.

Council of Laodicea

The order of the Gospels adopted by the Council of
Laodicea around the year 363 A. D. was in this wise:
²

*εὐκγγέλια δ', κατὰ Ματθαῖον, κατὰ Μάρκον,
κατὰ Λουκᾶν, κατὰ Ἰωάννην.*

Gregory of Nazianzus

Gregory (died c. 390 A. D.), in his work entitled, "On the Genuine Books of Inspired Scripture," arranges the four Gospels in the following order:

*Ματθαῖος μὲν ἔγραψεν Ἑβραϊοῖς θύματα
Χριστοῦ, Μάρκος δ', Ἰταλῶν, Λούκας Ἀχαιοῦ.
Πᾶσι δ' Ἰωάννης κήρυξ μέγας, οὐρανοφώτης.*
Amphilochius of Iconium

In his "Lines to Seleucus," Amphilochius (died c. 394 A. D.) records this order of the four Gospels:

-
1. Cf. the 1601 ed. of the Works of Athanasius, trans. by Petrus Naunius Alcumarianus et al., pp. 110-111.
 2. Westcott, Op. Cit., Appendix D.

Εὐαγγελιστὰς τέσσαρας λέγου μόνους,
 Ματθαῖον, εἶτα Μάρκον, ὃ Δουκᾶν τρίτον
 Προσθεῖς κρίθαι, τὸν δὲ Ἰωάννην χρόνῳ
 Τέταρτον, ἀλλὰ πρῶτον ὕψει δοχμίκτων.

Chrysostom

Chrysostom (347-407 A. D.), in his Synopsis of Holy Scripture, groups the Gospels in the order of John and Matthew, Luke and Mark:

... τὰ εὐαγγέλια τὰ τέσσαρα, δύο μὲν τῶν
 μαθητῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰωάννου καὶ Ματθαίου·
 δύο δὲ Δουκᾶ καὶ Μάρκου· ὧν ὁ μὲν τοῦ
 Πατροῦ ὁ δὲ τοῦ Πύλου γεγονόσι μαθηταί.

There is no semblance of chronological sequence whatever for the Gospels in Chrysostom's words. It is evident that in his arrangement Chrysostom is guided by the division of writers into two groups for the purpose of distinguishing between those who were the disciples of Christ and those who were not.

Chrysostom departs from the general tradition that Mark wrote in Rome, and states that he wrote in Egypt.

And Mark, too, in Egypt, is said to have done this self same thing (of putting in writing what he had spoken) at the entreaty of the disciples. ¹

Because Chrysostom alone differs from the already well established and widespread tradition, his testimony carries little weight in this connection.

Old Latin Prologues²

The evidence gathered from these Prologues concerning the

-
1. Chrysostom, Homilies on the Gospel of St. Matthew, I, 7.
 2. Zahn, Op. Cit., II, p. 400, gives the original text.

order of the Gospels is that the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, written in Judea and in Italy, respectively, were written before that of Luke. Luke is said to have written his Gospel in parts of Achaia, testifying that others had been written before his.

Qui cum iam descripta essent evangelia per Matthaeum quidem in Judaea, per Marcum autem in Italia, sancto instigante spiritu in Achaiae partibus hoc scripsit evangelium, significans etiam ipse, ante alia esse descripta.

Jerome

Jerome (340-420 A. D.) has this to say in his "Preface to the Commentary on Matthew" with regard to the order of the Gospels:

Primus omnium Matthaeus est publicanus, cognomento Levi; qui Evangelium in Judaea Hebraeo sermone edidit, ob eorum vel maxime causam, qui in Jesum crediderant ex Judaeis, et nequaquam Legis umbram, succedente Evangelii veritate, servabant. Secundus Marcus, interpret apostoli Petri, et Alexandrinae Ecclesiae primus episcopus.... Tertius Lucas medicus, natione Syrus Antiochensis qui et ipse discipulus apostoli Pauli, in Achaiae Baeotiaeque partibus volumen condidit.... Ultimus Joannes....

Jerome accepts the then old tradition that Matthew was the first to write, Mark the second, Luke the third, John the last.

He has nothing to add as to the origin of the Gospels. His testimony concerning Mark as the first episcopus of the Church of Alexandria coincides with that of Eusebius.

Syriac Canon

This listing of the New Testament canon, first edited by

Mrs. Lewis (London 1894), dates back close to the year 400

A. D. It lists the Gospels in this order:¹

Gospel of Matthew	2522 lines
Gospel of Mark	1675 lines
Gospel of Luke	3083 lines
Gospel of John	1737 lines

Augustine

Augustine² (354-430 A. D.) is another to second the tradition that the Gospels were written in the order of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John.

Isti igitur quatuor Evangelistae universo terrarum orbe notissimi, et ob hoc fortasse quatuor, quoniam quatuor sunt partes orbis terrae, per cujus universitatem Christi Ecclesiam dilatari, ipso sui numero sacramento quodammodo declararunt, hoc ordine scripsisse perhibentur. Primum Matthaeus, deinde Marcus, tertio Lucas, ultimo Joannes.

Rufinus

Rufinus (c. 410 A. D.) in his Comm. in Symb. Apost.³ lists the Gospels in this order:

Novi vero quatuor Evangelia, Matthaei, Marci, Lucae, et Joannis.

List of the Sixty Canonical Books

This listing of the canonical books of the Bible contains⁴ the four Gospels in the following order:

περὶ τῶν β' βιβλίων καὶ ὅσων τούτων ἕκτος
 α' Ευκγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαίου
 β' Κατὰ Μάρκον
 γ' Κατὰ Λουκάν
 δ' Κατὰ Ἰωάννην

1. Souter, Op. Cit., (Selected documents), p. 226.
2. Harmony of the Gospels, I, 2.
3. Westcott, Op. Cit., Appendix D.
4. Ibid., Appendix D.

New Testament Manuscripts

The majority of the Greek mss. which we have in our possession today place the Gospel of Mark before that of Luke in their arrangements. Of the oldest codices, the most important ones such as the Codex Alexandrinus, Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus, Sinaitic Syriac, and the Peshitto Syriac put the four Gospels in the order of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. However, there are some exceptions as in Codex Bezae, and a few of the other mss. as the old African Latin Codex k, cursives 90 and 399, and the old Latin mss. Vercellensis and Platinus. All these latter mss. place Luke before Mark. In the final analysis, when the orders of the mss. are weighed against one another, those which put Mark before Luke far outweigh the others.

- - - - -

After reviewing all the evidence which has been presented, we must conclude that history is almost unanimous in its testimony that Mark wrote his Gospel before Luke.

Concerning the order, the only evidence with which some doubt may be connected is that of Clement of Alexandria. But here we must agree with Zahn¹ that Clement's unusual order, if he is taken literally, must yield to the more general tradition.

In any case, Clement's isolated statement, which seems to say that Luke was written before Mark, must give way before the tradition which represents the two Gospels as having been written in the order Mark-Luke, not only because the witness for the latter view is incomparably stronger but also because Clement's view might have been the result of critical reflection, which is inconceivable in the case of the opposing tradition.

As to the time of composition of the Gospels, the testimony of history places the composition of the Marcan account

1. Op. Cit., II, p. 396.

at an early date. A recapitulation of the various events at this point will aid in seeing this. Mark must have remained in Ephesus, where he had been with Paul, a year or so after Paul left,¹ and then travelled to Rome.² He arrived in Rome probably late in 56 or early in 57. Peter, it seems, came to Rome at that time,³ and he and Mark worked there some time; the believers, who had heard Peter preach, pleaded with Mark to record what he had preached. Mark obliged them. He wrote before Peter sent him to Alexandria. He was succeeded by Annianus at Alexandria in 62. Working back from 62, we arrive at 58 or very early in 59 as the time when, we think, Mark composed his Gospel.

-
1. We recall that Mark came to Ephesus early in 54. No doubt he worked with Paul until Paul left Ephesus in the spring of 55. We have no account of Mark leaving Ephesus at that time either with Paul or without him, so it may be reasonable to think that Mark remained there until he travelled to Rome, which may have been a little more than a year's time.
 2. Cf. Part I under Rome.
 3. We thus judge because of the great amount of work which was done before Paul came to Rome. Luke speaks of brethren who came to meet him and Paul at the Forum of Appius and Three Taverns (Acts 28: 15), and the brethren at Rhegium (Acts 28: 13).

III.

THE OPINIONS OF THE SCHOLARS AS TO
WHETHER LUKE USED MARK

It seems that the very decided consensus of the early Church as to the order of the Gospels went unchallenged to any great extent until the 18th and 19th centuries. Then the scholars, under the influence of rationalism, began to re-study the entire problem. With the aid of internal evidence and various interpretations of the early testimonies of the Church, there arose a hypothesis for every possible permutation of the order of the synoptic Gospels.¹

It is our purpose here to examine these various theories in relation to the subject which we are discussing. In the first place, we wish to tabulate their results on the chronological order of the Synoptics. This, of course, will be very valuable if the many years of study and the great talent which have been expended on the synoptic problem bear out the witness of the early Church. Secondly, we should like to determine who and how many of the scholars, after a great quantity of careful research, have definitely concluded in their hypothesis that Luke used Mark's Gospel as one of his sources.

Simplicity was a dominant thought in the preparation of the tables below, and for that reason references to the works of these men have been omitted. The titles and other bibliographical material may be found at the rear of this paper, or in Meyer's,

1. A great number of these hypotheses deal only with the synoptic Gospels, because many of the scholars saw no real connection between them and John's Gospel.

Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospel of Matthew,
Godet's, A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke, and B. Weiss',
A Manual Introduction to the New Testament (Vol. II).

The date behind each scholar's name indicates the approximate time of the first appearance of his hypothesis.

The multitudinous variations of the relations of the synoptic Gospels, their original forms, later redactions and revisions, which have been proposed by the scholars, have been hidden somewhat in the effort to classify them into certain general patterns. However, the classifications are not misleading if it is kept in mind that, for the most part, they represent the final revisions or forms in which the Gospels come to us today.

1. Scholars who place Mark before Luke.

- * Indicates those who state definitely that Luke used the Gospel of Mark as one of his sources. A definite opinion could not be obtained from some, either because of the nature of their hypothesis or because we did not possess their complete system.

a) Mark, Matthew, Luke.

*Storr (1786)	Sevin (1866)
*Herder (1797)	Scholten (1869)
*Simon (1798)	Godet (1871)
*Lachmann (1835)	Westcott (1881)
*C. H. Weiss (1838)	*H. A. W. Meyer (1884)
*Reuss (1842)	*Edersheim (1886)
*Ewald (1850)	*Abbott (1888)
*Ritchie (1850)	*B. Weiss (1889)
Thiersch (1852)	*Hawkins (1899)
Tobler (1858)	*Bacon (1902)
Plitt (1860)	*Pfleiderer (1903)
Wittichen (1862)	*Burton (1904)
Reville (1862)	*Gould (1905)
Eichthal (1863)	*Plummer (1906)
Holtzmann (1863)	*Allen (1907)
Schenkel (1864)	*Montefiore (1909)
Weizsaecker (1864)	*Sanday (1911)

*Moffatt (1918)
 *A. T. Robertson (1920)
 *Jones (1921)
 E. Meyer (1921)
 *Burkitt (1922)
 *Bruce (1925)
 *Goodspeed (1926)
 *Ropes (1934)
 Dibelius (1935)

*V. Taylor (1935)
 *Redlich (1936)
 *J. A. Scott (1936)
 *Helm and Enslin (1936)
 *Torrpy (1936)
 *Lake and Lake (1937)
 *Riddle (1939)
 *Linn (1941)

b) Mark, Luke, Matthew (Greek)

*Wilke (1838)
 *B. Bauer (1841)
 *Hitzig (1843)
 *Volkmar (1870)
 *Lagrange (1910)
 *Harnack (1911)
 *Streeter (1930)
 *Hunter (1946)

c) Matthew, Mark, Luke

*Grotius (1645)
 *Mill (1707)
 *Bengel (1736)
 *Wetstein (1751-2)
 *Townson (1783)
 *Seiler (1805)
 *Hug (1808)
 *Credner (1836)
 Lessing (1838-40)
 *Hilgenfeld (1850)
 Keil (1853)
 Aberle (1863)

Bisping (1865)
 *Hengstenberg (1865)
 Klostermann (1867)
 *Gru (1871)
 Schanz (1881)
 Holsten (1883)
 *Luthardt (1899)
 *Ylvisaker (1905)
 *Zahn (1909)
 Farrar (1927)
 *Lanski (1934)
 *J. Chapman (1937)
 *W. Arndt (present)

d) Priority of Mark, in reference to the other two Gospels.

