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PREFACE TO THE FOURTH GERMAN EDITION.

The third edition of this Commentary appeared in the year 1861. The accessions to the exegetical literature of the Book of Acts since that date have been on the whole meagre; and they have been chiefly directed to the investigation of certain specially important facts which are recorded in the Book, as regards their miraculous character and their relation to the Pauline Epistles. The critical researches as to this canonical writing are, doubtless, not yet concluded; but they are in such a position that we must regard the attempts—prosecuted with so much keenness, confidence, and acuteness—to make the Book of Acts appear an intentional medley of truth and fiction like a historical romance, as having utterly failed. To this result several able apologetic works have within the last ten years contributed their part, while the criticism which finds "purpose" everywhere has been less active, and has not brought forward arguments more cogent than those already so often discussed. Even the new edition of the chief work of Baur, in which its now departed author has devoted his last scientific labours to the contents of the Acts of the Apostles, furnishes nothing essentially new, and it touches only here and there on the objections urged by his opponents.

1 There has just appeared in the first part of the Stud. und Krit. for 1870 the beginning of an elaborate rejoinder to Holsten, by Beyschlag: "die Visionshypothese in ihrer neuesten Begründung," which I can only mention here as an addition to the literature noted at ix. 3-9. [Soon after this preface was written, there appeared Dr. Overbeck's Commentary, which, while formally professing to be a new edition of de Wette's work, is in greater part an extravagant application to the Book of Acts of a detailed historical criticism which de Wette himself strongly condemned. It is an important and interesting illustration of the Tübingen critical method (above referred to) as pushed to its utmost limits; but it possesses little independent value from an exegetical point of view.]

W. P. D.
With reference to the method of judging the New Testament writings, which Dr. Baur started, and in which he has taken the lead, I cannot but regret that, in controversy with it, we should hear people speak of "believing" and "critical" theology as of things necessarily contrasted and mutually exclusive. It would thus seem, as if faith must of necessity be uncritical, and criticism unbelieving. Luther himself combined the majestic heroism of his faith with all freedom, nay, boldness of criticism, and as to the latter, he laid stress even on the dogmatic side ("what makes for Christ"),—a course, no doubt, which led him to mistaken judgments regarding some N. T. writings, easily intelligible as it may appear in itself from the personal idiosyncrasy of the great man, from his position as a Reformer, and from the standpoint of science in his time. As regards the Acts of the Apostles, however, which he would have called "a gloss on the Epistles of St. Paul," he with his correct and sure tact discerned and hit upon the exact opposite of what recent criticism has found: "Thou findest here in this book a beautiful mirror, wherein thou mayest see that this is true: Sola fides justificat." The contrary character of definite "purpose," which has in our days been ascribed to the book, necessarily involves the corresponding lateness of historical date, to which these critics have not hesitated to transfer it. But this very position requires, in my judgment, an assent on their part to a critical impossibility. For—as hardly a single unbiased person would venture to question—the author has not made use of any of the Pauline Epistles preserved to us; and therefore these letters cannot have been accessible to him when he was engaged in the collection of his materials or in the composition of his work, because he would certainly have been far from leaving unused historical sources of such productiveness and of so direct and supreme authenticity, had they stood at his command. How is it to be still supposed, then, that he could have written his work in an age, in which the Epistles of the apostle were already everywhere diffused by means of copies and had become a common possession of the church,—an age, for which we have the oldest testimony in the canon itself from the unknown author of the so-called Second Epistle of Peter (iii. 15 f.)?

It is my most earnest desire that the labour, which I have gladly devoted, as in duty bound, to this new edition, may be serviceable to the correct understanding of the book, and to a right estimate of its historical contents; and to these ends may God give it His blessing!

I may add that, to my great regret, I did not receive the latest work of Wieseler,¹ which presents the renewed fruit of profound and inde-

¹ Beiträge zur richtigen Würdigung der Evangelien und der evang. Geschichte, Gotha, 1869.
pendent study, till nearly half of my book was already finished and in

ype. But it has reference for the most part to the Gospels and their

Chronology, the investigation of which, however, extends in many cases

also into the Book of Acts. The arguments adduced by Wieseler in his
ten th Beitrag, with his wonted thoughtfulness and depth of research, in

proof of the agreement of Luke xxiv. 44 ff. and Acts i. 1, have not

availed to shake me in my view that here the Book of Acts follows a

different tradition from the Gospel.

DR. MEYER.

HANNOVER, October 22, 1869.
PREFATORY NOTE.

The explanations prefixed to previously issued volumes of this Commentary [see especially the General Preface to Romans, vol. I.] regarding the principles on which the translation has been undertaken, and the method followed in its execution, are equally applicable to the portion now issued.

W. P. D.

GLASGOW COLLEGE, May, 1877.
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ERRATA.

On pages 33, 35, and 36, for the letters (D), (R), and (V), indicating the notes appended to the chapter, read (H), (R), and (V) respectively.
PREFACE TO THE AMERICAN EDITION.

The Book of Acts is the indispensable and invaluable link of connection between the Gospels and the Epistles. It is the proper sequel and natural result of the one, and forms a fit preface and a suitable setting for the other. It is difficult to overestimate our indebtedness to this book, historically, theologically, and ecclesiastically.

As an epitome of the labours of thirty eventful years, it is remarkable for the fulness and variety of the information it contains; and is no less remarkable for the omission of much which it would be of great interest for us to know. Even in the life of Paul, of whose labors it specially treats, there are considerable periods of which nothing is recorded, or the events of which are dismissed with a sentence. As many volumes would have been required to give a full narrative in detail, this brief treatise is written on the principle of selection; and the selection of material is alike judicious and fair. The impartiality and truthfulness of the writer is amply evinced by the honest record which he makes of the imperfections in the church, and of the differences which arose between some of its acknowledged leaders.

The united testimony of the early church to the authenticity of this book, and to its authorship—as the work of Luke, the writer of the third Gospel—is confirmed by internal evidence, deduced from the identity of style, the continuity of the narrative, the reference of the writer to a previous treatise addressed to the same individual, and the correspondence of plan. No less than fifty words, not found elsewhere in the N. T., are common to both books. Dr. Schaff, in the revised edition of his History of the Christian Church, vol I., page 739, writes: "No history of thirty years has ever been written so truthful, so impartial, so important, so interesting, so healthy in tone and so hopeful in spirit, so aggressive yet so genial, so cheering and inspiring, so replete with lessons of wisdom and encouragement for work in
spreading the gospel of truth and peace, and yet withal so simple and modest, as the Acts of the Apostles. It is the best as well as the first manual of church history."

Severe critical assaults have been directed against the Book of Acts. The writer has been accused of systematic perversion of facts, and of deliberate addition of events and incidents which had no foundation in truth, in order to serve his special purpose of preparing an irenicum between the Petrine or Jewish Christians, and the Pauline or Gentile party, who held more liberal and enlarged views of the gospel. Now there is no evidence whatever in the book of any such design; and its credibility and perfect reliability are clearly demonstrable from the harmony between the records it contains and authentic secular history; and from the numerous and striking coincidences between the Acts and the Epistles. The argument constructed by Paley on this subject, in his Horæ Paulinæ, is unanswerable.

Dr. Meyer was born in Gotha, January 10th, 1800. He was baptized on the 12th day of the same month, and was named Henry August Wilhelm. The family name was formerly written Major, or Mayer. As a child, he was constitutionally feeble, but by constant well-regulated exercise he acquired the power of great physical and mental endurance. At the gymnasium of Gotha he early laid the foundation of his high classical culture. He had a decided taste for the classical languages and literature, and made distinguished proficiency in them. In 1818 he entered the University of Jena to study theology. Simple and social were the years of his student life. On leaving the university he became a tutor in an institution under the care of Pastor Oppermann, whose daughter he married in 1823, with whom he lived in great domestic enjoyment for forty years. In 1823 he was installed as pastor in Osthausen, and in 1830 called to the more prominent position of pastor at Harste, near Göttingen.

In 1829 he issued the first part of the great work of his life, which was followed in 1832 by another instalment. His original plan of the work expanded as he proceeded, and he did not live to see it completed. His views, during forty years of most assiduous study of the Scriptures, changed considerably; and such changes were frankly expressed in successive editions, and in fresh productions on other portions of the Word. The principle of grammatico-historical interpretation, however, which he at first adopted was rigidly adhered to throughout his life. It was his custom carefully to revise, correct, and polish each work before making it ready for the press.

In 1837 he removed to Hoga, and in 1844 was called to Hannover as Consistorialrath, Superintendent, and Chief Pastor of the Neustädter St.
Johannis Kirche. In 1845 the faculty at Göttingen conferred on him the degree of Doctor of Theology. In 1846 he suffered from a severe illness, which so injured his health that he never afterward regained his former strength. In consequence of this his labours were somewhat modified and diminished, though still abundant, and he adopted very strict rules of abstinence and exercise, which he maintained until the close of his life. He called water and walking his two great physicians. He was accustomed to rise early, generally at four o'clock.

In 1864 his wife died, and after that bereavement he lived in the family of his son, and was very greatly cheered by the gleesome gladness and constant attendance of his granddaughters, who accompanied him in his daily walks, in all kinds of weather. In 1865 he retired from official life and devoted his time to his studies and to the society of friends. He was a man of peace, and all party-political proceedings and irritating religious controversies were exceedingly offensive to him. His views of truth became clearer and more positive with his advancing years and his materer studies.

His last illness was brief, nor were his sufferings great. The last Sunday of his life, June 15th, was spent in his usual way, with great personal enjoyment to himself and others. About the middle of that night he was suddenly seized with great pain, from which he obtained some relief. On the 19th, two days before his decease, he said: "Willingly would I still remain with you; but willingly am I also ready to depart, if God calls me." On the evening of June 21st, 1873, he quietly fell asleep. His remains were laid in the Neustädter churchyard, and on the cross at his tomb is engraved this text: Romans xiv. 8. Dr. Gloag, the able translator of a part of Meyer's Commentaries, writes about six months after his death: "It is hardly to the credit of our theologians, that the greatest modern exegete should have recently passed away, with such slight notice, at least in our English periodicals, of his literary works and vast erudition."

Among Commentaries on the Acts the work of Meyer occupies a deservedly pre-eminent place. In extent of erudition and accuracy of scholarship it stands unsurpassed. No name is entitled to take precedence of that of Meyer as a critical exegete; and it would be difficult to find one that equals him in the happy combination of superior learning with keen penetration, analytical power, and clear, terse, vigorous expression. He has admirable exegetical tact and acumen, and presents his results with candour and perspicuity. So impartial and candid is he, that he never allows his own peculiar views to colour or distort his interpretations of the language of Scripture. Any Biblical student will find exquisite delight in tracing his clear and cogent reasonings to the gen-
erally correct decision reached by his calm judicial mind and deep spir-
ritual instinct. He has no sympathy with the school of rationalistic
interpreters, and firmly believes in the supernatural—the divine inter-
position in human affairs. The Bible is to him the Word of God; and
redemption through the incarnation and death of the Son of God a
glorious reality. The peculiarity of his views concerning the person of
Christ do not seem to affect his full appreciation of the Saviour's work.
Indeed his doctrine is decidedly evangelical, and he readily receives
whatever is revealed, provided he has satisfactory evidence of the
authenticity of the record. His honesty and fearlessness are so great
that he does not even seek to harmonize apparent discrepancies; while
his views of inspiration are such as to permit him to regard some of
them as irreconcilable and contradictory. Some of his statements,
therefore, must be carefully scrutinized and received with caution, but
no theologian, however learned or eminent, can consult his excellent
Commentaries without deriving great profit and grateful satisfaction.

Alford, referring to the Commentaries and critical notes of Meyer, says:
"Though often differing widely from him, I cannot help regarding his
Commentaries on the two Epistles to the Corinthians as the most mas-
terly and complete that I have hitherto seen on any portion of Script-
ure." Dr. Howard Crosby, whose high attainments as a scholar render
him an authority equal to the highest in such matters, characterizes
Meyer's Commentaries as "unsurpassed," and states "his work is a
ετήσια ἔστη." He states: "Meyer's faults are his purism, which
presses a classical exactness on Hellenistic Greek, and a low view of
inspiration, which permits him to see irreconcilable difficulties" in the
sacred narratives; but further adds: "In the Epistles Meyer is
specially sound and forcible." Dr. T. W. Chambers, another thor-
oughly qualified judge, writes: "Meyer has been justly called the
prince of exegetæ; being at once acute and learned." Dr. Gloag
regards him as "the greatest modern exegetæ" and speaks of his Com-
mentaries as "unrivalled."

Dr. Dickson, Prof. of Divinity in the University of Glasgow, Editor
of Meyer's Commentaries, as published by T. & T. Clarke, Edinburgh,
characterizes the production of Meyer as "an epoch-making work of
exegesis," and adds: "I have thought it right, so far as the English
reader is concerned, to present, according to my promise, the work of
Meyer without addition or subtraction in its latest and presumably best
form as it left his hand." This American edition is an exact reprint of
the Scottish one.

Meyer's Commentary on Acts is intrinsically worthy of republication
at any time, but the immediate occasion of its hasty reproduction at this
time is to be found in the fact that the attention of Sunday-schools, and of Christian people generally, will be specially directed to the Book of Acts, during the first six months of the present year, and both pastors and teachers will find in Meyer an invaluable aid.

The work of the American editor, which, though far too hurried, has been one of genuine delight, consists: First, in transferring from the page to foot-notes most of the exceedingly numerous references to authorities. These notes are indicated by small numerals, on each page. It is thought that thus the book will be better suited for the general reader, while the scholarly student can still avail himself of all the references he may desire. Second, in appending a number of supplementary notes to each chapter. These notes have been written and selected for the purpose of expanding and confirming, and, in some instances, of modifying and correcting the statements of the author. The notes have been designedly made more copious in the hope of rendering the work more serviceable to Sunday-school teachers and to the general reader.

A list of the books used, referred to, or quoted in preparing the supplementary notes is furnished. They are all in the English language, most of them inexpensive, many of them handy volumes and easily procurable. We would specially commend to Biblical students the well-known and excellent work of Prof. Hackett, which Dr. Gloag, in the preface to his own work on the Acts, modestly styles "the best work on the subject in the English language." The Rev. S. Cox, editor of the Expositor, London, says of the Commentaries of Hackett and Gloag, they "are probably the best in our language, each of them marked by sound scholarship, good common-sense, and a candid and devout spirit. If a choice must be made, give Gloag the preference." We most heartily concur in the last sentence, and unhesitatingly say of Gloag what Gloag himself has said of Hackett, it is the best book on the Acts in the English language. The works of Abbott, Alexander, Plumptre, Jacobus; and Howson and Spence, edited by Schaff, are suitable for popular reading and Sunday-school work.

It is hoped that the Table of Contents, and the Index to the Supplementary Notes, to which reference is made in the text by small capitals in brackets, will be of service to the reader, and facilitate the study of the volume. The attentive, earnest perusal of Meyer's work cannot fail not merely to increase the reader's knowledge of the Scriptures, but also to awaken fresh interest in the thorough study of the Sacred Book.

W. ORMISTON.

NEW YORK, January 6, 1889.
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<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Fate of Judas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Thou, Lord.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>The Lot.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Other tongues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Hades.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Parousia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Sadducees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Annas the high priest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>For we cannot but speak.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Stated prayer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>All things common.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Ananias.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Peter's shadow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Theudas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>A murmuring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Seven men.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>The face of an angel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Stephen's speech.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Historical errors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Abraham's call.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Death of Terah.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Four hundred years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Jacob's burial.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
<td>Cast out... children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
<td>An angel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>A great persecution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Devout men carried Stephen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Simon believed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Samaritans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Mission of Peter and John.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td>They received the Holy Ghost.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Saul.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Damascus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>A light from heaven.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>197</td>
<td>Stood speechless.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>197</td>
<td>Many days.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>198</td>
<td>Peter and Paul—Lydda and Joppa.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LETTER</th>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>VERSE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>Conversion of Cornelius.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>A devout man.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>Fell into a trance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>Accepted with him.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XL.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>They of the circumcision contended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Antioch.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>Herod.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>He killed James.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>Peter in prison.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>Death of Herod.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>Special documentary source.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>Prophets and teachers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>John as an attendant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>Second psalm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>Paul’s sermon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>Iconium.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>An assault made.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>Cities of Lycaonia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>Gods in the likeness of men.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>Chosen them elders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>Except ye be circumcised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Apostles and elders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>James answered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>Paul’s visits to Jerusalem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>Send greeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>Verse supposed spurious.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>The contention of Paul and Barnabas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>We endeavored to go.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>The chief city.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Baptism of Lydia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>The inner prison.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>And washed their stripes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>Thessalonica.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>Honorable women.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>Timothy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>The market-place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>An unknown God.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>Corinth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Galio.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>Having shorn his head.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>Apollos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>Baptism of John.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>Ephesus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>Whether there be any Holy Ghost.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>Exorcists.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>He dismissed the assembly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX.</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>After the uproar.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>Τὴν εκκλησίαν τοῦ Κυρίου.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18-36</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>Paul’s address at Miletus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>Rhodes and Patara.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>Disciples at Tyre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>Philip’s four daughters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>Tarried many days.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>Paul purifying himself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>Paul’s defence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>Art thou a Roman?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>I did not know that he is the high priest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LETTER</th>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>VERS.</th>
<th>PAGE.</th>
<th>NOTES.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>XXIII.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>Pharisees and Sadducees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>The Lord stood by him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>Paul's sister's son.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A¹</td>
<td>XXIV.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>Tertullus began to accuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>According to our law, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C²</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>Felix trembled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E¹</td>
<td>XXV.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>I appeal to Caesar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>Unto my Lord.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R¹</td>
<td>XXVI.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>Almost thou persuadest me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C¹</td>
<td>XXVII.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>And he put us therein.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>Fair Havens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>Toward the N. W. and S. W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>Euroclydon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F¹</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>The angel of God.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>They cast four anchors out of the stern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>Except these abide, ye cannot be saved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>XXVIII.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>Melita.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>This sect spoken against.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>Two whole years in his own hired house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C¹</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>Paul's second imprisonment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E¹</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>Evidential value of the Acts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SEC. I.—AUTHORSHIP AND GENUINENESS OF THE BOOK.

The fifth historical book of the New Testament, already named in early Christian antiquity (Canon Murat., Clem. Al. Strom. v. 12, p. 606, ed. Potter, Tertull. c. Marc. v. 2 f., de jejun. 10, de bapt. 10; comp. also Iren. adv. haer. iii. 14. 1, iii. 15. 1) from its chief contents πράξεως τῶν ἀποστόλων, announces itself (i. 1) as a second work of the same author who wrote the Gospel dedicated to Theophilus. The Acts of the Apostles is therefore justly considered as a portion of the historical work of Luke, following up that Gospel, and continuing the history of early Christianity from the ascension of Christ to the captivity of Paul at Rome; and no other but Luke is named by the ancient orthodox church as author of the book, which is included by Eusebius, H. E. iii. 25, among the Homologoumena. There is indeed no definite reference made to the Acts by the Apostolic Fathers, as the passages, Ignat. ad Smyrn. 3 (comp. Acts x. 41), and Polycarp, ad Phil. 1 (comp. Acts ii. 24), cannot even be with certainty regarded as special reminiscences of it; and the same remark holds good as to allusions in Justin and Tatian. But, since the time of Irenaeus, the Fathers have frequently made literal quotations from the book (see also the Epistle of the churches at Vienne and Lyons in Eus. v. 2), and have expressly designated it as the work of Luke¹ (Ά). With this fact before us, the passage in Photius, Quaest. Amphiloch. 145 (see Wolf Cur. IV. p. 781, Schmidt in Staudlin’s Kirchenhist. Archiv, I. p. 15), might appear strange: τῶν δὲ συγγραφέων τῶν πράξεων οἱ μὲν Κλήμεντα λέγοντι τῶν Ρώμης, ἄλλοι δὲ Βαρνάβαν καὶ ἄλλοι Δουκάν τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν, but this statement as to Clement and Barnabas stands so completely isolated, unsupported by any other notice of ecclesiastical antiquity, that it can only have reference to some arbitrary assumption of individuals who knew little or nothing of the book. Were it otherwise, the Gospel of Luke must also have been alleged to be a work of Clement or Barnabas; but of this there is not the slightest trace. That the Book of Acts was in reality much less known and read than the Gospels, the interest of which was the most general, immediate, and supreme, and than the N. T. Epistles, which were destined at once for whole churches, and, inferentially, for yet wider circles, is evident from Chrysostom, Hom. I.: πολλοὶ τούτων τὸ βιβλίον οὐδ' ἄρχον τινὰ, γνώριμον

¹ It cannot be a matter of surprise that our old codd. name no author in the superscription (only some minius all name Luke), since there are not several “Acts of the Apostles” in the Canon, as there are several Gospels, needing distinctive designation by the names of their authors. Comp. Ewald, Jahrh. IX. p. 57.
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And thus it is no wonder if many, who knew only of the existence of the Book of Acts, but had never read it (for the very first verse must have pointed them to Luke), guessed at this or that celebrated teacher, at Clement or Barnabas, as its author. Photius himself, on the other hand, concurs in the judgment of the church, for which he assigns the proper grounds: Λόγως δὲ Λοουκάς ἐπικρίνει. Πρῶτον μὲν εἰ δὲν πιστοὶ εἰσίν, ὡς καὶ ἐτέρα αὐτῷ πραγματεία, τὰς ἀσποδομὰς περίχουσα πράξεις καταβίβαζε. Δεύτερον δὲ, εἰ δὲν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων εὐαγγελιστῶν διαστέλλεται, οὕτως μὴν τῆς ἀναλήψεως οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν τὸ σύνταγμα προετέρων ἐποίησατο, ἀλλ' οὗτος μονος καὶ τὴν ἀνάληψιν ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψατο, καὶ πάλιν τὴν τῶν πράξεων ἀπαρχὴν ἀπὸ ταύτης ὑπετέρωσα. Moreover, so early an ecclesiastical recognition of the canonicity of this book would be inexplicable, if the teachers of the church had not from the very first recognized it as a second work of Luke, to which, as well as to the Gospel, apostolic (Pauline) authority belonged. The weight of this ancient recognition by the church is not weakened by the rejection of the book on the part of certain heretical parties; for this affected only its validity as an authoritative standard, and was based entirely on dogmatic, particularly on anti-Pauline, motives. This was the case with the Ebionites (Epiphan. Haer. xxx. 16), to whom the reception of the Gentiles into Christianity was repugnant; with the Seriorias (Euseb. H. E. iv. 29), whose ascetic principles were incompatible with the doctrines of Paul; with the Marcionites (Tertull. c. Marc. v. 2, de praescr. 22), who could not endure what was taught in the Acts concerning the connection of Judaism and Christianity; and with the Manichaeans, who took offence at the mission of the Holy Spirit, to which it bears testimony (Augustin. de utilit. credendi, ii. 7, epist. 237 [al. 253], No. 2).—From these circumstances—the less measure of acquaintance with the book, and the less degree of veneration for it—is to be explained the somewhat arbitrary treatment of the text, which is still apparent in cods. (particularly D and E) and versions (Ital. and Syr.), although Bornemann (Acts apost. ad Codicis Cantabrig. videm rec. 1848) saw in cod. D the most original form of the text ("agmen ducit codex D hauß dubie ex autographo haustus," p. xxviii.), which was an evident error.


1 So much the less can it be assumed with certainty, from the fragment of Papiae, preserved by Apollinaris, on the death of Judas (of which the different forms of the text may be seen, (1) in Theophyl. on Acts i. 18, and Cramer, Cat. in Act. p. 12 f.; (2) in Oecum. I. p. 11, Cramer, Cat. in Matth. p. 281, and Boissonade, Anecd. II. p. 464; (3) Schollon in Matthaei on Acts i. 18), that Papiae had in view the narrative of the event in the Acts, and wished to reconcile it with that of Matthew. He gives a legend respecting the death of Judas, deviating from that of Matthew and the Acts, and independent of both. See the dissertations on this point: Zahn in the Stud. u. Krit. 1860, p. 649 ff., and in opposition to him, Overbeck in Hilgenf. Zeitshcr. 1867, p. 25 ff.; also Stelitz in the Stud. u. Krit. 1868, p. 87 ff.
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references of individual passages (de Wette, Einl. § 115, and Zeller, p. 403 ff.), and also from that unity in the tenor and connection of the essential leading ideas (see Lekebusch, p. 89) which pervades the whole. This similarity is of such a nature that it is compatible with a more or less independent manipulation of different documentary sources, but not with the hypothesis of an aggregation of such documentary sources, which are strung together with little essential alteration (Schleiermacher's view; comp. also Schwanbeck, über d. Quellen der Schriften des Luk. I. p. 253, and earlier, Königsmann, de fontibus, etc., 1798, in Pott's Sylloga, III. p. 215 ff.). The same peculiarities pervade the Acts and the Gospel, and evince the unity of authorship and the unity of literary character as to both books. See Zeller, p. 414 ff. In the passages xvi. 10–17, xx. 5–15, xxi. 1–18, xxvii. 1–xxviii. 16, the author expressly by "we" includes himself as an eye-witness and sharer in the events related. According to Schleiermacher, these portions—belonging to the memoirs, strung together without elaboration, of which the book is composed—proceed from Timothy, a hypothesis supported by Bleek (in his Einleit., and earlier in the Stud. u. Krit. 1836, p. 1025 ff., p. 1046 ff.), Ulrich (Stud. u. Krit. 1837, p. 367 ff., 1840, p. 1003 ff.), and de Wette, and consistently worked out by Mayerhoff (Einl. in d. Petr. Schr. p. 6 ff.) to the extent of ascribing the whole book to Timothy; whereas Schwanbeck seeks to assign these sections, as well as in general almost all from xv. 1 onwards, to Silas. 1 But the reasons, brought forward against the view that Luke is the narrator using the we, are wholly unimportant. For, not to mention that it is much more natural to refer the unnamed I of that narrative in the first person plural to Luke, who is not elsewhere named in the book, than to Timothy and Silas, who are elsewhere mentioned by name and distinguished from the subject of the we; and apart also from the entire arbitrariness of the assertion that Luke could not have made his appearance and taken part for the first time at xvi. 10; the circumstance that in the Epistle to the Philippians no mention of Luke occurs, although the most plausible ground of the objectors, is still merely such in semblance. How long had Luke, at that time, been absent from Philippi! How probable, moreover, that Paul, who sent his letter to the Philippians by means of Epaphroditus, left it to the latter to communicate orally the personal information which was of interest to them, and therefore adds in the Epistle only such summary salutations as iv. 22! And how possible, in fine, that Luke, at the time of the composition of the Philippian Epistle, was temporarily absent from Rome, which is strongly supported, and, indeed, is required to be

1 Assuming, with extreme arbitrariness, that the redactor has in xvi. 10 ff., misled by the preceding ἤτοι ἀδέλφους ἡμῶν (1), copied the first person after the Silas-document, and only in ver. 19 felt the necessity of changing the ἡμῶν of Silas into the names concerned, in doing which, however, he has forgotten to include the name of Timothy. See Schwanbeck, p. 270 f., who has many other instances of arbitrariness, e.g. that ἄνθρωπος ἐν τοῖς ἁλοιβοῖς. xvi. 22, stood in the Silas-document after ἐκλεκτοῖς, and other similar statements, which refute themselves. The holding Luke and Silas as identical (van Voltum in Hilgenf. Zeitschr. 1887, p. 228 ff.) was perhaps only a passing etymological fancy (tunc, silos). See, in opposition to it, Cripps in Hilgenf. Zeitschr. 1893, p. 563 ff.
assumed by Phil. ii. 20 f., comp. on Phil. ii. 21. The non-mention of Luke in the Epistles to the Thessalonians is an unserviceable argumentum siletio (see Lekebusch, p. 895); and the greater vividness of delineation, which is said to prevail where Timothy is present, cannot prove anything in contradistinction to the vividness of other parts in which he is not concerned. On the other hand, in those portions in which the "we" introduces the eye-witness,\(^1\) the manipulation of the Greek language, independent of written documents, exhibits the greatest similarity to the peculiar colouring of Luke's diction as it appears in the independent portions of the Gospel. It is incorrect to suppose that the specification of time according to the Jewish festivals, xx. 6, xxvii. 9, suits Timothy better than Luke, for the designations of the Jewish festivals must have been everywhere familiar in the early Christian church from its connection with Judaism, and particularly in the Pauline circles in which Luke, as well as Timothy, moved. The insuperable difficulties by which both the Timothy-hypothesis, already excluded by xx. 4 f., and the Silas-hypothesis, untenable throughout, are clogged, only serve more strongly to confirm the tradition of the church that Luke, as author of the whole book, is the person speaking in those sections in which "we" occurs. See Lekebusch, p. 140 ff.; Zeller, p. 454 ff.; Ewald, Gesch. d. Apost. Zeitalt. p. 88 ff., and Jahrb. IX. p. 50 ff.; Klostermann, l.c.; Oertel, Paul. in d. Apostelgesch. p. 8 ff. In the "we" the person primarily narrating must have been the "I," with which the whole book begins. No other understanding of the matter could have occurred either to Theophilus or to other readers. The hypothesis already propounded by Königsmann, on the other hand, that Luke had allowed the "we" derived from the memoir of another to remain unchanged, as well as the converse fancy of Gfrörer (heil. Sage, II. p. 244 f.), impute to the author something bordering on an unintelligent mechanical process, such as is doubtless found in insipid chroniclers of the Middle Ages (examples in Schwabe, p. 188 ff.), but must appear utterly alien and completely unsuitable for comparison in presence of such company as we have here.

Recent criticism, however, has contended that the Acts could not be composed at all by a companion of the Apostle Paul (de Wette, Baur, Schwégler, Zeller, Kößlin, Hilgenfeld, and others). For this purpose they have alleged contradictions with the Pauline Epistles (ix. 19, 23, 25-28, xi. 30, compared with Gal. i. 17-19, ii. 1; xvii. 16 f., xviii. 5, with 1 Thess. iii. 1 f.), inadequate accounts (xvi. 5, xviii. 22 f., xxviii. 30 f.), omission of facts (1 Cor. xv. 32; 2 Cor. i. 8, xi. 25 f.; Rom. xv. 19, xvi. 3 f.), and the partially unhistorical character of the first portion of the book (according to de Wette, particularly ii. 5-11), which is even alleged to be "a continuous fiction" (Schwégler, nachapostol. Zeitalt. I. p. 90, II. p. 111 f.). They have discovered un-Pauline miracles (xxviii. 7-10), un-Pauline speeches and actions (xxi. 20 ff., xxiii. 6 ff., chap. xxii., xxvi.), an un-Pauline attitude (towards Jews and Jewish-Christians: approval of the

GENUINENESS.

It is alleged that the formation of legend in the book (particularly the narrative of Simon and of Pentecost) belongs to a later period, and that the entire tendency of the writing (see sec. 2) points to a later stage of ecclesiastical development (see especially Zeller, p. 470 ff.); also that its politically apologetic design leads us to the time of Trajan, or later (Schwegler, II. p. 119); that the ἱερασί in the narrative of the travels (held even by Köstlin, Ueber d. Synopt. Evang. p. 292, to be the genuine narrative of a friend of the apostle) is designedly allowed to stand by the author of the book, who wishes to be recognized thereby as a companion of the Apostle (according to Köstlin: for the purpose of strengthening the credibility and the impression of the apologetic representation); and that the Book of Acts is "the work of a Pauline member of the Roman church, the time of the composition of which may most probably be placed between the years 110 and 125, or even 130 after Christ" (Zeller, p. 488). But all these and similar grounds do not prove what they are alleged to prove, and do not avail to overthrow the ancient ecclesiastical recognition. For although the book actually contains various matters, in which it must receive correction from the Pauline Epistles; although the history, even of Paul the apostle, is handled in it imperfectly and, in part, inadequately; although in the first portion, here and there, a post-apostolic formation of legend is unmistakable; yet all these elements are compatible with its being the work of a companion of the apostle, who, not emerging as such earlier than chap. xvi., only undertook to write the history some time after the apostle's death, and who, when his personal knowledge failed, was dependent on tradition developed orally and in writing, partly legendary, because he had not from the first entertained the design of writing a history, and had now, in great measure, to content himself with the matter and the form given to him by the tradition, in the atmosphere of which he himself lived. Elements really un-Pauline cannot be shown to exist in it, and the impress of a definite tendency in the book, which is alleged to betray a later stage of ecclesiastical development, is simply imputed to it by the critics. The We-narrative, with its vivid and direct impress of personal participation, always remains a strong testimony in favour of a companion of the apostle as author of the whole book, of which that narrative is a part; to separate the subject of that narrative from the author of the whole, is a procedure of sceptical caprice. The surprisingly abridged and abrupt conclusion of the book, and the silence concerning the last labours and fate of the Apostle Paul, as well as the silence concerning the similar fate of Peter, are phenomena which are intelligible only on the supposition of a real and candid companion of the apostle being prevented by circumstances from continuing his narrative, but would be altogether inconceivable in the case of an author not writing till the second century, and manipulating with a definite tendency the historical materials before him,—inconceivable, because utterly at variance with his supposed designs. The hypothesis, in fine, that the tradition of Luke's authorship rests solely on an erroneous inference from the ἱερασί in the narrative of the travels (comp. Col. iv. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 11; see especially
Köstlin, p. 201), is so arbitrary and so opposed to the usual unreflecting mode in which such traditions arise, that, on the contrary, the ecclesiastical tradition is to be explained, not from the wish to have a Pauline Gospel, but from the actual possession of one, and from a direct certainty as to its author.—The Book of Acts has very different stages of credibility, from the lower grade of the legend partially enwrapping the history up to that of vivid, direct testimony; it is to be subjected in its several parts to free historical criticism, but to be exempted, at the same time, from the scepticism and injustice which (apart from the attacks of Schrader and Gfrörer) it has largely experienced at the hands of Baur and his school, after the more cautious but less consistent precedent set by Schneckenburger (über d. Zweck d. Apostelgesch. 1841.) On the whole, the book remains, in connection with the historical references in the apostolic Epistles, the fullest and surest source of our knowledge of the apostolic times, of which we always attain most completely a trustworthy view when the Book of Acts bears part in this testimony, although in many respects the Epistles have to be brought in, not merely as supplementing, but also in various points as deciding against particular statements of our book (a).

Notes by American Editor.

(a)

"This work, as well as the Gospel, being anonymous, attempts have been made to refer the authorship to some other person than St Luke." "We are inclined to give the weight which it deserves to the ancient opinion, and to accept the traditional view of the origin of both the Gospel and the Acts, rather than any of the modern suppositions, which are very difficult to be reconciled with the statements in the Acts and the Epistles, and which are the mere offspring of critical imaginations." (Lambly.)

The evidence that Luke wrote the Acts is threefold:—The explicit testimony of the early Christian writers—the relation in which the Acts stands to the Gospel which is ascribed to Luke—and the similarity of style in the two books. —See Introductions to the Acts, by Hackett, and by Abbott.

(b)

In the preface to the Gospel the writer speaks of his perfect understanding of all the things whereof he was about to write, implying the utmost care on his part accurately to ascertain the facts. The same course was doubtless adopted by him in writing this second treatise. With the opportunities at his command of personal observation, of intercourse with the parties concerned in the events recorded, and probably of the aid of written documents, and with his admitted claims for diligence in use of them, the writer of the Acts merits the highest confidence granted to the best accredited testimony. Professor Hackett, in his Introduction to the Acts, says: "We have not only every reason to regard the history of Luke as authentic, because he wrote it with such facilities for knowing the truth, but because we find it sustaining its credit under the severest scrutiny to which it is possible that an ancient work should be subjected." "This history has been confronted with the Epistles of the N. T. and it has been shown as the result, that the incidental correspondences between them and the Acts are numerous and of the most striking
AIM AND SOURCES OF THE BOOK.

kind.” “The speeches in the Acts which purport to have been delivered by Peter, Paul, and James have been compared with the known productions of these men; and it is found that they exhibit an agreement with them, in point of thought and expression, which the supposition of their common origin would lead us to expect.” “We have a decisive test of the trustworthiness of Luke in the consistency of his statements and allusions with the information which contemporary writers have given us respecting the age in which he lived and wrote.”

SEC. II.—AIM AND SOURCES OF THE BOOK.

When the aim of the Acts has been defined by saying that Luke wished to give us a history of missions for the diffusion of Christianity (Eichhorn), or a Pauline church-history (Credner), or, more exactly and correctly, a history of the extension of the church from Jerusalem to Rome (Mayerhoff, Baumgarten, Guericke, Lekebusch, Ewald, Oertel), there is, strictly speaking, a confounding of the contents with the aim. Certainly, Luke wished to compose a history of the development of the church from its foundation until the period when Paul laboured at Rome; but his work was primarily a private treatise, written for Theophilus, and the clearly expressed aim of the composition of the Gospel (Luke i. 4) must hold good also for the Acts on account of the connection in which our book, according to Acts i. 1, stands with the Gospel. To confirm to Theophilus, in the way of history, the Christian instruction which he had received, was an end which might after the composition of the Gospel be yet more fully attained; for the further development of Christianity since the time of the ascension, its victorious progress through Antioch, Asia Minor, and Greece up to its announcement by Paul himself in Rome, the capital of the world, might and ought, according to the view of Luke, to serve that purpose. Hence he wrote this history; and the selection and limitation of its contents were determined partly by the wants of Theophilus, partly by his own Pauline individuality, as well as by his sources; so that, after the pre-Pauline history in which Peter is the chief person, he so takes up Paul and his work, and almost exclusively places them¹ in the foreground down to the end of the book, that the history becomes henceforth biographical, and therefore even the founding of the church of Rome—which, if Luke had designed to write generally, and on its own account, a mere history of the extension of the church from Jerusalem to Rome, he would not, and could not, have omitted—found no place. The Pauline character and circle of ideas of the author, and his relation to Theophilus, make it also easy enough to understand how not only the Jewish apostles, and even Peter,

¹ The parallel between the two apostles is not made up, but historically given. Both were the representatives of apostolic activity, and what the Acts informs us of them is like an extended commentary on Gal. ii. 8. Comp. Thiersch, Kirche im apostol. Zeitalt. p. 139 f. At the same time, the purpose of the work as a private composition is always to be kept in view; as such it might, according to its relation to the receiver, mention various important matters but briefly or not at all, and describe very circumstantially others of less importance. The author, like a letter-writer, was in this untramelled. Comp. C. Berthau, über Gal. ii. (Programm), Hamb. 1864.
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fall gradually into the background in the history, but also how the reflection of Paulinism frequently presents itself in the pre-Pauline half ("hence this book might well be called a gloss on the Epistles of St. Paul," Luther's Preface). One who was not a disciple of Paul could not have written such a history of the apostles. The fact that even in respect of Paul himself the narrative is so defective and in various points even inappropriate, as may be proved from the letters of the apostle, is sufficiently explained from the limitation and quality of the accounts and sources with which Luke, at the late period when he wrote, had to content himself and to make shift, where he was not better informed by his personal knowledge or by the apostle or other eye-witnesses.

Nevertheless, the attempt has often been made to represent our book as a composition marked by a set apologetic and dogmatic purpose. A justification of the Apostle Paul, as regards the admission of the Gentiles into the Christian church, is alleged by Griesbach, Diss. 1798, Paulus, Frisch, Diss. 1817, to be its design; against which view Eichhorn decidedly declared himself. More recently Schneckenburger (üb. d. Zweck d. Apostelgesch. 1841) has revived this view with much acuteness, to the prejudice of the historical character of the book. By Baur (at first in the Tüb. Zeitschr. 1866, 8, then especially in his Paulus 1845, second edition edited by Zeller, 1866, also in his neuest. Theol. p. 331 ff., and in his Gesch. der drei ersten Jahrb. 1860, ed. 2) a transition was made, as regards the book, from the apologetic to the conciliatory standpoint. He was followed specially by Schwiegler, nachapost. Zeitalt. II. p. 78 ff.; Zeller, p. 320 ff.; and Volkmar, Relig. Jenu, p. 336 ff.; while B. Bauer (d. Apostelgesch. eine Ausgleichung des Paulinismus und Judenthums, 1850) pushed this treatment to the point of self-annihilation. According to Schneckenburger, the design of the Acts is the justification of the Apostle Paul against all the objections of the Judaizers; on which account the apostle is only represented in that side of his character which was turned towards Judaism, and in the greatest possible similarity to Peter (sec, in opposition to this, Schwanbeck, Quellen d. Luk. p. 94 ff.). In this view the historical credibility of the contents is maintained, so far as Luke has made the selection of them for his particular purpose (a). This was, indeed, only a partial carrying out of the purpose-hypothesis; but Baur, Schwiegler, and Zeller have carried it out to its full consequences, and have, without scruple, sacrificed to it the historical

1 Aberle, in the theol. Quartalschr. 1855, p. 178 ff., has maintained a view of the apologetic design of the book peculiar to himself; namely, that it was intended to defend Paul against the accusation still pending against him in Rome. Everything of this nature is invented without any indication whatever in the text, and is contradicted by the prologues of the Gospel and the Acts.

2 Certainly we are not carried by the Acts, as we are by the Pauline Epistles, into the fresh, living, fervent conflict of Paulinism with Judaism; and so this later work may appear as a work of peace (Renes, Gesch. d. N. T. p. 206, ed. 4) and reconciliation, in the composition of which it is conceivable enough of itself, and without imputing to it conciliatory tendencies, that Luke, who did not write till long after the death of Paul and the destruction of Jerusalem, already looked back on those conflicts from another calmer and more objective standpoint, when the Pauline ministry presented itself to him in its entirety as the manifestation of the great principle, 1 Cor. ix. 19 ff.
aim and sources of the book.

character of the contents. They affirm that the Paul of the Acts, in his compliance towards Judaism, is entirely different from the apostle as exhibited in his Epistles (Baur); that he is converted into a Judaizing Christian, as Peter and James are converted into Pauline Christians (Schwegler); and that our book, as a proposal of a Pauline Christian towards peace by concessions of his party to Judaism, was in this respect intended to influence both parties, but especially had in view the Roman church (Zeller). The carrying out of this view—according to which the author, with "set reflection on the means for attaining his end," would convert the Gentile apostle into a Petrine Christian, and the Jewish apostles into Pauline Christians—imputes to the Book of Acts an imperceptibly neutralizing artfulness and dishonesty of character, and a subtlety of distortion in breaking off the sharp points of history, and even of inventing facts, which are irreconcilable with the simplicity and ingenuous artlessness of this writing, and indeed absolutely stand even in moral contradiction with its Christian feeling and spirit, and with the express assurance in the preface of the Gospel. And in the conception of the details this hypothesis necessitates a multitude of suppositions and interpretations, which make the reproach of a designed concoction of history and of invention for the sake of an object, that they are intended to establish, recoil on such a criticism itself. See the Commentary. The most thorough special refutation may be seen in Lekebusch, p. 253 ff., and Oertel, Paulus in d. Apostelgesch. p. 183 ff. Comp. also Lechler, apost. u. nachapost. Zeitalt. p. 7 ff.; Ewald, Jahrb. IX. p. 63 ff. That, moreover, such an inventive reconciler of Paulinism and Petrinism, who is, moreover, alleged to have not written till the second century, should have left unnoticed the meeting of the apostles, Peter and Paul, at Rome, and their contemporary death, and not have rather turned them to account for placing the crown on his work so purposely planned; and that instead of this, after many other incongruities which he would have committed, he should have closed Paul's intercourse with the Jews (chap. xxviii. 25 ff.) with a rejection of them from the apostle's own mouth,—would be just as enigmatical as would be, on the other hand, the fact, that the late detection of the plan should, in spite of the touchstone continually present in Paul's Epistles, have remained reserved for the searching criticism of the present day.

As regards the sources (see Riehm, de fontibus, etc., Traj. ad Rhen. 1821; Schwanbeck, üb. d. Quellen d. Schriften d. Luk. I. 1847; Zeller, p. 289 ff.; Lekebusch, p. 403 ff.; Ewald, Gesch. d. apost. Zeitalt. p. 40 ff. ed. 3), it is to be generally assumed from the contents and form of the book, and from the analogy of Luke i. 1, that Luke, besides the special communications which he had received from Paul and from intercourse with apostolic men, besides oral tradition generally, and besides, in part, his own personal knowledge (the latter from xvi. 10 onwards), also made use of written documents. But he merely made use of them, and did not simply string them together (as Schleiermacher held, Einl. in d. N. T. p. 360 ff.). For the use has, at any rate, taken place with such independent manipulation, that the attempts accurately to point out the several documentary sources em-
ployed, particularly as regards their limits and the elements of them that have remained unaltered, fail to lead to any sure result. For such an independent use he might be sufficiently qualified by those serviceable connections which he maintained, among which is to be noted his intercourse with Mark (Col. iv. 10, 14), and with Philip and his prophetic daughters (xxi. 8, 9); as, indeed, that independence is confirmed by the essential similarity in the character of the style (although, in the first part, in accordance with the matters treated of and with the Aramaic traditions and documentary sources, it is more Hebraizing), and in the employment of the Septuagint. The use of a written (probably Hebrew) document concerning Peter (not to be confounded with the εἰρυμα Πέτρου), of another concerning Stephen, and of a missionary narrative perhaps belonging to it (chap. xiii. and xiv.; see Bleek in the Stud. u. Krit. 1886, p. 1043 f.; comp. also Ewald, p. 41 f.), is assumed with the greatest probability; less probably a special document concerning Barnabas, to which, according to Schwanbeck, iv. 36 f., ix. 1–30, xi. 10–30, xii. 25, xiii. 1–14, 28, xv. 2–4 belonged. In the case also of the larger speeches and letters of the book, so far as personal knowledge or communications from those concerned failed him, and when tradition otherwise was insufficient, Luke must have been dependent on the documents indicated above and others; still, however, in such a manner that—and hence so much homogeneity of stamp—his own reproduction withal was more or less active. To seek to prove in detail the originality of the apostolic speeches from the apostolic letters, is an enterprise of impossibility or of self-deceiving presupposition; however little on the whole and in the main the genuineness of these speeches, according to the respective characters and situations, may reasonably be doubted. As regards the history of the apostolic council in particular, the Epistle to the Galatians, not so much as even known to Luke, although it supplements the apostolic narrative, cannot, any more than any of the other Pauline Epistles, be considered as a source (in opposition to Zeller); and the apostolic decree, which cannot be a creation of the author, must be regarded as the reproduction of an original document. In general, it is to be observed that, as the question concerning the sources of Luke was formerly à priori precluded by the supposition of simple reports of eye-witnesses (already in the Canon Murat.), recently, no less à priori, the same question has been settled in an extreme negative sense by the assumption that he purposely drew from his own resources; while Credner, de Wette, Bleek, Ewald, and others have justly adhered to three sources of information—written records, oral information and tradition (Luke i. 1 ff.), and the author’s personal knowledge; and Schwanbeck has, with much acuteness, attempted what is unattainable in the way of recognizing and separating the written documents, with the result of degrading the book into a spiritless compilation.¹ The giving up the idea of written

¹ According to Schwanbeck, the redaction of the book has used the four following documents: (1) A biography of Peter; (2) A rhetorical work on the death of Stephen; (3) A biography of Barnabas; (4) The memoirs of Silas. Of these writings he has pieced together only single portions almost unchanged; hence he appears essentially as a compiler.
TIME AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION.

sources—the conclusion which Lekebusch has reached by the path of thorough inquiry—is all the less satisfactory, the later the time of composition has to be placed and the historical character of the contents withal to be maintained. See also, concerning the derivation of the Petrine speeches from written sources, Weiss in the Krit. Beiblatt z. Deutsch. Zeitschr. 1854, No. 10 f., and in reference to their doctrinal tenor and its harmony with the Epistle of Peter, Weiss, Petr. Lehrbegr. 1855, and bibl. Theol. 1868, p. 119 ff. Concerning the relation of the Pauline history and speeches to the Pauline epistles, see Trip, Paulus in d. Apostelgesch. 1866; Oertel, Paulus in d. Apostelgesch. 1868. Comp. also Oort, Inquir. in orat., quae in Act. ap. Paulo tribuuntur, indolem Paulin. L. B. 1862; Hofstede de Groot, Vergelijking van den Paulus der Brieven met dien der Handelingen, Gröningen. 1880.

NOTE BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(c)

"The Book is a special history of the planting and extension of the church, both among Jews and Gentiles, by the gradual establishment of radiating centres, or sources of influence, at certain salient points throughout a large part of the empire, beginning at Jerusalem and ending at Rome." (Alexander.)

"The church of Christ described with respect to its founding, its guidance, and its extension, in Israel and among the Gentiles, from Jerusalem even to Rome." (Lange.)

The Acts like the Gospel is addressed to one individual for his information and instruction, but not designed for him alone. Luke wrote his history to preserve the memorials of the Apostles for Christians of all ages.

SEC. III.—TIME AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION.

As the Gospel of Luke already presupposes the destruction of Jerusalem (xxi. 20–23), the Acts of the Apostles must have been written after that event. Acts viii. 26 cannot be employed to establish the view that the book was composed during the Jewish war, shortly before the destruction of the city (Hug, Schneckenburger, Lekebusch; see on viii. 26). The non-mention of that event does not serve to prove that it had not yet occurred, but rather leads to the inference that it had happened a considerable time ago. A more definite approximation is not possible. As, however, the Gospel of John must be considered as the latest of the four, but still belongs to the first century, perhaps to the second last decade of that century (see Introduction to John, sec. 5), there is sufficient reason to place the third Gospel within the seventh decade, and the time of the composition of the Acts cannot be more definitely ascertained. Yet, as there must have been a suitable interval between it and the Gospel (comp. on i. 3), it may have reached perhaps the close of the seventh decade, or about the year 80; so that it may be regarded as nearly contemporary with the Gospel of John, and nearly contemporary also with the history of the Jewish

1 With justice Weiss lays stress on the importance of the Petrine speeches in the Acts as being the oldest doctrinal records of the apostolic age.
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war by Josephus. The vague statement of Irenæus, *Haer. iii. 1* (Euseb. v. 8), that Luke wrote his Gospel *after the death of Peter and Paul*, comes nearest to this definition of the time. On the other hand, the opinion, which has prevailed since the days of Jerome, that the *close* of the book, which breaks off *before the death of the apostle*, determines this point of time as the date of composition (so Michaelis, Heinrichs, Riehm, Paulus, Kuinoel, Schott, Guericke, Ebrard, Lange, and others), while no doubt most favourable to the interest of its apostolic authority, is wholly untenable. That the death of the apostle is not narrated, has hardly its reason in *political considerations* (my former conjecture), as such considerations could not at least stand in the way of a quite simple historical mention of the well-known fact. But it is to be rejected as an arbitrary supposition, especially considering the solemn form of the conclusion itself analogous to the conclusion of the Gospel, that the author was *prevented* from finishing the work (Schleiermacher), or that the *end has been lost* (Schott). Wholly unnatural also are the opinions, that Luke has, by narrating the diffusion (more correctly: the Pauline preaching) of the gospel as far as Rome (according to Hilgenfeld, with the justification of the Pauline Gentile-church up to that point), *attained his end* (see Bengel on xxviii. 31, and especially Baumgarten'); or that the author was led no further by his *document* (de Wette); or that he has kept silence as to the death of Paul of *set purpose* (Zeller), which, in point of fact, would have been *stupid*. The simplest and, on account of the compendious and abrupt conclusion, the most natural hypothesis is rather that, after his second treatise, Luke *intended to write a third* (Heinrichs, Credner, Ewald, Bleek). As he concludes his Gospel with a short—probably even amplified in the *textus receptus* (see critical note on Luke xxiv. 51, 52)—indication of the ascension, and then commences the *Acts* with a detailed narrative of it; so he concludes the Acts with but a short indication of the Roman ministry of Paul and its duration, but would probably have commenced the third book with a detailed account of the labours and fate of Paul at Rome, and perhaps also would have furnished a record concerning the other apostles (of whom he had as yet communicated so little), especially of Peter and his death, as well as of the further growth of Christianity in other lands. By what circumstances he was prevented from writing such a continuation of the history (perhaps by death), cannot be determined.

To determine the *place* of composition beyond doubt, is impossible. With the traditional view of the time of composition since the days of Jerome falls also the certainty of the prevalent opinion that the book was written in *Rome*; which opinion is not established by the reasons assigned

---

1 So also Lange, *apostol. Zeitatl.* I. p. 107; Otto, *geschichtl. Vork. d. Pastoral-briefe*, p. 180. This opinion is *unnatural*, because it was just in the issue of the trial—whether that consisted in the execution (Otto) or in the liberation of the apostle—that the Pauline work at Rome had its culmination, glorifying Christ and fulfilling the apostolic task (Luke xxiv. 47). See Phil. i. 20. How important must it therefore have been for Luke to narrate that issue, if he should not have had for the present other reasons for being silent upon it? That Luke knew what became of Paul after his two years' residence in Rome, is self-evident from the words ἔγγραφος ὁ διερχόμενος διὰ διοικήσεως *. k. r. λ.*, xxviii. 30.
on the part of Zeller, Lekebusch, and Ewald. Still more arbitrary, however, is its transference to Alexandria (Mill, according to subscriptions in codd. and vss. of the Gospel), to Antioch, or to Greece (Hilgenfeld); and not less so the referring it to Hellenic Asia Minor (Köstlin, p. 294).

**Remark.**—The circumstance that there is no trace of the use of the Pauline Epistles in the Acts, and that on the other hand things occur in it at variance with the historical notices of these Epistles, is, on the whole, a weighty argument against the late composition of the book, as assumed by Baur, Schwegler, Zeller, and others, and against its alleged character of a set purpose. How much matter would the Pauline Epistles have furnished to an author of the second century in behalf of his intentional fabrications of history! How much would the Epistle to the Romans itself in its dogmatic bearing have furnished in favour of Judaism! And so clever a fabricator of history would have known how to use it, as well as how to avoid deviations from the historical statements of the Pauline Epistles. What has been adduced from the book itself as an indication of its composition in the second century (110–130) is either no such indication, as, for example, the existence of a copious Gospel-literature (Luke i. 1); or is simply imported into it by the reader, such as the alleged germs of a hierarchical constitution; see Lekebusch, p. 422 ff.

**Sec. IV.**—**Chronological Summary of the Acts.**

_A. E._ Dion. 31, u.c. 784 (A). _The risen Jesus ascends to heaven._ Matthias becomes an apostle. _The outpouring of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost, and its immediate consequences_ (i. and ii.).—Since, according to the well-founded assumption that the feast meant at John v. 1 is not a Passover, it must be considered as certain that the time of the public ministry of Jesus embraced no more than three paschal feasts (John ii. 18, vi. 4, xii. ff.), consequently only two years and some months;¹ as it is further certain that our Lord was not crucified on the 15th, but on the 14th of the month Nisan, which fell on a Friday;² according to the researches founded on the Jewish calendar by Wurm (in Bengel's _Arch._ II. p. 1 ff., p. 261 ff.) and Anger ( _de tempor. in Act. ap. ratione_ , Lips. 1833, pp. 30–38), the date laid down above appears to result as the most probable ("anno 31, siquidem est intercalaris erat, diem Nisani 14 et 15, anno 33, siquidem vulgari erat, diem Nisani 14, anno vero 32 neutrum in Veneris diem incidere potuisse. Atqui anno 33, ideo quod ille annum sabbaticum proxime antecedebat, Adarbus alter adjiciendus erat. Ergo neque annum 32 neque 33 pro ultimo vitae Christi anno haberi posse appararet," Anger, p. 38). Nevertheless, the uncertainty of the Jewish calendar would not permit us to attain to any quite reliable result, if there were no other confirmatory points. But here

¹ The Fathers, who assumed only one year for the public ministry of Jesus, considered His death as occurring in the year 782, under the consilium of Rubellius Geminus and Fufius Geminus, which is not to be reconciled with Luke iii. 1. See Seyfarth, _Chronol. sacra_, p. 115 ff.

² Every calculation which is based on the 12th of Nisan as the day of the death of Jesus (so Wieseler, according to whom it happened on 7th April 30) is destitute of historical foundation, because at variance with the exact account of John, which must turn the scale against the Synoptical narrative (see on John xviii. 28).
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comes in Luke iii. 1, according to which John appeared in the 15th year of the reign of Tiberius, i.e. from 19th August 781 to 19th August 782 (see on Luke, l.c.*). And if it must be assumed that Jesus began his public teaching very soon after the appearance of John, at all events in the same year, then the first Passover of the ministry of Jesus (John ii. 13) was that of the year 782; the second (John vi. 4), that of the year 788; the third (John xii. ff.), that of the year 784. With this agrees the statement of the Jews on the first public appearance of Jesus in Jerusalem, that (see on John ii. 20) the temple had been a-building during a period of 46 years. This building, namely, had been commenced in the 18th year of the reign of Herod the Great (i.e. autumn 734–735). If now, as it was the interest of the Jews at John ii. 20 to specify as long an interval as possible, the first year as not complete is not included in the calculation, there results as the 46th year (reckoned from 735–736), the year from autumn 781 to autumn 783; and consequently as the first Passover, that of the year 782. The same result comes out, if the first year of the building be reckoned 784–735, and the full 46 years are counted in, so that when the words John ii. 20 were spoken, the seventh and fortieth year (i.e. autumn 781–782) was already current.—Aerr. Dion. 31–34, U.C. 784–787. Peter and John, after the healing of the lame man (iii.), are arrested and brought before the Sanhedrim (iv.); death of Ananias and his wife (v. 1–11); prosperity of the youthful church (v. 12–18); persecution of the apostles (v. 17–42). As Saul's conversion (see the following paragraph) occurred during the continuance of the Stephanic persecution, so the execution of Stephen is to be placed in the year 33 or 34 (vi. 8–vii.), and not long before this, the election of the managers of alms (vi. 1–7); and nearly contemporary with that conversion is the diffusion of Christianity by the dispersed (viii. 4), the ministry of Philip in Samaria (viii. 5 ff.), and the conversion of the chamberlain (viii. 26 ff.). What part of this extraneous activity of the emigrants is to be placed before, and what after, the conversion of Paul, cannot be determined.—Aerr. Dion. 35, U.C. 788. Paul's conversion (ix. 1–19), 17 years before the apostolic council (see on Gal. ii. 1).—According to 2 Cor. xi. 32, Damascus, when Paul escaped thence to betake himself to Jerusalem (ix. 24–28), was under the rule of the Arabian King Aretas. The taking possession of this city by Aretas is not, indeed, recorded by any other author, but must be assumed as historically attested by that very passage, because there the ethnarch of Aretas appears in the active capacity of governor of the city, and his relation to the πόλις Δαμασκηνών is supposed to be well

1 Not of his joint reign, from which Wieseler now reckons in Herzog's Enzykl. XXI. p. 547.

* In presence of this quite definite statement of the year of the emperor, the different combinations, which have been made on the basis of the accounts of Josephus concerning the war between Antipas and Aretas in favour of a later date for the public appearance of Jesus (54–55; Keim, Gesch. Jesu, I. p. 690 ff.), necessarily give way. Those, moreover, are not sufficiently reliable for an exact marking off of the year, to induce us to set aside the year of the emperor mentioned by Luke, which could only be based on general notoriety, and the exact specification of which regulates and controls the synchronistic notices in Luke iii. 1 f.

* Not merely of a judicial chief of the Arabian population of Damascus, subordinate to the Roman authority (Keim in Schenkel's Bibellex. I. p. 239.) There is no historical
known to the readers. It is therefore very arbitrary to regard this relation as a temporary private one, and not as a real dominion (Anger: "forte fortuna eodem, quo apostolum tempore propter negotia nescio quae Damasci versatum esse," and that he, either of his own accord or at the request of the Jews, obtained permission for the latter from the magistrates of Damascus to watch the gates). The time, when the Arabian king became master of Damascus, is assigned with much probability, from what Josephus informs us of the relations of Aretas to the Romans, to the year 87, after the death of Tiberius in March of that year. Tiberius, namely, had charged Vitellius, the governor of Syria, to take either dead or alive Aretas, who had totally defeated the army of Herod Antipas, his faithless son-in-law (Joseph. Antt. xviii. 5. 1). Vitellius, already on his march against him (Joseph. l.c. xviii. 5. 3), received in Jerusalem the news of the death of the emperor, which occurred on the 16th of March 87, put his army into winter quarters, and journeyed to Rome. Now this was for Aretas, considering his warlike and irritated attitude toward the Roman power, certainly the most favourable moment for falling upon the rich city of Damascus—which, besides, had formerly belonged to his ancestors (Joseph. Antt. xiii. 15. 2)—because the governor and general-in-chief of Syria was absent, the army was inactive, and new measures were to be expected from Rome. The king, however, did not remain long in possession of the conquered city. For when, in the second year of Caligula (i.e. in the year from 16th March 88 to 16th March 89), the Arabian affairs were regulated (Dio Cass. lix. 9. 12), Damascus cannot have been overlooked. This city was too important for the objects of the Roman government in the East, to allow us to assume with probability—what Wieseler, p. 172 ff., and on Gal. p. 599, assumes—that, at the regulation of the Arabian affairs, it had only just come by way of gift into the hands of Aretas, or (with Ewald, p. 389) that according to agreement it had remained in his possession during his lifetime, so that he would have to be regarded as a sort of Roman casual. This, then, limits the flight of Paul from Damascus to the period of nearly two years from the summer of 87 to the spring of 89. As, however, it is improbable that Aretas had entrusted the keeping of the city gates to the Jews in what remained of the year 87, which was certainly still disturbed by military movements; and as his doing so rather presupposes a quiet and sure possession of the city, and an already settled state of matters; there remains only the year 88 and the first months of the year 89. And even these first months of the year 89 are excluded, as, according to Dio Cassius, l.c., Caligula apportioned Arabia in the second year of his reign; accordingly Aretas can hardly have possessed the conquered city up to the very end of that year, especially as the importance of the matter for the Oriental interests of the Romans made an early arrangement of the affair extremely probable. Every month Caligula became more dissolute and worthless; and certainly the securing of the dangerous East would on this account
rather be accelerated than delayed. Accordingly, if the year 38\(^1\) be ascertained as that of the flight of Paul, there is fixed for his conversion, between which and his flight a period of three years intervened (Gal. i. 18), the year 35.—Aer. Dion. 38, 37, u.c. 789, 790. Paul labours as a preacher of the gospel in Damascus, ix. 20–23; journey to Arabia and return to Damascus (see on ix. 19).—Aer. Dion. 38, u.c. 791. His flight from Damascus and first journey to Jerusalem (ix. 23–26 ff.), three years after his conversion, Gal. i. 18. From Jerusalem he makes his escape to Tarsus (ix. 29, 30).—Aer. Dion. 39–48, u.c. 792–796. The churches throughout Palestine have peace and prosperity (ix. 31); Peter makes a general journey of visitation (ix. 32), labours at Lydda and Joppa (ix. 32–43), converts Cornelius at Caesarea (x. 1–48), and returns to Jerusalem, where he justifies himself (xi. 1–18). Christianity is preached in Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Antioch, and in that city even to the Gentiles, on which account Barnabas is sent thither, who fetches Paul from Tarsus, and remains with him for one year in Antioch (xi. 19–26). In this year (43) Agabus predicts a general famine (xi. 27, 28).—Aer. Dion. 44, u.c. 797. After the execution of the elder James, Peter is imprisoned without result by Agrippa I., who dies in August 44 (xii. 1–23). In the fourth year of the reign of Claudius occurs the famine in Judaea (see on xi. 28), on account of which Paul (according to Acts, but not according to Gal. ii. 1) makes his second journey to Jerusalem (with Barnabas), whence he returns to Antioch (xii. 29, 30, and see on xii. 25).—Aer. Dion. 45–51, u.c. 798–804. In this period occurs the first missionary journey of the apostle with Barnabas (xiii. and xiv.), the duration of which is not indicated. Having returned to Antioch, Paul and Barnabas remain there χρόνων εἷς δύο (xiv. 28).—Aer. Dion. 52, u.c. 805. The third journey of Paul to Jerusalem (with Barnabas) to the apostolic congress (xv. 1–29), according to Gal. ii. 1, fourteen years after the first journey. Having returned to Antioch, Paul and Barnabas separate, and Paul with Silas commences his second missionary journey (Acts xv. 30–41).—Aer. Dion. 53, 54, u.c. 806, 807. Continuation of this missionary journey through Lycaonia, Phrygia, and Galatia; journey from Troas to Macedonia; journey to Athens and Corinth, where Paul met with Aquila banished in the year 52 by the edict of Claudius from Rome, and remained there more (see on xviii. 11) than a year and a half (xvi. 1–xviii. 18).—Aer. Dion. 55, u.c. 808. From Corinth Paul journeys to Ephesus, and thence by Caesarea to Jerusalem for the fourth time (xvii. 20–22), from which, without staying, he returns to Antioch (xviii. 22), and thus closes his second missionary journey. He tarries there χρόνου τριώ (xviii. 23), and then commences his third missionary journey through Galatia and Phrygia (xviii. 23), during which time Apollos is first at Ephesus (xviii. 24 ff.) and then at Corinth (xix. 1).—Aer. Dion. 56–58, u.c. 809–811. Paul arrives on this

\(^1\) With this also agrees the number of the year AP of a Damascene coin of King Aretas, described by Eckel and Monnet, namely, in so far as that number (101) is to be reckoned according to the Pompeian era commencing with 690 u.c., and this is at any rate the most probable, whence the year 38 may be safely assumed for the coinage. The circumstance that there are extant Damascene coins of Augustus and Tiberius, and also of Nero, but none of Caligula and Claudius (see Eckel, l. 3, p. 390 f.), is unsatisfactory as evidence of a longer continuance of the city under the power of Aretas, and may be accidental.
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journey at Ephesus (xix. 1), where he labours for not quite three years (see on xix. 10). After the tumult of Demetrius (xix. 24–40) he journeys to Macedonia and Greece, and tarries there three months (xx. 1, 2).—Aer. Dion. 59, u.c. 812. Having returned in the spring from Greece to Macedonia (xx. 3), Paul sails after Easter from Philippi to Troas (xx. 6), and from Assos by way of Miletus (xx. 18–38), and Tyre (xxi. 1–6) to Potelemais (xxi. 7), thence he journeys by Caesarea (xxi. 8–14) to Jerusalem for the fifth and last time (xxi. 15–17). Arriving shortly before Pentecost (xx. 16), he is after some days (xxi. 18–33) arrested and then sent to Felix at Caesarea (xxiii. 23–35).—Aer. Dion. 60, 61, u.c. 813, 814. Paul remains a prisoner in Caesarea for two years (from the summer of 59 to the summer of 61) until the departure of Felix, who leaves him as a prisoner to his successor Festus (xxiv. 27). Festus, after fruitless discussions (xxv., xxvi.), sends the apostle, who had appealed to Caesar, to Rome in the autumn (xxvii. 9), on which journey he winters at Malta (xxviii. 11).—That Felix had retired from his procuratorship before the year 62, is evident from Joseph. Antt. xx. 8. 9, according to which this retirement occurred while Pallas, the brother of Felix, was still a favourite of Nero, and while Burrus, the praefectus praetorii, was still living; but, according to Tac. Ann. xiv. 65, Pallas was poisoned by Nero in the year 62, and Burrus died in an early month of the same year (Anger, de temp. rat. p. 101). See also Ewald, p. 52 ff. Further, that the retirement of Felix took place after the year 60, is highly probable from Joseph. Vit. § 8, and from Antt. xx. 8. 11. In the first passage Josephus informs us that he had journeyed to Rome μετ’ εἰκοσίδου καὶ εκατον εὑμβρίων of his life, in order to release certain priests whom Felix, during his (consequently then elapsed) procuratorship (καὶ δυ κρόνων Φίλιξ τῆς Τουλάδας εἰπτριπτέεν), had sent as prisoners thither. Now, as Josephus was born (Vit. § 1) in the first year of Caligula (i.e. in the year from 16th March 37 to 16th March 38), and so the completion of his 26th year fell in the year from 16th March 63 to 16th March 64, that journey to Rome is to be placed in the year 63, for the sea was closed in the winter months until the beginning of March (Veget. de re milit. iv. 30). If, then, Felix had retired as early as the year 60, Josephus would only have interested himself for his unfortunate friends three years after the removal of the hated governor,—a long postponement of their rescue, which would be quite inex-


8 Wieseler, p. 98, following Clinton, Anger, and others, has defended the year 64. He appeals especially to a more exact determination of the age of Josephus, which is to be got from Antt. xx. 11. 3, where Josephus makes his 56th year coincide with the 18th year of Domitian (13th September 68 to 13th September 91). Accordingly, Josephus was born between 18th September 37 and 16th March 38, and therefore the above journey is to be referred not to the year 63, but, as he would not have entered upon it in the autumn, only to the year 64. But this proof is not convincing, as we are at all events entitled to seek the strictly exact statement of the birth of Josephus in the Vit. § 1 (16 March 37 to 16th March 38), and are not, by the approximate parallelism of Antt. xx. 11. 2, justified in excluding the period from 16th March to 13th September, 37. Even if Josephus were born in March 37, his 56th year would still fall in the 18th year of Domitian.
plicable. But if Felix resigned his government in the year 61, it was natural that Josephus should first wait the result of the complaint of the Jews of Caesarea to the emperor against Felix (Joseph. Antt. xx. 8, 10); and then, when the unexpected news of the acquittal of the procurator came, should, immediately after the opening of the navigation in the year 62, make his journey to Rome, in order to release his friends the priests. Further, according to Joseph. Antt. xx. 8. 11, about the time of the entrance of Festus on office (κατὰ τὸν καυρὸν τοῦτον), Poppaea, the mistress of Nero, was already his wife (γυνὴ) which she became according to Tac. Ann. xiv. 59, Suet. Ner. 35, only in May of the year 62 (see Anger, l.c. pp. 101, 108). Now, if Festus had become already procurator in the year 60, we must either ascribe to the expression κατὰ τὸν καυρὸν τοῦτον an undue indefiniteness, extending even to inaccuracy, or in an equally arbitrary manner understand γυνὴ proleptically (Anger, Stölting), or as uxor injusta (Wieseler), which, precisely in reference to the twofold relation of Poppaea as the emperor's mistress and the emperor's wife, would appear unwarranted in the case of a historian who was recording the history of his own time. But if Festus became governor only in the summer of 61, there remains for τὸν καυρὸν τοῦτον a space of not quite one year, which, with the not sharply definite κατὰ κ.τ.λ., cannot occasion any difficulty. The objection urged by Anger, p. 100, and Wieseler, p. 86, on Gal. p. 584 f., and in Herzog's Encycl. XXI. p. 557, after Pearson and Schrader, against the year 61, from Acts xxviii. 16,—namely, that the singular τῷ στρατοπεδίῳ refers to Burrus (who died in the spring of 63) as the sole praefectus praetorii at the period of the arrival of the apostle at Rome, for before and after his prefecture there were two prefects,—is untenable, because the singular in the sense of: the praefectus praetorii concerned (to whom the prisoners were delivered up), is quite in place. The other reasons against the year 61, taken from the period of office of Festus and Albinus, the successors of Felix (Anger, p. 101 ff.; Wieseler, p. 89 ff.), involve too much uncertainty to be decisive for the year 60. For although the entrance of Albinus upon office is not to be put later than the beginning of October 62 (see Anger, l.c.), yet the building (completion) of the house of Agrippa, mentioned by Joseph. Antt. xx. 8. 11, ix. 1, as nearly contemporaneous with the entrance of Festus on office, and the erection of the wall by the Jews over against it (to prevent the view of the temple), as well as the complaint occasioned thereby at Rome, might very easily have occurred from the summer of 61 to the autumn of 62; and against the brief duration of the high-priesthood of Kabi, scarcely exceeding a month on this supposition (Anger, p. 105 f.), the history of that period of rapid dissolution in the unhappy nation raises no valid objection at all.—Δερ. Dion. 63, 64, u.c. 815–817. Paul arrives in the spring of 62 at Rome (xxviii. 11, 16), where he remains two years (xxviii. 30), that is, until the spring of 64, in further captivity. Thus far the Acts of the Apostles.—On the disputed point of a second imprisonment, see on Rom. Introd. p. 15 ff.

1 See also Laurent, neust. Studien, p. 94 ff.
REMARK 1.—The great conflagration of Rome under Nero broke out on 19th July 64 (Tac. Ann. xvi. 41), whereupon commenced the persecution of the Christians (Tac. Ann. xv. 44). At the same time the abandoned Gessius Florus (64–66), the Nero of the Holy Land, the successor of the wretched Albinus, made havoc in Judaea.

REMARK 2.—The Book of Acts embraces the period from A.D. 31 to A.D. 64, in which there reigned as Roman emperors: (1) Tiberius (from 19th August 14), until 16th March 37; (2) Caligula, until 24th January 41; (3) Claudius, until 15th October 54; (4) Nero (until 9th June 68).

AUTHORITIES TO WHICH REFERENCE HAS BEEN MADE IN THE FOLLOWING CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

## SYNOPSIS OF THE DATES FIXED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascension of Christ</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's first journey to Jerusalem</td>
<td>Claud.</td>
<td>II. III. a.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's arrival at Antioch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Claud. III.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43?</td>
<td>43?</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of James</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>about 44</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The famine</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's second journey to Jerusalem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's first missionary journey</td>
<td>Claud.</td>
<td>V. to 42 to 45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47?</td>
<td>47?</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47?</td>
<td>47?</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's third journey to Jerusalem, to the apostolic Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47?</td>
<td>47?</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul commences his second missionary journey</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expulsion of the Jews from Rome</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul arrives at Corinth</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's fourth journey to Jerusalem (of Caesarea), and third missionary journey</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Cas.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's abode at Ephesus, 55-58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's fifth journey to Jerusalem, and imprisonment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's removal from Caesarea to Rome, 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul's two years' imprisonment at Rome, 62-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Lehmann (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1858, p. 312 ff.) furnishes from this point onward the following dates:—Second journey to Jerusalem, 44; first missionary journey, 45 and 46; apostolic council, 47; second missionary journey, 48,—in 49 Paul arrives at Corinth; fourth journey to Jerusalem, 51; third missionary journey, 52, during which he remains at Ephesus from the autumn of 52 until 54, and in 53 proceeds to Macedonia and Greece; fifth journey to Jerusalem, and imprisonment, 56; removal from Caesarea to Rome, 58; imprisonment in Rome, 59 to 61.—These dates chiefly depend on the assumption that Felix had been recalled as early as the year 56.—Laurent, *neuest. Stud.* p. 94 ff., fixes, with me, on the year 61 as that of the departure of Felix and the voyage of the apostle.—Gerlauch (*Statthalter in Syria und Jud.**, § 14) does not
## By Different Chronologists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ehlers</th>
<th>Bertholdt</th>
<th>Starkel</th>
<th>Stieff</th>
<th>Kaulen</th>
<th>Winer</th>
<th>De Wette</th>
<th>Schleiermacher</th>
<th>Kocher</th>
<th>Fechner</th>
<th>Schott</th>
<th>Worm</th>
<th>Olshausen</th>
<th>Angell</th>
<th>Sancisi</th>
<th>and Heussler</th>
<th>Wiesenfelter</th>
<th>Ewald</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30?</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29 Id.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38?</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 or 28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38?</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41 or 45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>did not occur</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44 or 45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 or 44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44 or 44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44 or 45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44 or 45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44 or 45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 ff.</td>
<td>46 ff.</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46 ff.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>52?</td>
<td>52?</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>53?</td>
<td>53?</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54?</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>about</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>about</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Caes.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57 ff.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enter on the chronological question, but fixes on the year 60 or 61.—Holtzmann, *Judenth. u. Christentum*, p. 547 ff., agrees in essential points with our dates.—Stölling, *Berech. z. Exegese. d. Paul. Br.*, 1869, starting from the assumption that the fourteen years in Gal. II. 1 are to be reckoned from the composition to the composition of the Epistles, and that so likewise the fourteen years in 2 Cor. xii. 6 are to be determined, fixes for the conversion of Paul the year 40; for the first journey to Jerusalem, 48 (for the second, 45); for the third, 49; for the second missionary journey to Corinth, 50–52; for the fourth journey to Jerusalem, 53; for the arrest, 56; for the two years' imprisonment, 58 to 61.
INTRODUCTION.

NOTE BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(d)

Although the author contends strongly for the date he assigns for the ascension, that the feast referred to in John v. 1 was not the Passover, but the feast of Purim, and hence our Lord's public ministry extended only over a period of a little more than two years, the exact chronology of the Acts is still an unsettled question. The great diversity in the chronological table furnished by him is proof of this. "The exact number of Passovers from the baptism to the crucifixion of Christ, and the length of our Lord's ministry, are points on which there is much difference of opinion. For myself I can see no better view than the old one, that our Lord's ministry lasted three years." (Hyle.)

"What this feast was is, in all probability, a question which, though interesting and important in settling the length of our Lord's ministry, will never receive a final answer." "The data are clearly insufficient to decide convincingly how long Christ publicly taught on earth, nor shall we ever be able to attain any certainty on that deeply interesting question." (Farrar, Ex. VIII., Life of Christ.)

Dr. Robinson in his Harmony of the Gospels, and Dr. McDonald, of Princeton, in his Life and Writings of John, both consider the Passover to be referred to in John v. 1—as does also Dr. Jacobus in his Notes.

Hackett says: "The chronology of the Acts is attended with uncertainties which no efforts of critical labor have been able to remove." And he gives A.D. 33 as the probable date of the ascension. In this opinion Lewin and Canon Cooke concur, as does also Dr. P. J. Gloag in the introduction to his excellent commentary. Canon Farrar, in Excursus X., appended to his Life and Work of St. Paul, says: "How widely different have been the schemes adopted by different chronologists, may be seen from the subjoined table, founded on that given by Meyer."

"This important book forms the grand connecting link of the Gospels with the Epistles, being a sort of appendix to the former, and an introduction to the latter, and is therefore indispensably necessary to a right understanding of both." (Bloomfield.)

"Any view which attributes ulterior design to the writer beyond that of faithfully recording such facts as seemed important in the history of the Gospel, is, I am persuaded, mistaken. Many ends are answered by the book in the course of this narration, but they are the designs of Providence, not the studied purposes of the writer." (Alford.)

"The purpose of the writer was, evidently, to narrate the work of Christ continued after his ascension, and wrought through the Holy Spirit, and to furnish his readers with an account of how Christianity, after the death of its Founder, was preserved, established, and in so short a time communicated to so many nations." (Denton.)

The evidential value of the book is very great when considered in relation to the Gospels, the Epistles of Paul, and the facts of external history; and its bearing on the organization, worship, mission work, and future history of the Church is most obvious and important. (See Introductions by Plumptre and by Housson.)
CRITICAL NOTES.

Πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων.

B, Lachm. Tisch. have πράξεις ἀποστόλων. So also Born. Later enlargements of the title in codd.: Λουκα ἐναγγελιστῶν πράξεις ἀποστόλων, al. αἱ πράξεις τῶν ἀγίων ἀποστόλων. Peculiar to D; πράξεις ἀποστόλων. Ν has merely πράξεις, but at the close πράξεις ἀποστόλων.—The codex D is particularly rich in additions, emendations, and the like, which Bornemann has recently defended as the original text. Matth. ed. min. p. 1 well remarks: “Hic liber (the Book of Acts) in re critica est difficilissimum et impeditissimum, quod multa in so turbata sunt. Sed corruptiones versionum Syrarum, Bedae et scribæ codicis D omnem modum excudunt.” Tisch. justly calls the proceeding of Bornemann, “monstruosam quandam ac perversam novitatem” (x).

CHAPTER I.

Ver. 4. συναλιζόμενοι] min. Euseb. Epiph. have συναλιζόμενος. Recommended by Wetst. and Griesb. D has συναλιζόμενος μετ’ αὐτῶν. Both are ineptly explanatory alterations.—Ver. 5. The order: εν πνεύμα, ἑαυτῶν, adopted by Lachm., is not sufficiently attested by B Ν against A C E min. vss. Or. al.—Ver. 6. εἰς ἔργα] Lachm. Tisch. read ἱδρύμα, according to A B C Ν, the weight of which, considering the frequency of both words in Luke, prevails.—Ver. 8. μοι] Lachm. Tisch. Bornem. read μον, decisively attested by A B C D Ν Or.—Instead of πάση, Elz. Griesb. Scholz read ἐν πάσῃ. But εν is wanting in A C D min. Copit. Sahid. Or. Hilar. Inserted in accordance with the preceding.—Ver. 10. ἀφήνει λευκό] A B C Ν min. Syr. Copit. Arm. Vulg. Eusa. have ἀποθηται λευκάις. Adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. The Rec. is the usual expression. Comp. on Luke xxiv. 4.—Ver. 13. Lachm. Tisch. Bornem. have the order Ἰωάννης α. Ἰακώβους, which is supported by A B C D Ν min. vss., also Vulg. and Fathers. The Rec. is according to Luke vi. 14.—Ver. 14. After προσευχή Elz. has καὶ τῇ δεήσει, which, on decisive testimony, has been omitted by modern critics since Griesbach. A strengthening addition.—Ver. 15. μαθητῶν] A B C Ν min. Copit. Sahid. Aeth. Arm. Vulg. Aug. have ἄδελφον: recommended by Griesb., and rightly adopted by Lach. and Tisch.; the Rec. is an interpretation of ἀδελφόν, here occurring for the first time in Acts, in the sense of μαθητή. —Ver. 16. ταῦτα] is wanting in A B C Ν min. and several vss. and Fathers. Deleted by Lachm. But the omission occurred because no express passage of Scripture immediately follows.—Ver. 17. σὺν] Griesb. Scholz, Lachm. Tisch. Born. read εν according to decisive testimony; σὺν is an interpretation.—Ver. 19. ἀκελάδαι] There are different modes of writing this word in the critical authorities and witnesses. Lachm. and Tisch. read ἀκελαδῶν according to A B; Born. ἀκελαδάων according to D; Ν has ἀκελαδαί. —Ver. 20. λάβοι] Lachm. Tisch. and Born. read λαβοῖν according to A B C D Ν Eusa. Chrys. ; λάβοι was introduced from the LXX. —Ver. 24. ἐν ἔξετι, ἐκ τοῦτο, τῶν διό εὐα] Elz. has ἐκ τοῦτο, τῶν διὸ εὐα ἐν ἔξετι, in opposition to greatly preponderat-
ing testimony. A transposition for the sake of perspicuity. — Ver. 25. τίν κλήρον\(^{1}\) A B C\(^{3}\) D (τόπ. τών) Copt. Sahid. Vulg. Cant. Procop. Aug. read τίν τίτουν. Adopted by Lachm. Tischh. Born. (τίτουν τών). Rightly; the Rec. is a gloss according to ver. 17. — ἡς ἡς\(^{2}\) Elz. Scholz read εἰς ἡς. The former has preponderating testimony. — Ver 26. αἰτῶν\(^{1}\) A B C D** Μ min. vss. have αἰτοῖ. So Lachm. and Tischh. The dative not being understood gave place to the genitive. Others left out the pronoun entirely (Syr. Erp.).

Ver. 1. Τῶν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποίησε.] Luke calls his Gospel the first history, inasmuch as he is now about to compose a second. πρῶτος, in the sense of μεταφοράς. See on John i. 15. λόγος, narrative, history, or the like, what is contained in a book.\(^{3}\) As to ποιεῖν used of mental products, comp. Plat. Phaed. p. 61 B: ποιεῖν μιθάν, ἀλλ’ οὖ δό λόγον. Hence λογοσοφία = ἱστορικός.\(^{3}\) μὲν, without a subsequent ὁι. Luke has broken off the construction. Instead of continuing after ver. 2 somewhat as follows: “but this ἔνδεικνυσι λόγον is to contain the further course of events after the Ascension,” which thought he had before his mind in the μέν, ver. 1,—he allows himself to be led by the mention of the apostles in the protasis to suppress the apodosis, and to pass on at once to the commencement of the history itself.\(^{3}\) — περὶ πάντων\(^{4}\) a popular expression of completeness, and therefore not to be pressed. — ἦν ἡρσατο κ.τ.λ. ἦν is attracted, equivalent to ὅ; and, setting aside the erroneous assertion that ἡρσατο ποιεῖν is equivalent to ἐποίησα (Grotius, Calovius, Valckenær, Kuinoel), it is usually explained: “what Jesus begun to do and to teach (and continued) until the day,” etc., as if Luke had written: ὣν ἁρκαμνὸς ἡσσός ἐποίησα κ. ἐδίδαξεν ἀχρί κ.τ.λ. Comp. xi. 4.\(^{4}\) But Luke has not so written, and it is arbitrary thus to explain his words. Baumgarten, after Olshausen and Schneckenburger, has maintained that ἡρσατο denotes the whole work of Jesus up to His ascension as initial and preparatory, so that this second book is conceived as the continuation of that doing and teaching which was only begun by Jesus up to His ascension; as if Luke had written ἡρσατο ποιεῖν τε και διδάσκουν.\(^{5}\) In point of fact, ἡρσατο is inserted according to the very frequent custom of the Synoptists, by which that which is done or said is in a vivid and graphic manner denoted according to its moment of commencement. It thus here serves to recall to the recollection from the Gospel all the several incidents and events up to the ascension, in which Jesus had appeared as doer and teacher. The reader is supposedly mentally to realize from the Gospel all the scenes in which he has seen Jesus come forward as acting and

---

1 So in Xen. Apol. 10. 3, Anab. iii. 1. 1, and frequently. See also Schweigh. Lex. Herod. II. p. 76; Creuzer Symbol. I. p. 44 ff.

2 Pearson, ad Mort. p. 244.

3 Comp. Winer, p. 635 (E. T. 730); Buttm. neut. Gr. p. 838 (E. T. 865); Kühner, ad Xen. Anab. l. 2. l. 1; Baeml. Partik. p. 168 f.


teaching,—a beginning of the Lord, which occurred in the most various instances and varied ways up to the day of His ascent. The emphasis, moreover, lies on ποιημα το καλ διδακτευω, which comprehends the contents of the Gospel. It may, consequently, be paraphrased somewhat thus: "The first narrative I have composed of all that, by which Jesus exhibited His activity in doing and teaching during His earthly life up to His ascension." ποιημα precedes, comp. Luke xxiv. 19, because it was primarily the ἐργα of Jesus that demonstrated His Messiahship, John x. 38; Acts x. 38.

Ver. 2. Until the day on which He was taken up, after that He had commissioned by means of the Holy Spirit the apostles whom He had chosen, belonging to ὠν ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ. — ἄρα ἂς ἡμῶν] a usual attraction, but to be explained as in ver. 22; Luke i. 20, xvii. 27; Matt. xxiv. 38. — ενεκλήμενος] refers neither merely to the baptismal command, Matt. xxvii., nor merely to the injunction in ver. 4; but is to be left as general: having given them charges, "ut facere solent, qui ab amicis, vel etiam ex hoc mundo discendunt," Beza. — δια πνευμ. ἁγιων] belongs to ἐνεκλήμενος ἁγιασθησαν: by means of the Holy Spirit, of which He was possessor (Luke iv. 1, xiv. 18; John iii. 34, xx. 23), and by virtue of which He worked, as in general, so specially as regards His disciples (ix. 55). Yet it is not to be explained as: by communication of the Spirit (comp. Bengel), since this is not promised till afterwards; nor yet as: quae agere deberent per Spir. S. (Grot.), which the words cannot bear. Others * connect διὰ πνευμ. ἁγιων with ὁσον ἐξελέξατο, quos per Sp. S. elegerat. But there thus would result a hyperbaton which, without any certain example in the N. T., * would put a strong emphasis and yet without any warrant in the context, on διὰ πνευμ. ἁγιασθησαν: * is added with design and emphasis; it is the significant premiss to ενεκλήμενος κ.τ.λ. (whom He had chosen to Himself); for the earlier ἐκλογή on the part of Jesus was a necessary preliminary to their receiving the ἐντολή διὰ πνευμ. ἁγιων. — ἀνεκλήθη] Luke ix. 51, xxiv. 51 (Elz.).

Ver. 3. Ὡς καὶ] to whom also. To the foregoing ὁσον ἐξελέξατο, namely, there is attached a corresponding incident, through which the new intercourse, in which the ενεκλήμενος κ.τ.λ. took place, is now set forth. — μετὰ τό παθεῖν αὐτῶν] includes in it the death as the immediate result of the suffering (iii. 18, xvii. 3, xxvi. 28; Heb. xiii. 19). — δι' ἡμῶν τεσσαράκοντα.] He showed Himself to them throughout forty days, (v) not continuously, but from time to time, which is sufficiently indicated as well known by the preceding ἐν παλλ. τεκμηριωσόμενος. — τὰ περὶ τῆς βασ. τ. θεοῦ] speaking to them that which related to the Messiah's kingdom, which He would erect. The Catholics have taken occasion hence to assume that Jesus at this stage gave instructions concerning the hierarchy, the seven sacraments, and the like.—As to the variation of the narrative of the forty days from the narrative given in the Gospel, see on Luke xxiv. 50 f. This diversity

---

1 Comp. Papiae in Eus. Ill. 39.
4 Plat. Apol. p. 19 D, al.; Discen, ad Dem. de cor. p. 177 f.; and see on Rom. xvi. 27.
presupposes that a not inconsiderable interval occurred between the composition of the Gospel and that of Acts, during which the tradition of the forty days was formed or at least acquired currency. The purposely chosen ὀπτανόμενος conspiciendum ut praebens corresponds to the changed corporeality of the Risen One (comp. the remark subjoined to Luke xxiv. 51), but does not serve in the least degree to remove that discrepancy (in opposition to Baumgarten, p. 12), as if it presupposed that Jesus, on occasion of every appearance, quitted "the sphere of invisibility."

Comp. the ἡμέρα in Luke xxiv. 24; 1 Cor. xv. 5 ff.; comp. with John xx. 17; Acts i. 21 f., x. 41; Luke xxiv. 42 f.

Ver. 4. To the general description of the forty days' intercourse is now added by the simple καὶ, and, in particular, the description of the two last interviews, ver. 4 f. and ver. 6 f., after which the αὐτῆς ἔφη took place, ver. 9. — συναλίσκεται, συναλίσκεται] while He ate with them, He commanded them. συναλίσκεται is thus correctly understood by the vss. (Vulg.: consessisse), Chrysostom (τραπέζις κοινωνίας), Theophylact, Oecumenius, Jerome, Beda, and others, including Cassaubon. — συναλίσκεται (properly, to eat salt with one) in the sense of eating together, is found in a Greek translator of Ps. cxli. 4, where συναλίσκω (LXX.: συναινώ) corresponds to the Hebrew נַחֵם, also in Clem. Hom. 6, and Maneth. v. 389. As to the thing itself, comp. on x. 41. Usually the word is derived from συναλίζειν, to assemble. It would then have to be rendered; when He assembled with them. But against this it is decisive that the sense: when He had assembled with them, would be logically necessary, so that Luke must have written συναλίσκεσθείς. The conjecture of Hemsterhuis: συναλίζομενος, is completely unnecessary, although approved by Valkenaer. — τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τοῦ πατρὸς] see on Luke xxiv. 49. Jesus means the πρόβατος κατ' ἐξοχήν, given by God through the prophets of the O. T. (comp. ii. 16), which, i.e. the realization of which, they were to wait for (περιμένων only here in the N. T., but often in the classics); it referred to the complete effusion of the Holy Spirit, which was to follow only after His exaltation. Comp. John vii. 39, xv. 26, xiv. 16. Already during their earthly intercourse the πνεύμα ὑ. was communicated by Jesus to the disciples partially and provisionally. Luke ix. 55; John xx. 21, 22. — ἵνα ἥκωστε μου] The oblique form of speech is changed, as frequently also in the classics, with the increase of animation into the direct form, Luke v. 41, and elsewhere, particularly with Luke. Bengel, moreover, aptly says: "Atque hic parallelismus ad arctissimum nexum pertinet utriusque libri Lucae,"—but not in so far as ἵνα ἥκωστε μου points back to Luke xxiv. 49 as to an earlier utterance (the usual opinion), but in so far as Jesus

1 Comp. Tob. xii. 19; 1 Kings viii. 8.
2 Herod. v. 15. 102; Xen. Anab. vili. 3. 45; Lucian, Lucet. 7.
3 Not as Luther (when He had assembled them), Grotius ("in unum recolligens qui dispersi fuerunt"), and most interpreters, including even Kunoedd and Olshausen (not Beza and de Wette), explain it, as if Luke had employed the active. This is grammatically incorrect; it must then have been συναλίζεσθε, or, with logical accuracy (as Luther felt), συναλίσκεσθε.
here, shortly before his ascension, gives the same intimation which was also given by Him on the ascension day (Luke xxiv. 49), directly before the ascent; although according to the gospel the day of the resurrection coincides with that of the ascension (v. p. 6). Therefore ἦν ἀκούσα. μου is to be considered as a reference to a former promise of the Spirit, not recorded by Luke. Comp. John xiv. 16 f., xv. 26.—On ἀκούσα τι πυνος, see Winer, p. 187 (E. T. 249).

Ver. 5. Reminiscence of the declaration of the Baptist, Luke iii. 16; John i. 33. "For on you the baptism of the Spirit will now soon take place which John promised instead of his baptism of water."—βαπτισθήσεθε] τὴν ἐπίθυμον καὶ τὸν πλούτον τῆς χαράγης σημαίνει; Theophyl. ; Matt. iii. 11; Mark i. 8; Luke iii. 16; Acts xi. 16. Moreover, comp. on John i. 33.—οὐ μετὰ πολλ. ταύτ. ἡμέρ. is not a transposition for οὐ πολὺ μετὰ ταύτ. ἡμέρ., but: not after many of those, now and, up to the setting in of the future event, still current, days. The position of the negative is to be explained from the idea of contrast, not after many, but after few.¹

Ver. 6. Not qui convenerant (Vulgate, Luther, and others), as if what follows still belonged to the scene introduced in ver. 4; but, as is evident from αὐτάς, ver. 4, comp. with ver. 12, a new scene, at which the ascension occurred (ver. 9). The word of promise spoken by our Lord as they were eating (vv. 4, 5), occasioned (μετὰ οὖν) the apostles to come together, and in common to approach Him with the question, etc. Hence: They, therefore, after they were come together, asked Him. Where this joint asking occurred, is evident from ver. 12.² To the μετὰ corresponds the δι in ver. 7. —ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ κ.τ.λ.] The disciples, acquainted with the O. T. promise, that in the age of the Messiah the fulness of the Holy Spirit would be poured out (Joel iii. 1, 2; Acts ii. 16 ff.), saw in ver. 5 an indirect intimation of the now impending erection of the Messianic kingdom; comp. also Schneckenburger, p. 169. In order, therefore, to obtain quite certain information concerning this, their nearest and highest concern, they ask: "Lord, if Thou at this time restorsethe (fallen) kingdom to the people Israel?" The view of Lightfoot, that the words were spoken in indignation simply introduces arbitrarily the point alleged.—εἰ] unites the question to the train of thought of the questioner, and thus imparts to it the indirect character. See on Matt. xii. 10, and on Luke xiii. 23.—ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τοῦτω] i.e. at this present time, which they think they might assume from ver. 4 f. —ἀποκαΐθετ.] See on Matt. xvii. 11. By their τῷ Ἰσραὴλ they betray that they have not yet ceased to be entangled in Jewish Messianic hopes, according to which the Messiah was destined for the people of

¹ Comp. Winer, p. 152 (E. T. 301).
² See Köhler, II. 698. On τὸν ταύτ. inserted between πολλ. and ἡμέρ., comp. Xan. ἄποθ. iv. 2, 6, v. 7. 30, viii. 3. 30; Dem. 90. 11; Alc. 1. 14.
³ Concerning the time of the question, this expression ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τοῦτω gives so far information that it must have occurred very soon after that meal mentioned in ver. 4, so that no discussions intervened which would have diverted them from this definite inquiry as to the time. Therefore it was probably on the same day. The τοῦτω is thus explained, which sounds as a fresh echo of that εἰ μετὰ πολλ. ταύτ. ἡμέρ.
⁴ "Hanc mundum regnum restitutus Judaeis lilla, qui est mundi aeternum!"
Israel as such; comp. Luke xxiv. 21. An artificial explanation, on the other hand, is given in Hofmann, Schriftenw. II. 2, p. 647.—The circumstance that, by the declaration of Jesus, ver. 4 f., their sensuous expectation was excited and drew forth such a rash question, is very easily explained just after the resurrection, and need occasion no surprise before the reception of the Spirit itself; therefore we have not, with Baumgarten, to impute to the disciples the reflection that the communication of the Spirit would be the necessary internal ground for all the shaping of the future, according to which idea their question, deviating from the tenor of the promise, would be precisely a sign of their understanding.

Ver. 7 f. Jesus refuses to answer the question of the disciples; not indeed in respect of the matter itself involved, but in respect of the time inquired after, as not beseeching them (observe the emphatic σὺς ὑμῶν); and on the contrary (ἀλλὰ) He turns their thoughts, and guides their interest to their future official equipment and destination, which alone they were now to lay to heart. Chrysostom aptly says: διδασκάλου τούτῳ ἐπὶ μᾶς ἀ βουλεύει ὁ μαθητής, ἀλλʼ α συμφέρει μαθεῖν, διδάσκειν.—χρόνος ἡ καιρός] times ot, in order to denote the idea still more definitely, seasons. καιρός is not equivalent to χρόνος, but denotes a definite marked off portion of time with the idea of fitness. ¹ On ἡ, which is not equivalent to καί, comp. here Dem. Ol. 3: τίνα γὰρ χρόνον ἡ τίνα καιρόν τοῦ παρόντος βελτίω ζητείτε;—ἐκεῖνο εἰ τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐγώοις] has established by means of His own plenitude of power. On εἰ, comp. Matt. xxii. 28.—The whole declaration (ver. 7) is a general proposition, the application of which to the question put by the disciples is left to them; therefore only in respect of this application is an ad haec rem perfeclandi to be mentally supplied with οὖς. Bengel, however, well observes: “gravis descriptio reservati divini;” and “ergo res ipsa firma est, alias nullum ejus rei tempus esset.” But this res ipsa was, in the view of Jesus, which, however, we have no right to put into the question of the disciples, in opposition to Hofmann, ² the restoration of the kingdom, not for the natural, but for the spiritual Israel, comprehending also the believing Gentiles (Rom. iv. 9), for the Ἰσραήλ τοῦ Θεοῦ (Gal. vi. 16); see Matt. viii. 11; John x. 16, 26, viii. 42 ff. al.; and already Matt iii. 9;—δόμων ἐπελθοῦ τοῦ ἀγ. πν. ἐφίμασιν] power, when the Holy Spirit has (shall have) come upon you. ³—μύριστες] namely, of my teaching, actions, and life, what ye all have yourselves heard and seen, v. 21 f., x. 39 ff.; Luke xxivv. 48; John xv. 27.—ἐν τῷ Ιερουσαλ. . . τῆς τῆς] denotes the sphere of the apostles’ work in its commencement and progress, up to its most general diffusion; therefore γῆς γῆς is not to be explained of the land, but of the earth; and, indeed, it is to be observed that Jesus delineates for the apostles their sphere ideally. Comp. xiii. 47; Isa. viii. 9; Rom. x. 18; Col. i. 28; Mark xvi. 15.

Ver. 9. Καί νεφέλη This καί annexes what occurred after the ἐπήρθη, He was taken up on high, not yet immediately into heaven. The cloud, which received Him into itself, from before their eyes, is the visible manifestation

² Schriftenw. II. 2. p. 667.
³ Winer, p. 119 (E. T. 156).
of the presence of God, who takes to Himself His Son into the glory of heaven. Comp. on Luke i. 35; Matt. xvii. 5. Chrysostom calls this cloud το ὅλημα το βασιλείαν.—Concerning the ascension itself, which was certainly bodily, but the occurrence of which has clothed itself with Luke in the traditionary form of an external visible event (according to Dan. vii. 13; comp. Matt. xxiv. 30, xxvi. 64.) The representation of the scene betrays a more developed tradition than in the Gospel, but not a special design (Schnecckenburger: sanction of the foregoing promise and intimation; Baumgarten: that the exalted Christ was to appear as the acting subject properly speaking in the further course of the Book of Acts). Nothing of this kind is indicated.

Vv. 10, 11. Ἄρειντες ἄσαν] expresses continuance: they were in fixed gazing. To this (not to πορευομαι. aor.) εἰς τὸν ναόν belongs. Strangely erroneous is the view of Lange, Apost. Zeitalt. II. p. 13: that Ἰς is not temporal, but as if: "they wished to fix the blue (!) heaven, which one cannot fix." — πορευομένου αὐτοῦ] whilst He, enveloped by the cloud, was departing (into heaven). — καὶ ἱδοὺ] as in Luke vii. 12, Acts x. 17; not as an anacoluthon, but: behold also there! — The men are characterized as inhabitants of the heavenly world, ἄγγελος, who are therefore clothed in white. See on John xx. 12. — αἱ καὶ εἰσην] who (not only stood, but) also said: comp. ver. 3. — τί ἵσθηκατε κ.τ.λ.] The meaning is: "Remain now no longer sunk in aimless gazing after Him; for ye are not for ever separated from this Jesus," who will so come even as ye have seen Him go away into heaven.” — ὑπὸς] i.e. in the same manner come down from heaven a cloud as He was borne up. Comp. Matt. xxiv. 30. — On the emphasis οὕς, δυ τρόπον, comp. xxvii. 25; 2 Tim. iii. 8.

Ver. 12. The ascension took place on the Mount of Olives, which is not only here, but also in Luke xix. 29, xxi. 37, called Ἰακώβ. Its locality is indicated in Luke xxiv. 50, not differently from, but more exactly than in our passage (in opposition to de Wette and others); and accordingly there is no necessity for the undemonstrable hypothesis that the Sabbath day’s journey is to be reckoned from Bethphage. It is not the distance of the place of the ascension, but of the Mount of Olives, on which it occurred, that is meant. Luke here supposes that more precisely defined locality as already known; but if he had had any particular design in naming the Mount of Olives, he must have said so, and could least of all presume that Theophilus would understand such a tacit prophetic allusion, especially as the Mount of Olives was already sufficiently known to him from the Gospel, xix. 29, xxi. 87, without any such latent reference. — σαββάτου ἡχοῦ ὀδών] having a

---

1 See remark subjoined to Luke xxiv. 51.
2 Comp. iii. 4, vi. 15, vii. 55, xi. 6, xii. 9; 2 Cor. iii. 7, 13. τῷ ναῷ might also have stood, Luke iv. 30, xxi. 55; Acts iii. 12, x. 4, xxi. 1. See generally, Valck. Schol. p. 809 f. Comp. Polyb. vi. 11. 7.
3 See Nägellach, s. l. lus, p. 164, ed. 3.
4 According to Ewald, we are to think on Moses and Elias, as at the transfiguration. But if the tradition had meant these—and in that case it would certainly have named them—Luke would hardly have left them unnamed.
6 Wieseler, Synop. p. 435.
7 Baumgarten, p. 29 f.: that he wished to lead their thoughts to the future, according to Ezek. xi. 33; Zech. xiv. 6.
Sabbath's way. The way is conceived as something which the mountain has, i.e. which is connected with it in reference to the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. Such is—and not with Wetstein and Kuinoel: ἡξεν πρὸ ἀνέξεν—the correct view also in the analogous passages in Kypke, II. p. 8. The more exact determination of δὲ εἰσών ἵγγος Ἰερουσ. is here given; hence also the explanation of Alberti and Kypke, that it expresses the extent of the mountain (Sabbati constantis itinere), is contrary to the context, and the use of ἡξεν is to be referred to the general idea conjunctum quid cum quo esse. 3

Δ. ὁδὸς σαββάτου, a journey permitted on the Sabbath, according to the traditional maxims, was of the length of 2000 cubits. See on Matt. xxiv. 20. The different statements in Joseph. Antt. xx. 8. 6 (six stadia), and Bell. Jud. v. 2. 3 (five stadia), are to be considered as different estimates of the small distance. Bethany was fifteen stadia from Jerusalem, hence the locality of the ascension is to be sought for beyond the ridge of the mountain on its eastern slope.

