§1.J ITS AUTHORSHIP. [1nrRopucTioN.   
   
   
 of the latter part of the book beginning with xv. 13 (302), in the form of   
 personal memoirs, which then were worked.up. This hypothesis, which   
 has not any thing resembling evidence to support it, is sufficiently re-   
 futed by the way in which the mention of Silas is introduced ch. xv, 22   
 (included by the hypothesis in his own work) as being a ‘chief man   
 among the brethren.’ If it be answered that this notice of him was   
 inserted by Luke,—Is it, I would ask, likely, that an author who was at   
 no more pains in his work than to leave the first person standing in the   
 narrative of another which he used, would have added to the mention of   
 uew individuals notices of this kind ?   
 (c) More ingenious, and admitting of more plausible defence, is the   
 hypothesis, which identifies Luke himself with Silas. The latest and   
 ablest vindication of this view is contained in an article by the Author   
 of the literary history of the New Test. in Kitto’s Journal of Sacred   
 Lit. for Oct. 1850. The chief arguments by which he supports it are   
 these :—   
 (1) “The author of the Acts appears, in the early part of his history,   
 to have been well acquainted with the acts and sayings of Peter, as he   
 was afterwards with those of Paul. Now the only persons whom this   
 description would fit, are Silvanus (or Silas), and Mark (see 1 Pet.   
 y. 12,18). That Mark did not after Acts xv. travel with Paul, we   
 know: but Silas did, and from that time we find greater precision in   
 the narrative as regards the history of that Apostle.”   
 But to this it may be answered,—that the difference between the   
 kind of acquaintance which the historian possesses with Peter and his   
 sayings and doings, and that with Paul and his history, is very observ-   
 able even to a cursory reader. Nowhere in the first part of the book   
 does he use the first person: and nowhere, although the testimony has   
 plainly come in many parts from the authority of an eye-witness, does   
 the narrator himself appear as the eye-witness. In fact, all that the   
 above argument insists on, is easily and naturally satisfied, by the long   
 and intimate companionship of Luke and Silvanus as fellow-travellers   
 with Paul, during which time Luke may have gathered, if Silvanus   
 must be considered as his authority, all that we now find in the former   
 parts of our history \*.   
 (2) “Luke and Silvanus (Silas) are nowhere mentioned together.   
 Luke is never mentioned in the Acts: Silas is never coupled with Luke   
 2 I do not notice in the text the untenablenes of the author’s hypothesis that Sil-   
 vanus accompanied Peter from Jerusalem into the East, and became the bearer of his   
 first Epistle to Christians of Asia Minor, before the commencement of his own   
 connexion with Paul: i.e. before the gospel had ever been preached to many of those   
 addressed by Peter, which it had already been,—see 1 Pet. i. 12, 25. This extraor-   
 dinary hypothesis is not necessary to his theory of the identity of Luke and Silas:   
 indeed that theory is better without it, as then the silence the Acts on Peter’s pro-   
 ceedings after Acts xii. is which on that hypothesis it would not be.   
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