§ uj ITS SOURCES. [inrropuction.   
   
 part of the book\* presents more traces of Hebraistic idiom, not only in   
 speeches, but in the form of the historical narrative.   
 14. I proceed now to an enquiry promised in par. 1 of this section :   
 How far we have indications of the gaps in the author's personal testimony   
 in the latter part having been filled in by that of Paul.   
 Perhaps one of the best sections for the purpose of this examination   
 will be that from ch. xvii. 16—xviii. 5, which relates to a time when   
 Paul was left alone. Do we discover in the narrative or speech the   
 traces of an unusual hand, and if so, whose is it? That some unusual   
 hand has been here employed, is evident: for in the six verses 16—21   
 inclusive, we have no fewer than nine expressions foreign to Luke’s   
 style, or nowhere else occurring: and in the speech itself, no fewer   
 than nineteen. Now of these twenty-eight expressions, five are either   
 peculiar to, or employed principally by Paul; besides that we find the   
 phrase “his spirit,” so frequently used by him of his own mind or   
 feelings. Here I think we can hardly fail to trace the hand of the   
 Apostle by quite as many indications as we might expect to find. That   
 Luke should, as in every other case, have wrought in the section into his   
 work, and given it the general form of his own narrative, would only   
 be natural, and we find it has been so.   
 15. It may be instructive to carry on the examination of this part of   
 the history somewhat further. Atch. xviii. 5, Silas and Timotheus joined   
 Paul at Corinth. One at least of these, Timotheus, was afterwards for   
 a considerable time in the company of Luke in the journey from Philippi   
 to Jerusalem. But on his arrival at Corinth, no alteration in the style   
 of the narrative is perceptible. It still remains the mixed diction of   
 Paul and Luke: the uncommon words are fewer, while we have some   
 remarkable traces of Paul’s hand. Again, in vv. 24—28 of the same   
 chapter, we have a description of what took place with regard to Apollos   
 at Ephesus, when Paul himself was absent. This portion it would be   
 natural to suppose might have been furnished by Apollos himself, were it   
 not for the laudatory description of ver. 24. If not by Apollos, then by   
 Aquila and Priscilla to Paul on his return to Ephesus. And so it seems   
 to have been. ‘The general form is Luke’s: the peculiarities are mostly   
 Paul’s.   
 16. The examination of these sections may serve to shew that the   
 great Apostle appears to have borne a principal part in informing Luke   
 with regard to such parts of his history: the traces of this his share in   
 the work being visible by the occurrence of words and phrases peculiar   
 to him in the midst of the ordinary narrative from Luke’s own pen.   
 These he preserved, casting the merely narrative matter into the form   
 in which he usually wrote.   
 8 See on this and the following paragraphs, the foot notes on this part of the Intro-   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 duction in my Greek Test.   
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