Koppe (1782)
 Gratz (1812)
 Knobel (1831)
 Tholuck (1837)
 Sommer (1842)
 Giessen (1843)
 Sepp (1846)
 Gueder (1858)
 Freitag (1861)
 Weiffenbach (1873)
 Beyschlag (1881)
 Jacobsen (1883)

Feine (1885)
 Baldensperger (1888)
 Bousset (1892)
 Peske (1897)
 Wrede (1901)
 Schmiedel (1902)
 Oskar Holtzmann (1903)
 von Soden (1904)
 R. H. Lightfoot (1936)
 *Cartledge (1938)
 Grant (1943)

2. Scholars who place Luke before Mark.

a) Matthew }
 | } Mark
 Luke }

Owen (1764)	Schwartz (1884)
Griesbach (1789-90)	Delitzsch (1850)
Eichhorn (1794)	Kahnis (1850)
von Ammon (1805)	C. F. Baur (1851)
Saunier (1825)	Koestlin (1853)
Theile (1825)	Engelhardt (1858)
De Wette (1826)	Winer (1858)
Fritzsche (1826)	Zeller (1865)
Paulus (1830)	Keim (1867)
Sieffert (1832)	Bleek (1869)
Strauss (1835)	Kern (1907)
Neudecker (1842)	Doelling (?)
Schwegler (1843)	Noesgen (?)

b) Luke }
 | } Mark
 Matthew }

Euesching (1766)
Evanson (1792)
Gfroerer (1831)

c) Luke }
 | } Matthew
 Mark }

Roediger (1829)
Schneckenburger (1834)
Noack (1876)
Vogel (?)

d) Priority of Luke

Beza (1605)	Alford (1861)
Walch (1727)	Gillany (1864)
Macknight (1756)	J. P. Lange (1873)

e) Matthew, Luke, Mark--independent, but use of a common source.

Salmon (1894)
Thiessen (1943)

The results of the above tabulation show that very few scholars, comparatively speaking, disagree with the early traditional order, Mark-Luke. Out of the total of 148, 107

place Mark before Luke, and 41 put Luke before Mark. A mere computation of numbers shows that well over two scholars to one place Luke's Gospel at a later date than Mark's. But numbers are not the only consideration. The type of scholar and the kind of work he did must be recognized. If we take this into account, the tables show an overwhelming power of testimony for placing Mark first.

As for those who say that Luke used Mark's Gospel as source material, we see that of the 107 men who put Mark first, 65, well over half, affirm that he did. Most of these have been the more outstanding scholars in the field of New Testament Introduction. Therefore, we might conclude that research in general favors Luke having used Mark.

IV.

THE VARIOUS ARGUMENTS FOR THE PRIORITY OF MARK

As far as we can determine, arbitrary judgment has not been present in the investigations of the scholars with regard to the chronological sequence of the synoptic Gospels. They have furnished proof for their contentions. Most of the proof for their various hypotheses has centered around the Gospel of Mark. They have tried to show from internal evidence that Mark wrote before Luke, as well as before Matthew (absolute priority of Mark). Therefore, since this is in direct line with our problem, we propose to present and examine these arguments for the priority of Mark to see if they are tenable.

¹
B. H. Streeter has classified the arguments into five main groups. Since he has summarized them most clearly and concisely, we shall reproduce them in his own words. We shall begin each section with his summary, and then elaborate with the statements of others.

(1) "Matthew reproduces 90% of the subject matter of Mark in language very largely identical with that of Mark; Luke does the same for rather more than half of Mark."²

These general proportions may be seen in a table which Westcott prints in his Introduction to the Study of the Gospels (p. 195.)³ The total contents of the four Gospels is represented by the number 100.

-
1. The Four Gospels, p. 151 f.
 2. At the end of the chapter in which he discusses the priority of Mark, Streeter gives some rather comprehensive lists of passages in proof of the above percentages. Ibid., pp. 195-198.
 3. Originally this table was compiled by the German scholar Stroud.

	Peculiarities		Coincidences
St. Mark	7	93
St. Matthew.	42	58
St. Luke	59	41
(St. John)	92	8

For a detailed comparison of the contents of the synoptic Gospels, we must go to Swete. He has divided the Gospels into small sections corresponding more or less to the nature of the contents, and has listed these side by side for each of the three Gospels. Space will not permit the reproduction of this valuable table. However, these are the conclusions which he has drawn from it:

It appears from this table that out of 106 sections of the genuine St. Mark there are but four (excluding the head-line) which are wholly absent from both St. Matthew and St. Luke; of the remaining 101, 93 are to be found in St. Matthew, and 81 in St. Luke.¹

(2) "In any average section, which occurs in the three Gospels, the majority of the actual words used by Mark are reproduced by Matthew and Luke, either alternately or both together."

A very early observation, in this connection, was made² by C. H. Weisse:

The divergences of wording between the two other Synoptics is in general greater in the parts where both have drawn on the Logia document than where Mark is their source.

³

Swete notes that of the 1270 words which Mark contains (besides 60 proper names), 80⁴ are peculiar to Mark among the

1. Swete, The Gospel According to St. Mark, pp. lxvii-lxix. Cf. Plummer, Commentary on Luke (I. C. C.), p. xxxv.
2. In Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, pp. 123-4. The above are Schweitzer's words.
3. Op. Cit., p. xlvi.
4. Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, App., p. 699, gives 102, of which 32 are disputable. Hawkins, Horae Synopticae, p. 200, gives 71.

New Testament writers, and about 150 are shared by Matthew and Luke, and 100 are among the less widely distributed words of the New Testament. Westcott¹ remarks that the verbal coincidences "occur most commonly in the recital of the words of our Lord of others, and are comparatively rare in the simple narrative." Furthermore, "In the passages common to all three Evangelists about one-sixth consists of verbal coincidences, and of them one-fifth occur in the narrative, and four-fifths in the recitative parts."

(3) "The relative order of incidents and sections in Mark is in general supported by both Matthew and Luke; where either of them deserts Mark, the other is usually found supporting him.

"This conjunction and alternation of Matthew and Luke in their agreement with Mark as regards (a) content, (b) wording, (c) order, is only explicable if they are incorporating a source identical, or all but identical with Mark."

Here again, Swete's fine tabulation reveals that "from the beginning of the journeyings to Jerusalem to the Resurrection the order of the sections differs but slightly."² He continues:

It must be taken as a prima facie argument in favor of St. Mark's order that it is 'confirmed either by St. Matthew or St. Luke, and the greater part of it by both,' (Woods). Moreover, when one of the other synoptics strikes out a path peculiar to himself, his order usually has less verisimilitude, and is open on internal grounds to suspicion.³

Weisse⁴ produces an ingenious, though rather precarious, argument in relation to the order of the Synoptics from the

-
1. Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, pp. 197-199.
 2. Op. Cit., p. lxxvii-lxxix.
 3. Ibid., p. lxx.
 4. Schweitzer, Op. Cit., pp. 123-4.

other sources of the first and third Gospels, which he terms the "Logia of Matthew."

In those sections which the first and third Gospels have, but Mark has not, the agreement consists in the language and incidents, not in their order. Their common source, therefore, the "Logia" of Matthew, did not contain any type of tradition which gave an order of narration different from that of Mark.

Robertson¹ says this about the order of the Synoptics and its bearing on the priority of Mark:

A better way still is to study the lists in Hawkins' Horae Synopticae (2nd ed., 1909) or in Allen's Commentary on Matthew (International Critical) or in Swete on Mark. Thus one is bound to see that the general order of events is followed and that the framework of Mark lies at the basis of both Matthew and Luke.

Westcott² mentions specifically the outline that the Gospel-writers used:

The general plan of the first three Gospels exhibits a remarkable correspondence. The history of the Infancy contained in St. Matthew and St. Luke finds no parallel in St. Mark, but afterwards the main course of the three narratives is throughout coincident. The preparation for the Ministry, the mission of John the Baptist, the Baptism, the Temptation, the return to Galilee, the preaching in Galilee, the journey to Jerusalem, the entrance into Jerusalem and the preaching there, the Passion, the Resurrection--such is the common outline which they all present, and the same relative order of the subordinate incidents is always preserved by St. Mark and St. Luke, and also by St. Matthew with the exception of some of the earlier sections.

1. Studies in Mark's Gospel, p. 30.

2. Op. Cit., pp. 194-5.

(4) "The primitive character of Mark is further shown by (a) the use of phrases likely to cause offence, which are omitted or toned down in the other Gospels, (b) roughness of style and grammar, and the preservation of Aramaic words."¹

Swete² points out the "relative fullness of St. Mark's knowledge in matters of detail." One of his examples will serve to illustrate what he means, and that is the parallel in Mark 1:20, Matthew 4:22 and Luke 5: 11. From these same chapters, Swete adduces evidence to show that "when St. Mark does not add to our knowledge, his presentation of a fact or saying is often distinct from that which it assumes in St. Matthew and St. Luke, and has the appearance of being the original from which one or both of the other accounts have been derived." However, as he continues, Mark "is not on the whole distinguished by brevity," but is constantly fuller than the other Gospels, partly through habit, and "partly from his way of (1) presenting facts in a vivid and pictorial form, and (2) interpreting character and conduct." Examples of (1) may be found in the story of the Gerasene, the Baptist's martyrdom, the epileptic boy, the scribe's question, etc., and those of (2) in passages such as Mk. 1: 41, 3: 5, 5: 36, 6: 20, 10: 21, 15: 15, etc. Swete also shows that Mark is "concise where the other evangelists are full.... Thus, the Sermon on the Mount finds only an occasional echo in the Second Gospel (e. g., 4: 21, 9: 50, 10: 11); the long charge to the Twelve (Mt. 10) is reduced by St. Mark to a few verses (6: 8-11); etc."

1. Cf. also the tabulations compiled by Allen, Commentary on Matthew (I. C. C.), and Hawkins, Horae Synopticae (1909), pp. 114-153.

2. Op. Cit., pp. lxxi-lxxv.

1

Westcott:

Each contains additions to the common matter which are not distinguishable externally from the other parts; and the Gospel of St. Mark which contains the fewest substantial additions presents the greatest number of fresh details in the account of incidents not peculiar to it.

The Gospel of St. Mark, conspicuous for its vivid simplicity, seems to be the most direct representation of the first evangelic tradition, the common foundation on which the others were reared. In essence, if not in composition, it is the oldest; and the absence of the history of the Infancy brings its contents within the limits laid down by St. Peter for the extent of the Apostolic testimony.

Redlich² submits three reasons for the revision of Mark's language by the other two: (a) reverential, (b) grammatical and (c) stylistic.

