

## TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

The translation which you have before you represents my first foray into the world of 18<sup>th</sup> century academic Latin. Where I lack expertise in this area, I hope I have been able to make adequate compensation with my general knowledge of Latin and academic style. Turning Koppe's workmanlike periods into something like modern prose presented its challenges. Many sentences had to be shortened or rephrased. At times, in place of a more literal rendering, I have made substitutions which seemed to me to convey the same idea.

I have made no concerted effort to translate each Latin word with one and only one English equivalent. Holding to such a rule would be awkward if not impossible when a word like the Latin *sententia*, so frequent in this text, can variously mean *sentence*, *statement*, *judgment*, *opinion*, *purpose*, or *thought*. For this and comparable words in the Latin vocabulary, I hope the contextual choices I have made among various synonyms are true to the author's original intent and do not lead to any misinterpretations among readers.

Only in the case of the word *epitome* have I held fast to one translation. The Latin title of this work is *Marcus non Epitomator Matthei*, an "epitomator" being a writer of an epitome, and the thesis being addressed is whether Mark's Gospel is an "epitome" of Matthew's. As a genre, *epitome* has much the same meaning in Latin as it does in English. Thus, it seemed best to use the same word, and use it consistently, rather than alternatives like *abridgement*, *digest*, or *summary*.

It is interesting to note that Koppe's Latin more often than not maintains a distinction between "Mark" the person and "Mark" the Gospel (so also for the other evangelists and their texts). English is not so careful in this regard, often using the evangelist's name for both. I confess that in my translation, I have often indifferently blurred this distinction as well. Regardless of modern critical views, to Koppe there certainly would have been no doubt that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John were the authors of the Gospels that bear their names.

In general, I have kept the formatting of the original intact, except where a change would improve readability (such as eliminating Roman numerals). Italics and capitalization correspond exactly to their use in the original. Since the original footnote references skip the letters *j* and *v* (in accord with conventions of Latin orthography), the references in the translation do so as well. This was intended as a convenience to anyone who may need to look up the footnotes in the original text. All words that were written in Greek in the original are here enclosed in single quotes. This includes direct quotations from the New Testament, for which Koppe uses only the Greek text. As far as possible, I have relied on the ESV (English Standard Version) for the translation of phrases and verses from Scripture. For works cited in the footnotes, I used the Internet to see whether their Latin titles had any acknowledged English translations. Apart from these items and

one footnote quoting Papias as reported by Eusebius, the entire translation is my own, and I take responsibility for whatever errors it may contain.

Any notes which I have added appear in italicized square brackets. Although I have not made a critical examination of Koppe's dissertation, I did discover in the course of preparing this translation a few places where his Greek New Testament must have differed from what is now the accepted text. I have noted these discrepancies where they occur. The original also had a few typographical errors which I have silently corrected, as none of them seemed to warrant further attention. I hope I have not introduced any new ones.

Finally, I would like to thank J. P. Holding for inviting me to do this project. As I cannot consider myself even an amateur scholar of biblical textual criticism, it was a pleasure to be able to spend this very brief period walking amongst the earlier terrain of that field's history. I hope that the results may prove of some use, however minor, and I welcome comments or suggestions for their improvement.

Richard Winterstein  
April 2, 2008

THE PRORECTOR AND SENATE OF  
GEORGIA-AUGUSTA UNIVERSITY

EXHORT THE PUBLIC  
TO CELEBRATE PIOUSLY

THE HOLY BIRTH OF JESUS CHRIST

DECEMBER 25, 1782.

*Mark is not an Epitome of Matthew*

by J. B. Koppe

GÖTTINGEN: DIETERICH, 1782

In the attempt to make an accurate determination of the origins, purpose, method, and plan involved in the composition of the Gospel of Mark, all scholars acknowledge that the *agreement* of Mark with Matthew in some passages along with the *disagreement* in others poses a great difficulty. For on the one hand, there is close correspondence between Matthew and Mark not just in their selection and sequence of events, but still more so in their narrative structure, sentences, words, and even minor turns of phrase. Hence, it appears virtually incontrovertible that one of them had reference to the text of the other and repeated identical passages in his book. On the other hand, however, Matthew relates many items which are omitted in Mark, and Mark in turn furnishes some for which the reader of Matthew must seek in vain. Furthermore, even those episodes which are contained in both authors occasionally differ from each other in sequence, length, and wording. As a result, it is not easy to understand how there could be such a difference between the two authors when it would seem one of them had recourse to the other and followed him in so many places.

Virtually all critics, commentators, and theologians have united around a single explanation which, in their estimation, can make a permanent solution of these difficulties: namely, *that Mark, who should be taken as having written after Matthew, sought to present an epitome of Matthew, but he altered certain parts after his own fashion and augmented the whole with material from his own sources.* To the best of our knowledge, Augustine<sup>a</sup> was the first to formulate this thesis, and the majority of later commentators have made it their own as well. Those who hesitate to say explicitly that Mark is an epitome of Matthew, differ from the majority view more in the matter of details than in the general idea: to wit, Millius<sup>b</sup>, Olearius<sup>c</sup>, Maknight<sup>d</sup>, Wolf<sup>e</sup>, Wetsten<sup>f</sup>,

---

<sup>a</sup> *The Harmony of the Gospels (De Consensu Evangeliorum)*, L. 1. c. 2.

<sup>b</sup> *Prolegomena to the New Testament*, p. 12, 103 ff. "As regards the composition of the Gospel, it was by no means Mark's intention to condense Matthew's Gospel into an epitome, as more than a few believe. For he did not universally follow Matthew's ordering, as a writer of an epitome naturally would do, and he is not uncommonly more copious in his wording than Matthew when narrating the same event. On top of

*Michaelis*<sup>g</sup>, *Elsner*<sup>h</sup>, *Koecher*<sup>i</sup>, *Büsching*<sup>k</sup>, and others. Whatever these men may individually appear to say against the ancient opinion of Augustine, they all agree or at least do not deny that the following statements are true: *first*, that Matthew was read by Mark; *second*, that during the actual process of composition, Mark followed Matthew in the selection, arrangement, and narration of events; *finally*, that where Mark differs from Matthew, be it in the addition of material, the rearrangement of items, or a variation in wording, he does so not because there was a variant reading in his copy of Matthew, but rather because he had some deliberate and conscious intent. That anyone would still take up arms against such an established position awarding Mark's Gospel the *sole title* of epitome must seem like sheer futility. And yet there are a few who ought to be regarded