Vv. 13, 14. Εἰς Ἰηνήδον] not: into their place of meeting, as Beza and others hold, but, in accordance with what immediately precedes: into the city. The simple style of a continued narrative. — τῇ τίπερον] τῇ τῇ, the room directly under the flat roof, used for praying and for meetings. 4 It is here to be conceived as in a private house, whose possessor was devoted to the gospel, and not with de Dieu, Lightfoot, Hammond, Schoetgen, and Krebs, as an upper room in the temple (on account of Luke xxiv. 53; see on that passage), because, considering the hatred of the hierarchy, the temple could neither be desired by the followers of Jesus, nor permitted to them as a place for their special closed meetings. Perhaps it was the same room as in John xx. 19, 26. — οὗ Ἰηναν καταμ.] where, i.e. in which they were wont to reside, which was the place of their common abode. The following δὲ πείτιος κ. τ. λ. is a supplementary more exact statement of the subject of ἠνίοθεν.

According to Acts, it is expressly the Eleven only, who were present at the ascension. In the Gospel, xxiv. 33, comp. vv. 36, 44, 50, the disciples of Emmaus and others are not excluded; but according to Mark xvi. 14, comp. vv. 15, 19, 20, it is likewise only the Eleven.—As to the list of the apostles, comp. on Matt. x. 2–4; Mark iii. 17, 18; Luke vi. 14–16. — δὲ ζηλώνης] the (formerly) zealot. See on Matt. x. 4. — Ἰωάννας ἰακώβου] the relationship is arbitrarily defined as: brother of the (younger) James. It is: son of (an otherwise unknown) James. See on Luke vi. 15; John xiv. 22; and Huther on Jude, Introd. § 1. Already the Syriac gives the correct rendering. — ἡμωμαθαῖον] denotes no mere external being-together; but, as Luther correctly renders it: unanimously. 5 — σῶν γυναῖκι]
along with women; not: cum uxoribus (as Calvin holds);¹ they are partially known from the Gospels; Matt. xxvi. 56, 61; Luke viii. 2 f., xxiv. 10; Mark xv. 40 f. — kai Μαρία kal, also, singles out, after the mention in general terms, an individual belonging to the class as worthy of special remark.² — ἄδελφοι] The unbelief of the four brothers-german (a) of the Lord was very probably overcome by His resurrection. Comp. on 1 Cor. xv. 7. Observe that here, besides the eleven apostles, two other classes are specified as assembled along with them (σω … καὶ σω), namely (a), women, including the mother of Jesus; and (b) the brethren of Jesus. Among the latter, therefore, none of those eleven can be included. This, in opposition to Lange, Hengstenberg, and older commentators. Comp. on John vii. 3.

Ver. 15. Ἑσ ταῖς ἁμᾶρ. ταύτη] between the ascension and feast of Pentecost. — Πέτροι] even now asserting his position of primacy in the apostolic circle, already apparent in the Gospels, and promised to him by Jesus Himself. — τῶν ἄδελφων (see the critical notes) denotes, as very often in the Book of Acts and the Epistles, the Christians according to their brotherly fellowship; hence here (see the following parenthesis) both the apostles and the disciples of Jesus in the wider sense. — ὄνοματ.] of persons, who are numbered.³ — There is no contradiction between the number 120 and the 500 brethren in 1 Cor. xv. 6 (in opposition to Baur and Zeller, who suppose the number to have been invented in accordance with that of the apostles: 12 × 10), as the appearance of Jesus in 1 Cor. i. c., apart from the fact that it may have taken place in Galilee, was earlier, when many foreign believers, pilgrims to the feast, might have been present in Jerusalem, who now left.⁴ — ἐν τῷ αὐτῶ] locally united.⁵

Vv. 16, 17. Ἀνθρώποι ἄδελφοι is more honourable and solemn than the simple familiar ἄδελφοι.⁶ — θείο] It could not but be an especial object with Peter to lay the foundation for his judgment, by urging that the destruction of Judas took place not accidentally, but necessarily according to the counsel of God. — τῆν γραφὴν ταύτην] this which stands written — comp. on viii. 35 — is not, with Wolf and Eckermann, to be referred to Ps. xii. 10 (John xiii. 18, xviii. 3), because otherwise that passage must have been adduced; but to the passages contained in ver. 20, which Peter has already in view, but which he only introduces — after the remarks which the vivid thoughts crowding on him as he names Judas suggest — at ver. 20 in connection with what was said immediately before. — ὅτι κατηρ.] ὅτι is equivalent to eἰς έκείνω, ὅτι (Mark xvi. 14; John ii. 18, ix. 17; 2 Cor. i. 18, al.). If Judas had not possessed the apostolic office, the γραφή referred to, which predicted the very  

¹ See also Calovius and others, not uninterested in opposing celibacy.
² See Fritzsche, ad Marc. p. 11.
³ See on Matt. xii. 46, xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3; John vii. 5.
⁴ Comp. Ewald, ad Apos. 3. 4. The expression is not good Greek, but formed after the Hebrew, Num. i. 2, 18, 30, lii. 40, 43.
⁵ Comp. Wiedler, Ἱστορία p. 484; and see on 1 Cor. xv. 6; also Lechler, apost. u. nachapost. Zittel, p. 275 f.; Baumgarten, p. 29 f.
⁶ Comp. ii. 1, iii. 1; Luke xvii. 35; Matt. xxii. 34; 1 Cor. vii. 5, xi. 30, xiv. 23; Hist. Susamm. 14; often also in the LXX. and in Greek writers. See Raphel, Polyb., and Loesner.
vacating of an apostolic post, would not have been fulfilled in his fate. This fulfillment occurred in his case, insomuch as he was an apostle. — τὸν κλῆρον ὑπὸ διακονίας ταὐτάτω, the lot of this (presenting itself in us apostles) ministry, i.e. the apostolic office. Comp. Rom. xi. 13. οἱ κληρονομοὶ is primarily the lot, ver. 28, then that which is assigned by lot, and then generally what is assigned, the share; just as in Greek writers.1 Baumgarten gratuitously would understand it as an antitype of the share of the twelve tribes in the land of Canaan. The genitive is to be taken partitively—share in this ministry—as the idea of apostolic fellowship, in which each κληρονομὸς has therefore his partial possession in the service, also occurs in the sequel (see vv. 22, 29). — λαγχάνειν here not, as in Luke i. 9, with the partitive genitive, but, as is usual (2 Pet. i. 1), with the accusative of the object.8 The word is the usual term for obtaining by lot, as in Luke i. 9; it next signifies generally to obtain, and is especially used of the receiving of public magistracies.9 So here in reference to τὸν κλῆρον ὑπὸ διακονίας ταὐτάτω; in which case, however, an allusion to a hierarchical constitution (Zeller) is excluded by the generality of the usus logandi of the expressions, which, besides, might be suggested by the thought of the actual use of the lot which afterwards took place.

Ver. 18. This person now acquired for himself a field for the wages of his iniquity—a rhetorical indication of the fact exactly known to the hearers: for the money which Judas had received for his treason, a place, a piece of land, was purchased, Matt. xxvii. 6–8. This rhetorical designation, purposely chosen on account of the conscientiousness of Judas,4 clearly proves that ver. 18 is part of the speech of Peter, and not, as Calvin, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Olshausen, and others think, a remark inserted by Luke. With regard to the expression of the fact itself, Chrys. correctly remarks: ἦδην ποιεῖ τὸν λόγον καὶ λαμβάνοντος τὴν αἰτίαν παιδευτικὴν ὑπῆρχαν ἀποκαλοῦντες. To go further, and to assume—what also the fragment of Papias in Cramer's C. C. narrates—that the death of Judas took place in the field itself,8 is not warranted by any indication in the purposely chosen form of representation. Others, such as Strauss, Zeller, de Wette, Ewald, have been induced by the direct literal tenor of the passage to assume a tradition deviating from Matthew, that Judas himself had actually purchased the field; although it is improbable in itself that Judas, on the days immediately following his treason, and under the pressure of its tragical event, should have made the purchase of a property, and should have chosen for this purchase the locality of Jerusalem, the arena of his shameful deed. — καὶ προμιθής γενόμενος, etc.) καὶ is the simple and, annexing to the infamous deed its bloody reward. By προμιθής γενόμενος κ. ἑλ. the death of Judas is represented as a violent fall,7 and bursting. The particular circumstances are presupposed as well known.

1 Comp. Acta viii. 21, xxxvi. 18; Wied. ii. 9, v. 6; Eclesia, xxv. 19.
3 Dem. 1806. 14; Plat. Vorg. p. 473 E.
4 Beza aptly remarks that the mode of expression affirms "non quid consatus sit Judas, sed consitorum iudicavit eventum."
6 Which cannot be rendered surprensus (Vulgate, Erasmus, Luther, Castalio).
7 προμιθής, headlong: the opposite ὑπνος, Rom. ii. xi. 179, xxiv. 11.
ADDRESS OF PETER

but are unknown to us. The usual mode of reconciliation with Matthew—that the rope, with which Judas hanged himself, broke, and that thus what is here related occurred—is an arbitrary attempt at harmonizing. Luke follows another tradition, of which it is not even certain whether it pointed to suicide (n). The twofold form of the tradition, and in Papias there occurs even a third, does not render a tragical violent end of Judas unhistorical in itself (Strauss, Zeller, and others), but only makes the manner of it uncertain. See, generally, on Matt. xxvii. 5.—ἐλάκησε] he cracked, burst in the midst of his body—a rhetorically strong expression of bursting with a noise.

Ver. 19. Not even these words are to be considered, with the above mentioned expositors, as an inserted remark of Luke, but as part of the speech of Peter. For all that they contain belongs essentially to the complete description of the curse of the action of Judas: ἐγένετο forms with ἐλάκησε and ἐξεφώθη, ver. 18, one continuously flowing representation, and γυμνῶν... ἢρων, is more suitable to rhetorical language than to that of simple narration. But τῷ ἰδίῳ ἰαλάκτω ἀϊτῶν and τοῦτ ἦσσι χαρ. αἰμ. are two explanations inserted by Luke, the distinction between which and Peter’s own words might be trusted to the reader; for it is self-evident (in opposition to Lange and older commentators) that Peter spoke not Greek but Aramaic. — γυμνῶν ἐγέν.] namely, what is stated in ver. 18.—ωτε] so that, in consequence of the acquisition of that field and of this bloody death of Judas becoming thus generally known. According to our passage, the name “field of blood” (Ἄμονι βυνῃ, comp. Matt. xxvii. 8) was occasioned by the fact that Judas, with whose wages of iniquity the field was acquired, perished in a manner so bloody—according to others, on the field itself (see on ver. 18). The passage in Matthew, l.c., gives another and more probable reason for the name. But it is by no means improbable that the name soon after the death of Judas became assigned, first of all, in popular use, to the field purchased for the public destination of being a χαμιν ἐνταφίου; hence Peter might even now quote this name in accordance with the design of his speech. — διάλεκτος] in the N. T. only in Acts, a mode of speaking, may express as well the more general idea of language, as the narrower one of dialect. In both senses it is often used by Polybius, Plutarch, etc. In the older Greek it is colloquium. In all the passages of Acts it is dialect, and that, excepting at ii. 6, 8, the Aramaic, although it has this meaning not in itself, but from its more precise definition by the context.

1 See on Matt. xxvii. 5, and comp. Introduct. sec. 1.
3 Also Schleierm. Ebl. p. 372.
5 Aeschin. l. 90; Matt. xxvii. 7.
6 Valckenaer well observes on the distinction between these two ideas: “Habent omnes dialecti aliquid inter se commune; habent enim omnes (saepe lingua matrem, sed dialectum efferunt, quod habent singulare peculliare sibi.” The Greeks also employ φως in both senses (see also Ciem. Al. Strom. l. 31, p. 401, Pott).
Ver. 20. Τῷ] The tragic end of Judas was his withdrawal from the apostolic office, by which a new choice was now necessary. But both that withdrawal and this necessity are, as already indicated in ver. 16, to be demonstrated not as something accidental, but as divinely ordained.—The first passage is Ps. lxix. 26, freely quoted from memory, and with an intentional change of the plural (LXX. αἵτων), because its historical fulfilment is represented καὶ ἔσοχήν in Judas. The second passage is Ps. cix. 8, verbatim after the LXX. Both passages contain curses against enemies of the theocracy, as the antitype of whom Judas here appears.—The εἰσαθήσεσθαι not that χωρίον which had become desolate by the death of Judas (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and others; also Strauss, Hufmann, de Wette, Schenckener, but it corresponds to the parallel ἐκσακοφη, and as the χωρίον is not to be considered as belonging to Judas (see on ver. 16), the meaning is: "Let his farm, i.e. in the antitypical fulfilment of the saying in the Psalm, the apostolic office of Judas, become desolate, forsaken by its possessor, and non-existent, i.e. let him be gone, who has his dwelling therein." — τήν εἰσακοφήν] the oversight,1 the superintendence which he had to exercise, πρὸς, in the sense of the πλήρωσις: the apostolic office. Comp. 1 Tim. iii. 1 (of the office of a bishop).

Vv. 21, 22. Οὖν] In consequence of these two prophecies, according to which the office of Judas had to be vacated, and its transference to another is necessary. — τοῦ συνειδότουν] dependent on τοι, ver. 22: one of the men who have gone along with us,2 who have taken part in our wanderings and journeys. Others: who have come together with us, assembled with us.3 So Vulgate, Beza, de Wette, but never so in the N. T. See on Mark xiv. 53. — τῆς παντικρατορίας ἡ πᾶσα τὸν χρόνον, ἐν ὧν. — εἰσαθήσεσθαι καὶ ἐξολθήσει εἰς] a current, but not a Greek, designation of constant intercourse. Deut. xxviii. 19; Ps. cxvi. 8; 1 Sam. xxix. 6; 3 Chron. i. 10. Comp. John x. 9; Acts ix. 28. — ἐν ἡμῖν] a brief expression for εἰσαθήσεσθαι. ἐν ἡμῖν. ἐν ἡμῖν. ἐν ἡμῖν.4 — ἀρτιόμι. Ιωάννου is a parenthesis, and εἰς τῆς ἡμερας is to be attached to εἰσαθήσεσθαι . . . ἡμῶν, as Luke xxiii. 5. See on Matt. xx. 8. — εἰς τ. ἡμ. ἡμῖν κ. τ. λ. ἡμῖν is not put by attraction for ἡμῖν, as the attraction of the dative, very rare even among the Greek writers,5 is without example in the N. T., but is the genitive of the definition of time.6 Hence also the expression having the preposition involved, ἐπὶ ἡμῖν ἡμερας, ver. 2, comp. xxiv. 11. — μάρτυρα τῆς ἀναστ. ἄντων] i.e. apostile, inasmuch as the apostles announce the resurrection of Jesus (1 Cor. xv.), the historical foundation of the gospel, as eye-witnesses, i.e. as persons who had themselves seen and conversed with the risen Jesus; comp. ii. 32, and see on ver. 8. — τοῦτων] is impressively removed to the end, pointing to those to be found among the persons present (of those there),

1 Lucian, D. D. xx. 8, frequently in the LXX. and Apocyr.
2 ix. 28, x. 23, al.; Hom. H. x. 234.
3 Soph. O. R. 572; Polyb. i. 78. 4.
4 See Valckenaer on the passage, and ad loc. Eccl. vii. 53; Winer, p. 580 (E. T. 790).
5 Comp. also John i. 51.
6 See Küchler, ad loc. Mem. iv. 2.
7 Matth. § 377; 2; Winer, p. 135 (E. T. 204). So, too, in Lev. xxiii. 15; Bar. i. 19. Comp. Tob. x. 1; Susann. 15 Hist. Bel and Drag. 3.
and emphatically comprehending them. —Thus Peter indicates, as a requisite of the new apostle, that he must have associated with the apostles (ἡμῖν) during the whole of the ministry of Jesus, from the time when John was still baptizing (ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτ. Ἰωάνν.) until the ascension. That in this requirement, as Heinrichs and Kuinoel suppose, Peter had in view one of the Seventy disciples, is an arbitrary assumption. But it is evident that for the choice the apostles laid the entire stress on the capacity of historical testimony (comp. x. 41), and justly so, in conformity with the positive contents of the faith which was to be preached, and as the element of the new divine life was to be diffused. On the special subject-matter of the testimony (τὸς ἀναστ. αὐτοῦ) Bengel correctly remarks: "qui illud credidere, totam fidem susceperet." How Peter himself testified, may be seen at 1 Pet. i. 3. Comp. Acts ii. 32, iii. 15, iv. 33, v. 32, x. 40.

Ver. 23. Ἐσπρων] The subject is, as in vv. 24, 26, all those assembled. They had recognised in these two the conditions required by v. 21 f. "Ideo hic demum sore incipit, quae res gravis divinæ decisioni committitur et immediata apostoli peragitur vocatio," Bengel. For this solemn act they are put forward. — Ἰωάνν. τ. καλ. Βαρομαζών] Concerning him nothing further is known. For he is not identical* with Joses Barnabas, iv. 36, against which opinion that very passage itself testifies; from it have arisen the name Ἰωάνν in B and Βαρνάβα in D (so Bornemann).* Barsabas is a patronymic (son of Saba); Justus is a Roman surname (בֶּר), adopted according to the custom then usual, see Schoettgen.—Nor is anything historically certain as to Matthias.*

Vv. 24, 25. Without doubt it was Peter, who prayed in the name of all present. The προσευχή, is contemporaneous with ἐπαν: praying they said. See on Eph. i. 9. — κύριε] (κ), ἄρμα. Comp. iv. 20. In opposition to the view of Bengel, Olshausen, and Baumgarten, that the prayer is directed to Jesus, —for which ἐπί ἐξελέξεως is appealed to, because Christ chooses His own messengers—xv. 7 is decisive, where the same Peter says expressly of God: ἐξελέξατο διὰ τοῦ στόρματος μοι ἀκούσας τὰ ἔθνη, etc., and then also calls God καρδιογνώστης (comp. Ἰησ. Ἰουλ. Jer. xvii. 10). By the decision of the lot the call to the apostleship was to take place, and the call is that of God, Gal. i. 15. God is addressed as καρδιογνωστ. because the object was to choose the intrinsically best qualified among the two, and this was a matter depending on the divine knowledge of the heart. The word itself is found neither in Greek writers nor in the LXX.—In λαβεῖν τῶν τόπων (see the critical notes) the ministry is considered as a place, as a post which the person concerned

* See also Mynster in the Stud. u. Krit. 1889, p. 396 f.
* Traditional notices in Cave, Antiq. ap. p. 735 f. According to Eus. i. 12. 1, he was one of the Seventy. Concerning the apocryphal Gospel under his name, already mentioned by Origen, see Fabric. Cod. apocr. N. T. p. 782 ff. Apocryphal Acta Andreæ et Matthias may be seen in Tischendorf, Act. apocr. p. 139 ff.
is to receive. Comp. Ecclus. xii. 12. — kal ἀποστολῆς] designates more definitely the previous διακονιας. There is thus here, among the many instances for the most part erroneously assumed, a real case of an ἐν διὰ διώκῃ.1— ᾧς ἦν παρίσης] away from which Judas has passed over, to go to his own place. A solemn circumstantiality of description. Judas is vividly depicted, as he, forsaking his apostleship (ἀφ’ ἦς), has passed from that position to go to his own place. Comp. Ecclus. xxiii. 18: παραδίδωσιν ἀπὸ τῆς κληρος αὐτοῦ. — πορευθ. εἰς τ. τόπ. τ. ἱδιων] denotes the end destined by God for the unworthy Judas as his own, to which he must come by his withdrawal from the apostolic office. But the meaning of ὁ τόπος ὁ ἰδιος (the expression is purposely chosen as correlative to τὸν τόπον τ. δικαι., etc.) is not to be decided from the linguistic use of τόπος, as τόπος may denote any place, but entirely from the context. And this requires us to understand it Gehenna, which is conceived as the place to which Judas, according to his individuality, belongs. As his treason was so frightful a crime, the hearers could be in no doubt as to the τόπος ἱδιος. This explanation is also required for the completeness and energy of the speech, and is itself confirmed by analogous rabbinical passages.8 Hence the explanations are to be rejected which refer τόπ. ἱδιος to the habitation of Judas,9 or to that γεροίνον, where he had perished,1 to or to the “societas, quam cum sacerdotibus ceterisque Jesu adversariis interaret” (Heinrichs). Others (Hammond, Homerberg, Heumann, Kypke, comp. already Occumenius) refer πορευθῆναι . . . ἱδιον even to the successor of Judas, so that the τόπ. ἱδιος would be the apostleship destined for him. But such a construction would be involved (πορευθ. would require again to be taken as an object of λαβεῖν), and after λαβεῖν . . . ἀποστολῆς tautological. The reading δικαιον, instead of ἱδιον, in A hits the correct meaning. The contrast appears in Clem. Cor. I. 5 as to Paul: εἰς τὸν ἱδιον τοῦτον ἵππων, and as to Peter: εἰς τὸν ψαλιδημον τὸν τῆς ὁμογ.8

Ver. 26. And they, namely, those assembled, gave for them (ἀνοίκτις, see the critical notes) lots — i.e. tablets, which were respectively inscribed with one of the two names of those proposed for election — namely into the vessel in which the lots were collected, Lev. xvi. 8. The expression ἵδωκαν is opposed to the idea of casting lots; comp. Luke xxiii. 34 and parallels. — ἐπέσεν ὁ κλῆρος [the lot, (φ) giving the decision by its falling out, fell by the shaking of the vessel.6 — τῇ Μαρσί. on Matthias, according to the figurative conception of the lot being shaken over both.7 — This decision by the θεία τοῦ τοι of the lot is an Old Testament practice,8 suitable for the time before the effusion of the Spirit, but not recurring afterwards, and therefore not to be justified in the Christian congregational life by our passage. — συνάσχεσθαι.

1 See Fritsche, ad Matth. p. 356; Nägelb. s. filos, p. 361, ed. 3.
2 See in Lightfoot, e.g. Baal Turtin, on Num. xxiv. 26: “Balaam livit in locum sumum, i.e. in Gebennam.”
3 Krauchen, Moldenhauer, Krahe, Bolten.
4 Eisner, Zeller, Lange, Baumgarten, and others.
5 Comp. Polyx. Phil. 9; Ignat. Magn. 5.
6 πάλλειν, comp. Hom. II. III. 316. 324, vili. 181, Od. xi. 906, al.
7 Hom. Od. xiv. 990; Ps. xxii. 19, al. Comp. LXX. Esekk. xxiv. 6; John i. 7.
8 Plat. Legg. vi. 729 C; comp. Prov. xvi. 33.
9 Num. xxvi. 52 ff.; Josch. vil. 14; 1 Sam. x. 20; 1 Chron. xxiv. 5, xxv. 8; Prov. xvi. 33; comp. also Luke i. 9.
NOTES.

mera τ. etd. αυ.] he was numbered along with the eleven apostles, so that, in consequence of that decision by lot, he was declared by those assembled to be the twelfth apostle. Bengel correctly adds the remark: "Non dicuntur manus novo apostolo impositae, erat enim prorsus immediate constitutus." It is otherwise at vi. 6. — The view which doubts the historical character of the supplementary election at all (see especially Zeller), and assumes that Matthias was only elected at a later period after the gradual consolidation of the church, rests on presuppositions (it is thought that the event of Pentecost must have found the number of the apostles complete) which break down in presence of the naturalness of the occurrence, and of the artless simplicity of its description.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(v) Name. V. 1.

The name of the book is traditional and ancient, but not apostolic or appropriate. The work is certainly not a record of the acts of the apostles, as it says little of any of them except Peter and Paul. The word "Acts" seems to be used in the sense of "Memoirs." Dr. Plumtre would call it Origines Ecclesiae. The record is authentic and reliable, but makes no claims to completeness. It is a history of beginnings only of the work of the church on earth, but a continuation of the work of Christ in her and for her.

(v) "Forty days." V. 8.

In this passage alone is the period between the resurrection and the ascension defined. Some assert that there is a discrepancy between the statement here given and the Gospel; they say according to the Gospel both events occurred on the same day. No such discrepancy really exists between the account which closes the Gospels and opens the Acts. The later account is more full and minute, and furnishes some incidents connected with the sublime event, and indicates the time when it occurred. Surely no candid reader of the Gospel narratives can for a moment suppose that all which is recorded of the life of our Lord on earth after his resurrection transpired in one day. Moreover, if he ascended on the same day he rose from the sepulchre, it must have been very late at night, which seems at variance with the entire record. Our author supposes an interval between the two grand events, but suggests that during that interval, or rather from the time between the writing of the two treatises by Luke, a period probably of not more than five years, a tradition "was formed, or at least acquired currency, concerning the forty days and other incidents of the ascension." See his Commentary on Luke xxiv. 50-5; and on Acts i. 3 and 9.

1 συγκαταθηκέσθαι. In this sense, thus equivalent to συγκαταζηκέσθαι (xix. 19), is not elsewhere found; D actually has συγκατακληθηκέσθαι as the result of a correct explanation. The word is, altogether, very rare; in Plut. Them. 21 it signifies to condemn with. Frequently, and quite in the sense of συγκαταθηκέσθαι, συγκαταθηκέσθαι is found. P only καταθηκέσθαι. So also Constitt. ap. vi. 12. 1.
But no such supposed "more developed tradition" is required to harmonize the record, or to vindicate the veracity of the historian. The later account does not contradict, but only supplements the earlier.

"Luke alone, in his Gospel and in the Acts, has given us a detailed view of the scene, which is indicated by Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 7, and assumed throughout the whole N. T. Interpreters like Meyer think themselves obliged to limit the ascension of Jesus to a purely spiritual elevation, and to admit no external visible in which this elevation was manifested."

"The reality of such a fact as that related by Luke in his account of the ascension is indubitable, both from the standpoint of faith in the resurrection, and from the standpoint of faith in general. The ascension is a postulate of faith." (Godet.)

The ascension was a necessary consequence of the resurrection; it was predicted in the O. T.; it was prefigured by the translation of Enoch and of Elijah; it is recorded by two evangelists; it is presupposed in the Gospel of John; it is referred to as a fact and a foundation for doctrine in the Epistles; Stephen, Paul, and John saw him in his ascended state; so that the visible personal ascension of our Lord from the slope of Olivet into heaven is a doctrine most surely believed and rejoiced in.

(a) "His brethren." V. 14.

The four brothers-german of our Lord, James, Joses, Simon, and Judas: these have generally been supposed to be the sons of Mary, the sister of the mother of Jesus, and therefore only his cousins. For this supposition we find no authority in Scripture. James, the son of Alpheus, one of the twelve, is clearly a different person from "James, the Lord's brother." Three Jameses are mentioned in the Gospels—James, the son of Zebedee, brother of John, one of the twelve;—James, the son of Alpheus, brother of Judas, one of the twelve;—and James, the son of Joseph, brother of our Lord, but not one of the twelve. The story of the immaculate conception and perpetual virginity of Mary has not the slightest foundation in the Bible, and the common and natural meaning of the terms used in Matt. xiii. 55, 56, Mark vi. 3, Gal i. 19, and Ps. lxix. 8, implies that his brothers were the sons of his mother. That those called his brethren were different persons from the son of Alpheus and his brothers is manifest, because after the twelve were chosen and named by Jesus, "his brethren" did not believe in him. In this passage they are mentioned as distinct from, and not of the eleven apostles. An interesting and satisfactory discussion of this question may be found in a small volume, by Rev. Chauncey W. Fitzh, D.D.

(b) Fate of Judas. V. 18.

There is a difference but no contradiction in the accounts given by Matthew and Luke. Matthew does not say what happened to the body of Judas after he hanged himself; nor does Luke say what he did to himself ere he fell headlong and burst asunder in the midst. We have not the link to connect the act of suicide with what befell his body; but the two facts are in no sense at variance.

"Matthew traces the traitor's fall through all its human stages of remorse
to his own self-inflicted penalty. Luke (Peter) portrays not the act of Judas in the frenzy of desperation, but the act of God in righteous retribution."

"The two accounts are (not as Meyer the result of different traditions, but) companion pictures by inspired artists equally and perfectly informed. Whereof, in strict suitability to their several designs, one reveals the human side of the tragedy, and the other the divine."

"Matthew wrote as a historian for a wide circle of readers, many of whom had no previous knowledge of the case; he therefore states the main fact, and, according to his custom, passes over the minute details. Peter orally addressing those who knew the facts as fully as himself, and less than six weeks after their occurrence, and upon the very spot, assumes the main fact as already known, and naturally dwells upon those very circumstances which the Evangelist many years later no less wisely and naturally leaves out altogether. However this may seem to others, there is scarcely an American or English jury that would scruple to receive these two accounts as perfectly consistent."

(Alexander.

(1) "'Thou, Lord.'" V. 24.

Whether this prayer was addressed to Christ or to God the Father has been disputed. We agree with those who consider Christ as here addressed. The word Κύριος, when used absolutely in the N. T., generally refers to Christ;—Jesus is called Κύριος in verse 21;—all the other apostles were selected by him, as was afterwards Paul. The first Christians were in the habit of praying to Christ. Peter on a former occasion in addressing Jesus said, "Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee."

(2) "'The lot.'" V. 26.

Under the Theocracy the lot was used for various purposes; for the division of the land—for decision in certain criminal cases—for the selection of troops in military enterprises—and for the appointment to important offices. The only instance under the new dispensation is this case of Matthias. The Roman soldiers gambling at the cross for the robe of Jesus is an illustration of the practice, but no sanction for it. From the sanction of O. T. and this example of the apostles many argue in favor of the admissibility of the practice. Calvin, in his Com. on this text, says: "Those men who think it to be wickedness to cast lots at all, offend partly through ignorance, and partly they understand not the force of this word. There is nothing which men do not corrupt with their boldness and vanities, whereby it has come to pass that they have brought lots into great abuse and superstition. For that divination or conjecture which is made by lots is altogether devilish." Though the custom has been corrupted and depraved, he holds it to be lawful and Christian. Others have called in question the propriety of this election of Matthias, and argue with no little plausibility that Matthias was not the divinely appointed successor of Judas, but Paul, who was soon after specially chosen and commissioned by Christ himself to the apostleship. But Matthias was reckoned one of the twelve (Acts vi. 2). Inasmuch as we have no instance of casting lots after the Spirit was given to the church, the practice now, in our judgment, is more than questionable.
CHAPTER II.

Ven. 1. ἁπαντεὶς ὁμοθυμαδὸν] Lachm. and Tisch. read πάντες ὁμοι, after A B C* Ν, min. Vulg. Correctly: the ὁμοθυμαδὸν, so very frequent in the Acts, unintentionally supplanted the ὁμοι found elsewhere in the N. T. only in John; πάντες, which is wanting in Ν*, critically goes along with the reading ὁμοι. — Ver. 2. καθήμενοι] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read καθεύθυνοι, according to C D. The Recepta (comp. on xx. 9) is more usual in the N. T., and was accordingly inserted. — Ver. 3. ὁσι] is wanting only in Ν*. — εἰκάσθησαν] Born., following D* Ν*, Syr. utr. Arr. Copt. Ath. Did. Cyr., reads εἰκάθισαν. A correction occasioned by γλώσσαν. — Ver. 7. After εἰς σταυρὸς δὲ Elz. has πάντες, which Lachm. Scholz, Tisch. Born. have erased, following B D, min. and several vs. and Fathers. From ver. 12.— πρὸς ἀλλήλους] is wanting in A B C Ν, 26, Copt. Sahid. Aeth. Vulg. Theodoret. Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. It was, as self-evident, easily passed over. Its genuineness is supported by the reading πρὸς ἀλλήλους, ver. 12, instead of ἀλλος πρὸς ἄλλον, which is found in 4, 14, 16., Aeth. Vulg. Chrys. Theophyl., and has manifestly arisen from this passage. — Ver. 12. τι ἢν θέλων τοῦτο εἶναι] Lachm. Born. read τι θέλει τοῦτο εἶναι, following A B C D, min. Chrys.: A has θέλει after τοῦτο. But after λέγειν the direct expression was most familiar to the transcribers (comp. ver. 7.). — Ver. 13. διακληρόν] Elz. reads χληρώνετες, against preponderating testimony. — Ver. 16. ἱστη] Tisch. and Born. have deleted this word on too weak authority; it is wanting among the cods. only in D. — Ver. 17. εἰπτιοῖς] Elz. reads εἰπτιοῖ, against decisive cods. From LXX. Joel iii. 1. — Ver. 22. αὐτοῖ] Elz. reads καὶ αὐτοῖ. But Lachm. and Tisch. have correctly deleted καὶ, in accordance with A B C* D E Ν, min. and several vs. and Fathers. καὶ, both after καθὼς and before αὐτοῖ, was very familiar to the transcribers. — Ver. 23. After ἐκδόσαν Elz. and Scholz read λαβόντες, which is wanting in A B C Ν*, min. and several vs. and Fathers. An addition to develop the construction. — Instead of χειρῶν, Lachm. Tisch. Born. have χειρᾶς, following A B C D Ν, min. Syr. p. Aeth. Ath. Cyr. And justly, as χειρῶν was evidently inserted for the sake of the following ἀνόμων. — Ver. 24. ὁμώμοιοι] D, Syr. Erp. Copt. Vulg. and several Fathers read ὁμώμοιοι. So Born. From vv. 27, 31. — Ver. 27. ἄμειν] Lachm. Born. and Tisch. read ἄμειν, which was already recommended by Griesb., in accordance with A B C D Ν, min. Clem. Epiph. Theophyl. As in the LXX. Ps. xvi. 10, the reading is also different, A having ἄμειν and B ἄμειν: the text here is to be decided merely by the preponderance of testimonies, which favours ἄμειν. — Ver. 30. Before καθήμενα, Elz. Scholz. Born. read τὸ κατὰ σύρκα ἀναστήσειν τῶν Χριστῶν, which is wanting in A B C D* Ν, min. and most vs. and several Fathers, has in other witnesses considerable variation, and, as already Mill correctly saw, is a marginal gloss inserted in the text. — Instead of τοῦ θρόνον, Lachm. Born. Tisch. read τῶν θρόνων, according to A B C D Ν, min. Eus. This important authority, as well as the circumstance that ἑνὶ with the genitive along with καθήμενα is very usual in the N. T. (comp. Luke xxii. 20; Acts xii. 21, xxv. 6, 17; Matt. xix. 28, xxiii. 2,
xxv. 31), decides for the accusative. — Ver. 31. κατελείφθη] A B C D E Φ, min. and several Fathers read ἐγκατελείφθη. Recommended by Grieseb., and adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. From ver. 27. Therefore not only is δόνῃ (instead of δόνου) read by Tisch., but also after κατελείφθη there is read by Elz. ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ, for the omission of which the authorities decide. — οὕτω...οὕτε is according to important testimony to be received, with Lachm. Tisch. Born., instead of οὕτω...οὕτε, as the reading given in the text appears likewise to have been formed from ver. 27. — Ver. 33. οὐείσι] Elz. Scholz have νῦν οὐείσι. But, according to A B C D Φ, min. and many vss. and Fathers, Lachm. Born. Tisch. have erased νῦν, which is an addition by way of gloss. — Ver. 37. ποιήσωμεν is found in A C E Φ, min. Fathers. But the deliberative subjunctive was the more usual. Comp. on iv. 16. — Ver. 38. ἐφη] is, with Lachm. and Tisch., to be erased, as it is entirely wanting in B min. Vulg. ms. Aug., and other witnesses read φοιν, which they have partly after μετανοήσα. (A C Φ, 15, al.), partly αὐτοῦ (D). A supplementary addition. — Ver. 40. διεμαρτήρατο] Elz. Scholz read διεμαρτύρησα, against decisive testimony. A form modelled after the following imperfect. — Ver. 41. After νῦν, Elz. Scholz read ἠμένως, which Lachm. and Tisch. have deleted, in accordance with far preponderating testimony. A strengthening addition. — Ver. 42. καὶ before τῷ κλάσει is rejected by decisive testimony (erased by Lachm. Tisch. Born.). — Ver. 43. ἐγένετο] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read ἐγένετο, according to A B C D Φ, min. Vulg. Copt. Syr. utr. This considerable attestation prevents us from assuming a formation resembling what follows; on the contrary, ἐγένετο has been inserted as the more usual form. — Ver. 47. τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ] is wanting in A B C Φ, Copt. Sahid. Aeth. Arm. Vulg. Cyr. Deleted by Lachm., after Mill and Bengel. It was omitted for the sake of conformity to ver. 41, because ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ, iii. 1, was considered as still belonging to ii. 47, and therefore iii. 1 began with Περὶ τῶν δὲ (so Lachm.).

Ver. 1. When the day of Pentecost became full, i.e., when the day of Pentecost had come, on the day of Pentecost. 1 The day is, according to the Hebrew mode, 2 conceived as a measure to be filled up; 3 so long as the day had not yet arrived, but still belonged to the future, the measure was not yet filled, but empty. But as soon as it appeared, the fulfilment, the making the day full, the συμπλήρωσις 4 therewith occurred; by which, without figure, is meant the realization of the day which had not hitherto become a reality. The expression itself, which concerns the definite individual day, is at variance with the view of Olshausen and Baumgarten, who would have the time from Easter to be regarded as becoming full. Quite without warrant. Hitzig 5 would place the occurrence not at Pentecost at all. See, in opposition to this, Schneckenb. p. 198 f. — ἡ πεντηκοστή] is indeed originally to be referred to the ημέρα understood; but this supplementary noun had entirely fallen into disuse, and the word had become quite an independent substantive. 6 πεντηκοστή also occurs in Tob. ii. 1, quite apart from its nu-

---

1 Concerning the Pentecostal occurrence, see van Hengel, de gave der talen, P watcher-studie, Leid. 1864.

2 See Gewes. Thees. s.v. Χειρ.

3 Comp. also ix. 23; Luke ii. 6, xxii. 9, 51,
and many similar passages in the N. T. and in the Apocrypha.

4 Comp. 3 Ech. 1. 58; Dan. ix. 2.

5 Ostern und Pfingst, p. 50 f.

6 Comp. 3 Macc. xii. 82.
moral signification, and ἐν τῷ πεντηκοστῇ ἁπτῷ is there: on the Pentecost-feast. The feast of Pentecost, Ἠμέρα πεντηκοστῆς, Deut. xvi. 9, 10 (ἅγια ἐνταῦθα εἰςδύομένων, Tob. l.c.), was one of the three great festivals, appointed as the feast of the grain-harvest (Ex. xxiii. 16; Num. xxviii. 26), and subsequently, although we find no mention of this in Philo and Josephus, regarded also as the celebration of the giving of the law from Sinai, falling (Ex. xix. 1) in the third month. It was restricted to one day, and celebrated on the fiftieth day after the first day of the Passover (Lev. xxiii. 15, 16); so that the second paschal day, i.e. the 16th of Nisan, the day of the sheaf offering, is to be reckoned as the first of these fifty days. Now, as in that year the Passover occurred on the evening of Friday (see on John xviii. 28), and consequently this Friday, the day of the death of Jesus, was the 14th of Nisan, Saturday the 15th, and Sunday the 16th, the tradition of the ancient church has very correctly placed the first Christian Pentecost on the Sunday. Therefore the custom—which, besides, cannot be shown to have existed at the time of Jesus—of the Karaites, who explained נָעַשׁ in Lev. xxiii. 15 not of the first day of the Passover, but of the Sabbath occurring in the paschal week, and thus held Pentecost always on a Sunday, is to be left entirely out of consideration (in opposition to Hitzig); and it is not to be assumed that the disciples might have celebrated with the Karaites both Passover and Pentecost. But still the question arises: Whether Luke himself conceived of that first Christian Pentecost as a Saturday or a Sunday? As he, following with Matthew and Mark the Galilean tradition, makes the Passover occur already on Thursday evening, and be partaken of by Jesus Himself, and accordingly makes the Friday of the crucifixion the 15th of Nisan; so he must necessarily—but just as erroneously—have conceived of this first πεντηκοστή as a Saturday, unless we should assume that he may have had no other conception of the day of Pentecost than that which was in conformity with the Christian custom of the Sunday celebration of Pentecost; which, indeed, does not correspond with his account of the day of Jesus' death as the 15th Nisan, but shows the correctness of the Johannine tradition. — ἦσαν πάντες ὅπως ἐνὶ τῷ αἰῶνα) Concerning the text, see the critical remarks; concerning ἐνὶ τῷ αἰῶνα, see on i. 15. These πάντες, all, were not merely the apostles, but all the followers of Jesus then in Jerusalem, partly natives and partly strangers, including the apostles. For, first of all, it may certainly be presumed that on the day of Pentecost, and, moreover, at the hour of prayer (ver. 15), not the apostles alone, but with them also the other μαθηταί—among whom there were, without doubt, many foreign pilgrims to the feast—were assembled. Moreover, in ver. 14 the apostles are distinguished from the rest. Further, the πάντες,

1 See Fritzschene in loc.
5 In opposition to the view of Hupfeld, de primitiva et vera festorum ap. Hebr. ratisone, Hal. 1852, who will have the fifty days reckoned from the last paschal day; see Ewald, Jahrb. IV. p. 194 f.
6 Ideler, II. p. 613; Wieseler, Synop. p. 849.
7 See also Valhinger in Herzog's Enzykl. XI. p. 476 f.
designedly added, by no means corresponds to the small number of the apostles (i. 26), especially as in the narrative immediately preceding mention was made of a much greater assembly (i. 15); it is, on the contrary, designed—because otherwise it would have been superfluous—to indicate a still greater completeness of the assembly, and therefore it may not be limited even to the 120 persons alone. Lastly, it is clear also from the prophetic saying of Joel, adduced in ver. 18 ff., that the effusion of the Spirit was not on the apostles merely, but on all the new people of God, so that ἀναρέσ (ver. 1) must be understood of all the followers of Jesus—of course, according to the latitude of the popular manner of expression.

Ver. 2 describes what preceded the effusion of the Spirit as an audible συνεπών—a sound occurring unexpectedly from heaven as of a violent wind borne along.¹ The wonderful sound is, by the comparison (ὁπερὶ) with a violent wind, intended to be brought home to the conception of the reader, but not to be represented as an actual storm of wind (Eichhorn, Heinrichs), or gust (Ewald), or other natural phenomenon.²—οἴκος] is not arbitrarily and against N. T. usage to be limited to the room (Valckenaer), but is to be understood of a private house, and, indeed, most probably of the same house, which is already known from i. 18, 15 as the meeting-place of the disciples of Jesus. Whether it was the very house in which Jesus partook of the last supper (Mark xiv. 12 ff.), as Ewald conjectures, cannot be determined. If Luke had meant the temple, as, after the older commentators, Morus, Heinrichs, Olshausen, Baumgarten, also Wieseler, p. 18, and Lange, Apost. Zeitalt. II. p. 14, assume, he must have named it; the reader could not have guessed it. For (1) it is by no means necessary that we should think of the assembly on the first day of Pentecost and at the time of prayer just as in the temple. On the contrary, ver. 1 describes the circle of those met together as closed and in a manner separatist; hence a place in the temple could neither be wished for by them nor granted to them. Nor is the opinion, that it was the temple, to be established from Luke xxiv. 53, where the mode of expression is popular. (2) The supposition that they were assembled in the temple is not required by the great multitude of those that flocked together, ver. 6. The private house may have been in the neighbourhood of the temple; but not even this supposition is necessary, considering the miraculous character of the occurrence. (3) It is true that, according to Joseph. Ann. viii. 3. 2, the principal building of the temple had thirty halls built around it, which he calls οἴκος; but could Luke suppose Theophilus possessed of this special knowledge? "But," it is said, (4) "the solemn inauguration of the church of Christ then presents itself with imposing effect in the sanctuary of the old covenant," Olshausen; "the new spiritual temple must have . . . proceeded from the envelope of the old temple," Lange. But this locality would need first to be proved! If this inauguration did not take place in

¹ Comp. μετὰ βίαν, Arriam. Exp. Al. II. 6. 3; Pansan. x. 17. 11.
the temple, with the same warrant there might be seen in this an equally imposing indication of the entire severance of the new theocracy from the old. Yet Luke has indicated neither the one nor the other idea, and it is not till ii. 44 that the visit to the temple emerges in his narrative.—Kaiser \textsuperscript{1} infers from ἥσαν . . . ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, ver. 1, as well as from ὁκος, καθήμενοι, ὅμοιόυσιν, ver 15, etc., that this Christian private assembly, at the first feast of Pentecost, had for its object the celebration of the Ἀγαπαί. An interpretation arbitrarily put into the words. The sacredness of the festival was in itself a sufficient reason for their assembling, especially considering the deeply excited state of feeling in which they were, and the promise which was given to the apostles for so near a realization. —οὗ ἥσαν καὶ ἐκτὸς

Ver. 3. After the audible οὐκείοι immediately follows the visible. Incorrectly Luther: "there were seen on them the tongues divided as if they were of fire." The words mean: There appeared to them, i.e. there were seen by them, tongues becoming distributed, fire-like, i.e. tongues which appeared like little flames of fire, and were distributed (ii. 45; Luke xxii. 17, xxiii. 34) upon those present; see the following ἕξιας κ.τ.λ. They were thus appearances of tongues, which were luminous, but did not burn: not really consisting of fire, but only ὡσιν πυρός; and not confluent into one, but distributing themselves severally on the assembled. As only similar to fire, they bore an analogy to electric phenomena; their tongue-shape referred as a οὐκείοι to that miraculous λαλεῖν which ensued immediately after, and the fire-like form to the divine presence (comp. Ex. iii. 2), which was here operative in a manner so entirely peculiar. The whole phenomenon is to be understood as a miraculous operation of God manifesting Himself in the Spirit, by which, as by the preceding sound from heaven, the effusion of the Spirit was made known as δικίος, and His efficacy on the minds of those who were to receive Him was enhanced. A more special physiological definition of the οὐκείοι, vv. 2, 3, is impossible. Lange,\textsuperscript{4} fancifully supposes that the noise of the wind was a streaming of the heavenly powers from above, audible to the opened visionary sense, and that the tongues of fire were a disengaging of the solar fire-power of the earth and its atmosphere (?). The attempts, also, to convert this appearance of fire-like tongues into an accidental electric natural occurrence (Paulus, Thiess, and others) are in vain; for these flames, which make their appearance, during an accumulation of electric matter, on towers, masts, and even on men, present far too weak resemblances; and besides, the room of a house, where the phenomenon exclusively occurred, was altogether unsuited for any such natural development. The representation of the text is monstrously altered by Heinrichs: Fulgura cellam were pervadebant, sed in

\textsuperscript{1} Commentat. 1830, pp. 3-23; comp. bibi. Thoel. II. p. 41.

\textsuperscript{2} Comp. Augustl, Denkwürdigkeiten aus der christl. Arch. IV. p. 124.

\textsuperscript{3} Therefore the expression is not to be explained from Isa. v. 24, for there an example of that which consumes.

\textsuperscript{4} Apost. Zeitalt. II. p. 19.
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inuisitas imaginea effixit apostolorum commotamen; as also by Heu-
mann: that they believed that they saw the fiery tongues merely in the
ecstatic state; and not less so by Eichhorn, who says that “they saw flames”
signifies in rabbinical usus loquendi: they were transported into ecstatic
excitement. The passages adduced by Eichhorn from Schoettgen contain
no merely figurative modes of expression, but fancies of the later Rabbins
to be understood literally in imitation of the phenomena at Sinai,—of
which phenomena, we may add, a real historical analogue is to be
recognised in our passage. — ἐκδίκαιο τῇ] namely, not an indefinite subject,
something, 1 but such a γλῶσσα ὕσει πυρός. If Luke had written ἐκδίκαιον (see
the critical remarks), the notion that one γλῶσσα sat upon each would not
have been definitely expressed. 2 Oecumenius, Bezæ, Castalio, Schoettgen,
Kuinöel, incorrectly take πῦρ as the subject, since, in fact, there was no
fire at all, but only something resembling fire; ὕσει πυρός serves only for
comparison, and consequently πῦρ cannot be the subject of the continued
narrative. Others, as Chrysostom, Theophylact, Luther, Calvin, Wolf,
Bengel, Heinrichs et al., consider the πνεῦμα ἄγιον as subject. In that case
it would have to be interpreted, with Fritzsche, Conject. I. p. 18: καθισαντὸς ἵπτε ἐνα ἐκαστον αὐτῶν ἐπλησθήσαν ἄπαντες πνεῦματος ἄγιον, and Matt. xvii. 18
would be similar. Very harsh, seeing that the πνεῦμα ἄγιον, in so far as it
sat on the assembled, would appear as identical with its symbol, the fiery
tongues; but in so far as it filled the assembled, as the πνεῦμα itself, differ-
ent from the symbol.—The τῇ joining on to the preceding (Lachm. reads καὶ,
following insufficient testimony) connects ἐκδίκαιος κ.τ.λ. with ὄφθαλμον κ.τ.λ.
into an unity, so that the description divides itself into the three acts:
ὄφθαλμος κ.τ.λ., ἐπλησθήσαν, κ.τ.λ., and ἥραντο κ.τ.λ., as is marked by the thrice
recurring καὶ.

Ver. 4. After this external phenomenon, there now ensued the internal
filling of all who were assembled, 3 without exception (ἐπλ. ἄπαντες, comp.
ver. 1), with the Holy Spirit, of which the immediate result was, that they,
and, indeed, these same ἄπαντες (comp. iv. 31)—accordingly not excluding
the apostles (in opposition to van Hengel)—polator λαλεῖν ἐτέρας γλώσσαις.
Earlier cases of being filled with the Spirit 4 are related to the present as
the momentary, partial, and typical, to the permanent, complete, and anti-
typical, such as could only occur after the glorifying of Jesus; see ver. 38 ;
John xvi. 7, vii. 39. — ἥραντο] brings into prominence the primum impetus
of the act as its most remarkable element. — λαλεῖν ἐτέρας γλώσσαις] For the
sure determination of what Luke meant by this, it is decisive that ἐτέρας
γλώσσαις on the part of the speakers was, in point of fact, the same thing
which the congregated Parthians, Medes, Elamites, etc., designated as
ταῖς ἑμετέραις γλώσσαις (comp. ver. 8: τῇ ἵδε διαλεκτῷ ἰμῶν). The ἐτέραι
γλώσσαι (κ) therefore are, according to the text, to be considered as abso-
lutely nothing else than languages, which were different from the native

2 Comp. Winer, p. 481 (E. T. 648).
3 Chrysostom well remarks: oϊς ἄν εἰσέ
πάντες, καὶ ἀποστόλων ὅσιν ἐκεῖ, εἰ μὴ καὶ εἰ ἄλλοι μετέχοντο. See also van Hengel, p. 54 ff.
4 Luke i. 41, 47; John xx. 22; comp. also
Luko ix. 55.
language of the speakers. They, the Galileans, spoke, one Parthian, another Median, etc., consequently languages of another sort, i.e., foreign, 1 Cor. xiv. 21; and these indeed—the point wherein precisely appeared the miraculous operation of the Spirit—not acquired by study (γλώσσας καυσίς, Mark xvi. 17). Accordingly the text itself determines the meaning of γλώσσας as languages, not tongues, as van Hengel again assumes on the basis of ver. 3, where, however, the tongues have only the symbolic destination of a divine ομηρων; and thereby excludes the various other explanations, and in particular those which start from the meaning vox obsoleta et poetica. This remark holds good (1) of the interpretation of Herder, that new modes of interpreting the ancient prophets were meant; (3) against Heinrichs, who founds on that assumed meaning of γλώσσας his explanation of enthusiastic speaking in languages which were foreign indeed, different from the sacred language, but were the native languages of the speakers; (8) against Bleek. The latter explains γλώσσας as glosses, i.e., unusual, antiquated poetical and provincial expressions. According to him, we are not to think of a connected speaking in foreign languages, but of a speaking in expressions which were foreign to the language of common life, and in which there was an approximation to a highly poetical phraseology, yet so that these glosses were borrowed from different dialects and languages (therefore τρίπασ). Against this explanation of the γλώσσας, which is supported by Bleek with much erudition, the usus loquendi is already decisive. For γλώσσας in that sense is a grammaticotechnical expression, or at least an expression borrowed from grammarians, which is only as such philologically beyond dispute. But this meaning is entirely unknown to ordinary linguistic usage, and particularly to that of the O. and N. T. How should Luke have hit upon the use of such a singular expression for a thing, which he could easily designate by words universally intelligible? How could he put this expression even into the mouths of the Parthians, Medes, Elamites, etc.? For ημετέρας γλώσσας, ver. 11, must be explained in a manner entirely corresponding to this. Further, there would result for ημετέρας a wholly absurd meaning. ημετέρας γλώσσας, forsooth, would be nothing else than glosses, obsolete expressions, which are peculiar only to the Parthians, or to the Medes, or to the Elamites, etc., just as the 'Αρτακι γλώσσας of Theodorus are provincialisms of Attica, which were not current among the rest of the Greeks. Finally, it is further decisive against Bleek that, according to his explanation of γλώσσας

1 Luke ix. 39; Mark xvi. 13; Gal. i. 8.
2 Van Hengel understands, according to ver. 3, by τρίπασ γλ., "tongues of fire, which the believers in Jesus have obtained through their communion with the Holy Spirit." That is, "an open-hearted and loud speaking to the glorifying of God in Christ," such as had not been done before. Previously their tongues had been without fire.
3 Galen, esp. glossar. Hippocr. Proem. Aristot. Ars post. 21. 4 ff., 22. 3 f.; Quinetii. i. 8; Pollux. ii. 4; Plut. Pyth. orac. 24; and see Giese, Acc. Dialec. p. 43 ff.
4 Von d. Gabe der Sprachen am ersten christl. Pfingst., Riga, 1794.
5 After A. G. Meyer, de charismate τῶν γλωσσῶν, etc., Hannov. 1797.
7 See all the passages in Bleek, p. 38 ff., and already in A. G. Meyer, i.e.; Fritzche, ad Marc. p. 741.
8 In Athen. xiv. p. 540 c, p. 1457, ed. Dindorf.
transferred also to 1 Cor. xii. 14, no sense is left for the singular term γλώσσα λαλείν; for γλώσσα could not denote genus locutionis glossematicum, but simply a single gloss. As Bleek's explanation falls to the ground, so must every other which takes γλώσσαι in any other sense than languages, which it must mean according to vv. 6, 8, 11. This remark holds particularly (4) against the understanding of the matter by van Hengel, according to whom the assembled followers of Jesus spoke with other tongues than those with which they formerly spoke, namely, in the excitement of a fiery inspiration, but still all of them in Aramaic, so that each of those who came together heard the language of his own ancestral worship from the mouth of these Galileans, ver. 6.

From what has been already said, and at the same time from the express contrast in which the list of nations (vv. 9–11) stands with the question ὡς ἰδοὺ πάντες . . . Γαλιλαῖοι (ver. 7), it results beyond all doubt that Luke intended to narrate nothing else than this: the persons possessed by the Spirit began to speak in languages which were foreign to their nationality instead of their mother-tongue, namely, in the languages of other nations, the knowledge and use of which were previously wanting to them, and were only now communicated in and with the νεωτέρα ἀγνωσία. The author of Mark xvi. 17 has correctly understood the expression of Luke, when, in reference to our narrative, he wrote καινοί fivea instead of τρίταις. The explanation of foreign languages has been since the days of Origen that of most of the Church Fathers and expositors; but the monstrous extension of this view formerly prevalent, to the effect that the inspired received the gift of speaking all the languages of the earth, and that for the purpose of enabling them to proclaim the gospel to all nations, is unwarranted. “Poena linguarum dispersit homines: donum linguarum dispersos in unum populum collegit,” Grotius. Of this the text knows nothing; it leaves it, on the contrary, entirely undetermined whether, over and above the languages specially mentioned in vv. 9–11, any others were spoken. For the preaching of the gospel in the apostolic age this alleged gift of languages was partly unnecessary, as the preachers needed only to be able to speak Hebrew and Greek, and partly too general, as among the assembled there were certainly very many who did not enter upon the vocation of teacher. And, on the other hand, such a gift would also have been premature, since Paul, the apostle of the Gentiles, would, above all, have needed it; and yet in his case there is no trace of its subsequent reception, just as there is no evidence of his having preached in any other language than Hebrew and Greek (κ).

But how is the occurrence to be judged of historically? On this the

1 λέγει γλωσσηματική, Dionys. Hal. de Thuc. 34.
2 Comp., besides 1 Cor. xiv. 21, Eccl. præf.: ἕτερα ἔντερα γλώσσαν (Lec. Tact. 4. 49: γλώσσαι διαφόροι λαλεῖν); also Aesch. Sept. 171: κάλλιν δορίσων μὴ προβανθήην εἰνοφόρον στρατη. Not different is Pind. Pyth. x. 43: ἀλλ' ἰττίδεις γλώσσαν.
4 Augustin.: “cooperunt loquul linguis omnium gentium.”
following points are to be observed: (1) Since the sudden communication of a facility of speaking foreign languages is neither logically possible nor psychologically and morally conceivable, and since in the case of the apostles not the slightest indication of it is perceptible in their letters or otherwise (comp., on the contrary, xiv. 11); since further, if it is to be assumed as having been only momentary, the impossibility is even increased, and since Peter himself in his address makes not even the slightest allusion to the foreign languages—the event, as Luke narrates it, cannot be presented in the actual form of its historical occurrence, whether we regard that Pentecostal assembly (without any indication to that effect in the text) as a representation of the entire future Christian body (Baumgarten) or not. (2) The analogy of magnetism, is entirely foreign to the point, especially as those possessed by the Spirit were already speaking in foreign languages, when the Parthians, Medes, etc., came up, so that anything corresponding to the magnetic "rapport" is not conceivable. (3) If the event is alleged to have taken place, as it is narrated, with a view to the representation of an idea, and that, indeed, only at the time and without leaving behind a permanent facility of speaking languages, "in order to represent and to attest, in germ and symbol, the future gathering of the elect out of all nations, the consecration of their languages in the church, and again the holiness of the church in the use of these profane idioms, as also of what is natural generally," such a view is nothing else than a gratuitously-imported subjective abstraction of fancy, which leaves the point of the impossibility and the non-historical character of the occurrence entirely unsettled, although it arbitrarily falls back upon the Babylonian confusion of tongues as its corresponding historical type. This remark also applies against Lange, according to whose fanciful notion the original language of the inner life by which men's minds are united has here reached its fairest manifestation. This Pentecostal language, he holds, still pervades the church as the language of the inmost life in God, as the language of the Bible, glorified by the gospel, and as the leaven of all languages, which effects their regeneration into the language of the Spirit. (4) Nevertheless, the state of the fact can in nowise be reduced to a speaking of the persons assembled in their mother-tongues, so that the speakers would have been no native Galileans; along with which David Schulz explains ἐρχών γλώσσαι even of other kinds of singing praise, which found utterance in the provincial dialects contrary to their custom and ability at other times. Thus the very essence of the narrative, the miraculous nature of the phenomenon, is swept away, and there is not even left matter of surprise fitted to give sufficient

1 Adduced especially by Olshausen, and by Baumelein in the Wirtemb. Stud. VI. 5, p. 118.
2 Comp. Augustine, serm. 9: Loquebatur enim tunc unus homo omnibus linguis, quia locutura erat unitas ecclesiae in omnibus linguis.
3 Roscucuscher, Gabe der Sprachen, Marb. 1850, p. 97.
4 Apost. Zeitalt. II. p. 22 ff.
5 Paulus, Eichborn, Schulthess, de charismatib. op. s., Lips. 1818, Kuinnoel, Heirichs, Fritzche, Schrader, and others.
6 d. Geleistgaben d. ersten Christen, Breslau, 1886.
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occasion for the astonishment and its expressions, if we do not, with Thiess, resort even to the hypothesis that the speakers had only used the Aramaic dialects instead of the Galilean. Every resolution of the matter into a speaking of native languages is directly against the nature and the words of the narrative, and therefore unwarranted. (5) Equally unwarranted, moreover, is the conversion, utterly in the face of the narrative, of the miracle of tongues into a miracle of hearing, so that those assembled did not, indeed, speak in any foreign tongue, but the foreigners listening believed that they heard their own native languages. See against this view, Castalio in loc., and Beza on x. 46. This opinion—which Billroth on 1 Cor. strangely outbids by his fancy of a primeval language which had been spoken—is already represented by Gregory of Nazianzus, Orat. 44, as allowable by the punctuation of ii. 6; is found thereafter in the Pseudo-Cyprian (Arnold), in the appendix to the Opp. Cypr. p. 60, ed. Brem. (p. 475, ed. Basil. 1530), in Beda, Erasmus, and others; and has recently been advocated especially by Schneckenburger; 1 legend also presents later analogous phenomena—in the life of Francis Xavier and others. (6) The miraculous gift of languages remains the centre of the entire narrative, and may in nowise be put aside or placed in the background, if the state of the fact is to be derived entirely from this narrative. If we further compare x. 46, 47, the καθὼς καὶ ἐπείκει τὸ μισθόν, which there occurred at the descent of the Spirit on those assembled, cannot have been anything essentially different from the event in Acts ii. A corresponding judgment must in that case be formed as to xix. 6. But we have to take our views of what the γλῶσσαν καὶ ἑτέρων really was, not from our passage, but from the older and absolutely authentic account of Paul in 1 Cor. xii. 14: according to which it (see comm. on 1 Cor. xii. 10) was a speaking in the form of prayer—which took place in the highest ecstasy, and required an interpretation for its understanding—and not a speaking in foreign languages. The occurrence in Acts ii. is therefore to be recognised, according to its historical import, as the phenomenon of the glossolalia (not as a higher stage of it, in which the foreign languages supervened, Olschausen), which emerged for the first time in the Christian church, and that immediately on the effusion of the Spirit at Pentecost,—a phenomenon which, in the sphere of the marvellous to which it belongs, was elaborated and embellished by legend into a speaking in foreign languages, and accordingly into an occurrence quite unique, not indeed as to substance, but as to mode, 3 and far surpassing the subsequently frequent and well-known glossolalia, having in fact no parallel in the further history of the church. 4 How this transformation—the supposition of which is by

3 Comp. Hilgenfeld, p. 146.
4 The conclusion of Wieseler (Stud. u. Krit. 1859, p. 116), that Luke, who, as a companion of Paul, must have been well acquainted with the glossolalia, could not have represented it as a speaking in foreign languages, is incorrect. Luke, in fact, conceives and describes the Pentecostal miracle not as the glossolalia, which was certainly well known to him, as it...
no means to be treated with suspicion as the dogmatic caprice of unbelief (in opposition to Rossteuscher, p. 125) — took place, cannot be ascertained. But the supposition very naturally suggests itself, that among the persons possessed by the Spirit, who were for the most part Galileans (in the elaborated legend; all of them Galileans), there were also some foreigners, and that among these very naturally the utterances of the Spirit in the glossolalia found vent in expressions of their different national languages, and not in the Aramaic dialect, which was to them by nature a foreign language, and therefore not natural or suitable for the outburst of inspired ecstasy. If this first glossolalia actually took place in different languages, we can explain how the legend gradually gave to the occurrence the form which it has in Luke, even with the list of nations, which specifies more particularly the languages spoken. That a symbolic view of the phenomenon has occasioned the formation of the legend, namely, the idea of doing away with the diversity of languages which arose, Gen. xi., by way of punishment, according to which idea there was to be again in the Messianic time εἰς λαοι κυρίων καὶ γλώσσα μία is not to be assumed (Schneckenburger, Rossteuscher, de Wette), since this idea as respects the γλώσσα μία, is not a N. T. one, and it would suit not the miracle of speaking, such as the matter appears in our narrative, but a miracle of hearing, such as it has been interpreted to mean. The general idea of the universal destination of Christianity cannot but have been favourable to the shaping of the occurrence in the form in which it appears in our passage.

The view which regards our event as essentially identical with the glossolalia, but does not conceive the latter as a speaking in foreign languages, has been adopted by Bleek whose explanation, however, of highly poetical discourse, combined with foreign expressions, agrees neither with the τρυπ. γλ. generally nor with vv. 8 and 11; by Baur, who, however, explains on this account τρυπ. γλ. as new spirit-tongues, and regarded this expression as the original one, but subsequently, amidst a mixing up of different opinions, has acceded to the view of Bleek; by Steudel, who explains the Pentecostal event from the corresponding tone of feeling which the inspired address encountered in others, — a view which does not at all suit the concourse of foreign unbelievers in our passage; by Neander, who, however, idealizes the speaking of inspiration in our passage too indefinitely and indistinctly;

was a frequent gift in the apostolic age, but as a quite extraordinary occurrence, such as it had been presented to him by tradition; and in doing so, he is perfectly conscious of the distinction between it and the speaking with tongues, which he knew by experience. With justice Holtzmann also (in Herzog's Encycl. XVIII. p. 689) sees in our narrative a later legendary formation, but from a time which was no longer familiar with the nature of the glossolalia. This latter statement is not to be conceded, partly because Luke wrote soon after the destruction of Jerusalem, and the source which he here made use of must have been still older; and partly because he was a friend of Paul, and as such could, not have been otherwise than familiar with the nature of that χάρακ, which the apostle himself richly possessed.

1 Test. XII. Patr. p. 618.
2 Comp. Zeiler, Hilgenfeld.
3 In the Stud. u. Krit. 1859, p. 80 ff.
5 Which the Spirit has created for Himself as His organ, different from the usual human tongues. See also in his neuest. Theol. p. 923 f.
6 In the Stud. u. Krit. 1858, p. 618 ff.
7 In the Thib. Zeitschr. 1830, 2, p. 188 ff., 1831, 3, p. 128 ff.
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by Wieseler, who makes the ἐκπομπὴ γλώσσων be described according to the impression made upon the assembled Jews,—an idea irreconcilable with our text (vv. 6-12); by de Wette, who ascribes the transformation of the glossolalia in our passage to a reporter, who from want of knowledge, imported into the traditional facts a symbolical meaning; by Hilgenfeld, according to whom the author conceived the gift of languages as a special γένος of speaking with tongues; by van Hengel, who sees in the Corinthian glossolalia a degenerating of the original fact in our passage; and by Ewald, who represents the matter as the first outburst of the infinite vigour of life and pleasure in life of the new-born Christianity, which took place not in words, songs, and prayers previously used, nor generally in previous human speech and language, but, as it were, in a sudden conflux and moulding-anew of all previous languages, amidst which the synonymous expressions of different languages were, in the surging of excitement, crowded and conglomerated, etc.—a view in which the appeal to the ἀδιάβροχος πατήρ and μαρτυρία ἀδιάβροχος is much too weak to do justice to the ἐκπομπὴ γλώσσων as the proper point of the narrative. On the other hand, the view of the Pentecostal miracle as an actual though only temporary speaking in unacquired foreign languages, such as Luke represents it, has been maintained down to the most recent times, a conception which Hofmann supports by the signification of Pentecost as the feast of the first fruits, and Baumgarten, at the same time, by its reference to the giving of the law. But by its side the procedure of the other extreme, by which the Pentecostal occurrence is entirely banished from history, has been carried out in the boldest and most decided manner by Zeller (p. 104 ff.), to whom the origin of the narrative appears quite capable of explanation from dogmatic motives—according to the idea of the destination of Christianity for all nations—and typical views. καθότι, as, in which manner, i.e. according to the context, in which foreign language. — ἀρχήν ἄρματος, a purposely chosen word for loud utterance in the elevated state of spiritual gifts.

1 In the Stud. u. Krit. 1835, p. 128 ff., 1890, p. 117.
5 Weisses, evang. Gesch. II. p. 417 ff., identifies the matter even with the appearance of the risen Christ to more than 500 brethren, recorded in 1 Cor. xv. 6.—Größler, Gesch. d. Urohr. L. 2, p. 397 f., derives the origin of the Pentecostal history in our passage from the Jewish tradition of the feast of Pentecost as the festival of the law, urging the mythical miracle of tongues on Sinai (comp. also Schneckenburger, p. 308 ff.).
6 Comp. also Baur, who finds here Paul's idea of the λαλέσις γλώσσων τῶν ἐν πρώτοις και τῶν ἐγγένεσιν, 1 Cor. xiii. 1, converted into reality. According to Baur, neues. Théol. p. 328, there remains to us as the proper nucleus of the matter only the conviction, which became to the disciples and first Christians a fact of their consciousness, that the same Spirit by whom Jesus was qualified to be the Messias had also been imparted to them, and was the specific principle—determining the Christian consciousness—of their fellowship. This communication of the Spirit did not, in his view, even occur at a definite point of time.
8 Comp. II. 14, xxvi. 25.
9 1 Chron. xxi. 1; Ecclus. Prolog. II.; comp.
Ver. 5 gives, as introductory to what follows, preliminary information how it happened that Jews of so very diversified nationality were witnesses of the occurrence, and heard their mother-languages spoken by the inspired. Stolz, Paulus, and Heinrichs are entirely in error in supposing that ver. 5 refers to the λαλεῖν εἰρήν., γα., and that the sense is: "Neque id secur quam per erat, nam ex pluribus nationibus diverse loquentibus intererant isti coeuti homines," etc. The context, in fact, distinguishes the ἰουδαῖοι and the Γαλιλαῖοι (so designated not as a sect, but according to their nationality), clearly in such a way that the former are members of the nation generally, and the latter are specially and exclusively Galileans. ¹ — ἦσαν . . . κατοικοῦντες] they were dwelling, is not to be taken of mere temporary residence, ² but of the domicile ³ which they had taken up in the central city of the theocracy, and that from conscientious religious feelings as Israelites (hence εὐλαβείας, comp. on Luke ii. 25). Comp. Chrys.: τὸ κατοικεῖν εὐλαβείας ἵνα σημεῖαι πῶς; ἀπὸ τοσοῦτοι γὰρ εἶναι δύναται καὶ πατρίδας ἀδέντες . . . ἄκουτοι ἑκάστ. — τῶν ὑπὸ τῶν σώφρων.] ac. εἶναι, of the natione to be found under heaven (Bernhardy). — ὑπὸ τῶν σώφρων is classical, like ὑπὸ τῶν ἠλιῶν. ⁴ The whole expression has something solemn about it, and is, as a popular hyperbole, to be left in all its generality. Comp. Deut. ii. 25; Col. i. 23.

Ver. 6. Τις φωνῇ ταίνης] this sound, which, inasmuch as ὠνος points back to a more remote noun, is to be referred to the wind-like rushing of ver. 2, to which also γένος carries us back. Comp. John iii. 8. Luke represents the matter in such a way that this noise sounded forth from the house of meeting to the street, and that thereby the multitude were induced to come thither. In this case neither an earthquake (Neander) nor a "sympathy of the susceptible" (Lange) are to be called in to help, because there is no mention of either; in fact, the wonderful character of the noise is sufficient. Others, as Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Bleek, Schulz, Wieseler, Hilgenfeld, think that the loud speaking of the inspired is here meant. But in that case we should expect the plural, especially as this speaking occurred in different languages; and besides, we should be obliged to concede this speaking as being strong, like a crying, which is not indicated in ver. 4; therefore Wieseler would have it taken only as a definition of time, which the aorist does not suit, because the speaking continues. Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Castalius, Vatablus, Grotius, Heumann, and Schulthess take φωνῇ in the sense of φῶνη. Contrary to the usus loquendi; even in Gen. xlv. 16 it is otherwise. — συνεχέτω] mente confusa est (Vulgata), was perplexed. ⁵ — εἰς ἐκκατοσὶ] annexes to the more indefinite ἦσαν οὐκον the exact statement of the subject. ⁶ — διαλέξτω] is here also not national language, but dialect (see on i. 19), language in its provincial peculiarity. It is, as well as in ver. 8, designedly

¹ Comp. Plat. Ἐρ. p. 288 C, Τύμ. p. 23 C.
² Comp. ix. 22; 1 Macc. iv. 27; 2 Macc. x. 30; Herod. viii. 99; Plat. Ἐρ. 7, p. 846 D; Diod. S. i. 62; Lucian. Ναυ. 81.
³ Comp John xvi. 23; Acte xi. 29 al.; Jacobs, ad Archil. Taf. p. 622; Anselm on Hom. Od. x. 397; Bernhardy, p. 490.
chosen, because the foreigners who arrived spoke not entirely different languages, but in part only different dialects of the same language. Thus, for example, the Asiatics, Phrygians, and Pamphylians, respectively spoke Greek, but in different idioms; the Parthians, Medes, and Elamites, Persian, but also in different provincial forms. Therefore, the persons possessed by the Spirit, according to the representation of the text, expressed themselves in the peculiar local dialects of the ἐπίρων γλώσσαι. The view that the Aramaic dialect was that in which all the speakers spoke (van Hengel), appears—from ver. 8; from the list of nations, which would be destitute of significance; from προσήλυτοι (ver. 10), which would be meaningless; and from ver. 11,¹ as well as from the opinions expressed in vv. 12, 13, which would be without a motive—as an exegetical impossibility, which is also already excluded by τις ἐκάστος in ver. 6. — λαλοῦντων αὐτῶν] not, of course, that all spoke in all dialects, but that one spoke in one dialect, and another in another. Each of those who came together heard his peculiar dialect spoken by one or some of the inspired. This remark applies in opposition to Bleek, who objects to the common explanation of λαλεῖν ἐπίρων γλώσσαις, that each individual must have spoken in the different languages simultaneously. The expression is not even awkward (Olshausen), as it expresses the opinion of the people comprehended generally, and consequently even the summary αὐτῶν is quite in order.

Vv. 7, 8. Ἐξίσταντο denotes the astonishment now setting in after the first perplexity, ver. 6; ἐθαμαζοῦν is the continuing wonder resulting from it. Comp. Mark vi. 51.—ιδοὺ] to be enclosed within two commas. — πάντες οὖν Κ.Τ.Λ.] pointing out: all the speakers present. It does not distinguish two kinds of persons, those who spoke and those who did not speak (van Hengel); but see ver. 4. The dislocation occasioned by the interposition of εἰς ὑπάρχειν brings the πάντες οὖν into more emphatic prominence. — Γαλιλαῖοι] They wondered to hear men, who were pure Galileans, speak Parthian, Median, etc. This view, which takes Γαλ. in the sense of nationality, is required by vv. 8, 11, and by the contrast of the nations afterwards named. It is therefore foreign to the matter, with Herder, Heinrichs, Olshausen, Schulz, Rossteuscher, van Hengel, and older commentators, to bring into prominence the accessory idea of want of culture (uncultivated Galileans); and erroneous, with Stoltz, Eichhorn, Kuinoel, and others, to consider Γαλ. as a designation of the Christian sect—a designation, evidence of which, moreover, can only be adduced from a later period.² It is erroneous, also, to find the cause of wonder in the circumstance that the Galileans should have used profane languages for so holy an object (Kuinoel). So, in opposition to this, Ch. F. Fritzsch, nova opus. p. 510. — καὶ πῶς] καὶ, as a simple and, annexes the sequence of the sense; and (as they are all Galileans) how happens it that, etc. — ἡμεῖς ἀκούομεν ἐκάστος κ.τ.λ.] we on our part (in contrast to the speaking Galileans) hear each one, etc. That, accordingly, ἔγενετο is to be understood distributively, is self-evident from the connec-

¹ Where neither in itself nor according to ver. 8 can τις ἐκάστος γλώσσαν mean what van Hengel puts into it: as we do with our own tongues.
² Augusti, Denkwürd. IV. pp. 49, 55.
tion (comp. ταῖς ἡμετ. γλώσσαις, ver. 11); therefore van Hengel wrongly objects to the view of different languages, that the words would require to run: πῶς ἡμ. ἥκ. τ. ὁμ. ὁμ. ἐν ἑαυτ. ἐγγυπήθη. — ἐν ἑγγυπήθη:] designation of the mother-tongue, with which one is, in the popular way of expressing the matter, born furnished.

Vv. 9-11. Πάρθοι . . . Ἀμαθὴς is a more exact statement, placed in opposition, of the subject of ἐγγυπήθημεν. After finishing the list, ver. 11, Luke again takes up the verb already used in ver. 8, and completes the sentence already there begun, but in such a way as once more to bring forward the important point τῇ ἴδιῃ διαλέκτῳ, only in a different and more general expression, by ταῖς ἡμετ. γλώσσαις. Instead, therefore, of simply writing λαλῶντ. αὐτ. τα µεγαλ. τ. Θεοῦ without this resumption in ver. 11, he continues, after the list of nations, as if he had said in ver. 8 merely καὶ πῶς ἡμεῖς. — The list of nations itself, which is arranged not without reference to geography, yet in a desultory manner east, north, south, west, is certainly genuine (in opposition to Ziegler, Schulthess. Kuinoel), but is, of course, not to be considered, at any rate in its present order and completeness, as an original constituent part of the speech of the people (which would be psychologically inappropriate to the lively expression of strong astonishment, but as an historical notice, which was designedly interwoven in the speech and put into the mouth of the people, either already in the source whence Luke drew, or by Luke himself, in order to give very strong prominence to the contrast with the preceding ἐβληθαίοι. — Ἐλαμίται, on the Persian Gulf, are so named in the LXX. (Isa. xxi. 2); called by the Greeks Ἔλυμπαι. — Ἰουδαίοι There is a historical reason why Jews should be also mentioned in this list, which otherwise names none but foreigners. A portion of those who had received the Spirit spoke Jewish, so that even the native Jews heard their provincial dialect. This is not at variance with the εἰρπαῖς γλώσσασας, because the Jewish dialect differed in pronunciation from the Galilean, although both belonged to the Aramaic language of the country at that time; comp. on Matt. xxvi. 78. Heinrichs thinks that Ἰουδαίοι is inappropriate (comp. de Wette), and was only included in this specification in fluxu orationis; while Olshausen holds that Luke included the mention of it from his Roman point of view, and in consideration of his Roman readers. What a high degree of carelessness would either suggestion involve!1 Ewald guesses that Syria has dropped out after Judæa. — τῶν Ἀσιαίων] is here, as it is mentioned along with individual Asiatic districts, not the whole of Asia Minor, nor yet simply Ἰονία (Kuinoel), or Λύδια (Schneckenburger), to which there is no evidence that the name Asia was applied; but the whole western coast-region of Asia Minor.2 — τὰ µέρη τῆς Ἀσίας

1 i.e. p. 24 f.: "How comes it that we, no one excepted, hear them speak in the mother-tongue of our own people?" Thus, in his view, we are to explain the passage as the words stand in the text, and thus there is designated only the one mother-tongue—the Aramaic.

2 See Polyb. v. 44. 9, al. The country is called Ἐλυμπαῖς, Pol. xxxi. 11. 1; Strabo, xvi. p. 744.

3 Tertull. c. Jud. 7, read Armeniæm. Conjectural emendations are: Ἰουδαίαι (Caspar Barth), Ἰουδαία (Erasmus Schmid), Μυσιαῖα (Hemsterhuis and Valckenier).

4 Caris, Lydias, Mytilis, according to Plin. H. N. v. 38; see Winer, Realw., Wieseler, p. 83 ff.
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to the districts of the Libya situated towards Cyrene, i.e. Libya Cyrenaica, or Pentapolis, Upper Libya, whose capital was Cyrene, nearly one-fourth of the population of which were Jews. So many of the Cyrenean Jews dwelt in Jerusalem, that they had there a synagogue of their own (vi. 9). — οἱ ἐπιθυμοῦντες Ῥωμαίοι the Romans — Jews dwelling in Rome and the Roman countries of the West generally — residing (here in Jerusalem) as strangers (pilgrims to the feast, or for other reasons). As ἐπιθυμοῦντες, they are not properly included under the category of κατοικοῦντες in the preparatory ver. 5, but are by zeugma annexed thereto. — Ιουδαῖοι τε καὶ προσήλυτοι is in apposition not merely to οἱ ἐπιθυμοῦντες Ῥωμαίοι (Erasmus, Grotius, van Hengel, and others), but, as is alone in keeping with the universal aim of the list of nations, to all those mentioned before in vv. 9, 10. The native Jews (Josephus) heard the special Jewish local dialects, which were their mother-tongues; the Gentile Jews (προσήλυτοι) heard their different non-Hebraic mother-tongues, and that likewise in the different idioms of the several nationalities. — Κρήτες καὶ Ἀραβῶνες] are inaccurately brought in afterwards, as their proper position ought to have been before Ιουδαίοι τε καὶ προσήλυτοι, because that statement, in the view of the writer, held good of all the nationalities, — τ. ἡμετέρας γλώσσας ἡμεῖς. has the emphasis of contrast: not with their language, but with ours. Comp. ver. 8. That γλώσσα comprehends also the dialectic varieties serving as a demarcation, is self-evident from vv. 6–10. The expression τ. ἡμετέρας γλώσσας in ver. 4. — τὰ μεγάλεια τ. Θεοῦ] the great things of God which God has done. It is the glorious things which God has provided through Christ, as is self-evident in the case of that assembly in that condition. Not merely the resurrection of Christ (Grotius), but "tota hac oikovnia gratiae pertinet," Calovius. Comp. x. 46.

Vv. 12, 13. Διατρόφ.] see on Luke ix. 7. — τι ὥσπερ τότε εἰσαγαγ.; The optative with ἄν, in order to denote the hypothetically conceived possibility: What might this possibly wish to be? i.e. What might—if this speaking in our native languages, this strange phenomenon, is designed to have any meaning—to be thought of as that meaning? On the distinction of the sense without ἄν, see Kühner, ad Xen. Anab. v. 7. 83. — ἐπιστάμενος] another class of judges, consequently none of the impartial, of whom there was mention in vv. 7–12, but hostile persons (in part, doubtless, of the hierarchical party) who drew from the well-known freer mode of life of Jesus and His disciples a judgment similar to Luke vii. 84, and decided against the disciples. — διαχειλάζοντες mocking; a stronger expression than the simple verb. The scoffers explain the enthusiasm of the speakers.

3 Comp. Ps. xxxii. 19; Eccles. xvii. 8, xviii. 3, xxxii. 8; 3 Macc. vii. 22.

4 Comp. xvi. 18; Herm. ad Viger. p. 259.; Bernhardy, p. 410 ff.
5 Comp. also Maetzner, ad Anti. p. 130. On these of impersonal things, see Wetzstel and Stalbaum, ad Plat. REP. p. 370 B.
6 Dem. 1831. 35; Plat. A. p. 364 B; Polyb. xvii. 4. 4, xxxix. 2. 13; used absolutely also, Polyb. xxx. 12. 13.
which struck them as eccentric, and the use of foreign languages instead of the Galilean, as the effect of drunken excitement. Without disturbing themselves whence this foreign speaking, according to the historical position of the matter, this speaking with tongues, had come and become possible to the Galileans, they are arrested only by the strangeness of the phenomenon as it struck the senses, and, in accordance with their own vulgarity, impute it to the having taken too much wine. Comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 23. The contents of the speaking (van Hengel) would not, apart from that form of utterance as if drunk with the Spirit, have given ground for so frivolous an opinion, but would rather have checked it. The judgment of Festus concerning Paul (xxvi. 24) is based on an essentially different situation. — γελείκοις] γελείκος τὸ ἀπόσταγμα τῆς σταυροῦς πιῦ παρθῆναι, Hesychius.1

Vv. 14, 15. Σταυροῦς as in v. 20, xvii. 22, xxvii. 21; Luke xix. 8, xviii. 11. The introduction of the address (he stood up, etc.) is solemn. — σὺν τῶν ἑνδέκα thus Matthias is already included, and justly; ver. 32, comp. with i. 22. We may add that Grotius aptly remarks (although contradicted by Calovius): "Hic incipit (Petrus) nominis sui a rupe dicti meruit implere." — ἀνεθῇ as in ver. 4: but not as if now Peter also had begun to speak ἐν ἀγγελίᾳ ἀγγέλου. (van Hengel). That speaking is past when Peter and the eleven made their appearance; and then follows the simple instruction regarding it, intelligible to ordinary persons, uttered aloud and with emphasis. — κατοικόποιντες] quite as in ver. 5. The nominative with the article, in order to express the imperative address.2 — τῶν] namely, what I shall now explain to you. Concerning ἐκκόσμων (from οἶκος), auribus percipere, which is foreign to the old classical Greek, but in current use in the LXX. and the Apocrypha.3 In the N. T. only here.4 — ὑπὲρ ἑαυτὸν justifies the proceeding summons. The ὅτα, these there, does not indicate that the apostles themselves were not among those who spoke in a miraculous manner, as if the gift of tongues had been a lower kind of inspired speech;5 but Peter, standing up with the eleven, places himself in the position of a third person, pointing to the whole multitude, whom he would defend, as their advocate; and as he did so, the reference of this apologia to himself also and his fellow-apostles became self-evident in the application. This also applies against van Hengel, p. 64 f. — ὑπὲρ τρίτην] about nine in the morning; so early in the day, and at this first of the three hours of prayer (see on iii. 1), contemporaneously with the morning sacrifice in the temple, people are not drunk! Observe the sober, self-collected way in which Peter speaks.

Vv. 16, 17. But this (which has just taken place on the part of those assembled, and has been accounted among you as the effect of drunkenness) is the event, which is spoken of by the prophet Joel. — Joel iii. 1–5 (LXX. ii. 28–31) is freely quoted according to the LXX. The prophet, speaking as the organ of God, describes the σημεῖα which shall directly precede the dawn of the Messianic period, namely first the general effusion of the ful-

2 See Bernhardy, p. 67.
5 1 Cor. xiv. 18, 19; so de Wette, at variance with ver. 4.
ness of the Holy Spirit, and then frightful catastrophes in heaven and on earth. This prophecy, Peter says, has now entered upon its accomplishment. — καὶ ἐστιν] and it will be the case: quite according to the Hebrew (and the LXX.) τῷ θεῷ. The καὶ in the prophetic passage connects it with what precedes, and is incorporated in the citation. — εἰ τὰς εἰσαγάγεις ἡμῶν] The LXX., agreeing with the Hebrew, has only μετὰ τᾶς. Peter has inserted for it the familiar expression οὕτως γέγονεν (Isa. ii. 2; Mic. iv. 1, al.) by way of more precise definition, as Kimchi also gives it (see Lightfoot). This denotes the last days of the pre-Messianic period—the days immediately preceding the erection of the Messianic kingdom, which, according to the N. T. view, could not but take place by means of the speedily expected Parousia of Christ; see 2 Tim. iii. 1; Jas. v. 8; and as regards the essential sense, also Heb. i. 1. — ἐκχεῖν] a later form of the future. The outpouring figuratively denotes the copious communication. Tit. iii. 6; Acts x. 43. Comp. i. 5, and see on Rom. v. 5. — ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν] deviating from the Hebrew ἐν θεῷ. The partitive expression (Bernhardy, p. 222) denotes that something of the Spirit of God conceived as a whole—a special partial emanation for the bestowal of divers gifts according to the will of God (Heb. ii. 4; 1 Cor. xii.)—will pass over to every individual (ἐνί πᾶσιν σώματα). — πᾶσαι σώματα] every flesh, i.e. omnes homines, but with the accessory idea of weakness and imperfection, which the contrast of the highest gift of God, that is to be imparted to the weak mortal race, here presents. In Joel 1:11-128 certainly refers to the people of Israel, conceived, however, as the people of God, the collective body of whom, not merely, as formerly, individual prophets, shall receive the divine inspiration. Comp. Isa. liv. 13; John vi. 45. But as the idea of the people of God has its realization, so far as the history of redemption is concerned, in the collective body of believers on Christ without distinction of nations; so also in the Messianic fulfilment of that prophecy meant by Peter, and now begun, what the prophet has promised to all flesh is not to be understood of the Jewish people as such (van Hengel, appealing to ver. 39), but of all the true people of God, so far as they believe on Christ. The first Messianic effusion of the Spirit at Pentecost was the beginning of this fulfilment, the completion of which is in the course of a progressive development that began at that time with Israel, and as respects its end is yet future, although this end was by Peter already expected as nigh. — καὶ προφητεύσωσιν . . . ἐνυπνιασθήσονται describes the effects of the promised effusion of the Spirit. προφητεύσωσιν, affluat divino loquentur (Matt. vii. 29), is by Peter specially recognized as a prediction of that apocalyptically inspired speaking, which had just commenced with the ἔτερος γέλοιος. This we may the more warrantably affirm, since, according to the analogy of xix. 6, we must assume that that

1 Comp. Weiss, Patria, Lehrbegr. p. 88 f.
2 Winer, p. 74 (E. T. 91).
3 The impersonality of the Spirit is not thereby assumed (in opposition to Weiss, ibid. Theol. p. 186), but the distribution of the gifts and powers, which are represented as a partial effusion of the Spirit on individuals. For the personality of the Spirit, comp. especially the saying of Peter, v. 3.
4 Comp. Rom. iii. 29; Gal. ii. 10; 1 Cor. i. 29; Matt. xxiv. 22; Luke iii. 6.
speaking was not mere glossolalia in the strict sense, but, in a portion of the speaker's prophecy. Comp. the spiritual speaking in Corinth. — οἱ νῦν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες τῶν] the male and female members of the people of God, i.e. all without exception. Peter sees this also fulfilled by the inspired members of the Christian theocracy, among whom, according to i. 14, there were at that time also women. — ὃς τῶν . . . ἐννοοῖς] visions in waking and in sleeping, as forms of the ἀποκάλυψις of God, such as often came to the prophets. This prophetic distinction, Joel predicts, will, after the effusion of the Spirit in its fulness, become common property. The fulfilment of this part of the prophecy had, it is true, not yet taken place among the members of the Christian people of God, but was still before them as a consequence of the communication of the Spirit which had just occurred; Peter, however, quotes the words as already fulfilled (ver. 16), because their fulfilment was necessarily conditioned by the outpouring of the Spirit, and was consequently already in idea included in it. — νεκροί . . . προσβιτεροι] belong likewise, as the preceding clause (νῦν . . . θυγατέρες), to the representation of the collective body as illustrated per μερασμόν. The ὅρασις correspond to the lively feelings of youth; ἐννομα, to the lesser excitability of more advanced age; yet the two are to be taken, not as mutually exclusive, but after the manner of parallelism.—The verb, with the dative of the cognate noun, is here (ἐννοοῖς ἐνυπνασθε), they will dream with dreams; comp. Joel iii. 1) a Hebraism, and does not denote, like the similar construction in classic Greek, a more precise definition or strengthening of the notion conveyed by the verb (Lobeck, Paral. p. 524 f).

Ver. 18. A repetition of the chief contents of ver. 17, solemnly confirming them, and prefixing the persons concerned.—καὶ γε] and indeed. It seldom occurs in classical writers without the two particles being separated by the word brought into prominence or restricted, in which case, however, there is also a shade of meaning to be attended to. We must not explain the δολίους μοῦ and the δολίας μοῦ with Heinrichs and Kuinoel, in accordance with the original text, which has no μοῦ, of servile hominum genus, nor yet with Tychsen of the alienigenae (because slaves were wont to be purchased from abroad): both views are at variance with the μοῦ, which refers the relation of service to God as the Master. It is therefore the male and female members of the people of God (according to the prophetic fulfilment: of the Christian people of God) that are meant, inasmuch as they recognise Jehovah as their Master, and serve Him: my male and female worshippers; comp. the Hebrew וָאֶבָּא, וְּאָבֹא. In the twofold μοῦ Peter agrees with the translators of the LXX., 1 who must have had another reading of the original before them.

2 See Kloz, ad Devar. p. 319.
3 Illustratio vestaeini Joel iii. Gott. 1788.
4 So much the less ought Hengstenberg, Christol. I. p. 408, to have imported into this enclítica μοῦ what is neither found in it nor relevant: "on servants and handmaids of men, who are at the same time my servants and handmaids, and therefore in spiritual things are quite on a level with the free." Similarly Bengel, and recently Beelen (Catholic) in his Commentar. in Acta ap. ed. 2, 1864, who appeals inappropriately to Gal. iii. 37 f.
Vv. 19, 20. *After this effusion of the Spirit I shall bring about (διακο, as at Matt. xxiv. 24) catastrophes in heaven and on earth—the latter are mentioned at once in ver. 19, the former in ver. 20—as immediate heralds of the Messianic day.* Peter includes in his quotation this element of the prophecy, because its realization (ver. 16), conditioned by the outpouring of the Spirit which necessarily preceded it, presented itself likewise essentially as belonging to the allotted portion of the ἐκκαθαρισμός. The dreadful events could not but now—seeing that the effusion of the Spirit preceding them had already commenced—be conceived as inevitable and very imminent; and this circumstance could not but mightily contribute to the alarming of souls and their being won to Christ. *As to τεταρτά and σημεῖα, see on Matt. xxiv. 24; Rom. xv. 19—αἷμα . . . καταρακτόριον contains the σημεῖα ἐκ τῆς γῆς, namely, bloodshed (war, revolt, murder) and conflagration. Similar devastations belonged, according to the later Jewish Christology also, to the dolores Messiaeae.* See on Matt. xxiv. 6, 7. "Cum videris regna se invicem turbantia, tunc expectes vestigia Messiaeae." 1 The reference to blood-rain, fiery meteors, and pillars of smoke arising from the earth 2 is neither certainly in keeping with the original text of the prophecy, nor does it satisfy the analogy of Matt. xxiv. —ἀναίρεσις καταρακτόριον] vapour of smoke.*—Ver. 20. Meaning: the sun will become dark, and the moon appear bloody. Comp. on Matt. xxiv. 29; also Isa. xiii. 10; Ezek. xxxiii. 7.—πρὶν ἐξελθὲιν] ere there shall have come.*—τὴν ἡμέραν κυρίου] i.e. according to the sense of the prophetic fulfilment of the words: the day of Christ, namely of His Parousia. Comp. on Rom. x. 13. But this is not, with Grotius, Lightfoot, and Kuinoel, following the Fathers, to be considered as identical with the destruction of Jerusalem, which belongs to the σημεῖα of Parousia, to the dolores Messiaeae. See on Matt. xxiv. 29.—τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφάνεια the great (καὶ ἐξωχήν, fraught with decision, comp. Rev. xvi. 14) and manifest, i.e. which makes itself manifest before all the world as that which it is. Comp. the frequent use of ἐπιφάνεια for the Parousia (2 Thess. ii. 8, a.). The Vulgate aptly renders: manifestus. Instead of ἐπιφανής, the Hebrew has מִשְׁורָר, territūris, which the LXX., deriving from τῆς, has incorrectly translated by ἐπιφανῆ, as also elsewhere. 3 But on this account the literal signification of ἐπιφανής need not be altered here, where the text follows the LXX.* 4

Ver. 21. *And every one who shall have invoked the name of the Lord,—this Peter wishes to be understood, according to the sense of the prophetic fulfilment, of the invocation of Christ (relative worship: see on vii. 59; Rom. x. 12; Phil. ii. 10; 1 Cor. i. 2); just as he would have the σωθήσεται understood, not of any sort of temporal deliverance, but of the saving deliverance of the Messianic kingdom (iv. 12, xv. 11), which Jesus on His return will find; and hence he must now (vv. 22–36) demonstrate Jesus the crucified and risen and exalted one, as the Lord and Messiah (ver. 36).*

---

1 Berech. robb. sec. 41.
2 De Wette, comp. Kuinoel.
3 ἀρμάσει Plut. Thm. p. 87 B, yet in classical writers more usually ἀρμάν is the more general idea. Comp. on such combinations, Le- beck, Percol. p. 514.
4 See Klitz, ad Decar. p. 756 f.
5 See Biel and Schleusn. Thes. e.a.
And how undeniably, concisely, and convincingly he does so! A first fruit of the outpouring of the Spirit.

Ver. 22. Toιούτος] like τοιούτος, ver. 14, the words which follow.¹ — τὸν ἅγιον Ἀντίγκρασιον is, in the mouth of the apostle, only the current more precise designation of the Lord,² not used in the sense of contempt³ for the sake of contrast to what follows, and possibly as a reminiscence of the superscription of the cross (Beza and others), of which there is no indication in the text (such as perhaps: ἄνδρα δέ). — ἄνδρα ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀποδεικνύμ.] a man on the part of God approved, namely, in his peculiar character, as Messiah. ἀπό stands neither here nor elsewhere for ὑπό, but ἀπό denotes the going forth of the legitimation from God (ὕπωνιτις). — εἰς ὑμᾶς] in reference to you, in order that He might appear to you as such, for you. — δυνάµ. κ. τέραται κ. σημείαι] a rhetorical accumulation in order to the full exhaustion of the idea,⁴ as regards the nature of the miracles, their appearance, and their destination. Comp. ver. 19; 2 Thess. ii. 9; 2 Cor. xii. 12; Heb. ii. 4. — ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν] in the midst of you, so that it was beheld jointly by you all.

Ver. 23. Τοιούτος an emphatic repetition.⁵ There is to be no parenthesis before it. This one. . . delivered up, ye have by the hand of lawless men⁶ affixed and made way with: x. 39; Luke xxii. 2, xxiii. 32. By the ἀνάμια are to be understood Gentiles (1 Cor. ix. 21; Rom. i. 14), and it is here more especially the Roman soldiers that are meant, by whose hand Christ was affixed, nailed to the cross, and thereby put to death. On ἐκδοτοῦ, comp. Drac. 26, and examples from Greek writers in Raphel and Kypke, also Lobeck, Paral. p. 531. It refers to the delivering up of Jesus to the Jews, which took place on the part of Judas. This was no work of men, no independent success of the treachery, which would, in fact, testify against the Messiahship of Jesus! but it happened in virtue of the fixed, therefore unalterable, resolve and (in virtue of the) foreknowledge of God.⁷ — πρόγνωσις is here usually taken as synonymous with βούλη; but against all linguistic usage.⁸ Even in 1 Pet. i. 2, comp. ver. 20, the meaning praescientia (Vulgate) is to be retained. See generally on Rom. viii. 29. God's βούλη (comp. iv. 28) was, that Jesus was to be delivered up, and the mode of it was present to Him in His prescience, which, therefore, is placed after the βούλη. Objectively, no doubt, the two are not separate in God, but the relation is conceived of

¹ See Klöhnner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 3. 3, ad Anab. ii. 5. 10.
² Comp. iii. 6, iv. 10.
³ Comp. vi. 14, xxiv. 5.
⁴ Joseph. Antt. vili. 14. 5; Poppo, ad Thuc. i. 17. 1; Buttm. neut. Gr. p. 280 (E. T. 386).
⁵ Bornem. Schol. in Luc. p. 100.
⁶ See Schael. Meket. p. 84; Disseen, ad Dem. de cor. p. 326.
⁷ διὰ χρήσεως (see the critical remarks) is here not to be taken, like τῆς, for the mere per (see Fritzschel, ad Marc. p. 190), but, as it is a manual action that is spoken of, in its concrete, literal meaning. It belongs to vivid rhetorical delineation. Comp. Dorville, ad Charit. p. 273.
⁸ On βούλη, comp. the Homer. ὁδὸς ὕπελευσε βούλη, II. i. 5. Od. xi. 297.
⁹ This reason must operate also against Lamping's (Paul de praedestination. decreta, 1856, p. 102 ff.) defence of the common explanation, in which he specifies, as the distinction between βούλη and πρόγνωσις, merely this: "illud adumbrat Dei voluntatem, hoc inde profectum decretem." It is arbitrary, with Holsten, z. Ev. d. Paul. v. Pet. p. 146, to refer βούλη not to the saving will, but merely to the will as regards destiny. See, in opposition to this, ili. 18, where the suffering of Christ is the fulfilment of divine prophecy; comp. viii. 33 f., x. 43.
after the analogy of the action of the human mind.—The *datie* is, as in xlv. 1, that in which the *exhoarov* has its ground. Without the divine *boul* k. t. l. it would not have taken place.—The question, How Peter could say to those present: *Ye have put Him to death*, is solved by the remark that the execution of Christ was a public judicial murder, resolved on by the Sanhedrim in the name of the whole nation, demanded from and conceded by the Gentiles, and accomplished under the direction of the Sanhedrim (John xix. 16); comp. iii. 13 f. The view of Olshausen, that the death of Christ was a collective act of the human race, which had contracted a collective guilt, is quite foreign to the context.

Ver. 24. Τα ὁδήρακ] Peter most probably used the common expression from the O. T.: ἡ ὁδήρα, *snares of death*, in which the *bivaros* personified is conceived as a huntsman laying a snare.¹ The LXX. erroneously translates this expression as ὁδήρας ἑκατόν, misled by ἡ ὁδήρα, *dolor* (Isa. lxvi. 7), in the plural ὁδῆρας, used particularly of *birth-pangs*. See the LXX. Ps. xviii. 5; 2 Sam. xxii. 6. But Luke—and this betrays the use of a Hebrew source directly or indirectly—has followed the LXX., and has thus changed the Petrine expression *vincula mortis* into *dolores mortis*. The expression of Luke, who with ὁδήρας could think of nothing else than the only meaning which it has in Greek, gives the latter, and not the former sense. In the sense of Peter, therefore, the words are to be explained: after he has loosed the *snares of death*, with which death held him captive; but in the sense of Luke: after he has loosed the *pangs of death*. According to Luke,² the resurrection of Jesus is conceived as *birth* from the dead. Death *twisted³* in *birth-throes* even until the dead was raised again. With this event these pangs ceased, they were loosed; and because God has made Christ alive, God has loosed the pangs of death.⁴ To understand the *death-pangs of Christ*, from which God freed Him "resuscitando eum ad vitam nullis doloribus obnoxiam" (Grotius), is incorrect, because the liberation from the pains of death has already taken place through the death itself, with which the earthly work of Christ, even of His suffering, was finished (John xix. 30). Quite groundless is the assertion of Olshausen, that in Hellenistic Greek ὁδήρας has not only the meaning of *pains*, but also that of *bonds*, which is not at all to be vouched by the passages in Schleusen. Thes. V. p. 571. — καθότι: *according to the fact, that*; see on Luke i. 7. — οἶκ ὧν ἔκαπε] which is afterwards proved from David. It was thus impossible in virtue of the *divine destination* attested by David. Other reasons (Calovius: on account of the *unio personalis*, etc.) are here far-fetched. — *κρατισθαί ἐν* *αἰτίαν* The *bivaros* could not but give Him up; Christ could not be retained by death in *its power*, which would have happened, if He, like other dead, had not become alive again and risen to eternal life (Rom. vi. 9).³ By His

¹ Ps. xviii. 5 f., cxvi. 3. See Gesen. Thes. I. p. 440.

² Comp. on πρωτότοκος ἐν τοῖς περάσα, Col. i. 18.

³ A. ἑκατόν, ἑκατών ὑπ' ἕκατον, Χαριά.

⁴ On ὁδήρας, see LXX. Job xxxix. 3; Soph. O. C. 1612, 27. 897; Aelian. H. A. xii. 5.

¹ Comp. Pia: P. I. ix. p. 574 A: μεγάλας ἁδινί βεν καὶ ἐκάθωσαν συνέκαθαν. The most participle is ἐννεακούμεν with ἄναγκης.

² On κρατισθαί ὧν, to be ruled by, comp. 4 Macc. ii. 9; Deral. 1010. 17.
resurrection Christ has done away death as a power (2 Tim. i. 10; 1 Cor. xv. 25 f.)

Ver. 25. Eic abrón] so that the words, as respects their fulfilment, apply to Him. See Bernhardy, p. 220. — The passage is from Ps. xvi. 8 ff., exactly after the LXX. David, if the Psalm, which yet certainly is later, belonged to him, or the other suffering theocrat who here speaks, is, in what he affirms of himself, a prophetic type of the Messiah; what he says of the certainty that he should not succumb to the danger of death, which threatened him, has received its antitypeful fulfilment in Christ by His resurrection from the dead. This historical Messianic fulfilment of the Psalm justified the apostle in its Messianic interpretation, in which he has on his side not rabbinical predecessors (see Schoettgen), but the Apostle Paul (xiii. 35 f.). The προσώματος κ.τ.λ., as the LXX. translates ἐν ἀγίῳ, is, according to this ideal Messianic understanding of the Psalm, Christ’s joyful expression of His continued fellowship with God on earth, since in fact (ὅτι) God is by His side protecting and preserving Him; I foresaw the Lord before my face always, i.e. looking before me with the mind’s glance, I saw Jehovah always before my face. — ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἵστοτι] namely, as protector and helper, as παραστάτης. Concerning ἐκ δεξιῶν, from the right side out, i.e. on the right of it, see Winer, p. 344 (E. T. 459). The figurative element of the expression is borrowed from courts of justice, where the advocates stood at the right of their clients, Ps. cix. 31. — ἵνα μὴ σαλευθῶ] without figure: that I may remain unmoved in the state of my salvation. On the figurative use—frequent also in the LXX., Apocr., and Greek authors—of σαλευθῶ, comp. 2 Thess. ii. 2.