(5) "The way in which Marcan and non-Marcan material is distributed in Matthew and Luke respectively looks as if each had before him the Marcan material in a single document, and was faced with the problem of combining this with material from other sources.

" Matthew's solution was to make Mark's story the framework into which non-Marcan material is fitted, on the principle of joining like to like. Luke follows the simpler method of giving Marcan and non-Marcan material in alternate blocks; except in the Passion story, where, from the nature of the case, some interweaving of sources was inevitable."

Streeter³ elaborates on this final argument, showing how Matthew, "whenever he finds in a non-Marcan source teaching

1. Op. Cit., p. 200-209.

2. The Student's Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels, p. 24.

3. The Four Gospels, p. 166.

which would elaborate or illustrate a saying or incident in Mark, he inserts that particular piece of non-Marcian matter into that particular context in the Marcian story." Matthew illustrates a context of Mark in the saying about faith (Mt. 17: 20) and about the Apostles sitting on twelve thrones (Mt. 19: 28). In Mt. 19: 10-12, Matthew has added a few verses from a non-Marcian source on divorce to the Marcian discussions. And so this procedure is multiplied almost ad infinitum.¹

Streeter² calls special attention to this process in the longer discourses in Matthew. He states that all of these longer discourses are

clear cases of "agglomeration," that is, of the building up of sayings originally dispersed so as to form great blocks. Four times, starting with a short discourse in Mark as a nucleus, Matthew expands it by means of non-Marcian additions into a long sermon. Thus the 7 verses of Mark's sending out of the Twelve (Mk. 6: 7 ff.) become the 42 verses of Mt. 10. The three parables of Mk. 4--with one omission--are made the basis of the seven parable chapter, Mt. 13. The 12 verses, Mk. 9: 33-37, 42-48, are elaborated into a discourse of 35 verses in Mt. 18. The "Little Apocalypse" (Mk. 13) is expanded, not only by the addition of a number of apocalyptic sayings (apparently from Q), but also by having appended to it three parables of Judgment, Mt. 25.

Luke's method is different and simpler. Besides a few verses in dispute as to whether they are of Marcian origin, which are scattered throughout his Gospel, Luke alternates Marcian and non-Marcian material in great blocks all the way to the Last Supper, where there is much closer interweaving of sources. This is the way Streeter has presented the blocks:³

-
1. Cf. Allen, Op. Cit., for an extended research on how Matthew has used the Marcian and non-Marcian materials.
 2. Op. Cit., pp. 166-7.
 3. Ibid., p. 167. Cf. also Moffatt, Op. Cit., p. 265-275.

	<u>Marcan Materials</u>		<u>Non-Marcan Materials</u>
	Luke	1:1--4: 30
Luke	4: 31--6: 19	
		6: 20--8: 3
	8: 4--9:50	
		9: 51--18: 14
	18: 15-43	
		19: 1-27
	19: 28--22: 13	

1

Professor Riddle observes how Matthew and Luke use their source materials. He notices that Luke incorporates his materials in block fashion, while Matthew breaks up his materials, "re-arranging them topically."

- - - - -

2

Streeter concludes his presentation of the chief arguments for the priority of Mark with a rather emphatic note.

The net result of the facts and considerations briefly summarised under the forgoing five heads is to set it beyond dispute that Matthew and Luke made use of a source which in content, in order, and in actual wording must have been practically identical with Mark. Can we go a step farther and say simply that their source was Mark?

There are others who feel the same way as Streeter, namely, that the priority of Mark has been proven conclusively. Moffatt says, "the priority of Mark to Matthew and Luke no longer requires to be proved,"³ and with this single statement he proceeds with his investigation. R. H. Lightfoot⁴ is very confident: "Nothing, happily, has occurred...to upset the great 19th century discovery of the priority of St. Mark's Gospel." Likewise Cartledge:⁵ "Our study of the synoptic problem made

1. The Gospels, Their Growth and Origin, pp. 200-1.

2. Op. Cit., p. 168.

3. An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, p. 180.

4. History and Interpretation in the Gospels, p. 16.

5. A Conservative Introduction to the New Testament, p. 84.

us sure that Mark was the first Gospel written."

However, there have been other great scholars who are not so positive, and those who reject the absolute priority of Mark. For example, Zahn, with great learning, has defended the priority of Matthew.

It is true that all the arguments for the priority of Mark are the result of a vast amount of scholarly research. But a major failing of all this is the entire preoccupation with and emphasis on internal evidence. Instead, greater stress should be placed on the external evidence of history. History tries to be objective, while an interpretation of internal evidence tends to take on more of a subjective character.¹ History points to the priority of Matthew (cf. Part II), but many of the scholars contend for the priority of Mark (cf. Part III). This illustrates the need for approaching this problem again from the side of historical evidence, as has been done by certain scholars in the past.²

The above would not carry so much weight if it could be shown that the internal arguments for the priority of Mark are not built on the tacit presupposition that Mark is prior to the other two Gospels. In other words, it cannot be determined a priori that Mark is prior to Matthew and Luke, and then shown from the manner in which Matthew and Luke used Mark in content,

-
1. The use of compilations of internal evidence, which is not guided by evidence from the outside, can be misleading and can be made to prove anything. Sir John Hawkins, one of the greatest statisticians of the synoptic problem, admits this danger. (Horae Synopticae, Preface, p. vi.)
 2. J. L. Hug (1765-1846) used the tradition of the ancient Church about the origin of the Gospels as his starting point, and showed that Mark possessed and made use of Matthew. (In Zahn, Op. Cit., II, p. 408.)

wording, order, and distribution that Mark is prior to them. The fact that the arguments for the priority of Mark, especially regarding Matthew and Mark, are reversible¹ brings this argument in a circle (petitio principii) to light. Thus all the arguments presented by Streeter above are weakened tremendously, if not rendered useless to prove the absolute priority of Mark.

However, we cannot completely disregard the facts which the scholars have uncovered, showing the coincident material, wording and order in the synoptic Gospels. All we are saying is that when these facts are interpreted in the light of the external evidence of history, we will have come much closer to a true explanation. Therefore, we are inclined to regard the research of scholarship as having failed to prove conclusively the absolute priority of Mark, but at the same time adding a degree of certainty to the consensus of early history that Mark wrote before Luke.

1. Zahn adduces some very strong arguments in favor of the priority of Matthew. His arguments are almost point for point the reverse of those used to prove the priority of Mark. Op. Cit., II, pp. 601-617.

INTERNAL EVIDENCE TO SHOW THAT LUKE USED MARK

We shall now consider in detail the arguments set forth by the scholars from internal evidence by which they prove that Luke used Mark as one of his sources.

Perhaps a single quotation from Zahn¹ will be sufficient to indicate the nature of the problem before us.

In all five series (of parallels between Mk. and Lk.), however, Mark's order is, without exception retained throughout. This of itself is sufficient to render necessary some explanation of the dependence of one of the Gospels upon the otherBut if one of these Gospels is dependent upon the other, Mark must be considered the earlier of the two.

As we have seen (Part III), not all those who advocate the absolute priority of Mark hold to the dependence of Luke on Mark as one of his sources. Those who do hold that Luke used Mark present their arguments much in the same form as for the priority of Mark. As a matter of fact, all who set out to prove this from internal evidence must of necessity, if they wish to be complete, consider this problem under the same general categories which Streeter uses. These are: (1) content, (2) wording, (3) order, (4) language and (5) distribution.

(1) As for the argument from the contents, the scholars vary in their results all the way from over a half of Mark to the entire Gospel, as to the amount reproduced in Luke. Apparently, Streeter,² after having thoroughly examined the contents of both Gospels, comes to the conclusion that Luke has omitted

1. Introduction to the New Testament, III, p. 103-4.
 2. The Four Gospels, p. 160. Cf. also pp. 195-198 for Streeter's array of passages.

more than 45% of Mark and uses about 350 verses. Goodspeed¹ sets the proportion at three-fifths of Mark which can be identified in Luke. Swete's table² shows that out of the total of 106 sections, 81 are found in Luke. So according to him, Luke used about three-fourths of Mark. Ropes³ goes much further: "He (Luke) was unquestionably in possession of the Gospel of Mark (as was also Matthew), and has incorporated nearly the whole of it in his book." Bernhard Weiss⁴ has this to say:

Apart from greater and smaller omissions the causes of some of which are still quite transparent, the third Gospel has adopted the entire substance of the second in a still more complete way than the first; even in the rare instances where a narrative piece of Mark is visibly re-placed by the parallel account of another source (as in the scene in the synagogue at Nazareth or Peter's draught of fishes), we always find features of Mark's representation interwoven (cf. 4: 22, 24; 5: 10 f.); and notwithstanding the apparent freedom by which the history of the passion is frequently characterized, Mark's narrative invariably shows through.

In our investigation⁵ we have found that of the 678⁶ verses in Mark, Luke parallels 347 of them, which is a little more than half of Mark.

In all the statistics presented above, we must give due consideration to Streeter's⁷ warning against the effort to determine precisely how much material is common to both Luke and Mark.

-
1. An Introduction to the New Testament, p. 205.
 2. The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. lxix.
 3. The Synoptic Gospels, p. 66.
 4. A Manual Introduction to the New Testament, II, p. 289.
 5. We have used Fehling's Harmony of the Gospels. His arrangement is well adapted to this kind of study, because he lists the parallel passages in each Gospel after each incident.
 6. Using the A. V. Hawkins, Horae Synopticae, p. 14, has a total of 661 verses in Mk. He bases that on the best texts and the R. V.
 7. Op. Cit., p. 159.

First, in his account of the Last Supper and Passion, Luke appears to be "conflating"--to use the convenient technical term for the mixing of two sources--the Marcan story with a parallel version derived from another source, and he does this in a way which often makes it very hard to decide in regard to certain verses whether Luke's version is a paraphrase of Mark or is derived from his other source. Indeed there are only some 24 verses (cf. p. 216 f.) in this part of Luke's Gospel which can be identified with practical certainty as derived from Mark, though it would be hazardous to limit Luke's debt to Mark to these 24. Secondly, there are also, outside the Passion story, a number of cases where Luke appears deliberately to substitute a non-Markan for the Marcan version of a story or piece of teaching. Thus the Rejection at Nazareth, the Call of Peter, the parable of the Mustard Seed, the Beelzebub Controversy, the Great Commandment, the Anointing, and several less important items are given by Luke in a version substantially different from that in Mark, and always, it is important to notice, in context quite other from that in which they appear in Mark.

Any attempt to show how much of the substance of Mark Luke used brings with it the concomitant attempt to explain why he omitted what he did. Various solutions have been proposed. Streeter¹ thinks that when Luke omits a section of Mark and substitutes another version for it in a different context, that section did not stand in the copy Luke had. As for the "great omission" (Mark 6:45--8:26), he tells us of the one theory that this section of Mark was a later insertion, but he immediately adds two very formidable objections² which cause him to seek for another explanation. He explains this omission of Luke's by the hypothesis that Luke used a mutilated copy of

1. Ibid., pp. 172-179.

2. These objections are: (a) The style in this section of Mark is more Marcan than Mark; (b) great difficulty presents itself when it is noticed that this section was in Mark when Matthew used it.

Mark. Of course, as he says, he wants to submit this view only to show that "its absence from Luke constitutes quite insufficient ground for postulating an Ur-Marcus." We see, however, that Streeter puts no stock in his hypothesis, because he thinks that Luke regarded his non-Marcian source as primary and incorporated only what seemed most important in Mark. He also contends that Luke's omissions must not be regarded as "omissions," but as non-insertions, and "the absence of any particular passage from Luke creates no presumption that it was absent from the copy of Mark which he used."

