§ 1v.] AT WHAT TIME WRITTEN. [inrropuctiox.   
   
 that the former treatise’ of Acts i. 1, can be no other than this Gospel.   
 And on that follows the inference, that the Gospel was published before   
 the Acts of the Apostles. Now the last event recorded in.the Acts is an   
 interview of Paul with the Jews, shortly after his arrival in Rome. We   
 further have the publication of the Acts, by the words of ch. xxviii. 80,   
 postponed two whole years after that arrival and interview; but, I   
 believe, no longer than that. For had Paul continued longer than that   
 time in his hired house before the publication, it must have been so   
 stated; and had he left Rome or that house, or had any remarkable   
 event happened to him before the publication, we cannot suppose that   
 so careful a recorder as Luke would have failed to bring his work down   
 to the time then present, by noticing such departure or such event. I   
 assume then the publication of the Acts to have taken place two years   
 after Pauls arrival at Rome: i.e. according to Wieseler (see my   
 chronological table in Introduetion to Acts), in the spring of a.p. 63.   
 2. We have therefore a fixed date, before which the Gospel must have   
 been published. But if Iam not mistaken, we have, by internal   
 evidence, the date of its publication removed some time back from   
 this date. It is hardly probable that Luke would speak of, as “ the   
 former treatise,” a work in which he was then, or had been very lately,   
 engaged. But not to dwell on this,—even allowing that the prefatory   
 and dedicatory matter, as is usually the case, may have come last from the   
 hands of the author,—I find in the account of the Ascension, which   
 immediately follows, a much more cogent proof, that the Gospel had   
 been some considerable time published. For while it recapitulates the   
 Gospel account just so much that we can trace the same hand in it   
 (compare Acts i. 4 with Luke xxiv. 49), itis manifestly a different account,   
 much fuller in particulars, and certainly unknown to the Evangelist when   
 he wrote his Gospel. Now, as we may conclude, in accordance with the   
 “having traced down all things accurately from the very first,” of Luke   
 i. 8, that he would have carefully sought out every available source of   
 information at the time of writing his Gospel,—this becoming acquainted   
 with a new account of the Ascension implies that in the mean time fresh   
 sources of information had been opened to him. And this would most   
 naturally be by change of place, seeing that various fixed cycles of apos-   
 tolic teaching were likely to be current in, and about, the respective   
 mother churches. Now the changes of place in Luke’s recent history   
 had been,—two years before, from Caesarea to Rome, Acts xxvii. 1 ff. ;   
 two years and a half before that, from Philippi to Jerusalem, Acts xx. 6;   
 xxi. 15 ff,—and Cesarea. This last is left to be inferred from his leav-   
 ing Cesarea with Paul, ch. xxvii. 1 ;—atall events he was during this   
 time in Palestine, with, or near Paul. I shall make it probable in the   
 Introduction to the Acts of the Apostles, that during this period he was   
 engaged in collecting materials for and compiling that book ; and by   
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