---

that, he has many interpolations in various passages which are of great relevance in shedding light on the history... On the contrary, the notion of abbreviating Matthew's Gospel was so far from Mark's mind, that there is no shortage of respected authorities who believe Mark never even saw Matthew's Gospel... Nevertheless, the similarity in the phrasing and organization of the two authors militates against this view... Consequently, having made a comprehensive review of the various theories regarding the two authors, I am driven to what I believe is an inescapable conclusion: it could only have happened that Mark, who is in precise and nearly literal agreement with Matthew in numerous places, had Matthew's Gospel at hand when his version appeared. He copied out of Matthew's Gospel nearly 'verbatim' [*αυτόλεξει*] several parts that fit into his plan of composition, while including insertions here or there and additions which served to clarify and complete the gospel story. The actual composition of the Gospel seems to me to have proceeded like this: Mark, who was Peter's companion and scribe, committed pieces of the Gospel story to paper as soon as he received them, though with little consideration for their arrangement. He kept this collection with him as circumstances allowed and continually added new material to it as it became available. Then when Matthew's Gospel came into his hands, he used it as a model as much as he could for arranging the contents of his own collection. Nor did he shy away from Matthew's text where it dealt with the same topic; instead, he found a sort of pleasure in Matthew's phrasing and style. Occasionally he inserted material which rounded out the Gospel story and shed light on it in numerous places which he saw Matthew had not touched. On the other hand, he departed from Matthew in several shorter episodes insofar as he relied on his own notes or what he had taken down from Peter's spoken words. Also, he added not a few things to his own text which, though omitted in Matthew's, seemed appropriate in order to enrich the Gospel story."

<sup>c</sup> *Observations on the Gospel of Matthew*, p. 14 ff. He capably argues against Whiston that Mark was not an abbreviator of Matthew. But he passes over the question of whether Mark read Matthew or not in silence, though he makes an effort to explain the agreement between the two authors with an alternative albeit superficial theory. p. 16.

<sup>d</sup> *The Harmony of the Four Gospels*, p. 52. "Jerome (whom he cites instead of Augustine owing to a lapse of memory [--*Koppe's note*]) was of the opinion that Mark abridged Matthew's Gospel; but the characters of an abridgment do by no means agree to that work." [*Original in English*]

<sup>e</sup> *Curis*, Vol. I. p. 426.

<sup>f</sup> *New Testament*, Vol. I. p. 552. "Since Mark had the Gospel of Matthew before him, as is obvious from their harmony, and since he knew that Matthew had not preserved the order of events, he was able to employ the same freedom which Matthew had—and all the more so, because he knew that variety is pleasing to a reader, but a servile imitation is tedious."

<sup>g</sup> *An Introduction to the N. T.* V. II. p. 913. "When Mark is compared with Matthew, it is easy to see that he must have had Matthew before him, and that he wrote with the aim of translating Matthew's Hebrew text into a familiar tongue." [*Original in German*]

<sup>h</sup> *Commentary on the 4 Evangelists*

<sup>i</sup> *Sacred Analects, On the Beginning of Mark's Gospel*

<sup>k</sup> *The Harmony of the Four Evangelists*, p. 118. "It is apparent that Mark had Matthew's and Luke's works before his eyes, and that he took what was useful and necessary from either author as it suited his purpose. At times he used their exact words and at other times he varied them, but he also added minor details and even entire sayings and episodes which are contained in neither of the others." [*Original in German*]

as having truly advocated a contrary opinion: Calvin<sup>l</sup>, Dodwell<sup>m</sup>, Lardner<sup>n</sup>, and of late Priestley<sup>o</sup> expressly reject the notion *that Mark read Matthew*. Nevertheless, the opinions which these scholars render (albeit without proof or with insufficient proof) would appear to be refuted by the fact that there is verbal and material agreement between Matthew and Mark in what is often the minutest detail. Such opinions shall have to be abandoned by their exponents and left by the wayside; or, if there is perchance some brighter glimpse of the truth to be found in them, it shall have to be extracted, analyzed, developed, and corroborated with suitable arguments.

And this, accordingly, is what we now propose to do: *first*, to articulate the reasons why it scarcely seems possible to maintain the long-standing common opinion *that Mark read and studied Matthew and altered the latter's general scheme in various respects*; *next*, to explain the similarities between the two authors by a different and, unless we are gravely mistaken, more credible argument.

To the best of our knowledge, there is only *one* reason why scholars have convinced themselves that Mark read Matthew and produced an epitome of his Gospel in a judicious and free imitation: it is that the contents of Mark are commonly found to agree with their analogs in Matthew. That there is an undeniable similarity, we ourselves acknowledge without reservation. However, if the agreement between the two authors can be accounted for by an alternative theory which does not require Mark to have read and examined Matthew's book (we shall present such a theory further on), then the *sole* foundation on which the common opinion rests will be overturned, and the common opinion itself will collapse of its own accord.

There are in fact many serious challenges which can be levied against the common opinion. Either they have not been considered, or where they have been considered, they have been too negligently reviewed and dismissed. These points derive in part from *the witness of early writers*, whose testimony should be given special regard in creating an historical argument, such as ours undoubtedly is. They rely also on *certain other kinds of internal evidence* which can be deduced from *the temper of the times* when the book was composed and from *the contents of the very book* which is being investigated—contents which thus far have been given insufficient attention and scrutiny.

---

<sup>l</sup> From his prefatory remarks to the Gospel of Mark: "It certainly seems possible to me and indeed, based on the circumstances, quite open to conjecture that Mark had never seen Matthew's book when he wrote his own."

<sup>m</sup> *Dissertations on Ireneaus*, I. p. 68. "There were Gospels so hidden in the corners of the world where they were written, that later Gospel-writers could not discover what the earlier ones had written on the same subjects."