Hawkins¹ submits two general reasons why he thinks Luke omitted Mark 6: 45--8: 26. First, it was an accident, an unintentional copying mistake, and secondly, Luke purposely omitted this section, knowing that he had other material to incorporate and did not want to exceed the traditional length of an ancient book.² Then he goes into it more thoroughly. He sets out to print the individual passages in this omission and put beside each of them the reasons why he thinks Luke omitted them. We shall reproduce two samples of the kind of work he did:³

Mark 6:45-56
(The walking on the sea, the disciples' lack of discernment, and the landing at Gennesaret.)

(1) St. Luke has just before (8: 22-25) described a storm at sea. (2) The incident might conceivably be misunderstood and supposed to involve a Docetic view of Our Lord's Person. (3) St. Luke does not insist much on the frailties of the Twelve.

-
1. Oxford Studies, pp. 63-74. In Carpenter, Christianity According to St. Luke, pp. 131-2.
 2. Also Goodspeed, Op. Cit., p. 205 and Ruegg (S. K., 1896, pp. 94-101) and Sanday (O. S. S., 25).
 3. Oxford Studies, pp. 63-77. In Carpenter, Op. Cit., p. 132-3.

Mark 7: 31-37
(The healing of the deaf man with an impediment in his speech).

(1) The miracle is described as having been wrought at the expense of some painful emotion on the part of Our Lord, and possibly (2) the method employed approximates too closely, in St. Luke's opinion, to those in use among Oriental professional healers.

As we see it, the similar subject matter found in Luke and Mark is an extremely weak argument to prove that the former used the latter as a source, and the reasons given why Luke omitted certain portions of Mark are even weaker. The impotence of this argument is brought out by the fact that the coincident material in both Gospels may be explained equally as well by their dependence, not upon one another, but upon another common archetype, the oral Gospel.¹ Therefore, we are reluctant to attach much weight to the argument from similar content.

(2) The next argument which is brought forth to prove the use of Mark by Luke is that of verbal agreement.

As to the amount of agreement in diction, Streeter,² seemingly,

L. The foremost advocates of this hypothesis are Westcott, Norton, and Salmon. Cf. Westcott's, Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, Chap. 3. Norton, Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels, note D, section 7, says that the solution is "found only in fact, that they were all based upon unwritten narratives, which had, as yet, lost nothing of their original character; and which, therefore, were the narratives, true or false, of the first preachers of the religion." Salmon, Historical Introduction to the Study of the New Testament, p. 140 ff.: "Does it follow, then, that Mark's was the earliest Gospel of all, and that it was used by the other two Evangelists? Not necessarily; and the result of such comparison as I have been able to make is to lead me to believe that Matt. and Luke did not copy Mark, but that all drew from a common source, which, however, is represented most fully and with most verbal exactness in St. Mark's version."

2. Op. Cit., p. 160.

with the help of Rushbrooke's Synopticon, to which he refers, has come to the conclusion that Luke on an average retains 53% of the actual words of Mark. Westcott, although his intention is not to prove that Luke used Mark, submits various tables and ways of looking at the verbal coincidences in the Gospels. When Westcott speaks of verbal coincidences, apparently he means that one Evangelist has the very same words in the same order as the other. Such verbal coincidence is remarkably low in proportion in the Gospels.

The verbal coincidences between the different Gospels, while in themselves sufficiently remarkable, are yet considerably less than might appear from the popular statement of the facts.¹

In the other Gospels the proportion of verbal coincidences is still less. Those in St. Luke form about one-tenth, and in St. Mark about one-sixth of the whole Gospels....²

Thus of the verbal coincidences in St. Mark about four-fifths, of those in St. Luke about nineteen-twentieths, occur in the records of the words of others.... In the passages common to all three Evangelists about one-sixth consists of verbal coincidences, and of them one-fifth occur in the narrative, and four-fifths in the recitative parts.... One instance alone of verbal coincidence occurs in the numerous sections common only to St. Mark and St. Luke, and in this the coincidences in the recitative to those in the narrative part are as five to one.³

Zahn⁴ refers to one instance where Mark and Luke have the same words in exactly the same order (Mark 1: 4 and Luke 3: 3), and remarks that such similar combinations of words "do not

-
1. Westcott, Op. Cit., p. 197.
 2. Ibid., p. 197.
 3. Ibid., p. 198.
 4. Op. Cit., III, p. 104.

originate independently of each other."

If we examine the synoptic Gospels from the standpoint of words peculiar to Mark and one or both of the other Synoptics, we arrive at this proportion:

More than a sixth of his entire vocabulary is found also in Matthew and Luke, or in one of them, and nowhere else in the New Testament.¹

Hawkins² has done some outstanding work in the field of words and phrases characteristic to the Synoptics. He has found 41 such words and phrases in Mark, and "out of the 41 different words and phrases, 16 are found in the 50 'peculiar' verses, while 25 of them are found in Matthew, 22 in Luke...."

So we could continue to quote the results of the many different studies which have viewed the similarity of vocabulary between Mark and Luke from various standpoints. In the final analysis, however, these studies prove very little³ as to whether Luke used Mark, because the argument from the similarity of words and phrases is subject to the same serious limitations as that of similarity of content. It is not an incredible solution to verbal agreement that certain words and phrases grew to be stereotyped after constant usage in Christian circles. That would apply also to the words and phrases which are distinctive to the Synoptics only, because they are treating the same subject in approximately the same way.

(3) The next bit of internal evidence which has been used

-
1. Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible, l. c. Cf. Swete, Op. Cit., p. xlv.
 2. Horae Synopticae, (2nd ed. 1909), p. 14.
 3. What little proof might be in the argument from identities in language is expressed by Hawkins (Op. Cit., p. 54.) "These are so numerous and so close, and in many cases they contain constructions or words which are so very unusual or even peculiar that the use of written Greek documents is prima facie suggested by them. Certainly they throw very serious difficulties in the way of an exclusively 'oral' theory'."

to show that Luke used Mark is that their Gospels have very near the same order of events.

B. Weiss¹ notes this similarity:

Apart from the manifestly intentional precedence given to the synagogue scene at Nazareth, which has led to the transposition of the disciples' calling and the borrowing of both parts from another source (cf. also the transposition of the piece 8: 19 ff., which is equally self-explanatory, and is likewise given in accordance with another source), the Evangelist follows Mark's sequence still more exclusively than is done by the first Gospel, foreign to his literary manner as is its grouping, which for the most part is broken up by the fresh material he adds to it, and is moreover evidently no longer recognized by him as such.

In the five main sections of parallels between Mark and Luke which Zahn² has pointed out, he has found that, without exception, Mark's order is retained throughout. Streeter³ admits that though Luke omits far more of Mark than does Matthew, he "hardly ever departs from Mark's order, and only in trifling ways." Robertson⁴ observes that "Luke follows Mark's general order of events, especially in the first part of the Gospel." Goodspeed⁵ remarks: "But every section of Mark that Luke has taken over except two stands in exactly the Marcan order; that is, wherever Mark is used, the sequence of sections is just what it was in Mark." A more general similarity of sequence has been noted by the Harvard scholar, Ropes.⁶

1. Op. Cit., II, p. 289.

2. Op. Cit., III, pp. 102-3.

3. Op. Cit., p. 161-2.

4. Luke the Historian in the Light of Research, p. 67.

5. An Introduction to the New Testament, p. 205.

6. The Synoptic Gospels, p. 66. See Westcott, Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, pp. 194-5.

For the general outline of the course of Jesus' life from baptism by John to the crucifixion, he (Luke) seems to be wholly dependent on what he learned from Mark, and to have regarded Mark's narrative as giving a trustworthy historical sequence. He has occasionally departed from this order, sometimes for reasons still apparent to us, but for the most part he follows it in detail, and he seems to have had no other information concerning the outline of his biography for this period.

If we wish to gain a true impression of the facts, we must also include something on the disagreement of order between Mark and Luke. Swete¹ agrees that Luke is "generally in fair agreement with St. Mark," but does not wish to let his reader go without pointing out some of the chief differences of order in his Gospel with Mark:

The chief differences of order in St. Luke are as follows: (1) The charge of collusion with Beelzebub follows the arrival of the mother and brethren; (2) the parable of the mustard seed is detached from that of the sower and stands in a later context; (3) the preaching at Nazareth is placed at the outset of the ministry.

Moffatt² presents a more extensive and detailed list of differences in the order between Mark and Luke. It might be well to reproduce his discussion on these differences.

Luke's relation to the Marcan order is of primary significance in an estimate of his work. Between Mk. 1: 1-6 and Mk. 1: 7-8 he inserts an even fuller account of John's preaching (3: 7-14) than Mt. (3: 7-10); he then follows Mk. down to 4: 15 (equals Mk. 1: 15), but proceeds to insert a programmatic and proleptic account of the rejection of Jesus at Nazara (4: 16-30). Returning, in 4: 31-44, to the Marcan scheme (1: 21-39), he stops at this point to insert a special version of Peter's call (5: 1-11), in place of the tradition (Mk. 1: 16-20) which he has just omitted. The Marcan thread is followed again till 6: 11 (equals Mk. 3: 6), where he reverses the position of the call of the Twelve (6: 12-16--Mk. 3: 13-19, 6: 17-19--Mk. 3: 7-12). After this, Luke goes his own way

1. Op. Cit., p. lxx.

2. Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, pp. 264-5.

for a while. Mk. 4: 1-25 is reproduced in 8: 4-18; 8: 19-21 picks up Mk. 3: 31-35 (another instance of reversed order), and 8: 22-56 follows Mk. 4: 35--5: 43; the parabolic teaching of 4: 26-29, 33-34 is entirely omitted, and 4: 30-32 is not used till 13: 18-19. In 9: 1-9 Luke returns to Mk. (6: 6b-16), and the thread is on the whole followed in 9: 10-17 (equals Mk. 6: 30-44). Then omitting Mk. 6: 45--8: 26, with the exception of 8: 11-13 and 8: 14-21, which are caught up in reverse order later (12: 54-56, 11: 53--12: 1), he follows Mk. (8: 27--9: 8) in 9: 18-36 (omitting Mk. 9: 9-13), and on the whole in 9: 37-50 (equals Mk. 9: 14-41). Mk. 9: 42-48 reappears afterwards in 17: 1-2, the salt-saying of 9: 49-50 (like 10: 1-12) never appears at all, and it is not till 18: 15-34 that the Marcan scheme (10: 13-34) is resumed (18: 35-43--Mk. 10: 46-52). The narrative of the last days in Jerusalem then follows Mk. pretty closely, though it omits Mk. 11: 12-14, 20-26 (fig-tree incident), 13: 21-23, 33-37 and 15: 16-20, reverses the order of Mk. 14: 18-21 (equals 22: 21-23) and 14: 22-25 (equals 22: 15-20), and makes a number of significant additions.

The agreement in order of incidents is considered by Zahn¹ as of special significance "since, in many instances, the order followed is not a reproduction of the real succession of events, and of which Luke betrays a consciousness." Robertson² agrees with Zahn: "Luke sometimes prefers another order to the chronological, but is always a systematic treatment and not a mere hotch-potch." If such is the case, as we believe it is, agreement in order demands more of an explanation than a common oral tradition. In fact, it strongly suggests that Luke used Mark's Gospel as source material.

The disagreements in arrangement of incidents which Luke

1. Op. Cit., III, p. 103. He bases this upon the presupposition that Mark does not give the chronological order of events. Sanday (Smith, Dictionary of the Bible, I, p. 1224), Holtzmann, whom Sanday mentions, Salmond (Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible, III, p. 255), B. Weiss (Op. Cit., p. 239), etc. are also of the opinion that Mark does not give the chronological order.
2. Luke the Historian in the Light of Research, p. 53.

has, sometimes within parallels with Mark, lend themselves more to an oral tradition theory,¹ but would affect the final force of the argument of agreement very little.

