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 ch. xv. 23—29 (xxiii, 26-—30), must have been of this kind: some of   
 the discourses, as that of Peter ch. xi. 5—17, containing expressions   
 unknown to Luke’s style: more or less, the other speeches of Peter,   
 containing many striking points of similarity to (both) his Epistles,—   
 see reff. At the same time, from the similarity of ending of the earlier   
 sections (compare ch. ii. 46, 47; iv. 82 ff.; v. 42; ix. 31; xii. 24),   
 from the occurrence of words and phrases peculiar to Luke in the midst   
 of such speeches as those noted above, the inference must be (as in the   
 last paragraph) that such documents were not adopted until their lan-   
 guage had been revised, where thought necessary, by the author himself.   
 The very minute and careful detail of ch. xii., evidently intended to give   
 the highest authority to the narrative of Peter’s miraculous deliverance,   
 so that the house itself of Mary the mother of John Mark is specified,   
 ihe name of the female servant who went to the door, her remarks and   
 the answer made to her, are all given,—has apparently been the result of   
 diligent enquiry on the spot, from the parties concerned. We can hardly   
 resist the inference, that the very same persons who fifteen years before   
 had been witnesses of the deliverance, now gave the details of an   
 occurrence which they could never forget, and described their own   
 feelings on it.   
 9. Whether Luke at this time can have fallen in with Peter per-   
 sonally, is very questionable. That Apostle certainly does not appear   
 to have been at Jerusalem when Paul visited it: and from the omission   
 of all mention of him after ch. xv., the natural inference is, that he was   
 not there during any part of Paul’s imprisonment. (See note on Gal.   
 ii. 11, and Introduction to 1 Pet.)   
 10. But one very important section of the first part of the Acts is   
 concerned with events which happened at Cesarea,—and derived from   
 information obtained there. There dwelt Philip the Evangelist, one of   
 the seven (ch. xxi. 8): a most important authority for the contents of   
 eh, vi. and viii.’, if not also for some events previous to ch. vi. There   
 too, we may well believe, still dwelt, if not Cornelius himself’, yet some   
 of the “many that were come together” of ch. x. 27,—the persons perhaps   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 6 De Wette objects, that Philip could hardly have imparted ch. viii. in its present   
 form. At first sight, seems so: but the next verse, “he evangelized all the cities,   
 §e.,” can on the other hand hardly have been imparted by any but Philip: and this   
 leads us to think whether subsequent enquiry respecting the eunuch (who as he had   
 before come to Jerusalem to worship at the feast, so would again) may not have   
 enabled Philip to add this particular, “for he went his way rejoicing,” over and above   
 what he could know at the time.   
 7 It seems probable that the Roman forces never left Caesarea during the whole   
 period from Augustus to Vespasian. The territory during that time (see chronological   
 table) was alternately part of the province of Syria, and a dependent kingdom: but the   
 garrisons do not appear to have been changed in such cases.   
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