Ver. 26. Therefore my heart rejoiced and my tongue exulted. The aerists denote an act of the time described by προσώματος κ.τ.λ., the joyful remembrance of which is here expressed. — ἡ καρδία μου, ἡ καρδία: the heart, the centre of personal life, is also the seat of the moral feelings and determinations of the will. — Instead of ἡ γλῶσσα μου, the Hebrew has ἡ μὴ, i.e. my soul, in place of which the LXX. either found a different reading or gave a free rendering. — ἐκ δὲ καὶ ἡ σάρξ μου κ.τ.λ.] but moreover also my flesh (body) shall tabernacle, that is, settle itself by way of encampment, on hope, by which the Psalmist expresses his confidence that he shall not perish, but continue in life—while, according to Peter, from the point of view of the fulfilment that has taken place in Christ, these words εἰς Ἰσραήλ (ver. 25) prophetically express that the body of Christ will tarry in the grave on hope, i.e. on the basis of the hope of rising from the dead. Thus what is divinely destined for Christ—His resurrection—appears in poetic mould as the object of the hope of His body. — ἔτι ἐκ καὶ] Comp. Luke xiv. 26; Acts xxii. 28; Soph. O. R. 1345. — ἐπὶ ἐλπίδα] as in Rom. iv. 18.

Ver. 27. What now the Psalmist further says according to the historical sense: For thou wilt not leave my soul to Hades (ἵνα), i.e. Thou wilt not suffer

---

1 Xen. Hell. iv. 3. 16; otherwise, xxi. 29.
2 Xen. Cypr. Ill. 2. 21.
3 Dorville, ad Char. p. 307.
4 Delitzsch, Psych. p. 248 ff.
5 Ps. vii. 6, xxx. 13; et al.; see Schoettgen, p. 415.
me to die in my present life-peril, and wilt not give Thy Holy One, according to the Ketibh of the original: Thy holy one, the plural of category, comp. Hupfeld in loc., to see corruption—is by Peter, as spoken εἰς ἡμετέρον, taken in accordance with the prophetic meaning historically fulfilled in Him: Thou wilt not forsake my soul in Hades, after it shall have come thither; but by the resurrection wilt again deliver it, and wilt not suffer Thy Holy One, the Messiah, to share corruption, i.e. according to the connection of the sense as fulfilled, putrefaction (comp. xiii. 34 ff.). Instead of διαφθόραν, the original has ἰὲν σῷς, a pit, which, however, Peter, with the LXX., understood as διαφθόρα, and accordingly has derived it not from ἰὲν, but from ἰὲν, διαφθίρω; comp. Job. xvii. 14. — On δῶσεις, comp. x. 40. The meaning is: Thou wilt not cause, that, etc. Often so also in classical writers from Homer onward. As to ἵδειν in the sense of experiencing, comp. on Luke ii. 26.

Ver. 28. Thou hast made known to me ways of life; Thou wilt fill me with joy in presence of Thy countenance, meant by the Psalmist of the divine guidance in saving his life, and of the joy which he would thereafter experience before God, refers, according to its prophetic sense, as fulfilled in Christ, to His resurrection, by which God practically made known to him ways to life, and to his state of exaltation in heaven, where he is in the fulness of blessedness with God.—μετὰ τοῦ προσώπου σου] ἰὲν σῷς, in communion with Thy countenance, seen by me. Comp. Heb. ix. 24.

Vv. 29—31. Proof that David in this passage of his Psalm has prophetically made known the resurrection of Christ.

Ver. 29. Μετὰ παραρτήματι] frankly and freely, without reserve; for the main object was to show off a passage honouring David, that it had received fulfilment in a higher and prophetical sense in another. Bengel well remarks: "Est igitur hoc loco προσέρχεσθαι, prævia sermone mitigatio."—David is called ἀ παρακάτως as the celebrated ancestor of the kingly family, from which the nation expected their Messiah. —οὐ] that (not for). Peter wishes to say of David what is notorious, and what it is allowable for him to say on account of this very notoriety; therefore with εἰς there is not to be supplied, as is usually done, εἰ, but εἰς (ἐξετοί). — ἵν ἡμῶν] David was buried at Jerusalem. In τὸ μνήμα αὐτοῦ, his sepulchre, there is involved, according to the context, as self-evident: "cum ipso Davidis corpore corrupto; molliter loquitur," Bengel.

1 See Kühner, § 629; Buttm. neunt. Gr. p. 367 (E. T. 285).
2 This passage is a dictum probans for the abode of the soul of Christ in Hades, but it contains no dogmatic statement concerning the descentus ad infernos in the sense of the church. Comp. Güder, Lehre von d. Erhebung Christi unter d. Todten, p. 50; Weiss, Petrin, Lehrbegr. p. 283 f.
3 After this passage, compared with ver. 31, no further discussion is needed to show how unreasonably it has been taken for granted (see especially Holsten, s. Ev. d. Prarl. n. Petr. p. 128 ff.) that the early church conceived the resurrection of Christ as a μετάβασις εἰς ἐμαυτὸν σῶμα, entirely independent of the dead body of our Lord. How much are the evangelical narratives of the appearances of the risen Christ, in which the identity of His body has stress so variously laid on it, at variance with this opinion! Comp. x. 41.
4 Neh. iii. 16; Joseph. Ant. vili. 15. 3, xiii. 8. 4, Bell. Jud. i. 2. 5.
Vv. 30–32. οὕτω] infers from the previous καὶ τὸ μνῆμα αὐτοῦ . . . ταύτης, whence it is plain that David in the Psalm, l.c., as a prophet and divinely conscious progenitor of the future Messiah, has spoken of the resurrection of Christ as the one who should not be left in Hades, and whose body should not decay. — καὶ εἰδὼς] see 2 Sum. vii. 12. — ἐκ καρποῦ τ. ὁρφίος αὐτοῦ] sc. τινά. On the frequent supplying of the indefinite pronoun, see Kühner, II. p. 37 f.; Fritzsche, Conject. I. 36. The well-known Hebrew-like expression καρπὸς τῆς ὁρφίος αὐτοῦ (Ps. xxxii. 11) presupposes the idea of the uninterrupted male line of descent from David to Christ. — καὶ εἰσῆλθεν ἐπὶ τ. θρόνον αὐτοῦ] to sit on His throne, namely, as the Messiah, who was to be the theocratic consummator of the kingdom of David (Mark xi. 10; Acts xv. 16). Comp. Luke i. 32. — προειδοῦν] prophetically looking into the future. Comp. Gal. iii. 8. — ὅτι οὐ κατειλ.] since He, in fact, was not left, etc. Thus has history proved that David spoke prophetically of the resurrection of the Messiah. The subject of κατειλεύθην κ.τ.λ. is not David — which no hearer, after ver. 29, could suppose—but ὁ Χριστός; and what is stated of Him in the words of the Psalm itself is the triumph of their historical fulfilment, a triumph which is continued and concluded in ver. 32. — τοῦτον τὸν Ἰσραήλ] has solemn emphasis; this Jesus, no other than just Him, to whom, as the Messiah who has historically appeared, David's prophecy refers. — οὐ] neuter: wherever. See Bernhardy, p. 298. — μάρτυρες] in so far as we, His twelve apostles, have conversed with the risen Christ Himself. Comp. i. 22, x. 41.

Ver. 33 οὕτω] namely, in consequence of the resurrection, with which the exaltation is necessarily connected. — τῇ δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ] by the right hand, i.e. by the power of God, v. 31; Isa. lxiii. 12. The rendering: to the right hand of God, however much it might be recommended as regards sense by ver. 34, is to be rejected, seeing that the construction of simple verbs of motion with the dative of the goal aimed at, instead of with πρὸς or ἐπὶ, belongs in classical Greek only to the poets, and occurs, indeed, in late writers, but is without any certain example in the N. T., often as there would have been occasion for it; for Acts xxi. 16 admits of another explanation, and Rev. ii. 16 is not at all a case in point. In the passage of the LXX. Judg. xi. 18, deemed certain by Fritzsche, τῇ γῇ Μωύσε, if the reading is correct, is to be connected, not with ἔδωκεν, but as appropriating dative with ἀπὸ ἀναστάλαν ἁλίου. The objection, that by the right hand of God is here inapropriate (de Wette and others), is not tenable. There is something triumphant in the element emphatically prefixed, which is correlative to ἀνεμποτησαν ὁ Θεός (ver. 32); God's work of power was, as the resurrection, so
also the exaltation. Comp. Phil. ii. 9. A Hebraism, or an incorrect translation of ἑν τῷ ἐναγγ. τ. ἁγ. ἤν. ἀν. παρὰ τ. παρα. [contains that which followed upon the ὐψωθεῖς, and hence is not to be explained with Kuinoel and others: “after He had received the promise of the Holy Spirit from the Father;” but: “after He had received the promised (i. 4) Holy Spirit from His Father. See on Luke xxiv. 49. — τοῦτο is either, with Vulgate, Erasmus, Beza, Kuinoel, and others, to be referred to the πνεῦμα ἁγιον, so that the ὅ corresponds to the explanatory ὑδ quod 2 or—which, on account of the δ annexed to τοῦτο, is more natural and more suitable to the miraculous character—it is, with Luther, Calvin, and others, to be taken as an independent neuter: ἦν poured forth, just now, this, what ye, in effectu, see and hear, in the conduct and speech of those assembled. Accordingly, Peter leaves it to his hearers, after what had previously been remarked (τῷ ἐναγγ. . . . παραφέροντα), themselves to infer that what was poured out was nothing else than just the πνεῦμα ἁγιον. — The idea that the exalted Jesus in heaven receives from His Father and pours forth the Holy Spirit, is founded on such instructions of Christ as John xv. 26, xvi. 7. Comp. on i. 4.

Vv. 34, 35. Γάρ] The fundamental fact of the previous statement, namely, the τῷ δεξιᾷ Θεοῦ ὕψωθεῖς, has still to be proved, and Peter proves this also from a saying of David, which has not received its fulfilment in David himself. — λέγει δε αὐτὸς] but he himself says, but it is his own declaration; and then follows Ps. cx. 1, where David distinguishes from himself Him who is to sit at the right hand of God, as His Lord (τῷ κυρίῳ μου) of this King, designated by τῷ κυρίῳ μου of the Psalm, although it does not proceed from David (see on Matt. xxii. 43), is, according to the Messianic destination and fulfilment of this Psalm, 4 Christ, who is Lord of David and of all the saints of the O. T.; and His occupying the throne, sit Thou at my right hand, denotes the exaltation of Christ to the glory and dominion of the Father, whose σύνθρονος He has become; Heb. i. 8, 13; Eph. i. 21 f.

Ver. 36. The Christological aim of the whole discourse, which, as undoubtedly proved after what has been hitherto said (ὁ ὅ), is emphatically at the close set down for recognition as the summary of the faith now requisite. In this case ἀσφαλῶς (unchangeably) is marked with strong emphasis. — πᾶς οἷος ἵστ. ] without the article, because ἵστ. has assumed the nature of a proper name. 5 The whole people is regarded as the family of their ancestor Israel (Ἰσραήλ Ἰσραηλίται κλάσματα Χριστοῦ) him Lord, ruler generally, comp. x. 36, as well as also Messiah. The former general expression, according to which He is δ ἐν ὑπὴν αὐτῶν, Rom. ix. 5, and κεφαλὴ ὑπὲρ πάντα,
Eph. i. 22, the latter special, according to which He is the οὐρανός τοῦ κόσμου, v. 31, John iv. 42, and κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, Eph. i. 22, Col. 1. 18, together characterize the Messianic possessor of the kingdom, which God has made Christ to be by His exaltation, seeing that He had in His state of humiliation emptied Himself of the power and glory, and was only reinstated into them by His exaltation. Previously He was indeed likewise Lord and Messiah, but in the form of a servant; and it was after laying aside that form that He became such in complete reality. It is not to be inferred from such passages as this and Acts iv. 27, x. 38, xvii. 31 (de Wette), that the Book of Acts represents the Messianic dignity of Jesus as an acquisition in time; against which view even παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς in our passage (ver. 33), compared with the confession in Matt. xvi. 16, John xvi. 30, is decisive, to say nothing of the Pauline training of Luke himself. Comp. also ver. 34. — αἰτίων is not superfluous, but τῶν τῶν Ἰσραήλ is a weighty exegesis, which is purposely chosen in order to annex the strongly contrasting ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἴσταν- ρισταί (comp. iii. 13, vii. 52), and thus to impart to the whole address a deeply impressive conclusion. "Aculeus in fæce," Bengel.

Ver. 37. But after they heard it, what was said by Peter, they were pierced in the heart. — κατανικάσεα, in the figurative sense of painful emotion, which penetrates the heart as if stinging, is not found in Greek writers, who, however, use νπκεαζ μεν in a similar sense; but see LXX. Ps. cix. 18: κατανικαζενέαν τῇ καρδίᾳ, Gen. xxxiv. 7, where κατανεκρίσαν is illustrated by the exegesis: καὶ λυπηρῶν ἐν αὐτῶι σφόδρα. The hearers were seized with deep pain in their conscience on the speech of Peter, partly for the general reason that He whom they now recognised as the Messiah was murdered by the nation, partly for the more special reason that they themselves had not as yet acknowledged Him, or had been even among His adversaries, and consequently had not recognised and entered upon the only way of salvation pointed out by Peter.—On the figure of stinging, comp. Cic. de orat. iii. 34, of Pericles: "ut in eorum mentibus, qui audissent, quasi aculeos quosdam rolinairect." — τι ποιήσουμεν? what shall we do? The inquiry of a need of salvation surrendering itself to guidance. An opposite impression to that made by the discourse of Jesus in Nazareth, Luke iv. 28. — ἀναφέρει ἀδελφῶι] an affectionate and respectful address from broken hearts already gained. Comp. on i. 16. "Non ita dixerant prius," Bengel.

Ver. 38. What a definite and complete answer and promise of salvation! The μετανοήσατε demands the change of ethical disposition as the moral condition of being baptized, which directly and necessarily brings with it faith (Mark i. 15); the aorist denotes the immediate accomplishment (comp. iii. 19, viii. 22), which is conceived as the work of energetic resolution. So the apostles began to accomplish it, Luke xxvii. 47. — ἔτι τῷ ὄνοματι Ἰησ. Χριστοῦ] the ground of the name, so that the name "Jesus Messiah," as the contents of your faith and confession, is that on which the becoming baptized rests. Βαπτίζ. is only here used with ἔτι; but comp. the analogous

1 Comp. Weiss, bibl. Theol. p. 184 f. Susann. 11 (of the pain of love). Compare
2 Ecclus. xiv. 1, xii. 19, xx. 31, xlvii. 21; also Luke ii. 35. 3 Winer, p. 589 (E. T. 346).
expressions, Luke xxii. 8, xxiv. 47; Acts v. 28, 40; Matt. xxiv. 5, al. —
ei\(\) denotes the object of the baptism, which is the remission of the guilt
contracted in the state before μετάνοια. Comp. xxiii. 16; 1 Cor. vi. 11. —
καὶ λάθμ.] καὶ consequentium. After reconciliation, sanctification; both are
experienced in baptism. — τού ἀγίου πνεύματος] this is the δωρεά itself. Heb.
vi. 4; Acts x. 45, xi. 17.

Ver. 39. Proof of the preceding λήψεσθαι κ.τ.λ. : for to you belongs the
promise concerned, yours it is, i.e. you are they in whom the promise of the
communication of the Spirit is to be realized. — τοῖς εἰς μακράν] to those who
are at a distance, that is, to all the members of the Jewish nation, who are
neither dwellers here at Jerusalem, nor are now present as pilgrims to the
feast, both Jews and Hellenists.1 But, although Peter might certainly con-
ceive of the conversion of the Gentiles, according to Isa. ii. 2, xlix. 1, al., in
the way of their coming to and passing through Judaism, yet the mention
of the Gentiles here—observe the emphatically preceding φῶν—would be
quite alien from the destination of the words, which were intended to
prove the λήψεσθαι κ.τ.λ. of ver. 38. The conversion of the Gentiles does not
here belong to the matter in hand. Beza, whom Casaubon follows, under-
stood it of time: longe post futuros, but this is excluded by the very concep-
tion of the nearness of the Parousia.—As to the expression of direction,
eις μακρ., comp. on xxii. 5. — δομος αν προσκαλ. κ.τ.λ.] contains the definition
of πάσι τοις εἰς μακράν: as many as God shall have called to Himself, namely,
by the preaching of the gospel, by the reception of which they, as mem-
bers of the true theocracy, will enter into Christian fellowship with God,
and will receive the Spirit.

Ver. 40. Observe the change of the aorist διεμαρθύσατο (see the critical
notes) and imperfect παρεικάλει: he adjured them (1 Tim v. 21; 2 Tim. ii. 14,
iv. 1, often also in classical writers), after which followed the continued exhorta-
tion, the contents of which was: Become saved from this (the now living)
persevere generation away, in separating yourselves from them by the μετάνοια
and baptism. — σκολίος] crooked, in a moral sense = ἀδικός. Comp. on Phil.
ii. 15.

Ver. 41. Μίν αὖν] namely, in consequence of these representations of the
apostle. We may translate either: they then who received his word (namely,
σώθητε κ.τ.λ.), or, they then, those indicated in ver. 37, after they received his
word, etc.4 The latter is correct, because, according to the former view of
the meaning, there must have been mention previously of a reception of the
word, to which reference would here be made. As this is not the case,
those present in general are meant, as in ver. 37, and ἀποδεξάμενοι τὸν λόγον
αἰτοῦ (ver 40) stands in a climactic relation to κατενίγγην (ver. 37). —
προστίθησαν] were added (ver. 47, v. 14, xi. 24), namely, to the fellowship of

1 Comp. also Baumgarten. Others, with
Theophylact, Oecumenius, Erazmus, Calvin,
Piscator, Grotins, Wolf, Bengel, Helmbich,
de Wette, Lange, Hackett, also Weiss, Petr.
Lehrbegr. p. 148, and bibl. Theol. p. 149, ex-
3 Sm. vii. 19, comp. the classical ως εἰ
μακράν.
4 Comp. viii. 4 (so Vulgate, Luther, Beza,
Bengel, Kuinoel, and others).
4 Comp. i. 6, viii. 25, xv. 3 (so Castello, de
Wette).
the already existing followers of Jesus, as is self-evident from the context. — ψυχή persons, according to the Hebrew יברע, Ex. i. 5; Acts vii. 14; 1 Pet. iii. 20; this use is not classical, since, in the passages apparently proving it, ψυχή means, in the strict sense, soul (life).—The text does not affirm that the baptism of the three thousand occurred on the spot and simultaneously, but only that it took place during the course of that day (τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ). Observe further, that their baptism was conditioned only by the μετά πίστει and by faith on Jesus as the Messiah; and, accordingly, it had their further Christian instruction not as a preceding, but as a subsequent, condition (ver. 42).

Ver. 42 now describes what the reception of the three thousand had as its consequence; what they, namely, the three thousand and those who were already believers before (for the whole body is the subject, as is evident from the idea of προς τὴν ἡμέραν), as members of the Christian community under the guidance of the apostles perseveringly did. The development of the inner life of the youthful church follows that great external increase. First of all: they were perseveringly devoted to the instruction (2 Tim. iv. 3; 1 Cor. xiv. 6) of the apostles, they were constantly intent on having themselves instructed by the apostles. — τῇ κοινωνίᾳ is to be explained of the mutual brotherly association which they sought to maintain with one another. The same in substance with the ἀδελφότητι, 1 Pet. ii. 17, v. 9. It is incorrect in Wolf, Rosenmüller, and others to refer it to τῶν ἀποστόλων, and to understand it of living in intimate association with the apostles. For καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ is, as well as the other three, an independent element, not to be blended with the preceding. Therefore the views of others are also incorrect, who either take the following (spurious) καὶ as explicativum (et communio, videlicet factiones panis et precibus), or suppose a εἰ διὰ δὲνοῖ (Homberg) after the Vulgate: et communicacione factionis panis, so that τῇ κοινωνίᾳ, would already refer to the Agape. Recently, following Mosheim, the explanation of the communication of charitable gifts to the needy has become the usual one. But this special sense must have been indicated by a special addition, or have been undoubtedly suggested by the context, as in Rom. xv. 26; Heb. xiii. 10; especially as κοινωνία does not in itself signify communicatio, but communio; and it is only from the context that it can obtain the idea of fellowship manifesting itself by contributions in aid, etc., which is not here the case. — τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου in the breaking of their bread (τοῦ ἄρτου). By this is meant the observance of common evening-meals (Luke xxiv. 30), which, after the manner of the last meal of Jesus, they concluded with the Lord's Supper (Agape, Jude 12). The Peschito and several

1 En. 619, Med. 547, al.; see Kypke, Π. p. 19.
2 With the spuriousness of the second καὶ (see the critical note), the four particulars are arranged in pairs.
3 Comp. on Phil. i. 5. See also Weiss, Τελειωμένη θεία. p. 141 f., and Ewald. [Wolf.]
4 Cornelius a Lapide and Mede as quoted by De rito Christ. ante Const., N. p. 114.
5 So Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Olshausen, Baumgarten, also Löhe, Apohrism. p. 80 ff., Harneck, Christl. Gemeindegottesdienst. p. 76 ff., Hacett, and others. That the moral nature of the κοινωνία expresses itself also in liberality, is correct in itself, but is not here particularly brought forward, any more than other forms of its activity. This in opposition to Lechler, apost. Zeit. p. 385.
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Fathers, as well as the Catholic Church, with Suicer, Mede, Wolf, Lightfoot, and several older expositors, arbitrarily explain it exclusively of the Eucharist; comp. also Harnack, l.c. p. 111 ff. Such a celebration is of later origin; the separation of the Lord's Supper from the joint evening meal did not take place at all in the apostolic church, 1 Cor. xi. The passages, xx. 7, 11, xxvii. 35, are decisive against Heinrichs, who, after Kypke, explains the breaking of bread of beneficence to the poor (Isa. lviii. 7), so that it would be synonymous with κοινωνία (but see above). — ταῖς προσευχαῖς. The plural denotes the prayers of various kinds, which were partly new Christian prayers restricted to no formula, and partly, doubtless, Psalms and wanted Jewish prayers, especially having reference to the Messiah and His kingdom.—Observe further in general the family character of the brotherly union of the first Christian church.

Ver. 43. But fear came upon every soul, and many miracles, etc. Luke in these words describes: (1) what sort of impression the extraordinary result of the event of Pentecost made generally upon the minds of those who did not belong to the youthful church; and (2) the work of the apostles after the effusion of the Spirit. Therefore τι is the simple copula, and not, as is often assumed, equivalent to γάρ. — ἵνα [see the critical note] is in both cases the descriptive imperfect. Elsewhere, instead of the dative, Luke has ἵνα with the accusative, or ἐμφανίζει γίνεσθαι. — φόβος, as in Mark iv. 41, Luke i. 63, vii. 16, etc., fear, dread, which are wont to seize the mind on a great and wonderful, entirely unexpected, occurrence. This φόβος, occasioned by the marvellous result which the event of Pentecost together with the address of Peter had produced, operated quasi freno (Calvin), in preventing the first internal development of the church's life from being disturbed by premature attacks from without. — διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων.] for the worker, the causa efficiens, was God. Comp. ver. 22, iv. 30, xv. 12.

Vv. 44, 45. But (ἵνα, continuative) as regards the development of the church-life, which took place amidst that φόβος without and this miracle-working of the apostles, all were ἵνα τῷ αὐτῷ. This, as in i. 15, ii. 1, is to be understood as having a local reference, and not with Theophylact, Kypke, Heinrichs, and Kuinoel: de animorum consensu, which is foreign to N. T. usage. They were accustomed all to be together. This is not strange, when we bear in mind the very natural consideration that after the feast many of the three thousand—of whom, doubtless, a considerable number consisted of pilgrims to the feast—returned to their native countries; so that the youthful church at Jerusalem does not by any means seem too large to assemble in one place. — καὶ εἰς ἅπαν αὐτὰ κοινών] they possessed all things in common, i.e. all things belonged to all, were a common good. According to the more particular explanation which Luke himself gives (καὶ τὰ κτήματα

1 This Church draws as an inference from our passage the historical assertion: Sub una specie panis communicaverunt sancti in primitiva ecclesia. Confut. Conf. Aug. p. 548 of my edition of the Libri Symbolici. See, in opposition to this view, the striking remarks of Casaubon in the Exercitati. Anti-Baron. p. 466. Beelen still thinks that he is able to make good the idea of the daily unbloody sacrifice of the mass by the appended τ. προσευχ.!

2 πάσης ψυχῆς. Wintr. p. 147 (E. T. 194).

3 Comp., moreover, on the expression, Hom. Π. i. 138: Παλαιοί δὲ ἀγάλματα γίνονται, xii. 392, al.
... τις, comp. iv. 32), we are to assume not merely in general a distinguished beneficence, liberality, and mutual rendering of help, or "a prevailing willingness to place private property at the disposal of the church;" but a real community of goods in the early church at Jerusalem, according to which the possessors were wont to dispose of their lands and their goods generally, and applied the money sometimes themselves (Acts ii. 44 f., iv. 32), and sometimes by handing it to the apostles (Acts v. 2), for the relief of the wants of their fellow-Christians. See already Chrysostom. But for the correct understanding of this community of goods and its historical character (denied by Baur and Zeller), it is to be observed: (1) It took place only in Jerusalem. For there is no trace of it in any other church; on the contrary, elsewhere the rich and the poor continued to live side by side, and Paul in his letters had often to inculcate beneficence in opposition to selfishness and πλούσιον. Comp. also Jas. v. 1 ff.; 1 John iii. 17. And this community of goods at Jerusalem helps to explain the great and general poverty of the church in that city, whose possessions naturally—certainly also in the hope of the Parousia speedily occurring—were soon consumed. As the arrangement is found in no other church, it is very probable that the apostles were prevented by the very experience acquired in Jerusalem from counselling or at all introducing it elsewhere. (2) This community of goods was not ordained as a legal necessity, but was left to the free will of the owners. This is evident from Acts v. 4 and xii. 12. Nevertheless, (3) in the yet fresh vigour of brotherly love, it was, in point of fact, general in the church of Jerusalem, as is proved from this passage and from the express assurance at iv. 32, 34 f., in connection with which the conduct of Barnabas, brought forward in iv. 36, is simply a concrete instance of the general practice. (4) It was not an institution borrowed from the Essenes (in opposition to Grotius, Heinrichs, Ammon, Schneckenburger). For it could not have arisen without the guidance of the apostles; and to attribute to them any sort of imitation of Essenism, would be devoid alike of internal probability and of any trace in history, as, indeed, the first fresh form assumed by the life of the church must necessarily be conceived as a development from within under the impulse of the Spirit. (5) On the contrary, the relation arose very naturally, and that from within, as a continuation and extension of that community of goods which subsisted in the case of Jesus Himself and His disciples, the wants of all being defrayed from a common purse. It was the extension of this relation to the whole church, and thereby, doubtless, the putting into practice of the command Luke xii. 38, but in a definite form. That Luke here and in iv. 32, 34 expresses himself too strongly (de Wette), is an arbitrary assertion.

1 Comp. also Hundeshagen in Herzog's Encycl. III. p. 26. In this view the Pythagorean τὰ χῶα εὐλογία κοινή might be compared with it (Ritterh. ad Porphyr. Vit. Pyth. p. 40).
3 Bengel on iv. 34 aptly says: "non nisi summum fidél et amoris fidel convenit."
COMMUNITY OF GOODS.

Schneckenburger, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1855, p. 514 ff., and Ewald have correctly apprehended the matter as an actual community of goods. — τὰ κτήματα the landed possessions (belonging to him). — ὑπάρχεις possessions in general, in, namely, the proceeds. The reference is involved in the preceding verb (ἵπποπρασον). — καθότι ἀν τὸ χρείαν εἰσεῖ just as any one had need. ἀν with the indicative denotes: "accidisse aliquid non certo quodam tempore, sed quotiescunque occasio ita ferret." 5

Ver. 46. Καὶ ημέραν] daily. See Bernhardy, p. 241. — On προσκαρπεῖν ἐν, to be diligent in visiting a place, comp. Susann. 6. — ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ as confessors of the Messiah of their nation, whose speedy appearance in glory they expected, as well as in accordance with the example of Christ Himself, and with the nature of Christianity as the fulfilment of true Judaism, they could of course have no occasion for voluntarily separating themselves from the sanctuary of their nation; on the contrary, they could not but unanimously (ὁμοθυμ.) consider themselves bound to it; comp. Luke xxiv. 58. — κλώντες ἄρνον] breaking bread, referring, as in ver. 42, to the love-feasts. The article might stand as in ver. 42, but is here not thought of, and therefore not put. It would mean: their bread. — καὶ οἶκον] Contrast to ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ; hence: at home, in meetings in their place of assembly, where they partook of the meal, perhaps in detachments. Comp. Philem. 2. So most commentators, including Wolf, Bengel, Heinrichs, Olshausen, de Wette. But Erasmus, Salmasius, and others explain it domatim, from house to house. So also Kuinoel and Hildebrand. Comp. Luke viii. 1; Acts xv. 21; Matt. xxiv. 7. But there is nowhere any trace of holding the love-feasts successively in different houses; on the contrary, according to i. 18, it must be assumed that the new community had at the very first a fixed place of assembly. Luke here places side by side the public religious conduct of the Christians and their private association; hence after ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ the expression καὶ οἶκον was essentially necessary. — μετελάμβανον τροφής] they received their portion of food (comp. xxvii. 33 f.), partook of their sustenance. 6 Ver. 46 is to be paraphrased as follows: In the daily visiting of the temple, at which they attended with one accord, and amidst daily observance of the love-feast at home, they wanted not sustenance, of which they partook in gladness and singleness of heart. — ἐν ἁγίασθαι] this is the expression of the joy in the Holy Spirit, as they partook of the daily bread, "fructus fidei et character veritatis," Bengel. And still in the erection of

2 See v. 1; Xem. Oec. 30. 33; Eustath. ad Il. vi. p. 695.
3 Polyb. ii. 17. 11; Heb. x. 34, and Bleek in loc.
4 Comp. Luke xviii. 22; John xii. 5. See generally, Winer, p. 180 (K. T. 181 f.).
5 Herm. ad Vlper. p. 280. Comp. iv. 85; Mark vi. 50; Krüger, Anab. p. 5; Kühner, ad Mem. i. 1 16; and see on 1 Cor. xii. 2.
6 Observe how, on the one hand, the youthful church continued still bound up with the national cultus, but, on the other hand, developed itself at the same time as a separate society, and in this latter development already put forth the germs of the distinctively Christian cultus (comp. Nitschke, prakt. Theol. p. 174 ff., 313 ff.). The further evolution and independent vital power of this cultus could not but gradually bring about the severance from the old, and accomplish that severance in the first instance in Gentile-Christian churches.

the kingdom believers are ἰμώμαι εἰς ἀγαλλιάσει, Jude 24. This is, then, the joy of triumph. — ἀφελώτας] plainness, simplicity, true moral candour.¹ The word is not elsewhere preserved in Greek, but ἀφέλεια is.²

Ver. 47. Αἰσιοτίτες τ. Θεον] is not to be restricted to giving thanks at meals, but gives prominence generally to the whole religious frame of spirit; which expressed itself in the praises of God (comp. de Wette). This is clearly evident from the second clause of the sentence, καὶ ἔχοντες . . . λαῦ, referring likewise to their relation in general. That piety praising God, namely, and this possession of the general favour of the people, formed together the happy accompanying circumstances, under which they partook of their bodily sustenance with gladness and simple heart. — πρὸς δὲ τ. λαῦ] possessing favour, on account of their pious conduct, in their relation to the whole people.³ Comp. Rom. v. 1. — ὁ κύριος] i.e. Christ, as the exalted Ruler of His church. — τοῖς σωζόμενοις] those who were being saved, i.e. those who, by their very accession to the church, became saved from eternal perdition so as to partake in the Messianic kingdom. Comp. ver. 40.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(κ) Other tongues. V. 4.

The obvious and natural meaning of the passage is that the disciples were suddenly endowed with the faculty of speaking foreign languages, before utterly unknown by them. This special gift was promised by our Lord (Mark xvi. 17). The exercise of the gift is mentioned in connection with the conversion of Cornelius and his company (Acts ii. 15); also with the Ephesian brethren on whom Paul laid his hands (Acts xix. 6). And Paul speaks of "kinds of tongues" as one of the spiritual gifts, and discusses the question at length in 1 Cor. xiv. The gift is designated by a variety of names: καυσαϊ γλῶσσαις λαλεῖν (Mark xvi. 17); κτεραις γλῶσσαις λαλεῖν (Acts ii. 4); γλῶσσαις λαλεῖν (Acts x. 46); γλῶσσαις ορ γλῶσσης λαλεῖν. In this passage alone is the phrase "other tongues" employed. Various explanations have been offered of this wonderful phenomenon by those who deny the supernatural, or who, with our author, consider that the sudden communication of a facility of speaking foreign languages is neither logically possible nor psychologically and morally conceivable, or with Alford regard such an endowment as self-contradictory and impossible. It is supposed that the disciples were not all Galileans, but that some of them were foreign Jews, acquainted with other languages, in which they spoke—that the utterances were incoherent, jubilant expressions—that nothing more is meant than that some poetical, antiquated, provincial and foreign phrases were employed by the speakers; or that the utterances were ecstatic, spoken in a high state of inspiration, and often destitute

¹ Dem. 1469. 10: ἀφελής καὶ παράφροσις μεσοτές.
² Aes. V. Η. ill. 10, al.; Polyb. vi. 48. 4.
³ To refer this remark, on account of the later persecution, to the idealizing tendency and to legendary embellishment (Baur), is a very rash course, as between this time and the commencement of persecution a considerable period intervenes, and the popular humour, particularly in times of fresh excitement, is so changeable. Schwanbeck also, p. 45, denies the correctness of the representation, which he reckons among the peculiarities of the Petrine portion of the book.
of intelligible meaning—or that the words uttered had been heard by the disciples before, when mingling at the annual feasts with pilgrims of many nations; and now under high excitement these words or phrases were recalled and uttered—or some have supposed that only one language was spoken, but each hearer understood it as his own. That is, Peter spoke in Aramaic, but one understood it as Greek, another as Arabic, and another as Persian. Now, not one of these theories, however ingenious, accounts for the recorded facts, and some of them contradict them. But when the event is admitted to be distinctly miraculous, and the power a special gift of God, why is it to be considered either impossible or inconceivable? We may be wholly incapable of conceiving the modus operandi, yet admit the credibility and certainty of the fact. Some difficulty arises from considering the speaking with tongues discussed by Paul in 1 Cor. xiv., as identical in all respects with the event which transpired on the day of Pentecost. The gifts are analogous and similar, but not identical. The gift at Pentecost was unique, not only as the first in order, but also as superior in kind. Both are spiritual gifts, and of supernatural origin, and characterized by similar terms; but they differ in this, that at Pentecost distinct languages were spoken, which were understood at once by the hearers, while at Corinth a tongue was spoken unintelligible to the hearer, and required to be interpreted. At Pentecost the speaker understood what he said; while it is not perfectly clear that the speakers always understood what they uttered. Dr. Charles Hodge, however, regarding the gift spoken of by Paul as identical with that vouchsafed at Pentecost, thinks that the speaker, even when unintelligible to others, understood himself, at least generally, even when he was wholly unable to interpret in his own native tongue. Dr. J. A. Alexander says: “Other tongues can only mean languages different from their own, and by necessary implication previously unknown.” “The attempt to make this phrase mean a new style, or a new strain, or new forms of expression is not only unnatural, but inconsistent with the following narrative, where everything implies a real difference of language.” Dr. Leechler, in Lange, declares: “The narrative does not allow a single doubt to remain in an unprejudiced mind, that we are, here already in verse 4th, to understand a speaking of foreign languages, which were new to the speakers themselves.” And in reference to 1 Cor. xiv., he says: “The parallel passages claim respectively, at the outset, an interpretation of their own, independently of each other,” and adds, “It appears, then, that certain essential features of both occurrences are the same, while important differences between the two are discoverable.”

Calvin says: “I suppose it doth manifestly appear hereby that the Apostles had the variety and understanding of languages given unto them, that they might speak unto the Greek in Greek, and unto the Italians in the Italian tongue, and that they might have true communication and conference with their hearers.”

Dr. Jacobson, Bishop of Chester, says: “Nothing short of the sudden communication of the power of speaking languages, of which there had been previously no colloquial knowledge, and which were not learned in the ordinary course, can have been implied by this statement, reiterated as it is in vv. 6, 8, and 11. None of the suggestions of vehement excitement, for a time affecting the organs of speech, so as to render it more or less unintelligible, of ecstatic inarticulate utterances, of the use of archaic words or poetic phraseology, or of new modes of interpreting ancient prophecies, can be accepted as at all ade-
quate to this narrative." For a full discussion of the subject see Schaff's "History of the Christian Church," vol. i., pp. 224-245.

(1) Hades. V. 27.

A Greek word which, from its derivation, means that which is not seen, and is used to designate the invisible state—the infernal regions—the abode of the dead. In the Septuagint it is used as a translation of the Hebrew word Sheol. We have no appropriate word in English to express what is meant by the word Hades. The word occurs in the N. T. eleven times, and is rendered by the word hell in every instance except one (1 Cor. xv. 55), where it is rendered grave. In no instance does it mean hell as that word is now commonly understood—the place of punishment for the wicked after judgment—nor in any case does it necessarily mean grave. When it is said that the soul of Christ was not left in Hades—unhappily rendered in our version hell—the real meaning is that his soul was not left in the abode of separate spirits, whither it went at his death, even as his body did not remain in the grave or sepulchre where it was laid after his crucifixion. In the passage from the 16th Psalm here quoted by Peter, it would be absurd to understand it as denoting the place of the damned, whether the expression be interpreted of David the type, or of Jesus Christ the antitype, agreeably to its principal and ultimate object." (Campbell.) Doubtless from this passage the article of the Apostles' Creed is derived, "He descended into hell;" all that this can mean is that the soul of Christ at his death was separated from his body, and entered the abode of separate spirits, called by himself paradise. For interesting and instructive discussions of this question see Campbell's Dissertation VI., part ii.; Dr. Craven (Lange, Revelation); and Gloag.
CHAPTER III.

VER. 3. After ἐλεημοσ., λαθεῖν is to be defended, which is wanting in D, min. Theophyl. Lucif. and some vss., and is wrongly deleted by Heiri. and Bornem. The authorities which omit it are too weak, especially as the complete superfluousness of the word (it is otherwise in ver. 5) rendered its omission very natural. — Ver. 6. ἐγείρας καὶ] is wanting in B D Ῥ, Sahid.; deleted by Bornem. But as Peter himself raises up the lame man, ver. 7, this portion of the summons would more easily be omitted than added from Luke v. 23, vi. 8; comp. vii. 14. Lachm. and Tisch. have the form ἐγεῖας; rightly, see on Matt. ix. 5; Mark ii. 9. — Ver. 7. After ἐγείρε, A B C Ῥ, min., the vss., and some Fathers, have αὐτῶν. Adopted by Lachm. A usual addition. — Ver. 11. αὐτῶν] Elz. has τοῦ ἰαθέντος χώλος against decisive testimony. A church-lesson begins with ver. 11. — Ver. 13. καὶ Ἰσαὰκ κ. Ἰακώβ] Lachm. and Bornem. read καὶ Θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ, κ. Θεὸς Ἰακώβ, following A C D Ῥ, 15, 18, 25, several vss., Chrys., and Theophyl. From Matt. xxii. 32 (therefore also several of these witnesses have the article before Θεὸς), and LXX. Ex. iii. 6. — μέν] is wanting in Elz., but is to be defended on the authority of A B C E Ῥ, min., vss., and Fathers, and because no corresponding ἐν follows. — Ver. 18. αὐτῶν (not αὐτοῦ) is, with Lachm. and Tisch., according to decisive evidence, to be placed after Ἀριστον, and not after προφητῶν (Elz. Scholz). — Ver. 20. προκεκεχρωμένου] Elz.: προκεκεχρωμένου, against decisive evidence. A gloss (vv. 18, 21 ff.) more precisely defining the meaning according to the context (comp. also xiii. 23 f.). — Ver. 21. τῶν] Elz.: πάντων, against decisive testimony. Introduced to make the statement stronger, in accordance with ver. 24. — ἀν' αἰώνος] is wanting in D, 19, Arm. Cosm. Tert. Ir.; so Born. It was considered objectionable, because, strictly speaking, no prophets existed ἀν' αἰώνος. The position after ἄγιον (Lachm. Tisch.) is so decidedly attested that it is not to be derived from Luke i. 70. — Ver. 23. Instead of μέν, Elz. has μὲν γάρ, against decisive evidence. γάρ was written on the margin, because the connection was not understood. — πρὸς τοῖς πατέρας] is wanting in A B C Ῥ, min. Syr. Copt. Vulg. It is placed after εἰπεν in D E, vss., and Fathers. So Born. Rightly deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. An addition by way of gloss. — Ver. 23. Instead of ἔξωλθερ., A B C D, Lachm. Born. Tisch. read ἔξωλθηρ. An etymological alteration, which often occurs also in Codd. of the LXX. Comp. the variations in Heb. xi. 28.— Ver. 24. καταγγείλαν] Elz.: προκαταγγείλαν, against decisive evidence. A gloss of more precise definition. — Ver. 25. αἵ νῦν] Elz.: νῦν. But the article, which before νῦν was easily left out by a transcriber, is supported by preponderant witnesses, as is also the ἐν wanting before τῷ σπέρμ. in Elz., which was omitted as superfluous. — Ver. 26. After αὐτῶν Elz. has Ἰησοῦν, against many and important authorities. A familiar addition, although already read in A B. — ὑμῶν] C, min. vss. Ir. have αὐτῶν (so Lachm.) or αὐτοῦ. The original ὑμῶν was first changed into αὐτῶν (in conformity with ἐκαστον), and then the plural would be easily inserted on account of the collective sense. The pronoun is entirely wanting in B.
Ver. 1. After the description of the first peaceful and prosperous life of the church, Luke now, glancing back to ii. 43, singles out from the multitude of apostolic τετράκα σημεια that one with which the first persecution was associated. — ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ here also in a local reference;1 not merely at the same time and for the same object, but also in the same way, i.e. together, ἀνέβαιναν, 2 Sam. i.e. Prominence is here given to the united going to the temple and the united working, directing special attention to the keeping together of the two chief apostles. — ἀνέβαιναν they were in the act of going up. — ἐν τῷ ἡραν τῆς προςυπνήσει, used of the definition of time, in so far as a thing extends to a space of time.2 Hence: during the hour, not equivalent to ἐν τῷ ἡραν.3 Concerning the three hours of prayer among the Jews: the third (see on ii. 15), the sixth (noon), and the ninth (that of the evening sacrifice in the temple), see Lightfoot, Schottgen, and Wetstein, in loc. Comp. x. 8, 9.—The Attic mode of writing ἐνάτρυ is decidedly attested in the Book of Acts.

Ver. 2. Χελλάς εἰς καλ. μνημ.4 born lame. Comp. xiv. 8; John ix. 1. And he was above forty years old, iv. 22.—The imperfect ἐβασάζετο, he was being brought, denotes the action in reference to the simultaneous ἀνέβαιναν, ver. 1; and ἔσωσαν, its daily repetition. — τῇ λεγομ. ἡραιαν] which bears the ἰγ- name,5 "Beautiful." The proper name was, "gate of Nicanor." It lay on the eastern side of the outermost court of the temple, leading towards the valley of Kidron, and is described by Josephus, Bell. v. 5. 3, as surpassingly splendid: τῶν δὲ πυλῶν αἱ μὲν ἐννέα χρυσῷ καὶ ἀργυρῷ κεκαλυμμέναι πανταχόθεν ἡμῶν, ὡσοις τε παραστάδες καὶ τὰ ὑπέρθυρα μία δὲ ἡ ἐξωθεὶ τοῦ νεός Κορινθίου χαλκῷ πολὺ τῇ τιμῇ τὰς καταργύρους καὶ περιχρύσους ὑπεράγουσα. Καὶ δύο μὲν εκάστω τοῦ πυλῶν θύραι, τρίακοντα δὲ πυχών τὸ ύψος εκάστης, καὶ τὸ πλάτος ἡ πεντεκαίδεκα. Others (Wagenseil, Lund, Bengel, Walch) understand it of the gate Susan, which was in the neighbourhood of Solomon's porch, and at which the market for pigeons and other objects for sacrifice was held. But this is at variance with the signification of the word ἡραιας; for the name Susan is to be explained from the Persian capital (יוùìn, town of lilies), which, according to Middoth, 1 Kal. 3, was depicted on the gate.6 Others (Kuinoel, et. al.) think that the gate Chulda, i.e. tempestiva, leading to the court of the Gentiles, is meant.7 But this derivation of the name (from ἀνά, tempus) cannot be historically proved, nor could Luke expect his reader to discover the singular appellation porta tempestiva in ἡραιας, seeing that for this the very natural "porta speciosa" (Vulg.) could not but suggest itself. — Among the Gentiles also beggars sat at the gates of their temples8 — a usage probably connected with the idea (also found in ancient Israel) of a special divine care for the poor9 — τοῦ αἰρετοῦ  εος fine, ut peteret.

1 See on i. 18; comp. LXX. 2 Sam. ii. 18; Joseph. Antiq. xvi. 5. 6.
2 See on Mark xv. 1; Nägelsb. on the ἱλαδ, p. 394, ed. 3.
3 Alberti, Obs., Valckenaer, Wilner, and many others.
5 Perhaps, however, this picture of Susan on the gate of the temple is only an invention on account of the name, and the latter might be sufficiently explained from the lily-shaped decorations of the columns (יוùìn, ἡραιας).
7 Martial. i. 112.
8 Hermann, Privatallerth. § 14. 2.
Vv. 3-5. ἔλλογοντος εἰσελέγαν εἰς τ. ἱερ. For it was through this outermost gate that the temple proper was reached. — ἡ χώρα ἐλεημοσ. λαβ. he asked that he might receive an alms. Modes of expression used in such a case, Merere in me; In me benefaci tibi, and the like, may be seen in Vajiers vab. f. 20, 8, 4. — On λαβεῖν, which in itself might be dispensed with, see Winer, p. 565 [E. T. 760]. — ἀνεκήδας . . . βλέφων εἰς ἡμᾶς] They would read from his look, whether he was spiritually fitted for the benefit to be received. "'Talis intuitus non caruisti peculiari Spiritus motu; hinc fit, ut tam secure de miraculo pronuntiet," Calvin. Comp. xiii. 9. — ἐπειξέν αὐτοῖς] The supplying of τὸν νοῦν serves to make the sense clear. Comp. Luke xiv. 7; 1 Tim. iv. 16. He was attentive, intent upon them.\

Ver. 6. Δίδωμι I give thee here with. — ἐν τῷ ὄνωμ. . . . περιπάτει] by virtue of the name (now pronounced) of Jesus the Messiah, the Nazarene, arise and walk. ἐν denotes that on which the rising and walking were causally dependent. Mark xvi. 17; Luke x. 17; Acts iv. 10, xvi. 18. Comp. the utterance of Origen, c. Cels. 1, against the assertion of Celsus, that Christians expelled demons by the help of evil spirits: τοσοῦτον γὰρ ὄντα τὸ ὅνωμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. This name was the focus of the power of faith, through which the miraculous of the apostles operated. Comp. oν Matt. vii. 22; Luke ix. 49, x. 17; Mark xvi. 17. Ἀ δίων or the like is not (in opposition to Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others) to be supplied with ἐν τῷ ὄνωμι. k.t.l. Observe, moreover, first, the solemnity of the Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Ναζά. and secondly, that Χριστοῦ, as in ii. 38, cannot yet be a proper name. Comp. John xvii. 3, 8, 42.

Vv. 7, 8. Αὐτοῦ τῆς δεξιᾶς] comp. Mark ix. 27, and see Valckenaer, ad Theoc. iv. 35. — ἰστερεώθησαν] his feet were strengthened, so that they now performed their function, for which they had been incapacitated in the state of lameness, of supporting the body in its movements. — αἱ βάσις are the feet. — τὰ ὀσφύα: the ankle-bones, tali (very frequent in the classics), after the general expression subjoining the particular. — ἐγκαλλόμενος, springing up, leaping into the air. Not: exiitians, videlicet e gradatio (Casaubon), of which last there is no mention. — καὶ εἰσήλθε . . . τὸν θεόν] This behaviour bears the most natural impress of grateful attachment (comp. ver. 11), lively joy (περισσ. καὶ ἀλλόμενος, — at the same time as an involuntary proof of his complete cure for himself and for others), and religious elevation. The view of Thiess—that the beggar was only a pretended cripple who was terrified by the threatening address of Peter into using his feet, and afterwards, for fear of the rage of the people, prudently attached himself to the apostles—changes the entire narrative, and makes the apostle himself (vv. 12, 16, iv. 9, 10) the deceiver. Peter had wrought the cure in the possession of that miraculous power of healing which Jesus had imparted to His apostles (Luke ix. 1), and the supernatural result cannot in that case, any more than in any other miracle, warrant us to deny

---

2 As in Wisd. xili. 18; Joseph. Ant. viii. 5.
3 Xen. Opyr. vii. 1. 29; Anab. vii. 3. 28;
its historical character, as is done by Zeller, who supposes that the general χωλοι περιπατοῦνται, Luke vii. 22, Matt. xv. 31, has here been illustrated in an individual instance.

Ver. 10. Ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ, ὡς κ. τ. λ.] A well-known attraction. — πρὸς τὴν ἐλεοσ. [for the sake of alms. — δὲ καθήμενος] See on John ix. 8. — εἰς τῇ ὥρα Ἰ. εἰς: immediately at; on the spot of the Beautiful gate. See on John iv. 6. — θάμβους καὶ ἐκστάσεις] astonishment and surprise at what had happened to him—an exhaustive designation of the highest degree of wonder.5

Ver. 11. Κρατοῦντος] But as he held fast Peter and John, i.e. in the impulse of excited gratitude took hold of them and clung to them, in order not to be separated from his benefactors.6 There is no sanction of usage for the meaning commonly given, and still adopted by Olshausen and De Wette: assessori. For in Col. ii. 19 κρατεῖν occurs in its proper sense, to hold fast; the LXX. 2 Sam. iii. 6 is not at all in point, and in Achill. Tat. v. p. 809, ἐπεξείρει με κρατεῖν is: me retinere conabatur. — As to the porch of Solomon, see on John x. 28. — τὰυμαθία] the plural after the collective noun ὁ λαὸς.4

Ver. 12. Ἀπεκρίθησαν] he began to speak, as a reply to the astonishment and concourse of the people, which thereby practically expressed the wish for an explanation. See on Matt. xi. 25. Observe the honourable address, αὐτῷ, as in ii. 22, v. 35, xiii. 16, xxi. 28. — τὰ τοῦτο[περὶ] τοῦ περιπ. αὐτοῦ[]; The wonder of the people, namely, was unfounded, in so far as they regarded the healing as an effect of the δύναμις ἡ εἰσβεβλητα. of the apostles themselves. — τοῦτο[; is neuter; see ver. 10: at this. As to the ἤ, an, introducing the second question, observe that the course of thought without interrogation is as follows: Your astonishment is groundless, provided that you were reasonably entitled to regard us as the workers of this cure. The ἤ is accordingly: or else; if you think that you must wonder why, etc. — ἤμιθα emphatically prefixed: idια is then correlative. — εἰσβεβλητα] “quasi sit præmium pictatis nostræ a Deo nobis concessum,” Heinrichs. In us lies neither the causa effectiva nor the causa meritoria. — πεποιημένοι τοῦ περιπ. αὐτοῦ] to be taken together: as if we had been at work, in order that he might walk. That this telic designation of that which was done is given with the genitive of the infinitive, is certainly to be traced to the frequent use of this form of expression in the LXX.4; but the conception of the aim is not on that account to be obliterated as the defining element of the expression, especially as even in classical writers this mode of conception is found, and presents itself in the expression τοῦτοι ὑπὸς. The τοῦτοι is conceived as striking.

Ver. 13. Connection: Do not regard this cure as our work (ver. 12); no, God, the peculiar God of our fathers, glorified (by this cure),7 His servant

1 Winer, p. 581 (E. T. 781).
2 Comp. θείως καὶ θάμβος, Plat. de audi. 8, 140, and similar expressions, Lobbeck, Paral. p. 60 f.
3 Comp. John xx. 23; Rev. ii. 25, iii. 11; Song of Sol. iii. 4: αὐτὸν Ἐρασάμα αὐτῶν καὶ οὐκ ἐλέης αὐτῶν. — Polya. viii. 20, 8; Eur. Phoem. 600; Plat. Mor. p. 99 D.
5 See Winer, p. 306 (E. T. 410).
6 See, e.g., Herod. i. 117: τοῦτοι . . . . ὑπὸς ἐστιν ἡ ἡμεῖς ἐλέης, v. 100, 1. 309. Comp. πρόσωπον ὑπὸς, Krüger on Thuc. i. 56.
7 Comp. John ix. 3 f., xi. 4.
Jesus, whom you delivered up, etc. — what a striking contrast! — τὰ πατέρων ἦμ. embraces the three patriarchs. Comp. on Rom. ix. 5. — The venerated designation: “the God of Abraham,” etc. (Ex. iii. 15 f.), heightens the blame of the contrast. — ἑδόγας, namely, inasmuch as He granted such a result by means of His name (ver. 6). — τὸν παίδα is not to be explained, after the Vulgate, with the older interpreters (and still by Heinrichs, Kuhnbel), as filium, since only νῦς θεοῦ is throughout used of Christ in this sense; but with Piscator, Bengel, Nitzsch,1 Olshausen, de Wette, Baumgarten, and others, as servo; and the designation of the Messiah as the fuller of the divine counsel: servant of God, has arisen from Isa. xl.—lxxvi. namely, from the Messianic reference of the ἐπάνω ἔς there. Comp. Matt. xii. 18. So also in ver. 26, iv. 27, 30. Observe that an apostle is never called παῖς (but only δοῦλος) θεοῦ. Comp. especially iv. 29 f. — ἵνα ἴμεις μν] This μν, which pierces the conscience of the hearers, is not followed by any corresponding δ. Comp. on i. 1. The connection before the mind of Luke was: whom you have indeed delivered up, etc., but God has raised from the dead. But by κρίναντος ἐκείνου ἀπολίσθε is he was led away from carrying out this sentence, and induced to give to it another turn. — παρεδόκασε] namely, to Pilate. — ἤρνεσθαι αὐτὸν i.e. ye have denied that He is the Messiah, John xix. 14, 15; Luke xxiii. 2. Comp. also vii. 35. The object of the denial was obvious of itself, since Jesus had just been spoken of as the παῖς τοῦ θεοῦ. Observe, moreover, that with ἤρνεσθαι αὐτὸν the relative construction is not carried on, but with rhetorical emphasis the sentence is continued independent of it: and ye have denied Him.2 This is in keeping with the liveliness of the discourse and its antitheses; but without such a breaking off of the construction αὐτὸν would be quite superfluous, as the regimen remains the same as before. — κατὰ πρόσωπον] towards the face; ye have denied Him even unto the face of Pilate, so audaciously! Comp. Gal. ii. 11. There is no Hebraism.3 — κρίναντος ἐκείνου ἀπολίσθε is described as designedly used instead of αὐτοῦ, in order to make the contrast felt between what Pilate judged and what they did.4 Chrisrs. well says: ἵμας ἐκείνου ἰδέας ἐξετάσατε.

Vv. 14, 15. ‘Τοὺς δὲ] Contrast to κρίναντος ἐκ. ἀπολίσθε, ver. 13. — τὸν ἄγνοι καὶ δίκαιον] the κατ’ ἰδιόχυτ Ὑλότ, consecrated to God, inasmuch as He is the ἐπάνω ἔς, and Just, innocent and entirely righteous, see on John xvi. 10. Comp. Isa. liii. 11. To this characteristic description of Jesus ἀνάφω φώτα, Barabbas,5 forms a purposely chosen contrast: a man who was a murderer.6 It is more emphatic, more solemn, than the simple φώτα; but ἀνάφων φώτα would have been more contemptuous, Bernhardy, p. 48. — χαρισθήσαι ἰμι] condonari vobis,7 that he should by way of favour be delivered to

2 Comp. Bernhardy, p. 304; Köhner, § 799.
4 Comp. ver. 14. See Krüger and Köhner, ad Xen. Anab. iv. 3. 30; Dissen, ad Dem. de
5 Cor. p. 319; and the examples from Plato in
7 Comp. Soph. O. C. 948: ἄνω νεφελεῖν.
8 O. R. 862: ἄνω ἄργος.
9 Ducker, ad Flor. iii. 8. 10.
youn. — τὸν δὲ ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς] forms a double contrast, namely, to ἀνορα
φωνα and to ἀτέκτων. It means: the author of life, inasmuch as Christ
by His whole life-work up to His resurrection was destined (vv. 20, 21) to
provide eternal life, all that is included in the Messianic σωτηρία (Heb. ii. 10).
See John iii. 16, xi. 25; 2 Tim. i. 10. The inclusion, however, of physical
life (de Wette, Hackett), according to the idea of John i. 4, has no support in
the text, nor would it have been so understood by the hearers, although
even Chrysostom comes ultimately to the idea of the original Living one.—
ὅν ὁ Θεὸς . . . ὁ ἁμαρτάνων κ.τ.λ.] great in its simplicity. The latter, in which
ὁν is neuter, is the burden of the apostolic consciousness. Comp. on ii. 32.
Observe, moreover, on vv. 14, 15: “Graphice sane majestatem illam aposto-
licam expressit, quam illiuisse in dicendo vel una ejus testatur epistola,”
Erasmus. The Epistle of Peter is written as with runic characters.

Ver. 16. Ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει τοῦ ὑμω. αἰτοῦ] on account of faith in His name
(which we acknowledge as that of the Messiah), i.e. because we believe in
His Messiahship. On εἰς, of the cause on which the fact rests, on the ground
of, see Bernhardy, p. 250; as to the genitive of the object with πίστες, see
on Rom. iii. 22. Others—particularly Rosenmüller, Heinrichs, and Ols-
hausen—understand εἰς of the aim: in order that faith in Jesus may be
excited in you (and at the same time in the healed man himself, according to
Olshausen). But the very connection of thought is in favour of the first
explanation. For καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει κ.τ.λ. attaches itself closely to the pre-
ceding ὁ ἁμαρτάνων κ.τ.λ.; so that Peter, immediately after mentioning
the testimony, brings forward the extraordinary efficacy of the faith on
which this apostolic testimony is based. Still more decisive is the parallel-
ism of the second clause of the verse, in which the thought of the first
clause is repeated emphatically, and with yet more precise definition.—τὸ
δὲ αἰτοῦ] so far, namely, as the cure was effected by means of His name
pronounced, ver. 6. Observe the weighty repetition and position at the end.
—ἡ πίστες ὑπ' αὑτοῦ] the faith wrought (in us) through Him. Through
Christ was the faith, namely, in Him as the Messiah, wrought in Peter and
John, and in the apostles generally, partly by means of His whole mani-
festation and ministry during His life (Matt. xvi. 16; John i. 14), partly by
means of the resurrection and effusion of the Spirit. The view which takes
πίστες of trust in God brought about through Christ, is not in keeping with
the first half of the verse, which has already specifically determined the
object of πίστες. —ταύτα], δεικτικώς. For the bodily soundness of the man,
who was present (ver. 11), was apparent to their eyes.—ἀπέβαλεν πάντρ. ἑαυτᾶς
] corresponds to ὑπ' ἑαυτῆς in the first clause of the verse. The faith, etc.,
gave to this his restoration in the presence of you all; so that no other way
of its coming to pass was at all to be thought of.

Vv. 17, 18. Peter now pitches his address in a tone of heart-winning
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gentleness, setting forth the putting to death of Jesus (1) as a deed of ignorance (ver. 17) and (2) as the necessary fulfilment of the divine counsel (ver. 18). — καὶ νῦν] and now, i.e. et sic, itaque; so that νῦν is to be understood not with reference to time, but as: in this state of matters. — ἀδέλφοι] familiar, winning. Chrys.: αὐτῶν τὰς ψυχὰς εἰδὼς τῇ τῶν ἀδέλφων προστορίᾳ παρευνήθησατο. Comp. on the other hand, ver. 12: ἀνδρεῖς Ἰσραήλιται. — κατὰ ἀνοίγειν] unknowingly (Lev. xxii. 14), since you had not recognised Him as the Messiah; spoken quite in the spirit of Jesus. See Luke xxii. 34; comp. xiii. 27. "Hoc ait, ut spe veniae eos excitet," Priceans. Comp. also 1 Pet. i. 14. The opposite: κατὰ πρόθεσιν, κατὰ προαίρεσιν. — ἐσπερ καὶ οἱ ἱερές. ύμῶν] namely, have acted ignorantly. Wolf (following the Peshito) refers the comparison merely to ἐποίησατο: ... ignorantia adductos, ut faceretis sicut duces vestri. But it would have been unwise if Peter, in order to gain the people, had not purposed to represent in the same mild light the act also of the Sanhedrists (ἀρχοντες), on whom the people depended. Comp. 1 Cor. ii. 8. — Ver. 18. But that could not but so happen, etc. Comp. Luke xxiv. 44 ff. — πάντων τῶν προφητῶν] comp. Luke xxiv. 27. The expression is neither to be explained as a hyperbole (Kuinoel) nor from the typical character of history (Olahsen), but from the point of view of fulfilment, in so far as the Messianic redemption, to which the divine prediction of all the prophets referred (com. x. 48), has been realized by the sufferings and death of Jesus. Looking back from this standpoint of historical realization, it is with truth said: God has brought into fulfilment that which He declared beforehand by all the prophets, that His Messiah should suffer. On τ. Χριστὸν αὐτοῦ, comp. iv. 26; Luke ii. 26, ix. 20; Rev. xi. 10. — ὁ νῦν] so, as it has happened, vers. 14, 15, 17.

Ver. 19. Οὖν] infers from ver. 17 f. — μετανοήσατε] see on ii. 38. The εἰσοδέψατε (comp. xxvi. 20), connected with it, expresses the positive consequence of the μετανοεῖν. "Significatur in resipiens applicatio sui ad Deum," Bengel. — eis τῷ ἐξαλείψῃ. κ.τ.λ.] contains the aim, namely, the mediate aim: the final aim is contained in ver. 20, which repentance and conversion ought to have. The idea of the forgiveness of sins is here represented under the figure of the erasure of a hand-writing. Baptism is not here expressly named, as in ii. 38, but was now understood of itself, seeing that not long, before thousands were baptized; and the thought of it has suggested the figurative expression ἐξαλείψῃ: in order that they may be blotted out, namely, by the water of baptism. The causa meritoria of the forgiveness of sins is contained in ver. 18 (παθεῖν τὸν Χ.); the causa apprehendens (faith) is contained in the required repentance and conversion.

Ver. 20. The final aim of the preceding exhortation. In order that times of refreshing may come. Peter conceives that the καιροῖ ἀναφύτευσεν and the Parousia  

1 Since, in fact, only by this self-manifestation of the risen Christ must the true light concerning Him who was formerly rejected and put to death have dawned upon you; otherwise you could not have so treated Him. Comp. Xen. Anab. iv. 1. 19, and Kühner in loc. See also vii. 34, x. 5, xxii. 16; John ii. 22; 2 John 5. 2 See on Col. ii. 14. Comp. Ps. lii. 9; Isa. xlix. 23; Dem. 701. 13: ἐξαλείψεται τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ. 3 Comp. Weiss, Petr. Lehrbegr. p. 256.
(καὶ ἀποστείλῃ κ.τ.λ.) (M) will set in, as soon as the Jewish nation is converted to the acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah. It required a further revelation to teach him that the Gentiles also were to be converted—and that directly, and not by the way of proselytism—to Christ (chap. x.). — ἀπὸς ἀν, with the subjunctive, denotes the purpose that is to be attained in dependence on a supposition, here, in this event; if ye comply with the summons. This ἀν, consequently, is not equivalent to ἵνα (Vulg.: ut cuius venirent), in which case an apodosis which would be wanting is arbitrarily supplied in thought (see Erasmus and, recently, Beelen). Others (Beza, Castalian, Erasmus Schmid, Eckermann, et al.) consider ἀπὸς as a particle of time — ἀντὶ: quæddecunque venirent. Against this it may be decisively urged, in point of linguistic usage, that in Greek writers (in Herod. and the poets) the temporal ἀπὸς is joined with the indicative or optative, but does not occur at all in the N. T.; and, in point of fact, the remission of sins takes place not for the first time at the Parousia, but at once on the acceptance of the gospel. — καιροὶ ἀναψις.] seasons of refreshing: namely, the Messianic, as is self-evident and is clear from what follows. It is substantially the same as is meant in Luke ii. 25 by παράλληλας τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, — namely, seasons in which, through the appearance of the Messiah in his kingdom, there shall occur blessed rest and refreshment for the people of God, after the expiration of the troublous seasons of the αἰών ὁμοίως. The αἰώνες οἱ ἐπερχόμενοι in chap. ii. 7 are not different from these future καιροί. This explanation is shown to be clearly right by the fact that Peter himself immediately adds, as explanatory of καιροὶ ἀναψις.: καὶ ἀποστείλῃ τοῦ προκεχείρ. ὑμῖν Ἰησ. Χ., which points to the Parousia. Others rationalizing have, at variance with the text, explained the καιροὶ ἀναψ. either of the time of rest after death, or of deliverance from the yoke of the ceremonial law, or of the putting off of penal judgment on the Jews, or of the sparing of the Christians amidst the destruction of the Jews, or of the glorious condition of the Christian church before the end of the world. On ἀναψις, comp. LXX. Ex. viii. 15; Aq. Isa. xxviii. 13; Strabo, x. p. 459. — ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου] The times, which are to appear, are rhetorically represented as something real, which is to be found with God in heaven, and comes thence, from the face of God, to earth. Thus God is designated as ἀπὸς of the times of refreshing (Chrysostom). — τῶν προκεχ. ὑμῖν Ἰ. X.] Jesus the Messiah destined for you (for your nation). On προχειρίζωμαι (xxii. 14, xxvi. 18), properly, I take in hand; then, I undertake, I determine, and with the accusative of the person: I appoint one. Analogous is ὁ τῶν θεῶν ἀποκλήτος, Luke xxiii. 35.

Ver. 21. Whom the heaven must receive as the place of abode appointed

1 xv. 17; Luke ii. 33; Rom. iii. 4; Matt. vi. 5. 2 See Hartung, Partikell. II. p. 289; Klotz, ad Devar. p. 488 f. 3 Tim. iii. 1; Gal. i. 4; Acts xiv. 22. Analogous is the conception of κατάκαυνες and καταβηθεῖσαι in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Comp. ἄνωθεν, 2 Thess. i. 7, and the description given in Rev. xxi. 4 f.

4 Schinz in the Bibl. Hag. V. p. 119 ff. 5 Kraft, Oss. sacr. fasc. IX. p. 271 ff. 6 Barkey. 7 Grotius, Hammond, Lightfoot. 8 Vitringa. 9 Comp. 2 Macc. iii. 7, viii. 9; Polyb. vi. 58. 8; Plut. Galb. 8; Diod. Sic. xii. 23; Weist and Kypke in loc.; Schleusen. Thes. iv. p. 518.
for Him by God until the Parousia. Taken thus, οὐρανόν is the subject, and δὲ does not stand for ἐκεῖ, as if Peter wished historically to narrate the ascension; but the present tense places before the eyes the necessity of the elevation of Christ into heaven as an absolute relation, which as such is constantly present until the Parousia (ver. 20, and ἀρχῇ χρόνων κ.τ.λ., ver. 21). Hence also the infinitive is not of the duration of the action (δέχεσθαι), but of its absolute act (δεικνύει). Others find the subject in ὃν: who must occupy heaven (so Luther and many of the older Lutherans, partly in the interest of Christ’s ubiquity; also Bengel, Heinrichs, Olschhausen, Lange, Weiss, et al.); “Christus coelum debuit occupare ceu regiam suam,” Calovius. But against this view the linguistic usage of δέχεσθαι, which never signifies occupare, is decisive. — On the μὲν solitariwm Grotius aptly remarks, that it has its reference in ἀρχῇ χρόνων ἀποκαταστ., “quasi dicit: ubi illud tempus venerit, ex coelo in terras reedit.” — ἀρχῇ χρόνων ἀποκαταστ. πάνω] until times shall have come, in which all things will be restored. Before such times set in, Christ comes not from heaven. Consequently the times of the αἰών ὁ μέλλων itself—the καιρὸς ἀναφέξεως—cannot be meant; but only such times as shall precede the Parousia, and by the emergence of which it is conditioned, that the Parousia shall ensue. Accordingly the explanation of the universal renewal of the world unto a glory such as preceded the fall is excluded, seeing that that restoration of all things (πάνω) coincides with the Parousia, in opposition to de Wette, as well as many older expositors, who think on the resurrection and the judgment. The correct interpretation must start from Mal. iv. 6 as the historical seat of the expression, and from Matt. xvii. 11, where Christ Himself, taking it from Malachi, has made it His own. Accordingly the ἀποκατάστασις πάνω can only be the restoration of all moral relations to their original normal condition. Christ’s reception in heaven—this is the idea of the apostle—continues until the moral corruption of the people of God is removed, and the thorough moral renovation, the ethical restitutio in integrum, of all their relations shall have ensued. Then only is the exalted Christ sent from heaven to the people, and then only does there come for the latter the ἀνάψυξις from the presence of God, ver. 20. What an incitement neither to neglect nor to defer repentance and conversion as the means to this ἀποκατάστασις πάνω! The mode in which this moral restitution must take place is, according to ver. 22, beyond doubt,—namely, by rendering obedience in all points to what the

1 Gregory of Nazianzus, Oral. 2 de fil., already has evidently thus view: δει γὰρ αὐτῶν . . . ὃν οὐρανόν δεικνύει, and Oecumenius calls heaven the ἀνάψυξις τῶν ἀνεκταλαμένων. The Vulgate repeats the ambiguity of the original: quem oportet coelum quidem sceipere; but yet appears, by sceipere, to betray the correct view. Clearly and definitely Castalio gives it with a passive turn: “quem oportet coelo scipit.”

2 Beza, Piscator, Castalio, and others, the Socinians, also Kniep, de Wette, Baumgarten, Lechler, Hackett.

3 We should have to explain it as: who must accept the heaven (comp. Bengel). But what a singularly turgid expression would that be!

Messiah has during His earthly ministry spoken. Observe, moreover, that πάντων is not masculine, but neuter, as in Matt. xvii. 11, Mark ix. 13 (comp. ver. 32, κατὰ πάντα, δότα); and that ἀποκατάστασις cannot be otherwise taken than in its constant literal meaning, restoration, wherein the state lost and to be restored is to be conceived as that of the obedience of the theocracy toward God and His messenger (ver. 22). The state of forgiveness of sin (ver. 19) is not identical with this, but previous to it, as ἐπὶ κ. τ. λ. (ver. 20) shows : the sanctification following the reconciliation. — ἢν ἠλάφτανεν κ. τ. λ. The attracted ἢν refers to χρῶμεν: of which he has spoken, etc. Others refer it to πάντων, and explain: usque ad tempus, quo omnis eventum habebunt, quae, etc.; by which Peter is supposed to mean either the conquest of Messiah's enemies and the diffusion of the Christian religion, or the destruction of the Jewish state, or the erection of the Messianic kingdom and the changes preceding it, the diffusion of Christianity, the resurrection of the dead, and the judgment. Incorrectly, as ἀποκατάστασις, in the sense of impleto, eis πέρας ἐλθειν, and the like, is without warrant in usage; and as little does it admit the substitution of the idea realisation. — ἢς αἰώνος since the world began, to be taken relatively. See on Luke i. 70.

Vv. 23-24. Connection: What has just been said: “By the mouth of His holy prophets from the beginning,” is now set forth more particularly in two divisions,—namely: (1) Moses, with whom all O. T. prophecy begins (comp. Rom. x. 19), has announced to the people the advent of the Messiah, and the necessity of obedience to Him, vv. 22, 23. Thus has he made a beginning in speaking of the ἀποκατάστασις πάντων, which in fact can only be brought about by obedience to all which the Messiah has spoken. (2) But also the collective body of prophets from Samuel onwards, that is, the prophets in the stricter sense, etc., ver. 24 — Μωυσῆς] The passage is Deut. xviii. 15 ff., 19, which, applying according to its historical sense to the prophetic order generally which presents itself to the seer collectively as in one person, has received its highest fulfilment in Christ as the realized ideal of all the Old Testament interpreters of God, consequently as the άλληνος προφήτης. Comp. vii. 37. — ὃς εὑρ[ε] as He has raised up me by His prepara-

2 Polyb. iv. 23. 1; v. 2. 11; xxviii. 10. 7; Dion. Hal. x. 8; also Plat. Ac. p. 570.
3 On άλληνος, in this sense, comp. Matt. xxvi. 18; Plat. Ac. p. 366 D; Soph. Phil. 110. So also λόγος, to tell of something: see Stallbaum, ad Plat. Apol. p. 93 A; Phaed. p. 79 B.
4 Baumgarten, p. 83, endeavours to bring out essentially the same meaning, but without any change in the idea of ἀποκατάστασις, in this way: he supplies the verb ἀνασκευάζων with ἦν ἠλάφτανεν, and assumes the kingdom of Israel (1. 6) to be meant. To imagine the latter reference, especially after πάντων, is just as arbitrary, as the supplying of that verbal notion is exceedingly harsh. Hofm. Schriftdew. II. 2, p. 643, follows the correct reference of ἢν ἠλάφτανεν.
5 Rosenmüller, Morus, Stoiz. Herzhicha.
6 Grotius, Hammond, Bolten.
7 Kuinoel.
8 Oecumenius.
10 See on this passage and its different explanations, and also on its at any rate Messianic idea, Hengstenberg, Christol. I. p. 110 ff.; O. Baur, alttes. Weisag. I. p. 383 ff.
tion, calling, commission, and effectual communion. Bengel well remarks regarding the Messianic fulfilment: "Similitudo non officit excellentiae." — εἰσα γεί see on ii. 17. — εἰσοδήμω ικ. τοῦ λαοῦ In the LXX., it runs after the original text: εἰσι εἰσδιδαχῶ οἱ αὐτῶ. Peter, in order to express this threat according to its more special import, and thereby in a manner more deterrent and more incentive to the obedience required, substitutes for it the formula which often occurs in the Pentateuch after Gen. xvii. 14: οὐ προμέλασις εἰς Ἥλιον δεῖ, which is the appointment of the punishment of death excluding forgiveness. The apostle, according to his insight into the Messianic reference and significance of the whole passage, understands by it, exclusion from the Messianic life and ejection to Gehenna, consequently the punishment of eternal death, which will set in at the judgment. — καὶ... δεί] i.e. Moses on the one hand, and all the prophets on the other. Thus over against Moses, the beginner, who was introduced by μία, there is placed as similar in kind the collective body. See as to καὶ... δεί, on John vi. 51, and observe that δεί is attached to the emphasized idea appended (πάντες). — All the prophets from Samuel and those that follow, as many as have spoken, have also, etc.,—evidently an inaccurate form of expression in which two constructions are mixed up,—namely: (1) All the prophets from Samuel onward, as many of them as have spoken, have also, etc.; and (2) All the prophets, Samuel and those that follow, as many of them as have spoken, have also, etc. The usual construction since Casaubon, adopted also by Valckenaer and Kuinoel, is that of the Vulgate: "et omnes prophetiae a Samuel, et deinceps qui locuti sunt," so that it is construed καὶ δοῦν τῶν καθεξῆς ἐλλ. ; it yields a tautology, as those who follow after are already contained in πάντες οἱ προφῆται ἀπὸ Σ. Van Hengel's expedient, that after τῶν καθεξῆς there is to be supplied εἰς Ιωάννου, and after προφηταί, ἀπεξάκειται, is simply arbitrary in both cases.—After Moses Samuel opens the series of prophets in the stricter sense. He is called in the Talmud also (see Wetstein) magister prophetae. For a prophecy from 2 Sam., see Heb. i. 5. — κ. τῶν καθεξῆς] "longa temporum successionem, uno tamen consensu," Calvin. — τὰς ἤμιρας πατριῶν] i.e. those days, of which Moses has spoken what has just been quoted, namely, the χρόνον ἁπαξακαταρ. παν., which necessarily follows from ὃν ἐλάλησεν ὁ Θεός κ.τ.λ., ver. 21. Hence we are not to understand, with Schneckenburger, Weiss, Hofmann the time of the present as referred to; in which view Hofmann would change the entire connection, so as to make vv. 22-24 serve as a reason for the call to repentance in ver. 19, whereas it is evident that ὑπὸ ἐλάλησεν κ.τ.λ., ver. 21, must be the element determining the following appeals to Moses and the prophets.

Ver. 25. Ye are the sons of the prophets and of the covenant, i.e. ye belong

---

1 Comp. Weiss, Bibl. Theol. p. 146. [p. 419. 2 See Goen. Theol. II. p. 718; Ewald, Alcrith. 3 On εἰσοδήμων, funditus perdo, frequent in the LXX., the Apocrypha, and in the Test. XII. Patr., also in Clem. Rom. who has only the form εἰσοδῆθω, only known to later Greek, see Kypke, II. p. 27; Sturm, Dial. Mac. p. 362 s. 4 Comp. Baeumli, Patilk. p. 149. 5 Winler, p. 588 (E. T. 786). 6 Adnot.at. in loca nonnulla N. T. p. 101 ff. 7 Comp. Henstenberg, Christol. I. p. 143 ff. 8 Schriftdew. II. 1. p. 140. 9 Observe the great emphasis of the ὄνειρα as of the ὄνειρα (ver. 26). From their position of preference they ought, in the consciousness of
to both, inasmuch as what was promised by the prophets and pledged in the covenant is to be realized for and in you, as the recipients in accordance with promise and covenant. Comp. ii. 39; Rom. ix. 4, xv. 8. On νοι τῆς διαθήκης, comp. the rabbinical passages in Wetstein. Concerning νοι, used to denote closer connection (like ἵνα), see on Matt. viii. 12. Incorrectly Lightfoot, Wolf, and Kuinoel render: "prophetarum discipuli, Matt. xii. 27; so the Greek παῖς;" because then νοι in the same signification does not suit τῆς διαθήκης. Hence, incorrectly, also Michaelis, Morus, Heinrichs: "e vestra natione provenarunt prophetae." — διαθήκη, covenant. For God bound Himself by covenant to bless all generations through the seed of Abraham, on the condition, namely, that Abraham obeyed His command (Gen. xii. 1). So with διαθήκη also in the classics. — πρὸς τοὺς πατ. ἡμ.] πρὸς denotes the ethical direction. Bernhardy, p. 265. Abraham is conceived as representative of the forefathers; hence it is said that God had bound Himself towards the fathers when He spoke to Abraham. — καὶ ἐν τῷ στίχωμα σου] καὶ, and, quite as in ii. 17. — The quotation (Gen. xxii. 18; comp. xviii. 18, xii. 3) is not exactly according to the LXX. According to the Messianic fulfilment, from which point of view Peter grasps and presents the prophetic meaning of the passage (see ver. 26), ἐν τῷ στίχῳ σου is not collective, but: in thy descendant, namely, the Messiah (comp. Gal. iii. 16), the future blessing of salvation has its causal ground. As to παραιτεῖν, peoples, here nations, see on Eph. iii. 15.

Ver. 26. Progress of the discourse: "This bestowal—in accordance with God's covenant-arrangements—of salvation on all nations of the earth through the Messiah has commenced with you," to you first has God sent, etc. — πρῶτον] sooner than to all other nations. "Prævium indicium de vocazione gentium," Bengel. Rom. i. 16, xi. 11. On this intimation of the universality of the Messianic salvation Olshausen observes, that the apostle, who at a later period rose with such difficulty to this idea (ch. x.), was doubtless, in the first moments of his ministry, full of the Spirit, raised above himself, and in this elevation had glimpses to which he was still, as regards his general development, a stranger. But this is incorrect: Peter shared the views of his people, that the non-Jewish nations would be made partakers in the blessings of the Messiah by acceptance of the Jewish theocracy. He thus still expected at this time the blessing of the Gentiles through the Messiah to take place in the way of their passing through Mosaism. "Caput et summa rei in adventu Messiae in eo continetur, quod omnes omnino populi adoret Jovam illumque colant unanimiter." "Gentes non traditae sunt Israelici in hoc saeculo, at tradentur in diebus Messiae." See already Isa. ii. 2 f., lx. 3 ff. — ἀναστήσας] causing His servant to appear (the aorist participle synchronous with ἀνέπτυστον. This view of ἀναστ. is required by ver. 23. Incorrectly, therefore, Luther, Beza, Heumann, and Barkey: after He has raised Him from the dead.—εὐλογοῦντα ἵμας] blessing you. The
correlate of ἐνελγαί, v. 25. This efficacy of the Sent One procuring salvation through His redeeming work is continuous. — in τῷ ἀποστρατεύειν] in the turning away, i.e. when ye turn from your iniquities (see on Rom. i. 29), consequently denoting that by which the ἐνελγαί must be accompanied on the part of the recipients (comp. iv. 30) — the moral relation which must necessarily be thereby brought about. We may add, that here the intransitive meaning of ἀποστρατεύειν, and not the transitive, which Pisator, Calvin, Hammond, Wetstein, Bengel, Morus, Heinrichs adopt (when He turns away), is required by the summons contained in ver. 19. — The issue to which vv. 25 and 26 were meant to induce the hearers—namely, that they should now believingly apprehend and appropriate the Messianic salvation announced beforehand to them by God and assured by covenant, and indeed actually in the mission of the Messiah offered to them first before all others—was already expressed sufficiently in ver. 19, and is now again at the close in ver. 26, and that with a sufficiently successful result (iv. 4); and therefore the hypothesis that the discourse was interrupted while still unfinished by the arrival of the priests, etc. (iv. 1), is unnecessary.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(V) Parousia. V. 20.

V. 20, Rev. Version. "And that he may send the Christ who hath been appointed for you, even Jesus," προεγερθαμενον—the reading preferred, signifies taken in hand, determined, appointed. Jesus was their appointed, predestined Messiah.

"Nearly all critics understand this passage as referring to the return of Christ at the end of the world. The apostle enforces his exhortation to repent, by an appeal to the final coming of Christ, not because he would represent it as near in point of time, but because that event was always near to the feelings and consciousness of the first believers. It was the great consummation on which the strongest desires of their souls were fixed, to which their thoughts and hopes were habitually turned. They lived with reference to this event. They labored to be prepared for it (2 Pet. iii. 12). The apostles, as well as the first Christians in general, comprehended the grandeur of that occasion. It filled their circle of view, stood forth to their contemplations as the point of culminating interest in their own and the world's history; threw into comparative insignificance the present time, death, all intermediate events, and made them feel that the manifestation of Christ, with its consequences of indescribable moment to all true believers, was the grand object they were to keep in view as the end of their toils, the commencement and perfection of their glorious immortality."

"If modern Christians sympathized more fully with the sacred writers on this subject, it would bring both their conduct and their style of religious instruction into nearer correspondence with the lives and teaching of the primitive examples of our faith." (Hackett.)

1 So only here in the N. T.; but see Xen. Hist. III. 4. 19; Gen. xviii. 28, al.; Ecclus. viii. 5, xvii. 21; Bar. ii. 33; Sauppe, ad Xen. de re eq. 12. 13; Kräger, § iii. 2. 5.
"The reference is evidently to an objective and not a subjective advent. It is a matter of dispute in what manner the apostles regarded the second coming of Christ. In all probability they were so engrossed with it that they lost sight of intermediate events; it was the object of their earnest desire; the period was indeed concealed from them, but they continually looked forward to it; they expected it, as that which might occur at any moment. Afterwards, as revelation disclosed itself, and the course of Providence was developed, they did not expect it to occur in their days. Paul especially seems to have regarded it as an event in the remote future, and cautions his converts not to be shaken in mind or to be troubled, as if the day of Christ was at hand (2 Thess. ii. 2). The precise period of the advent, we are expressly informed by our Lord, formed no part of divine revelation; it was designedly left in uncertainty by God."  (Gioag.)
CHAPTER IV.

Ver. 2. τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν] D, min. and some vs. and Fathers have τῶν νεκρῶν. Recommended by Grieseb., adopted by Bornem. An alteration in accordance with the current ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν. — Ver. 5. εἰς] A B D E, min. Chrys. have ἐν, which Griesb. has recommended, and Lachm. Tisch. Born. adopted. A correction, as the reference of εἰς was not obvious, and it was taken for ἐν; hence also εἰς Ἰς (regarded as quite superficial) is entirely omitted in the Syr. — Ver. 6. Lachm. has simple nominatives, καὶ Ἀναγ. . . . Ἀλέξανδρος, in accordance no doubt with A B D Μ; but erroneously, for the very reason that this reading was evidently connected with the reading ἀνεφέβησαν, ver. 5, still preserved in D; Born. has consistently followed the whole form of the text in D as to vv. 5, 6 (also the name Ἰωάννης instead of Ἰωάννης). — Ver. 7. ἐν τῷ μέσῳ with the article is to be defended after Elz., with Lachm., on preponderating evidence (A B Μ). — Ver. 8. τοῦ Ἰσραήλ] is wanting in A B Μ, Vulg. Copt. Sahid. Aeth. Cyr. Fulg., and deleted by Lachm. But, as it was quite obvious of itself, it was more readily passed over than added. — Ver. 11. οἰκοδομῶν] so, correctly, Lachm. and Tisch., according to important authorities. The usual οἰκοδομῶν is from Matt. xxi. 42; comp. LXX. Ps. cxviii. 22. — Ver. 12. οὖν] A B Μ, min. Did. Theodoret. Bas. have οὖν, which is recommended by Grieseb. and adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. And rightly, as in Luke xx. 36, xii. 26. Born., following D, has merely οὖ. — Ver. 16. ποιήσομεν] A E Μ, min. have ποιήσωμεν. Recommended by Grieseb. and adopted by Lachm. But the deliberative subjunctive appeared more in keeping with the sense. Comp. on ii. 37. — Ver. 17. ἀπειλεῖσθε] D, min. have ἀπειληθεῖσθα. So Born. But the future was introduced in order that it might correspond to the question τι ποιήσομεν. The preceding ἀπειλῇ is wanting in A B D Μ, min. most vs. and some Fathers; deleted by Lachm. and Born. It might very easily be omitted by an oversight of the transcriber. — Ver. 18. ἀφαίρῃς, Elz. Scholz. Born. have αὐτοῖς. A common, but here weakly attested insertion. — Ver. 24. ὁ Θεὸς] is wanting in A B Μ, Copt. Vulg. Ath. Did. Ambr. Hilar. Aug. Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. But as it might be dispensed with so far as the sense was concerned, how easily might a transcriber pass over from the first to the second ὁ! On the other hand, there is no reason why it should have been inserted. — Ver. 25. ὁ διὰ στόματος. Δ. παῦς σου εἰπὼν] There are very many variations,1 among which ὁ τοῦ παυρούς ἦμων διὰ πνεύματος ἄγιον στόματος Δ. παῦς σου εἰπὼν has the greatest attestation (A B E Μ, min.), and is adopted by Lachm., who, however, considers πνεύματος as spurious (Præf. p. VII.). An aggregation of various amplifying glosses; see Fritzsche, de conform. Lachm. p. 55. — Ver. 27. εἰν τῷ πόλεμι ταύτῃ] is wanting in Elz., but has decisive attestation. Rejected by Mill and Whitby as a gloss, but already received by Bengal. The

1 See besides Tisch., especially Born. in loc., who reads after D: ὁ (D: ὁ) διὰ τοῦ στόματος Δανίλ, παῦς σου.
omission may be explained from the circumstance, that in the passage of the Psalm no locality is indicated. — Ver. 36. 'Ἰωνης] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read 'Ἰωνης, according to A B D E Μ, min. Chrys. Epiph. and several vs. A mechanical alteration, in conformity with i. 23. — ὁ τὸν] Lachm. and Tisch. read ὁ τὸν, according to A B E Μ, min. Theophyl. Rightly; ὁ τὸν appeared to be necessary.

Vv. 1, 2. Ἐπέστησαν] stood there beside them. The sudden appearance is implied in the context (ἀλοιπώρ. δὲ αὐτ., and see ver. 3). See on Luke ii. 9, xx. 1. — οἱ ἵρευται] The article signifies those priests who were then serving as a guard at the temple. — ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ] the leader on duty of the Levitical temple-guard (of the ἵρευται), and himself a priest; different from the προστάτης τοῦ ἱεροῦ. — As the concourse of people occurred in the temple-court, it was the business of the temple-guard officially to interfere. Therefore the opinion of Lightfoot, Erasmus Schmid, and Hammond, that the στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ is here the commander of the Roman garrison of the castle of Antonia, is to be rejected. — καὶ οἱ Σαδδουκαῖοι] see on Matt. iii. 7 (N). The Sadducees present in the temple-court had heard the speech of Peter, chap. iii., at least to ver. 15 (see ver. 2), had then mostly instigated the interference of the guard, and hence appear now taking part in the arrest of the apostles. — διαπονοομενοι... νεκρῶν] refers to οἱ Σαδδουκαῖοι. For these denied the resurrection of the dead, Matt. xxi. 23. “Sadducei negant dicuntque: defict nubes atque abit; sic descendens in sepulcra non reedit,” Trenchum, f. iii. 1. διαπονοῦμαι. Here and in xvi. 18 may be explained either according to classical usage: who were active in their exertions, exerted their energies, my former interpretation, or according to the LXX., who were grievously afflicted, the usual view, following the Vulgate and Luther. The latter meaning is most natural in the connection, is sufficiently justified in later usage by those passages, and therefore is to be preferred. Sorrow and pain come upon them, because Peter and John taught the people, and in doing so announced, etc. That was offensive to their principles, and so annoyed them. — En τῷ Ἰησοῦ] in the person of Jesus, i.e. in the case of His personal example. For in the resurrection of Jesus the ἁνάστασις ἐκ νεκρός in general—although the latter is not expressly brought forward by Peter—was already inferentially maintained, since the possibility of it and even an actual instance were therein exhibited (1 Cor. xv. 12). — We may add that, as the apostles made the testifying of the Risen One the foundation of their preaching, the emergence of the Sadducees is historically so natural and readily conceivable (comp. v. 17), that Baur’s opinion, as to an a priori combination having without historical ground attributed this rôle to them, can only appear frivolous and uncritical.

2 Ecclus. x. 9; Aq Gen. vi. 8; 1 Sam. xx. 30 (Hesychius, διαπονοομενοι: ἀνυψάθαι).
3 The classical writers use the simple verb wοισθα in this sense, whether the pain felt may be bodily or mental. See Krueger on Thuc. ii. 51. 4; Lobeck, ad A. p. 306; Duncan, Lex. Hom. ed. Routh, p. 909. Accordingly, in the above passages διαπονοομενοι is the strengthened wοισθα in this sense.
however zealously Zeller has sought to amplify and establish it. See in opposition to it, Lechler, Apost. Zeit. p. 326 ff.

Ver. 3. Εἰς ἱματιαν [into custody, i.e. into prison.] — ἐσοπτρα as they had gone to the temple at the ninth hour, and so at the beginning of the first evening (iii. 1), the second evening, which commenced at the twelfth hour, had probably already begun. See on Matt. xiv. 15.

Ver. 4. As a contrast to this treatment of the apostles (δὲ), Luke notices the great increase of the church, which was effected by the address of the apostle. The number of believers had before this been above three thousand (ii. 41, 47); by the present increase the number of men, the women, therefore, being not even included—on account of the already so considerable multitude of believers, came to be about five thousand. The supposition of Olshausen, “that at first, perhaps, only men had joined the church,” is arbitrary, and contrary to i. 14. At variance with the text, and in opposition to v. 14, de Wette makes woman to be included.

Ver. 5. ἔγενετο . . . συναχθήναι But it came to pass that, etc.—αὐτῶν refers not to the believers, but, as is presumed to be obvious of itself, to the Jews, whose people, priests, etc., were named above, ver. 1, and to whom those who had become believers belonged.—τοῖς ἄρχοντι κ. ἁρξείς the Sanhedrists and elders and scribes. A full meeting of the Sanhedrin was arranged, at which in particular the members belonging to the classes of representatives of the people and scribes were not absent. Comp. on Matt. ii. 4.—εἰς ἑπτασακλήματο not as if they had their official residence elsewhere as Zeller suggests, in the interest of proving the narrative unhistorical; but certainly many were at this most beautiful period of summer soon after Pentecost, at their country residences. So, correctly, Beza, "arccestitis videlicet qui urbe abercant ut sullennis esset hic conventus,"—but only by way of suggestion, Bengel, Winer, and others. Most of the older commentators, and Kuinoel, erroneously assume that εἰς stands for ἐν, in which case, moreover, a quite superfluous remark would be the result. —καὶ also, in order to mention these specially.—Ἀνανίαν τὸν ἄρχυτερον.] (ο). As at this time not Annas, but his son-in-law Caiaphas, was the ruling high priest, an erroneous statement must be acknowledged here, as in Luke iii. 2, which may be explained from the continuing great influence of Annas. Baumgarten still, p. 88,4 contents himself with justifying the expression from the age and influence of Annas—a view which could not occur to any reader, and least of all to Theophilus, after Luke iii. 2. — Nothing further is known of John and Alexander, who, in consequence of their connection with Caiaphas and with the following καὶ βασιλ. κ. τ. λ., are to be regarded as members of the hierarchy related to Annas. Conjectures concerning the former, that he is identical with the Jochanan Ben Zaccai celebrated in the Talmud, may be

1 Comp. Thuc. vii. 86. 1; Acts v. 18.
2 Comp. ix. 3; Luke iii. 21, xvi. 22. So also in classical writers (Hes. Theog. 539; Xen. Cyr. vi. 3. 11). See Sturs, Lex. Xen. I. p. 957.
3 Comp. Winer, p. 138 (B. T. 168).
4 See the particulars, as well as the unsatisfactory shifts which have been resorted to, on Luke iii. 2. Comp. Zeller, p. 127.
5 Comp. also Lange, Apostol. Zeitull. I. p. 96, and II. p. 55.
seen in Lightfoot *in loc.*; and concerning the latter, that he was the brother of Philo, in Mangey, — *ἐκ γένους ἀρχιερᾶ* of the high-priestly family. Besides Caiphas, John, and Alexander, all the other relatives of the high priest were brought into the assembly,—a proceeding indicative of the special importance which was ascribed to the pronouncing judgment on the dangerous prisoners.

Ver. 7. The apostles were placed in the midst (ἐν τῷ μικρῷ, comp. Matt. xiv. 6; John viii. 8), so that they might be seen by all; and, for the purpose of ascertaining the state of matters which had occasioned the popular tumult of yesterday, the question is first of all submitted to them for their own explanation: *By what kind of power,* 8 which was at your command, or *by what kind of name,* which ye have pronounced, *have ye done this?*—the cure which, they were aware, was the occasion of the discussion. Erroneously, Morus, Rosenmüller, and Olshausen have referred ῥόστι to the public teaching. For the judicial examination had to begin at the actual commencement of the whole occurrence; and so Peter correctly understood this ῥόστι, as vv. 9, 10 prove.— *ἐν ποιήσει ὄνοματι* The Sanhedrin certainly knew that the apostles had performed the cure ἐν ὄνοματι Ι. Χριστοῦ (iii. 6), and they intended to found on the confession of this point partly the impeachment of heresy and blasphemy—as the Jewish exorcists were accustomed to use names of an entirely different kind in their formulae, namely, those of the holy patriarchs, or of the wise Solomon, or of God Himself* —and partly the charge of effort at rebellion, which might easily be based on the acknowledgment of the crucified insurgent as the Messiah. — ὑμεῖς] you people! with depreciating emphasis at the close.

Vv. 8–10. Πλησθείς πνεύμ. ἁγίου] quite specially, namely, for the present defence. Comp. xiii. 9. "Ut praesens quodque tempus poscit, sic Deus organa sua movet," Bengel. See Luke xii. 11 f. — *ei*] in the sense of *εἰτε,* is here chosen not without rhetorical art. For Peter at once places the nature of the deed, which was denoted by ῥόστι, in its true light, in which it certainly did not appear to be a suitable subject of judicial inquiry, which presupposes a misdeed. *If we* (ὑμεῖς has the emphasis of surprise) *are this day examined in respect of a good deed done to an infirm man (as to the means, namely), whereby he has been delivered.* — In εἰτε ἐβεβηκαί is contained an equally delicate and pointed indication of the unrighteousness of the inquisitorial proceeding. — We are decidedly led to interpret ἐν τῷ as neuter (whereby, comp. Matt. v. 13), by the question of the Sanhedrin, ver. 7, in which *no person is named;* as well as by the answer of Peter: ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι Ι. Χ. κ.κ.λ., ver. 10, which is to be explained by *the uttering the name of Jesus Christ,* but not to be taken as equivalent to ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ. Hence the explanation, *per quem, cujus ope* (Kuinoel, Heinrichs), is to be rejected; but the emphatic ἐν τῷ (ver. 10) is nevertheless to be taken,

2 Observe the qualitative interrogative pronouns.

8 See Van Dalen, de dictinal. Idol. V. T. p. 530.

with Erasmus, as masculine, so that after the twice-repeated by k.r.l. there comes in instead of the ὄνομα 'I. X., as the solemnity of the discourse increases ("verba ut libera, ita plena gravitatis," Grotius), the concrete Person (on this one it depends, that, etc.), of whom thereupon with οὐτος, ver. 11, further statements are made. — by ὁ Θεὸς ἡγείρεν ἐκ νεκρ. a rhetorical asyndeton, strongly bringing out the contrast without μὲν ... δὲ. — οὐτος παρέστηκεν κ.τ.λ. Thus the man himself who had been cured was called into the Sanhedrin to be confronted with the apostles, and was present; in which case those assembled certainly could not at all reckon beforehand that the sight of the man, along with the παράθυρια of the apostles (ver. 18), would subsequently, ver. 14, frustrate their whole design. This quiet power of the man's immediate presence operated insstantaneously; therefore the question, how they could have summoned the man whose very presence must have refuted their accusation (Zeller, comp. Baur), contains an argumentum ex eventu which forms no proper ground for doubting the historical character of the narrative.

Ver. 11. οὐτος] referred to Jesus, the more remote subject, which, however, was most vividly present to the conception of the speaker. — ὁ λίθος κ.τ.λ. a reminiscence of the well-known saying in Ps. cxviii. 22, in immediate, bold application to the Sanhedrists (ἰς' ὑψωτ.), the builders of the theocracy, that have rejected Jesus, who yet by His resurrection and glorification has become the corner-stone, the bearer and Upholder of the theocracy, i.e. that which constitutes its entire nature, subsistence, and working.

Ver. 12. To the foregoing figurative assurance, that Jesus is the Messiah, Peter now annexes the solemn declaration that no other is so, and that without figure. — And there is not in another the salvation, i.e. καὶ ἐξοχὴν the Messianic deliverance (ii. 21). Comp. v. 31, xv. 11. This mode of taking ἡ σωτηρία is imperatively demanded, both by the absolute position of the word with the force of the article, and by the connection with the preceding, wherein Jesus was designated as Messiah, as well as by the completely parallel second member of the verse. Therefore Michaelis, Bolten, and Hildebrand err in holding that it is to be understood of the cure of a man so infirm. Nor is the idea of deliverance from diseases generally to be at all blended with that of the Messianic salvation (in opposition to Kypke, Moldenhauer, Heinrichs), as Peter had already, at ver. 11, quite departed from the theme of the infirm man's cure, and passed over to the assertion of the Messianic character of Jesus quite generally, without retaining any special reference to bodily deliverance. — ἐν ἀλλω οἴδασθαι no other is the ground, on which salvation is causally dependent. — γάρ] annexes a more precise explanation, which is meant to serve as a proof of the preceding. For also there is no other name under the heaven given among men, in which we must obtain salvation. — οὖτε γάρ (see the critical remarks): for also not.

1 See Dissen, Exc. II. ad Find. p. 273.
2 Winck, p. 149 (S. T. 198).
3 Moreover, see on Matt. xxii. 42, and comp. 1 Pet. ii. 4 ff.; also on 1 Cor. iii. 11; Eph. ii. 20.
CHAP. IV., 13–22.

The reading 


would not signify namque non, but would indicate that a further clause corresponding to the te was meant to follow it up, which, however, does not suit here, where the address is brought to a weighty close. The use generally doubtful, at least with prose writers, of φικ . . . φικ instead of φικ . . . φικ, is here excluded by γάρ, which makes the notion of neither—nor inapplicable. — εἰς προφ. a name different from that name. On the other hand previously: εἰν ἄλλω φικ., in no one but in Him. Comp. on Gal. i. 7. — το δέθμ. εἰν ἄνθρωπον which is granted by God — given for good — among men, in human society. The view adopted by Wolf and Kuinoel, that εἰν ἄνθρωπον stands for the simple dative, is erroneous. — ἄνθρωπος] in this generic reference did not require the article. ἐν τ. φυσικ., which might in itself be dispensed with, has solemn emphasis. Comp. ii. 5. — εἰν φ. as formerly εἰν ἄλλω. The name is to be conceived as the contents of the believing confession. Fides implicita, in opposition to the Catholics, cannot here be meant; iii. 19, 26. — δει] namely, according to God's unalterable destination.

Vv. 18–15. θεωροῦντες] "Inest notio contemplandi cum attendo aut admiratione.‖ — καὶ καταλαβόμενοι] and when they had perceived, when they had become aware. They perceived this during the address of Peter, which was destitute of all rabbinical learning and showed to them one γραμμάτων ἀπερωριον. ἀγράμματος denotes here the want of rabbinic culture. Ἱδώτης is the same: laymen, who are strangers to theological learning. The double designation is intended to express the idea very fully; ἄνθρωπος has in it, moreover, something disparaging: unlearned men. On ιδώτης, which, according to the contrast implied in the connection, may denote either a private man, or a plebeian, or an unlearned person, or a common soldier, or one inexperienced in gymnastic exercises, one not a poet, not a physician, and other forms of contrast to a definite professional knowledge, see Valcken. in loc.; Hemsterhuis, ad Lucian. Nectym. p. 484; Ruliken, ad Long. p. 410. Here the element of contrast is contained in ἀγράμματοι: hence the general meaning plebeiane is to be rejected. They were μορφικ τόν κόσμον, 1 Cor. i. 27. Comp. John vii. 15. — εἰπεῖνωσκόν τοῦ αὐτοίς, ὡς κ.τ.λ.] and recognised them, namely, that they were, at an earlier period, with Jesus. Their astonishment sharpened now their recollection; and therefore Baur and Zeller have taken objection to this remark without sufficient psychological reason. εἰπεῖνωσκ. is incorrectly taken (even by Kuinoel) as the pluperfect. The two imperfects, ἑδάμισαι and εἰπεῖνωσκ., are, as relative tenses, here entirely in place. — τοι δὲ ἄνθρωπον] emphatically put first. — σωφρονεῖς they conferred among themselves.

1 So Hermann, Opusc. III. p. 153.
2 Kloetz, ad Devar. p. 716; Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 3. 31; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II. p. 444 f.
3 Baemlein, Partik. p. 229.
4 Winer, p. 204 (E. T. 573).
5 See Ast, Lex. Plat. I. p. 177 f.; Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 4. 14; Stallb. ad Plat. Cris. p. 51 A; Prot. p. 355 A.
6 Tittmann, Synon. N. T. p. 121.
7 a. 34; Eph. iii. 18; Plat. Phaedr. p. 250 D; Polyb. viii. 4. 6; Dion. Hal. ii. 66.
8 Plat. Apol. p. 26 D.
9 Xen. Mem. iv. 3. 30; Plat. Crit. p. 100 D.
11 Comp Lys. acc. Nicom. 38, and Brent. in loc. [ten.
12 Kuinoel and Oehler, comp. Baumgarten.
13 See Winer, p. 968 (E. T. 387).
14 Comp xvii. 18; Plat. Mor. p. 322 C.
Ver. 16. The positive thought of the question is: We shall be able to do nothing to these men. What follows contains the reason: for that a notable miracle, a definite proof of divine co-operation, has happened through them, is evident to all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and we are not in a position to deny it. — To the μὲν corresponds ἀλλ', ver. 17; to the γνωστόν is opposed the mere δοζαστόν.\(^1\)

Vv. 17, 18. In order, however, that it be not further brought out among the people, i.e. spread by communication hither and thither among the people, even beyond Jerusalem. The subject is τῷ σμείον, not διδαχῇ; but the former is conceived of and dreaded as promoting the latter. ἐπὶ πλειον, magis, i.e. here ulterior.\(^2\) — Observe that the confession of ver. 16, made in the bosom of the council, in confidential deliberation, and without the presence of a third party, is therefore by no means "inconceivable" (in opposition to Zeller). The discussion in the council itself may have been brought about in various ways, if not even by secret friends of Jesus in the Sanhedrin (Neander, Lange). — ἀπελὴ ἀπειλη.] emphatically threaten.\(^3\) — λαλεῖν is quite general, to speak; for it corresponds to the two ideas, φθεγγεῖν\(^4\), and δοδάσκειν, ver. 18. — ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνομ. τοῦτῳ] so that the name uttered is the basis on which the λαλεῖν rests. Comp. on Luke xxiv. 47. They do not now name the name contemptuously, but do so only in stating the decision, ver. 18. — The article before the infinitive brings into stronger prominence the object.\(^5\) Concerning μὴ in such a case, see Baemelcin, Partik. p. 298 f.

