§ 1] ITS AUTHORSIUP. [anrropvuction.   
   
   
 parts, derived from various sources, in their original fragmentary state,   
 some in the third, others in the first person, Unquestionably such a   
 writer would in such a case have translated the whole into the third   
 person. (0) Seeing that Luke does use the first person in Acts i. 1,   
 and that the first person is resumed ch, (xiv. 22) xvi. 1O—17; xx. 5—   
 15; xxi. 1—18; xxvii. 1; xxviii. 16, it is but a fair inferenec that in   
 one and the same book, and that book betokening considerable care of   
 writing and arrangement, the speaker implied by the use of the first   
 person is one and the same throughout.   
 5. That the author never names himself, either as the author, or   
 otherwise, can of itself not be urged as an objection to any hypothesis   
 of authorship, unless by the occurrence of some mention, from which   
 the authorship by another may be fairly inferred. But, if we have in   
 this book no mention of Luke, we have as certainly no bint of any other   
 person having furnished the narrative. On the other hand we have a   
 hint by which it appears that some one other than all the specified   
 companions of Paul on a certain occasion (Acts xx. 4, 5) was with   
 him, and was the author of the narrative. After the mention by name   
 of Sopater, Aristarchus, Secundus, Gaius, Timotheus, Tychicus, and   
 Jrophimus, we read, ‘These having gone forward waited for us at   
 Troas:’ this pronoun including Paul and the writer, at least (see note   
 there).   
 G. That Paul himself, in Epistles written during the journeys here   
 deseribed, does not name Luke, cannot be alleged as any argument why   
 Luke should not have been the author of our narrative. For (a), we   
 have undoubted examples of Paul sometimes merely alluding generally   
 to those who were with him, as Phil. iv. 21, 22 ;—sometimes sedulously   
 suppressing their names while speaking of services performed by them,   
 as 2 Cor. viii. 18; sometimes not mentioning or alluding to them at   
 all, as in the Epistles to the Galatians and to the Ephesians ;—and   
 (b) strictly speaking, no Epistles appear to have been written by Paul   
 while our writer was in his company, before his Roman imprisonment.   
 For he does not seem to‘have joined him at Corinth, eh. xviii., whence the   
 two Epistles to the Thessalonians were written :—or to have been with   
 him at Ephesus, ch. xix.,—whence (probably) the Epistle to the   
 Galatians was written;—nor again to have wintered with him at   
 Corinth, ch. xx. 3, at the time of his writing the Epistle to the   
 Romans, and (possibly) that to the Galatians.   
 7. But independently of the above arguments to establish the identity   
 of the author throughout, we may infer the same from the similarity of   
 diction and style, which do not vary through the book. Here again we   
 have, as may be seen abundantly in the references to my edition of the   
 Greek text, terms peculiar to the writer occurring in various parts of the   
 book ;—favourite terms and phrases oceurring in all parts of the book,   
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