intRoDucTION.]| THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. (cH. vr.   
   
   
 Acts is the sequel to the Gospel, much more must the Acts have been   
 written after that event. To us in England, who receive the verse in   
 question as a truthful account of the words spoken by our Lord, and   
 see in them a weighty prophetic declaration which is even now not   
 wholly fulfilled, this argument at least has no weight.   
 3. The last-mentioned view (which is that of De Wette) differs from   
 that of Meyer, who sces in ch. viii. 26 (“it is desert”) a starting point,   
 and in the omission of all mention of the destruction of Jerusalem,   
 a terminus, for the publication of the history ; which he would there-   
 fore place at the beginning of the Jewish war, after the destruction of   
 Gaza by the revolutionary bands of the Jews, and before the destruction   
 of Jerusalem. But the notice of ch. viii, 26 cannot be fairly thus   
 taken: sce note there, in which I have endeavoured to give the true   
 meaning of “desert” as applying to the road and not to Gaza, and as   
 spoken by the angel, not added by the Evangelist. Meyer's latter ter-   
 minus, and the argument by which he fixes it, I hold to be sound. It   
 would be beside all probability, that so great, and for Christianity so   
 important an event, as the overthrow of the Jewish city, temple, and   
 nation, should have passed withont even an allusion in a book in which   
 that city, temple, and nation, bear so conspicuous a part.   
 4, Meyer also endeavours to render a reason why the subsequent   
 proceedings of Paul in Rome should not have been noticed. They   
 were, he imagines, well known to Theophilus, an Italian himself, if not   
 a Roman. But this is the merest caprice of conjecture. What con-   
 vincing evidence have we that Theophilus was a Roman, or an Italian ?   
 And this view would hardly (though Meyer labours to make it do so)   
 account for the narration of what did take place in Rome,—especially   
 for the last verse of the book.   
 5. De Wette attempts to account for the history ending where it   
 does, because the words of our Lord in ch. i. 8 had been accomplished,   
 and so the object of the history fulfilled. But how were they more   
 accomplished at that particular time than before? Rome had not been   
 specified in that command: and he who now preached at Rome was not   
 formally addressed in those words. Rather, if the object of the writer   
 had been merely to trace these words to their fulfilment, should he have   
 followed the actual Apostles to whom they were spoken, many of whom   
 we have reason to believe much more literally preached “ unto the ends of   
 the earth,” than St. Paul. But no such design, or none such in so   
 formal a shape, was in the mind of our Evangelist. ‘That the Lord   
 commanded and his Apostles obeyed, would be the obvious course of   
 history ; but that the mere bringing of one of those Apostles to the   
 head of the civilized world should have been thought to exhaust that   
 command, is inconceivable as a ground for breaking off the narration.   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 6. Still more futile is the view that it was broken off because the   
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