<sup>n</sup> *The Credibility of the Gospel History Supplement [Title in English]* Vol. I. c. X. This work presents the thesis that Mark and the three previous Gospel-writers as well had no knowledge of each others' books. Various arguments are presented, but they are neither properly marshaled, nor satisfactorily developed and explained. Cf. Michael's *Introduction*, Vol. II. p. 914

<sup>o</sup> *The Harmony of the Evangelists*. Dissertation XI. p. 73. "If the Gospel of Mark be an abridgement of that of Matthew, it is such an abridgement, I will venture to say, as was never made of any other work. This appears to me to be so obvious, that I wonder how any person can peruse the two histories and entertain the least suspicion of it." [*Original in English*]

First of all, then, it must be noted that among the earliest writers to discuss the origins of the Gospels, not one discloses even a hint of the idea that Mark wrote an epitome of Matthew or even copied from him. This fact is given greater force when one realizes that the writers in question had good knowledge of Matthew's Gospel and report traditions regarding Mark which have the primary intention of lending greater credence to what he reports. The most notable passages in this regard are to be found in Papias<sup>p</sup>, Irenaeus<sup>q</sup>, Clement of Alexander<sup>r</sup>, Tertullian<sup>s</sup>, Origen<sup>t</sup>, Gregory Nazianzus<sup>u</sup>, John Chrysostom<sup>x</sup>, Jerome<sup>y</sup>. Each of them makes essentially this claim: *Although Mark was not himself an apostle and was not an 'eyewitness' [αὐτόπτης] of the acts of Jesus, he nevertheless merits our confidence. For when he composed his Gospel, he received aid and advice in some way from Peter. Established tradition teaches that when the completed book appeared, it was commended to the church on the strength of Peter's authority.* Not one of them cites the agreement with Matthew's text, a point which actually would have created a stronger argument for Mark's reliability than anyone could have imagined. If such a tradition existed in that era in even the vaguest form, it does not seem credible to us that it could somehow have been overlooked not just by one author, but by every single author. Augustine, at last, is the first person (and among the ancients, the only person) to present such an idea. Yet he does so in such a way, that it appears not

---

<sup>p</sup> from Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*, III. 39. "Mark having become the interpreter of Peter wrote down accurately whatsoever he remembered. It was not, however, in exact order that he related the sayings or deeds of Christ. For he neither heard the Lord nor accompanied Him. But afterwards, as I said, he accompanied Peter, who accommodated his instructions to the necessities [of his hearers], but with no intention of giving a regular narrative of the Lord's sayings. Wherefore Mark made no mistake in thus writing some things as he remembered them. For of one thing he took especial care, not to omit anything he had heard, and not to put anything fictitious into the statements." [Original in Greek; trans. by Roberts-Donaldson]

<sup>q</sup> *Against Heresies*, L. III. c. 1. and Eusebius, V. 8. "Mark the disciple and interpreter of Peter also passed on to us in writing what Peter had preached." [Original in Greek]

<sup>r</sup> *Hypotyposis*, in Eusebius, II. 15. "With every possible kind of entreaty, they [the Romans] implored Mark, as he was a follower of Peter, to leave them also with a record in writing of the teachings they had received orally. They did not cease until they had compelled him to do it, and this became the origin of the written account of the Gospel according to Mark. It is said that when the apostle found out what had happened through a revelation of the Spirit, he was pleased with the eagerness of the men and commended the book for reading in the churches." Also, VI. 14: "The Gospel according to Mark had the following development. When Peter preached the word publicly in Rome and by the Spirit declared the Gospel, there were many present who asked Mark to write down Peter's words, seeing that Mark had been his follower for a long time and remembered what he had said. And so he composed his Gospel and gave it to those who had asked for it. But when Peter became aware of this, he neither urged that it be stopped nor pushed for it to be done." [Original in Greek]

<sup>s</sup> *Against Marcion*, IV. 5. "What Mark produced is called Peter's Gospel, because Mark was his interpreter."

<sup>t</sup> Eusebius, VI. 25. "The second Gospel is Mark's, according as Peter guided him in its composition." [Original in Greek]

<sup>u</sup> *Poems*, 44. "Mark for Ausonia scribed what God had wrought / As Peter, Christ's own mighty servant, taught." [Original in Greek; 'Ausonia' is a poetic name for Italy]

<sup>x</sup> *Fourth Homily on Matthew*, p. 46 in Bernard de Montfaucon's edition. "Each one (Luke and Mark) in like manner imitated his teacher: the one like Paul, flowing like a powerful river; the other like Peter, cultivating brevity of speech." [Original in Greek]

<sup>y</sup> *Lives of Illustrious Men*, c. 8. "Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, wrote a brief Gospel at the request of the brothers in Rome based on what he had heard Peter relate. When Peter became aware of it, he gave it his approval and offered it on his own authority for reading in churches."

that he means to *report it as a matter of historical fact* which is corroborated by long-standing tradition, but rather that he intends to *offer it as his own conjecture*, derived without question solely from the mutual agreement between Matthew and Mark. “*Mark<sup>z</sup> SEEMS to have imitated Matthew AS IF he were Matthew’s subordinate and abridger.*”

Having thus disposed of the external witnesses, we *now* turn exclusively to the internal evidence to judge whether there is any validity in such a conjecture, be it *Augustine’s* or that of any *commentator since*. There are essentially two types of argument to be made: one derives from the *temper of the times* when Mark wrote, and the other follows from the *contents of the book itself*.

Consider *the following facts*. We know that the Gospel of Mark was written at a time when the rudiments of the religion of Christ had barely been cast among the Gentiles. It was written for the use of a church which at the time still lacked an accurate and comprehensive written record of the deeds of Jesus. And it was written by a man who was close to an apostle with whom he could review and augment what was being circulated about the life of Jesus. These accounts he could incorporate according to his own free purpose. Finally, he wrote with the intention that this new text would proclaim and verify the divine majesty of the new religion’s founder, both to the Jews who greatly desired ‘signs’ [*σημείων*], and to the Gentiles who were scandalized by Jesus’ human birth, undistinguished life, and brutal and ignoble death. And yet we are supposed to believe that *this* Mark, at *this* time, for *this* church, with *this* intention, produced a book in which he did not include everything he knew to have been accurately told to Jesus’ honor, a truncated book deficient in some vital accounts of his words and deeds? — — We cannot imagine anything more improbable or more alien to the author, his time, or his place. It suited the temper of the times and the zeal and ardor of new Christians interested in knowing the origin of their faith to have the fullest, most copious documents available on Jesus’ life. It suited such a climate to have a collection made of the fragmentary records of his life as they were told by various figures and at the time circulated in written form only in part. And it suited the times to have the collected materials redacted into one volume, to be expanded and enhanced with whatever additional narratives emerged and could be verified. But it did not suit the times to take the collected materials—materials collected by an apostle at that—and again abridge them, and then, in place of *the book itself*, produce *an epitome* of a book and have it be commended not merely to this or that Christian reader, but to the church universal.

Let us now consider in somewhat greater detail the character of this “epitome” and the principles Mark would have heeded in copying and abbreviating his version of Matthew. We believe that this approach will most effectively demonstrate how untenable this entire thesis actually is.

*First of all*, there are many passages in Matthew that are omitted by Mark (which, of course, is the prerogative of an *abbreviator*). However, *the actual choice of which events and passages to exclude suggests that a different method was applied than would*

---

<sup>z</sup> *The Harmony of the Gospels*, L. 1. c. 2.

