§ 1] ITS ORIGIN. [INTRODUCTION.   
   
 into Macedonia.” He thence accompanied Paul to Macedonia, re-   
 maining perhaps at Philippi (but see below, § iv. 3) until Paul returned   
 thither again at the end of his second visit to Greece, after the disturbance   
 at Ephesus. Thence (Acts xx. 5) we find him again accompanying Paul   
 to Asia and Jerusalem (xxi. 17); being apparently with him at Cesarea   
 during his imprisonment (xxiv. 23); and travelling with him to Rome   
 (xxvii. 1—xxviii. 16). There we also find him remaining with the   
 Apostle to a late period, very nearly till his martyrdom. (See 2 Tim.   
 iv. 11.)   
 4. Of the time and manner of his death nothing certain is known,   
 and the traditions are inconsistent one with another: some alleging him   
 to have suffered martyrdom, while the general report is that he died a   
 natural death.   
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 1. A plain statement of the origin of this Gospel is given us by the   
 Author himself, in his preface, ch. i. 1—4. He there states that many   
 had taken in hand to draw up a statement, according to the testimony   
 of those who were from the beginning eye-witnesses and ministers of   
 the word, of the matters received (or fulfilled) among Christians ; and   
 that it therefore semed good to him also, having carefully traced the   
 progress of events from the first, to write an arranged account of the   
 same to his friend (or patron) Theophilus.   
 2. From this we gather, (1) that Luke was not himself an eye-witness,   
 nor a minister of the word from the beginning; (2) that he compiled his   
 Gospel from the testimony of eye-witnesses and Apostles, which he carefully   
 collected and arranged. For (1) he implicitly excludes himself from the   
 number of the “eye-witnesses and ministers of the word,” and (2) by the   
 “to me also” he includes himself among the “many” who made use of   
 the testimony of eye-witnesses and of Apostles.   
 8. I have before proved generally that the Gospels of Matthew and   
 Mark cannot have been among the number of these narratives of which   
 Luke speaks. I may now add to those proofs, that if Luke had seen   
 and received, as of apostolic authority, either or both of these gospels,   
 then his variations from them are, on his own shewing, unaccountable ;   
 if he had seen them, and did not receive them, his coincidences with them   
 are equally unaccountable. The improbabilities and absurdities involved   
 in his having either or both of them before him and working up their   
 narratives into his own, I have before dealt with, in the general Intro-   
 duction to the Three Gospels.   
 4. Judging entirely from the phenomena presented by the Gospel   
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