Vv. 19–22. "Ενώπ. τ. Θεοῦ] coram Deo, God as Judge being conceived as present: "multa mundus pro justis habet, quae coram Deo non sunt justa," Bengel. We may add, that the maxim here expressed, founded on Matt. xxii. 31, takes for granted two things as certain; on the one hand, that something is really commanded by God; and, on the other hand, that a demand of the rulers does really cancel the command of God, and is consequently immoral; in which case the rulers actually and wilfully abandon their status as organs of divine ordination, and even take up a position antagonistic to God. Only on the assumption of this twofold certainty could that principle lead Christianity, without the preoccupation of revolution, to victory over the world in opposition to the will of the Jewish and heathen rulers.\(^6\) For analogous expressions from the Greek and Latin writers and Rabbins, see Wetstein. The μᾶλλον μὴ is: rather (potius, Vulgate) than, i.e. instead of listening to God, rather to listen to you.\(^7\) The meaning of ἄκοινοι is similar to πειθαρχεῖν, ver.

---

\(^1\) Plat. Ptol. v. p. 479 D, vi. p. 510 A.
\(^2\) See xx, 8, xxiv. 4; 3 Tim. ii. 16, 11, 9; Plat. Phaedr. p. 361 B; Gorg. p. 433 A; and Stall. in loc.; Phaedr. p. 98 B; Xen. de scept. 4. 3. Comp. οἵ ἀλλάζοι, Lobeck; ad Phryn. p. 48.
\(^4\) On μὴ φθεγγεῖσθαι, not to become audible, Erasmus correctly remarks: "Plus est quam ne loquenteritur; q. d. ne hiccerent aut ullam vocem ederent." Comp. Castalio. See on φθέγγεσθαι, Dorvill. ad Chart. p. 409.

\(^5\) Bernhardy, p. 326; Winer, p. 306 (E. T. 406).

\(^6\) Comp. Wuttke, Sittenl. § 310. Observe withal, that it is not the magisterial command itself and per se that is divine, but the command for its observance is a divine one, which therefore cannot be connected with immorality without doing away with its very idea as divine.

\(^7\) Plat. Apol. p. 20 D; Arrian. Epict. i. 20.

\(^8\) Inconsistently the Vulg. has, at v. 29, magis. See Bacunl. Partik. p. 130.
29. — γὰρ] Ver. 20 specifies the reason, the motive for the summons: *private in*

*ver. 19.* "For to us it is morally, in the consciousness of the divine will, impossible not to speak," i.e. (v) we must speak what we saw and heard — namely, the deeds and words of Jesus, of which we were eye-witnesses and ear-witnesses. — ἡμεῖς we on our part. — προσαπαλπάμενοι] after they had still more threatened them, namely, than already in the prohibition of ver. 18, in

*which,* after ver. 17, the threatening was obviously implied. — μὴ δὲν εἰρίσκοντες τὰ πῶς κ.τ.λ.] because they found nothing, namely how they were to punish them. The article before whole sentences to which the attention is to be specially directed. — πῶς is not, with Kuinoel and others, to be explained *qua specie quo praetextu*; the Sanhedrin, in fact, did not know how to invent any kind of punishment, which might be ventured upon without stirring up the people. Therefore διὰ τῶν λαῶν, on account of the people, i.e. in consideration of them, is not to be referred, as usually, to ἀπέλθων αὐτοῖς, but to μὴ δὲν εἰρίσκοντες κ.τ.λ. — τῶν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] So much the greater must the miracle of healing have appeared to the unprejudiced people, and so much the more striking and worthy of praise the working of God in it. "πλείων τεσσάρας. Comp. Matt. xxvi. 53.

Vv. 23, 24. Πρὸς τῶν ἱδίων] to those belonging to them, i.e. to their fellow-

*apostles.* This explanation (Syr. Beza) is verified partly by ver. 31, where it is said of all, that they proclaimed the doctrine of God; partly by ver. 32, where the multitude of believers are contrasted with those. Hence neither are we to understand, with Kuinoel, Baumgarten, and others, the Christian church in general, nor, with Olschhausen, the church in the house of the apostles, or an assembly as in xii. 12. — ὁμοθυμαδῶν ἡράν] Thus all with one accord spoke aloud the following prayer; and not possibly Peter alone. The attempts to explain this away (Kuinoel, comp. Bengel: that the rest accompanied the speaker with a subdued voice; de Wette: that they spoke after him mentally; Olschhausen: either that one prayed in the name of all, or that in these words is presented the collective feeling of all) are at variance with the clear text. It is therefore to be assumed (comp. also Hildebrand) that in vv. 24–30 there is already a stated prayer (q) of the apostolic church at Jerusalem, which under the fresh impression of the last events of the life of Jesus, and under the mighty influence of the Spirit received by them, had shaped and moulded itself naturally and as if invol-

*untarily, according to the exigency which engrossed their hearts; and which at this time, because its contents presented to the pious feeling of the suppliants a most appropriate application to what had just happened, the assembled apostles joined in with united inspiration, and uttered aloud. With this view the contents of the prayer quite accord, as it expresses the memories of that time (ver. 25 ff.) and the exigencies (vv. 29, 30) of the*

---

1 Winck, p. 464 (E. T. 694).
2 Comp. Eccl. xiii. 3, ed. Compl.; Dem. 544. 30; Zeolm. I. 70.
3 Comp. Kühner, II. p. 138; Mark ix. 23; Luke i. 69; Acts xxii. 30.
5 Van Hengel, Ges. d. talent, p. 68.
6 This holds also in opposition to Baumgarten's view, that the whole assembly sang together the second Psalm, and then Peter made an application of it to the present circum-

stances in the words here given.
A PRAYER-MEETING.

threatened church in general with energetic precision, but yet takes no special notice of what had just happened to Peter and John. — The address continues to the end of ver. 26. Others' supply et after et, or before ὁ... τινῶν (Bengel), but less in keeping with the inspired fervour of the prayer. The designation of God by δίκαιον and ὁ παῖς αὐξ. κ.τ.λ., serves as a background to the triumphant thought of the necessary unsuccessfulness of human opposition. Comp. Neh. ix. 6; Rev. xiv. 7, al.

Vv. 25, 26. Ps. ii. 1, 2, exactly according to the LXX. The Psalm itself, according to its historical meaning, treats of the king, most probably of Solomon, mounting the throne; but this theocratic king is a type of the ideal of the Israelitish kingdom, i.e. of the Messiah, present to the prophetic eye. The Psalm is not by David (see Ewald and Hupfeld); but those who are praying follow the general assumption that the Psalms, of which no other is mentioned as author, proceed from him. — From the standpoint of the antitype of the Messiah thus: Wherefore raged, against Jesus, Gentiles, the Romans, and tribes, of Israel, imagined a vain thing, in which they could not succeed, namely, the destruction of Jesus? There arose, against Him, the kings of the earth, and the rulers, the former represented by Herod, and the latter by Pilate, assembled themselves, namely with the ἔνα πλεῖον and λαὸς (see ver. 27), against Jehovah, who had sent Jesus, and against His anointed. — χρίσσον] primarily, to snort; then, generally, ferocio; used in ancient Greek only in the middle.

Vv. 27, 28. For in truth there assembled, etc. This γάρ confirms the contents of the divine utterance quoted from that by which it had been historically fulfilled. — ἐπὶ ἁληθείας] according to truth really. — ἐπὶ τὸν ἄγιον πάντα τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἁγίου.] against Thy holy servant, etc. Explanation of the above καὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ αὐτοῦ. The (ideal) anointing of Jesus, i.e. His consecration on the part of God to be the Messianic king, took place, according to Luke, at His baptism, by means of the Spirit, which came upon Him while the voice of God declared Him the Messiah. The consecration of Christ is otherwise conceived of in John (ὁ πατὴρ ἡγιάσε; see on John x. 36). — Ἡρώθης] Luke xxiii. 11. — σὺν ἐνδεικνύει καὶ λαοῖς Ἰσραήλ.] with Gentiles and Israel's peoples. The plural λαοῖς does not stand for the singular, but is put on account of ver. 25, and is to be referred either, with Calvin and others, to the different nationalities (comp. ii. 5) from which the Jews—in great measure from foreign countries—were assembled at the Passover against Jesus; or, with Grotius and others, to the twelve tribes, which latter opinion is to be preferred, in accordance with such passages as Gen. xxviii. 3, xxxv. 5, xlviii. 4. The priesthood not specially named is included in the λαοῖς Ἰσραήλ. — συνθήμων] contains the design of the συνήχορσαν. This design of their coming together was "to kill Jesus;" but the matter is viewed according to the decree of God overruling it: "to do what God has predetermined." — ἵ χαίρειν] symbolizes in the lofty strain

1 Vulgate, Beza, Castello, Calvin, de Wette, and many.
2 Bernhardt, p. 348. Comp. x. 34; Luke iv. 25: Dem. 588; Polyb. i. 84. 4.
3 See Wesseling, ad Not. iv. 74.
4 Acts x. 38; Luke iii. 21, 22.
of the discourse the disposing power of God. A συνήμα is contained in προσώπῳ, inasmuch as the notion of the verb does not stand in logical relation to the literal meaning of ἰχθιόσω—when some such word as προσώπῳ would have been in accord—but only to the attribute of God thereby symbolized. — The death of the Lord was not the accidental work of hostile caprice, but the necessary result of the divine predetermination, to which divine δεῖ, the personally free action of man had to serve as an instrument. διὸ εἰσεῖναι, ἀλλὰ σὺ ἐὰν τὸ πάντων ἐπιτρέψῃ καὶ εἰς τέρας ἀγαγύ, ὃ εὐμήχανον καὶ σοφός συνήλθων μὲν γὰρ ἐκίνητο ὡς ἢ ἑκροὶ ἢ, ἐποίουν δὲ ἃ σὺ ἐβιάζον, Oecumenius. Beza aptly says: παύσασι refers not to the consilia et voluntates Herodis, etc., but to the eventus consiliorum.

Vv. 29, 30. Καὶ τάνων] and now, as concerns the present state of things. In the N. T. only in the Book of Acts; often in classical authors. ἐφεξῆς ἐστὶ σ. ἀνεκλ. aiv.: direct thine attention to their threatenings, that they pass not into reality. On ἵσταται in the sense of governing care, see Schaefer. App. ad Dom. V. p. 81. Comp. Isa. xxxvii. 17. αὐτῶν, according to the original meaning of the prayer (see on ver. 24), refers to the Πρώδος . . . Σιραμ., named in ver. 27, from whom the followers of Jesus, after His ascension, feared continued persecution. But the apostles then praying, when they uttered the prayer in reference to what had just occurred, gave it to in their conception of it a reference to the threatenings uttered against Peter and John in the Sanhedrim. — τοῖς δούλοις σου] i.e. us apostles. They are the servants of God, who execute His will in the publication of the gospel. But the παῖς θεοῦ καὶ ἀξιοῦ is Christ. Comp. on iii. 13.—μετὰ παρθένου πάσας.] with all possible freedom. — ἐν τῷ κ. τ.․ ἰχθιόσῳ σου ἐκτίνως ι.κ.π. i.e. vehil et Thou (for the confirmation of their free-spoken preaching; comp. xiv. 3; Mark xvi. 20) causet Thy power to be active for (εἰς, of the aim) healing, and that signs and wonders be done through the name (through its utterance), etc. — καὶ σ. κ. τ. ἑμεσθαί] is infinitive of the aim, and so parallel to εἰς ιασων, attaching the general to the particular; not, however, dependent on εἰς, but standing by itself. To supply ἐν τῷ again after καὶ (Beza, Bengel) would unnecessarily disturb the simple concatenation of the discourse, and therefore also the clause is not to be connected with δός.

Ver. 31. Ἐσαλείπη δὲ τότες] This is not to be conceived of as an accidental earthquake, but as an extraordinary shaking of the place directly effected by God, a σημείον—a analogous to what happened at Pentecost—of the filling with the πνεύμα, which immediately ensued. This filling once more with the Spirit (comp. ver. 8) was the actual granting of the prayer δός . . . λόγον σου, ver. 29; for the immediate consequence was ἐλάλουν τ. λόγ. τ. θεοῦ μετὰ παρθενίας, namely in Jerusalem, before the Jews, so that the threatenings

1 Comp. ver. 30, ch. 56, xiii. 11 ; 1 Pet. v 6 ; Herod. viii. 140. 2 ; Herm. ad Viger. p. 738.
3 Comp. Flaccus, Cato. 1 p. 567.
4 Ver. 88, xviii. 30, xx. 32, xxvii. 22.
5 Is to be so written with Tisch. and Lachm., comp. on Phil. 11. 23.
6 For examples of δός in prayers, see Elsner, p. 381 ; Elenchi, Lex. Soph. 1. p. 437.
7 See Theile, ad Jacc. p. 7 ; and on Phil. 11. 20.
8 Viewed by Zeiler, no doubt, as an invention of pious legend, although nothing similar occurs in the gospel history, to afford a connecting link for such a legend.
against Peter and John (vv. 19, 21) thus came to nothing. Luke, however, has not meant nor designated the free-spoken preaching as a glossolalia (van Hengel). 1

Ver. 32. Connection: Thus beneficial in its effect was the whole occurrence for the apostles (ver. 31); but (δὲ) as regards the whole body of those that had become believers, etc. (ver. 32). As, namely, after the former great increase of the church (ii. 41), a characteristic description of the Christian church-life is given (ii. 44 ff.); so here also, after a new great increase (ver. 4), and, moreover, so significant a victory over the Sanhedrin (vv. 5–31) had taken place, there is added a similar description, which of itself points back to the earlier one (in opposition to Schleiermacher), and indicates the pleasing state of things as unchanged in the church now so much enlarged. — τοῖς δὲ πληθοὺς of the multitude, i.e. the mass of believers. These are designated as πιστεύωντες, having become believers, in reference to ver. 4; but in such a way that it is not merely those πολλοί, ver. 4, that are meant, but they and at the same time all others, who had till now become believers. This is required by τὸ πλῆθος, which denotes the Christian people generally, as contrasted with the apostles. Comp. vi. 2. The believers' heart and soul were one,—an expression betokening the complete harmony of the inner life as well in the thinking, willing, and feeling, whose centre is the heart, 2 as in the activity of the affections and impulses, in which they were συμφιλοῦν, and ἴσαφιλοῦν. — καὶ οὖν εἰς] and not even a single one among so many. Comp. on John i. 3. — αὐτῷ] belongs to ἵππαρχος. 3 — As to the community of goods, see on ii. 44 (κ).

Ver. 33. And with this unity of love in the bosom of the church, how effective was the testimony of the apostles, and the divine grace, which was imparted to all the members of the church! — τῆς ἀναστ. τ. κυρ. Ἰησοῦ]. This was continually the foundation of the whole apostolic preaching; comp. on i. 22. They bore their witness to the resurrection of Christ, as a thing to which they were in duty bound. Hence the compound verb ἀπεκδίδον. 4 Observe, moreover, that here, where from ver. 32 onwards the internal condition of the church is described, the apostolic preaching within the church is denoted. — The χάρις μεγάλη is usually understood (according to ii. 47) of the favour of the people. Incorrectly, as οὖν γὰρ εἰνεῖτο κ.τ.λ., ver. 34, would contain no logical assignation of a reason for this. It is the divine grace, which showed itself in them in a remarkable degree (1 Cor. xv. 10). So, correctly, Beza, Wetstein, de Wette, Baumgarten, Hackett. — ἤν ἐν πάντω πάνω. αὐτῷ] upon them all: of the direction in which the presence of grace was active. Comp. Luke ii. 40.

Vv. 34, 35. Γὰρ] adduces a special ground of knowledge, something from

1 As extra Biblical analogies to the extraordinary ἐρασ. δὲ τοὺς, comp. Virg. Am. iii. 90 ff.; Ovid. Met. xv. 572. Other examples may be found in Doughtes, Anal. II. p. 71, and from the Rabbins in Schoettgen, p. 451.
2 Comp. Delitzsch, Psycho1 p. 250.
3 Phil. ii. 20. Comp. 1 Chron xli. 38: Phil. i. 27. See examples in Eissner, p. 317; Kypke, II. p. 81.
4 Comp. Luke viii. 9; Tob. iv. 8; Plat. Alc. I. p. 104 A.
5 Which (see Wytenbach, Bibl. crit. III. 2, 55 ff.) καὶ ἐκατον ἐγχειρισθέντων αὐτῶν τι δειδυναι και ἐν ποι ἁθήματος λέγει αὐτῷ, Oecumenius. Comp. 4 Macc. vi. 32; Dem. 284. 5.
which the χάρις μεγάλη was apparent. For there was found no one needy among them, because, namely, all possessors, etc. — πωλούντες κ.τ.λ.] The present participle is put, because the entire description represents the process as continuing: being wont to sell, they brought the amount of the price of what was sold, etc. Hence also παρασκούμ. is not incorrectly (de Wette) put instead of the aorist participle.¹ The aorist participle is in its place at ver. 87. — παρὰ τῶν σῶνε]. The apostles are, as teachers, represented sitting (comp. Luke ii. 46); the money is brought and respectfully² placed at their feet as they sit.³ — καθότι ἄν κ.τ.λ.] See on ii. 45.

Vv. 36, 37. Δὲ] autem, introduces, in contradistinction to what has been summarily stated in vv. 34, 35, the concrete individual case of an honourably known man, who acted thus with his landed property. The idea in the δὲ is: All acted thus, and in keeping with it was the conduct of Joses. — ἐνδικτυρίῳ ἡρῴ.] Παρὰ μὲν, son of prophetic address, i.e. an inspired instigator, exhorter. Barnabas was a prophet (Acts xiii. 1), and it is probable that (at a later period) he received this surname on the occasion of some specially energetic and awakening address which he delivered; hence Luke did not interpret the name generally by νίς προφήτης, but, because the προφήτης had been displayed precisely in the characteristic form of παράκλησις (comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 3), by νίς παρακλητ. At Acts xi. 28 also, παράκλησις appears as a characteristic of Barnabas. We may add, that the more precise description of him in this passage points forward to his labours afterwards to be related. — Λεβίτης] Jer. xxxii. 7 proves that Levites might possess lands in Palestine.⁴ Hence the field is not to be considered as beyond the bounds of the land (Bengel). — ὑπάρχειν ἄν. ἀγροῦ] Genitive absolute. — τὸ χρήμα] in the singular: the sum of money, the money proceeds, the amount received.⁵

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(S) Sadducees. V. 1.

It is worthy of note that in the Gospels the Pharisees are the great opponents of Christ, while in the Acts the Sadducees are most violently hostile to the apostles. This may be explained by the facts, that Christ specially endangered the influence of the Pharisees by unmasking their formality and hypocrisy; and that the apostles, in preaching so strenuously the resurrection of Jesus, successfully assailed the leading tenet of the Sadducees. The sect of the Sadducees was not numerous, but it exerted much influence. Josephus says: "Their opinions were received by few, yet by those of the greatest dignity." They rejected all tradition—the doctrine of a resurrection

¹ See, on the contrary, Kühner, II. § 673. 5.
² Comp. Chrysostom: πωλημ. σῶνε.
³ The delivery of the funds to the apostles is not yet mentioned in ii. 45, and appears only to have become necessary when the increase of the church had taken place. With the alleged right of the clergy personally to administer the funds of the church, which Sepp still finds sanctioned here, this passage has nothing to do.
⁵ Herod. III. 28; Poll. 9. 87; Wesseling, ad Diod. Sic. v. p. 626.
and a future state—the reality of direct divine influence, and strongly insisted on the perfect freedom of the human will. Their name is probably derived from a certain Zadok, pupil of a distinguished rabbi, whose followers held that “there was nothing for them in the world to come.”

(o) Anna the high priest. V. 6.

Caiaphas, son-in-law of Anna, at this time held the office of high priest, a fact which doubtless was known to Luke; but as Anna had been high priest, and even now wielded very great influence, the title is given to him. In the Gospel by Luke he is named along with Caiaphas, and that first in order, “Anna and Caiaphas being the high priests” (Luke iii. 1). On this passage Meyer writes: “But Anna retained withal very weighty influence, so that not only did he, as did every one who had been ἄρχετων, continue to be called by the name, but, moreover, he also partially discharged the functions of high priest. Anna, whose son-in-law, and five sons besides, filled the office, was accustomed to keep his hand on the helm.” It is also probable that Anna was president of the Sanhedrin, an office of equal importance with that of high priest, who was usually made president. Caiaphas was made high priest by Valerius Gratus, A.D. 34, and held office for twelve years. He was entirely under the influence of Anna, his father-in-law.

(p) For we cannot but speak. V. 20.

Peter and John were dauntless in their determination to obey God, even though interdicted by the highest earthly authority, secular or sacred. Their conduct was manly, heroic, Christlike. Socrates is reported to have said, on being condemned for teaching the people their duties to God: “O ye Athenians, I will obey God rather than you; and if you would dismiss me and spare my life on condition that I should cease to teach my fellow-citizens, I would rather die a thousand times than accept the proposal.” A similar instance of heroic fidelity to God’s law is recorded in 2 Macc. vii.:—A young man, scourged and threatened with death by Antiochus unless he deliberately violated the law of God, said: “I will not obey the king’s commandment; but I will obey the commandment of the law that was given unto our fathers by Moses.”

(q) A stated prayer. V. 24.

Some suppose that this was a liturgical form already introduced into the infant church, and used on this occasion as peculiarly appropriate. With this supposition Meyer agrees. But the prayer seems to have been the natural and sudden outburst of devotion and desire. Nor does the language used imply that all necessarily spoke aloud. It might be a concert of hearts rather than of voices, though all, as was customary, may have assented vocally at the close. Nor have we any intimation elsewhere of any forms of prayer, or of liturgical service at so early a period in the Christian Church. No evidence is found in the record that even the Lord’s Prayer was publicly used in the assemblies of Christians.
CHAP. IV.

(a) All things common. V. 32.

See also notes on ii. 44.—"Common in the use of their property, not necessarily in the possession of it." (Hackett.) "It would appear that by the community of goods is meant, not that the disciples lived in common, and that all property ceased among them, but that a common fund was instituted. The disciples were actuated by the spirit of love toward each other, which impelled them to regard the necessities of their brethren as their own. Not only did they give largely of their wealth, but many placed the whole of it at the disposal of the apostles." "In the first glow of Christian life the disciples put into actual practice the precept of our Lord" (Luke xii. 33). (Gloag.) The community of goods was voluntary, local, and temporary, not obligatory then or now.

We have here a specimen of Christian Socialism. The narrative gives us such a view of it as throws the secular thing called by that name into contempt, and reveals the lamentable imperfection connected even with the highest form of spiritual fellowship now existing on this earth. From it we learn that the socialism which these first Christians enjoyed was attractive, religious, and amalgamating. They recognized the authority, the creatorship, the revelation, and the predestination of God; and in their prayers they invoked his protection, interposition, and aid. Their union was most hearty and practical; it consisted with a diversity of position and service. It was under the spiritual and economical supervision of the apostles, and it was produced by the favor of God, for "great grace was upon them all." In what a sublime contrast does such a state of things stand to all the socialistic schemes of the world. Read the one hundred and thirty-third psalm. (Condensed from Thomas.) "The ideal perfection of man’s condition is just that, in which neither poor nor rich are to be found, but every individual has his wants supplied. Intimations that such a condition must one day be realized, are to be found, not only in the reckless cry after freedom and equality, but also in the most exalted of our race. Pythagoras and Plato were captivated with this idea; the Essenes and other small bodies attempted to realize it. But the outward realization of it requires certain internal conditions; and just because these conditions were wanting, the attempts referred to could not but fail. These conditions, however, were secured by the Redeemer, who poured pure brotherly love into the hearts of believers; but as the Church herself still appears in this world externally veiled, so the true community of goods cannot be outwardly practiced." (Olahausen.)
CHAPTER V.

VER. 2. After ὑποίστασ, Elz. Scholz have αὐτῷ, which Lachm. Tisch. Born. have rightly deleted, as it is wanting in AB D* Μ, min., and has evidently slipped in from ver. 1. — Ver. 5. After ἀκούστα, Lachm. Tisch. Born. have deleted the usual reading ταύτα; it is wanting in AB D Μ, min. Or. Lucif. and several vss., and is an addition from ver. 11. — Ver. 9. εἰσε] is very suspicious, as it is wanting in BD Μ, min. Vulg.; in other witnesses it varies in position, and Or. has φησιν. Deleted by Lachm. Born. and Tisch. — Ver. 10. παρὰ τ. π.] Lachm. and Tisch. read πρὸς τ. π. according to AB D Μ, Or.; other witnesses have ἐπὶ τ. π.; others, ἐπὶ τ. π.; others, ἐνώπιον. Born. also has πρὸς τ. π. But as Luke elsewhere writes παρὰ τ. π. (Luke viii. 41, xvii. 16), and not πρὸς τ. π. (Mark v. 22, vii. 25; Rev. i. 17), the Recepta is to be retained. — Ver. 15. παρὰ τάς πλ.] Lachm. reads καὶ εἰς τᾶς πλ. after AB D* Μ, min. D* has only κατὰ πλ.; and how easily might this become, by an error of a transcriber, καὶ τᾶς πλ., which was completed partly by the original κατὰ and partly by εἰς! Another correction was καὶ εἰς τᾶς πλατεῖας (E). No version has καὶ. Accordingly the simple κατὰ πλατ., following D*, is to be preferred. — Instead of κλίνον, Lachm. Tisch. Born. have rightly κλίνοντας (so AB D Μ); κλίνον was inserted as the worted form. — Ver. 16. εἰς ἱεροσ. εἰς is wanting in AB Μ, 103, and some vss. Deleted by Lachm. But the retention of εἰς has predominant attestation; and it was natural to write in the margin by the side of τῶν πέρι τοῦ ἔθνους the locally defining addition Ἰερουσαλήμ, which became the occasion of omitting the εἰς ἱεροσ. that follows. — Ver. 18. τ. χειρ. αὐτῶν] αὐτῶν is wanting in AB D Μ, min. Syr. Erp. Arm. Vulg. Cant. Theophyl. Lucif., and omitted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. But see iv. 3. — Ver. 23. ἐπιστόμως] Elz. has ἐξω τοῦ. But ἐξω has decisive evidence against it, and is a more precisely defining addition occasioned by the following ἐνω. — πρὸ] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read ἐπὶ, according to AB D Μ, 109; πρὸ is an interpretation. — Ver. 24. δὲ τὸ ἱερεῖς καὶ δὲ στράτ. τ. ἱεροῦ. κ. οἱ ἄρχειρ.] A B D Μ, min. Copt. Sahid. Arm. Vulg. Cant. Lucif. have merely δὲ τὸ στράτ. τ. ἱεροῦ κ. οἱ ἄρχειρ. So Lachm. Rinck, and Born. But ἱερεῖς being not understood, and being regarded as unnecessary seeing that οἱ ἄρχειρ. followed, might very easily be omitted; whereas there is no reason for its having been inserted. For the genuineness of ἱερεῖς also the several other variations testify, which are to be considered as attempts to remove the offence without exactly erasing the word, namely, οἱ ἱερεῖς κ. δὲ στρ. τ. ἱερ. κ. οἱ ἄρχειρ. and δὲ τοὺς ἄρχειρ. κ. δὲ στρ. τ. ἱερ. κ. οἱ ἄρχε. — Ver. 25. After αὐτῶν Elz. has λέγων, against decisive evidence. An addition, in accordance with ver. 22 f. — Ver. 26. ἵνα μὴ] Lachm. Born. have μή, according to B DE Μ, min. But the omission easily appeared as necessary on account of ἐφοβ. Comp. Gal. iv. 11. — Ver. 28. οὗ is wanting in AB Μ, Copt. Vulg. Cant. Ath. Cyr. Lucif. Rightly deleted by Lachm. and Tisch., as the transforming of the sentence into a question was evidently occasioned by ἐπηρώτησαν. — Ver. 32. After ἰσμην, Elz. Scholz. Tisch. have αὐτῶς, which
A D* Η, min., and several vss. omit. It is to be defended. As μαρτύρεις is still defined by another genitive, αὐτῷ became cumbersome, appeared inappropriate, and was omitted. B has καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν αὐτῷ μαρτύρεις (without ἵσμος), etc. But in this case EN is to be regarded as a remnant of the ἵσμος, the half of which was easily omitted after ἡμεῖς; and thereupon αὐτῷ was transformed into αὐτῷ. The less is any importance to be assigned to the reading of Lachm.: καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν αὐτῷ μαρτύρεις τοις κ. λ. — Ver. 33. ἰβουλέοντο Lachm. reads ἰβουλέοντο, according to A B E, min. An interpretation, or a mechanical interchange, frequent also in vss. of the classics; see Born. ad xv. 37. — Ver. 34. βραχύ τε, according to decisive evidence, is to be deleted, with Lachm. Tisch. Born. — ἀποστάλουσι] A B Η, 80, Vulg. Copt. Arm. Chrys. have ἀνθρώπους. So Lachm. Tisch. ; and rightly, as the words belong to the narrative of Luke, and therefore the designation of the apostles by ἀνθρώπους appeared to the scribes unworthy. It is otherwise in vv. 35, 38. — Ver. 36. προσεκλίθη Elz. Griesb. Scholz read προσεκλίθη, in opposition to A B C* Η, min., which have προσεκλίθη; and in opposition to C* D* E H, min. Cyr., which have προσέκληθη (so Born.). Other witnesses have προσετίθη, also προσεκληρώθη. Differing interpretations of the προσεκλίθη, which does not elsewhere occur in the N. T., but which Griesb. rightly recommended, and Matth. Lachm. Tisch. have adopted. — Ver. 37. χανάν] to be deleted with Lachm. and Tisch., as it is wanting in A* B Η, 81, Vulg. Cant. Cyr., in some others stands before λαον, and in C D, Eur. is interchanged with πολέων (so Born.). — Ver. 38. Instead of εἴσαρτε, Lachm. has ἐστετε, following A B C Η. A gloss. — Ver. 39. δύνατος] Lachm. Tisch. Born. have δυνήσασθε, according to B C D E Η, min., and some vss. and Fathers. Mistaking the purposely chosen definite expression, men altered it to agree with the foregoing future. — Instead of αὐτοῦ, which Lachm. Tisch. Born. have, Elz. and Scholz read αὐτό, against decisive testimony. An alteration to suit τὸ ἔργον. — Ver. 41. After δύνατος Elz. has αὐτό, which is wanting in decisive witnesses, and is an addition for the sake of completeness. Other interpolations are: Ἡσαῦ,—γοῦ Χριστοῦ,—Ἡσαῦ Χριστοῦ, —τῶν κυρίων,—τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Vv. 1–10. Ananias¹ and Sapphira, however, acted quite otherwise. They attempted in deceitful hypocrisy to abuse the community of goods, which, nevertheless, was simply permissive (ver. 4). For by the sale of the piece of land and the bringing of the money, they in fact declared the whole sum to be a gift of brotherly love to the common stock; but they aimed only at securing for themselves the semblance of holy loving zeal by a portion of the price, and had selfishly embezzled the remainder for themselves. They wished to serve two masters, but to appear to serve only one. With justice, Augustine designates the act as sacrilegium ("quod Deum in pollutione sefellerit") and fraud. — The sudden death of both is to be regarded as a result directly effected through the will of the apostle, by means of the miraculous power imparted to him; and not as a natural stroke of paralysis, independent of

¹ 77, 137, God's pillars; Jer. xxvii. 1; Dan. 1. 6; LXX. Tov. v. 12. It may, however, be the Hebrew name 77, 137 (Neh. iii. 22, LXX.), i.e. God covers.—The name Σαφειρης is apparently the Aramaic Μ'ΒΙ', formosa. Derived from the Greek σαφειρης, sapphire, it would have probably been Σαφειρης.
SIN OF ANANIAS AND SAPPHIRA.

Peter, though taking place by divine arrangement (see Ammon, Stolz, Heinrichs, and others). For, apart from the supposition, in this case necessary, of a similar susceptibility in husband and wife for such an impression of sudden terror, the whole narrative is opposed to it; especially ver. 9, the words of which Peter could only have uttered with the utmost presumption, if he had not the consciousness that his own will was here active. If we should take ver. 9 to be a mere threat, to which Peter found himself induced by an inference from the fate of Ananias, this would be merely an unwarranted alteration of the simple meaning of the words, and would not diminish the presumptuousness of a threat so expressed. Nearly allied to this natural explanation is the view mingling the divine and the natural, and taking half from each, given by Neander, the holy earnestness of the apostolic words worked so powerfully on the terrified conscience; and by Olshausen, the word of Peter pierced like a sword the alarmed Ananias, and thus his death was the marvel arranged by a higher disposing power. But this view is directly opposed to the content and the design of the whole representation. According to Baur, nothing remains historical in the whole narrative except that Ananias and his wife had, by their covetousness, made their names so hated, "that people believed that they could see only a divine judgment in their death, in whatever way it occurred;" all the rest is to be explained from the design of representing the πνεῦμα ἄγιον as the divine principle working in the apostles. Comp. Zeller, who, however, despairs of any more exact ascertainment of the state of the case. Baumgarten, as also Lange (comp. Ewald), agrees in the main with Neander; whilst de Wette is content with sceptical questions, although recognising the miraculous element so far as the narrative is concerned. Catholics have used this history in favour of the two swords of the Pope. — The severity of the punishment, with which Porphyry reproached Peter, is justified by the consideration, that here was presented the first open venture of deliberate wickedness, as audacious as it was hypocritical, against the principle of holiness ruling in the church, and particularly in the apostles; and the dignity of that principle, hitherto unoffended, at once required its full satisfaction by the infliction of death upon the violators, by which "awe-inspiring act of divine church-discipline," at the same time, the authority of the apostles, placed in jeopardy, was publicly guaranteed in its inviolableness ("ut poena duorum hominum sit doctrina multorum," Jerome). — ἕνωσεν Ἰησοῦς ἑαυτῇ, purloined. — ἀπὸ τοῦ ῥημάτος ἡμῶν τοῦ τίμημα.

Ver. 3. Peter recognises the scheme of Ananias as the work of the devil, who as the liar from the beginning (John viii. 44), and original enemy of the πνεῦμα ἄγιον and of the Messianic kingdom, had entered into the heart of Ananias (comp. on John xiii. 27; Luke xxii. 3), and filled it with his presence. Ananias, according to his Christian destination and ability

---

1 Jerome, Epp. 8.
3 Tit. ii. 10; 2 Macr. iv. 22; Jos. vii. 1; Xen. Cyr. iv. 2. 48; Pind. Nem. vi. 108; Valck. p. 285 f.
(Jas. iv. 7; 1 Pet. v. 9), ought not to have permitted this, but should have allowed his heart to be filled with the Holy Spirit; hence the question, διατι ἐκλήρωσεν κ.τ.λ. — ψεύδεσθαι σε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον] that thou shouldst by lying deceive the Holy Spirit: this is the design of ἐκλήρωσεν. The explanation is incorrect which understands the infinitive ἐκβατικώς, and takes it only of the attempt: unde accidit, ut πνεῦμα ἅγιον decipere tentares (Heinrichs, Kuinoel). The deceiving of the Holy Spirit was, according to the design of Satan, really to take place; and although it was not in the issue successful, it had actually taken place on the part of Ananias. — τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον Peter and the other apostles, as overseers of the church, were pre-eminently the bearers and organs of the Holy Spirit (comp. xiii. 2, 4); hence through the deception of the former the latter was deceived. — For examples of ψεύδεσθαι, of de facto lying, deception by an act, see Kypke, II. p. 32 f. The word with the accusative of the person occurs only here in the N. T., often in the classical writers. — This instantaneous knowledge of the deceit is an immediate perception, wrought in the apostle by the Spirit dwelling in him.

Ver. 4. When it remained, namely, unsold; (the opposite, προβέθην), did it not remain to thee, thy property? and when sold, was it not in thy power? — That the community of goods was not a legal compulsion, see on ii. 48. — ἐν τῷ σῇ ἔδωκεν ἐπηρξεν] ἐν τῷ ἔδωκεν, which is to be taken out of προβέθην. It was in the disposal of Ananias either to retain the purchase-money entirely to himself, or to give merely a portion of it to the common use; but not to do the latter, as he did it, under the deceitful semblance as if what he handed over to the apostles was the whole sum. The sin of husband and wife is cleverly characterized in Constitt. ap. vii. 2, 4: κλέφωτες τὰ ἑαυτῶν. — τῷ δότῳ quid est quod, i.e. cur? Comp. on Mark ii. 17. Wherefore didst thou give this deed in thy heart? i.e. wherefore didst thou receive on this deed (namely, on the instigation of the devil, ver. 8) — obx ἐφεσόμεθα ἐνθρόπως, ἀλλὰ τῷ Θεῷ. The state of things in itself relative: not so much . . . but rather, is in the vehemence of the address conceived and set forth absolutely: not to men, but to God. “As a lie against our human personality, thy deed comes not at all into consideration; but only as a lie against God, the supreme Ruler of the theocracy, whose organs we are.” The taking it as non tam, quam is therefore a weakening of the words, which is unsuited to the fiery and decided spirit of the speaker in that moment of deep excitement. The datives denote the persons, to whom the action refers in hostile contrastinection. Examples of the absolute ψεύδεσθαι with the dative are not found in Greek writers, but in the LXX. Josh. xxiv. 27; 2 Sam. xxii. 45; Ps. xviii. 44, lxviii. 36. By τῷ Θεῷ Peter makes the deceiver sensible of his fatal guilt, for his sin now appeared as blasphemy. This τῷ Θεῷ is quite

1 Isa. lvii. 11; Dent. xxxiii. 29; Hos. ix. 2.
2 See Blomfiel: Ged. ad Alex., Pena, 473.
3 Comp. xix. 31; the Heb. הָעִבָּד הָעִבָּד (Dan. i. 8; Mal. ii. 9), and the classical expression ἐδῶκεν σε ὑμῖν, and the like.
4 Comp. 1 Thess. iv. 8; Winer, p. 451 f. (E. T. 631).
5 See also Fritsche, ad Marc. p. 781.
6 Bernhardy, p. 99. Valckenars well remarks: "ψευδεσθαι τινα notat mendacio aliquem deciperes, ψευδ. t. v. mendacio contumeliam aliquo faceris."
warranted, for a lying to the Spirit (ver. 8, τὸ πρεπεῖ) is a lie against God (τὸ Θεόν), whose Spirit was lied to. Accordingly the divine nature of the Spirit and his personality are here expressed, but the Spirit is not called God.

(s) Vv. 5, 6. 'Εξέφυλλον as in xii. 23; elsewhere not in the N. T., but in the LXX. and later Greek writers. Comp. xx. 10. ἀναστάσεως occurs in the old Greek from Homer onward. — ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀναστάσεσ ἀπὸ ἀνδρῶν upon all hearers, namely, of this discussion of Peter with Ananias. For ver. 6 shows that the whole proceeding took place in the assembled church. The sense in which it falls to be taken at ver. 11, in conformity with the context at the close of the narrative, is different. Commonly it is taken here as in ver. 11, in which case we should have to say, with de Wette, that the remark was proleptic. But even as such it appears unsuitable and disturbing. — αἱ νεωτέροι ὑπὸ the younger men in the church, who rose up from their seats (ἀναστάσεις), are by the article denoted as a definite class of persons. But seeing that they, unsummoned, perform the business as one devolving of itself upon them, they must be considered as the regular servants of the church, who, in virtue of the church-organization as hitherto developed, were bound to render the manual services required in the ecclesiastical commonwealth, as indeed such ministering hands must, both of themselves and also after the pattern of the synagogue, have been from the outset necessary. But Neander, de Wette, Rothe, Lechler, and others doubt this, and think that the summons of the νεωτέροι to this business was simply based on the relation of age, by reason of which they were accustomed to serve and were at once ready of their own accord. But precisely in the case of such a miraculous and dreadful death, it is far more natural to assume a far more urgent summons to the performance of the immediate burial, founded on the relation of a conscious necessity of service, than to think of people, like automatons, acting spontaneously. — ἀναστάσεως αὐτῶν] means nothing else than contraxerunt eum. We must conceive the stretched out limbs of him who had fallen down, as drawn together, pressed together by the young men, in order that the dead body might be carried out. The usual view: they prepared him for burial, by washing, swathing, etc., confounds σωσίλευν with περιστηλευν, and, moreover, introduces into the narrative a mode of proceeding improbable in the case of such a death. Others incorrectly render: they covered him (de Dieu, de Wette); comp. Cant.: incoeleunt. For both meanings Eur. Troad. 399 has been appealed to, where, however, ὁ δίμαρτος ἐν χειρὶ πῖπλοις συνεστάλησαν means: they were not wrapped up, shrouded, by the hands of a wife with garments (in which they wrapped them) in order to be buried. As little is συνεστάλθαι in Lucian. Imag. 7: to be covered; but: to be pressed together, in contrast to the following διψύχωσθαι, to flutter in the wind. The explanation ammonerunt is also without precedent of usage.

1 See Mosheim, de rob. Christ. ante Ostom. p. 114.
2 See also Walsh, Diss. p. 79 f.
3 Comp. Land. : cælezerunt (sic); Castal. : convarinzerunt; I Cor. vii. 29.
4 Pomp. Od. xxiv. 398; Plat. Hyp. maj. p. 291 1 D; Diod. Sic. xii. 12; Joseph. Ant. xix. 4. 1; Tob. xii. 14; Ecclus. xxviii. 17.
5 Vulgate, Kramma, Luther, Beza, and others.
Ver. 7. But it came to pass—about an interval of three hours—and his wife came in. The husband had remained away too long for her. A period of three hours might easily elapse with the business of the burial, especially if the place of sepulture was distant from the city (see Lightfoot). After ἔγενε ὁ δὲ a comma is to be put, and ὦς ἦν ὑπ. τρ. διάστ. is a statement of time inserted independently of the construction of the sentence.¹ The common view: but there was an interval of about three hours, and his wife came in, is at variance with the use, especially frequent in Luke, of the absolute ἔγενε.² As to the καὶ after ἔγενε, see on Luke v. 12. On διάστημα used of time, comp. Polyb. ix. 1. 1.

Ver. 8. Ἀπεκρίθη comp. on iii. 12. Bengel aptly remarks: "respondit mulier, cujus introitus in coetum sanctorum erat instar sermonis. — τοσούτων] for so much, points to the money still lying there. Arbitrarily, and with an overlooking of the vividness of what occurred, Bengel and Kuinoel suppose that Peter had named the sum. The sense of tantilli, on which Bornemann insists,³ results not as the import of the word, but, as elsewhere frequently,⁴ from the connection.

Vv. 9, 10. Wherefore was it agreed by you (dative with the passive, see on Matt. v. 21) to try the Spirit of the Lord (God, see vv. 4, 5) i.e. to venture the experiment, whether the πνεῦμα ἁγιον, ruling in us apostles, was infallible.⁵ The περατζων challenges by his action the divine experimental proof. — οἱ πόνοι] a trait of vivid delineation;⁶ the steps of those returning were just heard at the door outside (ver. 10). — πρὸς τὸν ἀνδρὰ αὐτὴς] beside her (just buried) husband.

Ver. 11. Φόβος] quite as in ver. 5, fear and dread at this miraculous, destroying punitive power of the apostles. — ἔφ. δὲν τ. ἐκκλ. καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας κ. τ. λ. upon the whole church (in Jerusalem), and (generally) on all (and so also on those who had not yet come over to the church, ver. 13) to whose ears this occurrence came.

Vv. 12–16. After this event, which formed an epoch as regards the preservation of the holiness of the youthful church, there is now once more introduced as a resting-point for reflection, a summary representation of the prosperous development of the church, and that in its external relations. — δὲ is the simple μεταβασικών, carrying on the representation.—By the hands of the apostles, moreover, occurred signs and wonders among the people in great number. And they were all with one accord in Solomon's porch, and there-

¹ See on Matt. xx. 22; Luke ix. 28; Schaefer, ad Dem. V. p. 283.
³ See on John v. 8; Acts iii. 10.
⁴ Comp. H. 48 c., iv. 28 ff.
⁵ All Christians, comp. II. 1. In contrast to τῶν ἐν λόγῳ. The limitation of ἐξαρτές to the apostles (Kuinoel, Olshausen, and others) is by Baur urged in depreciation of the authenticity of the narrative. The apostles are assumed by Baur to be presented as a group standing isolated, as superhuman, as it were magical beings, to whom people dare not draw nigh; from which there would result a conception of the apostles the very opposite of that which is found everywhere in the N. T. and in the Book of Acts itself! Even Zeller has, with reason, declared himself opposed to this interpretation on the part of Baur.
fore publicly: of the rest, on the other hand, no one ventured to join himself to them; but the people magnified them, the high honour in which the people held the Christians, induced men to keep at a respectful distance from them: and the more were believers added to the Lord, great numbers of men and women; so that they brought out to the streets, etc. The simple course of the description is accordingly: (1) The miracle-working of the apostles continued abundantly, ver. 12: ὑδ...παλά. (2) The whole body of believers was undisturbed in their public meetings, protected by the respect of the people (καὶ ἡσαυ, ver. 12...δύ λαος, ver. 18), and the church increased in yet greater measure; so that under the impression of that respect and of this ever increasing acceptance which Christianity gained, people brought out to the streets, etc., vv. 14, 15. Ziegler, entirey mistaking the unartificial progress of the narrative, considered καὶ ἡσαυ...γνωτικὼν as a later insertion; and in this Eichhorn, Heinrichs, and Kuinoel agree with him; while Laurent recognizes the genuineness of the words, but looks on them as a marginal remark of Luke. Beck declared even ver. 15 also as spurious. It is unnecessary even to make a parenthesis of ver. 14 (with Lachmann), as δοτε in ver. 14 is not necessarily confined in its correct logical reference to ἀλλʼ ἵματι. ad. δύ λαος alone, but may quite as fitly refer to vv. 13 and 14 together. — τῶν δὲ λαοὺν are the same who are designated in the contrast immediately following as δύ λαος, and therefore those who had not yet gone over to them, the non-Christian population. It is strangely perverse to understand by it the newly converted (Heinrichs), or the more notable and wealthy Christians like Ananias (Beza, Morus, Rosenmüller). By the τῶν λαοὺν, as it forms the contrast to the ἄπαντες, Christians cannot at all be meant, not even as included (Kuinoel, Baur). — καλλαθαι αὐτοῖς] to join themselves to them, i.e. to intrude into their society, which would have destroyed their harmonious intercourse. This αὐτοῖς and αὐτοῖσι in ver. 18 must refer to the ἄπαντες, and so to the Christians in general, but not to the apostles alone, as regards which Luke is assumed by de Wette to have become "a little confused." — μᾶλλον δέ] in the sense of all the more, etc. The bearing of the people, ver. 13, promoted this increase. — τῶν κυρίων would admit grammatically of being construed with πιστεύοντες (xvi. 84); but xi. 24 points decisively to its being connected with προσεκιθεῖτο. They were added to the Lord, namely, as now connected with Him, belonging to Christ. — πληθυν] "pluris tantum: jam non inititur numeros uti iv. 4," Bengel. — καὶ πλεῖον (see the critical remarks) emphatically placed first: so that they (the people) through streets, along the streets, brought out their sick from the houses, etc.

Footnotes:
1 "Est culm in sancta disciplina et in sincere pietatis cultu arcana quaedam evanescet, quae maiores etiam invitos constrangent," Calvin. It would have been more accurate to say: "quae profanum vulgus et maiores etiam," etc.
— ἐπὶ κλιν. κ. κρασβάτ.] denotes generally: small beds¹ and couches. The distinction made by Bengel and Kuinoel with the reading κλινῶν, that the former denotes soft and costly, and the latter poor and humble, beds, is quite arbitrary. — ἐπέγραμ. Πέτρου, genitive absolute, and then ἡ σκιά: the shadow cast by him. — καὶ at least⁵ is to be explained as an abbreviated expression: in order that, should Peter come, he might touch any one, if even merely his shadow (τὸ) overshadoned him.⁶ That cures actually took place by the shadow of the apostle, Luke does not state; but only the opinion of the people, that the overshadowing would cure their sick. It may be inferred, however, from ver. 6 that Luke would have it regarded as a matter of course that the sick were not brought out in vain, but were cured by the miraculous power of the apostle. As the latter was analogous to the miraculous power of Jesus, it is certainly conceivable that Peter also cured without the medium of corporeal contact; but if this result was in individual instances ascribed to his shadow, and if men expected from the shadow of the apostle what his personal miraculous endowment supplied, he was not to be blamed for this superstition. Zeller certainly cannot admit as valid the analogy of the miraculous power of Jesus, as he does not himself recognize the historical character of the corresponding evangelical narrative. He relegates the account to the domain of legend, in which it was conceived that the miraculous power had been, independently of the consciousness and will of Peter, conveyed by his shadow like an electric fluid. An absurdity, which in fact only the presupposition of a mere legend enables us to conceive as possible. — τὸ πλῆθος the multitude (vulgaris) of the neighbouring towns. — aírčes] as well those labouring under natural disease as those demonically afflicted; comp. Luke iv. 40 f.—Then follows ver. 17, the contrast of the persecution, which, however, was victoriously overcome.

Vv. 17, 18. 'Ἀναστάς] The high priest stood up; he raised himself: a graphic trait serving to illustrate his present interference.⁴ "Non sibi quiescendum ratus est," Bengel. The ἀρχεῖοις is, according to iv. 6, Ἀννᾶς, not Caiphas, although the latter was so really. — καὶ πάντες οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ, ἡ οὖν αἱρέσις τῶν Σαδδουκῶν.] and all his associates,⁸ which were the sect of the Sadducees. This sect had allied itself with Ἀννᾶς, because the preaching of Christ as the Risen One was a grievous offence to them. See iv. 1, 2. The participle ἡ οὖν (not οἱ aírveis is put) adjusts itself to the substantive belonging to the predicate, as is often the case in the classical writers.⁶ Luke does not affirm that the high priest himself was a Sadducee, as Olshausen, Ewald, and others assert. This remark also applies in opposition to Zeller, who addsuces it as an objection to the historical character of the narrator, that Luke makes Ἀννᾶς a Sadducee. In the Gospels also there is no trace of the Sadduceism of Ἀννᾶς. According to Josephus,⁷ he had a son who be-

---

¹ κλινῶν, see the critical remarks, and comp. Epict. iii. 5. 13.
² καὶ εἶπε, see Herrn. ad Vigil. p. 888.
³ Comp. Fritzsch., Diss. in 2 Cor. II. p. 130, and see on 2 Cor. xi. 16.
⁴ Comp. vi. 9, xxii. 9; Luke xv. 18, al.
⁵ His whole adherents, ver. 21; Xen. Anab. iii. 2 11, al.
longed to that sect. — ἐν τῇ ἡραὶδε ἁμωα. ἡραϊς. as in iv. 3. The public prison is called in Thuc. v. 18. 6 also merely τὸ ἱμάστιον; and in Xen. Hist. vii. 36. οἰκία ἁμωα. Vv. 19, 20. The historical state of the case as to the miraculous mode of this liberation,—the process of which, perhaps, remained mysterious to the apostles themselves,—cannot be ascertained. Luke narrates the fact in a legendary interpretation of the mystery; but every attempt to refer the miraculous circumstances to a merely natural process (a stroke of lightning, or an earthquake, or, as Thies, Eck, Eichhorn, Eckermann, and Heinrichs suggest, that a friend, perhaps the jailer himself, or a zealous Christian, may have opened the prison) utterly offends against the design and the nature of the text. It remains matter for surprise, that in the proceedings afterwards (ver. 27 ff.) nothing is brought forward as to this liberation and its circumstances. This shows the incompleteness of the narrative, but not the unhistorical character of the fact itself (Baur, Zeller), which, if it were an intentional invention, would certainly also have been referred to in the trial. Nor is the apparent uselessness of the deliverance, for the apostles are again arrested, evidence against its reality, as it had a sufficient ethical purpose in the very fact of its confirming and increasing the courage in faith of the apostles themselves. On the other hand, the hypothesis that Christ, by His angel, had wished to demonstrate to the Sanhedrin their weakness (Baumgarten), would only have sufficient foundation, provided the sequel of the narrative purported that the judges had really recognised the interposition of heavenly power in the mode of the deliverance. Lange* refers the phenomenon to a visionary condition: the apostles were liberated "in the condition of genius-life, of second consciousness." This is extravagant fancy introducing its own ideas. — ἄγγελος) not the angel, but an angel. — διὰ τῆς νυκτὸς) per noctem, i.e. during the night; so that the opening, the bringing out of the prisoners, and the address of the angel, occurred during the course of the night, and toward morning-dawn the apostles repaired to the temple. The expression is thus more significant than διὰ τῆς νυκτος would be, and stands in relation with ἐν τῷ τῶν ὀσμῶν, ver. 21. Hence there is no deviation from Greek usage. — ἐξαγαγ.) But on the next day the doors were again found closed (ver. 23), according to which even the keepers had not become aware of the occurrence. — Ver. 20. ὑπάρχεισ] take your stand and speak; in which is implied a summons to boldness. Comp. ii. 14. — τὰ ἁμαρτά τῆς ὑστ. τοῦ ἁμαρτά the words of this life. What life it was, was self-evident to the apostles, namely, the life, which was the aim of all their effort and working. Hence: the words, which lead to the eternal Messianic life, bring about its attainment. Comp. John vi. 68. See on ταῦτα, Winer, p. 238 (E. T. 297 f.) We are not to think here of a hypallage, according to which ταῦτα refers in sense to τ. ἁμαρτά. — Comp. xvi. 9, and see on Gal. ii. 1. — Nagelsbach on the Ἀδαμ, p. 232, ed. 3. — Winer, Fritzsche. — Bengel, Kuhnlein and many others. Comp. xlii. 38; Rom. vii. 24.
Vv. 21-23. "Τὸ δὲ ἡρῴουν] about the dawn of day." The ἀξιοσώμενος is simply a continuation of the narrative: after they heard that, etc., as in ii. 37, xi. 18, and frequently. — παραγεγένεσθαι] namely, into the chamber where the Sanhedrin sat, as is evident from what follows. They resorted thither, unacquainted with the liberation of the apostles which had occurred in the past night, and caused the Sanhedrim and the whole eldership to be convoked, in order to try the prisoners. — καὶ πᾶσιν τὴν ἑρωσίαν] The importance which they assigned to the matter (comp. on iv. 6) induced them to summon not only those elders of the people who were likewise members of the Sanhedrim, but the whole body of elders generally, the whole council of representatives of the people. The well-known term γερωσία is fittingly transferred from the college of the Greek gerontes to that of the Jewish presbyters. Heinrichs considers πᾶσα τὰ γερωσία, as equivalent to τὸ συνέδριον, to which it is added as honorificementissima compellatio. Warranted by usage; but after the quite definite and well-known τὸ συνέδριον, the addition would have no force. — Ver. 23 contains quite the artless expression of the official report.

Vv. 24, 25. "Ο ἦτερος] the (above designated) priest, points to the one expressly named in ver. 21 as ὁ ἀρχιερέας. The word in itself has not the signification high priest; but the context gives to the general expression this special reference. — ὁ στρατηγὸς τ. ἵερος] see on iv. 1. He also, as the executive functionary of sacred justice, was summoned to the Sanhedrin. — ὁ ἀρχιερέας] are the titular high priests; partly those who at an earlier date had really held the office, and partly the presidents of the twenty-four classes of priests. Comp. on Matt. ii. 4. — The order in which Luke names the persons is quite natural. For first and chiefly the directing ἵερος, the head of the whole assembly, must feel himself concerned in the unexpected news; and then, even more than the ἀρχιερεῖας, the στρατηγὸς, because he, without doubt, had himself carried into effect the arrest mentioned at ver. 18, and held the supervision of the prison. — διηνύσασθε... τούτῳ] they were full of perplexity (see on Luke xxiv. 4) concerning them (the apostles), as to what this might come to — what they had to think as the possible termination of the occurrence just reported to them. Comp. on ii. 12, also x. 17. — ἐτώνες κ.τ.λ.] Comp. v. 20, 21.

Vv. 26-28. Οὐ μετὰ βίαις] without application of violence. Comp. xxiv. 7 and the passages from Polybius in Raphel. More frequent in classical writers is βια, ἐκ βιας, πρὸς βιαν. — οὐ καὶ μὴ λαβασθ.] contains the design of ἐποδέουσα γαρ τ. λαόν. They feared the people, in order not to be stoned. How easily might the enthusiasm of the multitude for the apostles have resulted in a tumultuous stoning of the στρατηγὸς and his attendants (ὑπηρέτ.), if, by

---

1 On ἡρῴουν, see Lobeck, ad Phryn. 275 f.; and ἐν τῷ, used of nearness in time, see Bernardy, p. 207. Often so in Thuc.; see Kräger on 1. 109. 3. Comp 3 Macc. v. 2; Tob. v. 11.
2 Although nowhere else in the N. T.; hence here, perhaps, to be derived from the source used by Luke.
3 Dem 439. 19: Polyb xlviii. 5. 1; Herm. Staatsalterth. § 94. 186.
4 Following Vitringa, Archelamg. p. 386.
5 1 Macc. xii. 6; 2 Macc. i. 10, iv. 44; Judith iv. 8, xi. 14, xv. 8; Loesner, p. 178.
6 So also in 1 Macc. xvi. 1; Bar. 1. 7; Heb. v. 6; and see Krobs, p. 173.
any compulsory measures, such as putting them in chains, there had been fearless disregard of the popular feeling! It is erroneous that after verbs of fearing, merely the simple μῆ, μῆσθα κ. τ. λ., should stand, and that therefore ἵνα μὴ λῆθ. is to be attached to ἡγεμον. . . . βίαις, and ἐφόβ. κ. τ. λ. to be taken parenthetically. ¹ Even among classical writers those verbs are found connected with δικαίωμα μῆ. ² — Assuming the spuriousness of ὁ, ver. 28 (see the critical remarks), the question proper is only to be found in καὶ βούλθει κ. τ. λ., for which the preceding (παραγγελία . . . διδαχῆς ἐμῶν) paves the way. —παραγγ. παρηγγ. [see iv. 17, 18. — ἰνὶ τ. δόμῳ. τ.] as in iv. 17. —βούλθει: your efforts go to this; “verbum invidiosum,” Bengel. — ἐπαγαγεῖν κ. τ. λ.] to bring about upon us, i.e. to cause that the shed blood of this man be avenged on us (by an insurrection of the people). “Pro confessa sumit Christum iure oculos suos fluxisse,” Calvin.³ On the (contemptuous) τοῦρ . . . τοῦν Bengel rightly remarks: “fugit appellare Ἰησοῦς; Petrus appellat et celebrat, νν. 30, 31.” —Observe how the high priest prudently leaves out of account the mode of their escape. Disobedience towards the sacred tribunal was the fulcrum.

Ver. 29. Ἐν καὶ ἀπόστολοι] and, generally, the apostles. For Peter spoke in the name of all; hence also the singular ἀπόκριθ. ⁴ — παραχρεῖν κ. τ. λ.] “Ubi enim iussa Domini et servi concurrent, oportet illa prius exsequi.” ⁵ The principle is here still more decidedly expressed than in iv. 19, and in all its generality.

Vv. 30–33 now present, in exact reference to the previous Θεῷ μᾶλλον, the teaching activity of the apostles as willed by God. — ἐν δὲ τ. παρ. ἡγεμ. [Comp. iii. 18. — ἡγεμον] is, with Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Erasmus, and others, to be referred to the raising from the dead, as the following relative sentence contains the contrast to it, and the exaltation to glory follows immediately afterwards, ver. 31. Others, such as Calvin, Bengel, de Wette, hold that it refers generally to the appearance of Christ, whom God has made to emerge. ⁶ — δυσχεραίνα] to murder with one’s own hands. ⁷ This purposely chosen significant word brings the execution of Christ, which was already in iv. 10 designated as the strict personal act of the instigators, into prominent view with the greatest possible force as such. So also in the examples in Kypke, II. p. 54. The following aorist αἰματομ. is synchronous with δυσχεραίνα as its modal definition. — ἵνα [ζῷον] on a tree: an expression, well known to the hearers, for the stake. ⁸ on which criminals were suspended. The cross is here designedly so called, not because the σταυρός was a Roman instrument of death, ⁹ but in order to strengthen the representation, because ἵνα [ζῷον] reminded them of

¹ So Winer, p. 472 (E. T. 694), de Wette.
³ Comp. Matt. xxiii. 35, xxvii. 35; Acts xvii. 6; Joel. xxiii. 15; Judg. ix. 34; Lev. xxii. 16.
⁶ iii. 32, 33, xii. 33; Luke i. 65, vili. 16.
⁷ See xxvi. 31; Polyb. vili. 23. 8. Comp. δυσχεραίνα, Job xxx. 34.
⁸ Υἱ. Gen. xi. 19; Dent. xxii. 3; Isa. x. 31; comp. Acts x. 30: 1 Pet. ii. 24; Gal. iii. 13.
⁹ See, on the other hand, II. 35, iv. 10.
the occurred (see on Gal. iii. 18). — Ver. 31. Him has God exalted by His right hand to be the Leader (not as in iii. 15, where a genitive stands alongside), i.e. the Ruler and Head of the theocracy, a designation of the kingly dignity of Jesus, and a Saviour (the author and bestower of the Messianic salvation). On the idea, comp. ii. 36. As to ἡ ἀρχή, autò, see on ii. 23. — ὧν ἡμᾶς μετάνοιαν κ.τ.λ.] contains the design of τοῖς..., ἡ ἀρχή: in order to give repentance to the Israelites and the forgiveness of sins. With the exaltation of Christ, namely, was to commence His heavenly work on earth, through which He as Lord and Saviour, by means of the Holy Spirit, would continually promote the work of redemption to be appropriated by men, would draw them to Him, John xii. 32, 33, in bringing them by the preaching of the gospel (1 Pet. i. 23) to a change of mind (comp. xi. 18; 2 Tim. ii. 25), and so, through the faith in Him which set in with the μετάνοια, making them partakers of the forgiveness of sins in baptism (comp. 1 Pet. iii. 21). The appropriation of the work of salvation would have been denied to them without the exaltation of Christ, in the absence of which the Spirit would not have operated (John vii. 39, xvi. 7); but by the exaltation it was given to them, and that, indeed, primarily to the Israelites, whom Peter still names alone, because it was only at a later period that he was to rise from this his national standpoint to universalism (chapter x.). — With the reading auτòi ωπρ. (see the critical remarks), ωπρ. governs two genitives different in their reference, the one of a person and the other of a thing, and auτòi could not but accordingly precede; but the emphasis lies on the bold ἡμείς, to which then τὸ πνεύμα κ.τ.λ. is added still more defiantly. — τῶν ἰδιοτ. τοῖς...of these words, i.e. of what has just been uttered. See on Matt. iv. 4. Peter means the raising and exaltation of Jesus. Of the latter the apostles were witnesses, in so far as they had already experienced the activity of the exalted Jesus, agreeably to His own promise (i. 5), through the effusion of the Spirit (ii. 38 f.). But Luke, who has narrated the tradition of the externally visible event of the ascension as an historical fact, must here have thought of the eye-witness of the apostles at the ascension. — καὶ τὸ πνεύμα δὲ τὸ ἁγίον] as well we...as also the Spirit, in which case δὲ, according to the Attic usage, is placed after the emphasised idea. The Holy Spirit, the greater witness, different from the human self-consciousness, but ruling and working in believers, witnesses with them (συμμαρτυρεῖ, Rom. viii. 16). Comp. xv. 28. — τοῖς πνευμ_pullax: autòi] to those who obey Him. In an entirely arbitrary manner this is usually restricted by a mentally supplied ἡμῖν merely to the apostles; whereas all who were obedient to God, in a believing recognition of the Messiah

1 Comp. Thuc. i. 193. 2; Aesch. Agam. 250; and τιμαί ἐρήμης, Eur. Th. 196.

2 Not merely the actual impulse and occasion given, as, after Heinrichs, Kuinkel, and de Wette, also Weis, Petr. Lehregr. p. 307 (comp. his δηλ. Theol. p. 182), would have us think. Against this view may be urged the appended καὶ ἐφεσιν ἐμαρτησίων, which is not compatible with that more free rendering of διεσάρται.

3 See Winer, p. 180 (G. T. 290); Dissem. ad Plut. Ol. i. 94; Fyfe. ii. 56.

4 On the other hand, see Hartung, Furtik. p. 191.

5 Basemann, Furtik. p. 169.
COUNSEL OF GAMALIEL.

Preached to them, comp. ii. 38, xi. 17, and so through the ἐπαχθής τῆς πίστεως, Rom. i. 5, had received the gifts of the Spirit. They form the category to which the apostles belong.

Ver. 38. Διειπνοντο] not: they gnashed with the teeth, which would be διείπνον τοὺς ὀδόντος,¹ but dissedebantur (Vulgate), comp. vii. 54: they were sawn through, cut through as by a saw,²—a figurative expression (comp. ii. 37) of deeply penetrating painful indignation.³ It is stronger than the non-figurative διασεαισθαν, iv. 2, xvi. 18. — ἐκδοκεωντο] they consulted, Luke xiv. 31; Acts xv. 87. The actual coming to a resolution was averted by Gamaliel.

Ver. 34. Gamaliel, Ἱωάννης, retributio Dei (Num. i. 10, ii. 20), is usually assumed to be identical with Rabban Gamaliel, Ἰουσαφ (senex), celebrated in the Talmud, the grandson of Hilliel and the son of R. Simcoon,—a view which cannot be proved, but also cannot be refuted, as there is nothing against it in a chronological point of view.⁴ He was the teacher of the Apostle Paul (Acts xxii. 3), but is certainly not in our passage to be considered as the president of the Sanhedrin, as many have assumed, because in that case Luke would have designated him more characteristically than by τις ἐν τ. συνεδρίῳ Ἰσραή. That he had been in secret a Christian,⁵ and been baptized, along with his son and Nicodemus, by Peter and John,⁶ is a legend deduced by arbitrary inference from this passage.⁷ An opposite but equally arbitrary extreme is the opinion of Pearson (Lectt. p. 49), that Gamaliel only declared himself in favor of the apostles from an inverteber partisan opposition to the Sadducees. Still more grossly, Schrader, ii. p. 63, makes him a hypocrite, who sought to act merely for his own elevation and for the kingdom of darkness, and to win the unsuspicous Christians by his dissimulation. He was not a mere prudent waiter on events (Thiersch), but a wise, impartial, humane, and religiously scrupulous man, so strong in character that he could not and would not suppress the warnings and counsels that experience prompted him to oppose to the passionate zeal, backed in great part by Sadducean prejudice, of his colleagues (ver. 17); and therefore to be placed higher than an ordinary jurist and politician dispassionately contemplating the case (Ewald). Recently it has been maintained that the emergence of Gamaliel here recorded is an unhistorical rôle⁸ assigned to him; and the chief⁹ ground alleged for this view

¹ Lucian. Calum. 94. ² Phot. cod. 171, p. 199. ³ See also Zeller. ⁴ Moreover, Baur puts the alternative: Either the previous miracles, etc., actually took place, and then Gamaliel could not have given an advice so problematic in tenor, whether he might have regarded them as divine miracles or not. Or, if Gamaliel gave this counsel, then what is said to have taken place could not have occurred as it is related. But this dilemma proves nothing, as there is a third alternative possible, namely, that Gamaliel was by the miracles which had occurred favorably inclined towards Christianity, but not decided; and therefore, as a prudent and conscientious man, judged at least a further waiting for light to be necessary. This favorable inclination is evidently to be recognized in the mode in which he expresses his advice; see on vv. 38, 39.
is the mention of Theudas, ver. 36 (but see on ver. 36), while there is further assumed the set purpose of making Christianity a section of orthodox, or in other words Pharisaic Judaism, combated by Sadduceism. As if, after the exaltation of Christ, His resurrection must not really have stood in the foreground of the apostles' preaching! and by that very fact the position of parties could not but necessarily be so far changed, that now the main interests of Sadduceism were most deeply affected. — νομοδιδάσκαλον] a νομικός, one skilled in the law (canonist) as a teacher. — βραχύ a short while. — On ἔσω ποιεῖν] to put without. — τ. ἀνθρώπους (see the critical remarks): thus did Gamaliel impartially designate them, and Luke reproduces his expression. The order of the words puts the emphasis on ἔσω; for the discussion was to be one conducted within the Sanhedrin. Comp. iv. 15.

Ver. 35. Ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώπινοι τούτοις] in respect of these men might be joined to προσέχετε ἵνα τοίς (Lachm.), as Luther, Castalio, Beza, and many others have done (whence also comes the reading ἀπὸ τῶν κ.τ.λ. in E); yet the currency of the expression πράσσειν τι ἐπὶ τινὶ is in favour of its being construed with τι μέλλετε πράσσειν. The emphasis also which thus falls on ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνθρ. is appropriate. — πράσσειν (not ποιεῖν) : agere, what procedure ye will take. Comp. iii. 17, xix. 36; and see on Rom. i. 33. Gamaliel will have nothing προσέχετε (xix. 36) done; therefore they must be on their guard (προσέχει, latt.).

Ver. 36. Γὰρ gives the reason for the warning contained in ver 35. In proof that they should not proceed rashly, Gamaliel reminds them of two instances from contemporary history (vv. 36, 37) when fanatical deceivers of the people (without any interference of the Sanhedrin) were overthrown by their own work. Therefore there should be no interference with the apostles (ver. 38); for their work, if it should be of men, would not escape destruction; but if it should be of God, it would not be possible to overthrow it. — πρὸ τούτων τῶν ἡμερῶν i.e. not long ago. Οὐ δέχεται παλαιώς ἡμερήμερα καίγονται ἡμῶν, ἀλλὰ νεώτερα, ἄ μάλιστα πρὸς πίστιν ἔσω σαν ἰαχώρα, Chrysostom. Comp. xxi. 88. Yet the expression, which here stands simply in contrast to ancient incidents (which do not lie within the experience of the generation), is not to be pressed; for Gamaliel goes back with to the time before the census of Quirinus. — Theudas] Joseph. Antt. xx. 5. 1, informs us that under the procurator Cephas Fadus' an insurgent chief Theudas (v) gave himself out to be a prophet, and obtained many adherents. But Fadus fell on the insurgents with his cavalry; they were either slain or taken prisoners, and Theudas himself was beheaded by the horsemen. This narrative suits our passage exactly as regards substance, but does not correspond as regards date. For the Theudas of Josephus lived under Claudius, and Tiberius

1 See on Matt. xxi. 25.
2 Thuc. vi. 13; Polyb. iii. 96. 2; 2 Sam. xix. 36.
3 Comp. Xen. Cyd. iv. 1. 3; Symm. Pa. cxiii. 7.
4 Bernhardy, p. 351.
6 Erasmus well paraphrases it: "Ex pia tertitis suntia consilium, quid in futurum oportet decidere."
7 Not before A.D. 44; see Anger, de temp. ref. p. 44.
Alexander succeeded Cuspius Fadus about A.D. 46; whereas Gamaliel's speech occurred about ten years earlier, in the reign of Tiberius. Very many,\(^1\) therefore, suppose, that it is not the Theudas of Josephus who is here meant, but some other insurgent chief or robber-captain acting a religious part,\(^2\) who has remained unknown to history, but who emerged in the turbulent times either of the later years of Herod the Great or soon after his death. This certainly removes all difficulties, but in what a violent manner! especially as the name was by no means so common as to make the supposition of two men of that name, with the same enterprise and the same fate, appear probable, or indeed, in the absence of more precise historical warrant, otherwise than rash, seeing that elsewhere historical mistakes occur in Luke (comp. iv. 6; Luke ii. 1, 2). Besides, it is antecedently improbable that tradition should not have adduced an admonitory example thoroughly striking, from a historical point of view, such as was that of Judas the Galilean. But the attempts to discover in our Theudas one mentioned by Josephus under a different name,\(^3\) amount only to assumptions incapable of proof, and are nevertheless under the necessity of leaving the difference of names unaccounted for. But inasmuch as, if the Theudas in our passage is conceived as the same with the Theudas mentioned by Josephus, the error cannot be sought on the side of Josephus;\(^4\) as, on the contrary, the exactness of the narrative of Josephus secures at any rate the decision in its favour for chronological accuracy over against Luke; there thus remains nothing but to assume that Luke—or in the first instance, his source—has, in the reproduction of the speech before us, put into the mouth of Gamaliel a proleptic mistake. This might occur the more easily, as the speech may have been given simply from tradition. And the tradition which had correctly preserved one event adduced by Gamaliel, the destruction of Judas the Galilean, was easily amplified by an anachronistic addition of another. If Luke himself composed the speech in accordance with tradition, the error is in his case the more easily explained, since he wrote the Acts so long after the insurrection of Theudas,—in fact, after the destruction of the Jewish commonwealth,—that the chronological error, easy in itself, may here occasion the less surprise, for he was not a Jew, and he had been for many years occupied with efforts of quite another kind than the keeping freshly in mind the chronological position of one of the many passing enthusiastic attempts at insurrection. It has been ex-

---

\(^1\) Origem, c. Cels. t. 6, Scaliger, Cassanbon, Benso, Grocius, Calovius, Hammond, Wolf, Bengel. Henmann, Krebe, Lardner, Morus, Rosenmüller, Heinrichs, Kalnzel, Guercke, Anzer, Olshausen, Ebrard.

\(^2\) So also Gerlach, d. Römischen Statthalte, p. 70, not without a certain irritation towards me, which I regret, as it contributes nothing to the settlement of the question.

\(^3\) Wieseler, Synopsis, p. 108 ff., and Baumgarten, also Köhler in Herzog's Encykl. XVI. p. 49 f., holding it to refer to the scribe Matthias in Joseph. Bell. i. 33. 2, Ant. xvii. 6; Sonntag in the Stud. u. Krit. 1837. p. 588 ff., and Ewald, to the insurgent Simon in Joseph. Bell. ii. 4. 3, Ant. xvii. 10. 6; Zuschlag in the monograph Thedas, Anfahrer eines 750. in Paläst. errungen Aufstandes, Cassel 1849, taking it to be the Theudion of Joseph, Ant. xvii. 4, who took an active part in the Idumean rising after the death of Herod the Great.

\(^4\) Baronius, Reland, Michælis, Jahn, Archdol. ii. 2, § 137.
plained as a proleptic error by Valesius, 1 Lud. Cappellus, Wetstein, Ottius, 2 Eichhorn, Credner, de Wette, Neander, Bleek, Holtzmman, Keim, 3 as also by Baur and Zeller, who, however, urge this error as an argument against the historical truth of the entire speech. Olsphanus considers himself prevented from assenting to the idea of a historical mistake, because Luke must have committed a double mistake,—for, first, he would have made Gamaliel name a man who did not live till after him; and, secondly, he would have put Judas, who appeared under Augustus, as subsequent to Theudas, who lived under Claudius. But the whole mistake amounts to the simple error, that Luke conceived that Theudas had played his part already before the census of Quirinius, and accordingly he could not but place him before Judas. 4 — εἰναι τῶν giving out himself 5 for one of peculiar importance. 6 — ψ προσεκλίθη to whom leaned, i.e. adhered, took his side: πολλοὺς ἵππους, Josephus, I.c. 7 — ἕγινον εἰς οὕδεν] ad nihilum redacti sunt. 8 They were, according to Josephus, I.c., broken up (διελήθησαν) by the cavalry of Fadus, and partly killed, partly taken prisoners. —The two relative sentences ψ προσεκλ and δι έγινοθ ε are designed to bring out emphatically the contrast. Comp. iv. 10.

Ver. 57. 'Ἰουδαίος ὁ Γαλιλαῖος] Joseph. Ant. xviii. 1. 1, calls him a Gaulanite; for he was from Gamala in Lower Gaulanitis. But in Ant. xviii. 1. 6, 5. 2, Bell. ii. 8. 1, xvii. 8, he mentions him likewise as Γαλιλαῖος. Apparently the designation "the Galilean" was the inaccurate one used in ordinary life, from the locality in which the man was at work. Gaulanitis lay on the eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee.—He excited an insurrection against the census which Augustus in the year 7 aor. Dion. 8 caused to be made by Quirinius the governor of Syria (see on Luke ii. 2), representing it as a work of subjugation, and calling the people to liberty with all the fanatical boldness kindled by the old theocratic spirit. 9 — ἀκτεναρι... ἄποιοι ἀιρόν] he withdrew them from the governmen), and made them his own adherents. 10 — ἅπωλερο] a notice which supplements Josephus. Accord-

1 Ad. Ezech. H. E. ii. 11.
2 Spieglpe, p. 258.
3 According to Lange, Apost. Zeitatl. I. p. 94, the difficulty between Luke and Josephus remains "somewhat in suspense." Yet he inclines to the assumption of an earlier Theudas, according to the hypothesis of Wieseler. According to this hypothesis, the Greek name (see Wetstein) Théudás (— Θεόδας — Θεόδουρος), preserved still on coins in Mionnait, must be regarded as the Greek form of the name Πέτρος. But why should Gamaliel or Luke not have retained the name Matthew? Or what could induce Josephus to put Matthew instead of Theudas? especially as the name Πέτρος was not strange in Hebrew (Schoettg. p. 423), and Josephus himself mentions the later insurgent by no other name.

4 Entirely mistaken is the—even in a linguistic point of view erroneous—interpretation of μετὰ τοῦτον (ver. 57) by Calvin, Wetstein, and others, that it denotes not temporis ordinam, but, generally, insuper or prostrato.

5 ἄνωτερον, in which consists the arrogance, the self-exaltation; "character false doctrine," Bengel.

6 προφετή εἰλευρ εἰμι, Joseph. Ant. xx. 5. 1. On τις, extimus quidam (the opposite εἰς—Vulgate, ad Herod. iii. 140), see Wetstein in loc. ; Winer, p. 160 (E. T. 219) ; Disen, ad Pind. Pyth. viii. 85, p. 399.

7 Comp. Polyb. iv. 51. 5; also προσελκυμε, Polyb. vi. 10, 10, v. 82, 3.

8 See Scheunner, Thes. IV. p. 140.

9 Thirty-seven years after the battle of Actium, Joseph. Ant. xviii. 21.


11 Attraction: Hermann, ad Fig. p. 260.
ing to Joseph. *Antt. xx. 5. 2, two sons of Judas perished at a later period, whom Tiberius Alexander, the governor of Judaea, caused to be crucified.*

Still later a third son was executed." — διασκορπισθησαν] they were scattered,
—which does not exclude the continuance of the faction, whose members were afterwards very active as zealots, and again even in the Jewish war; therefore it is not an incorrect statement (in opposition to de Wette).

Vv. 38-40. ᾶλ] is the simple copula of the train of thought; τὸ νῦν as in iv. 29. — ἐν ἀνθρώπων] of human origin (comp. Matt. xxii. 25), not proceeding from the will and arrangement of God (not ἐκ Θεοῦ).— η βοήθη εὐρή ὅ τ' ἐκ τοῦ τοῦτο] "Disjunctio non ad diversas res, sed ad diversa, quibus res appellatur, vocabula pertinent." This project or (in order to denote the matter in question still more definitely) this work (as already in the act of being executed). — καταλυθησται] namely, without your interference. This conception results from the antithesis in the second clause: οὐ δίωνεις καταλύσας αὐτός. For similar expressions from the Rabbins, see Schoettgen. The reference of καταλύσιον to personae (αὐτός, see the critical remarks) who are overthrown, ruined, is also current in classical authors.—Notice, further, the difference in meaning of the two conditional clauses: τὸν ἱ and εἰ . . . ἔτιν, according to which the second case put appeared to Gamaliel as the more probable. — μὴ pies καὶ θεομάχοι εὑρεθήσεται] although grammatically to be explained by a skelos, προσήκει ἑαυτοῖς (Luke xxii. 34), or some similar phrase floating before the mind, is an independent warning: that ye only be not found even fighters against God. — Valckenaer and Lachmann (after Princæus and Hammond) construe otherwise, referring μὴ πιστεύεις εἰς αὐτός, and treating δὲ . . . αὐτός as a parenthesis. A superfluous interruption, to which also the manifest reference of θεομάχοι to the directly preceding εἰ δὲ εἰκ Θεοῦ ἔτιν κ. τ. λ. is opposed. — καὶ] is to be explained elliptically: not only with men, but also further, in addition. — θεομάχοι.] — εὑρεθήσεται] even if only in tautum; and yet how greatly to their self-conviction on account of their recent condemnation of Jesus! — δειραντες] The Sanhedrim would at least not expose themselves, as if they had instituted an examination wholly without result, and therefore they order the punishment of stripes, usual for very various kinds of crime—here, proved disobedience—but very ignominious (comp. xvi. 87, xxii.) — Concerning the counsel of Gamaliel generally, the principle therein expressed is only right conditionally, for interference against a spiritual development must, in respect of its admissibility or necessity, be morally judged of according to the nature of the cases; nor is that counsel to be considered as an abso-

---

1 Comp. *Bell. II. 8. 1.*
2 *Bell. II. 17. 8 f.* ; *Vit. v. 11.*
3 Joseph. *Bell. II. 17. 7.*
4 *Frieseche, ad Marc. p. 377.*
6 * Xen. *Cyr. vili. 5, 94 ; Plat. *Legg.* iv. p. 714 C ; *Lucian. Gall. 23.* Comp. καταλύσεις τοῦ τοπίου, Polyb. x. 25, 3, etc.
7 Comp. *Gal. i. 8, 9 ; and see Winer. p. 577 f.*
8 *E. T. 366* ; *Stallb. ad Plat. *Phaed.* p. 90 E.
9 *See Hom. II. 1. 96, ii. 108; Matt. xx. 9 (Eliz.); Rom. xi. 31; Basenlein, *Partik.* p. 925; *Nagel, on the *Mead, p. 18, ed. 3.*
11 *See Symm. Prov. ix. 18, xxi. 16; Job xxvi. 8; *Herschel. Alleg. 1; Lucian. *Jov. 70.* On the thing itself, comp. *Hom. II. vi. 129 ; εἰκ* ἐν ἑαυτῷ διόνειν ἐνσωριανοίς μαχαιρεσήσθων.*
lute maxim of Gamallel, but as one which is here presented to him by the critical state of affairs, and is to be explained from his predomi-
nant opinion that a work of God may be at stake, as he himself indeed makes this opinion apparent by ei . . . ισην, ver. 39 (see above).

Ver. 41 f. Χαιροντες] comp. Matt. v. 11, 12. — ὑπὸ τοῦ ὁνόματος] placed first with emphasis: for the name, for its glorification. For the scourging suffered tended to that effect, because it was inflicted on the apostles on account of their steadfast confession of the name. Comp. ix. 16. "Quum reputarent causam, prævalebat gaudium," Calvin. The absolute τὸ ὄνομα denotes the name καὶ ἔκαστην,—namely, "Jesus Messiah" (iii. 6, iv. 10), the confession and announcement of which was always the highest and holiest concern of the apostles. Analogous is the use of the absolute ὅλος (Lev. xxiv. 11, 16), in which the Hebrew understood the name of his Jehovah as implied of itself. Comp. 3 John 7. — καθεξῆς, ἀποκάλυπτ.] An oxymoron. — πῶσν ἡμέραν] every day the σὺ ἐπαινοῦσα in preaching took place. They did it day after day without cessation. — καὶ ὁδῷ] domi, in the house, a contrast to εὐ τῷ ἱερῷ. See on ii. 46. — ἄνεικνοντο διδασκόντες]. — καὶ εἰπεῖς, ἵνα. τ. X.] and announcing Jesus as the Messiah, a more specific definition of διδασκόντες as regards its chief contents.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(s) Ananias. V. 1.

His punishment.—The statement of our author, though strong, is near the truth. Peter was merely the organ of the Holy Spirit, and his address was the sentence of death. It was not Peter who either pronounced or executed the sentence, but God himself. Dr. Davidson observes: "It is evidently set forth as the miraculous instantaneous effect of Peter's words. This, with the harshness of the divinely inflicted punishment, which is out of character with the gospel history, prevents the critic from accepting the fact as historical, at least in the way it is told." Others denounce the punishment as too severe, and not in accordance with the benign spirit of Christ. Porphyry accuses Peter of cruelty. To this charge Jerome very justly replies: "The apostle Peter by no means calls down death upon them, as the foolish Porphyry falsely lays to his charge, but by a prophetic spirit announces the judgment of God, that the punishment of two persons might be the instruction of many." "But whether used directly against Peter, or indirectly against God himself, the charge of rashness and undue severity may be repelled without resorting to the ultimate plea of the divine infallibility and sovereignty, by the complex nature of the sin committed, as embracing an ambitious and vainglorious desire to obtain the praise of men by false pretences; a selfish and avaricious wish to do this at as small expense as possible; a direct falsehood, whether told by word or deed, as to the completeness of the sum presented; but above all, an impious defiance of God the Spirit, as unable to detect the

1 Comp. Phil. i. 29; 2 Cor. xi. 26-30; Gal. vi. 14, 17, al.; 1 Pet. ii. 19.
2 See Herm. ad Vig., p. 771; Bernhardy, p. 477.
3 See Winer, p. 168 (E. T. 214).
imposture or to punish it; a complication and accumulation of gratuitous and aggravated crimes, which certainly must constitute a heinous sin—if not the unpardonable sin—against the Holy Ghost." (Alexander.) The sin of Ananias was an aggravated combination of all iniquity—vanity and hypocrisy, covetousness and fraud, impiety, and contempt of God. As analogous instances refer to the fate of Nadab and Abihu; Korah and his company; the man that gathered sticks upon the Sabbath day, and Achan.

(v) Peter’s shadow. V. 15.

"The expression is rhetorical; the sick were anxious that something belonging to Peter might touch them, even if it were only his shadow." It is not said, but it is implied, that cures were thus wrought. Analogous instances are recorded in the evangelical history: the infirm woman (Matt. ix. 21, 22); cures effected by handkerchiefs from the person of Paul (Acts xix. 12). See specially Lange, in loc.

(v) Theudas. V. 36.

Josephus gives the history of an impostor named Theudas, who drew a great multitude of people after him. He was apprehended and beheaded by order of the Roman ruler. But this event occurred in the reign of Claudius, about ten years after the speech of Gamaliel had been delivered. Assuming that this Theudas is the one referred to by Gamaliel, a charge of anachronism and "historical mistake" is brought against Luke. Now without making any comparison between the two historians for accuracy, or insisting that Luke is as good authority as Josephus, the assumed difficulty may be removed by supposing that Gamaliel referred to some one of the many turbulent insurrectionary chiefs, of whom Josephus speaks as overrunning the land about the time of the death of Herod the Great. He says: "At this time there were great disturbances in the country, and the opportunity that now offered itself induced a great many to set up for kings." "Judea was at this time full of robberies; and as the several companies of the seditious lighted upon any one to lead them, he was created a king forthwith."

"The name was not an uncommon one, and it can excite no surprise that one Theudas, who was an insurgent, should have appeared in the time of Augustus, and another, fifty years later, in the time of Claudius. Josephus gives an account of four men named Simon, who followed each other within forty years, and of three named Judas within ten years, who were all instigators of rebellion." (Hackett.) Now such an explanation, or others equally probable, must be proved to be false, before a charge of ignorance or error is brought against the writer of the Acts. The "charge is in the last degree improbable, considering how often such apparent inconsistencies are reconciled by the discovery of new but intrinsically unimportant facts; and also the error, if it were one, must have been immediately discovered, and would either have been rectified at once, or made the ground of argumentative objection." (Alexander.)
CHAPTER VI.

Ver. 3. 'Αγίου] is wanting in B D _ANY, 137, 180, vss. Chrys. Theophil. Delected by Lachm. Tisch. Born. ; the Syr. expresses κυρίου. A more precisely de-
fining addition (comp. ver. 5), which is also found inserted at ver. 10. — κατα-
στήσαμεν] Elz. has καταστήσαμεν, against decisive evidence. An over-hasty cor-
rection. — Ver. 5, πλήρης] A C\* D E H Μ, min. have πλήρης, which, although
adopted by Lachm., is intolerable, and is to be regarded as an old error of
transcription. — Ver. 8. χάριτος] Elz. has πίστεως, contrary to decisive evidence.
From ver. 5. — Ver. 9. καὶ ἀλοχός] is deleted by Lach., following A D\* Cant.
It was easily overlooked after Κιλικίας; whereas it would be difficult to con-
ceive a reason for its being inserted. — Ver. 11. βλάσφημα] D has βλάσφημας.
Recommended by Griesb. and adopted by Born. But ἥμαρτα βλάσφημα was ex-
plained by the weakly-attested βλάσφημα (blasphemies) as a gloss; and this,
taken as a genitive, thereupon suppressed the original βλάσφημα. — Ver. 13.
After ἥμαρτα, Elz. has βλάσφημα, against a great predominance of evidence.
From ver. 11. — After ἄγιον, Elz. has τοῦτον, which, it is true, has in its favour
B C, Tol. Sahid. Syr. utr. Chrys. Theophil. 2, but was added with reference
to ver. 14, as the meeting of the Sanhedrim was conceived as taking place within
the area of the temple court.

Vv. 1–7. An explanation paving the way for the history of Stephen,
ver. 8 ff. Ver. 7 is not at variance with this view.

Ver. 1. Δέ] Over against this new victory of the church without, there
now emerges a division in its own bosom. — ἐν ταῖς ἱεροπ. μαρτ.] namely,
while the apostles continued, after their liberation, to devote themselves
unmolested to their function of preaching (v. 42). Thus this expression
(ἐν ταῖς ἱεροπ. μαρτ.) finds its definition, although only an approximate one, always
in what precedes. Comp. on Matt. iii. 1. — πληθυνώντων] as a neuter verb
(Bernhardy, p. 389 f.): amidst the increase of the Christian multitude, by
which, consequently, the business of management referred to became
the more extensive and difficult.1 — 'Ελληνωτῆς, elsewhere only preserved
in Phot. Bibl. (see Wetstein), according to its derivation, from ἑλληνικὸς, to
present oneself in Grecian nationality, and particularly to speak the Greek
language;2 and according to its contrast to 'Εβραίος, is to be explained: a
Jew, and so non-Greek, who has Greek nationality, and particularly speaks
Greek: ix. 29. Comp. Chrysostom and Oecumenius. As both appella-
tions are here transferred to the members of the Christian church at Jeru-
salem, the 'Εβραίος are undoubtedly: those Christians of the church of Jerusa-
lem, who, as natives of Palestine, had the Jewish national character, and spoke

1 Comp. Aesch. Ag. 389; Polyb. iii. 105. 7; Apeor.
Herod. iii. 8. 14, often in the LXX. and Lobeck, ad Phryg. p. 380.
the sacred language as their native tongue; and the Ἑλληνοριαί are those members of this church, who were Greek-Jews, and therefore presented themselves in Greek national character, and spoke Greek as their native language. Both parties were Jewish Christians; and the distinction between them turned on the different relation of their original nationality to Judaism. And as the two parties (v) embraced the whole of the Jews who had become Christian, it is a purely arbitrary limitation, when Camerarius, Beza, Salmasius, Pearson, Wolf, Morus, Ziegler, would understand exclusively the Jewish proselytes who had been converted to Christianity. These are included among the Greek-Jews who had become Christian, but are not alone meant; the Jews by birth who had been drawn from the ἰασυρότιοι to Jerusalem are also included. The more the intercourse of Greek-Jews with foreign culture was fitted to lessen and set aside Jewish narrow-mindedness, so much the more easy it is to understand that many should embrace Christianity. πρὸς] denotes, according to the context, the antagonistic direction, as in Luke vi. 30. Comp. Acts ix. 29. ἐν τῇ ὑπάκουᾳ τῇ καθημ.] in the daily service (2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 1, 18), here: with provisions, in the daily distribution of food. Ver. 2 requires this explanation. καθημερινός only here in the N. T., more frequently in Plutarch, etc., belongs to the later Greek. The neglect of due consideration, παραθεωρεῖν, which the widows of the Hellenists met with, doubtless by the fault not of the apostles, but of subordinates commissioned by them, is an evidence that the Jewish self-exaltation of the Palestinian over the Greek-Jews, so much at variance with the spirit of Christianity, had extended also to the Christian community, and now on the increase of the church, no longer restrained by the fresh unity of the Holy Spirit, came into prominence as the first germ of the later separation of the Hebrew and Hellenistic elements; as also, that before the appointment of the subsequently named Seven, the care of the poor was either exclusively, or at least chiefly, entrusted to the Hebrews. The widows are not, as Olshausen and Lekebusch, p. 98, arbitrarily assume, mentioned by synecdoche for all the poor and needy, but simply because their neglect was the occasion of the γογγυστέα. We may add, that this passage does not presuppose another state of matters than that of the community of goods formerly mentioned (Schleiermacher and others), but only a disproportion as regards the application of the means thereby placed at their disposal. There is nothing in the text to show that the complaint as to this was unfounded (Calvin).

Ver. 2. Τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν] the mass of the disciples; i.e. the Christian multitude in general, not merely individuals, or a mere committee of the church. Comp. iv. 82. It is quite as arbitrary to understand, with Light-
foot, only the 120 persons mentioned in i. 15, as, with Mosheim and Kuinoel, to suppose that the church of Jerusalem was divided into seven classes, which assembled in seven different places, and had each selected from their midst an almoner. As the place of meeting is not named, it is an over-hasty conclusion that the whole church could not have assembled all at once. — obi ἀρεστῶν ἐστίν] non placet. The Vulgate, Beza, Calvin, Piscator, Cassaubon, Kuinoel, incorrectly render: non aequum est, which the word never means, not even in the LXX. It pleased not the apostles to leave the doctrine of God—its proclamation—just because the fulfilment of the proper duty of their calling pleased them. — καταλείψας.] A strong expression under a vivid sense of the disturbing element (to leave in the lurch). — διακονεῖν τραπέζις] to serve tables, i.e. to be the regulators, overseers, and dispensers in reference to food. The expression, which contains the more precise definition for τῷ διακόνῳ of ver. 1, betrays "indignitatem aliquam" (Bengel). —The reference which others have partly combined with this, partly assumed alone, of τράπεζα to the money-changers' table, is excluded, in the absence of any other indication in the text, by the διακόνειν used stately of the ministration of food. Moreover, the designation of the matter, as if it were a banking business, would not even be suitable. The apostles would neither be ἀρχηγοὶ nor ἀρχιποικισταὶ. They may hitherto in the management of this business have made use, without fixed plan, of the assistance of others, by whose fault, perhaps, the murmuring of the Hellenists was occasioned.

Ver. 3. Accordingly (οὖν), as we, the apostles, can no longer undertake this business of distribution, look ye out, i.e. direct your attention to test and select, etc. — ἐπαν] (w) the sacred number. — σοφίας] quite in the usual practical sense: wisdom, which determines the right agency in conformity with the recognised divine aim. With a view to this required condition of fullness of the Spirit and of wisdom, the men to be selected from the midst of the church were to be attested, i.e. were to have the corresponding testimony of the church in their favour. — οὖς κατατηρήσωμεν ἐνὶ τῷ τραπεζίῳ ὑμῶν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔχουσιν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔχουσιν, when they are chosen, over the business in question. This officium, ministration, is just that, of which the distributing to the widows was an essential and indeed the chief part, namely, the care of the poor in the church, not merely as to its Hellenistic portion. The limitation to the latter would presuppose the existence of a special management of the poor already established for the Hebrew...
portion, without any indication of it in the text; nor is it supported by the Hellenic names of the persons chosen (ver. 5), as such names at that time were very common also among the Hebrews. Consequently the hypothesis, that pure Hellenists were appointed by the impartiality of the Hebrews,\(^1\) is entirely arbitrary; as also is the supposition of Gieseler,\(^2\) that three Hebrews and three Hellenists, and one proselyte, were appointed; although the chosen were doubtless partly Hebrews and partly Hellenists.—Observe, moreover, how the right to elect was regarded by the apostles as vested in the church, and the election itself was performed by the church, but the appointment and consecration were completed by the apostles; the requisite qualifications, moreover, of those to be elected are defined by the apostles.\(^3\) From this first regular overseership of aims, the mode of appointment to which could not but regulate analogically the practice of the church, was gradually developed the diakonate, which subsequently underwent further elaboration (Phil. i. 1).\(^4\) It remains an open question whether the overseers corresponded to the Διακονοί of the synagogue\(^5\) — τὴν διακονίαν τοῦ λόγου] correlate contrasting with the διακονεῖν τραπέζαις in ver. 2.\(^6\) The apostolic working was to be separated from the office of overseer; while, on the other hand, the latter was by no means to exclude other Christian work in the measure of existing gifts, as the very example of Stephen (vv. 8–10) shows; comp. on viii. 5.

Ver. 5. Παντὸς τοῦ πλῆθους] "pulcher consensus cum obsequio," Bengel. The aristocracy of the church was a μετ' εὐδοξίας πλῆθους ἄρρητοκρατία.\(^7\) — πιστεως] is not, with Wetstein, Kuinoel, and others, to be interpreted honesty, trustworthiness; for this qualification was obvious of itself, and is here no peculiar characteristic. But the prominent Christian element in the nature of Stephen was his being distinguished by fulness of faith

---

\(^1\) Rothe, de Wette, Thiersch, Kirche im apost. Zeitalt. p. 75.

\(^2\) Kirchengesch. I. sec. 25, note 7.


\(^4\) But the assumption that the institution of the so-called deacons was originally one and the same with the presbyterate, and that only at a later period it ramified into the distinction between the presbyterate in the narrower sense and the diaconate" (Lange. apost. Zeitalt. II. p. 75, after J. H. Böhmer; comp. also Lechler, p. 300), is not to be proved by xii. 20. See in loc. Rittehi, allkathol. K. p. 355 ff., thinks it very probable that the authority of the Seven was the first shape of the office of presbyter afterwards emerging in Jerusalem. So also Holtzmann, loc. c. p. 616. Similarly Weiss, bibl. Theol. p. 143, according to whom the presbyters stepped into the place of the Seven and took upon them their duties. But the office of presbyter was still at that time vested in the apostles themselves; accordingly, the essential and necessary difference of the two functions was from the very first the regulative point of view. The presbyterate retained the oversight and guidance of the diaconate (Phil. i. 1); comp. also xi. 30; but the latter sprang, by reason of the emerging exigency, from the former, not the converse.

\(^5\) As Leyrer, in Herzog's Encycl. XV. p. 318, thinks. The ecclesiastical overseership arose out of the higher need and interest of the new present, but the synagogal office might serve as a model that offered itself historically. The requirements for the latter office pointed merely to "well-known trustworthy" men.

\(^6\) Vitringa; on the other side Rhenfeld, see Wolf, Cursae.

\(^7\) Observe, however, that it is not said: τῇ διακονίᾳ τῇ προενεχῇ καὶ τῶν λόγων, and therefore it is not to be inferred from our passage, with Abrens (Amst. d. Schlsseel. p. 87 f.), that by τῇ προενεχῇ a part of "the office of the keys" is meant. See, in opposition to this, Distlerbeck in the Stud. u. Krit. 1885, p. 768 f.

\(^8\) Plat. Menex. p. 229 D.
(comp. xi. 24), on which account the church united in selecting him first. — Φιλαπτων.] At a later period he taught in Samaria, and baptized the chamberlain (viii. 5 ff.). Concerning his after life and labours (see, however, xxi. 8) there are only contradictory legends. — Νικόλαον] neither the founder of the Nicolaitans,¹ nor the person from whom the Nicolaitans had borrowed their name in accordance with his alleged immoral principles;² Thiersch wishes historically to combine the two traditions.³ Νικόλαος, Rev. ii. 6, is an invented Greek name, equivalent to κρατούντες τὸν διδάχθην Βαλαάδι (ver. 14), according to the derivation of Δι' θυγατί, perdidit populum.⁴ Of the others mentioned nothing further is known. — προσήλυτον Ἡσιοχ.] From this it may be inferred, with Heinsius, Gieseler, de Wette, Ewald, and others, that only Nicolas had been a proselyte, and all the rest were not; for otherwise we could not discern why Luke should have added such a special remark of so characteristic a kind only in the case of Nicolas. But that there was also a proselyte among those chosen, is an evidence of the wisdom of the choice. — Ἠσιοχαῖ] but who dwelt in Jerusalem.—The fact that Stephen is named at the head of the Seven finds its explanation in his distinguished qualities and historical significance. Comp. Peter at the head of the apostles. Chrysostom well remarks on ver. 8: καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἑαυτοὺς ἑν τις πρόκριτος καὶ τὰ πρωτεύει εἰχεν’ εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἡ χειροστοι κοινή, ἀλλ’ ἡμεῖς οὗτος ἐπισκόπους ἴχνει πλεονα. Nor is it less historically appropriate that the only proselyte among the Seven is, in keeping with the Jewish character of the church, named last.

Ver. 6.⁵ And after they (the apostles) had prayed, they laid their hands on them. — καὶ, is the simple copula, whereupon the subject changes without carrying out the periodic construction.⁶ It is otherwise in i. 24. The idea that the overseers of the church (comp. on xiii. 8) form the subject, to which Hoelemann is inclined, has this against it, that at that time, when the body of the apostles still stood at the head of the first church, no other presiding body was certainly as yet instituted. The diaconate was the first organization, called forth by the exigency that in the first instance arose. — The imposition of hands,¹ as a symbol exhibiting the divine communication of power and grace, was employed from the time of Moses² as a special theocratic consecration to office. So also in the apostolic church, without, however, its already consummating admission to any sharply defined order (comp. 1 Tim. v. 22). The circumstance that the necessary gifts (comp. here vv. 3, 5) of the person in question were already known to exist³ does not exclude the special bestowal of official gifts, which was therein contemplated; seeing that elsewhere, even in the case of those who have the Spirit, there

¹ As, after Iren. Haer. ii. 27, Epiph. Haer. 25, Calvin, Grotius, and Lightfoot assumed.
² Constitt. ap. vi. 8. 5; Clem. Al. Strom. ii. p. 177, iii. p. 187.
⁴ See Ewald and Dübsterleue, i.e.
⁵ See, on the imposition of hands, Bauer in the Stud. v. Krit. 1866, p. 343 ff.; Hoelemann in his neue Bibelstud. 1866, p. 208 ff., where also the earlier literature, p. 288, is noted.
⁷ צייר וברד, Vitringa, Synag. p. 866 ff.
⁸ Num. xxvii. 18; Deut. xxxiv. 9; Ewald, Albert. p. 67 f.
yet ensues a special and higher communication.—Observe, moreover, that here also (comp. viii. 17, xiii. 3) the imposition of hands occurs after prayer, and therefore it was not a mere symbolic accompaniment of prayer without collative import, and perhaps only a "ritus ordini et decoro congruens" (Calvin). Certainly its efficacy depended only on God’s bestowal, but it was associated with the act representing this bestowal as the medium of the divine communication.

Ver. 7, attaching the train of thought by the simple καὶ, now describes how, after the installing of the Seven, the cause of the gospel continued to prosper. "The word of God grew"—it increased in diffusion. How could the re-established and elevated love and harmony, sustained, in addition to the apostles, by upright men who were full of the Holy Spirit and of wisdom (ver. 8), fail to serve as the greatest recommendation of the new doctrine and church to the inhabitants of the capital, who had always before their eyes, in the case of their hierarchs, the curse of party spirit and sectarian hatred? Therefore—and what a significant step towards victory therein took place!—a great multitude of the priests became obedient to the faith, that is, they submitted themselves to the faith in Jesus as the Messiah, they became believers; comp. as to ὑπακοή πιστεύω, on Rom. i. 5.