*be characteristic of someone composing an epitome.* There are only two ways to abridge a lengthy or detailed narrative. If the individual elements and events are to be retained, then what is told by the first author in a copious, abundant, and ornate style can be recast in a simpler, more direct, and plainer style. Alternatively, if a selection is to be made of certain events and ideas, then only the most important ones should be kept, or at any rate only those most fit for the purpose which the epitome is meant to serve. Meanwhile, items of secondary importance and those which do not particularly align with the purpose of the epitome can be excluded. Yet we observe Mark to have employed neither of these methods. There is scarcely a place or two in Mark's entire Gospel where *the same passage or event* is expressed any more briefly or directly than in Matthew<sup>a</sup>; on the contrary, there are *many events* in Mark which are recounted in *greater and fuller detail* than in Matthew, as will be noted more fully below. Indeed, the choice of which events and passages to exclude happened in such a way that no logical reason can be given for why some parts were kept and others rejected, on the assumption that Mark had the same version of Matthew. In order to make this point clearer, we will now list some definite examples of the kind of passages which are absent in Mark.

First, Mark lacks *certain passages of significant length that describe matters which pertain to Jesus*, although they were transmitted in detail in Matthew. Relevant to this point are:

1. The genealogy (which perhaps could have seemed less useful to the church outside of Palestine) as well as the miraculous birth of Jesus (Matt. 1:2).<sup>b</sup>
2. The miraculous healings of the son of the centurion from Capernaum (Mk. 8:5-13) and the two blind men (Mk. 9:27-34). (Admittedly, the healing of the blind men could have been omitted because Mark records other examples of the same type of miracle elsewhere: Mk. 8:22-26, Mk. 10:46 ff. As for the healing of the son, this explanation seems less likely, since the miracle is distinct *both* on account of the remarkable faith of the centurion *and* because of the fact that Jesus could perform it at a distance, which as an illustration of miraculous power is practically unparalleled among what is recorded.
3. The passage describing the delegation sent by John to ask Jesus if he would openly identify himself as the Messiah (Matt. 11:1-19).
4. The remorse of the betrayer Judas and his miserable death (Matt. 27:3-10). (This had all the less reason for being omitted, since the *crime* of the man was not excluded.)

---

<sup>a</sup> The sole passages which to some extent are able to illustrate this point are: Mk. 12:35-37 vs. Matt. 22:41-46; Mk. 14:1-2 vs. Matt. 26:1-5; Mk. 15:1 vs. Matt. 27:1-2.

<sup>b</sup> Actually, some commentators and critics have conjectured that at one point these two sections were not present even in Matthew's work. However, this conjecture has been advanced solely because of certain dogmatic problems, and thus far it remains unsubstantiated by any solid argument.

5. The story of how the Sanhedrin bribed the soldiers who had night watch at Jesus' tomb (Matt. 28:11-15)—which, nevertheless, could have been intentionally omitted, if by chance Mark knew that the myth of the disciples stealing Jesus' body had not yet reached Rome.
6. Many of Jesus' sayings, including some of the most important: the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5-7); a dialogue with a Pharisee and a disciple of better character (Matt. 8:19-22). Various other sayings (Matt. 10:15-42). Denunciation of Capernaum and praises of the disciples (Matt. 11:20-30). A similar rebuke of the Pharisees (Matt. 22:33-45 and 23:1-39). Exhortations to modesty, gentleness, and 'patience' (Matt. 18:10-35). An oblique commendation of celibacy (Matt. 19:10-12). Parables about slaves hired late and on short notice to tend the vineyard (Matt. 20:16). A description of the banquet prepared for people of every class and nation (Matt. 22:1-14).

No one can deny that these passages possess considerable ability to ignite and inflame a love for Christ and his creed. Moreover, Mark could have reported even more of the sayings of Christ than Matthew (especially the parables), so it cannot be said that reporting the words of Christ was at all contrary to his intent. Therefore, if Mark did have before his eyes those brilliant testimonies of the divine wisdom and glory of Jesus which were in the volume that he presumably used, we can conceive of no reason why he would have passed them by. Yet there are further complications.

There is *another* category of omissions relating to *episodes reported in both Matthew and Mark*. *They consist of certain accounts of deeds and sayings from which particular details are missing which have some weight and are very well suited for illustrating the power, wisdom, and majesty of Jesus*. We believe the following are worth recalling:

1. The dialogue of Jesus with John on the need for himself also to receive baptism (Matt. 3:14-15 vs. Mk. 1:9-11).
2. In the temptation account (Mk. 1:12-13), the means by which he resists and conquers temptation (Matt. 4:1-11).
3. The prophecy of Isaiah which primarily explains the plan of Jesus' wanderings in Galilee (Matt. 4:13-17).
4. This remarkable statement from the words of Jesus when he was dining at the house of the publican (Mk. 2:13-17): 'Go and learn what this means, "I desire mercy and not sacrifice." ... but sinners' (Matt. 9:13). Also, another statement from when he saw the great multitude of people in need and lamented the scanty number of disciples: 'The harvest is plentiful ... into his harvest' (Matt. 9:37-38).

5. In the parable of the seed which bears a greater or smaller yield in proportion to the nature of the field (Mk. 4:1-20), there are various statements greatly redounding to the honor of the disciples (Matt. 13:12, 16, 17); so also in the parable of the vinedressers who horribly mistreat the servants sent by the master (Mk. 12:1-12), a singular idea full of comfort for the Gentiles especially: *Who shall be a citizen in the kingdom of the Messiah? Not the Jew, merely because he is a Jew, but every righteous person who desires true holiness* (Matt. 21:43).
6. A statement in the passage where he sends out the disciples (Mk. 6:7-10) about not going to the Samaritans, but only to the Jews (Matt. 10:5-6). Similarly, that he came only to save the Israelites (Matt. 15:23-24) in the account of the Canaanite woman (Mk. 7:24-30).
7. In a defense against the Pharisees (Mk. 7:1-23, 8:11-21, and 11:27 & 33), stern words against the Pharisees (Matt. 15:13-14, 16:2-4 and 21:28-32).
8. When the disciples sought to know why they could not heal the demoniac (Mk. 9:14-29), this statement: ‘Because of your little faith,’ plus in what follows, the remarkable commendation of ‘faith’ and its power (Matt. 17:20).
9. In the speech on the destruction of Jerusalem (Mark 13:11-36), (i) a passage on false prophets (Matt. 24:11-12); (ii) the words ‘or on a Sabbath’ (Matt 24:20); (iii) words on the shortening of the period of tribulation for the sake of the righteous and on false Christs (Matt 24:22-28). Parables spoken to explain the *sudden* coming of that day (Matt. 24:37 – 25:30). Finally, a passage on the coming itself (Matt. 25:31-46).
10. In the description of the Passover meal, at which Judas the betrayer was also present (Mk. 14:12-25), the question of the betrayer: ‘Is it I?’ with Jesus’ response: ‘You have said so’ (Matt. 26:25).
11. Mk. 14:43-51: A statement expressing emotions of love and sadness: ‘Friend, why are you here?’ (Matt. 26:50).
12. Mk. 14:53-65: An oath whereby Caiaphas calls upon Jesus to state whether or not he is the Messiah: ‘I adjure you ... tell us’ (Matt. 26:63)
13. Mk. 15:1-20: The dream of Pilate’s wife (Matt. 27:19) and Pilate’s washing of his hands to signify Jesus’ innocence (Matt. 27: 24-25).
14. Lastly, in the narration of Jesus’ death, each of the episodes that follow his death as ‘signs’ (Mark 15:33-39): the miraculous splitting of the