(4) The comparison of the literary character of the two Evangelists, is complex, varied and profuse.

We shall begin with what has been said about Mark's Gospel. Some scholars are hesitant to ascribe any kind of literary artistry to Mark. Tasker² says: "Mark is almost entirely lacking in conscious literary artistry, though his work has an intensity quite peculiarly its own."³ Moffatt also: "Mark has no special style; his book has not the Biblical tinge of Mt. nor the literary art of Luke."⁴ Salmond is a little more positive:

It is the Greek of one to whom Greek is not his mother tongue, and who knows the language in its Biblical, popular, and colloquial forms, not in its literary usage. The command of words is moderate, and the grasp of idiomatic expression is limited. But there is enough for the purpose--enough for simple, truthful narrative; not enough for a literary composition, but enough for the construction of a collection of notes and reminiscences.

What literary character Mark has is usually described thus.

"The most striking peculiarity of the second Gospel is its descriptive character."⁵ "Again his Gospel is marked by special

-
1. Cf. Hawkins, Horae Synopticae (2nd ed. 1909), pp. 77-78. "There is nothing to make copyists and compilers likely to invert, either intentionally or accidentally, the order of the materials before them, whatever omissions or abbreviations or adaptations they may make in dealing with those materials; but such inversions would take place naturally and easily in the course of memoriter narration and instruction."
 2. The Nature and Purpose of the Gospels, p. 57.
 3. Op. Cit., p. 237. Cf. also Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament, p. 119.
 4. Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible, III, p. 251.
 5. B. Weiss, A Manual of Introduction to the N. T., II, p. 239.

vividness."¹ As a result of Mark's pictorial presentation and the interpretation of character and conduct in his Gospel, he has a relative abundance of minute details.² Mark also is "characterized by an almost impetuous activity....Swift and incisive, his narrative proceeds straight to the goal like a Roman soldier on his march to battle."³ Goodspeed notes the movement of Mark's Gospel:⁴

This is why we get in Mark as in no other Gospel this strange vague sense of great things close at hand--conflicts, insights, purposes, decisions. It shows us Jesus not primarily as a teacher but as a man of action. He moves through the narrative with masterful vigor, finally even facing the nation's priesthood not with mere words but with bold acts of reformation. It is not without significance that in this earliest gospel we see Jesus as a man of action.⁵

It is the conciseness and succinctness which Mark has maintained that gives the impression of this quick movement. On Mark's terse way of putting things, Swete⁶ has the following to say: "In one respect, indeed, St. Mark is concise where the other Evangelists are full. With a single exception (c. 13) he represents the longer discourses of St. Matthew and St. Luke by a few compact sentences." However, as Swete continues, Mark is not always concise: "On the other hand, instructions de-

-
1. Farrar, Messages of the Books, p. 59. Examples of Marcan vividness may be found in the story of the Gerasene demoniac, the healing of the epileptic boy, the scribe's question, healing of the blind man, the anointing at Bethany, etc. Marcan interpretation of character and conduct may be seen from such passages as these: 1: 41, 3: 5, 5: 36, 6: 20, 6: 52, 10: 21, 15: 15, 16: 8.
 2. Swete, Op. Cit., p. lxxiii. Cf. also Zahn, I. N. T., II, p. 461 and ppl 481-483 note 4.
 3. Farrar, Op. Cit., pp. 58-9.
 4. Op. Cit., p. 146.
 5. Cf. also B. Weiss, Op. Cit., II, pp. 240-1.
 6. Op. Cit., p. lxxiv.

livered privately to the Twelve are sometimes given more at length by St. Mark than by the other two Synoptists (cf. e. g., 7: 18-23, 8: 17-21, 9: 33-50, 13: 34-37)."

The grammatical constructions which are characteristic of Mark have been put down by B. Weiss.¹ It might be well that we reproduce what he has written:

In keeping with this mode of presentment we have the linguistic expression down to the smallest detail, the predilection for the descriptive imperfect, for the vividly realistic historical present, for emphasizing the commencement of an act (*ἤρξατο* 26 times), for plastic, marked and richly coloured expressions, more especially for diminutives and every form of climax (*πολύς* 43 times, *πολλά* 15 times, doubling the expression for the same thing, particularly the negative, and the combination of positive and negative), as also for the constantly recurring *εὐθύς* (40 times). Answering to the descriptive character we have the circumstantial particularity of expression, the recurrence of similar features expressed in almost the same way, the repetition of the same or cognate words, the noun instead of the pronoun, the abundance of pronominal and adverbial turns of expression, the paraphrasing of the finite verb by *εἶναι* with the participle. The language is strongly Hebraistic, as shown in the simple form of construction, the sentences being carried on by *καὶ* and *δέ*; cases of participial construction are comparatively rare, but where they do occur are sometimes awkwardly heaped together. Peculiarities are found in the pregnant use of *εἰς*, of the narrative *ὅτι*, where the Evangelist himself shapes the diction, and a series of Latin words (*κεντυρίων, κέβρατος, φέστης, πραυτίριον, κοφάντης, σπεκουλάτωρ, φραγαλλοῦν*), and phrases (2: 23, 15: 15).

All that may be said about Mark's unique literary character² is very neatly summarized for us by J. A. Kleist:

1. Op. Cit., II, pp. 241-2.
2. The Gospel of St. Mark, p. 1751

Of one thing we must be sure: the second Gospel deserves loving study because it is unique; unique perhaps in point of time, in the sense that it may be the first Christian utterance in Greek; unique in rush and forward movement; unique in brevity and compactness; unique in ruggedness of construction; unique in graphic detail and vigorous phrase; unique in its ultimate relation to the prince of the Apostles.

The literary character of Luke's Gospel, on the other hand, is considered to be very artistic. ¹ Tasker calls Luke the first literary artist. ² Renan ³ has called it the most literary of the Gospels and the most beautiful book in the world. Farrar ⁴ compliments Lucan literary character: "He was master of a good Greek style;--an accomplished writer, a close observer, an unassuming historian, a well-instructed physician, and a most faithful friend." ⁵ Thiessen has this to say:

It has a classical preface like Herodotus and Thucydides. Whether or not he was a painter, he surely had the ability to paint word pictures! His Gospel comes nearest of the four to being a biography of Jesus. He writes history and connects the events in the life of Christ with the history of Syria and Rome. Luke writes as a man of culture and is cosmopolitan in outlook and tone. He has a rich vocabulary (about 312 words are peculiar to him in the Gospel) and a good command of Koine Greek. He writes in the spirit of Paul and the style of Hebrews.

Those who claim that Luke used Mark find support for their contention in a comparison of the literary characters of their Gospels. In the manner in which Luke allegedly used the Marcan

1. Moffatt, Op. Cit., p. 278-9. Here Moffatt has published some fine examples to show that Luke is true to the Atticist tradition of literary style, and remarks that the "Hellenistic features are not always in due proportion." Cf. also Robertson, Grammar of the Greek N. T., (large--2nd ed.), pp. 120-123, B. Weiss, Op. Cit., II, p. 299, Riddle, The Gospels Their Origin and Growth, p. 206.
2. The Nature and Purpose of the Gospels, p. 65.
3. See Goodspeed, Op. Cit., p. 186.
4. Op. Cit., p. 74.
5. Introduction to the N. T., pp. 155-6.

account they see two principles which guided him in his work. First, Luke edited the portions of Mark's Gospel which he incorporated, and secondly, he made certain stylistic and grammatical refinements of the Marcan text.

With regard to the former, B. Weiss¹ speaks of an elaboration of Mark's text:

The literary, reflective, explanatory and expansive elaboration of Mark's text appears even more strongly throughout the third Gospel than the first; details only mentioned in Mark where they have importance for the narrative, are here anticipated in order to make the implied course of events clear from the beginning; or conversely, details here omitted or modified are presupposed in the subsequent narrative as in Mark (cf. first connected paragraph taken from Mk., the literary elaboration in 4: 32, 36, 37, explanation in 4: 31, 36, the paraphrasing in 4: 43, the more exact definition in 4: 38, reflection in 4: 35, 40, 41, the statement in 4: 42 anticipated from Mark 1: 37, also in 5: 17, 8: 23, 27, 42, 51, and the presupposition in 5: 19 that Jesus was in the house and was thronged by the multitude, taken solely from Mark). So familiar is Mark's narrative to the Evangelist, that he not unfrequently makes use of it to embellish accounts drawn from other sources (cf. Lk. 7: 6 with Mk. 5: 39; 7: 14 with 5: 41; 10: 1 with 6: 7; 15: 1 with 2: 15; 17: 14 with 1: 44; 19: 28 with 10: 32).²

Luke, the editor, has not only elaborated on the text he used but has deleted material here and there.³ They say that he omitted some of the interesting details found in Mark (4: 38,

1. Op. Cit., II, p. 290.

2. Swete (Op. Cit., p. lxxiv) attributes Luke's fullness to his literary style, and furnishes more examples of his development.

3. Streeter (Op. Cit., pl 163) attributes the omissions of Luke to this editorial freedom. "Matthew and Luke use the more succinct and carefully chosen language of one who writes and then revises an article for publication."

8: 14), and abbreviated the majority of his pleonasms.

Luke is said to have refined Mark's style and grammar. "Luke has a more polished style and smooths out apparent roughness or lack of exactness in Mark (cf. Mark 1: 4 with Luke 5: 19)."² In this connection, Goodspeed³ gives us his observation:

The description of the heavens as split or ripped open and the Spirit plunging down like a dove to enter into him is so harsh and bold that two redactors--Matthew and Luke--have greatly softened it. Mark describes Jesus as taken possession of by the Spirit, but in Matthew and Luke the Spirit simply lights on him.

⁴ Zahn cites an example in Mark 1: 4 and Luke 3: 3 (also Mk. 1: 32 and Luke 4: 40) where Luke appears as the "stylist smoothing down the awkward expressions which Mark uses in making his citations. In fact this is everywhere the case." He continues to show how Luke seems to have removed the most marked⁵ Hebraisms and Aramaic words (Mark 6: 39 removed in Luke 9: 14). Luke removes Aramaic names found in Mk. 3: 16, 18; 5: 41; 9: 5; 10: 46, 51; 11: 10; 12: 43; 14: 32, 36, 45; 15: 22, 34--in some cases translations are substituted: Lk. 6: 15; 8: 54, 9: 33, 21: 3, where there are no parallels--cases where the Hebrew or Aramaic word is stricken out: 19: 38; 22: 49, 42, 47; 23: 33) in order to "soften somewhat the Semitic colouring, setting aside

1. Streeter, Op. Cit., p. 163. Zahn (Op. Cit., III, pp. 102-3) notes some of these omissions, and adds, "although Luke consciously omitted some things found in Mark, he endeavored to find substitutes for the omissions."
2. Robertson, Luke the Historian in the Light of Research, p. 68.
3. Op. Cit., p. 136.
4. Op. Cit., III, pp. 104-5.
5. Zahn does not say that Luke omitted all the Hebraisms. "Luke uses a few Hebraisms, not only in the narratives probably, or certainly, taken from older sources, but in connective phrases and summaries, which are his own composition." (Op. Cit., III, p. 104, and note 11, p. 135 for examples.)