The better portion of the so numerous (Exra ii. 36 ff.) priestly class could not but, in the light of the Christian theocratic fellowship which was developing itself, recognise and feel all the more vividly the decay of the old hierarchy. Accordingly, both the weakly attested reading ἰουδαῖοι, and the conjecture of Casaubon, approved by Beza: καὶ τῶν ἱερέων, ἡκ. τινες, are to be entirely rejected; nor is even Elnser’s view, which Heinsius anticipated, and Wolf and Kuinoel followed, to be adopted, viz. that by the ὄχλος τῶν ἱερ., the sacerdotes ex plebe, plebeii sacerdotes, ἤλθον, are meant in contradistinction to the theologically learned priests, ἱερεῖς οἱ ἴδιοι οἱ ἱερεῖς. The text itself is against this view; for it must at least have τοὺς: πολλοὶ τε ἱερεῖς τοῦ ὄχλου. Besides, such a distinction of priests is nowhere indicated in the N. T., and could not be presumed as known. Compare, as analogous to the statement of our passage, John xii. 42.

Vv. 8, 9. Yet there now came an attack from without, and that against that first-named distinguished overseer for the poor, Stephen, who became the πρωτομάρτυς. The new narrative is therefore not introduced abruptly (Schwanbeck).—χάριτος is, as in iv. 38, to be understood of the divine grace, not as Heinrichs, according to ii. 47, would have it taken: gratia, quam apud permittos interat. This must have been definitely conveyed by an addition.—οὐναίσκω] power generally, heroism; not specially: miraculous power, as the following ἰπταῖ τῆς κατὰ κ.τ.λ. expresses a special exercise of the generally characteristic χάρις and δίναις. —τινις τῶν ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς λαγ. Λευκρ.1 some of those who belonged to the so-called Libertine-synagogue. The number of synagogues in Jerusalem was great, and is estimated by the

---

1 Lake has not expressed himself in some such way as this: καὶ ἐν τῷ πρωτομάρτυρι τῆς χάριος ἐπητευθήσατο.
2 This also in opposition to Weiss, bib.
3 xii. 24, xix. 20, etc. Comp. the parable of the mustard-seed, Matt. xiii. 31, 32.
4 Const. op. ii. 49. 2.
Rabbins, at the fanciful number 480 (i.e. 4 x 10 x 12). Chrysostom already correctly explains the Δισπέρινον: οἱ Ῥωμαίου ἀπελευθερωμενοι. They are to be conceived as Jews by birth, who, brought by the Romans, particularly under Pompey, as prisoners of war to Rome, were afterward emancipated, and had returned home. Many also remained in Rome, where they had settled on the other side of the Tiber. They and their descendants after them formed in Jerusalem a synagogue of their own, which was named after the class-designation which its originators and possessors brought with them from their Roman sojourn in exile, the synagogue of the freedmen (libertinos). This, the usual explanation, for which, however, further historical proof cannot be adduced, is to be adhered to as correct, both on account of the purely Roman name, and because it involves no historical improbability. Grotius, Vitringa, Wolf, and others understand, as also included under it, Italians, who as freedmen had become converts to Judaism. But it is not at all known that such persons, and that in large numbers, were resident in Jerusalem. The Roman designation stands opposed to the view of Lightfoot, that they were Palestinian freedmen, who were in the service of Palestinian masters. Others, suppose that they were Jews, natives of Libertum, a (problematical) city or district in proconsular Africa. If there was a Libertum, the Jews from it, of whom no historical trace exists, were certainly not so numerous in Jerusalem as to form a separate synagogue of their own. — καὶ Κυρ. καὶ Ἀλεξ.] Likewise two synagogue communities. Calvin, Beza, Bengel, Heumann, and Klos, were no doubt of opinion that by ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς . . . καὶ Ἁσιᾶς there is meant only one synagogue, which was common to all those who are named. But against this may be urged, as regards the words of the passage, the circumstance that ἄγων only suits Δισπέρινος, and as regards matter of fact, the great number of synagogues in Jerusalem, as well as the circumstance that of the Libertini, Cyrenaeans, etc., there was certainly far too large a body in Jerusalem to admit of them all forming only one synagogue. In Cyrene, the capital of Upper Libya, the fourth part of the inhabitants consisted of Jews, and in Alexandria two of the five parts into which the city was divided were inhabited by them. Here was also the seat of Jewish-Greek learning, and it was natural that those removing to Jerusalem should bring with them in some measure this learning of the world without, and prosecute it there in their synagogue. Wieseler, p. 63, renders the first καὶ and indeed, so that the Cyrenaeans, Alexandrians, and those of Cilicia and Asia, would be designated as a mere part of the so-called Libertine synagogue. But how arbitrary, seeing that καὶ in the various other instances of its being used

1 Magn. f. 72, 4; Ketow. f. 105, 1.
2 Sueton. Tiber. 86; Tacit. Ann. II. 86; Philo, Leg. ad Cest. p. 1014 C.
4 Suidas: Δισπέριος ἵππα τινος.
5 Conjectures: Δισπέριοι, Libyans (Oecumenius, Lyra, Beza, ed. 1 and 2, Clericus, Gothofredus, Walckenaer), and Δισπέριος τινὸς καὶ Κυρ. (Schultheiss, de charism. Sp. St. p. 108 f.). See Weiss, who even considers Δισπέριος as another form (inflexio) of the name Δισπέριος. The Arm. already has Libyorum.
6 Deam. emendat. Voch. in X. T. p. 68.
7 Joseph. Antt. xiv. 7. 2, xvi. 6. 1; c. Agion. II. 4.
8 Joseph. Antt. xiv. 7. 2, xiv. 10. 1, xxx. 5. 2; Bell. Jud. II. 18. 7.
throughout the representation always expresses merely the simple and! The Synagoga Alexandrinorum is also mentioned in the Talmud.\(^1\) Winer and Ewald divide the whole into two communities: (1) Κερνων and 'Αλεξ., joined with the Libertines; and (2) the synagogue formed of the Cilician and Asiatic Jews. But against this view the above reasons also militate, especially the τῆς λεγομένης, which only suits Λεβερτίνων. The grammatical objection against our view, that the article τῶν is not repeated before Κερνων., and before 'Αλεξ., is disposed of by the consideration, that those belonging to the three synagogues, the Libonite-synagogue, the Cyreneans, and the Alexandrians are conceived together as one hostile category,\(^3\) and the two following synagogal communities are then likewise conceived as such a unity, and represented by the καὶ τῶν prefixed.\(^5\) We have thus in our passage ἠκτεν synagogues, to which the τῶν belonged,—namely, three of Roman and African nationality, and two Asiatic. The two categories—the former three together, and the latter two together—are represented as the two synagogal circles, from which disputants emerged against Stephen. To the Cilician synagogue Saul doubtless belonged. — Ἁσία is not to be taken otherwise than in ii. 9. — συζητούντες] as disputants, ix. 29. The συζητεῖν had already begun with the rising up (ἀνέστησαν).\(^6\)

Vv. 10, 11. The ἄσις is to be explained, not of the Jewish learning, but of the Christian wisdom,\(^4\) to which the Jewish learning of the opponents could not make any resistance.\(^6\) The πνεῦμα was the πν. ἄγων,\(^7\) with which he was filled, vv. 3, 5. — ὃς] Dative of the instrument. It refers, as respects sense, to both preceding nouns, but is grammatically determined according to the latter, Matthaei, page 991. — τότε] then, namely, after they had availed nothing in open disputation against him. "Hic agnosce morem improborum; ubi veritate discendunt impares, ad mendacia confugiunt," Erasimus. Paraph. — ὑπευρέβον] they instigated, secretly instructed.\(^8\) — ἀκρο. ἀμεν κ.τ.λ.] provisional summary statement of what these men asserted that they had heard as the essential contents of the utterances of Stephen in question. For their more precisely formulated literal statement, see vv. 13, 14.

Vv. 12–14. The assertion of these ὑποβλητοί served to direct the public opinion against Stephen; but a legal process was requisite for his complete overthrow, and prudence required the consent of the people. Therefore they stirred up the people, and the elders of the people and the scribes, etc. — συνεκινήσαν] they drew them into the movement with them, stirred up them also. Often in Plut., Polyb., etc. — καὶ ἐκποιήσαν] as in iv. 1. The subject is still those hostile τῶν. — συνήρχον] they drew along with them, as in xix. 29. — μάρτυρας φειδεῖς] Consequently, Stephen had not spoken the

---

1 Mapfl. f. 73. 4.
2 See Krüger, ad Xem. Anab. h. 1. 7; Sanppo and Kähner, ad Xem. Mem. 1. 1. 19; Dissen, ad Dem. de orr. p. 372 f.
3 Vulg. : "et eorum qui erant."
4 Bernhardy, p. 477 f.; Winer, p. 280 f. (E. T. 444.)
5 Luke xxv. 15; and see on Eph. 1. 8, 17.
6 Comp. 1 Cor. 1. 17 f., ii. 6 f.
7 But τῷ ἄγων is not added; for "adversarii semelabant Spiritum in Stephano; Spiritum sanctum in eo esse non sciebant," Bengel.
8 Comp. Apian. l. 74, ὑπεύρεσαν καταγγέλλοντες. The Lat. subornantur, or, as the Vulg. has it, subornentur (Suet. Ner. 96).
9 Joseph. Bell. v. 10. 4; Plut. Thb. Gr. 8.
some words, which were then adduced by these witnesses, ver. 14, as heard from him. Now, namely, in presence of the Sanhedrin, it concerned them to bear witness to the blasphemy alleged to have been heard according to the real state of the facts, and in doing so those ἄνδρες ἐνοβλητοί dealt as false witnesses. As formerly a saying of Jesus was falsified in order to make Him appear as a rebel against the theocracy; so here also some expression of Stephen now unknown to us,—wherein the latter probably had pointed, and that in the spirit of Jesus himself, to the reformatory influence of Christianity leading to the dissolution of the temple-worship and legal institutions, and the consummation of it by the Parousia, and had indeed, perhaps, quoted the prophecy of the Lord concerning the destruction of Jerusalem,—was so perverted, that Stephen now appears as herald of a revolution to be accomplished by Jesus, directed against the temple and against the law and the institutions of Moses. Against the view of Krause, a that an expression of other, more inconsiderate, Christians was imputed to Stephen, may be urged not only the utter arbitrariness of such a supposition, but also the analogy of the procedure against Jesus, which very naturally presented itself to the enemies of Stephen as a precedent. Heinrichs, after Heumann and Morus, thinks that the μάρτυρες were in so far ψεύδεις, as they had uttered an expression of Stephen with an evil design, in order to destroy him; so also Sepp. p. 17. But in that case they would not have been false, but only malicious witnesses; not a ψεύς, but a bad motive would have been predominant. Baur also and Zeller maintain the essential correctness of the assertion, and consequently the incorrectness of the narrative, in so far as it speaks of false witnesses. But an antagonism to the law, such as is ascribed by the latter to Stephen, would lack all internal basis and presupposition in the case of a believing Israelite full of wisdom and of the Holy Spirit; as regards its true amount, it can only be conceived as analogous to the subsequent procedure of Paul, which, as in xviii. 13, xxi. 21, was misrepresented with similar perversity; nor does the defensive address, vii. 44–53, lead further. Nevertheless, Rauch b has maintained that Stephen actually made the assertion adduced by the witnesses, ver. 14, and that these were only false witnesses, in so far as they had not themselves heard this expression from the mouth of Stephen, which yet was the purport of their statement. This is at variance with the entire design and representation, see particularly ver. 11. And the utterance itself, as the witnesses professed to have heard it, would, at any rate,

---

1 Matt. xxvi. 61; John ii. 12.
2 Comp. Weisse, ib. Theol. p. 148. But that Stephen, as Reuss thinks (in Herzog's Encycl. XV. p. 73), preached something which the apostles had not previously taught, is all the more uncertain an assumption, seeing that already in the sayings of Jesus Himself sufficient materials for the purpose were given. Comp. e.g. John iv. 21 ff., the sayings of Jesus concerning the Sabbath, concerning the Levitical purifications, concerning the ἀρτοφυσικαὶ of the law, concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, and the Parousia, etc. But Stephen (ο ἄν δεχθεὶς Ἵνα, Const. ap. vili. 46. 9) may have expressed himself in a more threatening and incisive manner than others, and thereby have directed the persecution to himself. In so far he was certainly the foremost of Paul.
3 Comment. in histor. aigis orat. Steph. Gott. 1780.
4 Comp. Baumgarten, p. 125.
even if used as a veil for a higher meaning, be framed after a manner so alien to Israelite piety and so unwise, that it could not be attributed at all to Stephen, full as he was of the Spirit. Oecumenius has correctly stated the matter: ἐπειδὴ ἄλλως μὲν ἤκουσαν, ἄλλως δὲ νῦν αὐτὸι προναύρων, εἰκόνως καὶ φενδόμαρτυρες ἀναγράφονται. — τὸ τόπον τοῦ ἁγίου] the holy place καὶ ἱερὸν in the temple. — Ver. 14. ὁ Ναζωρ. αὐτός] is not to be considered as part of the utterance of Stephen, but as proceeding from the standpoint of the false witnesses who so designate Jesus contemptuously, and blended by them with the words of Stephen. And not only is ὁ Ναζωρ. an expression of contempt, but also αὐτός: Jesus, this Nazarene! — τὸν τόπον τούτον] The false witnesses represent the matter, as if Stephen had thus spoken pointing to the temple.

Ver. 15. All the Sanhedrists saw the countenance of Stephen angelically glorified; a superhuman, angel-like δόξα became externally visible to them on it (x). So Luke has conceived and represented it with simple definiteness; so the serene calm which astonished even the Sanhedrists, and the holy joyfulness which was reflected from the heart of the martyr in his countenance, have been glorified by the symbolism of Christian legend. But it would be arbitrary, with Kuinoel (comp. Grotius and Heinrichs), to rationalize the meaning of εἶδου . . . ἄγγελον to this effect: "Os animi tranquillitatem summam referebat, adeo ut eum intuentibus reverentiam injiceret;" according to which the expression would have to be referred, with Neander and de Wette, to a poetically symbolical description, which does not correspond with the otherwise simple style of the narrative. The phenomenon was certainly "an extraordinary operation of the Spirit of Jesus;" but the form of it is added by tradition, which betrays the point of view of the miraculous also by the πάντες. The parallel adduced afresh by Olshausen (3 Sam. xiv. 17) is utterly unsuitable, because there the comparison to an angel relates to wisdom, and not to anything external. Nor is the analogy of the δόξα in the face of Moses (3 Cor. iii. 7) suitable, on account of the characteristic πρόσωπ. ἄγγελον. For Rabbinical analogies, see Schoettgen and Wetstein.

Notes by American Editor.

(v) A murmuring. V. 1.

The first dissension within the Christian Church arose from a natural jealousy of two parties, of different language and national manners. Each party, wedded to its own customs and ways, was naturally prejudiced somewhat against the other; both truly Christian, yet each imperfect and lacking in true charity. This trouble was the germ of the future disturbance caused by the Judaizing Christians during and after the age of the apostles. The same element of discontent and disunion exists still in countries where

---

1 3 Macc. ii. 14.
3 διετισάμενος εἰς αὐτόν: "nustatum est in judicis oculos in reum convertere, quum expectatur ejus defenso," Caesn.
4 Baumgarten, p. 130.
different races, nationalities, and languages prevail, as in our own land, where dwell together natives of almost every country in the world. There is need for the exercise of enlarged and enlightened charity, for the exhibition of Christian wisdom and apostolic tact, and for the cultivation of a spirit of mutual forbearance and brother-love.

"There is something very sad in the brief statement contained in the opening verses of this sixth chapter. It tells us that the curtain had fallen on the first act of the church's history. Hitherto unbroken peace had reigned in the church, and a mutual love, which manifested itself in the general community of goods. But now we see the fair life interrupted, and the apostle compelled by a dissension to make arrangements for governing the community. It is a humiliating thought that the first great movement to organize ecclesiastical order and discipline was forced upon the apostles by an outburst of human passions among believers." (Houteron, Acts.)

(w) Seven men. V. 3.

Luke does not designate these men deacons. Nor does it appear that any one of the seven was ever so called. Philip is spoken of as an evangelist, and both he and Stephen were successful preachers.

"Some of the ancient writers regarded them as the first deacons; others as entirely distinct from them. The general opinion at present is that this order arose from the institution of the Seven, but by a gradual extension of the sphere of duty at first assigned to them." (Hackett.) Various reasons have been imagined why seven were selected—that this was the sacred number among the Jews; that there were seven thousand believers at the time—one for each thousand; that there were seven congregations in Jerusalem; that it referred to the supposed existence of seven archangels; that it was a contrast to the twelve apostles, or a reference to the days of the week. But all such suppositions are arbitrary and vain. Lightfoot observes: "Let him that hath confidence enough pretend to assign a sufficient reason." The special exigency of the time required a particular work, and for this men were selected by the church and appointed by the apostles. The office of a deacon is scriptural, and his qualifications and duties are divinely specified.

(x) The face of an angel. V. 15.

Our author, speaking of the phenomenon, ascribes it to the "operation of the Spirit of Jesus, but the form of it is added by tradition." The narrative plainly implies that the appearance was supernatural, probably something similar to the radiance on the face of Moses, upon which the children of Israel could not look. The comparison with the angel is not intended to give any definite idea of his actual appearance, as we know nothing of the aspect of an angel's countenance; but it is used as a strong figure to suggest the idea of something superhuman and celestial.

Augustine thus beautifully writes of the martyr's transfigured face: "O lamb, foremost of the flock of Christ, fighting in the midst of wolves, following after the Lord, but still at a distance from him, and already the angel's friend! Yes, how clearly was he the angel's friend, who, while in the very midst of the wolves, still seemed like an angel; for so transfigured was he by the rays of the Sun of Righteousness, that even to his enemies he seemed a being not of this world."
CHAPTER VII.

Vers. 1. ἄρα is wanting in A B C Ν, min. Vulg. Cant. Germ. Bed. Deleted by Lachm. But if not genuine, it would hardly have been added, as it was so little necessary for the sense that, on the contrary, the question expressed in a shorter and more precise form appears to be more suitable to the standpoint and the temper of the high priest. — Ver. 3. τὴν γῆν] The article is wanting in Elz. Scholz, against far preponderant attestation. A copyist’s error. Restored by Griesb. Lachm. Tisch. Born. — Ver. 5. αὐτῷ δοῦναι δοῦναι αὐτῷ is decidedly attested; so Lachm. Tisch. Born. — Ver. 7. δουλεύωσιν, in accordance, no doubt, with A C D, vss. Ir., but it is a mechanical repetition from ver. 6. — Ver. 11. τὴν γῆν Αἰγυπτου] A B C D* (which has ἐν Ὀλυμπο τῆς Αἰγ.) Ν, 81, vss. have τὴν Αἰγυπτον. Recommended by Griesb, and adopted by Lachm. But how easily might THN be passed over after THN! and then the change ΑἰγυπτοΝ became necessary. — Ver. 12. Instead of σίτα, σιτία is to be received with Lachm. Tisch. Born. — in Αἰγυπτω] Lachm. Tisch. read εἰς Αἰγυπτον, following A B C E Ν, 40, in A iy. is an explanatory supplement to δονα. — Ver. 14. After συγγεν. Elz. has αὐτοῦ, in opposition to testimonies of some importance (also Ν), although it is defended by Born. A prevalent addition. — Ver. 15. δὲ] A C E Ν, 15, 18, vss. have καὶ κατείθη, which Griesb, has recommended, Rücker preferred, and Lachm. and Tisch. have adopted. D, 40, Syr. p. Cant. have no conjunction at all; so Born., but from the LXX. Deut. x. 22; καὶ κατ. is to be preferred as best attested. — Ver. 16. ἤ] Elz. reads ἤ, against decisive testimony. Mistaking the attraction. — τοῦ Συχίμ] Lachm. reads τοῦ ἐν Σ., according to A E Ν** min. Copf. Syr. p. Tol. B C Ν min. Sahid. Arm. have merely ἐν Σ. An alteration, because this Συχίμ was apprehended, like the preceding, as the name of a town, and the parallel with Gen. xxxiii. 19 was not recognized. — Ver. 17. ὄμολογησεν] So Tisch. Lachm. But Elz. and Scholz have ὄμολογησεν, against A B C Ν, 15, 36, and some vss. A more precisely defining gloss from the LXX, instead of which D E have ἐνγεγείλατο (so Born.). — Ver. 18. After ἐπερῶς Lachm. has ἐν’ Αἰγυπτον, according to A B C Ν, min. and several vss. An exegetical addition from the LXX. — Ver. 20. After πατρός Elz. has αὐτοῦ. See on ver. 14. — Ver. 21. ἐκτελέσται δὲ αὐτοῦ] Lachm. Born. read ἐκτελεστός δὲ αὐτοῦ, according to A B C D Ν min. A correction in point of style. — Ver. 22. πᾶσα σοφία] A C E Ν, vss. Or. (twice) Bas. Theodoret have ἐν πάσῃ σοφ. So Tisch. D* has πᾶσαν τὴν σοφίαν. So Born. Interpretations of the Recepta, in favour of which is also the reading πᾶσης σοφίας in B, which is a copyist’s error. — ἐν before ἔργω (Elz. Scholz) is as decidedly condemned by external testimonies as the αὐτοῦ after ἔργως, omitted in Elx., is attested. — Ver. 26 συνηλιασεν] B C D Ν, min. and some vss. have συνήλιασεν or συνήλιασεν. Valeck, has preferred the former, Griesb. recom-

1 How often συνήλιος is exchanged in vss. with σινός and σινώς, may be seen in Frotscher, ad Hier. iii. 11; Heind. ad Plat. Phaed. p. 64 D; Krüger, ad Xen. Anab. vii. 1. 23.
mended the latter, and Lachm. Born. (comp. also Fritzsche, de conform. Lachm. p. 31) adopted it. Gloss on the margin for the explanation of the original σουλαστεν...εις ειρήνην. On its reception into the text, the εις ειρήνην, separated from σουλαστεν, by αυτούς, was retained. — Ver. 27. ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς] A B C H M, min. Theophyl. have ἐφ’ ἡμῶν, So Tisch. and Lachm. From LXX. Ex. ii. 14. — Ver. 30. κυρίων] is to be deleted, with Lachm. and Tisch., following A B C M, Capt. Sahid. Vulg. A current addition to ἄγγελος generally, and here specially occasioned by the LXX. Ex. iii. 2. — Instead of φλογί πυρός, Tisch. has πυρὶ φλογὸς, after A C E, min. Syr. Vulg. The reading similarly varies in the LXX., and as the witnesses at our passage are divided, we cannot come to any decision. — Ver. 31. ἐθαύμασεν] So Griesb. Scholz, Tisch. Born. But Elz. and Lachm. have ἐθαύμασεν. Both have considerable attestation. But the suitableness of the relative imperfect was, as often elsewhere, not duly apprehended. — After κυρίων Elz. Scholz have πρὸς αὐτόν, which, however, Lachm. and Tisch. have deleted, following A B M, min. Capt. Arm. Syr. p. An exegetical amplification, instead of which D, after κατὰ, continues by: ὁ κύριος, εἰσὶν αὐτῷ λάθος. — Ver. 32. Lachmann's reading: ὁ Θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ κ. Ἰσαὰκ κ. Ἰακὼβ (so also Tisch.), has indeed considerable attestation, but it is an adaptation to iii. 13. — Ver. 33. ἐν ῥ] Lachm. Tisch. read ἐφ’ ῥ, which is to be preferred on account of preponderant attestation by A B C D** (D* has οὐ, so Born.) ἐν ῥ is from the LXX. — Ver. 34. ἀποστείλατο Lachm. Tisch. Born. read ἀποστείλω, which is so decidedly attested by A B C D. Chrys., and by the transcriber's error ἀποστείλω in E and M, that it cannot be considered as an alteration after the LXX. Ex. iii. 10. The Recepta is a mistaken emendation. — Ver. 35. Instead of ἀποστείλει, ἀποστεῖλεν is to be read, with Lachm. Tisch. Born., according to decisive evidence. — ἐν χειρὶ] Lachm. Tisch. Born., read σὺν χειρὶ, which is so decidedly attested, and might so easily give place to the current ἐν χειρὶ, that it must be preferred. — Ver. 36. γῇ] Lachm. reads γῇ, according to B C, min. Sahid. Cant. A transcriber's error. The originality of γῇ is supported also by the Λιγνότων (instead of Λιγνότω) adopted by Elz. and Born. after D, which, however, has preponderating testimony against it. — Ver. 37. After Θεός Elz. has Ἰμων, against decisive testimony. κυρίως and αὐτῶν ἀκούσατε are also to be rejected (Lachm. and Tisch. have deleted both), as important authorities are against them, and as their insertion after the LXX. and iii. 22 is more natural than their omission. — Ver. 39. ταῖς καρδίᾳ] Lachm. reads ἐν ταῖς καρδίᾳ, according to A B C M. This is evidently an explanatory reading. On the other hand, τῇ καρδίᾳ (in H, min. and some vss. Chrys. Oec. Theoph.), preferred by Rinck and Tisch., would unhappily be declared genuine, were it not that almost all the uncials and vss. support the plural. — Ver. 43. τοιῷ] is wanting in B D, min. vss. Or. Ir. Philast. Rightly erased by Lachm. and Tisch. From the LXX. — Ρεφαί] a great variety in the orthography. Lachm. and Tisch. have 'Ρεφάν, according to A C E. But Elz. Scholz have 'Ρεφάν; Born. 'Ρεφάν (D, Vulg. Ir.); B has 'Ρομᾶν; M*, 'Ρομᾶν; N**, 'Ραφάν. — Ver. 44. The usual ἐν before ταῖς, which Lachm. and Tisch. have deleted (after A B C D** H M, min. Chrys. and some vss.), is an explanatory addition. — Ver. 46. Θεῷ] B D H M*, Cant. have οἴκῳ. Adopted by Lachm. and Born. But in accordance with ver. 48 it appeared contradictory to the idea of Stephen, to designate the temple as the dwelling of God; and hence the alteration. — Ver. 48. After χειρός, Elz. has ναοῖς, against A B C D E M, min. and most vss. An exegetical addition. Comp. xvii. 24. — Ver. 51. τῇ καρδίᾳ] Lachm. and Born. read καρδίαις. But the
plural, which is found partly with and partly without the article in A C D \n, min. and several vss. Chrys. Jer., was occasioned by the plural of the subject. B has καρδίας, which, without being a transcriber's error (in opposition to Buttm. neuest. Gr. p. 148 [E. T. 170]), may be either singular or plural, and therefore is of no weight for either reading. — Ver. 52. γενέσθε] The reading γένεσθε in Lachm. Tisch. Born. is decidedly attested, and therefore to be adopted.

Ver. 1. The high priest interrupts the silent gazing of the Sanhedrists on Stephen, as he stood with glorified countenance, and demands of him an explanation of the charge just brought against him.—Is then this, which the witnesses have just asserted, so? With ei (see on i. 6; Luke xiii. 28) the question in the mouth of the high priest has something ensnaring about it. On the ἀπα, used with interrogative particles as referring to the circumstances of the case—here, of the discussion—see Klotz.¹

Vv. 2–53. On the speech of Stephen.²—This speech bears in its contents and tone the impress of its being original. For the long and somewhat prolix historical narrative, vv. 2–47, in which the rhetorical character remains so much in the background, and even the apologetic element is discernible throughout only indirectly, cannot—so peculiar and apparently even irrelevant to the situation is much of its contents—be merely put into the mouth of Stephen, but must in its characteristic nature and course have come from his own mouth. If it were sketched after mere tradition or acquired information, or from a quite independent ideal point of view, then either the historical part would be placed in more direct relation to the points of the charge and brought into rhetorical relief, or the whole plan would shape itself otherwise in keeping with the question put in ver. 1; the striking power and boldness of speech, which only break forth in the smallest portion (vv. 48–53), would be more diffused over the whole, and the historical mistakes—which have nothing surprising in them in the case of a discourse delivered on the spur of the moment—would hardly occur. —But how is the authentic reproduction of the discourse, which must in the main be assumed, to be explained? Certainly not by supposing that the whole was, either in its main points (Krause, Heinrichs) or even verbally (Kuinoel), taken down in the place of meeting by some person unknown.³ It is extremely arbitrary to carry back such shorthand-writing to the public life of those times. The most direct solution would no doubt be given, if we could assume notes of the speech made by the speaker himself, and preserved. But as this is not here to be thought of, in accordance with the whole spirit of the apostolic age and with vi. 12, it only remains as the

¹ Act Deyar. p. 177; Nägelab. on the Hist., p. 11, ed. 3.
³ Comp. Calvin: “Stephani responsio prima specie absurda et inepta videri posset.”
most natural expedient: to consider the active memory of an ear-witness, or even several, vividly on the stretch, and quickened even by the purpose of placing it on record, as the authentic source; so that, immediately after the tragical termination of the judicial procedure, what was heard with the deepest sympathy and eagerness was noted down from fresh recollection, and afterwards the record was spread abroad by copies, and was in its substantial tenor adopted by Luke. The purely historical character of the contents, and the steady chronological course of the greater part of the speech, remove any improbability of its being with sufficient faithfulness taken up by the memory. As regards the person of the reporter, no definite conjectures are to be ventured on;¹ and only this much is to be assumed as probable, that he was no hostile listener, but a Christian, perhaps a secret Christian in the Sanhedrim itself,—a view favoured by the diffusion, which we must assume, of the record, and more especially by the circumstance, that vv. 54-60 forms one whole with the reproduction of the speech interrupted at ver. 53, and has doubtless proceeded from the same authentic source. With this view even the historical errors in the speech do not conflict; with regard to which, however,—especially as they are based in part on traditions not found in the O. T.,—it must remain undetermined how far they are attributable to the speaker himself or to the reporter. At all events, these historical mistakes of the speech form a strong proof in what an unaltered form, with respect to its historical data, the speech has been preserved from the time of its issuing from the hands that first noted it down.

—From this view it is likewise evident in what sense we are to understand its originality, namely, not as throughout a verbal reproduction, but as correct in substance, and verbal only so far, as—setting aside the literary share, not to be more precisely determined, which Luke himself had in putting it into its present shape—it was possible and natural for an intentional exertion of the memory to retain not only the style and tone of the discourse on the whole, but also in many particulars the verbal expression. Definitions of a more precise character cannot psychologically be given. According to Baer and Zeller the speech is a later composition, "at the foundation of which, historically considered, there is hardly more than an indefinite recollection of the general contents of what was said by Stephen, and perhaps even only of his principles and mode of thought;" the exact recollection of the speech and its preservation are inconceivable; the artificial plan, closely accordant with its theme, betrays a premeditated elaboration; the author of the Acts unfolds in it his own view of the relation of the Jews to Christianity; the discussion before the Sanhedrim itself is historically improbable, etc.; Stephen is "the Jerusalem type of the Apostle of the Gentiles."² Bruno Bauer has gone to the extreme of frivolous criticism: "The speech is fabricated, as is the whole framework of circumstances in which it occurs, and the fate of Stephen."

Interpreters, moreover, are much divided in their views concerning the

¹ Olehausen, e.g., refers to vi. 7; Langer and Baumgarten to the intervention of Saul.
relation of the contents to the points of complaint contained in vi. 13, 14. Among the older interpreters—the most of whom, such as Augustine, Beza, and Calvin, have recourse to merely incidental references, without any attempt to enter into and grasp the unity of the speech—the opinion of Grotius is to be noted: that Stephen wished indirectly, in a historical way, to show that the favour of God is not bound to any place, and that the Jews had no advantage over those who were not Jews, in order thereby to justify his prediction concerning the destruction of the temple and the call of the Gentiles. But the very supposition, that the teaching of the call of the Gentiles was the one point of accusation against Stephen, is arbitrary; and the historical proofs adduced would have been very ill-chosen by him, seeing that in his review of history it is always this very Jewish people that appears as distinguished by God. The error, so often committed, of inserting between the lines the main thoughts as indirectly indicated, vitiated the opinion of Heinrichs, who makes Stephen give a defence of his conversion to Christ as the true Messiah expected by the fathers; as well as the view of Kuinoel, that Stephen wished to prove that the Mosaic ceremonial institutions, although they were divine, yet did not make a man acceptable to God; that, on the contrary, without a moral conversion of the people, the destruction of the temple was to be expected. Olshausen stands in a closer and more direct relation to the matter, when he holds that Stephen narrates the history of the O. T. so much at length, just to show the Jews that he believed in it, and thus to induce them, through their love for the national history, to listen with calm attention. The nature of the history itself fitted it to form a mirror to his hearers, and particularly to bring home to their minds the circumstance that the Jewish people, in all stages of their development and of the divine revelation, had resisted the Spirit of God, and that, consequently, it was not astonishing that they should now show themselves once more disobedient. Yet Olshausen himself does not profess to look upon this reference of the speech as "with definite purpose aimed at." In a more exact and thorough manner, Baur, whom Zeller in substance follows, has laid down as the leading thought: "Great and extraordinary as were the benefits which God from the beginning imparted to the people, equally ungrateful in return and antagonistic to the divine designs was from the first the disposition of that people." In this case, however, as Zeller thinks, there is brought into chief prominence the reference to the temple in respect to the charges raised, and that in such a way that the very building of the temple itself was meant to be presented as a proof of the perversity of the people,—a point of view which is foreign to Stephen, and arbitrarily forced on his words, as it would indeed in itself be unholy and impious. With reason, Luger, who yet goes too far in the references of details, Thiersch, Baumgarten, and F. Nitzsch have adhered to the historical standpoint given in vi. 13, 14, and kept strictly in view the apologetic aim of the speech; along with which, how-

1 Comp. Schneckenburger, p. 184, who considers the speech, as respects the chief object aimed at, as a preparation for xxviii. 36 ff.
2 Sam. vii. 13; 1 Kings v. 5, vi. 13; 1 Chron. xviii. 12; comp. on vv. 49, 50.
3 Comp. also de Wette.
ever, Thiersch and Baumgarten not without manifold caprice exaggerate, in the histories brought forward by Stephen, the typical reference and allegorical application of them—by which they were to serve as a mirror to the present—as designed by him,¹ as is also done in the Erlang. Zeitschr. 1859, p. 811 ff. Rauch is of opinion that the speech is directed against the meritoriousness of the temple-worship and of the works of the law, inasmuch as it lays stress, on the contrary, upon God's free and unmerited grace and election; a similar view was already held by Calvin; but to this there remains the decisive counter-argument, that the assumed point, the non-meritorious nature of grace and election, is not at all expressly brought out by Stephen or subjected to more special discussion. Moreover, Rauch starts from the supposition that the assertion of the witnesses in vi. 14 was true,² inasmuch as Stephen had actually said what was adduced at vi. 14.—But if the assertion in vi. 14 is not adduced otherwise than as really false testimony, then it is also certain that the speaker must have the design of exposing the groundlessness of the charges brought against him, and the true reason for which he was persecuted. And the latter was to the martyr the chief point, so that his defence throughout does not keep the apologetic line, but has an offensive character,³ at first indirectly and calmly, and then directly and vehemently; the proof that the whole blame lay on the side of his judges was to him the chief point even for his own justification. Accordingly, the proper theme is to be found in vv. 51, 53, and the contents and course of the speech may be indicated somewhat as follows: I stand here accused and persecuted, not because I am a blasphemer of the law and of the temple, but in consequence of that spirit of resistance to God and His messengers, which you, according to the testimony of history, have received from your fathers and continue to exhibit. Thus, it is not my fault, but your fault. To carry out this

¹ Thus, for example, according to Thiersch, even in the very command of God to Abraham to migrate, ver. 8 ff., there is assumed to be involved the application: "To us also, to whom God in Christ has appeared, there has been a command to go out from our kindred." In ver. 7, Stephen, it is affirmed, wishes to indicate: So will the race of oppressors, before whom he stood, end like Pharaoh and his host, and the liberated church will then celebrate its new independent worship. In the envy of Joseph's brethren, etc. (ver. 9 ff.), it is indicated that Christ also was from envy delivered up to the Gentiles, and for that God had destined Him to be a Saviour and King of the Gentiles. The famine (ver. 11) signifies the affliction and spiritual famine of the hostile Jews, who, however, would at length (ver. 15), after the conversion of the Gentiles, acknowledge Him when they had rejected. Moses' birth at the period of the severest oppression, points to the birth of Christ at the period of the census. Moses' second appearance points to the (in the N. T. not elsewhere occurring) second appearance of Christ, which would have as its consequence the restoration of the Jews. Aaron is the type of the high priest in the judgment hall, etc. According to Lager, the speech has the three main thoughts: (1) That the law is not a thing rounded off in itself, but something added to the promise, and bearing even in itself a new promise; (2) That the temple is not exclusively the holy place, but only stands in the rank of holy places, by which a perfecting of the temple is prefigured; (3) That from the rejection of Jesus no argument can be derived against him (Stephen), as, indeed, the ambassadors of God in all stages of revelation had been reviled. These three main thoughts are not treated one after the other, but one within the other, on the thread of sacred history; hence the form of repetition very often occurs in the recital (vv. 4, 5, 7, 18, 14, 19, 20, etc.).

² See, against this, on vi. 13.

³ Comp. the appropriate remarks of F. Nitzsch.
view more in detail, Stephen (1) first of all lets history speak, and that with all the calmness and circumstantiality by which he might still have won the assembly to reflection. He commences with the divine guidance of the common ancestor, and comes to the patriarchs; but even in their case that refractoriness was apparent through the envy toward Joseph, who yet was destined to be the deliverer of the family. But, at special length, in accordance with the aim of his defence, he is obliged to dwell upon Moses, in whose history, very specially and repeatedly, that ungodly resistance and rejection appeared, although he was the mediator of God for the deliverance of His people, the type of the Messiah, and the receiver of the living oracles of the law. Stephen then passes from the tabernacle to the temple prayed for by David and built by Solomon (ver. 44 ff.). But hardly has he in this case indicated the mode of regarding it at variance with the prophet Isaiah, which was fostered by the priests and the hierarchy (v. 48–50), than (2) there now breaks forth a most direct attack, no longer to be restrained, upon his hostile judges (ver. 51 ff.), and that with a bold reproach, the thought of which had already sufficiently glanced out from the previous historical representation, and now receives merely its most unveiled expression. This sudden outbreak, as with the zeal of an ancient prophet, makes the unrighteous judges angry; whereupon Stephen breaks off in the mid-current of his speech, and is silent, while, gazing steadfastly heavenwards to the glory of God, he commits his cause to Him whom he sees standing at the right hand of God.

Very different judgments have been formed concerning the value of the speech, according as its relation to its apologetic task has been recognised and appreciated. Even Erasmus (ad ver. 51) gave it as his opinion, that there were many things in it “quae non ita multum pertinere videantur ad id quod instituit.” He, in saying so, points to the interruption after ver. 58. Recently Schwanbeck, p. 251, has scornfully condemned it as “a compendium of Jewish history forced into adaptation to a rhetorical purpose, replete with the most trifling controversies which Jewish scholasticism ever invented.” Baur, on the other hand, has with justice acknowledged the aptness, strikingness, and profound pertinence of the discourse, as opposed to the hostile accusations,—a praise which, doubtless, is intended merely for the alleged later composer. Ewald correctly characterizes the speech as complete in its kind; and F. Nitzsch has thoroughly

1 The more fully, and without confining himself to what was directly necessary for his aim, Stephen expatiates in his historical representation, the more might he, on account of the national love for the sacred history, and in accordance with O. T. examples (Ex. xx. 5 f.; Deut. xxxii. 2 ff.), expect the eager and concentrated interest of his hearers, and perhaps even hope for a calming and clearing of their judgment.

2 Ver. 57 f., ver. 59 f.

3 We may not ask wherefore Stephen has not carried the history farther than to the time of Solomon. Vv. 51, 52 include in themselves the whole tragic summary of the later history.

4 What Stephen would still have said or left unsaid, if he had spoken further, cannot be ascertained. But the speech is broken off; with ver. 58 he had just entered on a new stream of reproaches. And certainly he would still have added a prophetic threatening of punishment, as well as possibly, also, the summons to repentance.
and clearly done justice to its merits. It is peculiarly important as the only detailed speech which has been preserved from one not an apostle, and in this respect also it is a "documentum Spiritus pretiosum," Bengel (v).

As regards the language in which Stephen spoke, even if he were a Hellenist, which must be left undecided, this forms no reason why he should not, as a Jew, have spoken in Hebrew before the supreme council. Nor does the partial dependence on the LXX. justify us in inferring that the speech was delivered in Greek; it is sufficient to set down this phenomenon to the account of the Greek translation of what was spoken in Hebrew, whether the source from which Luke drew was still Hebrew or already Greek.

Vv. 2, 3. Brethren and respectively (καί) fathers. The former (kinsmen, ἐνίς) refers to all present; the latter,1 to the Sanhedrists exclusively. Comp. xxii. 1.—ὅ θεός τῆς δούλης] God, who has the glory. And this δόξα (τὴν), as it stands in significant relation to ὅμοιος, must be understood as outward majesty, the brightness in which Jehovah, as the only true God, visibly manifests Himself.2—Haran, Ἱὰρ, LXX. Ἀραβάν, with the Greeks3 and Romans,4 Kαρρά, and Carrhae, was a very ancient city in northern Mesopotamia.5 The theophany here meant is most distinctly indicated by ver. 3 as that narrated in Gen. xii. 1. But this occurred when Abraham had already departed from Ur to Haran (Gen. xi. 31); accordingly not: πρὶν ἄν κατακόψω τὸν ἢν ἐν Χαρρά. This discrepancy6 is not to be set at rest by the usual assumption that Stephen here follows a tradition probably derived from Gen. xv. 7,7 that Abraham had already had a divine vision at Ur, to which Stephen refers, while in Gen. xii. there is recorded that which afterwards happened at Haran. For the verbal quotation, ver. 3, admits of no other historical reference than to Gen. xii. 1. Stephen has thus, according to the text, erroneously (z)—speaking off-hand in the hurry of the moment, how easily might he do so!—transferred the theophany that happened to Abraham at Haran to an earlier period, that of his abode in Ur, full of the thought that God even in the earliest times undertook the guidance of the people afterwards so refractory! This is simply to be admitted (Grotius, "Spiritus sanctus apostolos et evangelistas confirmanavit in doctrina evangelica; in ceteris rebus, si Hieronymo credimus, ut hominibus, reliquit quae sunt hominum"), and not to be evaded by having recourse7 to an

1 Comp. the Latin Patres and the Hebrew בּ in respectful address to kings, priests, prophers, and teachers; Lightfoot, ad Marc. p. 654.
2 Comp. ver. 55; Ex. xxiv. 16; Is. vi. 3; Ps. xxiv. 7, xxix. 8; and on 1 Cor. ii. 8.
3 Herodian. iv. 13. 7; Ptol. v. 18; Strabo. xvi. 1, p. 747.
5 See Mannert, Geogr. V. 2, p. 280 ff.; Ritter,
6 Ewald explains the many deviations in this speech from the ordinary Pentateuch, by the supposition that the speaker followed a later text-book, then much used in the schools of learning, which had contained such peculiarities. This is possible, but cannot be otherwise shown to be the case; nor can it be shown how the deviations came into the supposed text-book.
7 Comp. Neh. ix. 7; Philo, de Abr. II. pp. 11, 16, ed. Mang.; Joseph. Ant. i. 7. 1; see Krause, i.c. p. 11.
8 See Luger after Beza, Calvin, and others.
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anticipation in Gen. xi. 31, according to which the vision contained in xii. 1 is supposed to have preceded the departure from Ur (A\(^1\)) ; or, by what professes to be a more profound entering into the meaning, to the arbitrary assumption "that Abraham took an independent share in the transmigration of the children of Terah from Ur to Haran," to which primordial hidden beginning of the call of Abraham the speaker goes back. — In τῆς Μεσοποταμίας was situated in northern Mesopotamia, which the Chaldeans inhabited; but is not to be identified with that Ur, which Ammianus Marc. xxv. 8, mentions as castellum Persicum, whose situation must be conceived as farther south than Haran.\(^8\) — περὶ χυμάτων see on Matt. i. 18. — ἤτω τοιού ἰδιωτό quaeque tibi monstravero. "Non norat Abram, quae terra foret," Heb. xi. 8, Bengel.

Ver. 4. Τὸτε] after he had received this command. — μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν τοὺν πατέρα αὐτοῦ] Abraham was born to his father Terah when he was 70 years of age; and the whole life of Terah amounted to 205 years. Now, as Abraham was 75 years old when he went from Haran,\(^4\) it follows that Terah, after this departure of his son, lived 60 years (\(b\)). Once more, therefore, we encounter a deviation from the biblical narrative, which is found also in Philo, de migr. Abr. p. 415, and hence probably rests on a tradition, which arose for the credit of the filial piety of Abraham, who had not migrated before his father's death. The circumstance that the death of Terah is narrated at Gen. xi. 32, proleptically, comp. xii. 4, before the migration, does not alter the state of matters historically, and cannot, with an inviolable belief in inspiration, at all justify the expedient of Baumgarten, p. 134.\(^3\) The various attempts at reconciliation are to be rejected as arbitrarily forced: e.g. the proposal, Knatchbull, Cappellus, Bochart, Whiston, to insert at Gen. xi. 32, instead of 205, according to the Samaritan text 145, but even the latter is corrupted, as Gen. xi. 32 was not understood proleptically, and therefore it was thought necessary to correct it; \(c\) or the ingenious refinement which, after Augustine, particularly Chladenius,\(^7\) Loecher, Wolf, Bengel, and several older interpreters have defended, that μετέπερα is to be understood, not of the transferring generally, but of the giving quiet and abiding possession, to which Abraham only attained after the death of his father. More recently \(c\) it has been assumed that Stephen here follows the tradition \(b\) that Abraham left Canaan after the spiritual death of his father, i.e. after his falling away into idolatry—this,

\(^1\) Baumgarten, p. 124.

\(^2\) סֵפִּסקְלָר, Gen. xi. 23.

\(^3\) See, after Tuch and Knobel on Genesis, Arnold in Herzog's Encycl. XVI, p. 735.

\(^4\) Gen. xi. 25, 29, xli. 4 ; Joseph. Ant. i. 7. 1.

\(^5\) That the narrative of the death of Terah, Gen. i.e., would indicate that for the commencement of the new relation of God to men Abraham alone, and not in connection with his father, comes into account. Thus certainly all failles.

\(^6\) Naïvely enough, Knatchbull, p. 47, was of opinion that, if this alteration of the Ho.

brew text could not be admitted, it was better "cum Scaligerum nodum hunc solvendum reliquere, dum Elias venerit." According to Beelen in loc., Abraham need not have been the first-born of Terah, in spite of Gen. xi. 25, 27.

\(^7\) De conciliat. Mosis et Steph. circa annos Abr., Vit. p. 1710.

\(^8\) Michaelis, Krause, Kuinoel, Luger, Ols. Hansen.

\(^9\) Lightf. in loc.; Michael, de chronol. Mos. post dilu. sec. 15.
at least, was intended to protect the patriarch from the suspicion of having violated his filial duty — which opinion Michaelis incorrectly ascribes also to Philo. According to this view, ἀπεδανεῖον would have to be understood spiritually, which the context does not in the least degree warrant, and which no one would hit upon, if it were not considered a necessity that no deviation from Genesis i.e. should be admitted. — μετάφρασει namely, God. Rapid change of the subject; comp. on vi. 6. — εἰς ἱνα ὑμεῖς εἰναὶ κατοικ.; i.e. into which ye having moved now dwell in it. A well-known brachylogy by combining the conception of motion with that of rest.¹ The εἰς ἱνα calls to mind the immigration of the nation (which is represented by ὑμεῖς) from Egypt.

Ver. 5. ἀληφωσια, διάδοσις, hereditary possession. Heb. xi. 8. — βῆμα ποδὸς;¹

On the subject-matter, comp. Heb. xi. 9. — καὶ μὴ γείλατο Gen. xiii. 15. Καὶ is the copula. He gave not . . . and promised, the former he omitted, and the latter he did. — καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ καὶ is the simple and, not namely (see Gen. i.e.). The promise primarily concerned Abraham as the participant father of the race himself. Comp. Luke i. 71. — This verse, too, stands apparently at variance with Genesis, where, in chap. xxiii., we are informed that Abraham purchased a field from the sons of Heth. But only apparently. For the remark οἰκὸν ἐθνεν ἡμῖν αὐτῷ . . . ποδὸς refers only to the first period of Abraham’s residence in Palestine before the institution of circumcision (ver. 8), while that purchase of a field falls much later. It was therefore quite superfluous, either ² to emphasize the fact that Abraham had not in fact acquired that field by divine direction, but had purchased it, or ³ to have recourse to the erroneous assumption, not to be justified either by John vii. 8 or by Mark xi. 13, that οἰκ stands for οἶκω.

Vv. 6, 7. By the continuative ἄτε there is now brought in the express declaration of God, which was given on occasion of this promise to Abraham concerning the future providential guidance destined for his posterity. But God, at that time, spoke thus: “that his seed will dwell as strangers in a foreign land,” etc. The ἄτε does not depend on ἵλαλ., nor is it the recitative, but it is a constituent part of the very saying added.⁴ This is Gen. xv. 13, but with the second person (thy seed) converted into the third, and also otherwise deviating from the LXX.; in fact, καὶ λατρ. μοι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τόπῳ is entirely wanting in the LXX. and Hebrew, and is an expansion suggested by Ex. iii. 12. — οὖν πάροικον ἵλαλ. Comp. on Luke xxiv. 18; Eph. ii. 19. — διάδοσιαν αὐτῶ] namely, the ἀλλήλοιο. — τετρακόσια] Here, as in an oracle, the duration is given, as also at Gen. i.e., in round numbers; but in Ex. xii. 40 this period of Egyptian sojourning and bondage is historically specified exactly as 430 years (c’). In Gal. iii. 17 (see in loc.), Paul has inappropriately referred the chronological statement of Ex. xii. 40 to the space of time from the promise made to Abraham down to the giving of

¹ With Drusius, Schoettgen, Bengel.
² With Kuinoel and Olshausen.
³ LXX.: γείλατον γένοις ἕνα πάροικον κ.τ.λ.
⁴ ἵλαλ. belongs to the whole οὗτοι . . . καὶ μὴ γείλατον.
the law. — Ver. 7. As in the LXX. and in the original Heb. the whole passage vv. 6, 7 is expressed in direct address (τῷ σπέρμα σου), while Stephen in ver. 6 has adduced it in the indirect form; so he now, passing over to the direct expression, inserts the εἰς αὐτόν ὁ θεός, which is not in the LXX. nor in the Heb. — And, after this 400 years' bondage, the people . . . I shall judge; κρίνων of judicial retribution, which, as frequently in the N. T., is seen from the context to be punitive. — ἐγὼ has the weight of the authority of divine absoluteness. Comp. Rom. xii. 19. — ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τοῦ τοίτῳ] namely, where I now speak with thee (in Canaan). There is no reference to Horeb,1 as we have here only a freely altered echo of the promise made to Moses, which suggested itself to Stephen, in order to denote more definitely the promise made to Abraham. Arbitrary suggestions are made by Bengel and Baumgarten, who find an indication of the long distance of time and the intervening complications. Stephen, however, hero makes no erroneous reference (de Wette), but only a free application, such as easily presented itself in an extemporaneous speech.

Ver. 8. Διαθήκην περί τούτων] a covenant completed by means of circumcision.2 Abraham was bound to the introduction of circumcision; and, on the other hand, God bound Himself to make him the father of many nations. — διαθήκην] inasmuch as God proposed and laid on Abraham the conclusion of the covenant. — συν] so, i.e. standing in this new relation to God,3 as the hearer of the divine covenant of circumcision. Ishmael was born previously. — καὶ ὁ Ἰσαὰκ τ. Ἰσαώ[.]] namely, ἐγέννησεν κ. πιστ. τ. ἑαυτ. τ. ἵλ. Vv. 9–13. Ζηλοῖσαντες] here of envious jealousy, as often also in classical writers. Certainly Stephen in this mention has already in view the similar malicious disposition of his judges towards Jesus, so that in the ill-used Joseph, as afterwards also in the despised Moses, both of whom yet became deliverers of the people, he sees historical types of Christ. — ἀπέδωκεν εἰς Αἰγ.] they gave him away to Egypt.4 For analogous examples to ἀπάδωκεν, see Elpers, p. 390. — The following clauses, rising higher and higher with simple solemnity, are linked on by καὶ. — χάριν κ. σοφίαν] It is simplest5 to explain χάριν of the divine bestowal of grace, and to refer ἐναντίον Φαρ. merely to σοφίαν: He gave him grace, generally, and in particular, wisdom before Pharaoh, namely, according to the history which is presumed to be well known, in the interpretation of dreams as well as for other counsel.

— ἡγούμ.] “vice regis cuncta regentem,” Gen. xlii. 43, Grotius. — κ. ἱλ. τ. οἰκ. αὐτ. as high steward. — χορτάσματα] fodder for their cattle. So throughout with Greek writers.6 A scarcity of fodder, to which especially belongs the want of cereal fodder, is the most urgent difficulty, in a failure of crops, for the possessors of large herds of cattle. — ὑπατία that there was corn. The question, Where? finds its answer from the context and the familiar history. The following εἰς Αἰγυπτίων (see critical remarks) belongs to ἐξαιτήσι, and is, from its epoch-making significance, emphatically placed first. On

1 Ex. iii. 19: ἐν τῷ ὀφείλω τῷ γεν. 2 Gen. xvi. 10. Comp. on Rom. iv. 11. 3 Comp. on Eph. v. 88. 4 By sale, comp. v. 8; Gen. xiv. 4, LXX. 5 Comp. Gen. xxxiv. 21. 6 And comp. LXX. Gen. xxiv. 25, 26, xili. 27; Judg. xix. 19; Ecclus. xxxiii. 29, xxviii. 29.
ákóνεν, to learn, with the predicative participle, see Winer; frequently also in Greek writers.—ἀνεγνωσθεύτηκεν he was recognised by his brethren, to be taken passively, as also Gen. xiv. 1, when the LXX. thus translates ἐφίλεσαν. —τὸ γένος τοῦ Ἰωσήφ] the name is significantly repeated; a certain sense of patriotic pride is implied in it.

vv. 14, 15. Ἡμῖν ψυ. ἢδονη λ. πνεύμα] in 75 souls, persons, he called his father and, in general, the whole family, i.e. he called them in a personal number of 75, which was the number containing them. The expression is a Hebraism (2), after the LXX. Deut. x. 22. In the number Stephen, however, follows the LXX. Gen. xlvii. 27, Ex. i. 5, where likewise 75 souls are specified, whereas the original text, which Josephus follows, reckons only 70.—αὐτὸς κ. οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν] he and our patriarchs, generally. A very common epanorthosis. See on John ii. 12.

Ver. 16. Μετετίθεθαν] namely, αὐτὸς κ. οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν. Incorrectly Kuinoel and Olshausen refer it only to the πατέρες; whereas αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν are named as the persons belonging to the same category, of whom the being dead is affirmed. Certainly Gen. xlix. 30, according to which Jacob was buried in the cave of Machpelah, at Hebron (Gen. xxiii.), is at variance with the statement μετετίθη. εἰς Συχέα. But Stephen—from whose memory in the hurry of an extemporary speech this statement escaped, and not the statement, that Joseph's body was buried at Sychem—transfers the locality of the burial of Joseph not merely to his brethren, of whose burial-place the O. T. gives no information, but also to Jacob him-

---

1 p. 325 (E. T. 436).
3 Instead of the simple αὐτὸς, as A E, 40. Arm. Vulg. read.
4 Bornem. ad Xen. Symp. 7. 54; Kühner, ad Xen. Anab. i. 7. 11.
5 ll. 41, xxvii. 37.
6 At Deut. l.c. also Codex A has the reading 75, which is, however, evidently a mere alteration by a later hand in accordance with the two other passages. Already Philo (see Loechner, p. 185) mentions the two discrepant statements of number (75 according to Gen. l.c. and Ex. l.c., and 70 according to Deut. l.c.) and allegorizes upon them.
7 Antl. ii. 7. 4, vi. 5. 6.
8 According to the Hebrew, the number 70 was thus made up: all the descendants of Jacob who came down with him to Egypt are fixed at 66, Gen. xlvii. 29, and then, ver. 27, Joseph and his two sons and Jacob himself (that is, four persons more) are included. In the reckoning of the LXX., influenced by a discrepant tradition, there are added to those 66 persons (ver. 29) in ver. 27 (contrary to the original text), visi et Ioseph et pater eius aut pl. in γη Αἰγύπτου ψυχές εἴσοδον, so that 75 persons are made out. It is thus evidently contrary to this express mode of reckoning of the LXX., when it is commonly assumed (also by Westerm, Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, Olshausen) that the LXX. had added to the 70 persons of the original text 5 grandchildren and great-grandchildren of Joseph (who are named in the LXX. Gen. xlvii. 20). But in the greatest contradiction to the above notice of the LXX. stands the view of Seb. Schmald, with whom Wolf agrees, that the LXX. had added to the 66 persons (ver. 29) the wives of the sons of Jacob, and from the sum of 73 therefore made up had again deducted 3 persons, namely, the wife of Judah who had died in Canaan, the wife of Joseph and Joseph himself, so that the number 75 is left. Entirely unhistorical is the hypothesis of Krebs and Loechner: "Stephanum apud Luc. (et LXX.) de eo loco, qui in Aegyptum instat fuerint, Moses de his, qui eo cenerint, quorum non nisl 70 furent." Blass conjectured, instead of πνεύμα in our passage: πνεύμα (?) and Mssonius, instead of the numeral signs OE (75), the numeral signs CM (68). For yet other views, see Wolf.
9 See also Hackett.
11 Josh. xxiv. 33, comp. Gen. i. 25.
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self, in unconscious deviation, as respects the latter, from Gen. xlix. 80 (n'). Perhaps the Rabbinical tradition, that all the brethren of Joseph were also buried at Sychem, was even then current, and thus more easily suggested to Stephen the error with respect to Jacob. It is, however, certain that Stephen has not followed an account deviating from this, which transfers the burial of all the patriarchs to Hebron, although no special motive can be pointed out in the matter; and it is entirely arbitrary, with Kuinoel, to assume that he had wished thereby to convey the idea that the Samaritans, to whom, in his time, Sychem belonged, could not, as the possessors of the graves of the patriarchs, have been rejected by God. — ὁ ὑψηλῶτα Ἄβραμ[ ῥ.] which, formerly, Abraham bought. But according to Gen. xxxiii. 19, it was not Abraham, but Jacob, who purchased a piece of land from the sons of Hamor, the father of Shechem. On the other hand, Abraham purchased from Ephron the field and burial-cave at Hebron (Gen. xxiii.). Consequently, Stephen has here evidently fallen into a mistake, and asserted of Abraham what historically applied to Jacob, being led into error by the fact that something similar was recorded of Abraham. If expositors had candidly admitted the mistake so easily possible in the hurry of the moment, they would have been relieved from all strange and forced expedients of an exegetical and critical nature, and would neither have assumed a purchase not mentioned at all in the O. T., nor, a combining of two purchases, and two burials; nor, against all external and internal critical evidence, have asserted the obnoxious Ἄβραμ. to be spurious, either supplying Ἰακώβ as the subject to ὑψηλῶτα, or taking ὑψηλῶτα as impersonal; nor would Ἄβραμ., with unprecedented arbitrariness, have been explained as used in a patronymic sense for Abrahamites, i.e. Jacobites. Conjectural emendations are: Ἰακώβ, ὁ τοῦ Ἄβραμ. Other forced attempts at reconciliation may be seen in Grotius and Calovius. — τοῦ Συκέου, the father of Sychem. The relationship is presupposed as well known. — ὑψηλῶτα is later Greek. — τοῦ ἄρνου. the genitive of price: for a purchase-money consisting of silver. The LXX. (Gen. xxxiii. 19) has ἵκαρον ἄρνου, for which Stephen has adopted a general expression, because the precise one was probably not present to his recollection.

1 Lightf. and Wetst. in loc.
2 Joseph. Ant. ii. 8. 3.
3 Flacius, Bengel, comp. Lager.
4 Gen. xlii., xxxiii.
5 Gen. i.; Josh. xxiv.
7 Comp. Calvin.
8 Beza, Bochart.
9 Quod est unum erat, Kuinoel.
10 Glass, Fessel, Surenhusius, Kröbes.
11 Clericus.
12 Cappellinus.
13 Not the son of Sychem, as the Vulgate, Erasmus, Castallo, and others have it. See Gen. xxxiii. 19. Lachmann reads τοῦ ἵκαρον ἄρνου, Z., in accord doubtless with important witnesses, of which several have only ἵκαρον, but evidently an alteration arising from the opinion that Συκεους was the city. The circumstance that in no other passage of the N.T. the genitive of relationship is to be explained by ואריה, must be regarded as purely accidental. Entirely similar are the passages where with female name ἰφθάνον is to be supplied, as Luke xxiv. 10. See generally, Winer, p. 178 f. (E. T. 297). If ἰφθάνον were to be supplied, this would yield a fresh historical error; and not that quite another Hamor is meant than at Gen. l.c. (in opposition to Boelen).
14 Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 187 f.
15 Probably the name of a coin, see Bochart, Hieroz. l. p. 473 Z.; Gesenius, Thes. hist. p. 1241, s. v. ἰκαρος. 
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Vv. 17, 18. *Kathóς* is not, as is commonly assumed, with an appeal to the critically corrupt passage 2 Macc. i. 31, to be taken as a particle of time *cum*, but 1 as *quemadmodum*. *In proportion as the time of the promise, the time destined for its realization, drew nigh, the people grew, etc. — ὡς ὕμνος, κ.τ.λ.* which God promised (ver. 7). ὡμολογ., often so used in Greek writers; comp. Matt. xiv. 7. — ἀνήσυχος βασιλέις ἐτερον τῆς βασιλείας εἰς ἄλλαν στίχων μετελάθεις,9 Joseph. Antt. ii. 9. 1. — ὡς οὐκ ἐδει τὸν Ἰωσέφ ὃν κνων not Joseph, his history and his services to the country. This might be said both in Ex. i. 8 and here with truth; because, in all the transactions of Pharaoh with Moses and the Israelites, there is nothing which would lead us to conclude that the king knew Joseph. Erroneously Erasmus and others, including Krause, hold that *oía* and ἥτις here signify to love; and Heinrichs, Kuhnol, Olshausen, Hackett render: who did not regard the merits of Joseph. In 1 Thess. v. 12, also, it means simply to know, to understand.

Ver. 19. *Κατασφηξώσαι* to employ cunning against any one, to beguile, LXX. Ex. i. 10. Only here in the N. T. — τοῦ ποιεῖν ἑκάστα γὰρ βρέφον αὐτῶν a construction purely indicative of design; comp. on iii. 12. But it cannot belong to κατασφηξον,4 but only to ἑκάστα. Comp. 1 Kings xvii. 20. He maltreated them, in order that they should expose their children (*ἐκάστα*), i.e. to force upon them the exposure of their children.8 — εἰς τὸ μὴ ζωον.] *ne vivi conservarentur*, the object of ποιεῖν ἑκάστα τ. βρ. αὐτ.6

Ver. 20. *Ἐν τῷ καρφῷ* "tristi, opportuno," Beng. — ἀστείος τῷ Θεῷ.] Luther aptly renders: *a fine child for God,—i.e. so beautifully and gracefully formed," that he was by God esteemed as ἀστείος.8 In substance, therefore, the expression amounts to the *superlatives* idea; but it is not to be taken as a paraphrase of the superlative, but as conceived in its proper literal sense.9 The expressions *θεοειδές* and *θεοείκελος*, compared by many, are not here revelant, as they do not correspond to the conception of ἀστείος τῷ Θεῷ. — Moses' beauty 10 is also praised in Philo, Vit. Mos. i. p. 604 A, and Joseph. Antt. ii. 9. 7, where he is called παῖς μορφή θείος. According to Jalkut Rubeni, f. 75. 4, he was beautiful as an angel. — μήνας τρεῖς] Ex. ii. 2. — τοῦ πατρός] Ambrae, Ex. vi. 20.

Vv. 21, 22. *Ἐκεῖνος ἔδει αὐτὸν, ἀνεύλ. αὐτῶν* Repetition of the pronoun as in Matt. xxvi. 71; Mark ix. 28; Matt. viii. 1.11 — ἀνεύλατον took him up (sustulit, Vulg.). So also often among Greek writers, of exposed children; see Wetstein. — ἐκείνῳ in contrast to his own mother. — εἰς νῦν] Ex. ii. 10, for a son, so that he became a son to herself. So also in classical Greek with

1 Comp. also Grimm on 2 Macc. i. 31.
2 The previous dynasty was that of the *Hyksos*; the new king was *Ahasuerus*, who expelled the *Hyksos*. See Knobel on Ex. i. 8.
3 But see Kypke, ii. p. 37; and from Philo, Loesner, p. 186. *Aorist* participle, as in i. 34.
5 On τούτου ἑκάστα τὸ ἑκάστα, comp. τούτου ἑκάστων = ἑκάστων, Herod. iii. 1; on ἑκάστων, Eur. *Andr.* 70.
6 Comp. LXX. Ex. i. 17; Luke xvii. 32. See on 2 Cor. viii. 6; Rom. i. 20.
7 Comp. Judith xi. 23.
8 Comp. Winer, p. 282 (E. T. 310).
9 See also on 2 Cor. x. 4. Heslod, *Ep.* 895: ἀναιτίος ἀδικήτως, and Aesch. *Agam.* 392: *θεοί* ἀνεύλατοι, are parallel; as are from the O. T., Gen. x. 9, Jonah iii. 3.
10 Ex. ii. 2; comp. Heb. xi. 22. [p. 377.
Jews Under the Laws.

verbes of development. — πάντη σοφία λαί.] Instrumental dative. The notice itself is not from the O. T., but from tradition, which certainly was, from the circumstances in which Moses was placed, true. The wisdom of the Egyptians extended mainly to natural science, with magic, astronomy, medicine, and mathematics; and the possessors of this wisdom were chiefly the priestly caste, which also represented political wisdom. — διστάσεις ἐν λόγῳ, κ. ἔργον.] see on Luke xxiv. 19. ἐν ἔργῳ refers not only to his miraculous activity, but generally to the whole of his abundant labours. With ἄνων ἐν λόγῳ. Ex. iv. 10 appears at variance; but Moses in that passage does not describe himself as a stammerer, but only as one whose address was unskilful, and whose utterance was clumsy. But even an address not naturally fluent may, with the accession of a higher endowment, be converted into eloquence, and become highly effective through the Divine Spirit, by which it is sustained, as was afterwards the historically well-known case with the addresses of Moses. Thus, even before his public emergence, for to this time the text refers, a higher power of speech may have formed itself in him. Hence ἄνων ἐν λόγῳ is neither to be referred, with Krause, to the writings of Moses, nor to be regarded, with Heinrichs, as a once-current general eulogium; nor is it to be said, with de Wette, that admiration for the celebrated lawgiver had caused it to be forgotten that he made use of his brother Aaron as his spokesman.

Ver. 23. But when a period of forty years became full to him,—i.e. when he was precisely 40 years old. This exact specification of age is not found in the O. T. (Ex. ii. 11), but is traditional. — ἀνέβη ἐν τῇ πνεύματι καρδίαις αὐτοῦ] it arose into his heart, i.e. came into his mind, to visit, to see how it went with them, etc. The expression is adopted from the LXX., where it is an imitation of the Hebrew וְיוֹרֵה נִנְעָה, Jer. iii. 16, xxxii. 35; Isa. lxv. 17. 10 Neither is ἀ διάλογος, for which Luke xxiv. 38 is erroneously appealed to, nor ἡ βούλη to be supplied. — ἑνωτιφ.] inisere, Matt. xxv. 36, often also in Greek writers. He had hitherto been aloof from them, in the higher circles of Egyptian society and culture. — τῶς ἀδελφοῖς] “motivum amoris,” Bengel. Comp. ver. 26.

Vv. 24, 25. See Ex. ii. 11, 12. — ἀδικείσθαι] to be unjustly treated. Errorneously Kuinoel holds that it here signifies verbearī. That was the maltreatment. — ἡμύνατο] he exercised retaliation. Only here in the N. T., often in classic Greek. Similarly ἀμείβομαι. — κ. ἑποίησε, ἐκδίκ. and procured revenge (Judg. xi. 36). He became his ἐκδίκος, vindex. — τῷ καταποννυμ.] for him who was on the point of being overcome, present participle. — παράξεος] mode of the ἡμύνατο κ. ἑποίησε, κ.τ.λ. Wolf aptly says: “Percussionem vio-

3 Bernhardy, p. 218 f.
4 Philo, Vita. Mox.
5 Ιερουσαλήμ. (Πλ.)
6 Comp. Just. xxxvi. 2.
7 Comp. Joseph. Antiq. iii. 1. 4: πλήθου ἄμειβομενοι νεφελωτέρως.
8 Comp. Luke xxi. 15.
10 Berech. f. 115. 8; Soheloth. Rabb. f. 118. 3.
lentam causis causa factam hic innui indubium est." Comp. Matt. xxvi. 31, and see ver. 28. — The inaccuracy, that τὸν Διέρρητιον has no definite reference in the words that precede it, but only an indirect indication in ἀδικοεμον, which presupposes a malfarorer, is explained from the circumstances of the event being so universally known.—Ver. 25. But he thought that his brethren would observe that God by his hand (intervention) was giving them deliverance. — didawin] the giving is conceived as seen now beginning; the first step toward effecting the liberation from bondage had already taken place by the killing of the Egyptian, which was to be to them the signal of deliverance.

Vv. 26, 27 f. See Ex. ii. 13 f. — ἠφη] he showed himself to them,—when, namely, he arrived among them "rursus invisurus suos." Well does Bengel find in the expression the reference utro, ex improviso. — αὐτοίς] refers back to ἰδελφοίς. It is presumed in this case as well known, that there were two who strove. — συνήλασεν αὐτ. εἰς εἰρ.] he drove them together, by representations, to (eir., denoting the end aimed at) peace. The aorist does not stand de conatu, but the act actually took place on Moses' part; the fact that it was resisted on the part of those who strove, alters not the action. Grotius, moreover, correctly remarks: "Vox quasi vim significans agentis instantiam significat." — ὁ δὲ ἀδικῶν τ. πύρνσ.] but he who treated his neighbour, one by nationality his brother, unjustly, was still in the act of maltreating him. — ἵπωσαν] thrust him from him. On κατορνησσεν, has appointed, comp. Breni, ad Dem. Ol. p. 171; and on διαστήσεις, who judges according to the laws, as distinguished from the more general κρίνεις, Wyttenbach, Ep. crit. p. 219. — μὴ ἀνελείν κ.τ.λ.] thou wilt not surely despatch (ii. 23, v. 38) me? To the pertness of the question belongs also the ρί.

Vv. 29, 30. See Ex. ii. 15–22, iii. 2. — ἐν τῷ λύσῳ τοῦρο:] on account of this word, denoting the reason which occasioned his flight. — Μαδαμ.] Ἡρ] a district in Arabia Petraea. Thus Moses had to withdraw from his obstinate people; but how wonderfully active did the divine guidance show itself anew, ver. 30! On παροικοίς, comp. ver. 6. — καὶ πληρωθ. ἵπων τεσσαράς.] traditionally, but comp. also Ex. vii. 7: "Moses in palatii Pharaonis degit XL annos, in Mediane XL annos, et ministravit Israelani annos XL." — ἐν τῷ ἰρήμω τοῦ ἔρ. Σ.] in the desert, in which Mount Sinai is situated, Ἡρ ἴρῆς, Ex. xix. 1, 9; Lev. vii. 28. From the rocky and mountainous base of this desert Sinai rises to the south (and the highest), and Horeb more to the north, both as peaks of the same mountain ridge. Hence there is no contradiction when, in Ex. iii., the appearance of the burning bush is transferred to the neighbourhood of Horeb, as generally in the Pentateuch the names Sinai and Horeb are interchanged for the locality of the giving of the law, except in Deut. xxxiii. 2, where only Horeb is mentioned, as also in Mal. iv. 4; whereas in the N. T. and in Josephus only Sinai is named. The latter name specially denotes the locality of the giving of the law, while

1 Winer, p. 537 (E. T. 788).
2 Euseb. Comp. i Kings iii. 16.
3 Comp. ii. 3, vili. 3, ix. 17, al.; Heb. ix. 28.
4 The opposite: ἐρήμη χειλέσσω, Hom. Il.
xx. 134.
5 Grotius, Wolf, Kuhnel.
6 Winer, p. 369 (E. T. 484).
7 Beresh. Rabb. f. 115. 3.
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Horeb was also the name of the entire mountain range. — ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς βάτου] in the flame of fire of a thorn bush. Stephen designates the phenomenon quite as it is related in Exodus, i.e., as a flaming burning bush, in which an angel of God was present, in which case every attempt to explain away the miraculous theophany, a meteor, lightning, must be avoided.

Vv. 31–33. See Ex. iii. 8–5. — τὸ ὄναμα] spectaculum. See on Matt. xvii. 9. — κατανοεῖν] to contemplate, Luke xii. 24, 27; Acts xi. 6. — φωνῇ κυρίον] as the angel represents Jehovah Himself, so is he identified with Him. When the angel of the Lord speaks, that is the voice of God, as it is His representative servant, the angel, who speaks. To understand, with Chrysostom, Calovius, and others, the angelus increatus — i.e. Christ as the λάγος — as meant, is consequently unnecessary, and also not in keeping with the anarthrous ἄγγελος, which Hengstenberg wrongly denies (p1). Comp. xii. 7, 23. — λύσον τὸ ὑπόθεμα τῶν ποδ. σου.] The holiness of the presence of God required, as it was in keeping generally with the religious feeling of the East, that he who held intercourse with Jehovah should be barefooted, lest the sandals charged with dust should pollute (Josh. v. 15) the holy ground (γῆ ἄγια); hence also the priests in the temple waited on their service with bare feet.

Ver. 34. 'Ἰδὼν εἰδον] LXX. Ex. iii. 7. Hence here an imitation of the Hebrew form of expression. Similar emphatic combinations were, however, not alien to other Greek. — καταβήν] namely, from heaven, where I am enthroned. — ἀποστειλῶ (see the critical remarks), adhortative subjunctive.

Vv. 35–37. The recurring τοῦτον is emphatic: this and none other. Also in the following vv. 36, 37, 38, οὐτος . . . οὐτος are always emphatically prefixed. — ἐν ἡρῴοσαν] whom they at that time, ver. 27, denied, namely, as ἀρχοντα καὶ δικαιστήν. The plural is purposely chosen, because there is meant the whole category of those thinking alike with that one (ver. 27). This one is conceived collectively. — ἀρχ. κ. λατρεύων] observe the climax introduced by λατρεύω. In relation to the preceding δικαστ. It is introduced because the obstinacy of the people against Moses is type of the antagonism to Christ and His work (ver. 51); consequently, Moses in his work of deliverance is a type of Christ, who has effected the λατρεύως of the people in the highest sense. — According to the reading σιν χειρι (see the critical remarks), the meaning is to be taken as: standing in association with the

1 See the particulars in Knobel on Ex. xix. 2.
2 On ἄρχει νοέσε, comp. xi. 1, 8; Lachmann; Heb. i. 7; Rev. i. 14, ii. 18, xix. 12; Isa. xxix. 6, liv. 15; Pind. Pyth. iv. 400.
3 P. 70.
4 See on the present day the Arabe, as is well known, enter their mosques barefooted. The precept of Pythagoras, ἀνυκόδης δὲ καὶ ἱπποκείμενα, was derived from an Egyptian custom. Jamblich, Vith. Ἐπικ. 23. The Samaritan trode barefoot the holiest place on Gerizim, Robinson, III. p. 330.
6 See on 1 Cor. ii. 1; Lobeck, Paralip. p. 282. ἰδὼν εἰδον is found in Lucian, Dial. Mar. iv. 3.
7 Isa. lxvi. 1; Matt. v. 34. Comp. Gen. xi. 7, xvii. 21; Ps. cxliv. 5.
8 See Emsl. ad Eur. Bacch. 341, Med. 1244.
hand, i.e. with the protecting and helping power, of the angel. Comp. the classical expression σῶν θεοίς. This power of the angel was that of God Himself (ver. 34), in virtue of which he wrought also the miracles, ver. 36. — As to the gender of βάρης, see on Mark xii. 26. — After the work of Moses (ver. 36), ver. 37 now brings into prominence his great Messianic prophecy, which designates himself as a type of the Messiah; whereupon in ver. 38 his exalted position as the receiver and giver of the law is described, in order that this light, in which he stands, may be followed up in ver. 39 by the shadow—the contrast of disobedience towards him.

Ver. 38. This is he who . . . had intercourse with the angel . . . and our fathers, was the mediator (Gal. iii. 19) between the two. — ἐν τῷ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν τῷ ἑρμῆ ἐν τῇ ἀσυνέλευσε, in the assembly of the people, held for the promulgation of the law, in the desert, Ex. xix. This definite reference is warranted by the context, as it is just the special act of the giving of the law that is spoken of. — λαγχαί τῶν αὐτοῦ i.e. utterances which are not dead, and so ineffectual, but living, in which, as in the self-revelations of the living God, there is effective power (John vi. 51), as well with reference to their influence on the moulding of the moral life according to God’s will, as also especially with reference to the fulfilment of the promises and threatenings thereto annexed. Incorrectly Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Kuinoel, and others hold that ζητοῦν stands for ζητοῦτοι. Even according to Paul, the law in itself is holy, just, good, spiritual, and given for life (Rom. vii. 12, 14); that it nevertheless kills, arises from the abuse which the power of sin makes of it, and is therefore an accidental relation.

Vv. 39, 40. They turned with their hearts to Egypt, i.e. they directed their desires again to the mode of life pursued in Egypt, particularly, as is evident from the context (ver. 40), to the Egyptian idolatry. Ex. xx. 7, 8, 24. Others, including Cornelius a Lapide, Morus, Rosenmüller: they wished to return back to Egypt. But the οἱ προσπορεύονται ἡμῶν in ver. 40 would then have to be taken as: “who shall go before us on our return,”—which is just as much at variance with the historical position at Ex. xxxii. 1 as with Ex. xxxiii. 4, 1 Kings xii. 28, and Neh. ix. 18, where the golden bull appears as a symbol of the God who has led the Israelites out of Egypt. — θεοί; the plural, after Ex. xxxii. 1, denotes the category, without reference to the numerical relation. That Aaron made only one idol was the result of the universally expressed demand; and in accord with this universal demand is also the expression in Ex. xxxiii. 4.—οἱ προσπορ.] borne before our line of march, as the symbols, to be revered by us, of the present Jehovah. — δὲ γὰρ. Μ. οὗτος] γὰρ gives the motive of the demand. Moses, hitherto our leader, has in fact disappeared, so that we need another guidance representative of God. —οὗτος] spoken contemptuously. — The nominative absolute is designedly chosen, in order to concentrate the whole

1 Deut. xviii. 15 (comp. above, iii. 29).
2 On γίνομαι μετα, κεφαλ. aus, which is no Hebraism, comp. ix. 19, xx. 18; Mark xvi. 10; Act. Lese. Phil. i. p. 394.
3 Comp. 1 Pet. i. 23; Heb. v. 12; Deut. xxxii. 47.
4 Rom. vii. 5, 13 f.; 1 Cor. xv. 53.
6 See on vi. 14.
attention on the conception. For this Moses . . . we know not what has happened to him, since he returns not from the mount.

Ver. 41. ἔμοιοποίησαν they made a bull, Ex. xxxii. 4: έποιησαν αὐτά μύτης χώνευτον. The word does not elsewhere occur, except in the Fathers, and may have belonged to the colloquial language. The idol itself was an imitation of the very ancient and widely-spread bull-worship in Egypt, which had impressed itself in different forms, e.g. in the worship of Apis at Memphis, and of Memnon at Heliopolis. Hence μύτης is not a calf, but a young bull already full-grown, but not yet put into the yoke. — Examples of ἀνάγει—namely, to the altar, 1 Kings iii. 15—θωσιαν may be seen in Eissner, p. 398, and from Philo in Locsen, p. 189. —εἰσφαίνοντο they rejoiced in the works of their hands. By the interpretation: "they held sacrificial feasts" (Kuinzel), the well-known history (Ex. xxxii. 6), to which the meaning of the words points, is confounded with that meaning itself. — ἔργοι plural of the category, which presented itself in the golden calf. On εἰσφαίνον ἐν, to denote that on which the joy is causally based, compare χαιρεῖν ἐν, Luke x. 20; see on Phil. i. 18.

Ver. 42. ἔστρεψε δὲ ὁ θεὸς but God turned,—a figurative representation of the idea: He became unfavourable to them. The active in a neuter sense; nothing is to be supplied. Incorrectly Vitringa, Morus, and others hold that ἔστρεψε connected with παρέδ. denotes, after the Hebrew וְיָדַע, τָּרָדִיד. This usage has not passed over to the N. T., and, moreover, it is not vouched for historically that the Israelites at an earlier period practised star-worship. Heinrichs connects ἔστρ. with αἰώνις: "convertit animos eorum ab una idololatria ad aliam." But the expression of divine disfavour is to be retained on account of the correlation with ver. 39. — καὶ παρέδ. αἰώνις λατρ. and gave them up to serve, an explanatory infinitive. The falling away into star-worship, ἔτταρ. τ. εἰσφαίνον = τις ἐπίλεξεν ἐν, in which, from the worshipper's point of view, the sun, moon, and stars are conceived as living beings, is apprehended as wrought by an angry God by way of punishment for that bull-worship, according to the idea of sin being punished by sin. The assertion, often repeated since the time of Chrysostom and Theophylact, that only the divine permission or the withdrawal of grace is here denoted, is at variance with the positive expression and the true biblical conception of the divine retribution. Self-surrender (Eph. iv. 19) is the correlative moral factor on the part of man. — μὴ σφάγα κ.τ.λ.] Amos v. 25–27, freely after the LXX. Ye have not surely presented unto me sacrifices and offerings, offerings of any kind, for forty years in the wilderness? The question supposes a negative answer; therefore without an interroga-tion the meaning is: Ye cannot maintain that ye have offered . . . to me. The apparent contradiction with the accounts of offerings, which were actually presented to Jehovah in the desert, disappears when the pro-

1 Comp. on Matt. viii. 92; Buttm. neut. Gr. p. 395 (E. T. 279); Valck. Schol. p. 492.
2 Comp. Heb. ix. 12, 13, 19; Herod. ii. 98.
3 Ecles. xiv. 5, xxxix. 31, ii. 29; Xen. Hier. l. 16.
4 1 Macc. ii. 63; Acts v. 23, xv. 16; Kühner, II. pp. 9, 10.
5 See on Rom. i. 24.
6 Ex. xxiv. 4 ff.; Num. vii., ix. 1 ff.
phetic utterance, understood by Stephen as a reproach, is considered as a sternly and sharply significant divine verdict, according to which the ritual offerings in the desert, which were rare and only occurred on special occasions (comp. already Lyra), could not be taken at all into consideration against the idolatrous aberrations which testified the moral worthlessness of those offerings. Usually μοι is considered as equivalent to mihi soli. But this is incorrect on account of the enditic pronoun and its position, and on account of the arbitrarily intruded μονον. Fritzschē puts the note of interrogation only after προσευκεν αυτοις, ver. 43: "Sacrare et victimas per XL annos in deserto mihi obtulístis, et in pompa tulístis aedem Molochi, etc.?" In this way God’s displeasure at the unstedfastness of His people would be vividly denoted by the contrast. But this expedient is impossible on account of the μφ presupposing a negation. Moreover, it is as foreign to the design of Stephen, who wishes to give a probative passage for the λατρείαν τῇ στρατιᾷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, to concede the worship of Jehovah, as it is, on the other hand, in the highest degree accordant with that design to recognise in ver. 42 the negative element of his proof, the denial of the rendering of offering to Jehovah, and in ver. 43 the positive proof, the direct reproach of star-worship.

Ver. 43. Kai . . . προσευκεν αυτοις] is the answer which God Himself gives to His question, and in which καί joins on to the negation implied in the preceding clause: No, this ye have not done, and instead of it ye have taken up from the earth, in order to carry it in procession from one encampment to another, the tent, ἡ λου, the portable tent-temple, of Moloch. — τοῦ Μολόχ] so according to the LXX. The Hebrew has בַּבְלָה, of your king, i.e. your idol. The LXX. puts instead of this the name of the idol, either as explanatory or more probably as following another reading. 5 מַלֹך, Hebrew מַלֹך, (Red), called also בֶּלָו and בֶּלָם, was an idol of the Ammonites, to whom children were offered, and to whom afterwards even the Israelites 6 sacrificed children. His brazen image was, according to Rabbinical tradition, especially according to Jarchi on Jer. vii. 31, hollow, heated from below, with the head of an ox and outstretched arms, into which the children were laid, whose cries were stifled by the sacrificing priests with the beating of drums. The question whether Moloch corresponds to Kronos or Saturn, or is to be regarded as the god of the sun, 7 is

1 According to another view, the period of forty years without offerings appears in the prophet as the “golden age of Israel,” and as a proof how little God cares for such offerings. See Ewald, Proph. in loc.

2 As by Morus, Rosenmüller, Heinrichs, Olshausen, similarly Kuinoel.

3 Ad Marc. p. 65 f.

4 מַלֹך, comp. LXX. 2 Kings xxvi. 18.

5 Whether the children were burned alive, or first put to death, might seem doubtful from such passages as Ezek. xx. 26, 31. But the burning alive must be assumed according to the notices preserved concerning the Carthaginian procedure at such sacrifices of children (see Knobel on Lev. xviii. 21). — The extravagant assertion that the worship of Moloch was the orthodox primitive worship of the Hebrews (Vatke, Daumer, Ghiliani), was a folly of 1835–49. Lev. xvii. 32, xx. 5; 1 Kings xi. 7; 2 Kings xxiii. 10; Jer. vii. 31.

6 Comp. the description, agreeing in the main, of the image of Kronos in Diod. Sic. xx. 14.

7 Theophylact, Spencer, Deyling, and others, including Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Olshausen, Münzer, Creuzer.
settled for our passage to this extent, that, as here by Moloch and Rephan
two different divinities from the host of heaven must be meant, and Rephan
corresponds to Kronos, the view of Moloch as god of the sun receives thereby
a confirmation, however closely the mythological idea of Kronos was origi-
nally related to the notion of a solar deity¹ and consequently also to that of
Moloch. See, moreover, for Moloch as god of the sun, Müller in Herzog’s
Encyl.²—καὶ τὸ ἀστρον τοῦ θεοῦ ἵμ. 'Ρεφαν] and the star (star-image) of your (al-
leged) god Rephan, i.e. the star made the symbol of your god Rephan. 'Ρεφαν
is the Coptic name of Saturn, as Kircher³ has proved from the great Egyp-
tian Scala. The ancient Arabs, Phoenicians, and Egyptians gave divine
honours to the planet Saturn; and in particular the Arabic name of this
star, ١٦٩٦٨٠٧٩٠١٩٠٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧θ١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١٨٠٧٩٠١
translators⁴ have expressed by Rephan, the Coptic name of Saturn known
to them.⁵—We may add, that there is no account in the Pentateuch of the
worship of Moloch and Rephan in the desert; yet the former is forbidden
in Lev. xviii. 21, xx. 2; Deut. xviii. 10. It is probable, however, that from
this very fact arose a tradition, which the LXX. followed in Amos, l.c.—
τοῖς τύπωσι τήν ἁγι. τ. Μόλ. κ. τ. ἁστρ. τ. θεοῦ ἵμ. 'Ρεφ. It
includes a reference to the tent of Moloch, in so far as the image of the
idol was to be found in it and was carried along with it. For examples in
which the context gives to τύπος the definite sense of idol, see Kypke, II.
Only here in the N. T., but often in classic writers. —Βαβ., LXX.: Δυσασκῶν,
so also in Hebrew. An extension in accordance with history, as similar
modifications were indulged in by the Rabbis; see Lightfoot, p. 75.

Ver. 44. 'Ἡ ἁγι. τοῦ μαρ.] not a contrast to ver. 48, for the bringing out
of the culpability, "hic ostendit Steph., non posse ascribi culpam Deo,"
Calvin, comp. Olshausen and de Wette, which there is nothing to indicate;
but after the giving of the law (ver. 38) and after the described back-
sliding and its punishment (vv. 39–48). Stephen now commences the new
section of his historical development,—that of the tabernacle and of the
temple,—as he necessarily required this for the subsequent disclosure of the

² IX. p. 716 f.
³ Lingua Aeg. restituta, p. 49, 297.
⁴ See Winet, Recit. II. p. 87, and generally Müller in Herzog’s Encyl. XII. p. 738.
⁵ In general, the LXX. has dealt very freely
with this passage. The original text runs
according to the customary rendering: and
you carried the tent of your king and the frame
(τάξις) of your images, the star of your divinity,
which ye made for yourselves. See Hitzig in
loc.; Gesenius, Thea. II. p. 659. The LXX.
took τάξις, which is to be derived from τέξης,
as a proper name ('Peťaî), and transposed the
words as if there stood in the Hebrew בְּלָא
Moreover, it is to be observed that the words of the original may
be taken also as future, as a threat of punish-
ment (E. Meler, Ewald): so shall ye take up
the tent (Ewald: the pole) of your king and
the platform of your images, etc. According
to this, the fugitives are conceived as taking on
their backs the furniture of their gods, and
carrying them from one place of refuge to
another. This view corresponds best with the
connection in the prophet; and in the threat
is implied at the same time the accusation,
which Dümsterdieck in the Stud. u. Krit. 1849,
p. 910, feels the want of, on which account he
takes it as present (but ye carry, etc.). —The
speech of Rephan, as we have it, simply follows
the LXX.

⁶ See Movers, PЊœn. l. p. 289 f., Müller,
l.c.
guilt of his opponents precisely in respect to this important point of charge. The Hebrew יפניא לי means tent of meeting, of God with his people, i.e. tent of revelation, not tent of the congregation,¹ but is in the LXX., which the Greek form of this speech follows, incorrectly rendered by ἡ σκήνη τοῦ μαρτυρίου, the tent in which God bears witness of Himself, as if derived from θε, a witness. For the description of this tabernacle, see Ex. xxv.—xxvii. — κατὰ τῶν τινῶν δι' ἑυρ.] see Ex. xxv. 0, 40.²

Ver 45. Which also our fathers with Joshua—in connection with Joshua, under whose guidance they stood—after having received it from Moses, brought in to Canaan. διαδέχθησαν, only here in the N. T., denotes the taking over from a former possessor.³—ἐν τῷ κατάσχεσι τῶν ἔθνων] κατάσχεσις, as in ver. 5, possessio.⁴ But ἐν is not to be explained as put for εἰς, nor is κατάσχεσις τῶν ἔθνων taking possession of the land of the Gentiles, as is generally held, which is not expressed. Rather the fathers brought in the tabernacle of the covenant during the possession of the Gentiles, i.e. while the Gentiles were in the state of possession. To this, then, significantly corresponds what further follows: ὕσιν ἐξωσεν δὲ Θεός κ.τ.λ. But of what the Gentiles were at that time possessors, is self-evident from εἰσόθησιν—namely, of the Holy Land, to which the εἰς in εἰσόθησιν refers according to the history well known to the hearers. —ἀπὸ προοίμων τ. π. ἡμ.] away from the face of our fathers, so that they withdrew themselves by flight from their view.⁵—ἐως τῶν ἡμ. Α.] is to be separated from the parenthetical clause ὕσιν ἐξωσεν . . . ἡμῶν, and to be joined to the preceding: which our fathers brought in . . . until the days of David, so that it remained in Canaan until the time of David inclusively. Kinoel attaches it to ὕσιν ἐξωσεν κ.τ.λ.; for until the time of David the struggle with the inhabitants of Canaan lasted. This is in opposition to the connection, in which the important point was the duration of the tabernacle-service, as the sequel, paving the way for the transition to the real temple, shows; with David the new epoch of worship begins to dawn.

Vv 46, 47. Καὶ ἐρώτασε] and asked, namely, confiding in the grace of God, which he experienced, Luke i. 30. The channel of this request, only indirectly expressed by David, and of the answer of God to it, was Nathan.⁶ What is expressed in Ps. cxxxii. 2 ff. is a later retrospective reference to it. See Ewald on the Psalm. This probably floated before the mind of Stephen, hence σκήνωμα and εὑρεῖν. The usual interpretation of ἐρώτασα: oportet, desiderabat, is incorrect; for the fact, that the LXX. Deut. xiv. 16 expresses ἕως by ἐπικόμενοι, has nothing at all to do with the linguistic use of αἰτομα. —εὑρεῖν σκήνωμα τῷ Θεῷ Ἰακ.] i.e. to obtain the establishment of a dwelling-place destined for the peculiar god of Jacob. In the old theocratic designation τῷ Θεῷ Ἰακωβ, instead of the bare αἱτῶ, lies the holy

---

¹ See Ewald, Alterth. p. 107.
² Comp. Heb. viii. 5, and thereon Lusenmann and Dellitzsch, p. 387 f.
³ 4 Macc. iv. 18; Dem. 1218, 23. 1045, 10; Polyb. ii. 4. 7; xxxi. 19. 7; Lucian. Dial. M. xi. 3.
⁴ LXX., Apocr., Joseph., Vulgate, Calvin, Grotius, Kinoel, and others.
⁵ Comp. LXX. Ex. xxxiv. 34; Deut. x. 23.
⁶ On the original form ἐρωτα, from ἐρωτάω, see Winer, p. 86 (E. T. 111.).
⁷ 3 Sam. vii. 2; 1 Chron. xviii. 1.
THE TEMPLE AND THE PROPHETS.

national motive for the request of David; on σάρυμα applied to the temple at Jerusalem, comp. 3 Esdr. i. 50, and to a heathen temple, Pausan. iii. 17. 6, where it is even the name. Observe how David, in the humility of his request, designates the temple, which he has in view, only generally as σάρυμα, whereas the continuation of the narrative, ver. 47, has the definite oίκον. — Stephen could not but continue the historical thread of his discourse precisely down to the building of Solomon's temple, because he was accused of blasphemy against the temple.

Vv. 48-50. Nevertheless this φυσάμενος αὐτῷ oίκον (ver. 47) is not to be misused, as if the presence of the Most High—observe the emphatic prefixing of ὁ θεος, in which lies a tacit contrast of Him who is enthroned in the highest heavens to heathen gods—were bound to the temple! The temple-worship, as represented by the priests and hierarchs, ran only too much into such a misuse. — χειροποιητος neuter: in something which is made by hands, xvii. 24. — Vv. 49, 50 contain Isa. lxvi. 1, 2, slightly deviating from the LXX. — ὁ συνάξας . . . ποιῶν μονή a poetically moulded expression of the idea: heaven and earth I fill with my all-ruling presence. Thus there cannot be for God any place of His rest (τῶν τῆς καταφύσεως), any abode of rest to be assigned to Him. — oικοδομητε] The future used of any possible future case. Baur and Zeller have wrongly found in these verses a disapproving judgment as to the building of the temple, the effect of which had been to render the worship rigid; holding also what was above said of the tabernacle—that it was made according to the pattern seen by Moses—as meant to disparage the temple, the building of which is represented as "a corruption of the worship of God in its own nature free, bound to no fixed place and to no rigid external rites" (Zeller). Such thoughts are read between the lines not only quite arbitrarily, but also quite erroneously, as is evident from ver. 46, according to which the building of Solomon appears as fulfilment of the prayer of David, who had found favour with God. The prophetic quotation corresponds entirely to the idea of Solomon himself, 1 Kings viii. 27. The quotation of the prophetic saying was, moreover, essentially necessary for Stephen, because in it the Messianic reformation, which he must have preached, had its divine warrant in reference to the temple-worship.

Ver. 51. The long-restrained direct offensive now breaks out, as is quite in keeping with the position of matters brought to this point. This against Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Olshausen, and others, who quite arbitrarily suppose that after ver. 50 an interruption took place, either by the shouts of the hearers, or at least by their threatening gestures; as well as against Schwanbeck, p. 252, who sees here "an omission of the reporter." Stephen has in ver. 50 ended his calm and detailed historical narrative. And now it is time that the accused should become the bold accuser, and at length throw in the face of his judges the result, the thoughts forming

1 Comp. John iv. 20 ff.
2 Comp. LXX, Isa. xvi. 19; 2 Chron. vi. 19.
3 Comp. Matt. v. 34; 1 Kings viii. 27.
4 With whom Schneckenburger in the Stud.
5 v. Krit., 1855, p. 598 ff., concurred, ascribing to Stephen a view akin to Eusebiam.
6 Comp. 1 Kings vii. 94.
7 Comp. Baur, i. p. 58, ed. 2; Ewald, p. 213.
which were already clearly enough to be inferred from the previous historical course of the speech. Therefore he breaks off his calm, measured discourse, and falls upon his judges with deep moral indignation, like a reproving prophet: \textit{Ye stiff-necked! etc. — ἀπειρίτμ. τῇ καρδ. κ. τ. ὥσιν} an upbraiding of them with their unconverted carnal character, in severe contrast to the Jewish pride of circumcision. The meaning without figure is: \textit{Men whose management of their inner life, and whose spiritual perception, are heathenishly rude, without moral refinement, not open for the influence of the divine Spirit.} \footnote{1} — ὑμεῖς] with weighty emphasis. — \textit{αἰεὶ} always; even yet at this day! — ὡς οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν καὶ ὑμεῖς] sc. \textit{αἰεὶ τῷ πν. ἀγ. ἀντιπ. ; for the fathers are thought of in their resistance to God and to the vehicles of His Spirit, and therefore not the bare \textit{κατεί} is to be supplied.} \footnote{2} — The term \textit{ἀντιπίστευν}, not occurring elsewhere in the N. T., is here chosen as a \textit{strong designation}. \footnote{3} Bengel well puts it: "\textit{in adversum ruitis.}"  

Ver. 52. Proof of the \textit{ὡς οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν καὶ, αἰεὶ, ὑμεῖς — καὶ ἀπέκτεν.} καί is the climactic even; they have even \textit{killed} them. \footnote{4} The characteristic more special designation of the prophets: \textit{τοὺς προκαταγείλαντας κ. τ. λ., augments the guilt. — τοῦ δικαίου} κατ᾽ ἐξοχήν of Jesus, the highest messenger of God, \textit{the (ideal) Just One}. \footnote{5} Contrast to the relative clause that follows. — \textit{νῦν} in the present time, opposed to the times of the fathers; \textit{ὑμεῖς} is emphatically placed over against the latter as a parallel. — \textit{προδόται} betrayors (Luke vi. 16), inasmuch as the Sanhedrists, by false and crafty accusation and condemnation, delivered Jesus over to the Roman tribunal and brought Him to execution.  

Ver. 53. \textit{οἵτινες] quippe qui.} Stephen desires, namely, now to give the \textit{character}, through which the foregoing \textit{οὐ νῦν ὑμεῖς προδόται κ. τ. λ.,} as founded on their actually manifested conduct, \textit{receives its explanation. — ἐλάβετε] ye have received, placed first with emphasis. — εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων} upon arrangements with angels, i.e. so that the arrangements made by angels, the direct servants of God, which accompanied the promulgation of the law, \footnote{6} made you perceive the obligation to recognise and observe the received law—comp. the contrast, κ. οὐκ ἐφοβάτε — as the ethical aspect of your \textit{ἐλάβετε.} Briefly, therefore: \textit{Ye received the law with reference to arrangements of angels, which could not leave you doubtful that you ought to submit obediently to the divine institution.} — \textit{εἰς denotes, as often in Greek writers and in the N. T., the direction of the mind, in view of}. \footnote{7} — \textit{διαταγή is arrangement, regulation}, as in Rom. xiii. 2, with Greek writers \textit{διατάξεις}. \footnote{8} At variance with linguistic usage, Beza, Calvin, Piscator, Eslner, Hammond, Wolf, Krause, \footnote{9}
Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others, taking διαραγή in the above signification, render: accepistis legem ab angelis promulgatam, as if eis stood for ευ.

Others—Grotius, Calovius, Er. Schmid, Valckenier, and others—explain διαραγή as agmen dispositum, because διαλάβων is often, also in the classics, used of the drawing up of armies,¹ and διαραγής of the divisions of an army,² and translate praesentibus angelorum ordinibus, so that eis is likewise taken for ευ. But against this view, with which, moreover, eis would have to be taken as respectu, there is the decisive fact, that there is no evidence of the use of διαραγή in the sense assumed; and therefore the supposition that διαραγή = διαραγής in this signification is arbitrary, as well as at variance with the manifest similarity of the thought with Gal. iii. 19. Bengel³ renders: Υε received the law for commands of angels, i.e. as commands of angels, so that eis is to be understood as in ver. 21.⁴ But the Israelites did not receive the law as the commands of angels, but as the commands of God, in which character it was made known to them δι' ἀγγέλων.⁵—Moreover, the mediating action of the angels not admitting of more precise definition, which is here adverted to, is not contained in Ex. xix., but rests on tradition, which is imported already by the LXX. into Deut. xxxiii. 2. Comp. on Gal. iii. 19.⁶ It was a mistaken attempt at harmonizing, when earlier expositors sought to understand by the angels either Moses and the prophets⁷ or the seniores populi;⁸ indeed, Chrysostom even discovers here again the angel in the bush.

Vv. 54–56. Ταῦτα] The reproaches uttered in vv. 51–58. — διεπρ. ταῖς καρδ.] see on v. 33. — ἐβρυαχον τ. ὀδόντ.] they gnashed their teeth, from rage and spite.⁹ — εἰν' αἰνόν] against him. — πλήρ. πνεύμ.] which at this very moment filled and exalted him with special power, iv. 8. — εἰς τὸν οἰρανὸν] like Jesus, John xvii. 1. The eye of the suppliant looks everywhere toward, heaven,¹⁰ and what he beheld saw in the spirit (πλήρ. πνεύμ. ἄγιον); he only and not the rest present in the room. — τοῖς οἰρανοῖς] up to the highest.¹¹ — δόξαν θεοῦ] ἡμᾶς: the brightness in which God appears.¹² — ἐστώτα] Why not sitting?¹³ He beheld Jesus, as He has raised Himself from God's throne of light and stands ready for the saving reception of the martyr. Comp. ver. 59. The prophetic basis of this vision in the soul of Stephen is Dan. vii. 13 f. Chrysostom erroneously holds that it is a testimony of the resurrection of Christ. Rightly Occumenius: ἵσα δείξῃ τὴν ἀνωτέρων τὴν εἰς αἰνόν. Comp. Bengel: "quasi obvium Stephano." De Wette finds no explanation satisfactory, and prefers to leave it unexplained; while Borne-
mann is disposed only to find in it the idea of morandi et existendi, as formerly Beza and Knapp, Scr. var. arg. — eide} is to be apprehended as mental seeing in ecstasy. Only of Stephen himself is this seeing related; and when he, like an old prophet, gives utterance to what he saw, the rage of his adversaries—who therefore had seen nothing, but recognised in this declaration mere blasphemy—reaches its highest pitch, and breaks out in tumultuary fashion. The views of Michaelis and Eckermann, that Stephen had only expressed his firm conviction of the glory of Christ and of his own impending admission into heaven; and the view of Hezel, that he had seen a dazzling cloud as a symbol of the presence of God,—convert his utterance at this lofty moment into a flourish of rhetoric. According to Baur, the author's own view of this matter has objectivised itself into a vision, just as in like manner vi. 15 is deemed unhistorical. — eide . . . θεωρη . . . Ι' behold. As to ὁ νῦς τ. ἄνθρω., the Messianic designation in accordance with Dan. vii. 13, see on Matt. viii. 20.

