intRropuction.] THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. [eu. vi.   
   
   
 in the addresses or salutations of the Hpistles. And the two names,   
 Silvanus (from silva, a wood) and Lucanus (from lucus, a grove) are su   
 cognate that they might well be the appellations of one and the same   
 person.” .   
 This ingenious argument, if well weighed, will be found to have but   
 little foree. As to Luke not being named in the Acts, the fact itself   
 goes for nothing. If it have any weight, it would be at first sight against   
 the hypothesis. That one who was careful to insert an explanatory   
 notice respecting one so well known as “ Saul, who is also called Paul,”   
 should take no notice at all of the fact hereafter likely to occasion so   
 much confusion,—that he who was named Silas in the history, was   
 known by Paul, and mentioned in his Epistles, as Lucas,—is hardly pro-   
 bable. But let us observe the occasions on which Silvanus and Lucas   
 have been mentioned by Paul. In 1 Thess. i. 1, and 2 Thess. i. 1, we   
 have Silvanus joined with Paul and Timotheus. In 2 Cor. i. 19, we   
 have an allusion to the preaching of Christ at Corinth by Paul, Silvanus,   
 and ‘Timotheus. Accordingly in Acts xviii. 5, we find that Silas and   
 Timotheus came from Macedonia and joined Paul at Corinth: this oc-   
 curring in a part of the history when (I am speaking according to the   
 ordinary and prima facie inference, from the disuse of the first person   
 since xvi. 17) the author was absent from Paul. Now let us turn to   
 Col. iv. 14, Philem. 24%. These Epistles belong to a time when we   
 know by the latter chapters of the Acts, that the writer of the history   
 was with Paul. Accordingly I find Lucas mentioned in both places.   
 So far at least is in remarkable accordance with the common view that   
 Silas and Lucas were not one, but two persons, and that the latter was   
 the author of the Acts, and not the former.—It may be said that Paul   
 called the same person Lucas whom he had previously called Silvanus:   
 and this may be supported by his variations between Peter and Cephas.   
 But (1) I conceive that the ease of Peter was too exceptional an one   
 (both names having apparently been given him and used by our Lord   
 Ilimself) to found an analogy upon: and (2) Peter’s names are forms   
 of the same meaning in two different languages, not words of similar   
 meaning in the same language.   
 But the principal argument in my mind against this hypothesis (over   
 and above that from ch. xv. 22) is, that it would introduce unaccount-   
 able confusion into the form and expression of a history, which on the   
 common view is lucid and accountable enough. Imagine Silas to be the   
 speaker in ch. xvi., and Luke to be merged in Silas. Then ‘we’ from   
 yer. 10 to ver. 18, means, Silas and Timotheus. In ver. 19, it would be   
 natural to desert the first person, in order to express what happened to   
 Paul and Silas, and not to Timotheus. The same specification of Paul   
 and Silas might, for the same reason, be continucd during the stay at   
 3 I omit at present 2 Tim. iv. 11.   
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