rocks and the rising of the dead (Matt. 27:52-53). (These omissions are all the more remarkable in light of the fact that Mark does not hesitate to mention another miracle, *the rending of the temple veil*, which had greatest significance for the Jews.)

Reviewing each of the above items with the utmost diligence and discretion, we concede that it is possible to discern a motive for the missing phrases in the passages listed under number 6 (but these *only*): Mark being a teacher not of *Jews* but rather of *Gentiles*, he could have been cautious lest Gentile Christians should question whether *in Jesus' own plan*, his merits and salutary teaching were really meant for them. However, we do not observe that a plausible reason of the same type can be formulated to cover the remaining examples.

And what, last of all, shall be said about the *final* category of omissions? This, of course, consists of those events which involve the Apostle Peter himself. Consider this point: *would not Mark, being Peter's disciple, and the Roman church have special reason to retain the worthiest and most important passages involving Peter, since even if he did not transmit them directly, they nevertheless should have had his support and authority?* The events are as follows:

1. Peter's encounter with Jesus when he walked on the sea, his rescue by Jesus when he began to sink, and the added stern rebuke 'little faith' (Matt. 14:28-31).
2. A key passage where Peter is granted honor and authority, (Matt. 16:17-20).
3. The fish which Jesus commanded Peter to catch and the stater paid in place of the didrachma (Matt: 17:24-27).
4. When Peter asked for a reward for the steadfastness he and the other disciples had shown, this promise which was vouchsafed to him: 'you will also sit on twelve thrones ... Israel' (Matt. 19:28).
5. The sober exhortation to meekness and patience in enduring and forgiving the wrongs of others (Matt. 18:21-22).
6. Lastly, Peter's rebuke for wounding the priest's servant with his sword (Matt. 26:52-54).

We know there are some who think these omissions should be attributed to Peter's modesty; they say that Peter would have wanted Mark to suppress anything that Jesus said or did to his (Peter's) glory. Far be it from us to say it would be improbable that Mark, being Peter's disciple and friend, would fail to comply with him fully in *this* wish of his. But it has to be granted that this explanation can only be applied to the verses marked 2 and 4 above. What about the remaining episodes, which contain not

*praises* but rather *rebukes* of Peter and his pride, lack of faith, and hot temper? Why should they have been omitted by Mark, or at least fail to appear in his Gospel? See again items 1, 3, 5, and 6 above. Also, note that Mark does furnish other passages which reflect Peter in a favorable light but which are not found in Matthew at all. See Mk. 16:7 vs. Matt. 28:7.

*Next*, however, there is something which anyone can see contradicts the usual practice of a person preparing an epitome: *in nearly the majority of passages contained in both Matthew and Mark, Mark gives a fuller and more detailed account than Matthew.* Some notable examples of this fact are given here:

1. Peter's mother-in-law suffering from a fever (Mk. 1:29-34 vs. Matt. 8:14-16)
2. The healing of the paralytic (Mk. 2:1-12 vs. Matt. 9:1-8).
3. The calming of the storm at sea (Mk. 4:36-41 vs. Matt. 8:23-27).
4. The healing of the demon-possessed in the region of Gadarene and the herd of pigs drowned in the sea (Mk. 5:1-17 vs. Matt. 8:28-34).
5. The daughter of Jairus being brought back to life and the healing of the woman suffering from a discharge of blood (Mk. 5:22-43 vs. Matt. 9:18-26). (In addition, Mark's version of this entire passage has a finer, more elegant style than Matthew's and is written in better Greek.)
6. The death of John the Baptist (Mark 6:14-29 vs. Matt. 14:1-12).
7. The feeding of the crowd of 5000 in the wilderness (Mk. 6:30-44 vs. Matt. 14:13-21).
8. The healing of the sick on the shore of Gennesaret (Mk. 6:53-56 vs. Matt. 14:34-36).
9. The healing of the demon-possessed man whom the disciples could not heal (Mk. 9:14-26 vs. Matt. 17:4-17).
10. Jesus welcomes and embraces the little children (Mk. 10:13-16 vs. Matt. 19:13-15).
11. The healing of the blind man near Jericho (Mk. 10:46-52 vs. Matt. 22:29-34).
12. The triumphant entry of Jesus into the city of Jerusalem (Mk. 11:1-10 vs. Matt. 21:1-9; see especially Mk. 11:4-6).

13. Jesus anointed by the woman (Mk. 14:3-9 vs. Matt. 26:6-13).
14. The Passover supper prepared by Jesus' disciples (Mk. 14:12-16 vs. Matt. 26:17-19).
15. The man named Simon compelled to carry the cross (Mk. 15:21 vs. Matt. 27:32)
16. Jesus lowered from the cross and buried (Mk. 14:40-47 vs. Matt. 27:55-61).

Each of these passages illustrates Mark's *fullness* and *abundance* as opposed to Matthew's *brevity* and *paucity of words*. It should be clear that either Matthew made an epitome of Mark, or—as we believe, and will explain below—each reported the matter as he knew it and according to the tradition he had received, employing his own method and scheme as he saw fit, independent of the other.