Vv. 57, 58. The tumult, now breaking out, is to be conceived as proceeding from the Sanhedrists, but also extending to all the others who were present (vi. 12). To the latter pertains especially what is related from ὄρωμαι onward. — They stopped their ears, because they wished to hear nothing more of the blasphemous utterances. — ἔξω τῆς πόλεως] see Lev. xxiv. 14. "Locus lapidationis erat extra urbem; omnes enim civitates, muris cinctae, paritatem habent ad castra Israelis." — ἐλθοβολῶν] This is the fact generally stated. Then follows as a special circumstance, the activity of the witnesses in it. Observe that, as αὐτῶν is not expressed with ἐλθοβ., the preceding ἐν αὐτῶν is to be extended to it, and therefore to be mentally supplied.—οἱ μάρτυρες] The same who had testified at vi. 13. A fragment of legality! for the witnesses against the condemned had, according to law, to cast the first stones at him. — ἀπόθεντο τα ἴματα αὐτῶν] ὅτε εἶναι κοινόι καὶ ἀπαρατόδιατοι εἰς τὸ λαβοβολεῖν, Theophylact. — Σαφένεια] So distinguished and zealous a disciple of the Pharisees—who, however, ought neither to have been converted into the "notarial witness," nor even into the representative of the court conducting the trial (Sepp)—was for such a service quite as ready (xxii. 20) as he was welcome. But if Saul had been married or already a young widower (Ewald,) which does not follow from 1 Cor. vii. 7, 8, Luke, who knew so exactly and had in view the circumstances of his life, would hardly have called him νεανίας; although this denotes a degree of age already higher than μειρᾶκον. Comp. xx. 9, xxiii. 17, also v. 10; Luke vii. 14. — καὶ ἐλθοβολῶν] not merely the witnesses, but generally. The repetition has a tragic effect, which is further strengthened by the appended contrast ἐπικαλ. κ.τ.λ. A want of clearness, occasioned by the use of two documents (Bleek), is not discernible. — The

1 In the Sächs. Stud. 1843, p. 73 f.
2 Lobeck, ad Aj. 120.
3 Comp. John xii. 41.
4 Following older commentators, in Wolf.
6 Gloss in Babyl. Sanhedr. f. 42. 2.
7 Which Bornemann has added, following D and vss.
8 Comp. LXX. Ex. xxiii. 47.
9 Deut. xvii. 7; Sanhedr. vi. 4.
10 Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 218.
stoning, which as the punishment of blasphemy was inflicted on Stephen, seeing that no formal sentence preceded it, and that the execution had to be confirmed and carried out on the part of the Roman authorities, is to be regarded as an illegal act of the tumultuary outbreak. Similarly, the murder of James the Just, the Lord's brother, took place at a later period. The less the limits of such an outbreak can be defined, and the more the calm historical course of the speech of Stephen makes it easy to understand that the Sanhedrists should have heard him quietly up to, but not beyond, the point of their being directly attacked (ver. 51 ff.), so much the less warrantable is it, with Baur and Zeller, to esteem nothing further as historical, than that Stephen fell "as victim of a popular tumult suddenly arising on occasion of his lively public controversial discussions," without any proceedings in the Sanhedrim, which are assumed to be the work of the author.

VV. 59, 60. Ἐκτελοῦμεν] while he was invoking. Whom? is evident from the address which follows. — κύριος Ἠσσών both to be taken as vocatives, according to the formal expression κύριος Ἠσσώς, with which the apostolic church designates Jesus as the exalted Lord, not only of His church, but of the world, in the government of which He is installed as σῶμα θρόνος of the Father by His exaltation (Phil. ii. 6 ff.), until the final completion of His office. Stephen invoked Jesus; for he had just beheld Him standing ready to help him. As to the invocation of Christ generally, relative worship, conditioned by the relation of the exalted Christ to the Father. — δέξατο τὸ πνεύμα μου namely, to thee in heaven until the future resurrection.7 "Fecisti me victorem, recipie me in triumphum," Augustine. — φωνῇ μεγάλῃ] the last expenditure of his strength of love, the fervour of which also discloses itself in the kneeling. — τῷ στήνεσι σε ἄνευ ἁμαρτίας] fix not this sin (of my murder) upon them. This negative expression corresponds quite to the positive: ἀφέναι τῷ ἁμαρτίαν, to let the sin go as regards its relation of guilt, instead of fixing it for punishment. The notion, "to make availing" (de Wette), i.e. to impute, corresponds to the thought, but is not denoted by the word. Linguistically correct is also the rendering: "weigh not this sin to them," as to which the comparison of ἁμαρτία is not needed. In this view the sense would be: Determine not the weight of the sin (comp. xxv. 7), consider not how heavy it is. But our explanation is to be preferred, because it corresponds more completely to the prayer of Jesus, Luke xxiii. 34, which is evidently the pattern of Stephen in his request, only saying negatively what that expresses positively. In the case of such

1 Luke xxiv. 16; Sanhedr. vii. 4.
2 Ewald supposes that the Sanhedrim might have appealed to the permission granted to them by Pilate in John xviii. 31. But so much is not implied in John xviii. 31; see in loc. And ver. 57 sufficiently shows how far from "calmly and legally" matters proceeded at the execution. See Joseph. Ant. xx. 9. 1, and on John xviii. 31.
3 Rev. xxii. 90.
5 1 Cor. xv. 23; comp. x. 36.
6 See on Rom. x. 12; 1 Cor. i. 9; Phil. ii. 10.
7 Comp. on Phil. i. 36, remark.
8 Comp. Rom. x. 2; Eccl. xiv. 21, 22; 1 Macc. xii. 26, xiv. 26, xv. 4, al.
as Saul what was asked took place. In the similarity of the last words of Stephen, ver. 59 with Luke xxiii. 34, 40, as also of the words ἐξετάσει τῷ πν. μον with Luke xxiii. 46, Baur, with whom Zeller agrees, sees an indication of their unhistorical character; as if the example of the dying Jesus might not have sufficiently suggested itself to the first martyr, and proved sufficient motive for him to die with similar love and self-devotion. — ἤχουσθεν] "lugubre verbum et suave," Bengel; on account of the euphemistic nature of the word, never used of the dying of Christ. See on 1 Cor. xv. 18.

Notes by American Editor.

(x) Stephen's speech. V. 2.

"Opinions are divided concerning this speech of Stephen. Some regard it as inconclusive, illogical, and full of errors; others praise it as a complete refutation of the charges brought against him, and as worthy of the fulness of the Spirit with which he was inspired." "It is to be observed that the speech of Stephen is an unfinished production. He was interrupted before he came to a conclusion. We are therefore to regard it as in a measure imperfect." "It bears, in its nature and contents, the impress of authenticity." (Gloag.)

"The speaker's main object may be considered as twofold: first, to show that the charge against him rested on a false view of the ancient dispensation; and secondly, that the Jews, instead of manifesting a true zeal for the temple and the law, in their opposition to the gospel, were again acting out the unbelieving, rebellious spirit which led their fathers so often to resist the will of God and reject his favors." "Stephen pursues the order of time in his narrative; and it is important to mark that feature of the discourse, because it explains two peculiarities in it; first, that the ideas which fall logically under the two heads that have been mentioned are intermixed instead of being presented separately; and secondly, that some circumstances are introduced which we are not to regard as significant, but as serving merely to maintain the connection of the history." "It may be added that the peculiar character of the speech impresses upon it a seal of authenticity." (Hacket.)

Stephen "commenced this defence with great calm and dignity, choosing as his theme a subject which he knew would command the attention and win the deep interest of his audience. It was the story of the chosen people, told with the warm, bright eloquence of one not only himself an ardent patriot, but also a trained orator and scholar. He dwelt on the famous national heroes, with rare skill, bringing out particular events in their lives, and showing how, notwithstanding the fact that they had been sent by God, they had been again and again rejected by the chosen people." "What a magnificent conception, in the eyes of a child of Israel, were those instances of the lifework of Joseph and Moses, both God-sent regenerators of the loved people, both in their turn too rejected and misunderstood by those with whom their mission lay, but justified and glorified by the unanimous voice of history, which has surrounded

1 Comp. Oecumenius.
the men and their work with a halo of glory, growing only brighter as the centuries have multiplied! Might it not be the same with that Great One who had done such mighty works, and spoken such glorious words, but whom they had rejected and crucified?" (Hovson, Acts.)

(**) Historical errors. V. 3.

The historical allusions in the speech of Stephen in some respects differ from O. T. history; as to the time of Abraham's call, the time of Terah's death, the length of the sojourn in Egypt, the number of souls in Jacob's household, the purchase of the sepulchre, and the place of burial of the patriarchs. These variations or additions, which may either be fairly reconciled, or, at least, are of such a nature that were some fact known of which we are not informed all might be harmonized, our author unhappily characterizes as "errors," "historical mistakes," "historical errors," "mistakes," etc. In reference to all such apparent discrepancies two things should be borne in mind: first, Stephen, though "full of faith and power," was not an inspired teacher in the strict sense of the word; so that, provided we have a true record of his discourse, it may contain an error of statement, or a questionable date, and yet the accuracy of the sacred historian remain unimpeachable; and second, allowance should be made for the possible errors of copyists, specially with regard to numbers. Most of such difficulties, however, have been satisfactorily removed. Surely, in any view of the case, it is rash to assume that men of average culture and information, not to say such men of education and intelligence as Stephen and Luke unquestionably were, would be ignorant of the facts recorded in the sacred books, which had been their constant study. Nor need we suppose a speaker or writer likely to make erroneous statements, which a reference to the book of Genesis would at once have corrected, or to which even the audience addressed would at once have objected.

(a') Abraham's call. V. 3.

"The discrepancy is only apparent. It would appear from the sacred narrative that Abraham was twice called: once in Ur of the Chaldees, and afterwards at Haran." "To this solution of the difficulty Meyer objects that the verbal quotation from Gen. xii. 1 proves that Stephen had in view no other call than that mentioned in this passage. But, on the one hand, it is not surprising either that the call should be repeated to Abraham in nearly the same words, or that Stephen should apply the well-known words found in Gen. xii. 1 to the earlier call. And, on the other hand, the words are not precisely the same; for here there is no mention of a departure from his father's house, as there is when God called Abraham at Haran. When Abraham removed from Ur of the Chaldees he did not depart from his father's house, for Terah, his father, accompanied him; but when he removed from Haran he left Terah, if he were yet alive, and his brother Nahor." (Gloag.)

"It is a perversion of the text to suppose Stephen so ignorant of the geography here, as to place Canaan on the west of the Euphrates. His meaning evidently is that Abraham's call in that city was not the first which he received during his residence in Mesopotamia." (Hackett.)
(a') Death of Terah. V. 4.

"But this apparent disagreement admits of a ready solution, if we suppose that Abram was not the oldest son, but that Haran, who died before the first migration of the family, was sixty years older than he, and that Terah, consequently, was one hundred and thirty years old at the birth of Abraham. The relation of Abraham to the Hebrew history would account for his being named first in the genealogy." (Hackett.)

"The most probable explanation is that Abraham was the youngest son of Terah, and was not born until Terah was one hundred and thirty years old." (Gloag.)

(c') Four hundred years. V. 6.

"The exact number of years, as we elsewhere learn, was four hundred and thirty. A round sum is here given, without taking into account the broken number." "At first sight the words in the Mosaic narrative would seem to intimate that this was the period of Egyptian bondage; but Paul understands it differently. He reckons four hundred and thirty years as extending from the call of Abraham to the giving of the law." (Gloag.) A solution is "that the four hundred and thirty years in Ex. xii. 40 embraces the period from Abraham's immigration into Canaan until the departure out of Egypt, and that the sacred writers call this the period of sojourn or servitude in Egypt." (Hackett.)

(d') Jacob's burial and Abraham's purchase. V. 16.

"With respect to the concurrence or accumulation of supposed inaccuracies in this one verse, so far from proving one another, they only aggravate the improbability of real errors having been committed, in such quick succession, and then gratuitously left on record, when they might have been so easily corrected and expunged." (Alexander.)

Many critics, including our author, have given up all attempts at reconciliation, and simply assume that Stephen, in the excitement of the occasion, has made a mistake which Luke did not feel at liberty to correct. It is a very easy way to dispose of the difficulty, to say that Stephen made a mistake; but it is not so easy to account for such a man, before such an audience, publicly stating what must have been known by many of them not to be in harmony with well-known facts of their history; and further, that it should have been recorded by such a historian, and remain without either correction or objection for many generations. Surely if conjectural emendation is ever admissible in an approved text, it would be justifiable here; and very slight alterations indeed would eliminate the difficulty. Calvin says, "It is plain that a mistake has been made in the name of Abraham." The following reading has been suggested, which requires only that an ellipsis be supplied: "And were carried into Sychem, and were laid, some of them, Jacob at least, in the sepulchre that Abraham bought for a sum of money; and others of them in that bought from the sons of Emmor, the father of Sychem." The sketch is drawn with great brevity, and the facts greatly compressed, doubtless clearly apprehended by those to whom they were stated, though not easy to disentangle and ar-
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range now. It seems as rash as it is unnecessary, in view of all the circumstances, to charge either the orator or the historian with inaccuracy or misstatement, in this address.

(x1) Cast out ... children. V. 19.

"Meyer thinks we have here the construction of the infinitive of purpose: he oppressed them in order to make them so desperate as to destroy their own children. But such a meaning does not suit the context, and is grammatically unnecessary. In Hellenistic Greek the indication of the purpose is often changed to that of the result. The reference is to the command of Pharaoh, given to the Egyptians, that they should cast out all the male infants of the Israelites into the Nile." (Gloag, also Hackett and Lange.)

"Better—in causing their young children to be cast out. The words are rather a description of what the Egyptian king did in his tyranny, than of what the Israelites were driven to by their despair." (Plumptre.)

(x1') An angel. V. 30.

There is a division of opinion as to whether this was a created angel, or the angel of Jehovah—the messenger of the covenant—the second person of the Godhead, even then appearing as the revealer of the Father. Our author, with others, adopts the former opinion, while Hackett, Alexander, Abbott, Barnes, Jacobus, with Alford, adopt the latter view, in support of which Gloag says: "The Mosaic narrative is in favor of the latter view. The Angel of the bush who guided the Israelites in the wilderness is in the O. T. frequently identified with God; and here he appropriates to himself the titles of the Supreme Being, for speaking out of the bush he says, 'I am the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob.' "
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CHAPTER VIII.

VER. 1. πάντες τὲς] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read πάντες δὲ, according to B C D E H, min. Vulg. Copt. al., and several Fathers. A, min. Syr. Aeth. have τὲς; Μ* has only πάντες; Μ** has καὶ π. The δὲ has the preponderance of testimony, and is therefore to be adopted, as also in ver. 6. — Ver. 2. ἐποίησαν] Lachm. and Born. read ἐποίησαν, according to decisive testimony. — Ver. 5. πόλν] Lachm. reads τὴν πόλιν, after A B Μ*, 31, 40. More precise definition of the capital. — Ver. 7. πολλῶν] Lachm. reads πολλαί,¹ and afterwards ἔξηρχοντο, following A B C E Μ*, min. Vulg. Sahid. Syr. utr.; ἔξηρχοντο is also in D, which, however, reads πολλοῖς (by the second hand: ἀπὸ πολλοῖς). Accordingly ἐξῆρ- χοντο, as decisively attested, is to be considered genuine (with Born. and Tisch.), from which it necessarily follows that Luke cannot have written πολλαί (which, on the contrary, was mechanically introduced from the second clause of the verse), but either πολλῶν (H) or πολλοῖς (D*). — Ver. 10. ἦ καλο- μένη] is wanting in Elz., but is distinctly attested. The omission is explained from the fact that the word appeared inappropriate, disturbing, and feeble. — Ver. 12. τὰ περὶ] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read περὶ, after A B C D E Μ*. Correctly; εἰσαγελίζ. is not elsewhere connected with περὶ, and this very circumstance occasioned the insertion of τὰ. — Ver. 13. δυνάμεις καὶ σημεία μεγάλα γινόμενα] Elz. Lachm. Born. read: σημεία κ. δυνάμεις μεγάλα γινομένας. Both modes of arrangement have important attestation. But the former is to be considered as original, with the exclusion, however, of the μεγάλα deleted by Tisch., which is wanting in many and correct codd. (also in Μ*), and is to be considered as an addition very naturally suggesting itself (comp. vi. 8) for the sake of strengthening. The later origin of the latter order of the words is proved by the circumstance that all the witnesses in favour of it have μεγάλας, and therefore it must have arisen after μεγάλα was already added. — Ver. 16. οὕτω] A B C D E Μ*, min. Chrys. have οὕδετο. Recommended by Griesb. and adopted by Rinck, Lachm. Tisch. Born. The Recep. came into the text, through the inattention of the transcribers, as the word to which they were more accustomed. — Ver. 18. On decisive evidence ἵδως is to be adopted, with Griesb. and the later editors, instead of θεασάμ. The latter is a more precise definition. — Ver. 21. ἐνώπιον] A B C D Μ*, min. and several Fathers have ἐναντίον or ἐναντ., which last Griesb. has recommended, and Lachm. Tisch. Born. have adopted. Correctly; the familiar word was inserted instead of the rare one (Luke i. 8). — Ver. 22. κυρίων] So Lachm. Tisch. Born. But Elz. Scholz have Θεοί, against preponderating evidence. A mechanical repetition, after ver. 21. — Ver. 25. The imperfects ὑπετρέφων and εἰσαγελίζοντο (Lachm. Tisch. Born.) are decisively attested, as is also the omission of τῆς before θασάλ., in ver. 27. — Ver. 27. δὲ before ἐγώλ. is wanting in Lachm. and Born., following A C* D* Μ*, Vulg. Sahid. Oec. An incorrect expedient to help the con-

¹ Instead of which, however, he (Præf. p. viii.) conjectures πολλαί.
stricture. — After ver. 36, Eiz. has (ver. 37): ἐπεξ ὅ Ἑλληνιστ.: Εἰ πιστεύεις ἕξ ὄνομα τῆς καρδίας, ἔξωςιν. 'Αποκρύπτες ὅ ἐπεξ' πιστεύω τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. This is wanting in decisive witnesses; and in those which have the words there are many variations of detail. It is defended, indeed, by Born., but is nothing else than an old (see already Iren. iii. 12; Cypr. ad Quir. iii. 43) addition for the sake of completeness. — Ver. 39. After πιστεύεις Ἀ**, min. and a few vers. and Fathers have ἄγνων ἐπέπεσον ἐπί (or εἰς) τὸν εὐνοῦχον, ἄγγελος ὅτε. A pious expansion and falsification of the history, induced partly by ver. 36 and partly by x. 44.

Ver. 1. The observation Σαῦλος... αὐτόν¹ forms the significant transition to the further narrative of the persecution which is annexed. — ἐν συνεδρίῳ ὁ ἦν jointly assenting, in concert, namely, with the originators and promoters of the ἀναίρεσις.² On ἀναίρεσις, in the sense of caedes, supplicium, comp. Num. xi. 15; Judith xv. 4; 2 Macc. v. 13; Herodian. ii. 6. 1, iii. 2. 10. Here, also, the continuance and duration are more strongly denoted by ἐν with the participle than by the mere finite tense. — ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ] is not, as is usually quite arbitrarily done, to be explained indefinitely illé tempore, but (comp. ii. 41): on that day, when Stephen was stoned, the persecution arose, for the outbreak of which this tumultuary stoning served as signal (ο'). — τὴν ἐν Ἰερους.] added, because now the dispersion (comp. xi. 19) set in. — πάντες ] a hyperbolical expression of the popular mode of narration.³ At the same time, however, the general expression τὴν ἐκκλησίαν does not permit us to limit πάντες especially to the Hellenistic part of the church.⁴ But if the hyperbolical πάντες is not to be used against the historical character of the narrative (Schneckenburger, Zeller), neither are we to read withal between the lines that the church had been formally assembled and broken up, but that to dispersion into the regions of Judaea and Samaria — which is yet so clearly affirmed of the πάντες ! — a great part of those broken up, including the apostles, had not allowed themselves to be induced (so Baumgarten). — κ. Σαμαρείας] This country only is here mentioned as introductory to the history which follows, ver. 5 ff. For a wider dispersion, see xi. 19. — πλὴν τῶν ἀποστ.] This is explained, in opposition to Schleiermacher, Schneckenburger, and others, who consider these statements improbable, by the greater steadfastness of the apostles, who were resolved as yet, and in the absence of more special divine intimation, to remain at the centre of the theocracy, which, in their view at this time, was also the centre of the new theocracy.⁵ They knew themselves to be the appointed upholders and πρωταγωγοί (Oecumenius) of the cause of their Lord.

Vv. 2, 3. The connection of vv. 1–3 depends on the double contrast,

¹ Observe the climax of the three statements concerning Saul, vii. 59, viii. 1 and 2; also how the second and third are inserted antithetically, and how all three are evidently intended to prepare the way for the subsequent importance of the man.
² Comp. Luke xi. 46, and on Rom. i. 31.
³ Matt. iii. 5; Mark iii. 33, cf.
⁴ Baar, I. p. 46, ed. 2; comp. de Wette.
⁵ Quite inappropriately, premises that πάντες, Zeller, p. 155, in opposition to this inquiry: "Wherefore was this necessary, if all their followers were dispersed?"
that in spite of the outbreak of persecution which took place on that day, the dead body of the martyr was nevertheless honoured by pious Jews; and that, on the other hand, the persecuting zeal of Saul stood in stern opposition thereto. On that day arose a great persecution, ver. 1. This, however, prevented not pious men from burying and lamenting Stephen, ver. 2; (a) but Saul laid waste, in that persecution which arose, the church (of Jerusalem, ver. 8). The common opinion is accordingly erroneous, that there prevails here a lack of connection—ver. 2 is a supplementary addition, according to de Wette—which is either to explained by the insertion of extracts from different sources, or betokens that ἵψεν ὁ δὲ ... ἀποστόλων is an interpolation, or at least it makes it necessary to hold these words as transposed, so that they had originally stood after ver. 2. 4—αθυμαίζων] to carry together, then, used of the dead who are carried to the other dead bodies at the burial-place, and generally: to bury. 5 According to the Scholiast on Soph. l.c. and Phavorinus, the expression is derived from gathering the fruits of harvest. Comp. Job v. 28. —The ἄνδρες εὐλαβείς are not, in opposition to Heinrichs and Ewald, Christians, but, as the connection requires, religious Jews who, in their pious conscientiousness (comp. ii. 5), and with a secret inclination to Christianity, had the courage to honour the innocence of him who had been stoned. Christians would probably have been prevented from doing so, and Luke would have designated them more distinctly. —κοπέτος: θρήνος μετὰ φοφοῦ χειρῶν, Hesychius. 6—ἐλ疣αινέτο] he laid waste, comp. ix. 21; Gal. i. 13. The following sentence informs us how he proceeded in doing so; therefore a colon is to be placed after τ. ἐκκλ. —κατὰ τοὺς ὅικ. εἰσπορ.] entering by houses, house by house, Matt. xxiv. 7. 8—συρόω] dragging.

Vv. 4, 5. Διῆλθον] they went through, they dispersed themselves through the countries to which they had fled. 9—Ver. 5. Of the dispersed persons active as missionaries who were before designated generally, one is now singled out and has his labours described, namely Philip, not the apostle, as is erroneously assumed by Polycrates in Eusebius, 10 but he who is named in vi. 5, xxi. 8. That the persecution should have been directed with special vehemence to the colleagues of Stephen, was very natural. Observe, however, that in the case of those dispersed, and even in that of Philip, preaching was not tied to an existing special office. With their preaching probably there was at once practically given the new ministry, that of the evangelists, xxi. 8; Eph. iv. 11, as circumstances re-

---

1 Olshausen, Bleek.
2 Ziegler in Gabler's Journ. f. theolog. Lit., I.
3 Heinrichs, Kuhn.  
4 According to Schwanbeck, p. 385, v. 1 is to be regarded as an insertion from the biography of Peter.
5 Soph. Aj. 1048; Plut. Sull. 36.  
6 Comp. Joseph of Arimathia and Nicodemus.
7 See Gen. i. 10; i Macc. ii. 70; Nicarch. 30; Plut. Flux. 17; Heyne, Obs. in T.  
   8 Winer, p. 374 (E. T. 500).
10 The οἵ μὲν οὖν διασπασθέντες is resumed at xi. 19.—a circumstance betokening that the long intervening portion has been derived from special sources here incorporated.
11 iii. 31. 2, v. 24. 1; see, on the contrary, vv. 1, 14, and generally, Zeller, p. 254 ff.; Ewald, p. 365 f.
quired, under the guidance of the Spirit. — κατ' ἅλθι, from Jerusalem. — τῆς Σαμαρ. into a city of Samaria. What city it was (Grotius and Ewald think of the capital, Olshausen thinks that it was perhaps Sichem) is to be left entirely undetermined, and was probably unknown to Luke himself. Comp. John iv. 5. Kuinoel, after Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Calovius, and others, takes τῆς Σαμαρ. as the name, not of the country, but of the capital. In that case, indeed, the article would not have been necessary before πόλιν, as Olshausen thinks. πόλις, too with the genitive of the name of the city, is a Greek idiom; but ver. 9, where τῆς Σαμαρ. is evidently the name of the country (τὰ θεωρητά), is decidedly opposed to such a view. See also on ver. 14. — ἀυτοῖς] namely, the people in that city.

Vv. 6, 7. Προσέχον] they gave heed thereto, denotes attentive, favourably disposed interest, xvi. 14; Heb. ii. 1; 1 Tim. i. 4; often in Greek writers. The explanation jdes probetabant, Krebs, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others, confounds the result of the prošèchon (ver. 12) with the prošèchon itself,—a confusion which is committed in all the passages adduced to prove it. — ἐν τῷ ἄκουσειν ἀυτοῖς κ. κτ.λ.] in their hearing, etc., while they heard. — In ver. 7, more than in v. 10, those affected by natural diseases (παραλελ. κ. χωλολ), who were healed (ἰθαραπαεθ.), are expressly distinguished from the possessed; whose demons came out (ἐκῆρσθε) with great crying. — Notice the article before ἔχοντων: of many of those who, etc., consequently, not of all. As regards the construction, πολλὰν is dependent on the τὰ πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα to be again tacitly supplied after πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα.

Ver. 9. Σιμών] is not identical, in opposition to Heumann, Krebs, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, Neander, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, with the Simon of Cyprus in Joseph., whom the Procurator Felix, at a latter period, employed to estrange Drusilla, the wife of Azizus king of Emesa in Syria, from her husband. For (1) Justin, expressly informs us that Simon was from the village Gitthon in Samaria, and Justin himself was a Samaritan, so that we can the less suppose, in his case, a confusion with the name of the Cyprian town Kīnoth. (3) The identity of name cannot, on account of its great prevalence, prove anything, and as little can the assertion that the Samaritans would hardly have deified one of their own countrymen, ver. 10. The latter is even more capable of explanation from the national pride, than it would be with respect to a Cyprian. — προσέχον] he was formerly, even before the appearance of Philip, in the city. The following μαγείων κ.τ.λ. then adds how he was occupied there; comp. Luke xxiii. 12. — μαγείων] practising magical arts, only here in the N. T. The magical exercises of the wizards, who at that time very frequently wandered about in

1 Seebaste, which was also called Samaria, Joseph. Ant. xviii. 6. 2.
3 Ruhn. ἐπιστ. p. 196.
5 Comp. Luke iv. 40 f.
6 See Matthaei, p. 1538; Kühner, II. p. 609.
7 See also Gieseler's Kirchengesch. I. sec. 18, 8, and others.
8 Ant. xx. 7. 2. Neander, p. 107 f., has entirely misunderstood the words of Josephus. See Zeiller, p. 164 f.
9 Apol. I. 25; comp. Clem. Hom. i. 15; ii. 22.
10 Thuc. i. 112. 1.
11 But see Kur. Ιφθ. 7. 1337; Meleag. 13: Clearch. in Athen. vi. p. 266 E; Jaccobs, ad Anthol. VI. p. 29.
the East, extended chiefly to an ostentatious application of their attainments in physical knowledge to juggling conjurings of the dead and demons, to influencing the gods, to sorceries, cures of the sick, south-sayings from the stars, and the like, in which the ideas and formulae of the Oriental-Greek theosophy were turned to display.¹ — τινα . . . μιγαν] We are not, accordingly, to put any more definite claim into the mouth of Simon; the text relates only generally his boasting self-exaltation, which may have expressed itself very differently according to circumstances, but always amounted to this, that he himself was a certain extraordinary person. Perhaps Simon designedly avoided a more definite self-designation, in order to leave to the praises of the people all the higher scope in the designating of that (ver. 10) which he himself wished to pass for. — εαυτον] He thus acted quite differently from Philip, who preached Christ, ver. 5. Comp. Rev. ii. 20.

Ver. 10. Προσείχων] just as in ver. 6. — ἀπό μικροῦ ἐν ἐς μεγάλον] A designation of the whole body, from little and up to great, i.e. young and old.² — εὖτετί αὐτῷ ἡ δύν. τ. Θεοῦ ἡ καλ. μεγ. this is the God-power called great. The Samaritans believed that Simon was the power emanating from God, and appearing and working among them as a human person, which, as the highest of the divine powers, was designated by them with a specific appellation κατ' εἰκόνιν as the μεγάλη. Probably the Oriental-Alexandrine idea of the world-creating manifestation of the hidden God, the Logos, which Philo also calls μητρόπολις πασῶν τῶν δυνάμεων τοῦ Θεοῦ, had become at that time current among them, and they saw in Simon this effluence of the Godhead rendered human by incarnation,—a belief which Simon certainly had been cunning enough himself to excite and to promote, and which makes it more than probable that the magician, to whom the neighbouring Christianity could not be unknown, designed in the part which he played to present a phenomenon similar to Christ; comp. Ewald. The belief of the Samaritans in Simon was thus, as regards its tenor, an analogue of the ὁ λόγος σάρξ ἐγενετο, and hence served to prepare for the true and definite faith in the Messiah, afterwards preached to them by Philip: the former became the bridge to the latter. Erroneously Phialastr. Haer. 29; and recently Olshausen, de Wette, and others, put the words ή δύναμις κατ' εἰκόνιν into the mouth of Simon himself, so that they are held only to be an echo of what the sorcerer had boastingly said of himself.³ This is con-

² Comp. Heb. viii. 11; Acts xxi. 28; Bar. i. 4; Judith xiii. 4. 15; 1 Macc. v. 45; LXX. Gen. xix. 11; Jer. xlii. 1, al.
³ According to Jerome on Matth. xxiv., he asserted of himself: "Ego sum sermo Dei, ego sum speciosa, ego paracletus, ego omnipotens, ego omnia Dei." Certainly an invention of the later Simoulanos, who transferred specifically Christian elements of faith to Simon. But this and similar things which were put into the mouth of Simon (that he was ἀνωτέρω τις δύναμις καὶ αὐτῷ τῶν κάτω ἐκείνων θεό̣ν, Chem. Hom. ii. 22, 25; that he was the same who had appeared among the Jews as the Son, but had come among the Samaritans as the Father, and among other nations as the Holy Spirit, Iren. i. 23), and were wonderfully diluted on by opponents, point back to a relation of incarnation analogous to the incarnation of the Logos, under which the adherents of Simon conceived him. De Wette incorrectly denies this, referring the expression, "the great power of
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try to the text, which expressly distinguishes the opinion of the infatuated people here from the assertion of the magician himself, ver. 9. He had characterized himself *indefinitely*; they judged *definitely* and confessed (λέγουσιν) the highest that could be said of him; and, in doing so, accorded with the intention of the sorcerer.

Ver. 12. *They believed Philip, who announced the good news of the kingdom of God and of the name of Jesus Christ.*—εὐαγγελίζην, only here (see the critical remarks) with περί.1—The Samaritans called the Messiah whom they expected Ἰσραήλ or Ἰσραήλ, the *Conquerer,* and considered Him as the universal, not merely political, but still more religious and moral, Renower. See on John iv. 25.

Ver. 13. *Epierpote* also on his part (κ. αὐτός), like the other Samaritans, he became *believing,* namely, likewise ὁ Φαίλιππος εὐαγγελίζομεν κ.τ.λ. (f1). Entirely at variance with the text is the opinion2 that Simon regarded Jesus only as a great magician and worker of miracles, and not as the Messiah, and only to this extent believed on Him. He was, by the preaching and miracles of Philip, actually moved to faith in Jesus as the Messiah. Yet this faith of his was only historical and intellectual, without having as its result a change of the inner life;3 hence he was soon afterwards capable of what is related in vv. 18, 19. The real μετάνοια is not excited in him, even at ver. 24. Cyril aptly remarks: ἰδανίσθη, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐφορείσθη. — ἐξαστατάτων he, who had formerly been himself ἐξαστατόν τῷ Θεῷ!

Vv. 14–17. *Or in Ἠρωος, ἀπόστ.]* applies, according to ver. 1, to all the

God," to the notion of an *angel.* This is too weak; all the ancient accounts concerning Simon, as well as concerning his alleged companion Helenus, the all-bearing mother of angels and powers, betoken a *Messianic* part which he played; to which also the name Ἕρως, by which he designated himself according to the Clemensine points, points this name (hardly correctly explained by Ritcehie, *altdath. Kirche,* p. 286 f., from ἀνερχόμενον, Deut. xxvii. 15, 18) denotes the *imperishable* and *unchangeable.* See, besides, concerning Simon and his doctrine according to the Clemensine, Uhnhorn, *de Homil. s. Recognt. des Clemens Rom.* p. 281 ff.; Zeller, p. 159 ff.; and concerning his doctrine of the Aesons and Syzygtes, *Philosoph. Orig.* vi. 7 ff. According to Baur and Zeller, the magician never existed at all; and the *legend* concerning him, which arose from Christian polemics directed against the Samaritan worship of the sun-god, the Oriental Hercules (Baal-Melkarth), is nothing else than a hostile *travesty* of the *Apostle Paul* and his antagonistic labours. Comp. also Hilgenfeld, *d. clement. Recognt.* p. 319 f.; Volckmar in the *theol. Jahrbr.* 1865, p. 270 ff. The Book of Acts has, in their view, admitted this legend about Simon, but has cut off the reference to Paul. Thus the state of the case is exactly reversed. The history of Simon Magus in our passage was amplified in the Clementine in an anti-Pauline interest. The Book of Acts has not cut off the hostile reference to Paul; but the Clementines have added it, and accordingly have dressed out the history with a view to combat Paulinism and Gnosticism, indeed have here and there caricatured Paul himself as Simon. We set to work unhistorically, if we place the simple narratives of the N. T. on a parallel with later historical excrescences and disfigurements, and by means of the latter attack the former as likewise fabulous representations. Our narrative contains the historical germ, from which the later legends concerning Simon Magus have luxuriantly developed themselves; the Samaritan worship of the sun and moon has nothing whatever to do with the history of Simon.

1 But see Rom. i. 3; Josephus, *Ant.* xv. 7. 2.
2 Grotius, Claricus, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel.
3 Bengel well remarks: "Agnovit, virtutem Del non esse in se, sed in Philippo. . . Non tamen pertinuit ad idem plenam, justissimam, cor purificantem, salvantem, tametid ad eam pervenisse speciosae videreur, donec se alter prordidit."
apostles, to the apostolic college, which commissioned two of its most distinguished members, Gal. ii. 9. — Σαμάρεια] here also the name of the country; see vv. 5, 9. From the success which the missionary labours of Philip had in that single city, dates the conversion of the country in general, and so the fact: δόθηκαί ἐγείρετον σαμαρεῖσκος τοῦ λόγου τοῦ θεοῦ (1). — The design of the mission of Peter and John1 (κ') is certainly, according to the text, in opposition to Schneckenburger, to be considered as that which they actually did after their arrival, ver. 15: to pray for the baptized, in order that δι’ αὐτόν they might receive the Holy Spirit (1). Not as if, in general, the communication of the Spirit had been exclusively bound up with the prayer and the imposition of the hands (vv. 17, 18) of an actual apostle; nor yet as if here under the Spirit we should have to conceive something peculiar:2 but the observation, ver. 16, makes the baptism of the Samaritans without the reception of the Spirit appear as something extraordinary: the epoch-making advance of Christianity beyond the bounds of Judaea into Samaria was not to be accomplished without the intervention of the direct ministry of the apostles.3 Therefore the Spirit was reserved until this apostolic intervention occurred. To explain the matter from the designed omission of prayer for the Holy Spirit on the part of Philip,4 or from the subjectivity of the Samaritans, whose faith had not yet penetrated into the inner life,5 has no justification in the text, the more especially as there is no mention of any further instruction by the apostles, but only of their prayer, and imposition of hands,6 in the effect of which certainly their greater εὐαγγελία, as compared with that of Philip as the mere evangelist, was historically made apparent, because the nascent church of Samaria was not to develop its life otherwise than in living connection with the apostles themselves.7 The miraculous element of the apostolic influence is to be recognised as connected with the whole position and function of the apostles, and not to be referred to a sphere of view belonging to a later age (Zeller, Holtzmann). — δέδεται] has received.8 — καταβαίνετε] namely, to Samaria situated lower. — οἶδαν γὰρ ἐν ἡνεκαίρου [for as yet not at all, etc. — μόνον δὲ

1 Which Baur (I. p. 47, ed. 3) derives from the interest of Judaism to place the new churches in a position of dependence on Jerusalem, and to prevent too free a development of the Hellenistic principle. See, on the other hand, Schneckenburger in the Stud. u. Krit. 1865, p. 542 ff., who, however, likewise gratuitously imports the opinion that the conversion of the Samaritans appeared suspicious and required a more exact examination.  
2 τό γὰρ στρατός, Chrysostom, comp. Besa, Calvin.  
3 Comp. Baumgarten, p. 176 ff.  
4 Hofmann, Schriften. II. 2, p. 22.  
5 Neander, p. 80 f., 104.  
6 Ver. 15, comp. with vv. 17, 18, shows clearly the relation of prayer to the imposition of hands. The prayer obtained from God the communication of the Spirit, but the imposition of hands, after the Spirit had been prayed for, became the vehicle of the communication. It was certainly of a symbolical nature, yet not a bare and ineffective symbol, but the effective conductor of the gifts prayed for. Comp. on vi. 6. In xix. 5 also it is applied after baptism, and with the result of the communication of the Spirit. On the other hand, at x. 48, it would have come too late. If it is not especially mentioned in cases of ordinary baptism, where the operation of the Spirit was not bound up with the apostolic imposition of hands as here (see 1 Cor. 14-17, xii. 13; Tit. iii. 5), it is to be considered as obvious of itself (Heb. vi. 2).  
7 Surely this entirely peculiar state of matters should have withheld the Catholics from grounding the doctrine of confirmation on our passage (as even Beelen does).  
8 See xvii. 7; Winer, p. 945 (E. T. 388); Valcken. p. 437.
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but they found themselves only in the condition of baptized ones, not at the same time also furnished with the Spirit.

Ver. 18. The communication of the Spirit was visible (ἰδὼν, see the critical remarks) in the gestures and gesticulations of those who had received it, perhaps also in similar phenomena to those which took place at Pentecost in Jerusalem.—Did Simon himself receive the Spirit? Certainly not, as this would have rendered him incapable of so soon making the offer of money. He saw the result of the apostolic imposition of hands on others,—thereupon his impatient desire waits not even for his own experience—the power of the apostolic prayer would have embraced him also and filled him with the Spirit—and, before it came to his turn to receive the imposition of hands, he makes his proposal, perhaps even as a condition of allowing the hands to be laid upon him. The opinion of Kinoel, that from pride he did not consider it at all necessary that the hands should be laid on him, is entirely imaginary. The motive of his proposal was selfishness in the interest of his magical trade; very naturally he valued the communication of the Spirit, to the inward experience of which he was a stranger, only according to the surprising outward phenomena, and hence saw in the apostles the possessors of a higher magical power still unknown to himself, the possession of which he as a sorcerer coveted, "ne quid sibi desset ad ostentationem et quaestum," Erasmus.

Vv. 20, 21. Thy money be along with thee unto destruction; i.e. let perdition, Messianic penal destruction, come upon thy money and thyself! The sin-money, in the lofty strain of the language, is set forth as something personal, capable of ἀπώλεια. —εἶπες ἐὰν ἀπώλεια. a usual attraction: fall into destruction and be in it. —τὴν δοκεῶν τῶν θεῶν τὴν ἐονίαν ταύτην, ἵνα κ.τ.λ., ver. 19. Observe the antithetically chosen designation. —ἐνέργειας thou wast minded, namely, in the proposal made. —μερις σοῦ κλήρος synonyms, of which the second expresses the idea figuratively: part nor lot. The utterance is earnest. —ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ in this word, i.e. in the ἐνεργεία to be the medium of the Spirit, which was in question. Lange gratuitously imports the idea: in this word, which flows from the hearts of believers moved by the Spirit. λόγος of the "ipsa causa, de qua discipitant," is very current also in classical writers. Others, as Olshausen and Neander after Grotius, explain λόγος of the gospel, all share in whose blessings is cut off from Simon. But then this reference must have been suggested by the context, in which, however, there is no mention at all of doctrine. —ἐνέργεια straight, i.e. upright, 4 for Simon thought to acquire (κτάσσαι) an ἐνεργεία not destined for him, from immoral motives, and by an unrighteous means. Herein lies the immoral nature of simony, whose source is selfishness.

Vv. 22, 23. Ἀπὸ τῆς κακίας. i.e. turning thee away from, Heb. vi. 1. Comp. on 2 Cor. xi. 3. —εἰ ἄρα ἰσχύσει ταύται entreat the Lord (God,
ver. 21), and try thereby, whether perhaps, as the case may stand, there will be forgiven, etc. Comp. on Mark xi. 18; Rom. i. 10. Peter, on account of the high degree of the transgression, represents the forgiveness on repentance still as doubtful. Kuinoel, after older expositors, thinks that the doubt concerns the conversion of Simon, which was hardly to be hoped for. At variance with the text, which to the fulfilment of the μετανοεῖν, without which forgiveness was not at all conceivable, annexes still the problematic καὶ ἀρα. Concerning the direct expression by the future, see Winer, p. 285 (E. T. 376). — ὑ ἐπιστοιχεῖα the (conscious) plan, the project, is a ποιεῖν media, which receives its reference in bonam, or as here in malam partem, entirely from the context. — For I perceive thee fallen into and existing in gall of bitterness and in band of iniquity, i.e. for I recognise thee as a man who has fallen into bitter enmity against the gospel as into gall, and into iniquity as into binding fetters. Both genitives are to be taken alike, namely, as genitives of opposition; hence χαῖρε πικρία is not σέ φαλ αμαρών, as is usually supposed, in which case, besides, πικρία would only be tame and self-evident. On the contrary, πικρία is to be taken in the ethical sense, a bitter, malignant, and hostile disposition; often in the classical writers, which, figuratively represented, is gall, into which Simon had fallen. In the corresponding representation, ἄδεια is conceived as a band which encompassed him. Comp. Isa. lviii. 6. Others render σύνδεσμος, bundle. So Alberti, Wolf, Wetstein, Valckenaer, Kuinoel, and others, including Ewald. But in this way the genitive would not be taken uniformly with πικρίας, and we should expect instead of ἄδειας a plural expression. Ewald, moreover, concludes from these words that a vehement contest had previously taken place between Peter and Simon,—a point which must be left undetermined, as the text indicates nothing of it. — εἶναι εἰς[ε] stands as in ver. 20. Lange, at variance with the words, gratuitously imports the notion: "that thou wilt prove to be a poison . . . in the church."

Ver. 24. Ταύτης] whose prayer must be more effectual. On ὑπερθ. with πρός, comp. Ps. lxiv. 1. — διάκρις μητρίκας κ.τ.λ. ] "poenae metum, non culpae horrorem fatetur," Bengel. A humiliation has begun in Simon, but it refers to the apostolic threat of punishment, the realization of which he wishes to avert, not to the ground of this threat, which lay in his own heart and could only be removed by a corresponding repentance. Hence, also, his conversion, which even Calvin conjectures to have taken place, does not ensue. It

1 Not as if it were thereby made dependent on the caprice of God (de Wette’s objection), but because God, in presence of the greatness of the guilt, could only forgive on the corresponding sincerity and truth of the repentance and believing prayer; and how doubtful was this with such a mind! The whole greatness of the danger was to be brought to the consciousness of Simon, and to quicken him to the need of repentance and prayer.
2 Macc. xii. 45; Ar. Theaem. 786. at.
3 See the passages in Kypke, II. p. 43, and from Philo in Loosner, p. 198 f.
4 Rom. iii. 14; Eic. iv. 31.
6 Comp. Herodian. iv. 12. 11.
8 Comp. also Thiersch, Kirche im apost. Zeit. p. 91.
9 Comp. ebrard.
would, as a brilliant victory of the apostolic word, not have been omitted; and in fact the ecclesiastical traditions concerning the stedfastly continued conflict of Simon with the Jewish-apostolic gospel, in spite of all the strange and contradictory fables mixed up with it down to his overthrow by Peter at Rome, testify against the occurrence of that conversion at all.

Vv. 25, 26. Τὸν λόγον τ. κυρ. The word which they spoke was not their word, but Christ’s, who caused the gospel to be announced by them as His ministers and interpreters. But the auctor principalis is God (x. 36), hence the gospel is still more frequently called ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, iv. 29, 31, vi. 2, and frequently. — πολλαὶ τὰ κόμας . . . εἰναι.] namely, on their way back to Jerusalem. — εἰναι μέτα του κυρίου, with the accusative of the person, is rare, and belongs to the later Greek. — ἀγγελός δὲ κυρίου] is neither to be rationalized with Eichhorn to the effect, that what is meant is the sudden and involuntary rise of an internal impulse not to be set aside; nor with Olshausen to the effect, that what is designated is not a being appearing individually, but a spiritual power, by which a spiritual communication was made to Philip; the language is, in fact, not figurative, as in John i. 52, but purely historical. On the contrary, Luke narrates an actual angelic appearance, that spoke literally to Philip. This appearance must, in respect of its form, be left undefined, as a vision in a dream, is not indicated in the text, not even by ἀνατεθή, which rather (raise thyself) belongs to the pictorial representation; comp. on v. 17. Philip received this angelic intimation in Samaria, in opposition to Zeller, who makes him to have returned with the apostles to Jerusalem, while the two apostles were on their way back to Jerusalem. — Γάζα, Ναβ. i.e. the strong, a strongly fortified Philistine city, situated on the Mediterranean, on the southern border of Canaan. It was conquered, and destroyed, by Alexander the Great, — a fate which, after many vicissitudes, befell it afresh under the Jewish King Alexander Jannaeus, in B.C. 96. Rebuilt as New Gaza farther to the south by the Proconsul Gabinius, B.C. 58, the city was incorporated with the province of Syria. Its renewed, though not total destruction by the Jews occurred not long before the siege of Jerusalem. It is now the open town Ghuzzeh. — αἰγύ περί τοῦ ἴππου] applies to the way, von Raumer, Robinson, Winer, Buttmann, Ewald, Baumgarten, Lange, and older commentators, as Castalio, Beza, Bengel, and others. As several roads led from Jerusalem to Gaza, and still lead, the angel specifies the road, which he means, more exactly by the statement: this way is desolate, i.e. it is a desert way, leading through solitary and little cultivated districts. Such a road still exists; see Robinson, i.e. The object of this more precise specification can according to the text only be this, that Philip should take no other road

---

1 Comp. xiii. 48 f., xv. 33 f., xix. 10, 20.
2 Luke iii. 15; Acts xiv. 31, xvi. 10.
3 See Lobbeck, ad Phryn. p. 327 f.
4 Eickermann, Heinrichs, Kolnoel.
5 Gen. x. 19; Josh. xv. 43; Judg. iii. 3, xvi. 1; 1 Macc. xi. 10.
7 Plut. Alex. 35; Curt. iv. 6.
8 Strabo, xvi. 2. 30, p. 759.
9 Joseph. Antiq. xiii. 13. 3. Bell. i. 4. 2.
11 See Robinson, II. p. 748.
12 Comp. 2 Sam. ii. 9. LXX.
than that on which he would not miss, but would really encounter, the Ethiopian. The angel wished to direct him right surely. Other designs are imported without any ground in the text, as, e.g., that he wished to raise him above all fear of the Jews, or to describe the locality as suitable for undisturbed evangelical operations, and for deeper conversation, or even to indicate that the road must now be spiritually prepared and constructed (Lange). ἵππος stands without the article, because it is conceived altogether qualitatively. If αὐτὴ is to be referred to Gaza, and the words likewise to be ascribed to the angel, we should have to take ἵππος as destroyed, and to understand these words of the angel as an indication that he meant not the rebuilt New Gaza, but the old Gaza lying in ruins. But this would be opposed, not indeed to historical correctness (see Stark), but yet to the connection, for the event afterwards related happened on the way, and this way was to be specified. Others consider the words as a gloss of Luke. But if αὐτὴ is to be referred to the way, is is difficult to see what Luke means by that remark. If it is to indicate that the way is not, or no longer, passable, this has no perceptible reference to the event which is related. But if, as Wieseler, p. 401, thinks, it is meant to point to the fact that the Ethiopian on this solitary way could read without being disturbed, and aloud, no reader could possibly guess this, and at any rate Luke would not have made the remark till ver. 28. If, on the other hand, we refer αὐτὴ in this supposed remark of Luke to the city, we can only assume, with Hug and Lekebusch, p. 419 f., that Luke has meant its destruction, which took place in the Jewish war. But even thus the notice would have no definite object in relation to the narrative, which is concerned not with the city, but with the way as the scene of the event. Hug and Lekebusch indeed suppose that the recent occurrence of the destruction induced Luke to notice it here on the mention of Gaza; but it is against this view in its turn, that Luke did not write till a considerable time after the destruction of Jerusalem. Reland, Wolf, Krebs, inappropriately interpret ἵππος as unfortified, which the context must have suggested, and which would yield a very meaningless remark. Wassenberg, Heinrichs, and Kuinoel take refuge in the hypothesis of an interpolated gloss.

Ver. 27. Kai ἰδοὺ [And behold (there was) a man. Comp. on Matt. iii. 17. — ἰδοὺ ἵππος δυνάστης] is, seeing that δυνάστης is a substantive, most simply taken, not conjointly, a power-wielding eunuch, after the analogy of Herod. ii. 32: ἀνδρῶν δυνάστων παιδε, but separately: a eunuch, one wielding power, so that there is a double opposition. The more precise description what kind of wielder of power he was, follows, chief treasurer, γαστερίδας. The express mention of his sexual character is perhaps connected with the

1 Chrysostom, Oecumenius.
2 Bamberg.
3 Ewald, Joh. V. p. 227.
4 So Stark, I.e. c. p. 510 ff., following Erasmus, Calvin, Grotius, and others.
5 De Wette, Wieseler, and others, following older interpreters.
6 Joseph. Bell. ii. 18. 1.
7 See Introduction, sec. 8.
8 As in the passages in Sturm, Lex. Xen. ii. p. 539.
9 Comp. Ecclus. viii. 1.
10 See Bornemann in loc.
11 Plut. Mor. p. 863 C ; Athen. vi. p. 261 B.
universalism of Luke, in contrast to Deut. xxiii. 1. In the East, eunuchs were taken not only to be overseers of the harem, but also generally to fill the most important posts of the court and the closet; hence ἐνυόχος is often employed generally of court officials, without regard to corporeal mutilation. Many therefore, Cornelius a Lapide, de Dieu, Kuinoel, Olshausen, suppose that the Ethiopian was not emasculated, for he is called ἀνέφ and he was not a complete Gentile, as Eusebius and Nicephorus would make him, but, according to ver. 80 ff., a Jew, whereas Israelitish citizenship did not belong to emasculated persons. But if so, εὐνοῦχος, with which, moreover, the general word ἀνέφ is sufficiently compatible, would be an entirely superfluous term. The very fact, however, that he was an officer of the first rank in the court of a queen, makes it most probable that he was actually a eunuch; and the objection drawn from Deut. l.e. is obviated by the very natural supposition that he was a proselyte of the gate, comp. on John xii. 20. That this born Gentile, although a eunuch, had been actually received into the congregation of Israel (Baumgarten), and accordingly a proselyte of righteousness, as Calovius and others assumed, cannot be proved either from Isa. lvi. 8–6, where there is a promise of the Messianic future, in the salvation of which even Gentiles and eunuchs were to share; nor from the example of Ebedmelech, Jer. xxxviii. 7 ff., considered by Baumgarten as the type of the chamberlain, of whom it is not said that he was a complete Jew; nor can it be inferred from the distant journey of the man and his quick reception of baptism, which is a very arbitrary inference. Eusebius, ii. 1, also designates him as προσελκυόμενος ἐκ ἡλικίας, who had been converted. Ἐφεσός was, like Pharaoh among the Egyptian kings, the proper name in common of the queens of Ethiopia, which still in the times of Eusebius was governed by queens. Their capital was Nisaba. — On γάζα, a word received from the Persian, “pecuniari regim, quam gazon Persae vocant,” into Greek and Latin. — ἰνι, as in vi. 3. Nepos, Dotam. 5: “gazae custos regiae.” — Tradition, with as much uncertainty as improbability, calls the Ethiopian Indich and Judich, and makes him,—what is without historical proof, doubtless, but in itself not improbable, though so early a permanent establishment of Christianity in Ethiopia is not historically known,—the first preacher of the gospel among his countrymen, whose queen the legend with fresh invention makes to be baptized by him.

Vv. 28–31. He read aloud (see ver. 30), and most probably from the LXX. translation widely diffused in Egypt. Perhaps he had been induced by what he had heard in Jerusalem of Jesus and of his fate to occupy himself

---

3 Deut. xxiv. 1; Michaelis, Mos. R. II. § 95, IV. § 195; Ewald, Alerth. p. 918.
4 He might even have been married. See Gen. xxxix. 1, and Knobel in loc.
5 Lange, apost. Zeitatt. II. p. 199.
6 See Strabo, xvii. 1. 54, p. 850; Dio Cass. liv. 5; Plin. N. H. vi. 25. 7. [140 ff.
8 Curt. iii. 13. 5.
9 See Serv. ad Vergil. Am. i. 119, vol. i. p. 20, ed. Lion, and Wetstein in loc.
10 Bzovius, Annal. ad a. 1594, p. 549.
11 Ludolf, Comm. ad Hist. Aeth. p. 80 f.
12 Niceph. ii. 6.
on the way with Isaiah in particular, the Evangelist among the prophets, and with this very section concerning the Servant of God. Ver. 34 is not opposed to this. — εἰς δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα denotes the address of the Holy Spirit inwardly apprehended. Comp. x. 19. — κολλήσειταί attach thyself to, separate not thyself from.¹ — ἀρά γε γινώσκεις καὶ ἀναγινώσκεις;] For instances of a similar paronomasia,² see Winer, p. 591 [E. T. 794 f.]. Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 2; 2 Thess. iii. 11. ἀρά, num (with the strengthening γέ), stands here as ordinarily: “ut aliquid sive vere sive factae dubitationis admisscat.”³ Philip doubts whether the Ethiopian was aware of the Messianic reference of the words which he read. — πῶς γάρ ἀν ὄνωπιν κ.τ.λ.] an evidence of humility and susceptibility. ἀν, with the optative, denotes the subjective possibility conditionally conceived and consequently undecided.⁴ γάρ is to be taken without a no to be supplied before it: How withal. as the matter stands. See on Matt. xxvii. 23.

Vv. 32, 33. But the contents of the passage of Scripture which he read was this. τῆς γραφῆς] is here restricted by ἢν ἀνεγίνωσκεν to the notion of a single passage, as also, ver. 35, by ταύτης.⁵ Luther has given it correctly. But many others refer ἢν ἀνεγίνωσκεν to ἕν περιοχή: “locus autem scripturae, quem legebant, hic erat,” Kuinoel, following the Vulgate. But it is not demonstrable that περιοχή signifies a section; even in the places cited to show this,⁶ it is to be taken as here: what is contained in the passage,⁷ and this is then verbally quoted.⁸ — ὡς προβατὸν κ.τ.λ.] Isa. iii. 7, 8, with unimportant variation from the LXX.⁹ The subject of the whole oracle is the θησία θησις, i.e. according to the correct Messianic understanding of the apostolic church, the Messiah.¹⁰ The prophetic words, as Luke gives them, are as follows: As a sheep He has been led to the slaughter; and as a lamb, which is dumb before its shearer, so He opens not His mouth. In His humiliation His judgment was taken away; i.e. when He had so humbled Himself to the bloody death, comp. Phil. ii. 8, the judicial fate imposed on Him by God was taken from Him, so that now therefore the culmination and crisis of His destiny set in, comp. Phil. ii. 9. But His offspring who shall describe? i.e. how indescribably great is the multitude of those belonging to Him, of whom He will now be the family Head, comp. Phil. ii. 10! for ground of the origin of this immeasurable progenies, His life is taken away from the earth, so that He enters upon His heavenly work relieved from the trammels of earth.¹¹ geared does not, any more than ἐν ἔσο που, signify duration of life.¹²

¹ Compare Ruth ii. 8; Tob. vi. 17; 1 Macc. vii. 21.
² Compare the well-known saying of Julian: ἄνεγίνωσκε, ἄνεγίνωσκε, καταγίνωσκε.
⁴ See Kühner, § 467. [xii. 10.
⁵ Comp. l. 16; Luke iv. 21; and on Mark.
⁶ Comp. ad All. xiii. 25, and Stob. Ed. phys. p. 164 A.
⁷ Heych. Suld.: ὑστόθεσι.
⁸ Comp. the use of περιοχῆς, 1 Pet. ii. 6, and Huther in loc.
⁹ Which, however, deviates considerably, and in part erroneously, from the original Hebrew.
¹⁰ Matt. viii. 17; Mark xv. 38; John xil. 38 ff., 1. 29; 1 Pet. ii. 22 ff. Comp. the waif τοῦ Θεοῦ, iii. 13, 20, iv. 27, 30.
¹¹ The designation of His destiny of suffering as ἡ κρίσις αὐτῶν presupposes the idea of its vicarious and propitiatory character.
¹² Comp. John xil. 32; Rom. v. 10, viii. 29, 34, xiv. 9.
¹³ Luther, Beza, Calvin, and others.
The explanation, also, of the indescribably wicked race of the contemporaries of Christ, who proved their depravity by putting Him to death (ὅπερ αἰτέσθαι κ.τ.λ.), is inappropriate. Such is the view I have previously taken, with de Wette and older commentators. But in this way the prophecy would be diverted from the person of the Messiah, and that to something quite obvious of itself; whereas, according to the above explanation, the αἰτέσθαι ἀπὸ τ. γ. ἢ ζωη ἄνερ. stands in thoughtful and significant correlation to ἢ κρίειν ἄνερ τοῦ ἡμῶν. In these correlates lies the ὀκακοσύνη of the Humbled one, John xvi. 10. The Fathers have explained γενέα in the interest of orthodoxy, but here irrelevantly, of the eternal generation of the Son.\(^1\)

Vv. 34–38. Ἀποκριθεὶς] for Philip had placed himself beside him in the chariot, ver. 81; and this induced the eunuch, desirous of knowledge and longing for salvation, to make his request, in which, therefore, there was so far involved a reply to the fact of Philip having at his solicitation joined him. — The question is one of utter unconcealed ignorance, in which, however, it is intelligently clear to him on what doubtful point he requires instruction. — ἀνοίγας κ.τ.λ. a pictorial trait, in which there is here implied something solemn in reference to the following weighty announcement.\(^2\) — κατὰ τὴν οὖν] along the way.\(^3\) — τὴν καλέσα] σφόδρα ψυχῆς τούτο ἐκκαμωμένης, Chrysostom. — βαπτισθήσεται] Certainly in the εὐχερένσιον αὐτῷ τῶν Ἰησοῦν there was comprehended also instruction concerning baptism. — Ver. 38. Observe the simply emphatic character of the circumstantial description. — ἵκλησεν] to the charioteer. — Beza erroneously supposes that the water in which the baptism took place was the river Eleutherus. According to Jerome, de locis Ἰουρ., it was at the village Bethserson. Robinson, II. p. 749, believes that he has discovered it on the road from Beit Jibrin to Gaza. For other opinions and traditions, see Hackett, p. 157; Sepp., p. 34.

Vv. 39, 40. Luke relates an involuntary removal\(^4\) of Philip effected by the Spirit of God (εὐαγγ.)\(^5\) He now had to apply himself to further work, after the design of the Spirit (ver. 29) had been attained in the case of the Ethiopian. The Spirit snatched him away (comp. John vi. 15), in which act not only the impulse and the impelling power, but also the mode, is conceived of as miraculous—as a sudden unseen transportatio as far as Ashdod, ver. 40. The sudden and quick hurrying away which took place on the impulse of the Spirit is the historical element in the case, to which tradition, and how easily this was suggested by the O. T. conception, annexed, in addition to the miraculous operative cause, also the miraculous mode of the event. But to go even beyond this admission, and to allow merely the country and person of the converted Ethiopian to pass as historical (Zeller), is wholly without warrant with such an operation of angel and Spirit as the narrative contains, when viewed in connection with the

---

\(^1\) See Sinler, Thes. I. p. 764.
\(^2\) See on Matt. v. 2; 2 Cor. vi. 11. Comp. Acts x. 34.
\(^3\) See Winer, p. 874 (E. T. 460).
\(^4\) The excellent Bengel strangely remarks: that one or other of the apostles may have gone even to America ""pari trajectu."
\(^5\) Comp. 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4; 1 Thess. iv. 17; Ezek. iii. 14; 1 Kings xviii. 12; 2 Kings ii. 16; also what happened to Habakkuk in Bel and the Dragon, 33.
\(^6\) Kuinoel, Oshawen, Comp. also Lange, apost. Zeit/a.b. II. p. 112.
\(^7\) In 1 Kings xviii. 13; 2 Kings ii. 16.
supersensitive causal domain of N. T. facts in general.—ἐπορεύοντας ὑπὸ κ. ζ. λ. he obtained no further sight of Philip, for he made no halt, nor did he take another road in order to seek again him who was removed from him, but he went on his way with joy, namely, over the salvation obtained in Christ (comp. xvi. 84). He knew that the object of his meeting with Philip was accomplished. — εἰς Ἀσσοῦστα] He was found removed to Ashdod. Transported thither, he again became visible. — Ἀσσοῦστα ἡ πόλις, Josh. xiii. 3, 1 Sam. v. 5, was a Philistine city, the seat of a prince; after its destruction by Jonathan rebuilt by Gabinius, 270 stadia to the north of Gaza, to the west of Jerusalem, now as a village named Beulah. — Κασαρία is the celebrated Κασαρία, so called in honour of Augustus, built by Herod I. on the site of the Castellum Stratonicus,—the residency of the Roman procurators, on the Mediterranean, sixty-eight miles north-west of Jerusalem; it became the abode of Philip; see xxi. 8. He thus journeyed northward from Ashdod, perhaps through Ekron, Ramah, Joppa, and the plain of Sharon. There is no reason to regard the notice εἰς ... Κασαρίαν as prophetic, and to assume that Philip, at the time of the conversion of Cornelius, x. 1 ff., was not yet in Caesarea, seeing that Cornelius is by special divine revelation directed to Peter, and therefore has no occasion to betake himself to Philip.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(a) A great persecution. V. 1.

On the very day of the murder of Stephen, a fierce persecution began against the church. Probably the mob may have hastened from the scene of outrage and violence to the assemblies of the believers, in order to disperse them. This violent, sudden outbreak against those who, until now, had been not only tolerated, but apparently approved, arose doubtless from the fact that Stephen, who was a Greek, had not only preached Jesus, but had declared that the city and temple would be destroyed, and the gospel preached to all nations. The Pharisees, hitherto neutral, now made common cause with their rivals, the Sadducees, against the sect. The prudent cautions of Gamaliel were ignored; the agents of the civil government interfered not for the protection of the Christians, and the wild fury of fanatical bigotry, maddened by blood, rushed upon the defenceless witnesses for the truth, and scattered them. Thus by the violence of the enemies of Christ his followers were compelled to carry out his purpose intimated in Acts i. 8. The dispersion must have been very general, though not absolutely universal, as some, beside the apostles, must have remained, since Saul immediately afterward began to seize and imprison both men and women.

1 Winer, pp. 387, 573 (E. T. 516, 759); Butt-ann, neut. Gr. p. 287 (E. T. 383).
2 Comp. xxi. 18; Esth. i. 5; Xen. Anab. iii. 4. 13: εἰς τοῦτο δὲ τῶν αὐτόμον τεταρταγμένης ἐκθέσει, 2 Mac. i. 38.
3 Herod. ii. 197; Dio. lxxx. 35; in Strabo, xvi. 29, p. 739; oxytone, incorrectly; see Lipsius, gramm. Unters. p. 80.
4 Joseph. Ant. xiv. 5. 3.
6 Schleiermacher, Lekebusch, Laurent.
NOTES.

(8.) Devout men carried Stephen. V. 2.

How touching and affecting is the simple statement of Luke concerning the burial of Stephen, when contrasted with a subsequent elaborate legend: that “Gamaliel appeared in a vision to Lucius, a presbyter of the church at Jerusalem, and informed him where the body of Stephen lay. The high priest had designed that the corpse should be devoured by beasts of prey; but Gamaliel rescued it, and buried it at his own villa at Caphar Gariala, twenty miles from Jerusalem. All the apostles attended the funeral, and the mourning lasted forty days. Gamaliel himself, and Nicodemus, were afterward buried in the same grave. The relics of Stephen, thus miraculously discovered, were brought to Jerusalem, and authenticated by many miracles wrought by them among the people.”

When the first martyr “fell asleep,” “Saul was consenting unto his death,” but we do not find him attending the funeral. He believed that one who was promulgating doctrines subversive of the true religion had met a severe but deserved fate. While doubtless pitying the sufferings of the man, he rejoiced in the doom of the heretic, and hastened to bring others to a similar end. The two men met once and parted, one to enter into the joy of his Lord, the other to lay waste the church of Christ. The late Rev. William Arnot says: “I have often tried to conceive the scene at the next meeting of these two men, when Saul also became a martyr and joined the general assembly and church of the firstborn.” “We have not the means of determining whether Stephen or Saul owed most to the Lord. By looking on the surface of the sea we cannot tell what place is deepest; but we know that all places, alike the deepest and the shallowest, are filled, and all present one level surface to the sky. In like manner, as far as we can perceive, all the forgiven are alike. It is only He who bore their sins who can distinguish the aggravations of every case. Certain it is that the first martyr, and the man who kept the clothes of the executioners at his death, are now at peace. They are one in Christ.”

(91) Simon believed. V. 13.

He who had bewildered others by his sorcery, which he knew to be unreal, was bewildered by the reality of the power possessed by Philip, and was doubtless impressed by the doctrine of the Messiah preached by the evangelist. He made an outward profession of his faith and was baptized. His conversion was spurious and his profession insincere. His mind was aroused, but his conscience was not awakened. He desired the advantages which the gospel proffered, but he did not submit to what it demands. A sense of sin, a conviction of error, and any attempt at reparation for the wrongs he had done, are all wanting in his case. There may be subscription to a scriptural creed, the observance of the external ordinances of Christianity, and even some service rendered to the church, without genuine repentance or saving faith. A man may have been baptized, and yet be “in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity.” The wickedness of this man, who “thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money,” has not only given a name to the ecclesiastical offence of purchasing preferment or position in the church, which is branded as simony, but it is a warning against uniting with the church, or seeking office therein, with a view to worldly advantages of any kind.
(31) Samaritans. V. 14.

A mixed or, as some suppose, a purely heathen race, introduced by the kings of Assyria to supply the place of the ten tribes, who had been mainly carried away, and assimilated to the Jews by the reception of the law of Moses. Mingled with them were doubtless many Jews who were left after the captivity, and others who, as renegades, came to them from Judea. On the return of the Jews from the exile, they repeatedly sought to unite with them in rebuilding the temple, but were repulsed. They therefore erected a temple for themselves on Gerizim, and there set up a rival worship. The Jews and Samaritans mutually detested each other, and maintained a system of irritating hostility. Josephus says the Samaritans attacked and robbed the pilgrims on their way from Galilee to Jerusalem, and that, on one occasion, they desecrated the temple by scattering dead men's bones in the cloisters. They rigidly observed the law of Moses, and looked for the promised Messiah. They were therefore in some measure prepared for the announcement of his coming, and hence the success of the gospel among them.


These two apostles are frequently associated. They must have been warm personal friends. The striking contrast in their characters would unite them the more closely, and fit them to labor together. Peter fervid, zealous, impetuous; John mild, loving, persuasive. This is the last mention of John in the Acts, except once he is referred to in chap. xii. 2, where James is called the brother of John. In accordance with the directions of the Master, the early missionaries generally went out two by two. We read of Peter and John; Paul and Barnabas; Paul and Silas; and Barnabas and Mark.

The object of their mission at this time was of a general character—to inquire into the state of things, supply what was wanting, and extend the right hand of fellowship to the believers in Samaria.

(11) They received the Holy Ghost. V. 17.

Calvin on verse 16 writes: "Surely Luke speaketh not in this place of the common grace of the Spirit, whereby God doth regenerate us, that we may be his children; but of those singular gifts, wherewith God would have certain endued at the beginning of the gospel to beautify Christ's kingdom."

By the Holy Ghost here we do not understand the regenerating and sanctifying agency of the Holy Spirit in the conversion and renewal of the soul; but the impartation of such a presence of the Holy Spirit as is accompanied with supernatural gifts; the miraculous influences of the Spirit, which were manifested by speaking with tongues, or other visible tokens. The spiritual condition of those who "had received the word of God," and "were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus," was this: they had been spiritually quickened by the Spirit of God, and were saved by Him into whose name they were baptized, but they had not received any special gifts which were visibly manifested, as the believers elsewhere had received, and as they also received by the laying on of the hands of the apostles—whose peculiar prerogative it seems to have been to confer such gifts. The case of Ananias, in his relation to Paul, is altogether of an exceptional kind.
CHAPTER IX.

Ver. 3. ωτῶ] A B C G ης, min. have ἔτ, which is, no doubt, recommended by Grieseb. and adopted by Laehm. Tisch. and Born., but is inserted from xxii. 6 to express the meaning more strongly.—Instead of περὶστραφ. Laehm. has περὶστραφ. A weakly attested error of transcription.—Ver. 5. κυρίος εἴπεν] Deleted by Laehm. Tisch. Born., after A B C, min. Vulg. In some other witnesses (including ης), only κυρίος is wanting; and in others, only εἴπεν. The Recepta is a clumsy filling up of the original bare ὁ δὲ.—After διώκειτ, Elz., following Erasm., has (instead of ἀλλά, ver. 6) σκληροῦν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λατιζεῖν. Τρέμων τε καὶ θαμβῶν εἰπε’ κυρίε, τί με θέλεις ποιήσαι; καὶ ὁ κυρίος πρὸς αὐτόν, against all Greek codd. Chrys. Theoph. and several vss.1 An old amplification from xxii. 10, xxvi. 14.—Ver. 8. οὐδένα] Λ* B ης, Syr. utr. Ar. Vulg. have οὐδέν. So Laehm. Tisch. Born. The Recepta has originated mechanically from following ver. 7.—Ver. 10. The order εν δραματι ὁ κυρ. (Laehm. Tisch. Born.) has the decisive preponderance of testimony.—Ver. 12. εἰν δραματι] is wanting in A ης, loth Copt. Aeth. Vulg. B C have it after ἄνδρα (so Born.). Deleted by Laehm. and Tisch. An explanatory addition to εἰν. Instead of χειρα, Laehm. and Born. have τὰς χειρας, after B E, vss.; also A C ης, loth, which, however, do not read τὰς. From ver. 17, and because εἴπετο, τὰς χειρας is the usual expression in the N. T. (in the active ἀδύνατο so, except this passage).—Ver. 17. οὐκάκα] Laehm. Born. read ἡκονα, which is decidedly attested by A B C E ης, min.—Ver. 18. After ἀνειλιπέτε τε, Elz. has παραχρήμα, which is wanting in decisive witnesses, and, after Erasm. and Bengel, is deleted by Laehm. Tisch. Born. A more precisely defining addition.—Ver. 19. After ἐγένετο δὲ Elz. has ὁ Σάολος, against decisive testimony. Beginning of a churub-lesson.—Ver. 20. Ἰρισον] Elz. reads Χριστόν, against A B C E ης, min. vss. Iren. Amid the prevalent interchange of the two names this very preponderance of authority is decisive. But Ἱρισον is clearly confirmed by the following ότι οὗτος ἔστω ὁ νικῶ τ. Θεοῦ, as also by ver. 22, where οὗτος necessarily presupposes a preceding Ἱρισον.—Ver. 24. παρετήμουν τε] Laehm. Tisch. Born. read παρετηροῦντο δὲ καὶ, which is to be preferred according to decisive testimony.—αὐτῶν οἱ μαθηταί] Laehm. Tisch. Born. read οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτῶν, after A B C F ης, loth.2 Or. Jer. This reading has in its favour, along with the preponderance of witnesses, the circumstance that before (ver. 19) and after (ver. 26) the μαθηταί are mentioned absolutely, and the expression οἱ μαθ. αὐτῶν might appear objectionable. In what follows, on nearly the same evidence, διὰ τοῦ τείχους καθικαν αὐτῶν is to be read.—Ver. 26. After παραγ. δὲ, Elz. has ὁ Σάολος, E, ὁ Παύλος. An addition.—εἰ] B E G H, min. Occ. Theophyl. have εἰ, recommended by Grieseb. and adopted by Laehm. Tisch. Born. The evidence leaves it doubtful; but considering the frequency of παραγιν, with εἰ

(xiii. 14, xv. 4; Matt. ii. 1; John viii. 2), whereas it does not further occur with ἐν in the N. T., ἐν would be more easily changed into εἰς than the converse. — ἐπιφάνεια Lachm. and Born. read ἐπιφανεῖν (after A B C Μ, min.), which was easily introduced as the usual form (περασμα ὅλος only again occurs in the N. T. in xxvi. 21; Heb. iv. 15?). — Ver. 28. ἐν Ἰερουσ. Lachm. Tisch. Born. have rightly adopted εἰς Ἰερουσ., which already Griesb. had approved after A B C E G Μ, min. Chrys. Oec. Theophyl. ἐν was inserted as more suitable than εἰς, which was not understood. Accordingly, καὶ before πάρῃσι is to be deleted with Lachm. and Tisch., following A B C Μ, min. vss. An insertion for the sake of connection. — Ver. 29. Ἐλληνιστὰς] A has Ἐλληνας. From xi. 20. — Ver. 31. Lachm. Tisch. Born. read ἢ ... ἐκκλησία ... ἐχει εἰρ. εἰκο- δομομομενη κ. παρενομενη ... ἐπληθυνετο, after A B C Μ, min. and several vss., including Vulg. Rightly. The original ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησία, κ.τ.λ., in accordance with the apostolic idea of the unity of the church, was explained by αἱ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησίαι πάσαι (so E), which πασαι was again deleted, and thus the Recepta arose. — Ver. 33. Instead of κραξία, κραξίων is to be adopted, with Lachm. Tisch. Born., on preponderating evidence. — Ver. 38. δικησαι ... αὐτῶν. Lachm. and Tisch. read δικησης ... ἤμων, after A B C E Μ, lo. Vulg., which with this preponderance of evidence is the more to be preferred, as internal grounds determine nothing for the one reading or the other.

(Μ') Vv. 1, 2. Ἔρτι] See viii. 3, hence the narrative does not stand isolated (Schleiermacher). — ἐμπνεύων ἀπελθός κ. φῶν εἰς τ. μαθ. out of threatening and murder breathing hard at the disciples, whereby is set forth the passionateness with which he was eager to terrify the Christians by threats, and to hurry them to death. In ἐμπνεύων, observe the compound, to which the εἰς τ. μαθ. belonging to it corresponds; so that the word signifies: to breathe hard at or ὄρη an object; as often also in classical writers, yet usually with the dative instead of with εἰς. The expression is stronger than if it were said πνέων ἀπελθόν κ. τ.λ.¹ The genitives ἀπελθός and φῶν denote whence this ἐμπνεύων issued; threatening and murder, i.e. sanguinary desire (Rom. i. 29), was within him what excited and sustained his breathing hard. — τῷ ἄρχεσι.] If the conversion of Paul occurred in the year 35,² then Caiaphas was still high priest, as he was not deposed by Vitellius until the year 36.³ Jonathan the son of Ananus (Joseph. Antt. xviii. 4. 8) succeeded him; and he, after a year, was succeeded by his brother Theophilus.⁴—(Μ') Δαμασκῶς, Ὑφρί, the old capital of Syria, in which, since the period of theSeleucidae, so many Jews resided that Nero could cause 10,000 to be executed.⁵ It was specially to Damascus that the persecuting Saul turned his steps, partly, doubtless, because the existence of the hated sect in that city was well known to him — the church there may have owed its origin and its enlargement as well to the journeys of the resident Jews to the feasts, as to visits of the dispersed from Jerusalem; partly, perhaps, also, because personal connections promised

¹ Lobecck, ad AJ. p. 342; Boeckh, Expl. Find. p. 341.
² Comp. ἐμπνεύων ζωῆς, Josh. x. 40; φῶν πειρώματα, Nomn. Dionys. 23; Aristoph. Εκ. p. 437; Winer, p. 192 (E. T. 955).
³ Introduction, sec. 4.
⁴ Anger, de temp. rat. p. 184.
⁵ Joseph. Antt. xviii. 5. 8.
⁶ Joseph. Bell. Jud. i. 2. 25, ii. 20, 2.
for his enterprise there the success which he desired. — πρὸς τὰς συνάψυχας, from which, consequently, the Christians had not as yet separated themselves. — The recognition of the letters of authorisation at Damascus was not to be doubted, as that city was in the year 85 still under Roman dominion; and Roman policy was accustomed to grant as much indulgence as possible to the religious power of the Sanhedrin, even in criminal matters, only the execution of the punishment of death was reserved to the Roman authority. — τῷ δὲ δυνατῷ, who should be of the way. The way, in the ethical sense, is here κατ' ἔσοχθιν the Christian, i.e. the characteristic direction of life as determined by faith on Jesus Christ (ὁ δὲ κυρίον, xviii. 25), — an expression in this absolute form peculiar to the Book of Acts, but which certainly was in use in the apostolic church. Oecumenius indicates the substantial meaning: τῷ κατὰ Χριστὸν εἰπε πολιτείαν. — εἰς, with the genitive in the sense of belonging to.¹

Vv. 3-9. The conversion of Saul does not appear, on an accurate consideration of the three narratives,¹ which agree in the main points, to have had the way psychologically prepared for it by scruples of conscience as to his persecuting proceedings. On the contrary, Luke represents it in the history at our passage, and Paul himself in his speeches,² as in direct and immediate contrast to his vehement persecuting zeal, amidst which he was all of a sudden internally arrested by the miraculous fact from without. Moreover, previous scruples and inward struggles are à priori, in the case of a character so pure—at this time only erring—firm, and ardently decided as he also afterwards continued to be, extremely improbable: he saw in the destruction of the Christian church only a fulfilment of duty and a meritorious service for the glory of Jehovah.³ For the transformation of his firm conviction into the opposite, of his ardent interest against the gospel into an ardent zeal for it, there was needed—with the pure resoluteness of his will, which even in his unwearied persecutions was just striving after a righteousness of his own—a heavenly power directly seizing on his inmost conscience; and this he experienced, in the midst of his zealot enterprise, on the way to Damascus, when that perverted striving after righteousness and merit was annihilated. The light which from heaven suddenly shone around him brighter than the sun⁴ was no flash of lightning (οὐ). The similarity of the expression in all the three narratives militates against this assumption so frequently made, and occurring still in Schrader; and Paul himself certainly knew how to distinguish in his recollection a natural phenomenon, however alarming, from a φῶς ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ associated with a heavenly revelation.⁵ This φῶς was rather the heavenly radiance, with

² xix. 9, xxii. 4, xxiv. 14, 22.
³ See Bernhardy, p. 180; Winer, p. 184 (E. T. 244).
⁴ ix., xxii., xxvi.
⁵ xxii. and xxvi.; comp. also Gal. 1. 14, 15; Phil. iii. 13.
⁷ xxii. 3; comp. Gal. i. 14; Phil. iii. 6.
⁸ Phil. iii. 6.
⁹ xxvi. 13.
¹⁰ This applies in the main, also, against Ewald, p. 875, who assumes a dazzling celestial phenomenon of an unexpected and terrible nature, possibly a thunder-storm, or rather a deadly sirocco in the middle of a sultry day, etc.
which the exalted Christ appearing in His δόξα is surrounded. In order to
a scripturally true conception of the occurrence, moreover, we may not
think merely in general of an internal vision produced by God; nor is it
enough specially to assume a self-manifestation of Christ made merely to the
inner sense of Saul,—although externally accompanied by the miraculous
appearance of light,—according to which by an operation of Christ, who is
in heaven, He presented Himself to the inner man of Saul, and made Him-
self audible in definite words. On the contrary, according to 1 Cor. xv. 8, Christ
must really have appeared to him in His glorified body. For only the
objective, this also against Ewald, and real corporeal appearance corre-
sponds to the category of appearances, in which this is placed at 1 Cor. xv.
8, as also to the requirement of apostleship, which is expressed in 1 Cor.
ix. 1 most definitely, and that in view of Peter and the other original
apostles, by τόν κύριον ἡμῶν εὐαγγελίσαν. The Risen One Himself was in the
light which appeared, and converted Saul, and hence Gal. i. 1: τοῦ ἐξανωτοῦ
ἀντίκειται, with which also Gal. i. 16 fully agrees; comp. Phil. iii. 12.
This view is rightly adopted, after the old interpreters, by Lyttleton, Hess,
Michaelis, Haselaar, and by most modern interpreters except the Tübingen
School; as well as by Olshausen and Neander, both of whom, however,
without any warrant in the texts, assume a psychological preparation by the
principles of Gamaliel, by the speech of Stephen, and by the sight of
his death. For the correct view comp. Baumgarten; Diestelmaier; Oertel,
who also enlarges on the connection of the doctrine of the apostle with
his conversion. On the other hand, de Wette does not go beyond an ad-
mission of the enigmatical character of the matter; Lange connects the
objective fact with a visionary perception of it; and Holsten, after the ex-
ample of Baur, attempts to make good the vision, which he assumes, as a
real one, indeed, but yet as an immanent psychological act of Saul’s own mind,
— a view which is refuted by the necessary resemblance of the fact to the
other Christophanies in 1 Cor. xv. All the attempts of Baur and his

1 Weiss, Schweitzer, Schenkel, and others.
3 Comp. ix. 1.
4 Comp. ix. 17, 27.
5 Comp. Pan in Hilgenfeld’s Zeitschr. 1863, p. 189 ff.
6 See in loc.
7 On the conversion, etc., translated by Hahn, Hannov. 1751.
8 Lagd. Bat. 1800.
9 Jugendleben des Socrate, 1866, p. 37 ff.
10 Paulus in d. Apostelgesch. p. 113 ff.
11 See also Hofstedt de Groot, Pauli conversio praecipue theologiae Paul. fons, Groning. 1855, who, however, in setting forth this
connection mixes up too much that is arbitrary.
13 In Hilgenfeld’s Zeitschr. 1861, p. 228 ff.
14 See, in opposition to Holsten, Beyschlag in the Stud. u. Krit. 1864, pp. 197 ff., 231 ff.; Oertel, Ia. In opposition to Beyschlag, again, see Holsten, zum Evang. des Paulus u. Petr. p. 2 ff.; as also Hilgenfeld in his Zeitschr. 1861, p. 185 ff., who likewise starts from d priori presuppositions, which do not agree
with the exegetical results. These d priori presuppositions, marking the criticism of the
Baur School, agree generally in the negation of miracle, as well as in the position that
Christianity has arisen in the way of an immanent development of the human mind,—
whereby the credibility of the Book of Acts is abandoned. With Holsten, Lang, retyl.
Charakter, Paulus, p. 15 ff., essentially agrees; as does also, with poetical embellish-
ment, Hirzel in the Zeitschriften, 1861.—Hausrath, der Apostel Paulus, 1865, p. 33 ff., con-
tents himself with doubts, founded on Gal.
15 which leave the measure of the historical
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school to treat the event as a visionary product from the laboratory of Saul's own thoughts are exegetical impossibilities, in presence of which Baur himself at last stood still acknowledging a mystery. It is no argument against the actual bodily appearance, that the text speaks only of the light, and not of a human form rendered visible. For, while in general the glorified body may have been of itself inaccessible to the human eye, so, in particular, was it here as enclosed in the heavenly radiance; and the texts relate only what was externally seen and apparent also to the others, namely, the radiance of light, out of which the Christ surrounded by it made Himself visible only to Saul, as He also granted only to him to hear His words, which the rest did not hear. Whoever, taking offence at the diversities of the accounts in particular points as at their miraculous tenor, sets down what is so reported as unhistorical, or refers it, with Zeller, to the psychological domain of nascent faith, is opposed, as regards the nature of the fact recorded, by the testimony of the apostle himself in 1 Cor. xv. 8, ix. 1, with a power sustained by his whole working, which is not to be broken, and which leads ultimately to the desperate shift of supposing in Paul, at precisely the most decisive and momentous point of his life, a self-deception as the effect of the faith existing in him; in which case the narrative of the Book of Acts is traced to a design of legitimating the apostleship of Paul, which in the sequel is further confirmed by the authority of Peter. —Hardly deserving now of historical notice is the uncritical rationalism of the method that preceded the critical school of Baur, by which the whole occurrence was converted into a fancy-picture, in which the persecutor's struggles of conscience furnished the psychological ground and a sudden thunderstorm the accessories,—a view with which some associate the exegetical blunder of identifying the fact with 2 Cor. xii. 1 ff.; while Brennecke makes Jesus, who was only apparently dead, appear to Saul to check his persecuting zeal. These earlier attempts to assign the conversion of the apostle to the natural sphere are essentially distinguished, in respect

character in suspense. Holtzmann, Judendh. u. Christenth. p. 540 ff., finds "the—" in the details—contradictory and legendary narrative" of the Book of Acts confirmed in the main by the hints of the apostle himself in his letters; nevertheless, for the explanation of what actually occurred, he does not go beyond suggesting various possibilities, and finds it advisable "to ascribe to the same causes, from which it becomes impossible absolutely to discover the origin of the belief of the resurrection, such a range that they include also the event before Damascus." 1

1 See his Christenth. d. dritz ersten Jahrh. p. 48, ed. 2.

2 See xxii. 9. The statement, ix. 7: ἀποκάλυφαν ἀνὴρ ἑαυτὸς ἐκ τῆς ὅρασις, is evidently a trait of tradition already disfiguring the history, to which the apostle's own narrative, as it is preserved at xxii. 9, must without hesitation be preferred.

In the case of a miraculous event so entirely unique and extraordinary, such traditional variations in the certainly very often repeated narrative are so naturally conceivable, that it would, in fact, be surprising and suspicious if we should find in the various narratives no variation. To Luke himself such variations, amidst the unity of essentials, gave so little offence that he has adopted and included them unreconciled from his different sources. Baur transfers them to the laboratory of literary design, in which case they are urged for the purpose of resolving the historical fact into myth. See his Paulus, I. p. 71 ff., ed. 2.

3 After Vitringa, Oser. p. 170, and particularly Eichhorn, Ammon, Boehme, Heinrichs, Kninoel, and others.

4 Emmerling and Brutschneider.

5 After Bahrdt and Venturini.
of their basis, from those of the critical school of Baur and Holsten, by the circumstance that the latter proceed from the postulates of pantheistic, and the former from those of theistic, rationalism. But both agree in starting from the negation of a miracle, by which Saul could have come to be among the prophets, as they consign the resurrection of the Lord Himself from the dead to the same negative domain. In consequence of this, indeed, they cannot present the conversion of Paul otherwise than under the notion of an immanent process of his individual mental life. — ἀπὸ τ. οὐρανοῦ [belongs to περίψωστρ.] 1

Vv. 4, 5. The light shone around him, and not his companions. Out of the light the present Christ manifested Himself at this moment to his view: he has seen the Lord, who afterwards makes Himself known also by name; and the persecutor, from terror at the heavenly vision, falls to the ground, when he hears the voice speaking in Hebrew: Saul, Saul, etc. — τι με διώκεις; τι παρ' ἐμοὶ μέγα ἡ μικρόν ἡ δικεμνής ταῦτα ποιεῖς; Chrysostom. Christ Himself is persecuted in His people. Luke x. 16. "Caput pro membris clamabat." Augustine. — τις εἶ, κύριε χ;]. On the question whether Saul, during his residence in Jerusalem, had personally seen Christ or not, comp. on 2 Cor. v. 16, no decision can at all be arrived at from this passage, as the form in which the Lord presented Himself to the view of Saul belonged to the heavenly world and was surrounded with the glorious radiance, and Saul himself, immediately after the momentary view and the overwhelming impression of the incomparable appearance, fell down and closed his eyes. —Observe in ver. 5 the emphasis of ἤγω and οὐ.

Ver. 6. Αλλά [breaking off]. —According to chap. xxvi., Jesus forthwith gives Saul the commission to become the apostle of the Gentiles, which, according to the two other narratives, here and chap. xxii., is only given afterwards through the intervention of Ananias. This diversity is sufficiently explained by the fact that Paul in the speech before Agrippa abridges the narrative, and puts the commission, which was only subsequently conveyed to him by the instrumentality of another, at once into the mouth of Christ Himself, the author of the commission; by which the thing in itself, the command issued by Christ to him, is not affected, but merely the exactness of the representation, the summary abbreviation of which on this point Paul might esteem as sufficient before Agrippa. 2

Ver. 7. Εἰστικείουν ἐνεώ.] According to xxvi. 14, they all fell to the earth with Saul. This diversity is not, with Bengal, Haselar, Kuinoel, Baumgarten, and others, to be obviated by the purely arbitrary assumption, that the companions at the first appearance of the radiance had fallen down, but then had risen again sooner than Saul; but it is to be recognised as an un-

1 Comp. xxii. 6, xxvi. 13; Xen. Cyp. iv. 2, 15: φῶς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ προφανείς. On περίψωστρότερος, comp. Juvenec. in Stob. xxvii. 9; 4 Mac. iv. 10. 2 (1 Cor. ix. 1, xv. 8), Acts x. 17, 27. 3 xxvi. 14. 4 Schrader, Olshausen, Ewald, Keim, Bayenschlag, and others.

8 See on Mark xvi. 7, and Baumelein, Partik. p. 15.

9 In opposition to Zeller. p. 128.

7 εἰκός, dumb, speechless (here, from terror), is to be written with one ν (not ἐνεώς), as is done by Lachm. Tisch. Born. after A B C E H Η. See on the word. Valck. ad l.; Bornem, ad Xen. Anal. iv. 5. 35; Ruhnck. ad Tim. p. 169.
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essential non-agreement of the several accounts, whereby both the main substance of the event itself, and the impartial conscientiousness of Luke in not arbitrarily harmonizing the different sources, are simply confirmed (P'). — ἀκούοντες μὲν τῆς φωνῆς] does not agree with xxii. 9. The artificial attempts at reconciliation are worthless, namely: that τῆς φωνῆς, by which Orhist's voice is meant, applies to the words of Paul; or, that φωνῆ is here a noise (thunder), but in xxii. 9 an articulate voice; or, that ἱκανον in xxii. 9 denotes the understanding of the voice, or the definite giving ear in reference to the speaker, which is at variance with the fact, that in both places there is the simple contradistinction of seeing and hearing; hence the appeal to John xii. 28, 29 is not suitable, and still less the comparison of Dan. x. 7. — μηδένα δὲ θεωρ.] But seeing no one, from whom the voice might have come; μηδένα is used, because the participles contain the subjective cause of their standing perplexed and speechless. It is otherwise in ver. 8: οὐδὲν ἴδετε.

Vv. 8, 9. 'Ανεφανὲν δὲ τῶν ὀφαλμ.] Consequently Saul had lain on the ground with closed eyes since the appearance of the radiance (ver. 4), which, however, as the appearance of Jesus for him is to be assumed as in and with the radiance, cannot prove that he had not really and personally seen the Lord. — οὐδὲν ἴδετε] namely, because he was blinded by the heavenly light, and not possibly in consequence of the journey through the desert, see xxii. 11. The connection inevitably requires this explanation by what immediately follows; nor is the Recepta οὐδένα ἴδει. (see the critical remarks) to be explained otherwise than of being blinded, in opposition to Haselaar and others, who refer οὐδένα to Jesus. — μηδένω [he was for three days without being able to see, i.e. blind, so that he had not his power of vision. Hence here μή from the standpoint of the subject concerned; but afterwards οὐκ and οὐδέ, because narrating objectively. — οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδὲ ἔπεισεν] an absolute negation of eating and drinking, and not "a cibi potusue largioris usu abstinebat," Kuinoel. By fasting Saul partly satisfied the compunction into which he could not but now feel himself brought for the earlier wrong direction of his efforts, and partly prepared himself by fasting and prayer (ver. 11) for the decisive change of his inward and outward life, for which, according to ver. 6, he waited a special intimation. See ver. 18.

1 See the note on ver. 3 ff.
2 So, against the context, Chrysostom, Ammonius, Oecumenius, Camerarius, Castalio, Baza, Vatablus, Clarus, Eramus Schmid, Heumann, and others.
4 So, after Grotius and many older interpreters, in Wolf, Kuinoel, and Hackett.
5 Bengel, Baumgarten.
6 That the blinding took place as a symbol of the previous spiritual blindness of Saul (Calvin, Grotius, de Wette, Baumgarten, and others) is not indicated by anything in the text, and may only be considered as the edifying application of the history. Although Baur makes the formation of the legend attach itself to this idea. That blinding of Saul was a simple consequence of the heavenly radiance, and served (as also the fasting) to withdraw him for a season wholly from the outer world, and to restrict him to his inner life. And the blindness befell Saul alone; ἵνα μὴ κατασφην καὶ ἦν ἀπὸ τῆς φωνῆς. ἄλλα δὲ τὰ ἀφορμά, Oecumenius.
7 John ix. 29; Elenætæ, Louv. Soph. I. p. 308.
8 Comp. Winer, p. 439 (E. T. 610).
9 John iii. 7; Esth. iv. 16.
Ver. 10. 'O εἰρων] Christ. — εἰν δράματι in a vision; whether awake or asleep, the context does not decide, not even by ἀναστά, ver. 11. Eichhorn’s view, with which Kuinoel and partially also Heinrichs agree,—that Saul and Ananias had already been previously friends, and that the appearance in a dream as naturally resulted in the case of the former from the longing to speak with Ananias again and to get back sight by virtue of a healing power which was well known to him, as in the case of Ananias, who had heard of his friend’s fate on the way and of his arrival and dream,—is a fiction of exegetical romance manufactured without the slightest hint in the text, and indeed in opposition to vv. 11 f., 14. The course of the conversion, guided by Christ directly revealing Himself, is entirely in accordance with its commencement (vv. 8–9): “but we know not the law according to which communications of a higher spiritual world to men living in the world of sense take place, so as to be able to determine anything concerning them” (Neander). According to Baur, the two corresponding visions of Ananias and (ver. 12) Saul are literary parallels to the history of the conversion of Cornelius. And that Ananias was a man of legal piety (xxii. 12), is alleged by Schneckenburger and Baur to be in keeping with the tendency of Luke, although he does not even mention it here; Zeller, p. 196, employs even the frequent occurrence of the name to call in question whether Ananias “played a part” in the conversion of the apostle at all.

Vv. 11, 12. There is a “straight street,” according to Wilson, still in Damascus.—Σαῦλον δράματι Saul by name, Saul, as he is called. — ἵστη τῷ ζαύρῳ . . . ἀναστάεις contains the reason of the intimation given: for, behold, he prays, is now therefore in the spiritual frame which is requisite for what thou art to do to him, and—he is prepared for thy very arrival to help him—he has seen in a vision a man, who came in and, etc. — Imposition of hands is here also the medium of communication of divine grace. — ἄναηρ δράματι Ἀνανία] This is put, and not the simple οἴ, to indicate that the person who appeared to Saul had been previously entirely unknown to him, and that only on occasion of this vision had he learned his name, Ananias.

Vv. 13–16. Ananias, in ingenuous simplicity of heart, expresses his scruples as to conferring the benefit in question on a man who, according to information received from many (ἀπὸ τοῦ λοιπ.), had hitherto shown himself entirely unworthy of it (ver. 13), and from whom even now only evil to the cause of Christ was to be dreaded after his contemplated restoration to sight (ver. 14). Whether Ananias had obtained the knowledge of the inquisitorial ἐξονεία which Saul had at Damascus by letters from Jerusalem, or from the companions of Saul, or in some other way, remains undeter—

1 See vv. 13, 14, 17.  
2 x. xvi. 9, a.; differently vii. 31.  
3 p. 168 f.  
4 Chap. v. and xxii. 3, xxiv. 1  
5 The house in which Paul is said to have dwelt is still pointed out. See also the Austr., loc., and Petermann, Reisen im Orient, i. p. 98.  
6 Comp. Xen. Anab. i. 4. 11: πόλεις . . .  
7 Comp. on viii. 15.  
8 Wolf, Rosenmüller.  
9 Kuinoel.
mined. — τοῖς ἁγίοις σου] to the saints belonging to Thee, i.e. to the Christians: for they, through the atonement appropriated by means of faith, having been separated from the κόσμος and dedicated to God, belong to Christ, who has purchased them by His blood (xv. 28). — εἰς Θεόν. belongs to καὶ εἰς θύμων. — Ver. 14. As to the εἰκάλεσθαι τοῦ Christ, see on vii. 59. It is the distinctive characteristic of Christianity. — Ver. 15. οἰκίος ἐκλογῆς] a chosen vessel (instrument). In this vessel Christ will bear, etc. The genitive of quality emphatically stands in place of the adjective. — τοῦ βασιλέως κ.τ.λ. contains the definition of σκ. ἐκλ. μοι ἐστίν οὖς: to bear my Messianic name, by the preaching of the same, before Gentiles, and Kings, and Israelites. Observe how the future work of converting the Gentiles is presented as the principal work (ἰδθών κ. βασιλ.], to which that of converting the Jews is related as a supplemental accessory; hence καὶ εἰς Θεόν. is added with τί. — The γάρ, ver. 16, introduces the reason why He has rightly called him οἰκίος ἐκλογῆς κ.τ.λ.; for I shall show him how much he must suffer for my name, for its glorification. The ἔγας placed first has the force of the power of disposal in reference to οἰκίος ἐκλ. μοι ἐστίν: I am He, who will place it always before his eyes. On this Bengel rightly remarks: "re ipse, in toto ejus cursu," — even to his death. According to de Wette, the reference is to revelation: the apostle will suffer with prophetic foresight. But such revelations are only known from his later ministry, whereas the experimental ἐπίθεσις commenced immediately, and brought practically to the consciousness of the apostle that he was to be that οἰκίος ἐκλογῆς amidst much suffering.

Vv. 17, 18. Ἄκαθεν] here in the pregnant sense of the Christian brotherhood already begun. — The Ἰσραήλ . . . ἡρῴου, not to be considered as a parenthesis, and the καὶ πληθ. πνευμ. ἄγι. make it evident to the reader that the information and direction of the Lord, ver. 15, was fuller. — κ. πληθ. πν. ἄγι.] which then followed at the baptism, ver. 18. — And immediately there fell from his eyes—not merely: it was to him as if there fell—as it were scales. A scale-like substance had thus overspread the interior of his eyes, and this immediately fell away, so that he again saw—evidently a miraculous and sudden cure, which Eichhorn ought not to have represented as the disappearance of a passing cataract by natural means, fasting, joy, the cold hand of an old man! — εἰς ιεραίαν] in the neuter sense: he became strong. Here of corporeal strengthening.

1 Comp. on Rom. i. 7.
2 Ver. 21; 1 Cor. i. 2; Rom. x. 10 ff.
4 Comp. Gal. i. 16.
5 The apostle's practice of always attempting, first of all, the work of conversion among the Jews is not contrary to this, as his destination to the conversion of the Gentiles is expressly designated without excluding the Jews, and accordingly was to be followed out without abandoning the historical course of salvation: Τοῦτον μὲν πρῶτον καὶ Ἐλληνικ. Rom. i. 16. And what Paul was to attain in this way, entirely corresponds to the expression in our passage.
7 See on v. 41.
8 Com. xx. 23, 25, xxii. 11.
9 Comp. Tob. xi. 13.
10 See Aristot. Eth. x. 9; 1 Macc. vii. 35; 2 Macc. ii. 33; Tert. XII. Patr. p. 583; and examples in Kypke, II p. 44, and from the LXX. in Schleusner, II p. 807 f.
CHAP. IX., 19-26.

Vv. 19, 20 f. But he continued some days with the Christians there, and then he immediately preached Jesus in the synagogues, at Damascus, namely, that He was the Son of God. ¹ This is closely connected, and it is only with extreme violence that Michaelis and Heinrichs have referred ver. 19 to the time before the journey to Arabia,² and ver. 20 to the time after that journey. Pearson placed the Arabian journey before ver. 19, which is at variance with the close historical connection of vv. 18 and 19; just as the connection of vv. 21 and 22 does not permit its being inserted before ver. 22 (Laurent). The τιμήτωρ in Gal. l.c. is decisive against Kuinoel, Olshausen, Ebrard, Sepp, p. 44 f., and others, who place this journey and the return to Damascus after ver. 25. The Arabian excursion, which certainly was but brief, is historically—for Luke was probably not at all aware of it, and has at least left it entirely out of account as unimportant for his object, which has induced Hilgenfeld and Zeller to impute his silence to set purpose—most fitly referred with Neander to the period of the ἤμεραι ἱκανοι, ver. 23.³ The objection, that Saul would then have gone out of the way of his opponents and their plot against him would not have taken place,⁴ is without weight, as this hostile project may be placed after the return from Arabia.⁵ It is, however, to be acknowledged⁶ that the time from the conversion to the journey to Jerusalem cannot have been known to Luke as so long an interval as it actually was—three years, Gal. i. 18—seeing that for such a period the expression indefinite, no doubt, but yet measured by days (it is otherwise at ver. viii. 11), ἤμεραι ἱκανοι, ver. 23,⁷ is not sufficient.—ἐν ταῖς συναγογαῖς ἡμέραις, Chrysostom.—ὁ πορθμός] see on Gal. i. 18.—καὶ ὁ δοῦλος ὑπάρχεις] and hither, to Damascus, he had come for the object, that he, etc. How contradictory to his conduct now!⁸ On the subjunctive ἤγγησεν, see Winer.

Vv. 22, 23. But Saul, in presence of such judgments, became strong in his new work all the more.⁹—αὐτοὶ χίνεν] made perplexed, put out of countenance, ἐπεστράβη, εἰς τι εἰς εἰς.¹⁰ The form χίνεν instead of χίνω belongs to late Greek.¹¹—ἐπιληπτόντως] proving.¹²—ἐπιληπτόντως, as in vii. 28. ἱκανοι, as in ver. 43, xviii, 18, xxii. 7, of a considerable time,¹³ especially common with Luke (q').

