

In my previous two posts I showed why Papias is not a reliable source when it comes to the authorship of Matthew and Mark. If you haven't read those posts and are personally inclined to think that his testimony about Matthew and Mark are accurate, I suggest you read them (the posts) before reading this one.

In this post I want to argue that what he actually says about Matthew and Mark are not true of our Matthew and Mark, and so either he is talking about *other* Gospels that he knows about (or has heard about) called Matthew and Mark, that do not correspond to our Matthew and Mark, or he simply is wrong.

I'll reverse the order in which his comments are given, and deal with Matthew first.

In the quotation of the fourth century historian Eusebius, we read this:

And this is what [Papias] says about Matthew:

“And so Matthew composed the sayings in the Hebrew tongue, and each one interpreted [*Or: translated*] them to the best of his ability.”

The problems here are obvious....

THE REST OF THIS POST IS FOR MEMBERS ONLY. If you don't belong yet, THERE IS STILL HOPE!!!

You need to be logged in to see this part of the content. Please [Login](#) to access.



[Why Are the Gospels Anonymous?](#)
[Believing Papias When It's Convenient](#)