There is a *third* point to be added. *The two Gospels record the deeds of Jesus in different order, yet no credible reason can be given for why the ordering should deliberately have been changed.* Examples that may be cited here are:

1. Material about John the Baptist (Mk. 1:5-6 vs. Matt. 3:4-6; Mk. 1:7-8 vs. Matt. 3:11).
2. Peter's mother-in-law suffering from a fever (Mk. 1:29-34 vs. Matt. 8:14)
3. The calling of Matthew (Mk. 2:13-22 vs. Matt. 9:9).
4. The disciples gather grain while out walking (Mk. 2:23-28 vs. Matt. 12:1)
5. The paralytic healed on the Sabbath (Mk. 3:1-6 vs. Matt. 12:9-15)  
In these four passages, Luke's order agrees with Mark's.
6. The healing of a demoniac, after which there comes a discussion about 'blasphemy' against the Holy Spirit (Mk. 3:20-30 vs. Matt. 12:25-32).
7. The parable of the seed scattered in different fields (Mk. 4:1-20 vs. Matt. 13:1-22)
8. The parable of the mustard seed (Mk. 4:30-34 vs. Matt. 13:31-32).
9. The lack of faith of the people of Nazareth (Mk. 6:1-6 vs. Matt. 13:53-58).

10. A defense of the disciples for not keeping the traditions of the Pharisees (Mk. 7:5-13 vs. Matt. 15:2-9).
11. The teaching on avoiding divorce (Mk. 10:1-9 vs. Matt. 19:1-8).
12. The cursing of the fig tree and the cleansing of the temple of the moneychangers' wares (Mk. 11:11-24 vs. Matt. 21:12-22).
13. An exhortation to forbear with those who sin (Mk. 11:25-26 vs. Matt. 21:12-22).

Also, we note that Whiston<sup>c</sup> in particular used an argument such as this to call into question the ordering of events in Matthew's Gospel. And we admit, his suggestion has greater probability than any notion that Mark used the same version of Matthew that we have when he composed his Gospel yet copied *identical sections and even words* in a deliberately *altered sequence and arrangement*.

In the *fourth* place, Matthew and Mark differ not only in content, phrasing, and sequence, but *they also recount more than a few events with such differences that they appear to contradict each other*. Consider these examples:

1. The calling of Matthew (Mk. 2:13-22 vs. Matt. 9:9). Not only is there no mention of *Matthew* in Mark, but he even substitutes the name *Levi*. It warrants notice that in this regard he agrees with Luke.
2. The defense of the apostles, who had gathered grain (Mk. 2:23-28 vs. Matt. 12:1-8). Mark adds a statement which is not present in Matthew: 'The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath.' This addition directly affects the sense of the statement that follows, 'So the Son of Man is lord even of the Sabbath,' unlike in Matthew (so long as one interprets 'Son of Man' as having an everlasting significance with a unique reference).
3. The demon-possessed in the region of Gergesene (Mk. 5:1 ff. vs. Matt. 8:28 ff.). Matthew calls the region 'Gergesene,' while Mark calls it 'Gadarene.' Matthew reports that *two* men encountered Jesus and were healed by him; Mark, that there was *one*.
4. After the feeding of the 4000 (Mk. 8:1-10 vs. Matt. 15:32-39), Mark says that Jesus withdrew 'to the district of DALMANUTHA,' while Matthew says he went 'to the region of MAGDALA.\*'

---

<sup>c</sup> *A Short View of the Harmony of the Evangelists*, p. 100 ff.

\* [*Magdala* is found in some MSS, but the reading 'Magadan' is now preferred. Whichever reading is taken, Koppe's point remains the same.]

5. Mk. 10:35 ff. vs. Matt. 20:20 ff: In Matthew, we read that the *mother of James and John* made a request of Jesus in behalf of her sons, while in Mark it is the *sons themselves* without even passing mention made of their mother.
6. Mk. 10:46 ff. vs. Matt. 20:29 ff: According to Matthew, there were *two* blind men healed near Jericho; according to Mark, there was only *one*, and his name was Bartimaeus.
7. Mk. 12:28-34 vs. Matt. 22:34-40: A Pharisee asks Jesus to name the highest law of religion. There is clearly a difference between the two authors in their narrative intent. Matthew portrays the man as coming ‘to test’ *Jesus maliciously*; Mark, on the other hand, makes him out to be *eminent in character, ability, and mind*. See also Mk. 5:32-34.
8. Peter’s denial of Jesus (Mk. 14:66-72 vs. Matt. 26:69-75). Matthew reports that *two* women question Peter *in succession*, while Mark states that there was *one* who spoke with him *twice*.
9. The women returning from the tomb (Mk. 16:1 ff. vs. Matt. 28:1 ff.). Matthew says ‘they departed quickly from the tomb with fear and great joy, and ran TO TELL HIS DISCIPLES.’ In Mark, however, because of the dread and ‘astonishment,’ THEY SAID NOTHING TO ANYONE, v. 8.

We of course do not deny that the discrepancies in these and similar passages have already been resolved through judicious interpretation, so that each author can be properly vindicated from the charge of error. Nevertheless, if Mark had seen Matthew and based his own version of events on Matthew, why would he have thought it necessary to alter such passages as those listed above in a way that was most certain to create such ‘apparent contradictions’ [*ενατιοφανεσία*]? We freely admit that we can find no plausible answer for this question.

*Finally*, defenders of the theory that we are contesting themselves concede that there are many additions in Mark which were not recorded by Matthew. However, there are scholars who refrain from calling Mark an *epitome* who nevertheless suggest that the theory would suffer no harm if it were alleged that *Mark reproduced Matthew’s work with new material*. We would still call attention to not a few of the items in the last set of discrepancies between the two authors, which lead us to regard this suggestion as insufficiently probable. Be that as it may, Mark adds—

*First*, these complete accounts of Jesus’ acts:

1. The demoniac in the synagogue at Capernaum (Mk. 1:21-28).

2. Jesus and the disciples passing through the cities of Galilee (Mk 1:35-39).
3. The great crowd that rushed toward Jesus and the many demon-possessed who were healed (Mk. 3:7-13).
4. The parable of the seed which, having been hidden in the ground, sprouts on its own and bears a harvest (Mk. 4:26-29).
5. The healing of *one* mute (Mk. 7:31-37), compared with Matthew, who mentions a *collective* group of such miracles (Matt. 15:30-31).
6. The healing of a blind man (Mk. 8:22, 26).
7. The poor woman placing her mite in the offering-box (Mk. 12:41-44).
8. The appearance of Jesus to Mary Magdalene and the disciples going to Emmaus (Mk. 16:9-13).