Vv. 24, 25. Παραπεπράσπη δὲ καὶ (see the critical remarks), but they watched also, etc., contains what formed a special addition to the danger mentioned

¹ ó νική τοῦ θεοῦ occurs only here (xxii. 23 is a quotation from the O. T.) in the narrative of the Book of Acts. The historical fact is: Paul announced that Jesus was the Messiah, see ver. 22. He naturally did not as yet enter on the metaphysical relation of the Sonship of God; but this is implied in the conception of Luke, when he from his fully formed Pauline standpoint uses this designation of the Messiah.
² Gal. 1. 17.
³ Comp. on Gal. 1. 17 and Introduction to Romans, sec. 1.
⁴ De Wette.
⁵ With this agrees also the εὐθος, Gal. 1. 16, which requires the Arabian journey to be put very soon after the conversion, consequently at the very commencement of the ἤμεραι ἱκανοι, ver. 23. If this is done, that εὐθος is not opposed to our view given above (in opposition to Zeller, p. 302).
⁶ Comp. Baur.
⁷ Comp. ver. 43, xviii. 19, xvii. 7.
⁸ "Quod dicerent: At etiam Saul inter prophetas," I Sam. x. 11, Grothus.
⁹ p 270 (K. T. 399).
¹⁰ Nägelsb. on the Ibdad, p. 287, ed. 3.
¹¹ Chrysostom. Comp. on H. 6.
¹² Lobecch, ad Philin. p. 736.
¹³ Comp. 1 Cor. H. 16; Schleusner, Thes. s. v.; Jamblich. 60.
¹⁴ Plut. Legg. p. 736 C.
in ver. 28. The subject is the Jews; they did it—and thereby the apparent difference with 2 Cor. xi. 38 is removed—on the obtained permission or order of the Arabian ethnarch.\(^1\) More artificial attempts at reconciliation are quite unnecessary.\(^2\)—οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ (see the critical remarks), opposed to the Τουδιαοῦ, ver. 28. Saul had already gained scholares among the Jews of Damascus; they rescued him from the plot of their fellow Jews, in opposition to de Wette's opinion, that disciples of the apostle were out of the question. — διὰ τοῦ τελευτοῦ through the wall: whether an opening found in it, or the window of a building abutting on the city-wall, may have facilitated the passage. The former is most suited to the mode of expression. — ἐν σπηρὶδί[

Vv. 26, 27. Three years after his conversion (Gal. i. 18), Paul went for the first time back to Jerusalem.\(^4\) Thus long, therefore, had his first labours at Damascus lasted, though interrupted by the Arabian journey. For the connection admits of no interruption between vv. 25 and 26, the flight, ver. 25, and the παραγενσέως. σὲ εἰς Ἰεροσ., ver 26, stand in close relation to each other. Driven from Damascus, the apostle very naturally and wisely directed his steps to the mother-church in Jerusalem, in order to enter into connection with the older apostles, particularly with Peter, Gal. i. 18. — τοῖς μαθητ. to the Christians. — καὶ πάντες ἔφοβοι καὶ the simple and, which annexes the unfavourable result of the ἐπειρ. κολλ. τοῖς μαθ. Observe, moreover, on this statement—(1) that it presupposes the conversion to have occurred not long ago; (2) that accordingly the ἡμεραί ἱσκαλαί, ver. 28, cannot have been conceived by Luke as a period of three years; (3) but that—since according to Gal. i. 18 Paul nevertheless did not appear till three years after at Jerusalem—the distrust of all, here reported, and the introduction by Barnabas resting on that distrust as its motive, cannot be historical, as after three years' working the fact that Paul was actually a Christian could not but be doubted in the church at Jerusalem.\(^5\)—διὰ ἐτῶν μαθ.] to be amplified with Rinck and Bornemann, ἐτῶν. — Βαρναβᾶς[ see on iv. 36. Perhaps he was at an earlier period acquainted with the apostle. — ἐπιλαμβάνω.] graphically: he grasped him by the hand, and led him; αὐτὸν, however, is governed by ἡγατε, for ἐπιλαμβάνωθαι is always conjoined with the genitive.\(^6\) — πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστ.] an approximate and very indefinite

\(^1\) Comp. 3 Cor. xi. 38.
\(^2\) Comp. Wieseler, p. 143.
\(^3\) On the spelling σωφράς, attested by C Μ, see Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 113.
\(^4\) According to Laurent, neutest. Stud. p. 70 ff., the journey to Jerusalem in our passage is different from the journey in Gal. i. 18. The latter is to be placed before Ιερ. 20. But in that case the important journey, Ιερ., would be left entirely unmentioned in the Epistle to the Galatians (for it is not to be found at Gal i. 22, 23),—which is absolutely irreconcilable with the very object of narrating the journeys in that Epistle.
\(^5\) To explain the distrust from the enigmat-ically long disappearance and re-emergence of the apostle (Lange, Apost. Zeitalt. I. p. 90) is quite against the context of the Book of Acts, in which the Arabian journey has no place. The distrust may in some measure be explained from a long retirement in Arabia (comp. Ewald, p. 409), especially if, with Neander and Ewald, we suppose also a prolonged interruption of communication between Damascus and Jerusalem occasioned by the war of Artaas, which, however, does not admit of being verified.
statement, expressed by the plural of the category; for, according to Gal. i. 18, only Peter and James the Lord's brother were present; but not at variance with this, especially as Luke betrays no acquaintance with the special design of the journey—a design with which, we may add, the working related in vv. 28–30, although it can only have lasted for fifteen days, does not conflict. A purposely designed fiction, with a view to bring the apostle from the outset into closest union with the Twelve, would have had to make the very most of ἵστορον Ἰάκωβος. — καὶ ἀπαντήσατο. not Paul, so Beza and others, as already Abdias appears to have taken it, but Barnabas, which the construction requires, and which alone is in keeping with the business of the latter, to be the patron of Paul. — ἔτοι] not ἔτοι, τ. — ἐν τῇ δῆμῳ τ. Ἰεροσόλυμον] the name—the confession and the proclamation of the name—of Jesus, as the Messiah, was the element, in which the bold speaking (ἐπαφροσύνας) had free course.  

Vv. 28–30. Μετ' αὐτῶν εἰσερχομ. κ. ἑταρον.] See on i. 21. According to the reading εἰς Ἰερουσ. and after deletion of the following καὶ (see the critical remarks), εἰς Ἰερουσ. is to be attached to παρῆν. He found himself in familiar intercourse with them, while in Jerusalem he spoke frankly and freely in the name of the Lord Jesus. Accordingly εἰς Ἰερουσ. is to be taken as in κηρύσσειν εἰς (Mark i. 59), λέγειν εἰς (John viii. 26), μαρτυρεῖν εἰς (Acts xxiii. 11), and similar expressions, where εἰς amounts to the sense of coram. Comp. Matthiae, § 578, 3 b.; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. I. p. 594. With ἐκδέχεται τε κ.τ.λ. (which is only to be separated from the preceding by a comma) there is annexed to the general εἰς Ἰερουσ. παρῆν. a special portion thereof, in which case, instead of the participle, there is emphatically introduced the finite tense.—πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλλην.] with (against) the Greek-Jews, see on vi. 1.—ἐπεξερεύνοντα αὐτῶν ἄνελεῖν] does not exclude the appearance of Christ, xxii. 17, 18, as Zeller thinks, since it is, on the contrary, the positive fulfilment of the οὗ παραθέτων κ.τ.λ. negatively announced in chap. xxii. — ἐκατεριστείλατο they sent him away from them to Tarsus, after they had brought him down to Caesarea. On account of Gal. i. 27 it is to be assumed that the apostle journeyed from Caesarea to Tarsus, not by sea, but by land, along the Mediterranean coast through Syria; and not, with Calovius and Olshausen, that here Caesarea Philippi on the borders of Syria is to be understood as meant. The reader cannot here, any more than in viii. 40, find any occasion in the text to understand Κατατέρας otherwise than as the celebrated capital; it is more probable, too, that Paul avoided the closer vicinity of Damascus. — How natural it was to his heart, now that he was recognised by his older colleagues in Jerusalem but persecuted by the Jews, to bring the salvation in Christ, first of all, to the knowledge of his beloved native region! And doubtless the first churches of Cilicia owed their origin to his abode at that time in his native country.

2 ἵστορον Ἰάκωβος, Gal. i. 6.
3 Ἡσ. ap. ii. 2.
4 From this is dated the ἄνδρα Ἰερουσαλήμ κ.
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Ver. 31. Oν] draws an inference from the whole history, vv. 3–30: in consequence of the conversion of the former chief enemy and his transformation into the zealous apostle. — The description of the happy state of the church contains two elements: (1) *It had peace,* rest from persecutions, and, as its accompaniment, the moral state: *becoming edified—advancing in Christian perfection,* according to the habitual use of the word in the N.T.—*and walking in the fear of the Lord,* i.e. *leading a God-fearing life,* by which that edification exhibited itself in the moral conduct. (2) *It was enlarged,* increased in the number of its members, by the exhortation of the Holy Spirit, i.e. by the Holy Spirit through His awakening influence directing the minds of men to give audience to the preaching of the gospel. The meaning: *comfort, consolation,* is at variance with the context, although still adopted by Baumgarten. — Observe, moreover, with the correct reading ἡ μὲν οὖν εὐαγγελία κ. τ.λ. the aspect of unity, under which Luke, *surveying the whole domain of Christendom,* comprehends the churches which had been already formed, and were in course of formation. The external bond of this unity was the apostles; the internal, the Spirit; Christ the One Head; the forms of the union were not yet more fully developed than by the gradual institution of presbyters (xi. 30) and deacons. That the church was also in Galilee, was obvious of itself, though the name is not included in viii. 1; it was, indeed, the *cradle of Christianity.*

Vv. 32–35. (*n*) This journey of visitation and the incidents related of Peter to the end of chap. x. occur, according to the order of the text, in the period of Paul’s abode in Cilicia after his departure from Jerusalem, ver. 30. Olshausen, in an entirely arbitrary manner, transfers them to the time of the Arabian sojourn, and considers the communication of the return to Jerusalem, at ix. 26 ff., as anticipated. — διὰ πάντων] namely, τῶν ἁγίων, as necessarily results from what follows. — Αἰδία, in the O. T. *Lod,* a village resembling a town, not far from the Mediterranean, near Joppa (ver. 38), at a later period the important city of Diospolis, now the village of Ludd. — Αἰνπας was, according to his Greek name, perhaps a Hellenist; whether he was a Christian, as Kuinoel thinks, because his conversion is not afterwards related, or not, in favour of which is the anything but characteristic designation ἀνθρωπὸν τινα, remains undetermined. — ἰάραι *σε* actually, at this moment. — Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός] *Jesus the Messiah.* — στράτευσεν *σε] Erreoneously Heumann, Kuinoel: “Lectum, quem tibi hactenus alii
straverunt, in posterum tute tibi ipse sterne." The imperative aorist denotes the immediate fulfilment;¹ hence: make thy bed, on the spot, for thyself; perform immediately, in token of thy cure, the same work which hitherto others have had to do for thee in token of thine infirmity. — ἀπέγνωμι, used also in classical writers absolutely, without εἰσάγεται or the like.² — Sarona, ["א"ר] a very fruitful,³ plain along the Mediterranean at Joppa, extending to Caesarea.⁴ — ἀναίνεις ἐπιστρ. ἐπὶ τ. κύρ. ] The aorist does not stand for the pluperfect, so that the sense would be: all Christians;⁵ but: and there saw him, after his cure, all the inhabitants of Lydda and Saron, they who (quippe qui), in consequence of this practical proof of the Messiahship of Jesus, turned to the Lord. The numerous conversions, which occurred in consequence of the miraculous cure, are in a popular hyperbolical manner represented by πάντες οἱ κτ.λ. as a conversion of the population as a whole. — Since Peter did not first inquire as to the faith of the sick man, he must have known the man's confidence in the miraculous power communicated to him as the ambassador and announcer of the Messiah (ver. 34), or have read it from his looks, as in iii. 4. Chrysostom and Oecumenius adduce other reasons.

Ver. 36. Ἰονίπητος, Ἰονίπητος, now Jaffa, an old, strong, and important commercial city on the Mediterranean, directly south of the plain of Sharon, at this time, after the deposition of Archelaus, belonging to the province of Syria.⁶ — μαθητὴς] whether virgin, widow, or wife, is undetermined.⁷ On this late Greek word, only here in the N. T., see Wetstein. — Ταβίθα, Aramaic נֶבִיתָה, which corresponds to the Hebrew נֶבִיתָה (נָבִיתָה), i.e. מרגָדָא,⁸ a gazelle.⁹ It appears as a female name also in Greek writers;¹⁰ and the bestowal of this name is explained from the gracefulness of the animal, just as the old Oriental love-songs adorn their descriptions of female loveliness by comparison with gazelles. — καὶ ἔλεγα.] καὶ: and in particular. Comp. ver. 41. That Tabitha was a deaconess,¹¹ is not implied in the text; there were probably not yet any such office-bearers at that time.

Vv. 37, 38. Concerning the general ancient custom of washing the dead, see Dougtaei¹² and Wetstein; also Hermann.¹³ — ἐν ἕπερῳ] The article, which Lachmann and Bornemann have, after A C E, was not necessary, as it was well known that there was only one upper room (i. 13) in the house, and thus no mistake could occur. Nor is anything known as to its

¹ Eismal. ad Sop. Aj. 1180; Kühner, II. p. 89.
² Hom. Od. xii. 598; Plut. Arct. 22.
³ Notto be accented ἡπάνω, with Lachmann, but ἡπάνω. See Bornemann in loc. Comp. Lobeck, Paralip. p. 586.
⁴ Jerome, ad loc. xxxii. 19.
⁶ Kumol.
⁸ But probably a widow. To this point
⁹ Several.
¹⁰ Ver. 39; all the widows of the church, who lamented their dead companion.
¹⁴ Tholosch. Sepp.
¹⁵ Anal. II. p. 77 ff.
¹⁶ Private Letter. § 20. 5.
having usually served as the chamber for the dead; perhaps the room for privacy and prayer was chosen in this particular instance, because they from the very first thought to obtain the presence and agency of Peter. — μη ὅκυρας κ.τ.λ. Comp. Num. xxii. 16. "Fides non tollit civilitatem verborum," Bengel. On the classical ἄκειν, only here in the N. T., see Ruhnke, 1; Jacobs. 2 Thou mayest not hesitate to come to us. On ὄτιλθ., comp. Luke ii. 15.

Ver. 39. The widows, the recipients of the ἀγαθῶν ἵππ. λ. ἱλιποιος., ver. 38, exhibit to Peter the under and upper garments, which they wore 3 as gifts of the deceased, who herself, according to the old custom among women, had made them,—the eloquent utterance of just and deep sorrow, and of warm desire that the apostolic power might here become savingly operative; but, according to Zeller, a display calculated for effect. — ἡ Δορκᾶ[. The proper name expressed in Greek is, as the most attractive for non-Jewish readers, and perhaps also as being used along with the Hebrew name in the city itself, here repeated, and is therefore not, with Wassenberg, to be suspected.

Vv. 40-43. The putting out 4 of all present took place in order to preserve the earnestness of the prayer and its result from every disturbing influence. — τὸ σῶμα the dead body. See on Luke xvii. 37. On ἄνεκθάναται, comp. Luke vii. 15. — The explanation of the fact as an awakening from apparent death 5 is exceptively at decided variance with ver. 37, but is also to be rejected historically, as the revival of the actually dead Tabitha has its historical precedents in the raisings of the dead by Jesus. 6 Ewald's view also amounts ultimately to an apparent death (p. 245), placing the revival at that boundary-line, "where there may scarcely be still the last spark of life in a man." Baur, in accordance with his foregone conclusions, denies all historical character to the miracles at Lydda and Joppa, holding that they are narratives of evangelical miracles transferred to Peter; 7 and that the very name Ταβιθά is probably derived simply from the ταλήθα κοῦμ, Mark v. 40, for Ταβιθά properly (?) denotes nothing but maiden. — και] and in particular. — Ver. 42. ἐνί] direction of the faith, as in xi. 17, xvi. 31, xxii. 19; Rom. iv. 24. — Ver. 43. βυρακ] although the trade of a tanner, on account of its being occupied with dead animals, was esteemed unclean; 8 which Peter now disregarded. — The word βυρακες in Artemidorus and others, has also passed into the language of the Talmud (ברק). The more classical term is βυροδέψις. 9

1 Ad Thm. p. 190.
2 Ad Anthol. III. p. 894.
3 Observe the middle ἐνοίκησαν. (only here in the N. T.) they exhibited on themselves. There lay a certain self-consciousness, yes, a grateful ostentation, in their being able to show the pledges of her beneficence. See on the distinction between the active and middle of ἐνοίκησαν. Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. ii. 1. 21. Comp. also Asi, Lex. Plat. i. p. 772.
4 Comp. Matt. ix. 26; Mark v. 40; Luke viii. 54.
6 Hence it is just as unnecessary as it is arbitrary to assume, with Lange, apost. Zeitl. II. p. 123, that Tabitha had for a considerable time stood in spiritual rapport with Peter, and that this was the vehicle of the reviving agency.
7 Comp. also Zeller, p. 177 f.
8 Weistek and Schoettgen.
Notes by American Editor.

(\textit{m1}) \textit{Saul}. V. 1.

The first section of the ninth chapter furnishes a record of an event in the early history of the church of Christ, second in interest and importance only to the wonders of the day of Pentecost—the sudden, miraculous conversion of Saul of Tarsus. He was a man of rare endowments, varied attainments, great influence, and indomitable energy; and he became the mightiest champion, and most zealous and successful missionary of the faith he had so fiercely undertaken to overthrow. More than any, or than all of the apostles, he has impressed his spirit and personality on evangelical Christianity; and thus he has wielded a more potent influence in the world than any man of his own, or of any other age, unless, indeed, we except that mighty man of God, the great emancipator and lawgiver of Israel. Of this marked event we have three distinct accounts in the Acts—one in the narrative of Luke, two in speeches delivered by Paul himself—and numerous allusions in his epistles. These accounts agree in all principal points, and only differ in subordinate details. The variety furnishes the highest evidence of the credibility of the history. The separate accounts mutually supplement each other, and give completeness to the record. Farrar says: "It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of Paul’s conversion as one of the evidences of Christianity. That the same man who just before was persecuting Christianity with the most violent hatred should come, all at once, to believe in him whose followers he had been seeking to destroy, and that in this faith he should become a ‘new creature’—what is this but a victory which Christianity owed to nothing but the spell of its own inherent power? Of all who have been converted to the faith of Christ, there is not one in whose case the Christian principle broke so immediately through everything opposed to it, and asserted so absolutely its triumphant superiority. Henceforth to Paul Christianity was summed up in the one word, Christ."

(\textit{o1}) \textit{Damascus}. V. 2.

The name of Damascus occurs as early as the time of Abraham, and is, therefore, probably the oldest city in the world. It is situated about one hundred and forty miles north-east of Jerusalem, and was, at the time of Paul’s visit, the capital of Syria. Many Jews resided there, and it is probable a number of them were present on the day of Pentecost, so that a church was early planted in it. The city has had a romantic and diversified history. It played an important part in the Wars of the Crusades, and it is still one of the largest cities in the East, containing 150,000 inhabitants. Beautiful for situation as it is important in position, it has been described as "the eye of the East," or as "a handful of pearls in its goblet of emeralds."

(\textit{o1}) \textit{A light from heaven}. V. 3.

Our author strongly repudiates and refutes the opinions of those who attempt to account for the occurrence on natural principles—as that Paul was in greatly perturbed state of mind, in reference to all he had heard about Jesus,
and had witnessed concerning Stephen; that, while journeying in this unsettled and troubled state, he encountered a violent thunder-storm, and was blinded by a vivid flash of lightning; that his excited imagination heard a voice in the thunder, and saw a celestial form in the lightning. He says the light was rather the heavenly radiance, with which the exalted Christ, appearing in his glory, is surrounded. The Risen One himself was in the light which appeared and converted Saul. This, doubtless, is the meaning of the narrative. Paul was free from fanaticism, and under no hallucination, and was little likely to confound a merely natural phenomenon with a heavenly revelation. To him the sight and the sound alike were impressively and permanently real. “And about that which he saw and heard he never wavered. It was the secret of his inmost being; it was the most unalterable conviction of his soul; it was the very crisis and most intense moment of his life. Others might hint at explanations or whisper doubt: Saul knew. From that moment Saul was converted. A change total, utter, final had passed over him. And the means of this mighty change all lay in this one fact—at that awful moment he had seen the Lord Jesus Christ.” (Burrar.)

(r1) Stood speechless. V. 7.

The first apparent discrepancy here relates to the posture of Paul's companions. Luke says they stood; Paul says they all fell to the ground (xxvi. 14). “This verb often means to stand, not as opposed to other attitudes, but to be fixed and stationary, as opposed to the idea of motion. In this sense the passage is entirely consistent with xxvi. 14, where it is said that when they heard the voice they all fell to the ground. Plainly it was not Luke's object to say that they stood erect in distinction from kneeling, lying prostrate, and the like; but that, overpowered by what they saw and heard, they were fixed to the spot; they were unable for a time to speak or move.” (Hackett.)

The second apparent discrepancy relates to the voice from heaven. Luke says Paul's companions heard it; Paul says (xxii. 9), “They heard not the voice of him that spake to me.” The verb rendered to hear is often used in the sense of to understand—to hear with the understanding. The meaning is that the words of our Lord were heard indeed both by Paul and his companions, but were understood only by the former. “ἀκούω, like the corresponding word in other languages, means not only to hear, but to hear so as to understand.” The expression used by Luke differs from that employed by Paul—Luke uses φωνή; Paul, φωνήν. Jacobson and others think that this implies a difference in the meaning, attributing to the genitive case a partitive sense, and so understanding Luke to say the companions heard something of the voice, but indistinctly. Hackett and Alford both disapprove of this distinction.

(q1) Many days. V. 23.

During the time included by this phrase, the journey into Arabia, of which Paul speaks in his epistle to the Galatians, but of which Luke makes no mention, must have been made. There is an indefiniteness about the time, and where and how it was spent, which leaves room for various conjectures. “The following,” says Gloag, “appears to have been the series of events: Paul, immediately after his conversion, spent a few days with the disciples at Damas-
cus, preaching Christ in the synagogues of the Jews (verses 19–22). Soon afterward, urged by an internal impulse, he went to Arabia, where he spent two or three years in retirement, preparing himself for his great mission (Gal. i. 15–17). Then he returned to Damascus, and spent some time longer there preaching the gospel (ver. 23). Afterward, in consequence of a plot of the Jews against his life, he effected his escape and betook himself to Jerusalem (verses 24, 25). It is probable that the greater part of the three years was spent not in Damascus, but in Arabia; for it is to his residence in Arabia that Paul himself gives the greater prominence. Damascus is only incidentally mentioned by him. This also best accounts for the cold reception which he received from the disciples in Jerusalem." The fact that Luke makes no mention of the journey to Arabia may be accounted for by this consideration, that the Acts is not a biography of Paul in his private relations or experiences, but a record of his public labors for the extension and upbuilding of the church.

"Paul, in Arabia, was not an evangelist, but a student of theology; not a dispenser, but a receiver of revelations. He who formerly at Jerusalem sat at the feet of Gamaliel, in Arabia sat as a student at the feet of Jesus; and the Acts records not his studies but his labors; it relates public events which are history, not private events which are biography." (Gloag.)

(21) Peter and Paul—Lydda and Joppa. V. 32.

On the return of Paul from Damascus to Jerusalem he was introduced to the brethren there by Barnabas. There first Peter and Paul met and took counsel together. Kindred in spirit, though differing much in social culture and mental training, the high-born, philosophic pupil of Gamaliel and the humble illiterate boatman of Galilee formed, even during the brief intercourse of two weeks, an ardent, life-long friendship. Little did either of them at the time imagine the grandeur of the work in which they were engaged, or the great things they both were to do and to suffer for the sake of Him they sought to serve and honor. Still less did they suppose that their humble names would be inscribed in the heraldry of deathless fame, while the great men of their day, princes, philosophers, and priests, would be remembered chiefly because of their relation to them and their work. Scarcely had the names of Caligula, and Gamaliel, and Annas been known to-day but for their connection with these two humble great men and their mission. After a few days of wonderful and intimate fellowship, and mutual explanations of personal experience, they part—Paul to go to his native city, and Peter to visit the church in the vicinity of Jerusalem. Hitherto the attention of the apostles had mainly been given to the church in the capital; now the most restless and ardent of their number goes forth on a tour of pastoral and evangelistic labor. In his journeyings he came to Lydda, the ancient Lud, situated in the delightful pastoral plain of Sharon, famous for its beauty, flowers, and fruitfulness. The old loveliness of the plain remains, but it is now a solitude; and a soil rich enough to supply all Palestine with food, under the desolating rule of the Ottoman domination, is untilled and unproductive. Lydda is the reputed birthplace of St. George, whose name is associated with the mythical story of the dragon, and who is the so-called patron saint of England. Peter came to the saints there. It is worthy of note that there are four names by which the followers of Jesus were designated before they were called Christians—the name by which they are now
universally distinguished: disciples, i. 15; believers, ii. 44; saints, ix. 13; brethren, ix. 30. Here, and also at Joppa, now Jaffa, a seaport on the Mediterranean, and within six miles of Lydda, the apostle wrought two striking miracles, in restoring the confirmed paralytic Eneas to perfect strength, and in raising the deceased Dorcas to life. To the one he said: "Eneas, Jesus Christ maketh thee whole;" and to the other, after prayer: "Tabitha, arise." Attempts have been made to explain away these miracles, but they have totally failed. The impression made on all who witnessed them was that it was the mighty power of God, and in consequence "many believed in the Lord." Dr. W. M. Taylor says: "A wonder, and yet not a wonder. A wonder when we look at Peter, the human instrument; but no wonder at all when we think of Jesus Christ, the Divine Agent. It is Divine power that works in daily order, and Divine choice can alter that order in an individual instance. Hence let but the Deity of Jesus Christ be granted, and the whole matter is explained."
CHAPTER X.

Ver. 1. After τίς, Elz. Scholz have ἤν, which Lachm. Tisch. and Born. have deleted. It is wanting in A B C E G Λ, min., in the vss. and Theophyl.; it was inserted (after ix. 36), because the continuous construction of vv. 1–3 was mistaken. Almost according to the same testimony the usual τί, ver. 2, after ποιῶν is condemned as an insertion. — Ver. 3. ἤσει] Lachm. and Born. read ἤσει περί, after A B C E Λ, min. Dam. Theophyl. 2. Rightly; the περί after ἤσει was passed over as superfluous. — Ver. 5. After Σίμων read, with Lachm. Tisch. Born., τιμά, according to A B C, min. Copt. Arm. Syr. p. (in the margin) Vulg. The indefinite τιμά appeared not suited to the dignity of the prince of the apoftles, and was therefore omitted. — After ver. 6, Elz. (following Erasum.) has οὕτος λαλήσει σοι, τι σε δεῖ ποιεῖν, which, according to decisive testimony, is to be rejected as an interpolation from ix. 6, x. 32. The addition, which some other witnesses have instead of it: ὅσ λαλήσει ῥήματα πρὸς σε, ἐν οἷς σωθήσῃ σοῦ καὶ πᾶς ὁ οἶκός σου, is from x. 14. — Ver. 7. αὐτῷ] Elz. has τῷ Κορινθίων, against decisive testimony. On similar evidence αὐτῷ after οἴκητ. (Elz. Scholz) is deleted. — Ver. 10. αὐτῷ[ So Lachm. Born. Tisch. instead of the usual ίκεῖνα, which has far preponderant evidence against it, and was intended to remedy the indefiniteness of the αὐτῶν. — ἐπέσεθαν] A B C Λ, min. Copt. Or. have ἐγένετο, which Griesb. approved, and Lachm. Tisch. Born. have adopted, and that rightly, as it is preponderantly attested, and was easily replaced by the more definite ἐπέσεθα (Clem.: ἐπέσεθ) as its gloss. — Ver. 11. After καταβαίνων, Elz. has ἐπι' αὐτόν, which is wanting in A B C E Λ, min. vss. Or. Defended, indeed, by Rinck (as having been omitted in conformity to xi. 5); but the very notice καὶ ἠλθεν ἄρχει ἐμοί, xi. 5, has here produced the addition ἐπι' αὐτόν as a more precise definition. — δεδεμένων καὶ] is wanting in A B C E Λ, min. Arm. Aeth. Vulg. Or. Cyr. Theodoret. Deleted by Lachm. But see xi. 5. — Ver. 12. τῆς γῆς] is wanting in too few witnesses to be regarded as spurious. But Lachm. and Tisch. have it after ἐρπετά, according to A B C E Λ, min. vss. and Fathers. Rightly; see xi. 6, from which passage also the usual καὶ τὰ δῆρια before καὶ τὰ ἐρπετά is interpolated. τὰ before ἐρπετά and πετενά is, with Lachm. and Tisch., to be deleted. — Ver. 16. εὐθοῦς] So Lachm. and Tisch. after A B C E Λ, min. Copt. Aeth. Vulg. But Elz. Scholz have πάλιν, which is introduced from xi. 10, although defended by Born. (who places it after ἀνελ.) on account of its appearing superfluous. — Ver. 17. καὶ ἰδοὺ] Lachm. reads ἰδοι, after A B Λ, min.; but καὶ was unnecessary, and might appear disturbing. — Ver. 19. ἀνεκθυμομένων] Elz. has ἀνεκθυμ., against decisive evidence. Neglect of the double compound, elsewhere not occurring in the N. T. — ἀνερέτ] Elz. Lachm. Scholz add to this τρεῖς, which is wanting in D G H min. vss. and Fathers. An addition, after ver. 7, xi. 11; instead of which B has ὁ (ver. 7), which Buttman in the Stud. u. Krit. 1860, p. 357, unsatisfactorily defends by the artificial assumption—not confirmed by the expression in ver. 8—that the soldier was only taken with him as escort and attendant. — Ver. 20. Instead
CRITICAL REMARKS.

of ὅτι, Elz. has διότι, against decisive evidence. — Ver. 21. After ἁμαρτας, Elz. has τοῦ ἀπεσταλμένου ἀπὸ τοῦ Κορυφίου πρὸς αὐτῶν, against A B C D E G Ν, min. and most vss. Chrys. An addition, because ver. 21 commences a church-lesson. — Ver. 23. ἀναστάς] is wanting in Elz., but is just as certainly protected by decisive testimony, and by its being apparently superfluous, as ο Πέτρος, which in Elz. stands before ἐξῆλθε, is condemned by A B C D Ν, min. and several vss. as the subject written on the margin. — Ver. 25. τοῦ εἰσελθεῖτο] Elz. has merely εἰσελθεῖν. But τοῦ is found in A B C D E G Ν, min. Chrys. Bas. Theophyl. See the exegetical remarks. — Born. reads ver. 25 thus: προσεγγίζοντος δὲ τοῦ Πέτρου εἰς τὴν Κασάριναν, προφανῶν εἰς τῶν δουλῶν διεσφάζοντα παραγεγονέναι αὐτῶν τὸ μὲν ἑκκηρήσας καὶ συναντήσας αὐτῷ πεσὼν πρὸς τοῖς πόδας προσεκινήσαν αὐτῶν, only after D, Syr. p. (on the margin); an apocryphal attempt at depicting the scene, and how much of a foil to the simple narrative in the text! — Ver. 30. After εἰναι, Elz. has ἔμαχον, which, according to preponderant testimony, is to be rejected as a supplementary addition. Lachm. has also deleted πηρτεύων καὶ, after some important odd. (including Ν) and several vss. But the omission is explained by there being no mention of fasting in ver. 3. — Ver. 32. δὲ παραγεγον. λαλήσας καὶ] is wanting in Lachm., after A B Ν, min. Copt. Aeth. Vulg. But the omission took place in accordance with ver. 6. — Ver. 33. Instead of ὅτα, read, with Lachm. Tisch. Born. according to preponderating evidence, ἀπὸ (E παρά).— Instead of Θεοῦ, Lachm. and Tisch. have κυρίου, according to predominant attestation; Θεοῦ is a mechanical repetition from the preceding, in which the reading ἐνῷ, σοῦ. (Born.) is, on account of too weak attestation, to be rejected. — Ver. 36. δὶ] is wanting in A B Ν, min. Copt. Sahid. Aeth. Vulg. Ath. Deleted by Lachm.; but the omission very naturally suggested itself, in order to simplify the construction. — Ver. 37. ἀφάνεων] A C D E H Ν, min. have ἀράφανον, which Lachm. has on the margin. A D Vulg. Cant. Ir. add γάρ, which Lachm. puts in brackets. Born. has ἀράφανον γάρ. But ἀράφανον is necessary, according to the sense. — Ver. 39. After ἣμείς, Elz. has ἑμεῖς, against decisive testimony. A supplementary addition. — Ver. 42. αὐτὸς] B C D E G, min. Syr. utr. Copt. Sahid. have οὗτος. Recommended by Griesb. and adopted by Lach. and Born. An erroneous correction. See the exegetical remarks. — Ver. 43. αὐτῶν] ἀναίρεσις is neither strongly enough attested (A Ν), nor in accordance with the sense. — τοῦ κυρίου] A B E Ν, min. vss. Fathers have Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. So Lachm. An alteration, in order to denote the specific character of the baptism more definitely. Hence some odd. and vss. have both together. So Born, after D.

(ε'). Vv. 1, 2. Κασαρία] See on viii. 40.—The centurion was of the Italian cohort, which, stationed at Caesarea, consisted of Italians, not of natives of the country, like many other Roman troops in Syria. Such a Roman auxiliary corps was appropriately stationed at the place where the procurator had his residence, for the maintenance of tranquillity.1 — εἰσιβηθαὶ κ. φοβομένοις τ. Θεοῦ] pious and fearing God (τ'). The latter is the more precise definition of the more general εἰσιβηθαὶ. Cornelius was a Gentile, who, discontented with polytheism, had turned his higher interest towards Judaism, and

---

satisfied a deeper pious want in the earnest private worship of Jehovah along with all his family. Judaism, as Stoicism and the like in the case of others, was for him the philosophical-religious school, to which he, although without being a proselyte, addicted himself in his heart and devotional life. Hence his beneficence (ver. 2) and his general esteem among the Jews (ver. 23.) Comp. the centurion of Capernaum, Luke vii. Others consider him, with Mede, Grotius, Fecht,1 Deyling, Hammond, Wolf, Ernesti, Ziegler, Paulus, Olshausen, Neander, Lechler, and Ritschel, as a proselyte of the gate.2 But this is at variance with vv. 28, 34, 35, xi. 1, 18, xv. 7, where he is simply put into the class of the Gentiles,—a circumstance which cannot be referred merely to the want of circumcision, as the proselytes of the gate also belonged to the communion of the theocracy, and had ceased to be non-Jews like absolute foreigners.3 And all the great importance which this event has in a connected view of the Book of Acts, has as its basis the very circumstance that Cornelius was a Gentile. Least of all can his proselytism be proved from the expression φοβοχώνεις τὸν Θεόν itself, as the general literal meaning of this expression can only be made by the context 4 to apply to the worship of proselytes; but here we are required by ver. 35 to adhere to that general literal meaning without this particular reference. It is to be considered, moreover, that had Cornelius been a proselyte of the gate, it would have, according to xv. 7, to be assumed that hitherto no such proselyte at all had been converted to Christianity, which, even apart from the conversion of the Ethiopian, chap. viii., is—considering the many thousand converts of which the church already consisted—incredible, particularly as often very many were admitted simultaneously,5 and as certainly the more unprejudiced proselytes were precisely the most inclined to join the new theocracy. Accordingly the great step which the new church makes in its development at chap. x. consists in this, that by divine influence the first Gentile, who did not yet belong to the Jewish theocratic state, becomes a Christian, and that directly, without having first made the transition in any way through Mosaicism. The extraordinary importance of this epoch-making event stands in proportion to the accumulated miraculous character of the proceedings. The view, which by psychological and other assumptions and combinations assigns to it along with the miraculous character also a natural instrumentality,6 leads to deviations from the narrative, and to violences which are absolutely rejected by the text.7 The view which rejects the historical reality of the narrative, and refers it to a set purpose in the author,8 seeks its chief confirmation in the difficulties which the direct admission of the Gentiles had for long still to encounter, in what is narrated in chap. xv., and in the conduct of Peter at Antioch.9 But, on the other

1 De pl era. Cornelii, Rostoch. 1701.
2 Selden, de jure na. ii. 8 (whom de Wette follows), has doubted, but without sufficient reason, the existence of מַשָּׁרֶת in the proper sense, after the Captivity.
3 See Ewald, Alterth. p. 813; Kell, Archdol. i. p. 817.
4 As xili. 16, 26.
5 II. 41, iv. 4.
6 Neander, p. 115 f. [and Baumgarten.
7 See, on the other hand, Zeller, p. 179 f.
8 Baur, Zeller.
hand, it is to be observed, that not even miracles are able at once to remove in the multitude deeply rooted national prejudices, and to dispense with the gradual progress of psychological development requisite for this end, comp. the miracles of Jesus Himself, and the miracles performed on him; that further, in point of fact the difficulties in the way of the penetration of Christianity to the Gentiles were exceedingly great; and that Peter's conduct at Antioch, with a character so accessible to the impressions of the moment, comp. the denial, is psychologically intelligible as a temporary obscuration of his better conviction once received by way of revelation, at variance with his constant conduct on other occasions, and therefore by no means necessitates the presupposition that the extraordinary divine disclosure and guidance, which our passage narrates, are unhistorical. Indeed, the reproach which Paul makes to Peter at Antioch, presupposes the agreement in principle between them in respect to the question of the Gentiles; for Paul designates the conduct of Peter as ὑπόκρίσις, Gal. ii. 13.

Ver. 3. Εἰδὼν is the verb belonging to ἀνήρ ... Κορνήλ., ver. 1, and ἱκανοντ. ... διαπαντὸς is in apposition to Κορνήλ. — The intimation made to Cornelius is a vision in a waking condition, caused by God during the hour of prayer, which was sacred to the centurion on account of his high respect for Judaism, i.e. a manifestation of God made so as to be clearly perceptible to the inner sense of the pious man, conveyed by the medium of a clear (φανερῶς) angelic appearance in vision, which Cornelius himself, ver. 80, describes more precisely in its distinctly seen form, just as it at once on its occurrence made the corresponding impression upon him; hence ver. 4: ἦ ημος γενόμην. and τί ἔστι, κύριε; Eichhorn rationalized the narrative to the effect that Cornelius, full of longing to become acquainted with the distinguished Peter now so near him, learned the place of his abode from a citizen of Joppa at Caesarea, and then during prayer felt a peculiar elevation of mind, by which, as if by an angel, his purpose of making Peter's acquaintance was confirmed. This is opposed to the whole representation; with which also Ewald's similar view fails to accord, that Cornelius, uncertain whether or not he should wish a closer acquaintance with Peter, had, "as if irradiated by a heavenly certainty and directed by an angelic voice," firmly resolved to invite the apostle at once to visit him. — ὡσι περὶ ἡμ. ἐνάρ. (see the critical remarks): as it were about the ninth hour. Circumstantiality of expression.

Ver. 4. Εἰς μνημοσύνην ἐνώπ. τ. Θεοῦ] is to be taken together, and denotes the aim or the destination of ἄνεβησαν: to be a mark, i.e. a token of remembrance, before God, so that they give occasion to God to think on thee. Comp. ver. 51. The sense of the whole figurative expression is: "Thy prayers and thine alms have found consideration with God; He will fulfil the former and reward the later." See ver. 51. — ἄνεβησαν is strictly

---

1 See Ewald, p. 200 ff. ; Ritschl, altkath. K.
2 See on Gal. ii. 14.
3 Comp. Luke xxiv. 5
4 See Bornemann in loc.
5 Comp. Matt. xxvi. 13.
6 Assuredly from the heart of the devout Gentile there had arisen for the most part prayers for higher illumination and sanctification of the inner life; probably also, seeing that Christianity had already attracted so
suiited only to αἱ προσευχαί, which, according to the figurative embodiment of the idea of granting prayer, ascend from the heart and mouth of man to God; but it is by a zeugma referred also to the alms, which have excited the attention of God, to requite them by leading the pious man to Christ. The opinion that ἀνεβαίνει is based on the Jewish notion that prayers are carried by the angels to the throne of God, is as arbitrarily imported into the text as is the view that εἰς μνήματον signifies instar sacrificii, because forsooth, the LXX. express ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ by μνήματον. In all these passages the sense of a memorial-offering is necessarily determined by the context, which is not the case here with the simple ἀνεβαίνει. — On the relation of the good works of Cornelius to his faith, Gregory the Great already correctly remarks that he did not arrive at faith by his works, but at the works by his faith. The faith, however cordial and vivid it was, was in his case up till now the Old Testament faith in the promised Messiah, but was destined, amidst this visitation of divine grace, to complete itself into the New Testament faith in Jesus as the Messiah who had appeared. Thus was his way of salvation the same as that of the chamberlain, chap. viii. Comp. also Luther’s gloss on ver. 1.

Vv. 5-7. The tanner, on account of his trade, dwelt by the Mediterranean sea, and probably apart from the city, to which his house belonged. "Cadarus et sepulcrum separat et coriarium quinquaginta cubitos a civitate." — The πιστός is added to Σαμων (see the critical remarks) from the standpoint of Cornelius, as to him Peter was one unknown. — εἰσεβήνει the soldier, one of the men of the cohort specially attached and devoted to Cornelius (τῶν προσκαρπ. αὐτῶν), had the same religious turn of mind as his master, ver. 2.

Vv. 9, 10. On the following day, for Joppa was thirty miles from Caesarea, shortly before the arrival of the messengers of Cornelius at Peter’s house, the latter was, by means of a vision effected by divine agency in the state of ecstasy, prepared for the unhesitating acceptance of the summons of the Gentile; while the feeling of hunger, with which Peter passed into the trance, served the divine revelation as the medium of its special form. — ἐπὶ τῷ δῶμα for the flat οὐσία were used by the Hebrews for religious exercises, prayers, and meditations. Incorrectly Jerome, Luther, Priceus, Erasmus, Heinrichs, hold that the ἰπεραίον is meant. At variance with N. T. usage; even the Homeric δῶμα (hall) was something different; and why should Luke not have employed the usual formal word ἰπεραίον? Moreover,
the subsequent appearance is most in keeping with an abode in the open air.

— ἐκτετ[ρ]. See on iii. 1. πρόσεπεῖς, ἄμφρογχα, is not elsewhere preserved; the Greeks say πειναῖς, — ἤδειλε γεύσασθαι] he had the desire to eat—and in this desire, whilst the people of the house (αὐτῶν) were preparing food, παρασκευαζόμενων, the ἐκσάσης came upon him (ἰγκέντα, see the critical remarks), by which is denoted the involuntary setting in of this state.⁵ The ἐκσάσης itself is the wakening but not spontaneous state, in which a man, transported out of the lower consciousness (2 Cor. xii. 2, 3) and freed from the limits of sensuous restriction as well as of discursive thought, apprehends with his higher pneumatic receptivity divinely presented revelations, whether these reach the inner sense through visions or otherwise ⁷ (ν').

Vv. 11-13. Observe the vividly introduced historical present θεωρεῖ, — πίσσαραν ἀρχάς ἔδειμ.] attached with four ends, namely, to the edges of the opening which had taken place in heaven. Chap. xi. 5 requires this explanation, not the usual one: "bound together at the four corners." Nor does the text mention anything of ropes, bound to which it was let down. The visionary appearance has something marvellous even in the way of its occurrence. We are to imagine the vessel—whose four corners, moreover, are without warrant explained by Augustine, Wetstein, Bengel, Lange, and others as pointing to the four quarters of the world—looking like a colossal four-cornered linen-cloth (ἀδίδημη), letting itself down, while the corners attached to heaven support the whole. On ἀρχά, extremitates, see Jacobs.⁶—πάστα τὰ τετράποδα] The formerly usual interpretation: "four-footed beasts of all sorts, i.e. of very many kinds," is linguistically erroneous. The phenomenon in its supernatural visionary character exhibits as present in the σκίνος (ἐν ὑπ' ἐπηχεῖ) all four-footed beasts, reptiles, and birds, all kinds of them, without exception.⁶ In a strangely arbitrary manner Kuinoel, after Calovius and others, holds that these were only unclean animals. See on ver. 14. — τοῦ οἰκονομοῦ] See on Matt. vii. 26. — ἀνασκάει] Perhaps Peter lay during the trance. Yet it may also be the mere call to action: arise.⁷—θῶσον] oecide,²—slay, not: sacrifice,² see ver. 10.

Vv. 14-16. Peter correctly recognises in the summons θῶσον κ. φάγε, ver. 13, the allowance of selection at his pleasure among all the animals, by which, consequently, the eating of the unclean without distinction was permitted to him. Hence, and not because only unclean animals were seen in the vessel, his strongly declining μηδαμῶς, κίρε! This κίρε is the address to the—to him unknown—author of the voice, not to Christ.⁸—Concerning the animals which the Jews were forbidden to eat, see Lev. xi.; Deut. xiv.

¹ For examples of the absolute γεύσασθαι, see Kypke, ii. p. 47.
² See Elmer, Obs. p. 408: Kypke, l.c.
³ Comp. v. 5, 11; Luke i. 63, lv. 37.
⁵ Ad Ath. XI. p. 50.
⁶ That fishes (those without fins and scales were forbidden) are not included in the vision, is explained from the fact that the σκίνος was like a cloth. Fishes would have been unsuit-
⁷ See Elmer, Obs. p. 408: Kypke, l.c.
⁸ As in 1 Macc. i. 47 (Thierbach).
⁹ Schwiegler, Zeller.
1 ff. — ὅτι οὐδὲνε ἐφαγον πάν κοινὸν ὡς ἁκαθάρτῳ.] for never ate I anything common or unclean, the Talmudic מַעְלָם, i.e. for any profane thing I have always left unclean. ἡ does not stand for καλ, but appends for the exhaustion of the idea another synonymous expression.  
κοινὸς = βέβηλος; the opposite of ἁγιός (Ezek. xiii. 20). — καὶ φωνὴ) and a voice, not ἡ φωνὴ, because here other words were heard, came again the second time to him, πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου, pleonastically circumstantial. — ἀ δ Θεὸς ἐκαθάρισε, σοὶ μὴ κοινὸν] what God has cleansed, make not thou common, unclean. The miraculous appearance with the divine voice (ver. 18) had done away the Levitical uncleanness of the animals in question; they were now divinely cleansed; and thus Peter ought not, by his refusal to obey that divine bidding, to invest them with the character of what is unholy—to transfer them into the category of the κοινὸν, Rom. xiv. 14. This was man's doing in opposition to God's deed. — εἰς τρίς] for thrice, which "ad confirmationem valuit" (Calvin); εἰς denotes the terminus ad quem.— The object aimed at in the whole vision was the symbolical divine announcement that the hitherto subsisting distinction between clean and unclean men, that hedge between Jews and Gentiles, was to cease in Christianity, as being destined for all men without distinction of nation, vv. 34, 35. But in what relation does the ἀ δ Θεὸς ἐκαθάρισε stand to the likewise divine institution of the Levitical laws about food? This is not answered by reference to "the effected and accomplished redemption, which is regarded as a restitution of the whole creation," for this restoration is only promised for the world-period commencing with the Parousia; but rather by pointing out that the institution of those laws of food was destined only for the duration of the old theocracy. They were a divine institution for the particular people of God, with a view to separate them from the nations of the world; their abolition could not therefore but be willed by God, when the time was fully come at which the idea of the theocracy was to be realized through Christ in the whole of humanity. The abolition therefore does not conflict with Matt. v. 17, but belongs to the fulfilment of the law effected by Christ, by which the distinction of clean and unclean was removed from the Levitical domain and raised into the sphere of the moral idea.

Vv. 17–20. The ἐκκαθάρισις was now over. But when Peter was very doubtful in himself what the appearance, which he had seen, might mean. The true import could not but be at once suggested to him by the messengers of Cornelius, who had now come right in front of the house, to follow whom, moreover, an internal address of the Spirit urged him. — εἰς ἐκκαθάρισιν] i.e. in his reflection, contrasted with the previous ecstatic condition.—

2 Which Laehm. and Tisch. read, after A B η, min. vas. Clem. Or.; perhaps correctly, see xi. 8.
3 Fritzsche, ad Marc. p. 277; Bornemann, Schol. in Luc. p. xi. f.
4 See on Matt. xxvi. 42; comp. on John iv. 54.
5 Bernhardy, p. 283. Comp. εἰς τρίς, Herod. i. 86; Xen. Anab. vi. 4. 16; and Wetstein.
6 Oehler.
7 III. 20; Matt. xix. 28; Rom. viii. 19 ff.
8 Ver. 35; Rom. iii.; Gal. iii. 20; Col. iii. 11; John x. 16. Comp. Matt. xv. 17, 18.
9 Comp. Rom. ii. 28, 29. See also on Rom. xv. 14; Matt. v. 17.
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διπέρ.] as in v. 24, ii. 12. — καὶ ιδοὺ] See on i. 10. — ἐπὶ τὸν πυλῶνα] at the door. See on Matt. xxvi. 71. — φωνέσατε] Kuinoel quite arbitrarily: "sc. τινὰ, εξετάζοντι φωνιαμ, quod Judaei domum intrare metuebant, ver. 18." They called below at the door of the house, without calling on or calling forth any particular person, but in order generally to obtain information from the inhabitants of the house, who could not but hear the calling. That Peter had heard the noise of the men and the mention of his name, that he had observed the men, had recognised that they were not Jews, and had felt himself impelled by an internal voice to follow them, etc., are among the many arbitrary additions, "of a supplementary kind," which Neander has allowed himself to make in the history before us. — ἀλλὰ ἀναστὰς κατάβας] ἀλλὰ with the imperative denotes nothing more than the adver- sative at. "Men seek thee: but, do not let yourself be sought for longer and delay not, but rather arise and go down." The requisition with ἀλλὰ breaks off the discourse and renders the summons more urgent. — μὴν διακρινόμεν.] in no respect wavering; "for I, etc. The πνεῦμα designates Himself as the sender of the messengers, inasmuch as the vision (vv. 8-7) did not ensue without the operation of the divine Spirit, and the latter was thus the cause of Cornelius sending the messengers. — ἤγο] with emphasis. Chrysostom rightly calls attention to the κύριον and the ἐνσωσία of the Spirit.

Vv. 22-25. Ἁγγυρούμη.] as in vi. 8. — ἔχθρασ.] The communication on the part of the angel (vv. 4-7) is understood as a divine answer to the constant prayer of Cornelius (ver. 2). — Peter and his six (xi. 12) companions had not traversed the thirty miles from Joppa to Caesarea in one day, and therefore arrived there only on the day after their departure. The messengers of Cornelius, too, had only arrived at Peter's abode on the second day, and had passed the night with him, so that now, τῷ ἐπαύρων, it was the fourth day since their departure from Caesarea. Cornelius expected Peter on this day, for which, regarding it as a high family-festival, he had invited his certainly like-minded relatives and his intimate friends. — ὡς δὲ ἐγένετο τῷ συνεκλείν τὸν Π.] but when it came to pass that Peter entered. This construction is to be regarded as a very inaccurate, improper application of the current infinitive with τῶ. No comparison with the Hebrew וַיְהִי 'ם), Gen. xv. 12, is to be allowed, because 'ם) does not stand absolutely, but has its subject beside it, and because the LXX. has never imitated this and similar expressions by ἐγένετο τῶ. The want of corresponding passages, and the impossibility of rationally explaining the expression, mark it as a completely isolated error of language, which Luke either

1 As ver. 13.
2 See Fritzsche, ad Marc. p. 370; Basel.
3 In Partik. p. 17 f.
4 Jak. 1. 6; Bernhardt, p. 333.
5 See on Rom. iv. 20.
6 See on Matt. ii. 12.
7 v. 8, 9.
8 Ver. 23.
9 Ver. 24.
10 Gesenius, Lehrg. p. 787.
11 Gesenius, l.c.
12 Even at Rev. xii. 7 it is otherwise, as there, if we do not accede to the conjecture of Dus- terdieck, ἐγένετο must be again mentally supplied with ἀ Μάρκα, but in the altered meaning: there came forward, there appeared (comp. on Mark i. 4; John 1. 6), so that it is to be translated: And there came (i.e. there set in, there resulted) were in heaven; Michael
himself committed or adopted from his original source,—and not as a corruption of the transcribers, seeing that the most important witnesses decide in favour of τοῦ, and its omission in the case of others is evidently a correction.—ἐν τῷ τοῦ τάδε] at the feet of Peter.—προσκυνητη] See on Matt. ii. 2. He very naturally conjectured, after the vision imparted to him, that there was something superhuman in the person of Peter, comp. on Luke v. 8; and to this, perhaps, the idea of heroes, to which the centurion had not yet become a stranger, contributed.

Vv. 26–29. Κἀγὼ αὐτός] also I myself, I also for mine own part, not otherwise than you. See on Rom. vii. 25. —αὐτοῖς, ἀνώτ.] in conversation with him. The word occurs elsewhere in Tzetz.—εἰσιν] namely, into the room. In ver. 25, on the other hand, τοῦ εἰσελθέν τ. Π. was meant of the entrance by the outer door into the house. —Τις οὖν ήσθε, how very unallowed it is, etc.—ἐθιμοῦ] is a later form for the old classical ἐθιμοῦν. The prohibition to enter into closer fellowship with men of another tribe, or, even but, to come to them, comp. xi. 3, is not expressly found in the Pentateuch, but easily resulted of itself from the lofty consciousness of the holy people of God contrasted with the unholy heathen, and pervades the later Judaism with all the force of contempt for the Gentiles. The passage Matt. xxiii. 5, and the narrative of the conversion of Izates king of Adiabene in Josephus, appear to testify against the utterance of Peter in our passage, and therefore Zeller, p. 187, holds it as unhistorical. But Peter speaks here from the standpoint of the Judaistic theory and rule, which is not invalidated by exceptional cases and by abuses, as in the making of proselytes. Not even if Cornelius had been a proselyte of the gate could the historical character of the saying be reasonably doubted; for the Rabbinical passages adduced with that view (according to which the proselyte is to regard himself as a member of the theocracy, apply only to complete converts, proselytes of righteousness, "quamvis factus sit proselytus, attamen nisi observet precepta legis, habendus adhuc est pro ethnico," and are, moreover, outweighed by other expressions of contempt towards proselytes, as, e.g., "Proselyti sunt sicut scabies Israelit." It is erroneous to derive the principle which Peter here expresses from Pharisaic.

came, and his angels, in order to wage war.
Among Greek writers also, as is well known, the verb to be repeated in thought is often to be taken in an altered meaning. Comp. e.g. Plat. Rep. p. 471 C, and Stall. in loc. Least of all will such a supplement occasion difficulty in a prophetic representation, which is often stiff, singular, and abrupt in its delineation (as especially in Isaiah).

In opposition to Fritzche, ad Matth. p. 948, and Rinck, Lucubr. crit. p. 64.

Comp. now also Winer, p. 397 (E. T. 419).
Comp. Luke viii. 41, xvii. 19; Mark v. 22; John xi. 23, al.

2 Macc. vi. 5.

---

7 Herod. vii. 33; Xen. Mem. l. l. 9, Cyrop. l. 6. 6.
8 The classical ἄλλος ἡμῶν is not elsewhere found in the N. T., but often in the LXX. and Apoc. The designation is here tenderly for-bearing. It is otherwise in ver. 45, xi. 3.
9 Ewald, Alterth. p. 310.
10 See, e.g., Lightfoot on Matt. xviii. 17.
11 Antt. xx. 9, 4 f.
12 As Josephus l.c.
13 Matt. l.c.
14 But see on vv. 1, 9.
15 As Schlemoth Rabba 19 f., 113. 3, ad Ex. xii. 8.
16 Comp. Sohar, p. 99, 97.
17 Babyl. Niddah f. 18. 2.
ism, or to limit it to an intentional going in quest of them, which must have been made clear from the context. —ἀναντίψατε. [without contradiction. —καὶ ἐμὴ ὁ θεὸς ἔδειξε] Contrast to ἰμᾶς ἐπιστράθη. The element of contrast lies not in the copula, but in the relation of the two clauses: Ye know . . . and to me God has showed. Very often so in John. The ὁ θεὸς ἔδειξε took place through the disclosure by means of the vision, ver. 3 ff., the allegorical meaning of which Peter understood. —πρὸς κ.τ.λ.] namely, in and for itself. —τὸν λόγον] with what reason, i.e. wherefore. See examples from classical writers in Kypke. Comp. on Matt. v. 32. The dative denotes the mediate cause.

Ver. 30. The correct view is that which has been the usual one since Chrysostom, held by Erasmus, Beza, Grotius, Bengel, Kuinoel, Olshausen: Four days ago I was fasting until this hour, i.e. until the hour of the day which it now is, and was praying at the ninth hour. ἀπὸ τῆς πρῶτης ἡμέρας: on the fourth day from the present, counting backwards, and the expression is to be explained as in John xi. 18, xxi. 8; Rev. xiv. 20. Comp. Ex. xii. 15, ἀπὸ τῆς πρῶτης ἡμέρας: on the first day before. Cornelius wishes to indicate exactly (1) the day and hour when he had seen the vision, —namely, on the fourth day before, and at the ninth hour; and (2) in what condition he was when it occurred,—namely, that he had been engaged that day in an exercise of fasting, which he had already continued up to the very hour that day, which it now was; and in connection with this exercise of fasting, he had spent the ninth hour of the day—the prayer-hour—in prayer, and then the vision had surprised him, καὶ ἵνα κ.τ.λ. Incorrectly, Heinrichs, Neander, de Wette render: For four days I fasted until this hour, when the vision occurred, namely, the ninth hour, etc. Against this view it may be decisively urged that in this way Cornelius would not specify at all the day on which he had the vision, and that χρόνος cannot mean anything else than the present hour. —ἐνώπιον τ. Θεοῦ] Ver. 3. Rev. xvi. 19. The opposite, Luke xii. 6.

Ver. 38. Ἑώσιον τοῦ κυρίου (see critical remarks), ἐν κοινωνίᾳ Dei. Cornelius knows that it is God, who so wonderfully arranged everything, before whose eyes this assembly in the house stands. He knows Him to be present as a witness. —ἀπὸ (see the critical remarks), on the part of, divinitus.

Vv. 34, 35. Ἀναφέρεται κ.τ.λ.] as in viii. 35. —With truth, so that this insight, which I have obtained, is true. I perceive that God is not partial, allowing Himself to be influenced by external relations not belonging to the moral sphere; but in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness.
is acceptable to Him,—namely, to be received into the Christian fellowship with God. Comp. xv. 14. Peter, with the certainty of a divinely-obtained conviction, denies in general that, as regards his acceptance, God goes to work in any way partially; and, on the other hand, affirms in particular that in every nation—ἀν τε ἀκρόβυστος ἦστιν, ἀν τε ἐμπερίτωμος, Chrysostom—etc. To take this contrast, ver. 35, as no longer dependent on ὅτι, but as independent, makes its importance the more strongly apparent. What is meant is the ethical-religious preliminary frames requisite for admission into Christianity, which must be a state of fellowship with God similar to the piety of Cornelius and his household, however different in appearance and form according to the degree of earlier knowledge and morality in each case, yet always a being given or a being drawn of God, according to the Gospel of John, and an attitude of heart and life toward the Christian salvation, which is absolutely independent of difference of nationality. The general truth of the proposition, as applied even to the ungodly and sinners among Jews and Gentiles, rests on the necessity of μετάνοια as a preliminary condition of admission. It is a misuse of this expression when, in spite of ver. 43, it is often adduced as a proof of the superfluousness of faith in the specific doctrines of Christianity; for δεκτός αὐτῷ ἦστι in fact denotes (ver. 36 ff.) the capability, in relation to God, of becoming a Christian, and not the capability of being saved without Christ. Bengel rightly says: “non indifferentismus religionum, sed indifferentia nationum hic asseritur.”—Respecting προσωπολήτης, not found elsewhere, see on Gal. ii. 6 (v).

Vv. 36-43. After this general declaration regarding the acceptableness for Christianity, Peter now prepares those present for its actual acceptance, by shortly explaining the characteristic dignity of Jesus, inasmuch as he (1) reminds them of His earthly work to His death on the cross, vv. 36-39; (2) then points to His resurrection and to the apostolic commission which the disciples had received from the Risen One, vv. 40-42; and finally, (3) mentions the prophetic prediction, which indicates Jesus as the universal Reconciler by means of faith on Him, ver. 43.

Vv. 36-38. The correct construction is, that we take the three accusatives: τὸν λόγον, ver. 36, τὸ γενόμενον, ῥῆμα, ver. 37, and Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέως, ver 38, as dependent on ὑμεῖς ἀδαίτε, ver 37, and treat σύντος ἐστι πάντων κύριος as a parenthesis. Peter, namely, in the τὸν λόγον already has the ὑμεῖς ἀδαίτε in view; but he interrupts himself by the insertion σύντος . . . κύριος, and now resumes the thought begun in ver. 36, in order to carry it out more amply, and that in such a way that he now puts ὑμεῖς ἀδαίτε first, and then attaches the continuation in its extended and amplified form by Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέως, by way of apposition. The message, which He (God, ver. 35) sent to the Israelites,4 when He made known salvation through Jesus Christ, He is Lord of all!—ye know the word, which went forth through all Judaea, having begun from Galilee after the baptism which John preached—Jesus of Nazareth, ye know how God anointed Him, consecrated Him to be the Messianic King,5 with the
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1 Luther, Castelo, and many others.
2 ii. 38. iii. 19. al.
4 Comp. xiii. 26.
5 See on iv. 37.
PETER'S ADDRESS.

Holy Spirit and with power, who went about doing good and healing, etc. This view is quite in keeping with the hurriedly aggregated and inartistic mode of expression of Peter, particularly at this urgent moment of extraordinary and profound emotion.1 The most plausible objection to this construction is that of Bengel:2 "Novarens auditorum historiam, de qua max. non item rationes interiores, de quibus hoc versus." But the contents of the λόγος is, in fact, stated by εἰρήνην διὰ 'I. X. so generally and, without its rationes interiores, so purely historically, that in that general shape it could not be anything strange to hearers, to whom that was known, which is said in vv. 87 and 88. Erasmus, Er. Schmid, Homberg, Wolf, Heumann, Beck,3 Heinrichs, Kuinoel make the connection almost as we have given it; but they attach ὠμείς αὐτὰ to τὸν λόγον, and take τὸ γενόμενον βήμα as apposition to τὸν λόγον,—by which, however, οὕτως ἐστι πάντων κύριος makes its weight, in keeping with the connection, far less sensibly felt than according to our view, under which it by the very fact of its high significance as an element breaks off the construction. Others refer τὸν λόγον ὑπὲρ κ.τ.λ. to what precedes, in which case, however, it cannot be taken either as for ὅν λόγον, Beza, Grotius, comp. Bengel and others, or with Olshausen, after Calvin and others, for κατὰ τὸν λόγον ὑπὲρ κ.τ.λ.; but would have, with de Wette,4 to be made dependent on καταλαμβάνω, or to be regarded as an appositional addition,5 and consequently would be epezexgetical of ὅτι σὺν ἑστι … δεκτὸς αὐτῷ ἑστι. In this case εἰρήνη would have to be understood of peace between Jews and Gentiles. But even apart from this inadmissible explanation of εἰρήνη (see below), the λόγος of ver. 36, so far as it proclaims this peace, is something very different from the doctrine indicated in ver. 35, in which there is expresses only the universally requisite first step towards Christianity. Moreover, Peter could not yet at this time say that God had caused that peace to be proclaimed through Christ—for this he required a further development starting from his present experience—for which a reference to i. 8 and to the universalism of Luke's Gospel by no means suffices. Pfeiffer,6 likewise attaching it to what precedes, explains thus: he is in so far acceptable to him, as he has the destination of receiving the message of salutation in Christ; so that εἰπεγγέλλη would be passive,7 and τὸν λόγον, as also εἰρήνη, would be the object to it. But this is linguistically incorrect, inasmuch as it would require at least the infinitive instead of εἰπεγγέλλησαν; and besides, εἰπεγγέλλησαν τοῖς there is something proclaimed to me, is foreign to the N. T. usage. Weiss8 gives the meaning: "Every one who fears God and does right, by him the gospel may be accepted;" so that τὸν λόγον would stand by attraction for ὁ λόγος, which is impossible.9 According to Ewald, p. 248, τὸν λόγον κ.τ.λ. is intended to be nothing but an explanation to δικαίωσιν. A view which is the more harsh, the further τ. λόγον stands removed from δικαίωσι,, the less τὸν λόγον ὑπὲρ κ.τ.λ. coincides as regards the notion of it with
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1 Comp. on Eph. ii. 1; Winer, p. 588 (E. T. 706).
2 Comp. de Wette.
3 Obs. crit. exeg. i. p. 13.
4 Obs. Baumgarten and Lange.
6 In the Stud. u. Krit. 1850, p. 401 ff.
8 Petr. Lehrbegr. p. 151 f.
9 In 1 Pet. ii. 7 it is otherwise.
and the more the expression ἐργάζεσθαι λόγον is foreign to the N. T. — εἰρήνη is explained by many, including Heinrichs, Seyler, de Wette, of peace between Jews and Gentiles (Eph. ii. 17), but very arbitrarily, since no more precise definition is annexed, although the Jews are just named as the receivers of the gospel. Nor is there in what follows any mention of that peace. Hence it is to be generally taken as ὅλης, salvation, and the whole Messianic salvation is meant, which God has made known through Christ to the children of Israel; not specially peace with God, which yet is the basis of salvation. — διὰ τ. Χ. belongs to εἰναγ., not to εἰρήνη; for εἰναγ. εἰρ. διὰ τ. Χ. contains the more precise explanation of the τοῦ λόγου, διὰ ἄπειρ., consequently must also designate Jesus as the sent of God, through whom the λόγος is brought. — πάντων] not neuter, but masculine. Christ is Lord of all, of Jews and Gentiles, like God Himself, whose σῶμα He is. The aim of this emphatically added remark is to make the universal destination of the word primarily sent to the Jews to be felt by the Gentile hearers, who were not to regard themselves as excluded by διὰ ἄπειρ. τοὺς νόιας: "Εἰρ. — ῥῆμα word, not the things, de Wette and older expositors, which it does not mean even in v. 32; Luke ii. 15. It returns the preceding τοῦ λόγου. On γενόμ., comp. Luke iii. 2. Concerning the order of the words, instead of τὸ καθ ὀ. ὅ. Ἰουν. γενόμ. ῥῆμα, see Kühner. — In ver. 38 the discourse now passes from the word, the announcement of which to the Jews was known to the hearers, to the announcer, of whose Messianic working they would likewise have knowledge. — ὡς ἐκρατοῦν αὐτοῖς renders prominent the special divine Messianic element in the general Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἄν. ἀν. ω. ἑνς. As to the idea of this χρίευν, see on iv. 27. — διὰ δυσλείαν him (αὐτοῦ), who, after receiving this anointing, went through, Galilee and Judea, ver. 37, doing good, and in particular healing, etc. — In the compound verb καταδύνασθαι is implied hostile domination. — μετ' αὐτοῦ is not spoken according to a "lower view," de Wette, against which, see on ii. 38; but the metaphysical relation of Christ to the Father is not excluded by this general expression, although in this circle of hearers it did not yet demand a specific prominence. Comp. Bengel: "parcius loquitur pro auditorum captu de majestate Christi."

Vv. 39–41. Ὑμεῖς καὶ ἀνείλουν] namely, oi Ἰουδαίοι. Ὡν refers to the subject of ἐποίησαν. There lies at the bottom of the καί, also, the conception of the other persecutions, etc., to which even the ἀνείλον was added. See on the climactic idea indicated by καί after relatives, Hartung. — ἀνείλ. κρημάσα.] as

1 Rom. v. 1, Calovius, and others.
2 Comp. on Rom. x. 15.
3 Bengel and others.
4 Luther and others.
5 Rom. iii. 29. x. 12.
6 Comp. Rom. x. 12, xiv. 9; Eph. iv. 5 f.
7 Comp. ver. 43.
8 Comp. on Matt. iv. 4.
9 Ad Xen. Anab. iv. 2. 18.
11 Jas. ii. 6; Wlad. ii. 10, xv. 14; Eccles. xlvii. 12; Xcn. Symph. ii. 8; Strabo, vii. p. 270; Joseph. Antt. xii. 2. 3; Plat. de Is. et Ophr. 41: καταδύνασθαι ἔτοι καταβλαχάζων. Comp. καταδυνάλον.
12 Comp. John xvi. 32.
13 Partikel. i. p. 130.
in ii. 28. — εἰπὶ εἴδουν] as in v. 30. — καὶ εἰδωκεν κ.τ.λ.] and granted¹ that He should become manifest, by visible appearances, i. 3; John xxi. 1, not to all the people, but to witnesses who (quippe qui) are chosen before of God, namely, to us, who, etc. — τοῖς προκεχειρ. ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ] Peter with correct view regards the previous election of the apostles to be witnesses of the resurrection of Jesus, as done by God;² they are apostles δὰ θελήσωτε Θεοῦ, ἀφωνοιμενοι εἰς εὐγγ. Θεοῦ.³ And with the προ in προκεχειρ. he points back to the time of the previous choice as disciples, by which their election to be the future witnesses of the resurrection in reality took place. On προκεχειροτονεῖν, only here in the N. T., comp. Plat. Legg. vi. p. 765 B. — μετὰ τὸ ἀναστ. αὐτὸν εἰ νεκρῶν] is not, with Cameron and Bengel, to be connected with ἡμουν γενέσθαι, ver. 40, so that ou παντὶ . . . αὐτῷ would have to be arbitrarily and violently converted into a parenthesis; but with oίτις κ. κ. κ. oίτις αὐτῷ, which even without the passages, i. 4, Luke xxvii. 41, 43, John xxi. 12, would have nothing against it, as the body of the Risen One was not yet a glorified body.⁴ The words clearly exhibit the certainty of the attested bodily resurrection, but annexed to ver. 40 they would contain an unjustifiable self-evident remark. The apparent inconsistency of the passage with Luke xxii. 18 is removed by the more exact statement to Matt. xxvi. 29; see on that passage.

Ver. 42. Τῷ λαῷ] can only denote the Jewish people, seeing that the context speaks of no other (ver. 41), and cannot include the Gentiles also (Kuinoel). But the contents of oí . . . νεκρῶν is so different from Matt. xxviii. 29, also Acts i. 8, that there must be here assumed a reference to another expression of the Risen One, for He is the subject of παράγγελ., unknown to us. — οἱ αὐτοῖς εἰσὶν . . . νεκρῶν] that He, no other, is the Judge ordained by God, in His decree, over living, who are alive at the Parousia,⁵ and dead, who shall then be already dead.⁶—Incorrectly Olsenausen, resting on Matt. xxii. 32!—understands by εἰς τὸν κ. νεκρόν the spiritually living and dead. This meaning would require to be suggested by the context, but is here quite foreign to it.¹⁰

Vv. 48, 44. Now follows the divinely attested way of salvation unto this Judge of the living and dead. — πάντες οἱ προφ.] comp. iii. 24. — That every one who believes on Him receives forgiveness of sins by means of His name, of the believing confession of it, by which the objectively completed redemption is subjectively appropriated.¹¹ The general πάντα τοῦ πατ. εἰς αὐτῷ, which lays down no national distinction, is very emphatically placed at the end, Rom. iii. 29. Thus has Peter opened the door for further announcing to his hearers the universalism of the salvation in Christ. But

¹ Comp. ii. 97.
² I. 3, ii. 28, iii. 29, al.
³ John xvii. 3, 9, 11, vi. 37.
⁴ 1 Cor. 1. 1; Gal. 1. 1, al.
⁵ Rom. 11. 1; Gal. 11. 15.
⁶ So also Baur. I. p. 101, ed. 2, who, at the same time, merely passes over, with quite an arbitrary evasion, the difficulty that the criterion of apostleship in this passage is as lit-
⑦ See on Luke xxiv. 51, note; Ignat. ad Smyrn. 5; Const. Ap. vi. 11. 5.
⁸ 1 Thess. iv. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 51, 53.
⁹ Comp. 2 Tim. iv. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 5.
¹¹ Rom. iii. 25, x. 10, al.
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1. Comp. ii. 97.
2. I. 3, ii. 28, iii. 29, al.
4. 1 Cor. 1. 1; Gal. 1. 1, al.
5. Rom. 11. 1; Gal. 11. 15.
6. So also Baur. I. p. 101, ed. 2, who, at the same time, simply passes over, with quite an arbitrary evasion, the difficulty that the criterion of apostleship in this passage is as lit-
8. 1 Thess. iv. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 51, 53.
9. Comp. 2 Tim. iv. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 5.
11. Rom. iii. 25, x. 10, al.
already the living power of his words has become the vehicle of the Holy Spirit, who falls upon all the hearers, and by His operations makes the continuation of the discourse superfluous and—impossible. — Here the unique example of the outpouring of the Spirit before baptism—treated, indeed, by Bauer as unhistorical and ascribed to the set purpose influencing the author—is of itself intelligible from the frame of mind, now exalted after an extraordinary manner to the pitch of full susceptibility, in those present. The appropriate degree of receptivity was there; and so, for a special divine purpose, the νεφέμα communicated itself according to the free will of God even before baptism. Olsenhoven thinks that this extraordinary circumstance took place for the sake of Peter, in order to make him aware, beyond a doubt, in this first decisive instance, that the Gentiles would not be excluded from the gift of the Spirit. But Peter had this illumination already, ver. 34 f.; and besides, this object would have been fully attained by the outpouring of the Spirit after baptism. We may add that the quite extraordinary and, in fact, unique nature of the case stands decidedly opposed to the abuse of the passage by the Baptists.

Vv. 45, 46. Οἱ εἰς περὶ πιστοὶ those who were believers from the circumcision, i.e. believers who belonged to the circumcised, the Jewish-Christians. — δου συνήθες τὴν περὶ see ver. 28. — ἐν τῇ θυγατέρᾳ Cornelius and his company now represented, in the view of those who were astonished, the Gentiles as a class of men generally; for the article signifies this. Observe also the perfect; the completed fact lay before them. — γὰρ reason assigned ab effectu. — λαλοῦσας γλώσσας] γλῶσσας, or γλώσσος λαλεῖν is mentioned as something well known to the church, without the εἰπεῖν, by the characteristic addition of which the event recorded in chap. ii. is denoted as something singular, and not identical with the mere γλώσσας λαλεῖν, as it was there also markedly distinguished by means of the list of peoples. Now if, in the bare γλώσσας λαλεῖν, this γλώσσας were to be understood in the same sense as in chap. ii. according to the representation of the narrator, then—as Bleck’s conception, “to speak in glosses,” is decidedly to be rejected—no other meaning would result than: “to speak in languages,” i.e. to speak in foreign languages, different from their mother tongue, and therefore quite the same as εἰπεῖν γλώσσας λαλεῖν. But against

1 Comp. on xi. 15.
2 “Librum gratiss habet ordinem,” Bengel. Not the necessity, but the possibility of the bestowment of the Spirit before baptism, was implied by the susceptibility which had already emerged. The design of this extraordinary effusion of the Spirit is, according to ver. 45, to be found in this, that all scruples concerning the reception of the Gentiles were to be taken away from the Jewish-Christians who were present in addition to Peter, and thereby from the Christians generally. What Peter had just said: κατὰ τὸν πιστεύοντα εἰς αὐτόν, was at once divinely affirmed and sealed by this σημεῖον in such a way that now no doubt at all could remain concerning the immediate admissibility of baptism. Chrysostom strikingly calls this event the ἄπολεγας μεγάλης, which God had arranged beforehand for Peter. That it could not but, at the same time, form for the latter himself the divine confirmation of the revelation already imparted to him, is obvious of itself.
4 Comp. xi. 2; Rom. iv. 12; Gal. ii. 12, Col. iv. 11; Tit. i. 10. On περὶ the in the concrete sense, comp. Rom. iii. 30, iv. 9, 12, xv. 8; Gal. ii. 7; Phil. iii. 3.
5 See on chap. ii.
this we may decisively urge the very expression ἐβραῖς, with which agrees καινετικ in the apocryphal passage, only added in chap. ii., and almost ostentatiously glorified as the chief matter, but not inserted at all elsewhere, here or at chap. xix. or 1 Cor. xii.—xiv. So much the more decidedly is γλῶσσας here and in xix. 6 not to be completed by mentally supplying ἐβραῖς—so Baur still, and others, following the traditional interpretation—but to be explained: "with tongues," and that in such a way that Luke himself has meant nothing else—not, "in languages"—than the to him well-known glossolalia of the apostolic church, which was here manifested in Cornelius and his company, but from which he has conceived and represented the feast of Pentecost as something different and entirely extraordinary, although the latter also is, in its historical substance, to be considered as nothing else than the first speaking with tongues. Cornelius and his friends spoke with tongues, i.e. they spoke not in the exercise of reflective thought, not in intelligible, clear, and connected speech, but in enraptured eucharistic ecstasy, as by the involuntary exercise of their tongues, which were just organs of the Spirit.

Vv. 47, 48. Can any one, then, withhold the water, in order that these be not baptized? The water is in this animated language conceived as the element offering itself for the baptism. So urgent now appeared the necessity for completing on the human side the divine work that had miraculously emerged. Bengel, moreover, well remarks: "Non dicit: jam habent Spiritum, ergo aqua carere possunt." The conjunction of water and Spirit could not but obtain its necessary recognition. — τοῦ μὴ βαπτ. τούτων.] genitives according to the construction καλύπτων τινά τινος, and μη after verbs of hindering, as in xiv. 18. — καθώς καὶ ημών] as also we, the recipients of the Spirit of Pentecost. This refers to the prominent and peculiar character of the enraptured speaking, by which the fact then occurring showed itself as of a similar kind to that which happened on Pentecost, xi. 15. But καθώς καὶ ημών cannot be held as a proof that by γλῶσσας καλέων is to be understood a speaking in foreign languages—in opposition to Baumgarten, who thinks that he sees in our passage "the connecting link between the miracle of Pentecost and the speaking with tongues in the Corinthian church"—for it rather shows the essential identity of the Pentecostal event with the later speaking with tongues, and points back from the mouth of the apostle to the historical form of that event, when it had not yet been transformed by tradition into a speaking of languages. — προστάτω] The personal performance of baptism did not necessarily belong to the destined functions of the apostolic office. — εν τῷ ἄνδρ. τοῦ κυρίου belongs to βαπτισθ., but leaves untouched the words with which the baptism was performed. As, namely, the name of Jesus Christ is the spiritual basis of the being baptized...
the end to which it refers, so it is also conceived as the entire holy sphere, in which it is accomplished, and out of which it cannot take place. — ἅμαρχον to remain. And he remained and had fellowship at table with them, xi. 3. So much the more surprising is his ἐνθισμὸς at Antioch, Gal. ii. 11 ff.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(a') Conversion of Cornelius. V. 1.

The event recorded in this chapter was an important crisis in the progress of Christianity. Hitherto it had won its way among Jews, and through their instrumentality, so that it might be regarded as a peculiar Jewish sect; but now it was to be presented as a religion for the race, Jew and Gentile alike—a worship for the world. All restrictions of every kind were now to be removed, and the universal adaptation and power of the gospel was to be proclaimed and exemplified. What seems to us simple as a self-evident truth was then a mystery—that the Gentiles should be "partakers of the promise in Christ by the gospel."

Paul had already been chosen and was being prepared for the great work of making known unto the Gentiles "the unsearchable riches of Christ." And now Peter is specially commissioned to open the door for the Gentile world. The apostles and many of the Jewish believers doubtless expected that the gospel should be preached to the Gentiles. The predictions of the Old Testament, the statements of our Lord, and the distinct tenor of their commission received from him, to disciple all nations, clearly and unmistakably indicated the admission of all peoples into the kingdom of Christ. It was difficult, however, for them to understand how they could enter except by the divinely appointed way. The law of Moses was of divine origin. Circumcision was of God. The Jews were his peculiar people, hence it was natural that they should think obedience to the law of Moses a prerequisite to admission into the Christian church. Although some of the preachers of the gospel may have already attained more liberal views on the subject of Judaism, yet it required a special revelation to overcome the prejudices of many, and to make the path of duty clear. This question the visions vouchsafed to Cornelius and Peter finally settled. Henceforth all nations were to be held as equal, and all races welcomed to the privileges and provisions of the gospel. No man should be regarded any longer as unclean, or interdicted from Christ and his salvation. The whole transaction is narrated with great minuteness of detail. The two visions at Caesarea and Joppa were both real and supernatural, and divinely adapted to each other—a striking illustration of divine providence in the management of human affairs. The design of both was impressively and practically to teach the lesson that God is no respecter of persons; that mere external adventitious circumstances—as parentage, nationality, profession, or rank—are neither a passport nor a barrier to the divine favor; that in Christ Jesus there is "neither circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond, nor free." Neander says: "By a remarkable coincidence of inward revelation with a chain of outward circumstances, the illumination hitherto wanted was imparted."

1 xix. 5.
(τ'') A devout man. V. 2.

Cornelius, as is shown by our author, was a Gentile, probably an Italian, and in no formal way connected with the Jewish state or faith. He had clearly abandoned idolatry, and worshipped the one living and true God with reverential fear, and prayed to him constantly. As a centurion he had a good position and much influence; these he used for good purposes. His piety was not less practical than it was sincere. His hand obeyed the dictates of his heart in acts of munificent generosity. It is probable that through the ministrations of Philip or otherwise he had heard of the claims of Jesus to be the Messiah, and learned some of the facts of his wondrous life and death. Longing for light, he earnestly besought it, and it came.

His prayers and alms came up "for a memorial before God." The allusion is to the ascending incense from the ancient altar, and denotes their acceptance by God. But, Alexander justly says: "'Intrinsic merit or efficacy is no more ascribed in these words to the good works of Cornelius than to the oblations from which the figure or comparison is taken.' The acceptance implied does not denote personal salvation. He had still to hear the words by which he should be saved. But his earnest desire for light, and his following it as far as he had it, were pleasing to God. "'He who does, as far as in him lieth, according as natural grace from God enables him to do, as a pagan might do from the light of nature—which, let us not forget, is light from God—desiring to be directed aright, and seeking this grace from God's hand, and supplicating the forgiveness of his sins; to such an one God will open a way by his angel, or by sending to him teachers to direct him into the perfect way, and to teach him those truths which are as light to his soul." (Denton.) Dick says: "'Cornelius believed in the true God, and this faith rendered his religious services acceptable.' MacDuff, Abbott, and Jacobson concur with Calvin in the opinion that Cornelius was a true, though unenlightened believer before the visit of Peter.

There are three centurions mentioned with commendation by the evangelists. Of one our Lord said: "I have not found so great faith, no not in Israel" (Matt. viii. 10). Another, standing at the cross of Jesus, said: "Truly this was the Son of God" (Matt. xxvii. 54). And in this chapter Cornelius.

(v') Fell into a trance. V. 10.

"The ἐκάποιος of Peter seems to differ from the ἐσώμα of Cornelius in this, that whereas Peter was entirely insensible to external things, and saw only that which passed before his spirit, but which, as in a dream, had no objective reality, Cornelius in a waking state, and attentive to what was around him, saw what actually occurred. The linen cloth which came down from heaven was an internal vision imparted to Peter; whereas the angel who stood before Cornelius was an external reality." (Gloag, so also Alford, who, however, intimates that the usage of such a distinction between the two words is not always strictly observed.) "His senses being abstracted from outward objects and rapt in a supernatural state, a vision was revealed to his inner soul, engaging and absorbing all his thought and attention." This was a sudden and overpowering influence of the Spirit; a state of unconsciousness as to the impressions made upon the senses, and of entire abstraction from what was going on
in the world around him, during which time there are present to the soul clear visions of heavenly realities." The same word is used in the Septuagint concerning the condition of Abraham when the future history of his posterity was revealed to him; also in reference to the condition of Paul, xxii. 17. The trance may be distinguished from a dream in that it is not connected with natural sleep; and from a vision, in that the person in a trance is unconscious, and the objects presented have no real objective existence.

(v') Accepted with him. V. 35.

In reference to this statement of the apostle Alford observes: "It is very important that we should hold the right clue to guide us in understanding this saying. The question which recent events had solved in Peter's mind was that of the admissibility of men of all nations into the church of Christ. In this sense only had he received any information as to the acceptableness of men of all nations before God. He saw that in every nation men who seek after God, who receive his witness of himself, without which he has left no man, and humbly follow his will, as far as they know it—these have no extraneous hindrances, such as un circumcision, placed in their way to Christ, but are capable of being admitted into God's church, though Gentiles, and as Gentiles." "It is clearly unreasonable to suppose Peter to have meant that each heathen's natural light and moral purity would render him acceptable in the sight of God. And it is equally unreasonable to find any verbal or doctrinal difficulty in ἵππαζοντας δικαιοσύνην, or to suppose that δικαιοσύνη must be taken in its forensic sense, and therefore that he alludes to the state of men after becoming believers." This note is adopted by Taylor, and heartily approved by him.

Lechler forcibly says on this passage: "It is well known that the introductory words in the discourse of Peter have often been so interpreted as to teach that all religions are of equal value; that faith, as contradistinguished from morality, is not indispensable; and that, with respect to the salvation of the soul, all that is specifically Christian is of no importance. But the attempt to find a palliation of indifference in the subject of religion in this passage betrays, as even de Wette judges, very great exegetical frivolity; both the words themselves, and also the whole connection of the discourse, as well as of the narrative of which they form a part, decidedly pronounce against any such an interpretation." "If the language in verses 34, 35 meant that a heathen, a Jew, and a Christian were altogether alike in the eyes of God, and that any one of them could be as easily saved as another, provided he was honorable and upright in his conduct, then Peter should have simply allowed Cornelius to remain what he was—a heathen—without leading him to Christ."
CHAPTER XI.

Ver. 8. κοινών.] Elz. has πᾶν κοινών, against A B D E Ν, min. vss. and Fathers. From x. 14. — Ver. 9. μοι] is wanting in A B Ν, min. Copt. Sahid. Arm. Vulg. Epiph. Deleted by Lachm. Tisch. It is an addition, in accordance with ver. 7. — Ver. 10. The order ἀνεστ. πάλιν is, according to preponderant evidence, to be adopted. — Ver. 11. οικ. Lachm. Born. read ἤμεν, after A B D Ν, 40. Without attestation, doubtless, from the vss.; but on account of its apparent irrelevancy, and on account of ver. 5, to be considered as the original. — Ver. 12. μπατιν διακρίνομενον] is, as already Mill saw, very suspicious (as an interpolation from x. 20), for it is wholly wanting in D, Syr. p. Cant.; in A B Ν, lo"t: it is exchanged for μπαν διακρίνοντα or μ. διακρίναντα (so Lachm.), and in 33, 46, for μ. διακρίνομενον. Tisch. and Born. have rejected it; de Wette declares himself for the reading of Lachm. — Ver. 13. δὲ is to be read instead of ὑπὲ, with Lachm. and Born., in accordance with preponderant authority. — After ἦλπηνν Elz. has ἦλπας, an addition from x. 5, which has against it A B D Ν, min. and most vss. — Ver. 17. δὲ] is wanting in A B D Ν, min. vss. and several Fathers. Deleted by Lachm. It was omitted as disturbing the construction. — Ver. 18. ἐδόξαζων] The considerably attested ἐδόξασαν (Lachm.) has arisen from the preceding aorist. — Instead of ἀργας, Lachm. has ἀρας, after A B D Ν, min. A neglect of the strengthening γε, which to the transcribers was less familiar with ἀρα in the N. T. (Matt. vi. 20, xvii. 26, Acts vii. 27). — Ver. 19. Σερφαίνων] Lachm. reads Σερφαίνων, after A E, min. Theophyl., but this has been evidently introduced into the text as an emendatory gloss from erroneously take εἰς as denoting time. — Ver. 20. ἄλλωσιν] Elz. reads εἰσελθόντες, against decisive testimony. — 'Ελληνας] So A D Ν* vss. and Fathers. Already preferred by Grotius and Witsius, adopted by Griesb. Lachm. Tisch. Scholz. Born. But Elz. Matth. have 'Ελληνατάς, which, in particular, Ammon (de Hellenis Antioch. Eirl. 1810, krit. Journ. I. 3. p. 213 ff.; Magas. f. christl. Pred. III. 1. p. 222 f.) has defended, assuming two classes of Antiochene Jews, namely, Hebrew-speaking, who used the original text of the O. T., and Greek-speaking, who used the LXX. But see Schulthess, de Charism. Sp. St. p. 73 ff.; Rinck, Lucubr. crit. p. 65 f. The reading 'Ελληνας is necessary, since the announcement of the gospel to Hellenists, particularly at Antioch, could no longer now be anything surprising, and only 'Ελληνας exhausts the contrast to ἰουδαίοις, ver. 20 (not 'Εβραίοις as in. vi. 1). 'Ελληνιστ. might easily arise from comparison with ix. 29, for which Cod. 40 testifies, when after ἐδόξαν he inserts καὶ συνεζήτουν, — Ver. 22. ἀπελθέντων] is wanting in A B Ν, lo"t. Syr. and other vss., and is deleted by Lachm. Omitted as superfluous. — Ver. 25.1 ὁ Βαρνάβας and the twice-repeated αὐτῶν are to be deleted, with Lachm. and Tisch., after A B Ν, al.; the former as the subject

1 Bornemann has the peculiar expansion of the simple text from D: ἀκούσας δὲ, ὅτι Χαλδὸς ἦταν εἰς Ταρσοῦ, ἐξῆλθεν ἀνευζήτων αὐτῶν καὶ ὑπενεκάλεσεν αὐτῶν ἅλθεν εἰς Αὐτὶς.
written on the margin (seeing that another subject immediately precedes), and the latter as a very usual (unnecessary) definition of the object. — Ver. 26. αἰτοῦσα] read with Lachm. Tisch. Born. αἰτοῖς, after A B E Μ, min. The accusative with the infinite after ἔγνω was most familiar to the transcribers (ix, 3, 32, 37). — Lachm. and Tisch. have καὶ after αἰτ., following A C Μ, Cant. Syr. p. Ath. Vig. Rightly; apparently occasioning confusion, it was omitted. — Ver. 28. μέγαν . . . δοῦς] μεγάλην . . . τις is supported by the predominant testimony of A B D E Μ (Ε has μέγαν . . . δοῦς), min. Fathers, so that it is to be adopted, with Lachm. Tisch. Born., as in Luke xv. 14 (see on that passage), and the masculine is to be considered as an emendation of ignorant transcribers. — After Κλαυδίων, Elz. has καίσαρος, an inserted gloss, to be rejected in conformity with A B D Μ, Ioii. 40, Copt. Aeth. Sahid. Arm. Vulg. Cant.

Vv. 1-18. The fellowship into which Peter entered, chap. x., offends the Jewish Christians at Jerusalem, but their objection is alloyed by the apostle through a simple representation of the facts as a whole, and is converted into the praise of God. — κατὰ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν is not = ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ, but throughout Judaea. — Ver. 2. διεκρίνοντο] they strove against him. — οἱ εἰς περίτομα] the circumcised Christians, as in x. 45, opposed to the Gentiles (ἀκροβυσσ. ἐξοντα) whose conversion is reported. — δὲ is most simply taken as recitative, neither quare, Vulg., nor because, Grotius supplying: hoc querusum. — πρὸς ἀνώφελες κ.τ.λ.] Thus it was not the baptism of these men that they called in question, but the fellowship entered into by Peter with them, especially the fellowship at table. This was the stone of stumbling: for they had not come to Peter to be baptized, as a Gentile might present himself to become a proselyte; but Peter had gone in to them. (w') Without ground, Gfrörer and Zeller employ this passage against the historical character of the whole narrative of the baptism of Cornelius. — ἀκροβυστ. εἰς.] An expression of indignation. Eph. ii. 11. — Ver. 4. ἄραμφ. ἐξερεύναμεν. he began and expounded, so that ἐξερεύναμεν is a graphic trait, corresponding to the conception of the importance of the speech in contradistinction to the complaint; comp. ii. 4. — Ver. 6. εἰς ἣν ἀτενίσας κατενώνας κ. εἰδὼν on which I, having fixed my glance, observed (vii. 31) and saw, etc. This eidoν τά τετράποδα κ.τ.λ. is the result of the κατενώνας. — κ. τὰ θηριά] and the beasts; specially to make mention of these from among the quadrupeds. In x. 12 the wild beasts were not specially mentioned; but there πάντα stood before τά τετράποντα. — Ver. 11. ἦτοι (see the critical remarks) is to be explained from the fact, that Peter already thinks of the ἀδελφοί, ver. 12, as included. — Ver. 12. οἰκουμενᾶς the men of Joppa, who had gone with Peter to Cornelius,
x. 23, had thus accompanied him also to Jerusalem. They were now present in this important matter as his witnesses. — Ver. 18. τὸν ἀγγελόν] the angel already known from chap. x., — a mode of expression, no doubt, put into the mouth of Peter by Luke from his own standpoint. — Ver. 14. ἐν οἷς] by means of which. — Ver. 15. ἐν δὲ τῷ ἀρχαῖοι με λαλεῖν] This proves that Peter, after x. 48, had intended to speak still considerably longer. — καὶ ξύρι ἡμῖν and καὶ ἡμῖν, ver. 17 — it is otherwise with ήμῖν, ver. 16 — are to be taken as in x. 47. — ἐν ἀρχῇ] namely, at Pentecost. The period of the apostolic church was then at its beginning. — Ver. 16. Comp. i. 5. ὁ λεγόν] A frequent circumstantiality. 1 Peter had recollected this saying of Christ, because he had seen realized in the Gentiles filled with the Spirit what Jesus, i. 5, had promised to the apostles for their own persons. Herein, as respects the divine bestowal of the Spirit, he had recognised a placing of the Gentiles concerned on the same level with the apostles. And from this baptismus fluminis he could not but infer it as willed by God, that the baptismus fluminis also was not to be refused. — Ver. 17. προειδοσάνων] refers not to αἰώνοι, as is assumed by Beza, Heinrichs, and Kuinoel against the order of the words, but to ἡμῖν: "as also to us as having become believers," etc., that is, as He has given it also to us, because we had become believers, so that thus the same gift of God indicated as its basis the same faith in them as in us. — ἐν δὲ τις ἡμῖν διαφώνεις κ.τ.λ.] Two interrogative sentences are here blended into one: 2 Who was I on the other hand? was I able to hinder God, namely, by refusal of baptism? Concerning δὲ, in the apodosis, following after a hypothetical protasis, see Nägeliub. 3 Baeumlein. 4 — Ver. 18. ἰσχύσαν] they were silent, Luke xiv. 4, often in classical writers. 5 The following ἓν ἔχουσι κατακρίνεσθαι (imperfect) thereupon denotes the continuous praising. Previously contention against Peter, vv. 2, 3, now silence, followed by praise of God. — ἄπανθο] thus, as results from this event. By τὴν μετάνοιαν, however, is meant the Christian change of disposition; comp. v. 31. — τὸν ζωὸν] unto eternal Messianic life; this is the aim of τῆς μετάνοιας ἑως φθοράς. 6

Vv. 19, 20. Οἱ μὲν ὁ ἀποστολὴτες] A resumption of viii. 4, in order now to narrate a still further advance, which Christianity had made in consequence of that dispersion,—namely, to Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Antioch, for the most part, indeed, among the Jews, yet also (ver. 20) among the Gentiles, the latter at Antioch. 7 — ἀπὸ τῆς θλίψις] on account of, on occasion of, the tribulation. 8 — ἐπὶ Στεφάνου] Luther rightly renders: over Stephen, i.e. on account of Stephen. 9 Others, Alberti, Wolf, Heumann, Palaiaret, Kypke, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Olshausen, render: post Stephanum. Linguistically admis-

1 Luke xxii. 61 ; Thuc. i. 1. 1, and Krüger in loc ; also Bornemann, Ad Cyrop. i 2, 5.
2 Winer, p. 583 (K. T. 784).
3 On the Isid. p. 66, ed. 3.
4 Part. p. 92 f.
6 Comp. in loc., ver. 14.
7 The preaching to the Gentiles at Antioch is not to be placed before the baptism of Cornelius (Gieseler in Staedlin. Architr. IV. 2. p. 310. Baur, Schnackenburg, Wieseler, Lechler), but it was after that event that the missionary activity of the dispersed advanced so far. See xv. 7.
8 Comp. Herm. ad Soph. El. 63.
9 Comp. Erasmus, Beza, Bengal, and others, including de Wetze. See Winer, 267 (K. T. 490 f.); Ellendt, Leg. Soph. i. p. 619.
sible,' but less simple, as post Stephanum would have again to be explained as e medio sublato Stephano. — ἦσαν δὲ τινὲς ἐὰν αὐτῶν] does not apply to Ἰουδαίοις, as the δὲ, corresponding to the μέν, ver. 19, requires for αὐτῶν the reference to the subject of ver. 19, the διασπασάντες, and as αὐτὶς ἔλθοντες εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, ver. 20, so corresponds to the ἄναβαν ἐκκ. . . Ἀντιοχείας of ver. 19, that a diversity of the persons spoken of could not but of necessity be indicated. The correct interpretation is: "The dispersed travelled through the countries," as far as Phoenicia and Cyprus and Antioch, delivering the gospel — τὸν λόγον, κατ’ ἔξοχην, as in viii. 4. vi. 4, and frequently —to the Jews only, ver. 19, but some of them, of the dispersed, Cyprians and Cyrenians by birth, proceeded otherwise; having come to Antioch, they preached the word to the Gentiles there." — τὸς Ἑλληνα] is the national contrast to Ἰουδαίοις, ver. 19, and therefore embraces as well the Gentiles proper as the proselytes who had not become incorporated into Judaism by circumcision. To understand only the proselytes would be a limitation not founded here in the text, as in xiv. 1 (x').

Vv. 21–26. Χειρ κυρίου] See on Luke i. 66; Acts iv. 30. Bengel well remarks: "potentia spiritualis per evangelium se exserens." — αὐτῶν] these preachers to the Gentiles. — Ver. 22. εἰς τὰ ἄρα] Comp. on Luke iv. 21. — ἀ λόγος] the word, i.e. the narrative of it; see on Mark i. 45. — Ver. 23. χάριν τ. Θεοῦ] as it was manifested in the converted Gentiles. — τῇ προθεσίᾳ τῆς καρδ. προσμεν. τῷ κυρίῳ] with the purpose of their heart to abide by the Lord, i.e. not to again abandon Christ, to whom their hearts had resolved to belong, but to be faithful to Him with this resolution. — Ver. 24. δι' ἄνω . . . πίστεως] contains the reason, not why Barnabas had been sent to Antioch, but of the immediately preceding ἐπάρχῃ . . . κυρίῳ. — ἀνὴρ ἄγαθός] quite generally: an excellent man, a man of worth, whose noble character, and, moreover, whose fulness of the Spirit and of faith completely qualified him to gain and to follow the right point of view, in accordance with the divine counsel, as to the conversion of the Gentiles here beheld. Most arbitrarily Heinrichs holds that it denotes gentleness and mildness, which Baumgarten has also assumed, although such a meaning must have arisen, as in Matt. xx. 5, from the context, into which Baumgarten imports the idea, that Barnabas had not allowed himself to be stirred to censure by the strangeness of the new phenomenon. — Ver. 25. εἰς Ταρσοῦ] See ix. 30. — Ver. 26. According to the corrected reading ἐγένετο δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐναντίον κ.τ.λ. (see the critical remarks), it is to be explained: it happened to them, to be associated even yet (καὶ) a whole year in the church, and to instruct a considerable multitude of people, and that the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch. With χρηστιανῶν the construction passes into the accusative with the infinitive, because the subject becomes different (τοῖς μαθητ.). But it is logically correct that χρηστιανῶν κ.τ.λ. should still be dependent

1 Bernhardy, p. 249.
2 Heinrichs, Kuhnloel.
3 Comp. viii. 4, ix. 38.
4 Comp. de Wette and Lekobusch, p. 105.
5 Rinck.
6 Comp. 2 Tim. iii. 10.
7 Kuhnloel.
8 Comp. on Rom. v. 7.
9 Comp. xx. 16; Gal. vi. 14.
on ἰγένετο αὐτῶις, just because the reported appellation, which was first given to the disciples at Antioch, was causally connected with the lengthened and successful labours of the two men in that city. It was their merit, that here the name of Christians first arose. — On the climactic καί, etiam, in the sense of yet, or yet further, comp. Hartung. — συναχίσματι to be brought together, i.e. to join themselves for common work. They had been since ix. 26 ff. separated from each other. — χριστιανισι to bear the name. — Χριστιανοι This name decidedly originated not in, but outside of, the church, seeing that the Christians in the N. T. never use it of themselves, but designate themselves by μαθηται, διδασκαλοι, believers, etc.; and seeing that, in the two other passages where Χριστιανοι occurs, this appellation distinctly appears as extrinsic to the church. But it certainly did not proceed from the Jews, because Χριστιανος was known to them as the interpretation of Προφ, and they would not therefore have transferred so sacred a name to the hated apostates. Hence the origin of the name must be derived from the Gentiles in Antioch. By these the name of the Head of the new religious society, “Christ,” was not regarded as an official name, which it already was among the Christians themselves ever more and more becoming; and hence they formed according to the wonted mode the party-name: Christiani, — auctor nominis ejus Christus Tiberiu imperitante per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat.” At Antioch, the seat of the mother-church of Gentile Christianity, this took place at that time, for this follows from the reading ἰγένετο δε αὐτῶις, because in that year the joint labours of Paul and Barnabas occasioned so considerable an enlargement of the church, and therewith naturally its increase in social and public consideration. And it was at Antioch that this name was born first, earlier than anywhere else, because here the Christians, in consequence of the predominant Gentile-Christian element, asserted themselves for the first time not as a sect of Judaism, but as an independent community. There is nothing to support the view that the name was at first a title of ridicule. The conjecture of Baur, that the origin of the name was referred to Antioch, because that was the first Gentile city in which there were Christians, cannot be justified by the Latin form of the word.

Vv. 27, 28. Κατηχουσι whether of their own impulse, or as sent by the church in Jerusalem, or as refugees from Jerusalem is not evident. — προφηται inspired teachers, who delivered their discourses, not, indeed, in the ecstatic state, yet in exalted language, on the basis of an ἀποκάλυψις received. Their working was entirely analogous to that of the O. T. prophets. Revelation, incitement, and inspiration on the part of God gave them their qualification; the unveiling of what was hidden in respect of the divine

1 Partikel I. p. 123 f.
2 See on Rom. vii. 3.
3 Acts xxvi. 38; 1 Pet. iv. 16.
4 Ewald, p. 441 f., conjectures that it proceeded from the Roman authorities.
5 Tac. Ann. xv. 44.
6 πρωτοπ, or, according to B Μ. πρωτος L O.
7 De Wette, Baumgarten, after Wetstein and older interpreters.
8 Zeller also mistrusts the account before us.
9 See Wetstein, ad. Matth. xxii. 17.
10 Ewald.
counsel for the exercise of a psychological and moral influence on given circumstances, but always in reference to Christ and His work, was the tenor of what these interpreters of God spoke. The prediction of what was future was, as with the old, so also with the new prophets, no permanent characteristic feature; but naturally and necessarily the divinely-illuminated glance ranged very often into the future development of the divine counsel and kingdom, and saw what was to come. In respect to the degree of the inspired seizure, the προφηταί are related to the γέρωνας καθεύθυντας in such a way that the intellectual consciousness was not thrown into the back ground with the former as with the latter, and so the mental excitement was not raised to the extent of its becoming ecstatic, nor did their speaking stand in need of interpretation. — ἁναστάζοντας he came forward in the church-assembly. — ἀγαθοὺς. Whether the name 9 is to be derived from ἀγαθοῦ, a locust, 10 or from ἀγαθόν, to love, 11 remains undecided. The same prophet in xxii. 10. — διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος] This characterizes the announcement (ιήσους) of the famine as something imparted to the prophet by the Holy Spirit; hence Eichhorn's opinion, 8 that the famine was already present in its beginnings, does great violence to the representation of the text, which, moreover, by ὁσιὸς . . . Κλαύδιον states the fulfilment as having occurred afterwards, and consequently makes the event to appear at that time still as future, which also μελέτην ἔχοντας definitely affirms. — γιμνὸν . . . οἰκίωνον] that a great famine was appointed by God to set in over the whole inhabited earth. Thus generally is τὴν ὁικονομίαν. to be understood in the original sense of the prophet, who sees no local limits drawn for the famine beheld in prophetic vision, and therefore represents it not as a partial, but as an unrestricted one. Just because the utterance is a prediction, according to its genuine prophetic character, there is no ground for giving to the general and usual meaning of τὴν ὁικονομίαν,—which is, moreover, designedly brought into relief by ὁσιὸς,—any geographical limitation at all to the land of Judaea or the Roman empire. This very unlimited character of the vision, on the one hand, warranted the hyperbolical form of the expression, as given by Agabus, while yet, on the other hand, the famine extending itself far and wide, but yet limited, which afterwards historically occurred, might be regarded as the event corresponding to the entirely general prophetic vision, and be described by Luke as its fulfilment. History pointed out the limits, within which what was seen and predicted without limitation found its fulfilment, inasmuch, namely, as this famine, which set in in the fourth year of the reign of Claudius (A.D. 44), extended only to Judaea and the neighbouring countries, and particularly fell on Jerusalem itself, which was supported by the Syrian queen Helena of Adiabene with corn and figs. The view which includes as part of the fulfilment a yet later famine, 9 which occurred in the eleventh year of Claudius, especially at Rome, 10 offends against

1 See on x. 48.  
2 Comp. on 1 Cor. xii. 10.  
3 Comp. Ezra li. 46.  
4 With Drusius.  
5 With Grotius, Wiltha, Drusius, Wolf.  
6 Comp. Helmichs.  
8 See Joseph. Ant. xx. 2, 0, xx. 5, 2; Eus.  
9 Baumgarten.  
10 Suet. Claud. 18; Tacit. Ann. xii. 43.
the words (λυμν . . . ἠτις) as well as against the connection of the history. It is altogether inadmissible to bring in here the different famines, which successively occurred under Claudius in different parts of the empire, since, by the famine here meant, according to vv. 29, 30, Judaea was affected, and the others were not synchronous with this. Lastly, very arbitrary is the assertion of Baumgarten, that the famine was predicted as a sign and herald of the Parousia, and that the fulfilment under Claudius was therefore merely a preliminary one, which pointed to a future and final fulfilment. — On λυμν as feminine (Doric), as in Luke xv. 14, see on Luke iv. 26, and Bornemann on our passage.