expressions unnecessarily harsh, and striving to make the narrative more lucid. Likewise, Zahn¹ points out that Luke does not altogether avoid Latin terms (12: 6; 7: 41; 10: 35; 8: 30), but does avoid many of them in Mark (7: 2, 6; 23: 47; 20: 22; 23: 2; 21: 2). Otherwise Luke uses Greek names for everything Roman (2: 13) and for Jewish officials and authorities (22: 4, 52; 5: 17). There are countless instances where Luke selects the more pleasing and expressive word (cf. Mk. 1: 23; 5: 2 and Luke 4: 33; 8: 27; Mk. 1: 25 f. and Lk. 4: 35; Mk. 1: 28 and Luke 4: 37; Mk. 2: 4, 11 and Lk. 5: 19, 24--Lk, circumlocutes Mark in 5: 25). Luke substitutes the more polished words and phrases for the parallels in Mark (5: 26, 29, 31; 8: 6, 13, 14, 18, 19, 22, 23, 39, 40, 43; 9: 7, 10, 11; 18: 15; 19: 48; 21: 5, 14).² Luke has also removed such peculiarities of Mark as are due to Mark's personal relations and the fact that his Gospel was designed for Roman readers (Mk. 12: 42; 15: 17, 51 f.; 15: 21; cf. Luke 21: 2; 22: 14, 53; 23: 26), and "imperfections" in the presentation due to Mark's very exact reproduction of the narratives of Peter (Mk. 1: 29 equals Lk. 4: 38; Mk. 3: 26 equals Lk. 6: 14; Mk. 9: 14 f. equals Lk. 9: 37 f.; Mk. 13: 1-3 equals Luke 4: 40).³

As to the refinement of Mark's grammatical constructions, certain authorities have pointed to the fact that Luke frequently changes Mark's historical presents into the aorist or imperfect.⁴ Another common improvement noted by Cartledge is that Luke changes

-
1. Op. Cit., III, p. 136 note 13.
 2. A handy table for a quick survey of Luke's style in this respect, see Plummer, Commentary on Luke, (I. C. C.), pp1 lxvi-lxvii.
 3. Zahn, Op. Cit., III, p. 105.
 4. Cartledge, Op. Cit., p. 70. Cf. also Robertson, Luke the Historian in the Light of Research, p. 68.

Mark's loosely connected coordinate clauses to smoother subordinate ones. To illustrate that Luke presented the Gospel in a form intelligible to the Gentiles, Tasker¹ quotes Hoskyns:

As Sir Edwyn Hoskyns pointed out, in speaking of Luke's use of Mark: "Luke does not really interpret the awkward material behind him; he simplifies it. The result is that those passages which Luke has rewritten, rather than merely edited, provide the modern reader with best illustrations of a general humanitarianism uncomplicated by a peculiarly awkward Jewish background."

From the preceding observations on the manner in which Luke is supposed to have treated Mark's text, it is concluded that Luke made use of Mark's Gospel in preparing his own.

The true proof of the dependence of Luke is the double concern not to omit anything essential and to transform everything according to a literary ideal, excluding that which is picturesque from the section chosen, looking, to a higher degree, at the method in the presentation of facts and at greater elegance and precision in the use of terms, which the oral tradition is incapable of realizing; it is the special procedure of an author.

³

Zahn reaches this conclusion on the matter:

This, like the other assumption that Mark had Luke before him, would compel us to assume that Mark intentionally and regularly replaced the better language of Luke, or of the common source, by more awkward expressions. But this is incredible. Consequently a comparison of the style in Mark and Luke shows that, in the five sections of his Gospel mentioned, Luke made use of Mark in preparing his own work.

When we compare the styles of the two Evangelists, there is no escaping the fact that Mark has much less of the literary finesse which is so noticeable in Luke's Gospel. However, we should like

1. The Nature and Purpose of the Gospels, pp. 56-7.
2. Lagrange, Commentary on Mark, (Paris, 1910), introd. material.
3. Op. Cit., III, p. 105.

to stress that Mark has less of these artistic characteristics, for, as Kleist, has so ably contended, Mark is not altogether void of literary artistry. ¹ Nevertheless, judging from the language in the two Gospels, it would seem as if the hypothesis that Luke has used Mark's Gospel, editing and refining its language, is correct. But all that research has brought out in support of this, in our opinion, cannot furnish absolute proof that Luke used Mark. The evidence is certainly strong and the hypothesis of dependence seems much more probable, but it still remains to be proved that Luke did not write independently of Mark, having used another source.

(5) The concentration of Marcan parallels in Luke and the alternate gaps are used by the scholars as another manifestation of Luke's dependence on Mark as one of his sources. It is supposed that Luke had all of the Marcan material in a single document along with other source material, and his problem was to combine these into his Gospel.

-
1. Kleist, The Gospel of St. Mark, pp. 179-180. "The following are among those Marcan passages that owe their effectiveness to a complete absence of rhetoric: their power is in the bare thought (1: 8; 2: 10; 3: 28, 29; 9: 19; 10: 18, 43; 11: 23; 12: 17, 27; 14: 22; 15: 25, 37)." "Mark has several examples of effective parallelism, as in 1: 8; 2: 21-22; 22: 27; 3: 24-26; 2: 17; 4: 4 ff.; 4: 12, etc." Mark has a certain flexibility of expression: cf. 10: 12 with 10: 11; 10: 51 with 10: 36, etc. "Variety is a charm even in the speech of simple men." Mark knows the force of synonyms: 13: 33, 34--importance of repetition both as a means of emphasis (8: 26-38; 9: 43-45-47) and as a means of reproducing the colloquial tone of the teacher (2: 20; 3: 24-26; 14: 30)--chiasms, 1: 5--paronomasia, 7: 37 and 12: 14--asyndeton, 14: 6, 7--periodic structure, 15: 42; 5: 26-28--hendiadys, 1: 45--sentence balancing and disposal of the common element, 1: 45; 9: 14, 22--hysteron proteron, 12: 8--rhythm, 4:2; 9: 19.

Luke is thus a compiler and redactor of previous sources or traditions, though his functions are larger than those of the editors who finally put together the Hexateuch. Allowance must be made for his freedom of composition, as in Acts, but the primary feature of his work is its power of selection and collocation.¹

Furthermore, Professor Riddle² describes the process as it appears in Luke's Gospel:

It is instructive to observe, as far as the processes can be seen, how the materials are used. Clearly the Marcan gospel was one of the sources of the gospel section, and one can see how it was used.... the writer of Luke-Acts incorporated his materials in large blocks....

These blocks of Marcan material are determined from the longer parallels in the two Gospels. Although he wishes it to be understood that even these longer sections are not complete parallelisms, Zahn³ has noted five of them:

(1)	Luke 4: 31--6: 19	Mark 1: 21--3: 19
(2)	8: 4--9: 17	4: 1--6: 44
(3)	9: 18--50	8: 27--9: 40
(4)	18: 15--43	10: 13--52
(5)	19: 29--24: 8	11: 1--16: 8

Luke, it seems, had certain principles which he followed in using his source materials. Certainly it was not patch work, as if scissors and paste had been used.

It was, however, by no means his intention to join these sources together like mosaic, but with their help to create a new and independent work. For this reason he has worked them over entirely, and hence it is that in a certain degree a uniform linguistic character runs through the whole work, discernable also in

-
1. Moffatt, Op. Cit., p. 276.
 2. The Gospels, Their Origin and Growth, p. 200-1.
 3. Op. Cit., III, p. 102. Compare Streeter's table, The Four Gospels, in section IV, and that in Carpenter, Christianity According to St. Luke, p. 135.

the Acts which are written by the same hand (Acts 1: 1).¹

2

Streeter thinks that Luke had very little to guide him as to the exact historical occasion to which any particular item should be assigned, but was governed by literary considerations.

The way, then, in which materials derived from the Marcan and from non-Markan sources are combined must have been determined mainly by literary considerations, and very little, if at all, by extrinsic historical information.

Two other principles are detected by scholars. The one is Luke's repetition of certain incidents.

It is obvious that in the analysis of the text into source and editorial revision, due weight must be allowed to this element of freedom in Luke's method of composition, to "his fondness for repetition, and his tendency to vary even facts of some importance when rehearsing a story for the second time." (Ropes, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 1901, 12, 299 f.)³

4

The other principle is, as B. Weiss puts it: "...duplicates he avoids on principle, even omitting one of two somewhat

1. B. Weiss, Op. Cit., p. 298. Also Robertson, Luke the Historian in the Light of Research, pp. 61-2. "Assimilation rather than quotation--this was the method of the ancients....Luke employed the literary devices of men of his age....And yet Luke was not a slavish copyist. The stamp of his own personality is on all of his work."
2. Op. Cit., p. 165. Also Ropes, The Synoptic Gospels, p. 72, "Where Luke is not guided by Mark's sequence, but is free to arrange as he chooses, it is artistic feeling that governs him rather than deeper relations of thought, or any attempt to preserve or create a probable pragmatic order."
3. Moffatt, Op. Cit., p. 279. The same principle is noted by Lagrange (Commentary on Mark, in introduction), "He has repeated, in order not to leave Mark's order of events, certain features already mentioned before, that is to say, Luke contains doublets...." Cf. Hawkins, Horae Synopticae (1909), pp. 99-107 for an extensive study of the doublets contained in Luke. Some of them are: Luke 8: 16 and 11: 33 (Mk. 4:21) and Luke 8: 17 and 12: 2 (Mk. 4: 22).
4. Op. Cit., II, p.299.

similar narratives...," that is, Luke gives no account of the cursing of the barren fig-tree (Mk. 11: 13) because he has already narrated a similar event in 13: 6ff., and does not mention the anointing of Mk. 14: 3 because of the narrative of 7: 36ff., etc.

Here we have two contradictory principles which Luke is supposed to have employed. In reality, it is only the principles themselves that are contradictory, and it may be pointed out that the possibility is not excluded that Luke did both things, following now the one, and now the other.

Anyone who will give even a passing glance to the material of Mark and Luke as arranged in Burton and Goodspeed, A Harmony of the Synoptic Gospels in Greek, must confess that great blocks of Marcan parallels exist. He will also notice that interspersed among these blocks are shorter parallels to Mark, materials peculiar only to Luke, omissions of Marcan text, omission and addition within the blocks, and conflation (especially in the Passion narrative). One cannot leave such an examination without the feeling that Luke's Gospel is a literary masterpiece, and that Luke has produced a Gospel from various source materials. From all appearances, judging by the way he used his sources, one can easily conclude that Mark's Gospel was one of them, perhaps the primary one.

- - - - -

In bringing to a conclusion our examination of the various arguments from internal evidence as to whether or not Luke used Mark as one of his sources, we shall first take inventory of

the results. We have found the first two arguments from similar content and verbal agreement to be very weak, easily explainable by other hypotheses of independence. As for the third argument, any other theory than that of dependence has a difficult time in explaining the agreement of order of incident where Mark and Luke parallel one another, especially when many times it is not the real chronological sequence of events that is given. A comparison of the literary characters of the two books has yielded some rather convincing evidence which raises the probability of Luke having used Mark to a higher level. Finally, the distribution of narrative in Luke, parallel to Mark, and that which is not, seems to be satisfied by no supposition other than that of the dependence of Luke upon Mark.

The culminative effect of the results is that the internal evidence strongly favors the supposition that Luke used Mark's Gospel as one of his sources. We must remember, however, that to make these results final and absolute proof, is erroneous, because of the very nature of internal evidence.

VI.

THE PREFACE OF LUKE'S GOSPEL

Thus far we have made our approach through various avenues of external and internal evidence, with the result of a fairly complete picture of the problem. But no presentation of the case is ever complete without a thorough examination of what Luke himself has said about his sources. Therefore, since Luke has recorded nothing about his sources elsewhere than in the preface to his Gospel, we shall proceed to make a detailed study of it.