*Next*, these passages mixed in with accounts recorded also by Matthew:

1. The prophecy of Malachi applied to John the Baptist (Mk. 1:2).
2. This line in what is otherwise a much shorter account of the temptation: 'And he was with the wild beasts' (Mk. 1:13).
3. In Mk. 1:29, this line, 'the house of Simon and Andrew, with James and John,' occurs in place of 'Peter's house', which is found in Matthew. [Matt. 8:14]
4. In the defense of the disciples, who had gathered grain, the addition 'in the time of Abiathar the high-priest' (Mk. 2:26).
5. There are additional statements in the story of the healing of the paralytic on the Sabbath-day (Mk. 3:3-4) and the phrase 'with the Herodians' (v. 6).
6. The very name 'Jairus' in the story of the daughter of the ruler of the synagogue (Mk. 5:22), a point on which Luke agrees (Lk. 8:41).
7. In the story of Jesus walking on the water (Mk. 6:45-52), the incidental details 'to Bethsaida' in verse 45 and 'he meant to pass them by' in verse 48.
8. In the defense of the disciples against the Pharisees (Mk. 7:1-23), a passage about the ritual washing of the Pharisees, verses 3-4, and one on

the vices that pollute a man, listing *seven* which are missing from Matthew: ‘coveting, wickedness, deceit, sensuality, envy, pride, foolishness’ (v. 22). Absent from Mark, but present in Matthew, is ‘false witness.’ [Matt. 15:19]

9. In an exchange with the disciples (Mk. 8:27 ff.), a stern warning of the punishments if they desert him (v. 38).
10. When Jesus is ‘transfigured’ (Mk. 9:2) on the mountain, there are these additions: ‘as no cloth refiner ... bleach them’ (v. 3); ‘For he did not know what to say, for they were terrified’ (v. 6); the disciples discussing amongst themselves the meaning of the phrase ‘rising from the dead’ (v. 10).
11. In Mk. 9:33-50, greater detail is provided than in Matthew to explain the occasion for the entire exhortation (vv. 33-35). Additional statements are given in verses 37, 38-41, 44, 49, and 50.
12. In the conversation with the rich young man (Mk. 10:17 ff.), the young man’s approaching Jesus is described more fully (v. 17). It is also added that Jesus was moved at the sight of him: ‘looking at him, [he] loved him’ (v. 21). In the same passage: ‘follow me, AND TAKE UP THE CROSS\*’; lastly, the statement that the rich shall not enter into the kingdom of Christ, repeated and elaborated with *greater precision and detail*, v. 24. So also in v. 30. See Matt. 19:29.
13. When Jesus sets out for Jerusalem (Mk. 10:32 ff.), Mark notes that he *went ahead* of the disciples, *as those who were following him were afraid* (v. 32).
14. When he prepares for the triumphant entry into Jerusalem (Mk. 11:1 ff.), there is an addition regarding the colt: ‘on which no one has ever sat.’ This is also reported by Luke (Lk. 19:30).
15. In the story of the merchants cast out of the temple (Mk. 11:15 ff.), verse 16 is an addition: ‘And he would not allow anyone to carry anything through the temple.’
16. Regarding the cursing of the fig tree (Mk. 11:11-26), Matthew makes a *general* statement about the disciples (Matt. 21:20) which Mark attributes to *Peter* by name (Mk. 11:21).
17. In the discourse on the destruction of Jerusalem (Mk. 13:1 ff.), the disciples *Peter, James, and John* are explicitly named (v. 3). *One* of the disciples is said to have asked a question in Mark (v. 1), while according

---

\* [ΑΡΑΣ ΤΟΝ ΣΤΑΥΡΟΝ (*emphasis original*)—This phrase is not present in our text.]

to Matthew (24:1, 3), *all of the disciples* ask the question. Also, in verse 32, there is the straightforward addition, ‘nor the Son,’ which is somewhat implicit in Matthew’s ‘but the Father only.’ [Matt. 24:36]

18. In the flight of the apostles and Peter’s denial (Mk. 14:26-31), there is the minor addition ‘twice,’ where Matthew makes the *general* statement, ‘before the rooster crows.’ [Matt. 26:34] See also Mk. 14:68, 72.
19. When Jesus is brought before Caiaphas (14:43-54), Mark adds (i) that the betrayer said, ‘And lead him away under guard’ (v. 44); (ii) the story of the youth who left his cloak behind when he fled (v. 51); (iii) regarding Peter, that he was ‘warming himself at the fire’ (v. 54).
20. In Mk. 15:17 ff., a more detailed description of who *Barrabas* was is given than in Matthew 27:16.
21. As Jesus is dying on the cross (Mk. 15:22-29), this quotation from Isaiah is added: ‘and he was numbered with the transgressors.’\*
22. In the burial of Jesus (Mk. 15:40-47), there are these additions: (i) *more* women standing by the cross besides those who are mentioned by both authors (v. 41), one of whom, Salome, is identified by name; (ii) the gloss in v. 42: ‘since it was the day of Preparation, the day before the Sabbath;’ (iii) Pilate asking the centurion whether Jesus was really dead (vv. 44-45).
23. In the resurrection of Jesus (Mk. 16:1 ff.), Matt. 28:7 reads: ‘his disciples.’ Mark adds: ‘and Peter.’

Comparing these items closely with the earlier list of passages present in Matthew but omitted by Mark, the following conclusions are evident:

1. A *parable* (p. 14, no. 4 [p. XVIII in the original]) and *Old Testament prophecies* (p. 14, no. 1, and no. 21 above [pp. XIX and XX in the original]) are added by the same author who did not hesitate to exclude *several other parables narrated by Matthew* and *several other prophetic passages* adduced by Matthew. See p. 6, no. 1; p. 7, no. 6; and p.7, no. 3 [pp. X, XI, and XI in the original].
2. He occasionally includes some *quite minor* historical *details*, like: ‘and Andrew, with James and John’ (no. 3); ‘in the time of Abiathar the high priest’ (no. 4); ‘with the Herodians’ (no. 5); ‘to Bethsaida’ (no. 7); ‘as no cloth refiner ... bleach them’ (no. 10); ‘twice’ (no. 18); ‘warming himself at the fire’ (no. 19). Moreover, these items come from an author

---

\* [From a modern critical edition, it is seen that this verse is not well attested in Mark. However, it is found in Lk. 22:37]

who would have had to think that many *important words and deeds* of Jesus either had to be omitted outright or needed to be *condensed and abbreviated*. See pp. 6-9 [pp. X-XIV in the original].

3. He inserted these additions in *passages where he is believed to have done as much shortening as possible of Matthew's longer narrations*. Cf. 'He was with the beasts' (no. 2).
4. Finally, in some of these additions, there is accurate *agreement of Mark with Luke*. Consequently, it seems probable that the additional materials were not *original to Mark* or the product of *Peter's oral tradition*, but rather the result of another source—*some written text* which Luke also employed. Examples include Jairus, the name of the ruler of the synagogue (no. 6) and the colt on which no one had yet sat (no. 14).