Before we begin, perhaps it should be pointed out that the importance of the bearing of Luke's preface on our problem dare never be underestimated. Godet,¹ in the following quotation, has correctly emphasized this:

Apart from these first lines of Luke, we know absolutely nothing definite about the more ancient narratives of the life of Jesus which preceded the composition of our Gospels. Therefore every theory as to the origin of the synoptics, which is not constructed out of the materials furnished by this preface, runs the risk of being thrown aside as a tissue of vain hypotheses the day after it has seen the light.

Luke begins the introduction to his Gospel with the particle *ἐπειδή*², which is clearly a classical term. Thayer gives the meaning as, "seeing that" or "forasmuch as,"³ which corresponds to the Latin quoniam quidem. Preuschen-Bauer (a. 1.) furnish

-
1. Commentary on Luke, p. 33.
 2. Found in Aristotle, Dionysius, Philo, and nowhere else in the N. T., nor in the LXX, nor any other Greek version of the O. T., including the Apocrypha. (Thayer, Greek-English Lexicon of the N. T., a. 1.)
 3. Cf. Plummer, Commentary on Luke, (I. C. C.). He accepts the latter meaning.

the German equivalent, da nun einmal. If we dissect this word into its component parts, we shall perceive more accurately the precise meaning which Luke seems to have put into it. Godet¹ breaks it down thus:

To the idea of since (επει), adds that of notoriety; 'since, as is well-known;' πεε² draws attention to the relation between the great number of these writings and the importance of the events related: It is so (δη), and it could not be otherwise (πεε).

With this in mind, the translation which Blass³ gives comes closest to expressing the force of the Greek: "'inasmuch as already,' referring to a fact already well-known."

The idea of notoriety contained in the beginning word would not exclude a Gospel such as Mark's. In fact, it would favor it somewhat, since any Gospel so closely connected with the Apostle Peter would naturally gain an early conspicuity.

Luke now states the well-known fact that "many have taken in hand to draw up a narrative." Who are the πολλοί? "The context seems to imply that these, like Luke, were not eye-witnesses."⁴ It also follows that these writers were not of the "servants of the Word from the beginning."⁵

On this score,⁶ Mark might well be classed with the "many", because he was neither an eye-witness "from the beginning" nor

1. Op. Cit., p. 34.

2. Robertson (Grammar of the Greek N.T., p. 1154) says this part of the word denotes doing a thing to the limit, thoroughly. In it is a note of urgency, along with the idea both of intensiveness and extensiveness.

3. Grammar of the N. T. Greek, p. 274.

4. Plummer, Op. Cit., p. 2. Also, the "many" in Luke cannot be regarded as a "pardonable hyperbole" as Goodspeed takes it. (An Introduction to the N. T., p. 204.)

5. "It follows at once that the writers with whom Luke compares himself were not the eye-witnesses and servants of the Word from the beginning, but became such later." Zahn, I.N.T., III, p. 46.

6. Plummer thinks it is doubtful that Mark is included here. Op. Cit., p. 2.

a servant of the Word "from the beginning." We like the conclusion which Bruce¹ reaches concerning the matter:

The older exegetes understood the word as referring to heretical or apocryphal gospels, of course by way of censure. This view is abandoned by recent commentators, for whom the question of interest rather is: were Matthew's Logia and Mark's Gospel among the earlier contributions which Luke had in his eye? This question cannot be decided by exegesis, and answers vary according to the critical theories of those who discuss the topic. All that need be said here is that there is no apparent urgent reason for excluding Matthew and Mark from the crowd of early essayists.

Luke employs two very colorful words (ἐπιχειρησάντων ἀνατάξασθαι) to describe the action of the "many." From the component parts of the former word, the essential meaning would be, "to put the hand to." Thayer, a. l., defines the meaning of the word this way, "to take in hand, undertake, or attempt."

Luke seems to use the aorist tense in a culminative way, that is, he views the attempts as having attained the end of their processes and as being in existence at his time as completed efforts. The aorist here takes on somewhat the force of a perfect tense, which agrees well with the particle ἐπειδήπερ.

Some of the ancient church fathers² have seen in the word ἐπιχειρέω a rather contemptuous criticism of Luke's predecessors.³ However, as some scholars have pointed out, that is not the case, since the word of itself lends nothing to the idea that they were illegitimate or unsuccessful attempts. If so, by the same token, Luke would condemn his own attempt, because he certainly "brackets

1. Expositor's Greek Testament, Luke 1: 1-4.
2. Begun by Origen (Hom. 1 in Luke), followed by Eusebius (H. E., III, 24) and Athanasius (Festal Letter 39).
3. Robertson, Luke the Historian in the Light of Research, p. 45, and Ropes, The Synoptic Gospels, p. 63.

himself with these writers (*ἔδοξε καμοῖς*); what they attempted he may attempt." ¹ Also, as Zahn ² says, Luke did not imply the same criticism on the previous writers as Origen, because he would then have chosen the means least adapted to show that his undertaking was not unheard of or presumptuous.

It is quite evident that Luke meant no sharp reproof in *ἐπιχειρέω* itself, but when he combined it with *ὑπετάσσουμαι* some ³ say that he meant it to take on more of a meaning than a mere expletive. They say that the "attempt to compose" is not equivalent to "they have composed." In all probability this led Zahn ⁴ to conclude that Luke had "doubts" about these sources. However, the "doubts" arose out of the fact that Luke considered them so unadaptable for his particular purpose that he did not recommend them to Theophilus. "Luke may have regarded these attempts as insufficient, or he would not have added another." ⁵ Their insufficiency may have lain in the fact that they were not as full and comprehensive as Luke would have them to be for Theophilus. On the other hand, the combination of these words need not necessarily denote something more than an expletive. Luke could have used this combination in conformity with the elevated style of his preface, so that its function was no more than a "filler" word, as we have in English, "sit down to write." We cannot judge the attitude of the writer who uses either this expression

1. Plummer, Op. Cit., p. 2.
 2. Op. Cit., III, p. 44.
 3. Bruce, Expositor's Greek Testament, Luke 1: 1-4.
 4. Op. Cit., III, p. 45.
 5. Plummer, Op. Cit., p. 2.

or just "to write." So it may be with Luke's expression.

Neither the meaning of ἐπεχείρησον nor the word with ἀντιτίθεαι¹ argue Mark's Gospel out of the picture.

Following ἐπεχείρησον is the infinitive of design or result.² Whenever ἀνά is prefixed to a verb it denotes "up" or "back" or "again." Here "again" fits the context better. The other part of the verb connotes the placing of something in a certain order. Hence Westcott's³ "arrange afresh" approaches more closely the true meaning. Lenski⁴ captures the genius of the word in his definition, "'to arrange in due order once more,' which we have tried to convey by 'to recount.' Each of these many writers repeated in an orderly way the story of Jesus...." "This verb has been found only in Plutarch's Moral., 968, CD, about an elephant 'rehearsing' by moonlight certain tricks it had been taught (Moulton and Milligan, Vocabulary)."⁵ The Attic "to go regularly through again, rehearse" is retained in Luke's use of the word.

The question arises here again: would Mark's Gospel be included or excluded by the meaning of the above word? It seems that Mark would not be excluded, considering the fact that he arranged the Gospel story once more in an orderly manner.⁶

What the "many" took in hand to arrange once more in due

1. Bruce, Op. Cit., (Luke 1: 1-4), "The verb contains a gentle hint that in some respects finality had not been reached, which might be said with all due respect even of Matthew's Logia and Mark's Gospel." Lake and Lake, An Introduction to the New Testament, pp. 43 and 46, agree that Mark was probably one of the "attempts."
2. Blass, Op. Cit., p. 225.
3. Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, p. 190.
4. Commentary on Mark and Luke, p. 499.
5. Robertson, Word Pictures in the New Testament, p. 3.
6. Papias quotes John the Presbyter as saying that Mark did not write in order (), but this cannot be pressed into opposition to the idea of order in . The emphases are different. John the Presbyter stresses chronological order, while the present word connotes merely an orderly or consecutive arrangement in the more general sense.

order was a *διήγησις*. This word is found nowhere in the New Testament except in Luke's prologue. It stems from the word *διηγέομαι*, which means "to carry a narration through to the end," "relate in full" (Thayer, s. l.). The substantive form would then have the meaning of "a narration" or "narrative," which was the meaning attached to the word in classical Greek (Liddell and Scott, s. l.).

The nature of these narratives is implied from the etymology of *διήγησις*. "The substantive implies something more than mere notes or anecdotes: 'a leading through to the end'."¹ The preposition in the word leads us to think of a more detailed narrative. Vincent (Word Studies in the N. T., I, 251) says that the idea of "thoroughness" accompanies the word, and that it was particularly applied to a medical treatise. Galen applies it at least seventy-three times to the writings of Hippocrates. The singular number, "narrative," seems to imply that the "many" took in hand to arrange once more a narrative which embraced the whole of the evangelic matter (Vincent). Godet² agrees with Vincent: "The term *diegesis* designates not, as Schleirmacher maintained, recitals of isolated facts, but a complete narrative."

Διήγησις has nothing in its make-up to tell us whether these narratives were written or oral. However, it is quite clear from the context that written narratives are meant. "To take in hand" and the fact that Luke is undertaking the same thing do not lend themselves to oral communication, but rather to written narratives.³

-
1. Plummer, Op. Cit., p. 2-3. Cf. Blass, Philology of the Gospels, p. 16.
 2. Commentary on Luke, p. 34. Cf. also Meyer, Commentary on Luke, p. 230.
 3. Cf. Lenski, Op. Cit. p 499 and Zehn, Op. Cit., III, p. 48.

Διήγησις may easily describe a Gospel such as Mark wrote.

The περὶ τὰ ἔργα "which have been accomplished (πεπληροφωρημένων)¹ among us (ἐν ἡμῖν) "was the subject matter of the narratives. The ἐν ἡμῖν here most likely means the Christians, all the Christians, including the eye-witnesses and the ministers of the Word. Lenski² brings out the objective factor in this statement of Luke's in opposition to the subjective view taken by Origen, who said that these men wrote what the Christians believed.

The translators of The Twentieth Century New Testament have translated the remaining verses (vv. 2-4) very well. We should like to adopt their rendering as the basis for further discussion.

...exactly as they have been handed down to us by those who from the very first were eye-witnesses, and afterwards became bearers of the Message. I also, therefore, having investigated all these matters with great care from the beginning, have resolved to write a connected history of them for you. In this way you will be able to satisfy yourself of the accuracy of the story which you have heard from the lips of others.

First we note that the written narratives have what has been handed down from the eye-witnesses and bearers of the Message as their basis.³ The thing which has been transmitted is the oral tradition. Although there is nothing in παρένθεσις which determines whether the communication is oral or written, the context speaks for the oral.⁴ Then the written narratives of the "many" are

-
1. Most commentators render this word "have been accomplished."
 2. Op. Cit., p. 499. "When correctly read, Luke says that the writings of the many contain what is objectively completed among the Christians."
 3. Godet translates καθὼς as: "in conformity with." "Numerous written narratives on the history of Jesus are already in existence; they all of them rest on the oral narrations of the Apostles (ver. 2)." Cf. also Lenski, Op. Cit., p. 500 and Westcott, Op. Cit., p. 190.
 4. Zahn, Op. Cit., III, pp. 48 and 51 and p. 84 note 8, and Westcott, Op. Cit., p. 190, and Robertson, Word Pictures in the N. T., pp. 4-5.

built directly on the foundation of oral tradition.

The manner in which Luke has presented his own Gospel, after "having investigated all these matters with great care from the beginning," and the purpose for which he writes do not warrant a detailed discussion at this point.