Again, if these points are given careful and unbiased study, we sincerely doubt that anyone can conclude that Mark added the aforementioned items for the purpose of expanding and enriching Matthew's history of Christ, with no other possible design.

This concludes the argument which we thought could not implausibly be brought to bear against the thesis *that Mark wrote an epitome of Matthew*. To wit: the thesis lacks all historical credence, as has been established by the authority of the earliest writers. It is contrary to the temper of Mark's times and the general purpose for writing his book. Finally, it is contradicted by the testimony of the text itself, if a certain amount of care and sophistication is given to analyzing the omissions, the narrative sequence, the differences and near-contradictions, and the addition of unparalleled material.

Therefore, having concluded *this* comparison of Mark with Matthew, we shall now present as concisely as we can a simpler way of accounting for the agreement between the two authors. For as we saw above, this agreement alone was what gave rise to the common opinion about the relation of the two authors. Our thesis is this: *Wherever there is verbal and narrative correspondence between Matthew and Mark, the two authors were drawing on a common source. But in places where they differ, they had access to different traditions, be they written or oral*. It is of course accepted knowledge that not long after Christ was taken from this world, there appeared *numerous* accounts of his life, in Greek and in Hebrew and of varying length. This is known both from the prologue of Luke's own Gospel and from the common witness of the earliest writers. Moreover, it is accepted that the apostles themselves eventually collected this plethora of accounts so that they could see to the recording of their histories for the edification of the faith. The early versions of these "gospels" were most likely rather spare. Among the several documents to be written, read, and circulated were (a) histories of his *birth, noted miracles*, and of course his *death and resurrection*; and (b) *individual discourses, parables*, and 'collections' [*συλλογαί*] of *short sayings*. Soon, there would appear a person possessed of either greater literary skill or a deeper commitment to Christian teaching who devoted his labors to gathering these fragmentary records of Christ's life, which he in turn arranged and compiled into a single larger volume. Each time this

process occurred, *i.e.* whenever the accounts were *committed to writing* and particularly whenever they were *translated from Hebrew into Greek*, there inevitably and gradually appeared *dissimilarities among them* in their substance and especially in their wording. Writers from antiquity report that documents of this kind were in particularly frequent use in the churches of Palestine and the neighboring regions of Egypt and Syria. Their report is plausible on its face, and not just because *these* would logically have been the primary *areas* to be filled with the report of Jesus' wisdom and power; the apostles (all of whom of course spent much of their time in *these particular* regions) would also presumably have created and nurtured a desire for writings of this kind through their words. Supporting the same point by way of contrast, a quite different situation appears to have obtained in the churches of the west. Under the influence of Paul, a man who was not an 'eyewitness' [*αυτόπτης*] of Jesus' life and who at any rate had no profound interest in the *historical* aspects of the faith, the western churches were drawn away from any great passion and desire for first-hand testimonies about Jesus Christ and were less motivated to cultivate and foster such a tradition. As for the Roman church, however, it is easy to understand how Peter's words could have inspired an equal zeal to hear and read about the life of Christ. At their request, therefore, Mark fulfilled the wish of the church in the following manner. *Investigating what had been committed to writing, whether in individual fragments or in a 'composite' [σύστημα] collection of sayings and narratives, he selected those parts that were true and which answered to his immediate purpose.* However, he was not reliant on only a *single* source, much less one written by Matthew or any other *apostle*. *He incorporated these selections into his own work, copying whatever was in Greek and translating whatever was in Hebrew. If anything was erroneous or corrupted, he either excluded it outright or emended it. Lastly, he added new material which had not yet been documented in the books HE had, according as he remembered receiving it from Peter's mouth.* (Such material could indeed have been documented in other books not at his disposal.) If we should accept this theory of the origin of Mark's Gospel, then *first of all*, confidence is maintained in the authority of the ancient writers, who are unanimous in stating that Mark relied on the authority of no apostle save *Peter* in accomplishing his work. *Next*, there is a ready and transparent reason for the agreement between Matthew and Mark, regardless of how extensive that agreement actually is: the two authors *plainly* used the *same* primitive sources—or at least notably *similar* ones. (For it should not be thought that Matthew wrote *his* Gospel relying only on his own powers, based just on what he personally remembered. Instead, he consulted earlier narratives of the life of Christ just like *Mark* and *Luke* and compared them with his own memories.) Finally, we saw there were numerous complications tangled like knots around the common view that Mark wrote an *epitome* of Matthew, or at least *copied* him. The new theory cuts through them all with simple logic. Mark of course *lacks several events and passages* which Matthew gives; these include a number of *important* passages that are very effective at illustrating the power, wisdom, and goodness of Jesus. He lacks them, *because they were not in the texts that he used, nor did they ever reach him from any other source—or if they did, they did not come to his mind while he was composing his gospel.* It is comparable to the fact that we know Matthew omitted many details that were preserved for us only by John, details which are just as important as the details that Mark omits. (Certainly they are not any less important!) Moreover, *Mark wrote other parts in a fuller and more abundant style than*

*Matthew* because, obviously having no knowledge of how his counterpart wrote, he either *gave free rein to his own wit* or merely was *following his source*. This theory *also* explains why there is sometimes a *variation in sequence*. It *also* explains why there is *such* a difference in content as *to give the appearance that Matthew and Mark are in conflict*. Finally, it *also* explains why there are many additions which are absent from Matthew: not because Mark had extra material that seemed more important or useful than what he cut, but because these items were contained in the texts which Mark consulted, and there was no reason to ignore or reject them.

However, enough has now been said regarding the whole of this theory. For it is now time to address the chief cause of all that has been written, as if what has come so far were all a sort of preface: with the return once again of the Holy Nativity of our Lord Jesus Christ, we wish to encourage and inspire you, our brothers-in-arms, to join us in the devout remembrance of this singular divine blessing. So then, let us one and all remember how great a help and protection is offered to each one of us in the faith of Jesus Christ for the purpose of living a good and blessed life and making a cheerful and joyous end. Accordingly, with gratitude for this happiness that is ours, and by steadfast and diligent meditation, let us celebrate with public and private reverence this very day which brought forth for us and all human kind *this* Savior, born of a human mother. And may we also receive the fruits of this selfsame righteousness, a joyful and abundant harvest that will carry over to our entire life.

The 1<sup>st</sup> Night of Christmas, 1782