On the whole, we are forced by the evidence presented above to conclude that the language which Luke employs in his prologue may very well fit a reference to the Gospel of Mark.¹ Although Godet² concedes this point, he is not ready to admit that Mark was one of the narratives:

As to the Gospel of Mark, Luke's expressions might certainly suit this writing. For, according to tradition, Mark made use in his narrative of the accounts of an eye-witness, St. Peter. But still it may be questioned whether Luke would have employed the term undertake in speaking of a work which was received in the Church as one of the essential documents of the life of Jesus. For the rest, exegesis alone can determine whether Luke really had Mark before him either in its present or in a more ancient form. It appears probable, therefore, to me, that the works to which Luke alludes are writings really unknown and lost. Their incompleteness condemned them to extinction, in proportion as writings of superior value, such as our synoptics, spread through the Church.

Godet's arguments for excluding Mark are untenable. Luke could use a word like "undertake" with reference to Mark's Gospel which would not exclude it from being "received in the Church as one of the essential documents of the life of Jesus." Luke undertook the same task as his predecessors, and his Gospel was received in the Church as an essential document about Jesus. Godet, it seems, has pressed a foreign meaning into "undertake."

1. Zahn has this to say about it: "With regard to the numerous gospel writings, however, of which he did have some knowledge, there is at least one with which we have already become acquainted that exactly suits his description, namely, the Gospel of Mark." Op. Cit., III, p. 49.
2. Op. Cit., p. 35.

As to the whereabouts of the narratives Luke mentions no one knows, and the excellence of the synoptic Gospels may well be the cause for the extinction of the others. However, the Marcan narrative is not necessarily excluded on that account, for it is possible that Mark was the one to survive, and aided in the process of eliminating the others.

Luke does not inform us directly as to whether he used or incorporated Mark's Gospel into his own. Godet,¹ who has just denied that Mark could be among the narratives, is convinced, however, that Luke used the sources he mentions:

As to whether Luke availed himself of these writings, and in any way embodied them in his own work, he does not inform us. But is it not probable, since he was acquainted with them, that he would make some use of them? Every aid would appear precious to him in a work the importance of which he so deeply felt.

²
Goodspeed is speaking of the author of Luke-Acts when he says, "...for we have seen him carefully using the Gospel of Mark and other sources...." Zahn³ makes this pertinent remark after he has thoroughly investigated Luke's preface:

Although he does not say in so many words that he made use of the writings of his predecessors, he does not deny it.... A man of the literary training which the style of the dedication shows the author to have possessed, could not have been indifferent to writings, known to him, which dealt with the same topics as his own, even if his own investigations among the sources of the oral tradition, the particular purpose for which he wrote, and the corresponding arrangement of his book made him independent of his predecessors.

So there is little room for doubting that Luke used the writings which he mentions in his introduction.

-
1. Op. Cit., p. 35.
 2. Op. Cit., p. 205.
 3. Op. Cit., III, 51-2.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The conclusion to which we have come regarding this entire matter is that more than likely Luke had Mark's Gospel before him and used it as one of his sources. The personal relationship, a long and intimate friendship, would certainly be conducive to such a conclusion. History emphatically places Mark's Gospel before Luke's in point of time. This is supported by the many years of research by the scholars. All that has been done in the field of internal evidence strongly suggests that Mark was used by Luke. Finally, there is nothing in the preface of Luke's Gospel which would exclude Mark; what he says might well fit it.

Soli Deo Gloria

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALFORD, HENRY, The Greek Testament, revised edition, London, Deighton, Bell and Co., 1863 (Prolegomena).
- ALLEN, WILLOUGHBY C., International Critical Commentary: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907.
- ANDREWS, E. A., A Copious and Critical Latin-English Lexicon, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1857.
- ARNDT, WILLIAM, New Testament Introduction Notes, St. Louis, Concordia Mimeographing Co., n. d.
- BACON, BENJAMIN WISNER, An Introduction to the New Testament, New York, Macmillan Co., 1902.
- BAUER, WALTER D., Griechisch-Deutsches Woerterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der uebrigen urchristlichen Literatur, Giezen, Germany, Alfred Toepelmann Pub., 1928.
- BEBB, J. M., "Luke," Dictionary of the Bible, Hastings and Selbie, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901, III, pp. 162-173.
- BLASS, FRIEDRICH, Grammar of the New Testament Greek, revised edition, Henry Thackeray, London, Macmillan and Co., 1911.
- BRUCE, ALEXANDER BALMAIN, The Expositor's Greek Testament: The Synoptic Gospels, New York, Heddler Stoughton, n. d.
- BROWN, DAVID, A Commentary, Critical, Experimental, and Practical on the Old and New Testaments: Matthew-John, Jamison, Fausset and Brown, Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott and Co., n. d.
- BURTON, ERNEST DE WITT, Studies in the Gospel According to Mark, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1904.
- BURTON, ERNEST DE WITT, A Short Introduction to the Gospels, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1917.
- CARPENTER, S. C., Christianity According to St. Luke, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1919.
- CARTLEDGE, SAMUEL A., A Conservative Introduction to the New Testament, Grand Rapids, Zondervan Publishing House, 1941.
- DAVIS, JOHN D., A Dictionary of the Bible, Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1942.
- DEISSMANN, ADOLPH, Light from the Ancient East, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1922.

PRITZLAFF MEMORIAL LIBRARY
 CONCORDIA SEMINARY
 ST. LOUIS, MO.

- DIBELIUS, MARTIN, From Tradition to Gospel, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935.
- DUNCAN, G. S., St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930.
- EDERSHEIM, ALFRED, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, Grand Rapids, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1942.
- EUSEBIUS, Church History, in (Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church), New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925.
- FALLOWS, S., ZENOS, A. C., AND WILLET, H. L., The Popular and Critical Bible Encyclopedia and Scriptural Dictionary, Chicago, The Howard-Severance Co., 1906.
- FARRAR, F. W., The Messages of the Books, New York, Macmillan Co., 1927.
- GODET, F., A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke, New York, Funk and Wagnalls Co., ca. 1887.
- GOODSPEED, EDGAR J., The Formation of the New Testament, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1926.
- *GOODSPEED, EDGAR J., An Introduction to the New Testament, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1943.
- GOULD, EZRA P., International Critical Commentary: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905.
- GRANT, FREDERICK C., The Earliest Gospel, New York, Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1943.
- HAINACK, ADOLPH, The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels, New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1911.
- *HAWKINS, SIR JOHN C., Horae Synopticae, second edition, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1909.
- HAYES, D. A., The Synoptic Gospels and the Book of Acts, New York, The Methodist Book Concern, 1919.
- HUNTER, A. M., Introducing the New Testament, Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1946.
- HERIOWIG, OTTO ROBERT, Tablen zur Einleitung ins Neue Testament, Berlin, G. W. F. Mueller, 1835.
- IRENAEUS, Detectiones et Eversionis Falso Cognominatae Agnitionis seu Contra Omnes Haereses, Libri Quinque accedunt et Irenaei et Gnosticorum Fragmenta, Adolphus Stieren, T. O. Weigel, Lipsiae, 1848, tomi I, Pars I.
- KLEIST, JAMES A., The Gospel of Saint Mark, New York, The Bruce Publishing Co., 1936.

- LAKE, KIRSOPP, LAKE, SILVA, An Introduction to the New Testament, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1937.
- LACRANGE, P. M-J., Evangile selon Saint Marc, corrected edition, Paris, Librairie Lecoffre, 1947.
- LANGE, JOHN PETER, A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: The Gospel According to St. Mark, New York, Scribner, Armstrong, and Co., 1873.
- LIENSKI, R. C. H., Interpretation of St. Mark's and St. Luke's Gospels, Columbus, The Wartburg Press, 1943.
- LIENSKI, R. C. H., Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel, Columbus, The Wartburg Press, 1943.
- LIDDELL, HENRY GEORGE, AND SCOTT, ROBERT, A Greek-English Lexicon, Jones and McKenzie, Oxford, Clarendon Press, ca. 1940.
- LINN, OTTO P., Studies in the New Testament: The Gospels and Acts, third edition, Anderson, The Warner Press, 1943.
- LUTHARDT, C. E., Die Vier Evangelien: Das Evangelium des Markus und das Evangelium des Lukas, Leipzig, Doerffling und Franke, 1899.
- MACLEAN, J. L., "Mark," Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, Hastings, Selbie and Lambert, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917, II, pp. 119-136.
- MCGOWN, CHARLES CHARLTON, The Search for the Real Jesus, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940.
- MEYER, HEINRICH AUGUST WILHELM, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospel of Matthew, New York, Funk and Wagnalls, 1884.
- MIGNE, J. P., Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca et Latina, Paris, Garnier Brothers, n. d.
- MOFFATT, JAMES, An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918.
- MONTEFIORÉ, C. G., The Synoptic Gospels, revised, London, Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1927.
- MOULTON, W. F. AND GEDEN, A. S., A Concordance to the Greek Testament, second edition, Edinburg, T. and T. Clark, ca. 1899.
- NORTON, ANDREWS, The Evidence of the Genuineness of the Gospels, second edition, Cambridge, Metcalf and Co., 1846.
- PEAKE, A. S., A Guide to Biblical Study, New York, Dodd Mead and Co., 1897.

- PLUMMER, ALFORD, International Critical Commentary: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905.
- REDLICH, E. BASIL, The Student's Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels, London, Longmans, Green and Co., 1936.
- RIDDLE, DONALD WAYNE, The Gospels Their Origin and Growth, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1939.
- ROBERTSON, A. T., Studies in Mark's Gospel, New York, George H. Doran Co., 1919.
- ROBERTSON, A. T., Luke the Historian in the Light of Research, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920.
- ROBERTSON, A. T., Word Pictures in the New Testament, New York, Richard R. Smith Inc., 1930.
- XROBES, JAMES HARDY, The Synoptic Gospels, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard, University Press, 1934.
- SALMON, GEORGE, A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament, London, John Murray, 1894.
- SALMOND, S. D. F., "Mark," Dictionary of the Bible, Hastings and Selbie, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901, III, pp. 224-262.
- SCOTT, JOHN A., We Would Know Jesus, New York, Abingdon Press, 1936.
- SCHWEITZER, ALBERT, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, London, A. C. Black Ltd., 1926.
- SMITH, WILLIAM, Dictionary of the Bible, New York, Fleming H. Revell Co., n. d.
- SOUTER, ALEXANDER, The Text and Canon of the New Testament, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917.
- XSTREETER, BURNETT HILLMAN, The Four Gospels, revised, London, Macmillan and Co., 1905.
- TASKER, R. V. G., The Nature and Purpose of the Gospels, New York, Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1944.
- TAYLOR, VINCENT, The Formation of the Gospel Tradition, London, Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1935.
- THAYER, JOSEPH HENRY, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, corrected edition, New York, American Book Company, ca. 1889.

The Twentieth Century New Testament, Part I, New York, Fleming
H. Revell Co., ca. 1898.

X THIESSEN, HENRY CARENCE, Introduction to the New Testament,
Grand Rapids, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1943.

VINCENT, M. R., Word Studies in the New Testament, New York,
Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905.

X WEISS, BERNHARD, A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament,
New York, Funk and Wagnalls, 1889.

WESTCOTT, BROOKE F., A General Survey of the History of the
Canon of the New Testament, London, Macmillan and Co.,
1870.

X WESTCOTT, BROOKE F., An Introduction to the Study of the Gospels,
London, Macmillan and Co., 1881.

WHISTON, WILLIAM, The Works of Flavius Josephus, Philadelphia,
The John C. Whiston Company, n. d.

WRIGHT, A., "Luke," Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, Hastings,
Selbie and Lambert, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons,
1917, II, pp. 83-91.

YLVISAKER, JOH., The Gospels, Minneapolis, Augsburg Publishing
House, 1932.

X ZAHN, T., Introduction to the New Testament, Jacobus and Thayer,
Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1909.