Vv. 29, 30. That, as Neander conjectures and Baumgarten assumes, the Christians of Antioch had already sent their money contributions to Judaea before the commencement of the famine, is incorrect, because it was not through the entirely general expression of Agabus, but only through the result (ὅτις καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν Κλαυδ), that they could learn the definite time for sending, and also be directed to the local destination of their benevolence; hence ver. 29 attaches itself, with strict historical definiteness, to the directly preceding ὁτις . . . Κλαυδιος. The benevolent activity on behalf of Judaea, which Paul at a later period unwearyedly and successfully strove to promote, is to be explained from the dutiful affection toward the mother-land of Christianity, with its sacred metropolis, to which the Gentile church felt itself laid under such deep obligations in spiritual matters, Rom. xv. 27. — The construction of ver. 29 depends on attraction, in such a way, namely, that τῶν δὲ μαθητῶν is attracted by the parenthesis καθὼς καταρεῖσθαι τίς, according as every one was able, and accordingly the sentence as resolved is: οἱ δὲ μαθηταί, καθὼς καταρεῖσθαι τίς αὐτῶν, ὤριαν. The subsequent ἐκλατος αὐτῶν is a more precise definition of the subject of ὤριαν, appended by way of apposition. Comp. ii. 3. — πέμψα] sc. τς. — The Christian presbyters, here for the first time mentioned in the N. T., instituted after the manner of the synagogue (Ἰησοῦ), were the appointed overseers and guides of the individual churches, in which the pastoral service of teaching, xx. 28, also devolved on them. They are throughout the N. T. identical with the ἐπίσκοποι, who do not come into prominence as possessors of the chief superintendence with a subordination of the presbyters till the sub-apostolic

---

1 vv. 29, 30.
2 Ewald.
3 Comp. Wieseler, p. 149.
4 See Kyprk, II. p. 56; comp. also 1 Cor. xvi. 2.
5 We have no account of the institution of this office. It probably shaped itself after the analogy of the government of the synagogue, soon after the first dispersion of the church (viii. 1), the apostles themselves having in the first instance presided alone over the church in Jerusalem; while, on the other hand, in conformity with the pressing necessity which primarily emerged, the office of almoner was there formed, even before there were special presbyters. But certainly the presbyters were, as elsewhere (xv. 32), so also in Jerusalem (xx. 28, xxl. 18), chosen by the church, and apostolically installed. Comp. Thierack, p. 73, who, however, arbitrarily conjectures that the coming over of the priests, vi. 7, had given occasion to the origin of the office. — We may add that the presbyters do not here appear as almoners (in opposition to Lange, apost. Zeit.-alt. II. p. 146), but the monies are consigned to them as the presiding authority of the church. "Omnia enim in rite et ordine administrari optimius," Beza. Comp. besides, on vi. 3, the subjoined remark.
6 See on Eph. iv. 11; Huther on 1 Tim. iii. 2.
age—in the first instance, and already very distinctly, in the Ignatian epistles. That identity, although the assumption of it is anathematized by the Council of Trent, is clear from Acts xx. 17.1 Shifts are resorted to by the Catholics, such as Döllinger.2 — The moneys were to be given over to the presbyters, in order to be distributed by them among the different overseers of the poor for due application. — According to Gal. ii. 1, Paul cannot have come with them as far as Jerusalem.3 In the view of Zeller, that circumstance renders it probable that our whole narrative lacks a historical character—which is a very hasty conclusion.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(w1) They of the circumcision contended with him. V. 3.

Luke employs a designation here which, when he wrote, was full of significance; though it probably originated in the very event he here narrates. The difference of sentiment manifest now soon came to be a well-defined distinction between the Jewish and Gentile portions of the church. It is probable that those who reproached Peter with acting disorderly were only a party in the church at Jerusalem who regarded the observance of the law of Moses, if not essential to salvation, yet of the greatest importance; and specially that the rite of circumcision should be observed first, before any were admitted to either social or church fellowship. They did not censure Peter because he had preached the gospel to them, or caused them to be baptized, but that he had associated with them. His grave offence was that, contrary to the customs of his people, and the commands of the rabbins, he had eaten with the uncircumcised. It was a maxim of these teachers that a man might buy food of a Gentile, but not receive it as a gift from him, or eat it with him. It was to vindicate himself in this matter that Peter gave explanations to the brethren at Jerusalem. So clear, conclusive, and satisfactory was his statement of the whole case that his opponents were silenced, and probably most of them for the time at least convinced; and their indignant complaint against the apostle was changed into joyous thanksgiving to God. This dispute may be con-

3 Ewald's hypothesis also—that Paul had, when present in Jerusalem, conducted himself as quietly as possible, and had not transacted anything important for doctrine with the apostles, of whom Peter, according to zil. 17. had been absent—is insufficient to explain the silence in Gal. ii. concerning this journey. The whole argument in Gal. ii. is weak, if Paul, having been at Jerusalem, was silent to the Galatians about this journey. For the very non-mention of it must have exposed the journey, however otherwise little liable to objection, to the suspicions of opponents. This applies also against Hofmann, N. T. I p. 181; and Tröpfel, Paulus nach d. Apostelgesch., p. 79 ff. The latter, however, ultimately accedes to my view. On the other hand, Paul had no need at all to write of the journey at Acts xviii. 29 to the Galatians (in opposition to Wieseler), because, after he had narrated to them his coming to an understanding with the apostles, there was no object at all in referring in this Epistle to further and later journeys to Jerusalem. See on Gal. ii. 1.
NOTES.

sidered as the commencement of the Jewish controversy, which so greatly troubled the early church, and which Paul so triumphantly maintained and settled.

\((x^1)\) Antioch. V. 20.

Next to Jerusalem Antioch is the most important in apostolic history. It was the mother church of the Gentile Christians, as Jerusalem was of the Jewish. Here the first Gentile church was formed, and here first the name Christian was applied to believers. Hence also Paul started on each of his three great missionary tours. This city, populous and powerful, was ranked next to Rome and Alexandria in extent and importance in the Roman Empire. After the establishment of Christianity, it became one of the five patriarchates—Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, and Jerusalem being the other four. The gospel was first preached to the Gentiles in Antioch, by some who, fleeing from persecution, had gone thither, with very great success, probably about the same time or shortly after Peter's visit to Cæsarea. The church at Jerusalem, hearing of this success in all likelihood soon after Peter's account of the receiving of the Gentiles, sent Barnabas, a man of moral worth and spiritual power, and who, being a native of Cyprus, and a friend of Paul, would be in thorough sympathy with the work among the Greeks, to inquire into the state of things and report. When he saw the great work going on, he felt that aid was needed; and recalling his intercourse with Paul, and the fact that he had been specially called and chosen for this very work, he went to Tarsus, and brought Paul back with him to Antioch, where for a whole year, in delightful fellowship and successful work, they labored together—fratres nobiles. The future prominence and splendor of Paul's work somewhat casts into the shade the high character and great services of the good and gifted Son of Consolation, who should ever be regarded as occupying a place in the first rank of the founders of our holy faith.
CHAPTER XII.

Vers. 3. a] is wanting in Elz., but rightly adopted, in accordance with considerable attestation, by Griesb. Lachm. Tisch., because it was easily passed over as wholly superfluous. — Ver. 5. ἐκτενῆς] Lachm. reads ἐκτενῶς, after A ? B Μ; comp. D, εἰν ἐκτενεῖα. Several vss. also express the adverb, which, however, easily suggested itself as definition to γενοῦ. — υπὲρ] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read περί, which Griesb. has also approved, after A B D Μ, min. But περί is the more usual preposition with προσεῖσκεθαι (comp. also viii. 15) in the N. T. — Ver. 8. τῶν] So Lachm. Tisch. Born. But Elz. Scholz have περὶ τῶν, against A B D Μ, min. A more precise explanatory definition. — Ver. 9. αὐτῷ] after άκολουθεῖ, is, with Lachm. Tisch. Born., to be deleted, according to decisive evidence. A supplementary addition occasioned by μοι, ver. 8. — Ver. 13. αὐτοῦ] Elz. has τοῦ Ποταμοῦ, against decisive evidence. — Ver. 20. After ὁ δὲ Elz. has ὁ Ἡρῴδης, against preponderant authority. The subject unnecessarily written on the margin, which was occasioned by a special section (the death of Herod) beginning at ver. 20. — Ver. 23. δόξαν] Elz. Tisch. have τὴν δόξαν. The article is wanting in D E G H, min. Chrys. Theophyl. Occ., but is to be restored (comp. Rev. xix. 7), seeing that the expression without the article was most familiar to transcribers; see Luke xvii. 18 ; John ix. 24 ; Rom. iv. 20 ; Rev. iV. 9, xi. 13, xiv. 7. — Ver. 25. After συμπαραλ. Lachm. and Born. have deleted καί, following A B D Μ, min. and some vss. But how readily may the omission of this καί be explained by its complete superfluousness! whereas there is no obvious occasion for its being added.

Vv. 1, 2. Καὶ ἐν οἴνῳ δὲ τὴν καρδίαν] but at that juncture,¹ points, as in xix. 23,² to what is narrated immediately before; consequently: when Barnabas and Saul were sent to Jerusalem (xi. 30). From ver. 25 it is evident that Luke has conceived this statement of time in such a way, that what is related in vv. 1–24 is contemporaneous with the despatch of Barnabas and Saul to Judaea and with their stay there, and is accordingly to be placed between their departure from Antioch and their return from Jerusalem,³ and not so early as in the time of the one year's residence at Antioch, xi. 25.⁴ — Ἡρῴδης] Agrippa I., grandson of Herod the Great, son of Aristobulus and Berenice, nephew of Herod Antipas, possessed, along with the royal title,⁵ the whole of Palestine, as his grandfather had possessed it; Claudius having added Judaea and Samaria⁶ to his dominion already preserved and augmented by Caligula.⁷ A crafty, frivolous, and extravagant prince,

---

¹ Winer, p. 374 (E. T. 500).
² Comp. 2 Macc. III. 8 ; I Macc. xii. 14.
³ Schrader, Hug. Schott.
⁴ Wieseler, p. 159; Stößling, Beltr. s. Erez.
⁶ Joseph. Ant. xvi. 6. 10.
⁷ Joseph. Ant. xvi. 5. 1; xvi. 6. 1; Bell, H. 11. 5.
who, although better than his grandfather, is praised far beyond his due by Josephus (v.) — ἵνα βαλεῖν τὰς χεῖρας is not, with Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others, to be interpreted: συγκείτω, conatus est = ἰσχείωσε,¹ because for this there is no linguistic precedent at all, even in the LXX. Deut. xii. 7, xv. 10, the real and active application of the hand is meant, and not the general notion suscipere; but according to the constant usage,² and according to the context, προσήκειν συλλαβεῖν, ver. 8, it is to be interpreted of hostile laying hands on. Herod laid hands on, he caught at, i.e. he caused to be forcibly seized, in order to maltreat some of the members of the church — on οἱ ἀνήθε, used to designate membership of a corporation, see Lobeck.³ Elsewhere the personal dative ⁴ or ἐπὶ τινα ⁵ is joined with ἵνα βαλλεῖν τὰς χεῖρας, instead of the definition of the object aimed at by the infinitive. — On the apostolic work and fate of the elder James, who now drank out the cup of Matt. xx. 23, nothing certain is otherwise known. Apocryphal accounts may be seen in Abdiae Histor. apost. in Fabric. Cod. Apocer. p. 516 ff., and concerning his death, p. 528 ff. The late tradition of his preaching in Spain, and of his death in Compostella, is given up even on the part of the Catholics.⁶ — τ. ἄξεσθε. Ἰωάννος] John was still alive when Luke wrote, and in high respect. — μαχαίρα] probably, as formerly in the case of John the Baptist, by beheading,⁷ which even among the Jews was not uncommon and very ignominious; see Lightfoot, p. 91 (z'). — The time of the execution was shortly before Easter week (A.D. 44), which follows from ver. 8; and the place was probably Jerusalem.⁸ It remains, however, matter of surprise that Luke relates the martyrdom of an apostle with so few words, and without any specification of the more immediate occasion or more special circumstances attending it, ἀπλῶς καὶ ὡς τρείχειν Herod had killed him, says Chrysostom. A want of more definite information, which he could at all events have easily obtained, is certainly not to be assumed. Further, we must not in fanciful arbitrariness import the thought, that by "the entirely mute (?) suffering of death," as well as "in this absolute quietness and apparent insignificance," in which the first death of an apostle is here presented, there is indicated "a reserved glory," by which, in fact, moreover, some sort of more precise statement would not be excluded. Nor yet is the summary brevity of itself warranted as a mere introduction, by which Luke desired to pass to the following history derived from a special document concerning Peter;¹⁰ the event was too important for that. On the contrary, there must have prevailed some sort of conscious consideration

---

¹ Luke i. 1 ; Acts ix. 29.  
² iv. 3, v. 18, xxvi. 97 ; Matt. xxvi. 50; Mark xlv. 48 ; Luke xx. 19, xxi. 13; John vii. 50; Gen. xxii. 12; comp. Lucan, Tim. 4, also in Arrian, Polybius, etc.  
⁴ Ar. Lyc. 440; Acts iv. 3; Mark xlv. 48; Tischendorf, Esth. vi. 2.  
⁵ Gen. xxii. 12; 2 Sam. xviii. 12, and always in the N. T., except Acts iv. 3 and Mark xlv. 46.  
⁶ See Sepp, p. 78. Who, however, comes at least to the rescue of the bones of the apostle for Compostella !  
⁸ For Agrippa was accustomed to reside in Jerusalem (Joseph. Antt. xix. 7. 8); all the more, therefore, he must have been present or have come thither from Cæsarea, shortly before the feast (ver. 19).  
⁹ Baumgarten.  
¹⁰ Bleich.
involved in the literary plan of Luke,—probably this, that he had it in view to compose a third historical book (see the Introduction), in which he would give the history of the other apostles besides Peter and Paul, and therefore, for the present, he mentions the death of James only quite briefly, and for the sake of its connection with the following history of Peter. The reason adduced by Lekebusch, p. 219: that Luke wished to remain faithful to his plan of giving a history of the development of the church, does not suffice, for at any rate the first death of an apostle was in itself, and by its impression on believers and unbelievers, too important an element in the history of that development not to merit a more detailed representation in connection with it.—Clem. Al. in Euseb. ii. 9 has a beautiful tradition, how the accuser of James, converted by the testimony and courage of the apostle, was beheaded along with him.

Vv. 3, 4. Herod, himself a Jew, in opposition to Harduin, born in Judaism, although of Gentile leanings, a Roman favourite brought up at the court of Tiberius, cultivated out of policy Jewish popular favour, and sought zealously to defend the Jewish religion for this purpose. —προσέθεντο συλλαβήν] a Hebraism: he further seized. —τέσσαρα τετράδιαν, [four bands of four]—τετράδιον, a number of four, Philo, II. p. 583, just as τετράς in Aristotle and others—quattuor quaternionibus, i.e. four detachments of the watch, each of which consisted of four men, so that one such τετράδιον was in turn on guard for each of the four watches of the night. —μετὰ τὸ πάσχα] not to desecrate the feast, in consideration of Jewish orthodox observance of the law. For he might have evaded the Jewish rule, "non judicant die festo," at least for the days following the first day of the feast, by treating the matter as peculiarly pressing and important. Wieseler has incorrectly assumed the 15th Nisan as the day appointed for the execution, and the 14th Nisan as the day of the arrest. Against this it may be decisively urged, that by μετὰ τὸ πάσχα must be meant the entire Paschal feast, not the 14th Nisan, because it corresponds to the preceding αἱ ἡμέραι τῶν ἀζύμων. —ἀναγαγ. αὐτ. τῷ λαῷ] that is, to present him to the people on the elevated place where the tribunal stood (John xix. 18), in order there publicly to pronounce upon him the sentence of death.

Vv. 5, 6. But there was earnest prayer made by the church to God for him. On ἵστατιν, peculiar to the later Greek, 1 Pet. iv. 5; Luke xxii. 44. —προάγειν] to bring publicly forward. See on ver. 4.—τῇ νυκτὶ ἵστατι] on that night; when, namely, Herod had already resolved on the bringing forward, which was to be accomplished on the day immediately following. —According to the Roman method of strict military custody, Peter was bound by chain to his guard. This binding, however, not by one

1 Deyling, Obs. ii. p. 363; Wolf, Gier.
3 Comp. on Luke xix. 11, xx. 12.
4 On this Roman regulation, see Veget. R. M. iii. 8; Censorinus, de die nat. 28; Wetsch in loc.
5 Mooo Katon, v. 2.
6 See Bleek, Beltr. p. 188 ff.
9 See Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 511.
10 Comp. Joseph. Antiq. xviii. 6, 7; Plin. ep. x. 63; Senec. ep. 5, ad.
IMPRISONMENT OF PETER.

chain to one soldier, but by two chains, and so with each hand attached to a soldier, was an aggravation, which may be explained from the fact that the execution was already determined.¹ Two soldiers of the πετράδιον on guard were in the prison, fastened to Peter asleep (κοιμομ.), and, indeed, sleeping profoundly in the peace of the righteous; and two as guards, φυλακες, were stationed outside at some distance from each other, forming the πρώτην φυλακήν καὶ δευτέραν, ver. 10.

Vv. 7–11. The narrative of this deliverance falls to be judged of in the same way as the similar event recorded in v. 19, 20. From the mixture of what is legendary with pure history, which marks Luke’s report of the occurrence, the purely historical state of the miraculous fact in its individual details cannot be surely ascertained, and, in particular, whether the angelic appearance, which suddenly took place, is to be referred to the internal vision of the apostle,—a view to which ver. 9 may give a certain support. But as the narrative lies before us, every attempt to constitute it a natural occurrence must be excluded. This holds good not only of the odd view of Hezel, that a flash of lightning had undone the chains, but also of the opinion of Eichhorn and Heinrichs, “that the jailer himself, or others with his knowledge, had effected the deliverance, without Peter himself being aware of the exact circumstances;” as also, in fine, of the hypothesis of Baur, that the king himself had let the apostle free, because he had become convinced in the interval (v. ver. 8) how little the execution of James had met with popular approval. According to Ewald, Peter was delivered in such a surprising manner, that his first word after his arrival among his friends was, that he thought he was rescued by an angel of God; and our narrative is an amplified presentation of this thought.—Ver. 7. φως] whether emanating from the angel, or as a separate phenomenon, cannot be determined.—οἰκία] generally denoting single apartments of the house, is, in the special sense: place of custody of prisoners, i.e. prison, a more delicate designation for the συνεστέρικόν, frequent particularly among Attic writers.—And the chains fell from his hands, round which, namely, they were entwined.—Ver. 9. He was so overpowered by the wonderful course of his deliverance and confused in his consciousness, that what had been done by the angel was not apprehended by him as something actual.

¹ See, generally, Wisseler, pp. 381, 395.
² See ver. 7.
³ Ps. iii. 6.
⁴ εἰςφαν, see on Luke ii. 9.
⁵ Lange, apostol. Zeitatt. II. p. 150, supposes that the help had befallen the apostle in the condition of “second consciousness, in an extraordinary healthy disengagement of the higher life” [Geniuslieben], and that the angel was a “reflected image of the glorified Christ;” that the latter Himself, in an angelic form, came within the sphere of Peter’s vision; that Christ Himself thus undertook the responsibility; and that the action of the apostle transcended the condition of responsible consciousness. There is nothing of all this in the passage. And Christ is an angelic form is without analogy in the N. T.; is, indeed, at variance with the N. T. conception of the δόξα of the glorified Lord.
⁷ Who (p. 205) regards our narrative as more historical than the similar narratives in chaps. v. and xvi.
⁸ Matt. xxviii. 3.
⁹ Valck. ad Ammon. III. 4; Dorrill. ad Chart. p. 387.
¹⁰ Dem. 730, 2; 850, 1224, 3; Thuc. iv. 47, 2, 48, 1; Eypke, II. p. 87. Comp. Valck. ad Herod. viii. 119.
ἀληθές, as a real fact, but that he fancied himself to have seen a vision, comp. xvi. 9. — Ver. 10. τὴν φέροναν εἰς τὴν πόλιν] Nothing can be determined from this as to the situation of the prison. Fessel holds that it was situated in the court of Herod's castle; Walsh and Kuinoel, that Peter was imprisoned in a tower of the inner wall of the city, and that the πόλη was the door of this tower, if the prison-house was in the city, which is to be assumed from καὶ εἰς εἰδώλους κ.τ.λ., its iron gate still in fact led from the house εἰς τὴν πόλιν — Examples of αὐτόματος, used not only of persons, but of things, may be seen in Wetstein in loc., and on Mark iv. 28. | ὅμως μιαν] not several. — Ver. 11. γενόμενος ἐν ἰαυρῷ] when he had become (present) in himself, i.e. had come to himself, "cum animo ex stupore ob rem inopinatam iterum collecto satis sibi conscius esset." — Kai πάσης τῆς προσοψ. τοῦ λαοῦ τ. Ιουδ. | For he had now ceased to be the person, in whose execution the people were to see their whole expectation hostile to Christianity gratified.

Ver. 12. Συνώδων] after he had perceived it, namely, what the state of the case as to his deliverance had been, ver. 11. It may also mean, after he had weighed it, Vulg. considerans, namely, either generally the position of the matter, or quid agendum esset. The above view is simpler, and in keeping with xiv. 6. Linguistically inapropriate are the renderings: sibi conscius; and: "after that he had set himself right in some measure as to the place where he found himself." — There is nothing opposed to the common hypothesis, that this John Mark is identical with the second evangelist. Comp. ver. 25, xiii. 5.

Vv. 13, 14. Τὴν θύραν τοῦ πυλώνος] the wicket of the gate, x. 17. On κροτεῖν or κόπτεῖν, used of the knocking of those desiring admission — παραδίασαν] who, amidst the impending dangers, had to attend to the duties of a watchful doorkeeper; she was herself a Christian. — ἐπανασύνα] For examples of this expression used of doorkeepers, who, upon the call of those outside, listen (auscultant) who is there, see Kyrke. — τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ Π.] the voice of Peter, calling before the door. — ἀπὸ τῆς χαράς] prompted by the joy, which she now experienced, she did not open the door at once, but ran immediately in to tell the news to those assembled. — ἀπῆγγ. ἑστάναι κ.τ.λ.] eisaggýllèin is the more classical term for the announcement of a doorkeeper.

Vv. 15, 16. Maluy] Thou art mad! An expression of extreme surprise at one who utters what is absurd or otherwise incredible. The hearer also

of something incredible himself exclaims: μαίνομαι! as in Luke xxii. 59, and often in Greek writers: she maintained firmly and strongly.—διασχυτζει[.] Even according to the Jewish conception, the explanation suggested itself, that Peter's guardian angel had taken the form and voice of his προτάγε and was before the door. But the idea, originating after the exile, of individual guardian angels, is adopted by Jesus Himself, and is essentially connected with the idea of the Messianic kingdom. Olsenausen rationalizes this conception in an unbiblical manner, to this effect: "that in it is meant to be expressed the thought, that there lives in the world of spirit the archetype of every individual to be realized in the course of his development, and that the higher consciousness which dwells in man here below stands in living connection with the kindred phenomena of the spirit-world." Cameron, Hammond, and others explain: "a messenger sent by him from the prison." It is decisive against this interpretation, that those assembled could just as little light on the idea of the imprisoned Peter's having sent a messenger, as the maid could have confounded the voice of the messenger with the well-known voice of Peter, for it must be presumed from διασχυτζετο ούτως εξειν that she told the more special reasons for her certainty that Peter was there. — Ver. 16. ἀνοίκανεν consequently the persons assembled themselves, who had now come out of their room.

Ver. 17. Κατασείειν τῇ χειρί] to make a shaking motion with the hand generally, and in particular, as here, to indicate that there is a wish to bring forward something, for which one bespeaks the silence and attention of those present." The infinitive σιγᾶν, as also often with νείειν and the like, by which a desire is made known."—The three clauses of the whole verse describe vividly the haste with which Peter hurried the proceedings, in order to betake himself as soon as possible into safe concealment. Baumgarten invents as a reason: because he saw that the bond between Jerusalem and the apostles must be dissolved. As if it would have required for that purpose such haste, even in the same night! His regard to personal safety does not cast on him the appearance of cowardly anxiety; but by the opposite course he would have tempted God. How often did Paul and Jesus Himself withdraw from their enemies into concealment!—καὶ τοῖς ἄδελφοις who were not along with them in the assembly.—εἰς τὴν ἔρευν τοῦν is wholly indefinite. Even whether a place in or out of Palestine is meant, must remain undetermined. Luke, probably, did not himself know the immediate place of abode, which Peter chose after his departure. To fix without reason on Caesarea, or, on account of Gal. ii. 11, with Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others, on Antioch, or indeed, after Eusebius, Jerome, and many Catholics, on Rome, is all the more arbitrary, as from the words it

1 Jacobe, ad Anthol. IX. p. 440.
2 See Lightfoot ad loc.
3 See on Matt. xxviii. 10.
4 Matt. xxviii. 10.
5 Heb. 1. 14.
6 Comp. xiii. 16. xix. 23. xxi. 42.
7 See Polyb. i. 78. 3; Heliod. x. 7; Krebs and Wetstein in loc.
8 Comp. Joseph. Anti. xvii. 10. 2.
9 Ewald, p. 607.
10 But see on ver. 28.
11 Even in the present day the reference to Rome is, on the part of the Catholics (see Gams, d. Jahr. d. Märtyrertodes der Ap. Pet.
is not even distinctly apparent that the ἔρηπος τόπος is to be placed outside of Jerusalem, although this is probable in itself; for the common explanation of ἔξωθεν, relicta urbe, is entirely at variance with the context, ver. 16, which requires the meaning, relicta domo, into which he was admitted (A²).

—The James mentioned in this passage is not the son of Alpheus,—a traditional opinion, which has for its dogmatic presupposition the perpetual virginity of Mary,' but the real brother of the Lord,' ἀδελφὸς κατὰ γάμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. It is the same also at xv. 13, xxi. 18. See on 1 Cor. ix. 4, 5; Gal. i. 19. Peter specially names him, because he was head of the church in Jerusalem. The fact that Peter does not name the apostles also, suggests the inference that none of the twelve was present in Jerusalem. The Clementines and Hegesippus make James the chief bishop of the whole church.· This amplification of the tradition as to his high position goes, in opposition to Thieresch, beyond the statements of the N. T.²

WV. 18, 19. What had become of the (vanished) Peter,² whether accordingly, under these circumstances,³ the wonderful escape was capable of no explanation—this inquiry was the object of consternation (τάραξον) among the soldiers who belonged to the four ἑπάτρον, ver. 4, because they feared the vengeance of the king in respect to those who had served on that night-watch. And Herod actually caused those who had been the φίλακτος of the prison at the time of the escape, after previous inquiry,⁴ to be led to execution—ἀπαθίθεν, the formal word for this.⁵ After the completion of the punishment, he went down from Judaea to his residency, where he took up his abode. —εἰς τὴν Καισαρ.] depends, as well as ἀνά τ. Ἰωάν., on κατελθεῖν. The definition of the place of the διέρμην¹⁰ was obvious of itself.

¹ With Regnerus, 1867, very welcome, because a terminus a quo is thereby thought to be gained for the duration, lasting about twenty-five years, of the episcopal functions of Peter at Rome. Gams, indeed, places this Roman journey of Peter as early as 41, and his martyrdom in the year 65. So also Thieresch, K. in. apost. Zeit. p. 96 ff., comp. Ewald.


³ Lange (apost. Zeitatt. I. p. 196 ff., and in Herzog's Encycl. VI. p. 407 ff.) has declared himself very decidedly on the opposite side of the question, and that primarily on the basis of the passages from Hegesippus in Eusebius HF. 26 and iv. 82; but erroneously. Credner, Etat. II. p. 574 f., has already strikingly exhibited the correct explanation of these passages, according to which Jesus and James appear certainly as brothers in the proper sense. Comp. Huther on James, Intr. p. 8 ff.; Böckh, Eth. p. 648 ff. James the Just is identical with this brother of the Lord; see, especially, Euseb. H. E. II. 1, where the opinion of Clem. Al., that James the Just was the son of Alpheus, is rejected by Eusebius (against Wieseler on Gal. p. 81 f.), although it was afterwards adopted by Jerome. See, generally, also Ewald, p. 281 ff. Böttiger, d. Zeug. des Josep. von Joh. d. T., etc., 1868. Plist in the Zeitschr. f. Luth. Theol. 1884, I. p. 28 ff.; Laurent, neut. Stud. p. 184 ff.—According to Mark vi. 3, James was probably the eldest of the four brethren of Jesus.

⁴ Constit. ap. vili. 35. The Constit. ap. throughout distinguish very definitely James of Alpheus, as one of the twelve, from the brother of the Lord, whom they characterize as ἀνέστησαν. See II. 53. 3, vi. 12. 1, 5, 6, vi. 14. 1, viii. 4. 1, viii. 28 ff., viii. 18. 2, viii. 35, viii. 48. 7, v. 8, viii. 48. 1.

⁵ See Kitteh, auctorit. Kirche, p. 415 ff.

⁶ Gal. ii. 19; 1 Cor. xv. 7; Acts xv. xxi. 18; Epistle of James.

⁷ Luke i. 69; John xxi. 21.


⁹ οἰκονομία, 1v. 9; Luke xxiiil. 14.

¹⁰ See Wackenroder, G. t. c. II. p. 181; Kypke, II. p. 81; and from Philo: Loessner, p. 204.
EXECUTION OF THE SOLDIERS.

Ver. 20. Θυμομαχεῖν signifies to fight violently, which may be meant as well of actual war as of other kinds of enmity. Now, as an actual war of Herod against the Roman confederate cities of Tyre and Sidon is very improbable in itself, and is historically quite unknown; as, further, the Tyrians and Sidonians, for the sake of their special advantage (οι ἐπὶ τῶν πρέσβεων . . . βασιλικῶν), might ask for peace, without a war having already broken out,—namely, for the preservation of the peace, a breach of which was to be apprehended from the exasperation of the king; the explanation is to be preferred, in opposition to Raphel and Wolf: he was at vehement enmity with the Tyrians, was vehemently indignant against them. The reason of this θυμομαχία is unknown, but it probably had reference to commercial interests.—ὁμοθυμαδῶν here also, with one accord, both in one and the same frame of mind and intention.—νόμισμα [not precisely: with him, but before him, turned towards him].—βλάστησεν] according to the original Greek name, perhaps a Greek or a Roman in the service of Herod, his praefectus cubiculo, chamberlain, chief valet de chambre to the royal person, ὅ ἐπὶ τοῦ κοινῶν τοῦ βασιλέως. How they gained and disposed him in their favour, πεισάντες, possibly by bribery, is not mentioned.—οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν πρέσβεων . . . βασιλικῶν] see χώρας. This refers partly to the important commercial gain which Tyre and Sidon derived from Palestine, where the people from of old purchased in large quantities timber, spices, and articles of luxury from the Phoenicians, to whom, in this respect, the harbour of Caesarea, improved by Herod, was very useful; and partly to the fact, that Phoenicia annually derived a portion of its grain from Palestine.

Ver. 21. Ταῦτα δὲ ἡμεῖς.] According to Josephus, namely, he was celebrating just at that time games in honour of Claudius, at which, declared by flatterers to be a god, he became suddenly very ill, etc. —ἐνκυσμός, ἔστη βασιλ.] στολὴν ἐνυδάμους ἐξ ἁργυρίων πεποιμένην πάσαν, Joseph. l.c. —The βῆμα, the platform from which Agrippa spoke, would have to be conceived, in harmony with Josephus, as the throne-like box in the theatre, which, according to the custom of the Romans, was used for popular assemblies and public speeches, which was destined for the king, if Luke

1 Chrysostom correctly remarks the internal relation of what follows: εἰδοὺς ἐδίκησεν κατάλειψαν αὐτῶν, εἰ καὶ μὴ διὰ Πίτερον, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ μεγαλύτεραν. Com. Euseb. ii. 10. There is much subjectively supplied by Baumgarten, who considers it as the aim of this section to exhibit the character of the kingdom of the world in this bloody persecution directed against the apostles.


9 Polyb. xxvii. 8. 4.

10 See on i. 14.

11 See on John i. 1.

12 See the inscription in Wetstein.

13 Sueton. Domit. 16.

14 Scarcely overseer of the royal treasure (Gerlach), as καρία is used in Dio Cass. ix. l. 5. For the meaning chamber, i.e. not treasure chamber, but sleeping-room, is the usual one, and lies at the root of the designations of service, κοινώμαχοι (chamberlain) and κοινωνία (valet de chambre). Comp. Lobeck, l.c. In the LXX. and Apoc. also καρία is cubiculum. See Schleusen. Thes.

15 Comp. on εἰς, viii. 27, and on καρία, Wetstein and Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 203 f.

16 See Nitschelh. ad Hesd., p. 80 f.

17 Joseph. Antt. xvi. 9. 6.

12 1 Kings v. 9, 11; Essek. xxvii. 17; Joseph. Antt. xiv. 10. 6.

18 According to Joseph. Antt. xix. 8, 3, comp. xv. 6. 7, Βενετία δὲ τῶν θεσμῶν ἠμέρα.

19 Comp. xix. 39.
—which, however, cannot be ascertained—has apprehended the whole occurrence as in connection with the festival recorded by Josephus. This festival itself is not defined more exactly by Josephus than as held ὑπὲρ τῆς σωτηρίας of the emperor. Hence different hypotheses concerning it, such as that of Anger: that it celebrated the return of Claudius from Britain; and that of Wieseler: that it was the Quinquennalia, which, however, was not celebrated until August; a date which, according to the context, ver. 28, is too late. — εἷς ὁμοίως πρὸς αὐτοῖς] he made a speech in public assembly of the people (ver. 22) to them, namely, to the Tyrians and Sidonians, to whom, to whose representatives, he thus publicly before the people declared in a speech directed to them his decision on their request, his sentiments, etc. Only this simple view of πρὸς αὐτοῖς: to them,¹ not: in reference to them,—my first edition, and Baumgarten,—as well as the reference to the Tyrians and Sidonians, not to the people,² is suggested by the context, and is to be retained. That, moreover, the speech was planned to obtain popularity, is very probable in itself from the character of Herod, as well as from ver. 23; and this may have occasioned the choice of the word ἔμφυσαν, which often denotes such a rhetorical exhibition.³

Ver. 22. Ἐνθίδας δὲ οἱ κόλακες τὰς οὐδὲ ἐκεῖνα πρὸς ἄγαθου ἄλλιος ἀλλοθεν φωνάς ἀνεβδόμοι, θέεν προσαγορεύουσες, εὐμερὴς τε εἰς, ἐπιλέγοντες, εἰ καὶ ἐξειρνεὶν ὄν ἄνθρωπον ἐφοβήθημεν, ἀλλὰ τοιοῦτον κριττόνα σε θνητής φύσεις ἀλλοιολογοῦμεν! Joseph. l.c., who, however, represents this shout of flattery, which certainly proceeded from the mouth, not of Jews, but of Gentiles, as occasioned by the silver garment of the king shining in the morning sun, and not by a speech on his part. “Vulgus tamen vacuum curis et sine falsi verique discrimine solitas adulationes edoctum, clamore et vocibus adstrepebat.”⁴ ο ὁμοίως, the common people, is found in the N. T. only in the Book of Acts.⁵

Ver. 23. Ἐπάταξαν αὐτῶν ἅγγελος κυρίον] an angel of the Lord smote him. The paroxysm of disease suddenly setting in as a punishment of God, is in accordance with O. T. precedents,⁶ apprehended as the effect of a stroke invasibly befalling him from an angel. The fate of Nebuchadnezzar⁷ does not accord with this view, in opposition to Baumgarten. Josephus, l.c., relates that soon after that display of flattery, the king saw an owl sitting on a rope above his head, and he regarded this, according to a prophecy formerly received in Rome from a German, as a herald of death, whereupon severe abdominal pains immediately followed, under which he expired after five days, at the age of fifty-four years. That Luke has not adopted this fable,—instead of which Eichhorn puts merely a sudden shivering,—is a consequence of his Christian view, which gives instead from its own sphere and tradition the ἐπάταξαν . . . Θεῷ as an exhibition of the divine Nemesis;

⁴ Tacit. Hist. ii. 90.
⁵ See xvii. 5, xix. 30, 33. Comp. on xix. 30.
⁶ Comp. 2 Sam. xxiv. 17; 2 Kings xix. 33; Isa. xxxvii. 69.
⁷ Dan. iv. 29-30.
therefore Eusebius 1 ought not to have harmonized the accounts, and made out of the owl an angel of death. Bengel: "Adeo differt historia divina et humana." 11 — ἀνθρώπος ὡς αὐτὸς για τον δικαιοσύνην τῆς θεοῦς) he refused God the honour due to Him, inasmuch as he received that tribute of honour for himself, instead of declining it and directing the flatterers to the honour which belongs to God, "nulli creaturae communicabilem," Erasmus; 6 οίκων ἐπίπληξε τούτους, the flatterers, ὁ βασιλεὺς, οὐδὲ τὴν κολακείαν ἀσεβίσας ἀνετρέψατο. How entirely different the conduct of Peter, x. 26, and of Paul and Barnabas, xiv. 14 f. — γενόμενος σκηλεστός.] similarly with Antiochus Epiphanes. 4 This is not to be regarded as at variance with Josephus, who speaks generally only of pains in the bowels; but as a more precise statement, which is, indeed, referred by Baur to a Christian legend originating from the fate of Epiphanes, which has taken the abdominal pains that befell Herod as if they were already the gnawing worm which torments the condemned! 6 Kühn, 7 Elsner, Morus, and others, entirely against the words, have converted the disease of worms destroying the intestines 8 into the disease of lice, φθειρίας, as if φθειρόβρωτος 9 were used! — The word σκηλεστός is found in Theoph. e. pl. iii. 12. 8 (I), v. 9. 1. — εἰς ὕπτυσθεν] namely, after five days. Joseph. l.c. But did not Luke consider the γενόμενος σκηλεστός εἰς ὕπτυσθεν as having taken place on the spot? The whole brief, terse statement, the reference to a stroke of an angel, and the use of εἰς ὕπτυσθεν, 10 render this highly probable (b).  


Ver. 25. Ἡσαντερὼν they returned, namely, to Antioch, xi. 27–30, xiii. 1. The statement in ver. 25 takes up again the thread of the narrative, which had been dropped for a time by the episode, vv. 1–24, and leads over to the continuation of the historical course of events in chap. xiii. The taking of Ἡσαντερὼν in the sense of the pluperfect, 11 rests on the erroneous assumption that the collection-journey of this passage coincides with Gal. ii. The course of events, according to the Book of Acts, is as follows: — While, καὶ ἐκείνον τὸν καιρὸν, ver. 1, Barnabas and Saul are sent with the collection to Judaea, xi. 30, there occurs in Jerusalem the execution of James and the imprisonment and deliverance of Peter, 12 and then, 13 at Cesarea, the death of Herod. 14 But Barnabas and Saul return from Jerusalem.  

1 H. E. ii. 10.  
2 See, besides, Heinchen, Exc. II. ad Euseb.  
3 III. p. 235 ff.  
4 See on Luke i. 20.  
5 Isa. xlviii. 11. Comp. Joseph. l.c.  
6 8 Macc. ix. 6, 9. Observe how much our simple narrative—became eaten with worms—is distinguished from the overladen and extravagantly embellished description in 2 Macc. ix. 9 (see Grimm in loc.). But there is no reason, with Gerke, to explain σκηλεστός, figuratively (like the German wurmeischig): worn and shattered by pain.  
7 Mark ix. 44 f.; comp. Isa. xlv. 44.  
8 Ad Ad. V. II. l.c. x. 18.  
9 Bartholinus, de morbis Bibl. c. 23; Mead, de morbis Bibl. c. 15; and see the analogous cases in Wetstein.  
10 Hesych. Mil. 40.  
11 Comp. Acts v. 5, 10.  
12 "Jum ante Herodis obitum," etc., Heinrichs, Kuinoel.  
13 vv. 2–18.  
14 Vetr. 19.  
15 vv. 20–28.
to Antioch.¹ From this it follows that, according to the Acts, they visited first the other churches of Judaea and came to Jerusalem last; so that the episode, vv. 1–23, is to be assigned to that time which Barnabas and Saul on their journey in Judaea spent with the different churches, before they came to Jerusalem, from which, as from the termination of their journey, they returned to Antioch. Perhaps what Barnabas had heard on his journey among the country-churches of Judaea as to the persecution of the Christians by Agrippa, and as to what befell James and Peter, induced him, in regard to Paul,² not to resort to the capital, until he had heard of the departure and perhaps also of the death of the king. — συμπαραλαβάς. κ.η.λ.] from Jerusalem; see ver. 19.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

¹) Herod. V. 1.

This king was the grandson of Herod the Great. He ruled, in some degree independently, over a larger domain than that of his grandfather. His revenues, according to Josephus, were very large—a sum calculated as equal to two millions of dollars. He was a man of ability and of royal magnificence; but crafty, selfish, and extravagant, vainglorious, unprincipled, and licentious. His reign was short, and was stained by many acts of oppression and cruelty. His death, the result of a loathsome and torturing disease, was an evident Divine rebuke of his blasphemous impiety. In this matter Josephus concurs with Luke in the main facts of the case. After his death Judea was again reduced to a Roman province. The three Herods are thus distinguished: "Aschalonita necat pueros, Antipa Ioannem, Agrippa Jacobum, Claudens in Carceres Petrum."

Renan, speaking of Herod, says: "This vile Oriental, in return for the lessons of baseness and perfidy he had given at Rome, obtained for himself Samaria and Judea, and for his brother Herod the kingdom of Chalcis. He left at Rome the worst memories; and the cruelties of Caligula were attributed in part to his counsels." "The orthodox [Jews] had in him a king according to their own heart."

²) He killed James. V. 2.

Instigated by the Jews, with whom he sought to be popular, and whose ritual he zealously observed, Herod harassed the church by maltreating its members; and finding this course pleasing to the Jews, whose good-will he was anxious to secure, he seized James and beheaded him—a mode of death deemed very disgraceful by the Jews. The victim of this high-handed violence was James the elder, designated by our Lord a Son of Thunder. Very little is recorded concerning him in the Acts. He is to be distinguished from James the younger, son of Alpheus; and also from James, the Lord's brother. The death of James verified the prediction that he should drink of his Master's cup. He is the

¹ Ver. 22. ² See on xli. 30.
only one of the twelve of whose death there is any account in Scripture, and probably the first of the twelve who died. The record of his "taking off" is very brief—only two words, ἀνείλεν μαθητὰς. Conjecture as to the cause of such brevity is vain. There is a tradition which states that his accuser, or the officer who led him to the judgment-seat, was so influenced by the conduct and confession of the apostle, that he avowed himself a Christian, and, having asked and received the kiss of pardon from James, suffered martyrdom with him. "The accuracy of the sacred writer," says Paley, "in the expressions which he uses here is remarkable. There was no portion of time for thirty years before, or ever afterwards, in which there was a king at Jerusalem, a person exercising that authority in Judea, or to whom that title could be applied, except the last three years of Herod's life, within which period the transaction here recorded took place."

(a) Peter in prison. V. 5.

In the war of extermination which Herod had been instigated to wage against the Christians he used the policy of first removing the most marked ringleaders. He had cut off James, the brother of John, Peter's oldest friend, and one of the three highly favored by the Master, by a sudden and terrible death, so as to strike terror into the hearts of the disciples. This first act of the bloody tragedy had been played with success, and a second is about to open. There remained now no one, unless Saul of Tarsus, more obnoxious or more to be feared than the dauntless, intrepid son of Jonas. He therefore is next seized, and cast into prison, under many guards—a precaution surely unnecessary, for his friends had no apparent means by which to affect his rescue. But possibly some of the courtiers might have heard that he had once before, in some wonderful way, escaped from prison; and hence this double security. Not until after the feast of the passover would the punctilious monarch order his execution. Meantime the afflicted and disconsolate disciples, conscious of their helplessness, turn to the Lord in earnest and continued prayer. The last night before the expected execution has come; the disciples are gathered together in prayer; the apostle, calm in his confidence and fearless in his faith, quietly sleeps between his guards. Ere the dawn of the morning a dazzling light fills the cell, and an angel arouses the prisoner, and orders him to put on his attire, as for a journey. He safely leads him past the first and second watches through the gate into the open street, and then leaves him. Peter, with difficulty realizing what had been done in his behalf, went to the house of Mary, mother of Mark, and sister of Barnabas, and found the brethren there still in prayer. Wordsworth thus beautifully writes on this passage: "Herod's soldiers were watching under arms at the door of the prison; Christ's soldiers were watching with prayer in the house of Mary. Christ's soldiers are more powerful with their arms than Herod's soldiers with theirs; they unlock the prison doors and bring Peter to the house of Mary." And when the answer to their prayer had been granted they could scarcely believe that Peter was really in person, among them. He related to them all the circumstances connected with his deliverance, and they were filled with joy. Peter prudently, in the meantime sought safety in concealment.—ἐκ τῶν τοπῶν. Alford says: "I see in these words a minute mark of truth in our narrative." Lechler (in Lange)
CHAP. XII., NOTES.

observes: "The event is indeed most graphically described, and exhibits no features that can embarrass any one who believes in the interposition of the living God, in the real world, and who admits the actual existence and the operation of angels. Hence no sufficient reason is apparent which could induce those who admit the miraculous character of the historical facts, nevertheless, to assert that legendary matter has been commingled with the pure historical elements," as Meyer in the text has done.

"All rationalistic explanations to account for this deliverance of Peter are in direct opposition to the narrative. According to Hezel, a flash of lightning shone into the prison, and loosened the chains of Peter. According to Eichhorn and Heinrichs, the jailor, or others with his knowledge, delivered Peter without the apostle being conscious to whom he owed his freedom; and as the soldiers are a difficulty in the way of this explanation, they suppose that a sleeping draught was administered to them. All this is mere trifling. Others endeavor to get rid of the miraculous by questioning the correctness of the narrative. Meyer and de Wette think that the truth is here so mixed up with the mythical element that it is impossible to affirm what took place. Ruhr supposes that Herod himself delivered the apostle, as he found, in the interval, that the people were not gratified by the death of James, but that, on the contrary, that proceeding had made him unpopular. Neander passes over the narrative with the remark: 'By the special providence of God Peter was delivered from prison.' Whenever the miraculous in the narrative is given up, the only resource is the mythical theory—to call in question the truth of the history—as all natural explanations are wholly unavailing. The narrative, here, however, has no resemblance to a myth; there is a naturalness and freshness about it which remove it from all legends of a mythical description." (Glocy.)

Renan even admits in a note to chapter 14th of "The Apostles:" "The account in the Acts is so lively and just that it is difficult to find any place in it for any prolonged legendary elaboration."

(3°) Death of Herod. V. 23.

Josephus informs us that Herod died in the fifty-fourth year of his age, in the seventh of his reign, having reigned only three years over the whole of Palestine. "But Herod deprived this Matthias of the high priesthood, and burnt the other Matthias, who had raised a sedition with his companions, alive. And that very night there was an eclipse of the moon. But now Herod's distemper greatly increased upon him after a severe manner, and this by God's judgment upon him for his sins, for a fire glowed in him slowly." He further speaks of putrefaction, of convulsions, of worms, of fetid breath, and loathsomeness generally. He says also that it was said by those who understood such things that God indicted this punishment on the king for his great impiety. Just before his death he summoned the principal men of the entire Jewish nation to come to him. When they came the king was in a wild rage against them all, the entirely innocent as well as those against whom there might be ground of accusation. He ordered them all to be shut up in the Hippodrome, and left most solemn injunctions with his brother-in-law, Alexis, that when he died they should all be put to death, so that there might be a general mourning at his decease. He acted like a madman, and even had a
design of committing suicide. A more miserable death scene has never been portrayed than Josephus gives of the impious, infamous, and atrociously malignant and cruel Herod. (Josephus Antiq. xvii. 6, 5, and 7, and 8.) The points of difference between the account given by Luke and the history of Josephus are few and unimportant, and easily reconciled. There is really no contradiction in the narratives at all, and therefore it is wholly superfluous on the part of any commentator to have recourse to mythical explanations; as it the worms—mentioned however by Josephus as well as by Luke—had reference to the gnawing worm of remorse which preys upon the consciously guilty.
CHAPTER XIII.

Vers. 1. ἡσαυ ὁ] So Lachm. Tisch. Born. But Elz. and Scholz add τυνές, against A B D K, min. vss. Vig. A hasty addition, from the supposition that all the teachers and prophets of the church of Antioch could not be named. — Ver. 4. οὐνοὶ] Lachm. Tisch. read αὐτοὶ, after A B K, min. Vulg. Syr. utr. Ambr. Vig.; Born. has εἰ only, after D, Ath. As the reading of C is not clear, the preponderance of witnesses, which alone can here decide, remains in favour of the reading of Lachm. — Ver. 6. δῆλον] is wanting in Elz., but is supported by decisive testimony. How easily would transcribers, to whom the situation of Paphos was not precisely known, find a contradiction in δῆλον and ἄχρι Πάφου! — ἄνθρωπος τινικ] So Lachm. Tisch. Born., after A B C D K, min. Chrys. Theophyl. Lucif. and several vss. After τινικ, E, 36, Vulg. Sahid. Slav. Lucif. have ἄνθρωπο. But Elz. and Scholz omit ἄνθρωπο, which, however, is decisively attested by those witnesses, and was easily passed over as quite superfluous. — Ver. 9. The usual καὶ before ἀπεισίας is deleted, according to decisive evidence, by Lachm. Tisch. Born. — Ver. 14. τῆς Πισιδίας] Lachm. and Tisch. read τῆν Πισιδίαν, after A B C K. But it lacks any attestation from the vss. and Fathers. Therefore it is the more to be regarded as an old alteration (it was taken as an adjective like Πισιδικός). — Ver. 15. After εἰ Lachm. Born. Tisch. have τις, which has preponderant attestation, and from its apparent superfluousness, as well as from its position between two words beginning with E, might very easily be omitted. — Ver. 17. After τούτων Lachm. reads, with Elz., Ἰσραήλ, which also Born. has defended, following A B C D K, vss. Its being self-evident gave occasion to its being passed over, as was in other witnesses τούτων, and in others λαὸς τούτων. — Ver. 18. ἐτροφοφ.] So (after Mill, Grabe, and others) Griesb. Matthaei, Lachm. Scholz, Tisch., following A C E, min. vss. But Elz. Tisch. and Born. have ἐτροποφ. (mores eorum sustinent, Vulg.). An old insertion of the word which came more readily to hand in writing, and was also regarded as more appropriate. See the exegetical remarks. — Ver. 19. κατεκληρονόμησαν] Elz. reads κατεκληροδότησαν, against decisive witnesses. An interpretation on account of the active sense. — Ver. 20. καὶ μετὰ ... ἔδωκε] Lachm. reads ὡς ἔτοις τετρακοσίοις καὶ πνῆκαυστα, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἔδωκεν, which Griesb. has recommended and Born. adopted, after A B C K, min. Vulg. An alteration, in order to remove somehow the chronological difficulty. — Ver. 23. ἡγαγε] Elz. and Born. read ἡγεμόνε, in opposition to A B E G H K, min. and several vss. and Fathers. An interpretation in accordance with ver. 22. — Ver. 27. ἀπεστάλη] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read ἐξαπεστάλη, which is so decidedly attested by A B C D K, min. Chrys., that the Recepta can only be regarded as having arisen from neglect of the double compound. — Ver. 31. νῦν] is wanting in Elz., but is, according to important attestation, to be recognized as genuine, and was omitted because those who are mentioned were already long ago witnesses of Jesus. Hence others have ἄχρι νῦν (D. Syr. p. Vulg. Cant.; so Born.); and others still, καὶ νῦν (Arm.). — Ver. 32. αὐτῶν ἡμῖν] Sahid. Ar. Ambr. ms. Bed. gr. have only
aœtôv, A B C* D M, Aeth. Vulg. Hil. Amb. Bed. have only ἵμων (so Lachm. and Born., who, however, conjectures ἵμων") for which Tol. read ἵμων. Sheer alterations from want of acquaintance with such juxtaposition of the genitive and dative. — Ver. 33. τῷ πρὸτῳ Elz. and Scholz read τῷ δευτέρῳ (after ψαλμῷ). But τῷ πρῶτῳ, which (following Erasm. and Mill) Griesb. Lachm. (who places it after γεγραμμα, where A B C M, loµl 40 have their τῷ δευτέρῳ) Tisch. Born. have adopted, is, in accordance with D, Or. and several other Fathers, to be considered as the original, which was supplanted by τῷ δευτέρῳ according to the usual numbering of the Psalms. The bare ψαλμῷ, which Hesych. presb. and some more recent cod. have, without any numeral, is, although defended by Bengel and others, to be considered as another mode of obviating the difficulty erroneously assumed. — Ver. 41. δ] Elz. reads ϕ, which, as the LXX. at Hab. i. 5 has δ, would have to be preferred, were not the quite decisive external attestation in favour of δ. — The second ἐγγυν is wanting in D E G. min. Chrys. Cosm. Theophyl. Oec. and several vss.; but it was easily omitted, as it was regarded as unnecessary and was not found in the LXX. i.e. — Ver. 42: aœtôv] Els. reads εκ τῶν συναγωγῶν τῶν ἱουδαίων. Other variations are aœtôv εκ τῶν ἄποστλων εκ τῶν συναγ. τ. ἱουδ. or τῶν ἀποστλων εκ τῶν συναγ. τ. ἱουδ. Sheer interpolations, because ver. 42 begins a church lesson. The simple aœtôv has decisive attestation. — After παρεκάλουν Elz. has τα ἐννυ, which, although retained by Matthaei, is spurious, according to just as decisive testimony. It was inserted, because it was considered that the request contained here must not, according to ver. 45, be ascribed to the Jews, but rather to the Gentiles, according to ver. 48. — Ver. 43. After ἰσσόθηκαλ, A B (? ) C D M, vss. Chrys. have aœtôis (so Lachm. and Born.). A familiar addition. — προσερέμενων Els. reads ἐπιμενεῖν, against decisive evidence. — Ver. 44. ἐξομένων Elz. reads ἐρχομένω, against A C*** E*, min. An alteration, from want of acquaintance with this use of the word, as in Luke xiii: 33; Acts xx. 15, xxi. 36. — Ver. 45. ἀντιλέγοντες κα] is wanting in A B C G M, min and several vss. (erased by Lachm.). E has ἐναντιομένους καλ. Both are hasty emendations of style. — Ver. 50. τας εἰδείχ. Elz. reads καὶ τας εἰδείχ., against decisive testimony. καὶ, if it has not arisen simply from the repetition in writing of the preceding syllable, is a wrongly inserted connective.

With chap. xii. commences the second part of the book, which treats chiefly of the missionary labors and fortunes of Paul. First of all, the special choice and consecration of Barnabas and Paul as missionaries, which took place at Antioch, are related, vv. 1–8; and then the narrative of their first missionary journey is annexed, ver. 4–xiv. 28. These two chapters show, by the very fact of their independent commencement entirely detached from the immediately preceding narrative concerning Barnabas and Saul, by the detailed nature of their contents, and by the conclusion rounding them off, which covers a considerable interval without further historical data, that they have been derived from a special documentary source, which has, nevertheless, been subjected to revision as regards diction by Luke. ¹ This documentary

¹ Lachmann, Prag. p. ix., conjectured φ' ἵμων: "nostro tempore."
² Lekebusch, p. 108, explains this abrupt isolation as designed; the account emerges solemnly. But to this the simplicity of the following narrative does not correspond. Comp. Schleiermacher, Ebrl. p. 553 f.
³ See also Bleek in the Stu. u. Krit. 1866, p. 1048.
source, however, is not to be determined more precisely, although it may be conjectured that it originated in the church of Antioch itself, and that the oral communications mentioned at xiv. 27 as made to that church formed the foundation of it from xiii. 4 onward. The assumption of a *written* report made by the two missionaries, obtains no support from the living apostolic mode of working, and is, on account of xiv. 27, neither necessary nor warranted. Schwabeck considers the two chapters as a portion of a biography of Barnabas, to which also iv. 36 f., ix. 1–30, xi. 19–30, xii. 25 belonged; and Baur refers the entire section to the apologetic purpose and literary freedom of the author (c').

Ver. 1. This mention and naming of the prophets and teachers is intended to indicate how rich Antioch was in prominent resources for the sending forth messengers of the gospel, which was now to take place. Thus the mother-church of Gentile Christianity had become the seminary of the mission to the Gentiles. The order of the persons named is, without doubt, such as it stood in the original document: hence Barnabas and Saul are separated; indeed, Barnabas is placed first—the arrangement appears to have been made according to seniority—and Saul last; it was only by his missionary labours now commencing that the latter acquired in point of fact his superiority. — *κατά τὴν οὖσαν ἐκκλησίαν* with the existing church. *ἐκεῖ* is not to be supplied. This *οὖσαν* is retained from the original document; in connection with what has been already narrated, it is superfluous. — *κατά*, with, according to the conception of, here official, direction. — *προφήτας κ. διδάσκαλοι* as prophets and teachers, who did not speak in the state of apocalyptic inspiration, but communicated instruction in a regular and rational unfolding of doctrine. — The five named are not to be regarded only as a part, but as the whole body of the prophets and teachers at Antioch, in keeping with the idea of the selection which the Spirit designed. To what individuals the predicates "prophet" or "teacher" respectively belong, is not, indeed, expressly said; but if, as is probable in itself and in accordance with iv. 38, the prophets are mentioned first and then the teachers, the three first named are to be considered as prophets, and the other two as teachers. This division is indicated by the position of the particles: (1) *τέ . . . καὶ . . . καὶ*; (2) *τέ . . . καὶ*. — That the prophets of the passage before us, particularly Symeon and Lucius, were included among those mentioned in xi. 27, is improbable, inasmuch as Agabus is not here named again. *Those* prophets, doubtless, soon returned to Jerusalem. — Concerning *Simeon* with the Roman name *Niger*, and *Lucius of Cyrene*, who is not identical with the evangelist Luke, nothing further is known. The same is also the case with Menahem (Μηνήμη), who had been *συντρόφος* of the tetrarch Herod, i.e. of Antipas. But whether *συντρόφος* is, with the Vulgate, Cornelius a Lapide,
FIRST ORDAINED MISSIONARIES.

Walch, Heumann, Kuinoel, Olshausen, and others, to be understood as foster-brother, coniunctus,1 so that Menahem's mother was Herod's nurse; or, with Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Grotius, Raphel, Wolf, Heinrichs, Baumgarten, Ewald, and others, brought up with, contubernalis,—cannot be determined, as either may be expressed by the word.2 The latter meaning, however,3 makes the later Christian position of Menahem the more remarkable, in that he appears to have been brought up at the court of Herod the Great. At all events he was already an old man, and had become a Christian earlier than Saul, who is placed after him (p5).

Ver. 2. Λειτουργοῦντων . . . τῷ Κυρίῳ λειτουργεῖν, the usual word for the temple-service of the priests,4 is here transferred to the priest (αὐτῶν) engaged in Christian worship,5 in accordance with the holy character of the church, which had the αὐτός, the χρισμα of the Spirit,6 and indeed was a ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον.7 Hence: while they performed holy service to the Lord Christ, and, at the same time, festeled. Any more specific meaning is too narrow, such as, that it is to be understood of prayer, Grotius, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Olshausen, and many others, on account of ver. 3, but see on that passage, or of preaching, Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and others in Wolf. Both without doubt are included, not, however, the mass, as Catholics hold; but certainly the spiritual songs.8 — εἰς τὸ πνεύμα τὸ ἅγιον] the Holy Spirit said,9 namely, by one or some of these λειτουργοῦντες, probably by one of the prophets, who announced to the church the utterance of the Spirit revealed to him. — δὲ] with the imperative makes the summons more decided and more urgent.10 — μοι] to me, for my service. — δ ἡγέσεως αὐτῶν] for which, description of the design, I have called them to me,11 namely, to be my organs, interpreters, instruments in the propagation of the gospel. The utterance of the Spirit consequently refers to an internal call of the Spirit already made to both, and that indeed before the church, "ut hi quoque scirent vocationem illorum eique subscripterent," Bengal. The preposition is not repeated before δ = εἰς, because it stands already before τὸ ἅγιον, according to general Greek usage.12

1 Comp. Xem. Epd. ii. 3.
2 See Wetstein and Kuinoel.
3 Comp. 1 Macc. i. 6; 2 Macc. ix. 29; and see, in general, Jacobß, ad Anthol. XI. p. 28.
4 LXX. Ex. xxviii. 31: Num. iv. 38; Ex. xii. 48; Judith iv. 14; Heb. x. 11; comp. on Rom. xiv. 97.
5 The reference of αὐτῶν not to the collective ἁγιουργία, but to the prophets and teachers named in ver. 1 (Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, and many others, including Baumgarten, Hoetelmann, new Bibelstud. p. 289; Laurent. nee. Bibl. p. 160), is not to be approved on account of ἅγιορρος and on account of ver. 3. The whole highly important missionary act would, according to this view, be performed only in the circle of five persons, of whom, moreover, two were the missionaries themselves destined by the Spirit, and the church as such would have taken no part at all, not being even represented by its presbyters,—a proceeding which neither agrees with the fellowship of the Spirit in the constitution of the apostolic church, nor corresponds with the analogous concrete cases of the choice of an apostle, chap. i. and of the deacons, chap. vi. Comp. also xiv. 97, where the missionaries, on their return, make their report to the church. Moreover, it is evident of itself that the prophets and teachers are included in αὐτῶν.
6 1 John ii. 30.
7 1 Pet. ii. 5.
8 See in Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 16.
9 Comp. on xx. 98.
11 xvi. 10.
12 See Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. ii. 1. 83: Stahlb. ad Phaed. p. 79 D; Winer, p. 208 (E. T. 694 f.).
Ver. 3. The translation must be: *Afterwards, after having fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them,* as the consecration communicating the gift of the Spirit for the new and special holy office, they sent them away. For there is here meant a solemnity specially appointed by the church on occasion of that address of the Spirit, different from the preceding, ver. 2; and not the termination thereof. This is evident from the words of Luke himself, who describes this act differently, ἡστείας κ. προσκελής, from the preceding, λειτουργ. κ. νηστ., and by τὸ τέτει σαμε, it as something later; and also because νηστείας, in the sense of "when they had finished fasting," does not even give here any conceivable sense. — ἀπέλλογον] What the Spirit had meant by εἰς ἑρων, ἀ προσκελή, αὐτῶν, might, when they heard that address, come directly home to their consciousness, especially as they might be acquainted in particular with the destination of Saul at ix. 15; or might be explained by the receiver and interpreter of the Spirit's utterance. — That, moreover, the imposition of hands was not by the whole church, but by its representatives the presbyters, was obvious of itself to the reader.

Vv. 4, 5. *Διήρη* (see the critical remarks): such was the course taken with them; *they themselves, therefore, ipsis igitur. — ἐκκεμφθ. ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύμ.] for "vocatio prorsus divina erat; tantum manu Dei oblatos amplexa erat ecclesia," Calvin. — They turned themselves at first to the quarter where they might hope most easily to form connections—it was, in fact, the first attempt of their new ministry—to Cyprus, the native country of Barnabas, iv. 36, to which the direct route from Antioch by way of the neighbouring Seleucia, in Syria, also called Pieria, and situated at the mouth of the Orontes, led. Having there embarked, they landed at the city of Salamis, on the eastern coast of the island of Cyprus. — γενόμ. ēv] arrived at. Often so in classical authors since Homer. — *Ἰωάννης* See on xii. 12. — ὑπηρετήριον] as servant, who assisted the official work of the apostles by performing external services, errands, missions, etc., probably also acts of baptism. "Barnabas et Paulus divinitus nominati, atque his liberum fuit alios adsciscere," Bengel. — As to their practice of preaching in the synagogues, see on ver. 14. (p).

Vv. 6, 7. *Ὀλίγος τῷ νάν] For Paphos, i.e. New Paphos, the capital and the residence of the proconsul, sixty stadia to the north of the old city celebrated for the worship of Venus, lay quite on the opposite western side of the island. — μάγον] see on viii. 9. Whether he was precisely a representative of the cabalistic tendency, cannot be determined. But perhaps, from the Arabic name Elymas, which he adopted, he was an Arabian Jew. μάγον, although a substantive, is to be connected with ἀνδρα,

---

1 Comp. on vi. 6.
2 Kuhn and many others: "jejunio et precibus peractis."
3 Not by the prophet and teachers (Otto, Pastoralr. p. 61; Hodemann, i.c.); for the subject of vv. 9, 8 is the church, and its representatives are the presbyters, xx. 17, 28, xi. 30, xv. 2-28; 1 Tim. iv. 14. The church sends the two missionaries to the Gentiles, and consecrates them by its office-bearers (Rom. xii. 8; 1 Tim. v. 17).
4 See Nagelebach on the Iliad, p. 235, ed. 3.
5 x. 49; 1 Cor. i. 14.
6 See Förber, Geogr. l. p. 909 f.
7 Baumgarten.
SUCCESS IN CYPRUS.

iii. 14. — Βαρθούσος | 6. τὴν Ἴζον, Ἄλλος Ισσα (Ἰωνας). The different forms of this name in the Fathers and versions, Barjeus, Baruma, Barjeuban, Barumou-sán, have their origin in the reverence and awe felt for the name of Jesus. — ἀνθεράτο] Cyprus, which Augustus had restored to the senate, was, it is true, at that time a propraetorian province; but all provincial rulers were, by the command of Augustus, called proconsules. 

— overφα] although the contrary might be suspected from his connection with the sorcerer. But his intelligence is attested partly by the fact that he was not satisfied with heathenism, and therefore had at that time the Jewish sorcerer with him in the effort to acquire more satisfactory views; and partly by the fact that he does not feel satisfied even with him, but asks for the publishers of the new doctrine. In general, sorcerers found at that time welcome receptions with Gentiles otherwise very intelligent.

— τὸν λόγ. τοῦ Θεοῦ] Description of the new doctrine from the standpoint of Luke. See, moreover, on viii. 25.

Ver. 8. 'Ἐλύμας] The Arabic name, Μαρίπανσ, καὶ ἢξοχήν : magus, 4 by which Barjeus chose to be designated, and which he probably adopted with a view to glorify himself as the channel of Arabian wisdom by the corresponding Arabic name. — ὁ μάγος] Interpretation of 'Ἐλύμας, added in order to call attention to the significance of the name. 5 — ἀποστρέψαν ἄντι] a well-known pregnant construction, which Valckenaer destroys arbitrarily, and in such a way as to weaken the sense, by the conjecture ἀποφράεσα: to pervert and turn aside from the faith. Comp. LXX. Ex. v. 4.

Ver. 9. Σαῦλος δ', ὁ καὶ Παῦλος] sc. λεγόμενος. — Ας Saul, Ἱννφή, the longed for, is here for the first time and always henceforth 1 mentioned under his Roman name Paul, but before this, equally without exception, only under his Hebrew name, we must assume a set historical purpose in the remark ὁ καὶ Παῦλος introduced at this particular point, according to which the reader is to be reminded of the relation — otherwise presupposed as well known — of this name to the historical connection before us. It is therefore the most probable opinion, because the most exempt from arbitrariness, that the name Paul was given to the apostle as a memorial of the conversion of Sergius Paulus effected by him. 8 “A primo ecclesia spolio, proconsule Sergio Paulo, victoriae suae trophaeae retulit, erexitque vexillum, ut Paulus diceretur e Saulo.” 

The same view is adopted by Valla, Bengel, Olshausen, Baumgarten, Ewald; also by Baur, 10 according to whom, however, legend alone has wished to connect the change of name somehow adopted

1 Dio Cass. liv. 4.
2 Dio Cass. liri. 13.
3 Lucian. Alex. 80, Wetstein in loc.
5 Comp. Bornemann, Schol. in. Luc. p. lviil.
7 Comp. the name Abraham from Gen. xvii. onwards.
8 Lange, apost. Zeitt. p. 228 (comp. Herzog's Encycl. xi. p. 243), sees in the name Paul (the little) a contrast to the name Elymas; for he had in the power of humility confronted this master of magic, and had in a N. T. character repeated the victory of David over Goliath. Against this play of the fancy it is decisive, that Elymas is not termed and declared a master of magic, but simply ὁ μάγος.
9 Jerome in ep. ad Philem.; comp. de vir.
10 I. p. 106, ed. 2.
by the apostle—which contains a parallel with Peter, Matt. xvi. 16—with an important act of his apostolic life. Either the apostle himself now adopted this name, possibly at the request of the proconsul, or—which at least excludes entirely the objection often made to this view, that it is at variance with the modesty of the apostle—the Christians, perhaps first of all his companions at the time, so named him in honourable remembrance of that memorable conversion effected on his first missionary journey. Kuinoel, indeed, thinks that the servants of the proconsul may have called the apostle, whose name Saul was unfamiliar (I) to them, Paul; and that he thenceforth was glad to retain this name as a Roman citizen, and on account of his intercourse with the Gentiles. But such a purely Gentile origin of the name is hardly reconcilable with its universal recognition on the part of the Christian body. Since the time of Calvin, Grotius, and others, the opinion has become prevalent, that it was only for the sake of intercourse with those without, as the ambassador of the faith among the Gentiles, that the apostle bore, according to the custom of the time, the Roman name. Certainly it is to be assumed that he for this reason willingly assented to the new name given to him, and willingly left his old name to be forgotten; but the origin of the new name, occurring just here for the first time, is, by this view, not in the least explained from the connection of the narrative before us. Heinrichs oddly desires to explain this connection by suggesting that on this occasion, when Luke had just mentioned Sergius Paulus, it had occurred to him that Saul also was called Paul. Such an accident is wholly unnatural, as, when Luke wrote, the name Saul was long out of use, and that of Paul was universal. The opinion also of Witsius and Hackspan, following Augustine, is to be rejected: that the apostle in humility, to indicate his spiritual transformation, assigned to himself the name, Paulus = exiguus; as is also that of Schrader, after Drusius and Lightfoot, that he received at his circumcision the double name. Actu praesente adversus magnum acrem, Bengel.

Ver. 10. [Pαθισμάς] knavery, roguery. — νῦν διαβάλων i.e. a man whose condition of mind proceeds from the influence of the devil, the arch-enemy of the kingdom of the Messiah. An indignant contrast to the name Barjesus. διαβάλων is treated as a proper name, therefore without the article. — πάσης διευκολύνσις of all, that is right, x. 85. — διαστρέψων τὰς ὅδοις κυρ. τ. εὐθείας Will thou not cease to pervert the straight—leading directly to the goal—ways of the Lord, to give them a perverted direction? i.e. applying this general reproach to the present case: Wilt thou, by thy opposition to us, and by thy endeavour to turn the proconsul from the faith, persist in so working that God's measures, instead of attaining their aim according to the divine intention, may be frustrated? The straight way of God aimed here at the

1 Comp. Zeller, p. 212.
2 Ewald.
3 Comp. also Laurent, nouv. Stud. p. 147.
5 Comp. also Wieseler, p. 222 f.
6 Comp. iv. 8, 31, vili. 55, xiii. 53.
7 Polyb. xii. 10. 5, iv. 28. 4; Plut. Cat. m
8 Comp. pαθισμάς, xviii. 14.
9 Comp. on John viii. 44.
10 i Pet. v. 8; Rev. xx. 2.
11 Ver. 8.
12 Ver. 3.
winning of Sergius for the salvation in Christ, by means of Barnabas and Paul; but Elmas set himself in opposition to this, and was engaged in diverting from its mark this straight way which God had entered on, so that the divinely-desired conversion of Sergius was to remain unrealized. De Wette takes it incorrectly: to set forth erroneously the ways in which men should walk before God. On διαστρέφον, comp. in fact, Prov. x. 10; Isa. lxx. 8; Micah iii. 9; and notice that the διαστρέφειν κ.τ.λ. was really that which the sorcerer strove to do, although without attaining the desired success. Observe, also, the thrice repeated emphatic παντός . . . πάσης . . . πάσης, and that Κυρίος is not to be referred to Christ, but to God, whom the son of the devil resists, as is proved from ver. 11.

Ver. 11. Χειρ Κυρίον] a designation, borrowed according to constant usage from the O. T.,1 of "God's hand," and here, indeed, of the punitive hand of God, Heb. x. 31. — ἐνι στ] ec. ἐντι, is directed against thee. — ἢσι] The future is not imperative, but decided prediction. — μὴ βλέπων τ. φθόνον] self-evident, but "auger manifestam sentientiam." 2 To the blind the sun is φῶς ἀφέγγεις. — ἀχρί καιροῦ] for a season. 3 His blindness was not to be permanent; the date of its termination is not given, but it must have been in so far known by Paul, seeing that this penal consequence would cease with the cause, namely, with the withstanding. 4 With the announcement of the divine punishment is combined, by ἀχρί καιροῦ, the hint of future possible forgiveness. Chrysostom well remarks: το ἄχρι καιροῦ δὲ σοῦ κολαζευτός ἦν τὸ ἡμία, ἀλλ' ἐπιστρέφοντος εἰ γὰρ κολαζευτός ἦν, διαπεράσαντος ἀν αὐτοῦ ἐπίστευσεν τυφλόν. 5 — παραχρήσατα δὲ ἐπέπεσεν κ.τ.λ.] We are as little to inquire what kind of blindness occurred, as to suppose, with Heinrichs, that with the sorcerer there was already a tendency to blindness, and that this blindness actually now set in through fright. The text represents the blindness as a punishment of God without any other cause, announced by Paul as directly cognizant of its occurrence. — ἄχρις καὶ σκότος] dimness and darkness, in the form of a climax. See on ἄχρις, only here in the N. T., Duncan. 6 — The text assigns no reason why the sorcerer was punished with blindness, as, for instance, that he might be humbled under the consciousness of his spiritual blindness. 7 We must abstain from any such assertion all the more, that this punishment did not befall the similar sorcerer Simon. Rom. xi. 34.

Ver. 12. Ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ τ. Κυρίου] For he rightly saw, both in that announcement of punishment by Paul, and in the fate of his sorcerer, something which had a connection with the doctrine of the Lord, that is, with the doctrine which Christ caused to be proclaimed by His apostles. 8 Its announcer had shown such a marvellous familiarity with the counsel of God, and its opponent had suddenly experienced such a severe punishment, that he was astonished at the doctrine, with which so evident a divine judg-

1 I.XX. Judg. xi. 15; Job xix. 21; 2 Macc.
2 vii. 36; Ecclus. xxxiii. 2.
4 Comp. x. 9.
5 Quinctil. ix. 3. 45.
6 Soph. G. C. 1546.
8 Ver. 5. Comp. on ver. 12.
9 Comp. Occumenus.
10 See on viii. 25.
ment was connected. Comp. on the connection of the judgment concerning the doctrine with the miracle beheld, Mark i. 27. The ἐνιαυτοῦ obviously supposes the reception of baptism. — Whether the sorcerer afterwards became a believer the text does not, indeed, inform us; but the presumption of a future conversion is contained in ἄχρι καροῦ, ver. 11, and therefore the question is to be answered in the affirmative; for Paul spoke that ἄχρι καροῦ: ἔφη γὰρ γνώμη διδοῖς, Oecumenius. The Tübingen criticism has indeed condemned the miraculous element in this story and the story itself as an invented and exaggerated counterpart of the encounter of Peter with Simon Magus, chap. viii., — a judgment in which the denial of miracles in general, and the assumption of dogmatic motives on the part of the author, are the controlling presuppositions.  

Vv. 13–15. Having put to the open sea again from Paphos, ἀναχέθετε, as xvi. 11, and frequently, also with Greek writers,9 they came in a northerly direction to Perga, the capital of Pamphylia with its famous temple of Diana,4 where John Mark parted from them3 and returned to Jerusalem, for what reason is not certain,—apparently from want of courage and boldness, see xv. 38. But they, without their former companion (αὐτῶй), journeyed inland to the north until they came to Antioch in Pisidia, built by Seleucus Nicanor, and made by Augustus a Roman colony,4 where they visited the synagogue on the Sabbath, comp. ver. 5. Their apostleship to the Gentiles had not cancelled their obligation, wherever there were Jews, to turn first to these; and to Paul, especially, it could not appear as cancelled in the light of the divine order: ἰδοὺ αὐτὸν ἐπὶ πρῶτον καὶ Ἐλλήν, Rom. i. 16, clearly known to him, of his ardent love to his people, Rom. ix. 1 ff., of his assurance that God had not cast them off, Rom. xi., as well as of his insight into the blessing which would arise to the Gentile world even from the rejection of the gospel by the Jews, Rom xi. 11 ff. Hence, although apostle of the Gentiles, he never excludes the Jews from his mission,'but expressly includes them,3 and is wont to begin his labours with them. This we remark against the opinion, which is maintained especially by Baur and Zeller, that in the Book of Acts the representation of Paul's missionary procedure is unhistorically modified in the interest of Judaism. — ʿο ἐν πση ἁγιασμοῦ] denotes the person and his companions,—the company of Paul.10 Now Paul, and no longer Barnabas, appears as the principal person. The conspicuous agency of the Gentile apostle at once in the conversion of Sergius, and in the humiliation of the sorcerer, has decided his superiority. — τῆς Πατιδ. ] chorographic genitive.11

1 Comp. iv. 4, xi. 21, xix. 18.
2 See Baur and Zeller; comp. also Schneck-
enburger, p. 83.
3 Comp. Luke viii. 22.
4 On the ruins, see Fellows' Travels in Asia
Minor, p. 142 ff.
5 Ewald, p. 456, conjectures that now Titus
(Gal. ii. 1) had appeared as an apostolic com-
panion. But how natural it would have been
for Luke at least here to mention Titus, who
is never named by him.
6 On its ruins, see Hamilton's Travels in
Asia Minor, I. p. 431, ff.
7 Comp. on the contrary, ἡ ἁγιασμοῦ, Rom.
xi. 13.
8 1 Cor. ix. 20.
9 See, in opposition to it also, Kien in the
322 ff.
10 See on John xi. 19, and Valkenmaer, p.
493 f.
11 Krüger, § 47. 5. 5.
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For other designations of this situation of the city, see Bornemann.—📝 on the seats of the Rabbins, as Wolf, Wetstein, Kuinoel, think. Possibly; but it is possible, also, that they had already, before the commencement of the Sabbath, immediately on their arrival, announced themselves as teachers, and that this occasioned the request of the president to the strange Rabbins.

— τοῦ νόμου κ. τ. προφ.] namely, in the Parasha and Haphthara for that Sabbath.¹ — That, as Bengel thinks and Kuinoel and Baumgarten approve,² the Parasha, Deut. i.—because Paul, in ver. 18, hints at Deut. i. 31—and the corresponding Haphthara, Isa. i., were in the order of the reading, is uncertain, even apart from the fact that the modern Parshioth and Haphtharoth were fixed only at a later period.³ — ὁ ἀρχιστήριος. i.e. the college of rulers, consisting of the ἀρχιστήριοι αὐτού καὶ ἐξοχήν (Ἕβαλς Ἡβαλῆς), and the elders associated with him. — in animis vestris.—λέγων παρακλ. ¼ a discourse of exhortation, whose contents are an encouragement to the observance and application of the law and the prophets. For: "opus fuit expositoris, qui corda eorum afficiert."⁴ — λέγετε. On λέγων λέγειν, see Lobeck, Paral. p. 504.

Ver. 18. Καρα. τῇ χειρὶ See on xii. 17.—οἱ φθοραὶ τ. Θεοῦ is here, as the distinction from Ἰσραήλιται requires, the formal designation of the proselytes of the gate, who, without becoming actual Ἰσραήλιται by circumcision, were yet worshippers of Jehovah, and attenders at the synagogues, where they had their particular seats.⁵ Against the unfavourable judgment, which the following speech has met with from Schneckenburger, Baur, and Zeller,—namely, that it is only an echo of the speeches of Peter and Stephen, a free production of the narrator,—we may urge as a circumstance particularly to be observed, that this speech is directed to those who were still non-believers, not, like the Epistles of the apostle, to Christians, and accordingly does not find in the Epistles any exactly corresponding standard with which to compare it; that, further, nothing un-Pauline occurs either in its contents or form, —on the contrary, the Pauline fundamental dogma of justification⁶ forms its important concluding main point,⁷ and the Pauline delicacy, prudence, and wisdom of teaching are displayed in its entire plan and execution; that, in particular, the historical introduction, although it may not have originated without some influence from Stephen's speech, and the latter may have, by the editing, been rendered still more similar, yet presents nothing which could not have been spoken by Paul, as the speech of Stephen was known to the apostle and must have made an indelible impression on him; and that the use of Ps. xvi.⁸ as a witness for the resurrection of Jesus, was as natural to Paul as it was to Peter, as, indeed, to Paul also Christ rose κατὰ τὰς γραφάς.⁹ The reasons, therefore, adduced against its originality in the

¹ See on Luke iv. 17.
² Comp. also Tripp. Paulina, p. 194.
⁵ Comp. vv. 43, 59, xvii. 4, 17, xvi. 14, xviii. 7.
⁶ vv. 28 ff. do not contain a mere "timid allusion" to it, as Zeller thinks, p. 327.
⁷ In opposition to Baur's opinion (I. p. 117, ed. 2), that the author, after he had long enough made the Apostle Paul speak in a Petrine manner, felt that he must now add something specifically Pauline!
⁸ Comp. Acts ii. 35 ff.
⁹ 1 Cor. xv. 4.
main, are not sufficient, although, especially amidst our ignorance of the
document from which the speech thus edited is taken, a more complete as-
sertion of an originality, which is at all events only indirect, cannot be
made good.\(^1\)

Vv. 17–22. An introduction very wisely prefixed to prepare the minds
of the Jews, giving the historical basis of the subsequent announcement
that the Messiah has appeared, and carried down to David, the royal Mes-
sianic ancestor and type; the leading thought of which is not the free grace
of God, but generally the divine Messianic guidance of the people before the
final appearance of the Messiah Himself.

Ver. 17. Τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου Ἰσρ. (see the critical remarks) refers with τούτου
to the address ἄνδρες Ἰσρ., and with the venerated name Ἰσραήλ the theo-
cratic national feeling is appealed to.\(^3\) — ἐξελέγησον ὁ Ἰσραήλ for Himself,
namely, from the mass of mankind, to be His peculiar property. On τοῖς
πατριάρχαις, comp. Rom. ix. 5, xi. 16. In them the peo-
ple saw the channels and sureties of the divine grace. — ὑψωσεν] During
the sojourn in Egypt, God exalted the people, making them great in number
and strength, and especially distinguishing and glorifying them in the
period directly before the Exodus by miraculous arrangements of Moses.
The history, which Paul supposes as known, requires this interpretation,
comp. already Chrysostom, who in ὑψωσεν finds the two points: εἰς πλήθος
ἐπέδοσαν and τὰ βαθύματα δι᾽ αὐτῶν γέγονε. Others, among whom are Kuinoel,
Olahhausen, and de Wette, arbitrarily limit ὑψωσεν merely to the increase of
number, appealing even to Gen. xlviii. 19, Ecclus. xlv. 21, 1, 22, where,
however, ὑψών, as always,\(^8\) signifies nothing else than to exalt. The special
nature of the exaltation is derived purely from the context. Calvin,
Elsner, and Heinrichs suppose that the deliverance from Egypt is meant.
But the exaltation, according to the text, occurred ἐν τῇ παροικίᾳ ἐν γῇ
Διόνυσῳ,\(^4\) during their sojourn as strangers in Egypt. Beza and Grotius
think that it is the ὑψωσις of the people by and under Joseph that is
meant. Erroneously, as ὑψωσεν stands in historical connection with the
following ἐξήγαγεν. — μετὰ βραχίονος ψηλὸν] i.e. without figure: ἐν τῇ ισχίῳ
αὐτοῦ τῇ μεγάλῃ.\(^5\) Jehovah is conceived as a leader who advances with up-
lifted arm, at the head of His people, for their defence against all their
enemies.\(^6\)

Vv. 18, 19. 'Ων] might be the as of the protasis, so that καί, ver. 19,
would then be the also of the apodosis.\(^7\) But the common rendering
circiter is simpler and more suitable to the non-periodic style of the entire
context, as well as corresponding to the ως of ver. 20. — On the accentua-
tion of τεσσαρακοντατῃ, so Lachmann and Tischendorf, see Ellendt.\(^8\)—
ἐπροσωφόρ.] He bore them as their nourisher, as it were in his arms, i.e. he
nourished and cherished them. There is here a reminiscence of the LXX.

\(^1\) Comp. the thoughtful judgment of Weiss, Bibl. Theol. p. 226.
\(^2\) Comp. 8 Cor. xi. 22.
\(^3\) Comp. particularly Isa. 1. 2.
\(^4\) VII. 6, 29; Wisd. xix. 10.
\(^5\) LXX. Deut. iv. 37.
\(^6\) Comp. Ex. vi. 1, 6; Bar. ii. 11.
\(^7\) So Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 31. (2. T. p. 389).
\(^8\) LXX. Steph. I. p. 405 f.
Deut. i. 31, according to which passage God bore (ἡγεῖ) the Israelites in the wilderness as a man (ὤμος) beareth his son. The LXX. has rendered this ἡγεῖ by ἐπροσφερ., whence it is evident, as the image is borrowed from a man, that it is based on the derivation from ὁ τροφὸς and not from ἡ τροφή.

In the few other passages where the word is still preserved, women are spoken of—namely, 2 Macc. vii. 27, and Macar. Hom. 46. 8, where of a mother it is said: ἀναλαμβάνει καὶ περιπάτει καὶ τροφοφορεῖ ἐν πολλῇ στοργῇ. But as in this place and in Deut. i. 31 the motion of a male τροφὸς is quite as definitely presented; usually τροφεῖ, it follows that the two references, the male and the female, are linguistically justified in an equal degree; therefore Hesychius explains ἐπροσφόρον, entirely apart from sex, by ἐπερεῖν. From misapprehension of this, the word ἐπροσφορ. was at an early period—among the Fathers, Origen already has it—introduced in Deut. l.c.; ὁ ἤγει their manners, because the comparison of God to a nourishing mother or nurse, ἡ τροφή, was regarded as unsuitable, and following this reading in Deut. l.c., ἐπροσφορ. was also adopted in our passage for the same reason—[ἐν πάντα] see Deut. vii. 1. He destroyed them, i.e. καθελὼν. — κατακληρον. He distributed them for an inheritance. This compound is foreign to other Greek writers, but common in the LXX. in an active and neuter signification. The later Greeks have κατακληρονεῖν.

Ver. 20. And afterwards—after this division of the land among the Israelites—He gave them, during about 450 years, judges—Δῆσω, theocratic dictators, national heroes administering law and justice—until Samuel. The dative ἐπι τηρεῖ is dative of the time, during which something happens, comp. viii. 11. As Paul here makes the judges to follow after the division of the land, it is evident that he overlaps the time which Joshua yet lived after the division of the land, or rather includes it in the μετὰ ταῦτα, which in so summary a statement is the less strange, as Joshua was actually occupied until his death with the consolidation of the new arrangement of the land, Josh. xxiv. 1-28. But the 450 years are in contradiction with 1 Kings vi. 1, where the fourth year of Solomon’s reign, the year of the building of the temple, is placed 480 years after the Exodus from Egypt, which leaves only about 300 years for the period of the judges. But, on the other hand, the chronology of Josephus, who reckons 592 years from the Exodus out of Egypt to the building of the temple, agrees with Paul in our passage. If, namely, we reckon: (1) 40 years as the period of sojourn in the desert; (2) 25 years as the period of Joshua’s rule; (3) 450 years as the duration

1 So also Cyril, in Oecum. p. 182, in Deut. p. 415.
3 See Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 316.
5 With the Greeks their fatherland is often represented under this image. See Stahl. ad Plat. Resp. p. 470 D.
6 See Thuc. i. 4, and Krüger in loc.
7 LXX. Judg. xi. 34; 1 Kings ii. 8; Isa. xiv. 2, 3; 3 E-δρ. vili. 85.
8 See Nölgebach in Herzog’s Encycl. XIII. p. 28 ff.; Bertheau, Comment.
10 LXX. : 440.
11 In Antt. viii. 8. 1, comp. x. 8. 5.
12 In Antt. xx. 10, c. Ap. ii. 2, he reckons 612 years for the same period, thus 20 years more, which comes still nearer to the statement of time in our passage; see below.
13 Joseph. Antt. v. 1. 29.
of the judges, to Samuel inclusive, according to our passage; (4) 40 years as the reign of Saul; (5) 40 years as the reign of David, 1 Kings ii. 11; (6) the first four years of Solomon's reign,—there results from the Exodus out of Egypt to the building of the temple 599 years, with which there remains a difference between Paul and Josephus, which is fully covered by ὡς in the text. Accordingly, it appears as the correct view that Paul here follows the chronology entirely different from 1 Kings vi. 1, which is also followed by Josephus. This chronology arises from summing up all the numbers mentioned in the Book of Judges, 410 years, and adding 40 years for Eli; by which, however, a total much too high results, as synchronistic statements are included in the reckoning. All attempts at reconciling our passage with 1 Kings vi. 1 bear the impress of arbitrariness and violence—namely: (1) that of Perizonius, and others, that in 1 Kings vi. 1 the years are not reckoned, in which the Israelites in the time of the judges were oppressed by heathen nations, with which view Wolf agrees; (2) Cornelius a Lapide, Calovius, Mill, and others supply γενόμενα after πεντήκοντα, post haec, quae spatio 450 annorum gesta sunt, so that the terminus a quo is the birth of Isaac, in whom God chose the fathers; from thence to the birth of Jacob are 60 years, from the birth of Jacob to the entrance into Egypt are 130 years, after which the residence in Egypt lasted 210 years, and then from the Exodus to the division of Canaan 47 years elapsed, making in all 447 years, accordingly, about 450 years. With the reading of Lachmann, also, we must count in accordance with this computation. Comp. Beza. (3) Others have had recourse to critical violence. They suppose either that in this passage τριακοσίων is to be read (τ' for ι'), or that ὡς ἔτει τετρακοσίας is an addition of a marginal annotator, who reckoned thus from the birth of Isaac; or, at least, that 1 Kings vi. 1 is corrupt; in which case, however, Kuinoel grants that Paul follows a Jewish chronology of his time.—ὡς Σαμουήλ] i.e. until the end of the series of judges, which had commenced with Othniel and closed with Samuel, after which Saul's reign began. See ver. 21.

Ver. 21. Κακοθείνου] and from thence. ἰκαί has only here in the N. T., as also in later Greek, a temporal reference, yet so that the time is conceived as something in space stretching itself out. So, too, in the passages in Bornemann. —ἐκ τεσσάρων.] Ἐβασίλευσε Σαμύλ, Σαμουήλου ὄντος, ἐν ἑκατὸν πρὸς τοῖς δέκα τελευτάσωντος δὲ δύο καὶ εἰκοσι, Joseph. Antt. vi. 14. 9, according to the usual text, in which, however, καὶ εἰκοσι is spurious. In the O. T. there is no express definition of the duration of Saul's reign. However,
the explanation 1 that ἵτι γεσσαράδ., which, in fact, contains the duration of ἵδῳκαν. . . . Ἅσωλ., embraces the time of Samuel and Saul together, is to be rejected as contrary to the text; and instead of it, there is to be assumed a tradition—although improbable in its contents, yet determined by the customary number 40—which Paul followed.

Ver. 22. Μεταστ. αὐτόν] cannot be explained of the death of Saul, 2 because there is no ἐν τῷ ζήν 3 or the like added, or at least directly suggested, from the context. The word is rather to be considered as selected and exactly corresponding to the known history of Saul, expressing the divine rejection recorded in 1 Sam. xv. 16 ff., and deposition of this king from his office, according to the current usu logendi. 4 — ὁ καὶ εἶπε μαρτυρώνας] for whom He also bearing witness has said. ὁ is governed by μαρτυρ. ; and on εἶπε μαρτυρ., comp. i. 24: προσευξάμενοι εἰπον. — εἰφόρον Δαυίδ κ.τ.λ.] Ps. lxxxix. 21 is here quite freely blended with 1 Sam. xiii. 14 in the inexact recollection of the moment, and formed into one saying of God, as indeed in Ps. lxxxix. 21 God is the speaker, but not in Sam. xiii. 14. — εἰφόρον] God had sought for the kingdom of His people a so rare man like David. — καὶ τῷ καρδίαν μου] i.e. as my heart desires him. This and the following ὃ . . . μου is to be left without any more precise limitation—Eckermann, after the older commentators, supposes that it applies to the government of the people; Heinrichs: to the establishment of the theocracy—as the text does not furnish such a limitation, and πάντα τὰ θελ. forbids it. On these last words Bengel correctly remarks: "voluntates, multas, pro negotiorum varietate." 5

Vv. 28–25. Now proceeds to his main point, the announcement of the Messiah, the Son of David, as having appeared in Jesus, 6 whom John already preached before His coming. — τοῖς with great emphasis, placed first and standing apart. — καὶ ἐναγγελιὰν] according to promise, an essential element for the awakening of faith. Comp. ver. 32. — ἔγαγε τῷ Ἰσραήλ . . . "Ἰσραήλ] He brought' to the Israelites Jesus as deliverer, Messiah, John having previously preached before His coming a baptism of repentance, baptism obliging to change of mind, to all the people of Israel. — πρὸ προσοποῦ] Ἰσραήλ, i.e. ante, and that in a temporal sense. 9 With τῆς εἰσόδου, according to the context, is meant the official, Messianic, emergence among the people. The Fathers strangely and erroneously refer it to the incarnation. 9 — ὁ δὲ ἐπίΧρυσον ὧν Ἰσραήλ. τ. ὀρῶν] but when John fulfilled, was in the act of fulfilling, 10 the course—without figure: the official work incumbent on him. 11 Paul considers John's definite pointing to the ἐφίσμων as that with which the course of the Baptist approached its termination; the ὀρῶν of the forerunner was actually concluded as regards its idea and purpose, when Jesus Himself publicly appeared. — τίνα μὲ ἵππον. εἰκα;] is, with Erasmus, Castalio,

1 Erasmus, Beza, Calovius, Wolf, Morus, Rosenmüller, Heinrichs.
2 Grothus, de Wette, also my former interpretation.
3 3 Macc. vi. 19; Polyb. xxxii. 21, 8.
4 See Dan. ii. 21; 1 Macc. vili. 13; Luke xvi. 4; also in Greek writers.
5 Comp. Eph. vi. 6; Ps. cit. 7; 2 Macc. i. 3
6 vv. 23, 24, 25.
7 Zech. iii. 8.
8 Gesenius, Thes. ii. p. 1111.
9 See Sauber, Thes. i. p. 1043.
10 Imperfect; see Bernhardy, p. 378.
11 Comp. xx. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 7; Gal. ii. 2.
Calvin, Beza, and many others, to be taken as a question; not, with Luther, Grotius, Kuinoel, Lachmann, Buttmann, as a relative clause: "quem me esse putatis, non sum," which, indeed, is linguistically justifiable, but detracts from the liveliness of the speech.—οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγώ] namely, the Messiah, John i. 20, as self-evidently the expected Person, who was vividly before the mind of John and of his hearers.

Ver. 26. In affectionate address (ἀνδρεῖς ἀδελφοί) earnestly appealing to the theocratic consciousness (νοι γεν. Ἀβρ.), Paul now brings home the announcement of this salvation, procured through Jesus, ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτ. τάξεως, to the especial interest of the hearers.—ἐξεστῆλη] namely, forth from God, ver. 28, x. 36, not from Jerusalem (Bengel). But this εἰμί . . . ἐξεστησ. actually took place by the very arrival of Paul and his companions.

Ver. 27. Γὰρ] Chrysostom leads to the correct interpretation: διδοσιν αὐτοῖς ἐξοσιαλίαν ἀποσχισθήναι τῶν τῶν φόνων πεταλμηκότων. In accordance with the contrast: εἰμί and οἱ κατοικίωντες εἰς Ἰερουσ., the logical sequence is: "To you was the doctrine of salvation sent; for in Jerusalem the Saviour has been rejected;" therefore the preaching must be brought to those outside in the ἄσυρτος, such as you are. It does not conflict with this view, that at all events the preaching would come to them as Jews; since the fundamental idea rather is, that, because Jerusalem has despised Christ, now in place of the inhabitants of Jerusalem the outside Jews primarily are destined for the reception of salvation. They are to step into the places of those as regards this reception of salvation; and the announcement of salvation, which was sent to them, was withdrawn from those and their rulers, the members of the Sanhedrin, on account of the rejection of the Saviour. Thus there is in γὰρ the idea of divine retribution, exercised against the seat of the theocracy, and resulting in good to those outside at a distance; the idea of a Nemesis, by which those afar off are preferred to the nearest children of the kingdom. Most of the older commentators are silent on γὰρ here. According to Erasmus, it is admonitory, according to Calvin, exhortatory to yet greater compliance; but in this case the special point must first be read between the lines. Contrary to the contrast of εἰμί and οἱ κατοικίων. Ἰερουσ., γὰρ, according to de Wette, is designed to introduce the exposition of the idea of σωτηρία; according to Baumgarten, to convey the hint that the informal (οὐ) way, outwardly considered, in which the λόγος had reached Antioch, had its reason in the fact that the centre of the theocracy had resisted Jesus.—τὸν χοῦν ἁγιοσανυστ. κ.τ.λ.] not having known Him, i.e. Jesus, as the self-evident subject, they have also—καί, the also of the corresponding relation—fulfilled by their sentence, by the condemnation of Jesus, the voices of the prophets, which are read every Sabbath day. This fulfilment they effected involuntarily in their folly. But the prophecies had to be ful-

2 Comp. Jaa. iii. 15.
4 Comp. on v. 20.
5 Comp. ii. 29, iii. 25 f.
6 Objection of de Wette.
7 Comp. rois εἰς μακρᾶν, ii. 29
8 Comp. Matt. xxii. 40.
filled, Luke xxiv. 35 f.; 1 Cor. xv. 8. — ἀγνοεσαντες] a mild judgment, entirely in the spirit of Jesus.¹ Therefore not too lenient for Paul (Schneck- enburger). Luther, Calvin, Grotius, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, Hackett, and others refer ἀγνοεσαντες not only to τούτον, but also to καὶ τὰς φ. τ. προφ.: "qui hunc non norant, nec prophetarum oraculis ... intelligebant, eo condendo essercunt, ut haec eventu comprobarentur." Unnecessarily harsh, as κριναντες and εἰναληρ. require different supplements. — τὰς κ. τ. σάββη. ἀναγινωσκ. [a mournful addition; what infatuation!] — κριναντες] judging, namely, Jesus. Following Homberg, others have referred it to the φωνάς τ. πρ. : "and although judging, correctly valuing the voices of the prophets, they nevertheless fulfilled them." Incorrect, because at variance with history, and because the resolution of the participle by although is not suggested by the context, but rather (τούτον ἀγνοεσαντες) forbidden.

Vv. 28, 29, Kai] and, without having found, they desired.² — καθελοντες ... ἔθηκαν εἰς μνημ. [The subject is the inhabitants of Jerusalem and their rulers, as in the preceding. Joseph and Nicodemus³ were, in fact, both; therefore Paul, although those were favourably inclined to Jesus, could in this summary narrative continue with the same subject, because an exact historical discrimination was not here of moment, and the taking down from the cross and the placing in the grave were simply the adjuncts of the crucifixion and the promises of the corporeal resurrection, 1 Cor. xv. 4.]

Ver. 30. But God, after such extreme and unrighteous rejection of Jesus on the part of those men, what a glorious deed has He done! Thus Paul paves the way to announce the highest Messinian σημείον of Jesus,⁴ the resurrection from the dead; and that according to its certainty as matter of experience, as well as a fulfilment of the prophetic promise.⁵

Vv. 31—33. 'Επὶ ἡμέρ. πέλιονι, for several days, as in Luke iv. 25. Instead of the argumentative δι', δαχε would be still more significant. — τοῖς συμπαθέσιν κ.τ.λ.] Thus Paul according to this narrative, like Luke in the Gospel, follows the tradition which knows only Jewish appearances of the Risen One.⁶ — ὥσπερν] quippe qui. — καὶ ἡμεῖς κ.τ.λ.] we also, on our part, engaged in the same work of preaching as those eye-witnesses, announce unto you the promise made to the fathers, that, namely, God has completely fulfilled this, etc. — ἄν αὐτήν κ.τ.λ.] contains the particular part of the ἔκκλησια, the promise of the Messiah generally, which is announced. Entirely arbitrarily, Heumann, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others hold that it should be connected: εἰναγαγειμηθα, ὥσπερ τὴν πρῶς τοις πατέρας γενομ. ἐπαγγ. ὁ θεός ἐκπεπλε., and that ταῦτα is without significance. This very repetition of ταῦτα has rhetorical emphasis.⁷ — ἐκπεπλήρωκα] stronger than the simple verb, ver. 27.¹⁰ — τοῖς

¹ Luke xxiii. 34. Comp. on iii. 17; see also 1 Cor. ii. 8.
² On λέγετος, comp. ii. 29, x. 39.
³ John xix. 38 f. [viii. 29; Mark xv. 46.]
⁵ Comp. Rom. i. 4.
⁶ v. 31, 35—37.
⁷ Nägele on the Ἑκατ., p. 294, ed. 3.
⁸ See on Matt. xxviii. 10. Comp. i. 4.
⁹ Comp. ix. 20; see Dissen, ad. Dem. de cor. p. 295; Bernhard, p. 398.
¹⁰ Comp. the passages from Xenoph. in Strux, Herod. v. 35: τὴν ὑπογραφὴν εἰκαλη-
δρώσιν. Plat. Legg. p. 954 B: εἰκαλημύθη τὸ χρῖος ἀκαν. Polyb. i. 67. 1: τὸς εἰκαλής κ. τὰς ἔκακλησιας ἐκπεπλεῖ. B Max. i. 2. 22. Else-
where not in the N. T., but comp. ἐκκλημύθη, xxi. 26.
for the benefit of their children, descendants, us. The prefixing of r. tekna. aor. has a peculiar emphasis. — anasthesaoi 'Ioseoun] by this, that He raised up Jesus, from the dead. This interpretation is necessarily required by the connection, which is as follows: (1) The Jews have put to death Jesus, though innocent, and buried Him, vv. 28, 29. (2) But God has raised Him from the dead, as is certain from His appearance among His followers and their testimony, vv. 30, 31. (3) By this resurrection of Jesus, God has completely fulfilled to us the promise, etc., vv. 32, 33. (4) But the Raised One will, according to God's assurance, never again die, vv. 34–38. This, the only explanation accordant with the context, is confirmed by the purposely chosen  εκπενθήσεως, as, indeed, the fulfilment of the promise begun from the very appearance of Jesus has, although secured already essentially, as Hofmann interprets the compound verb, only become complete by His resurrection. It has been objected that  εκ νεκρων would have to be added to  anasthesasan, as in ver. 34; but incorrectly, as the context makes this addition very superfluous, which yet is purposely added in ver. 34, in order that the contrast of μηκείς μέλλοντα  υποστήριξιν εἰς διαφοράν might more strongly appear. The textual necessity of our interpretation excludes, accordingly, of itself the other explanation, according to which  anasthesas is rendered like  ὕπηκολος,  προδίκη  Ἰουδαῖος,  εὐχείδες, iii. 22, vii. 37. This rendering would hardly have been adopted and defended, had it not been thought necessary to understand Ps. ii. 7 of the appearance of Jesus upon earth. — ὅς . . . γεγραμμένη] denotes the anasthesas 'Ioseoun as the event which took place according to, besides other scriptural passages, the saying in Ps. ii. 7. — τῷ  πρώτῳ] Formerly—though not universally, yet frequently—the first Psalm was wont not to be separately numbered, but, as an introduction to the Psalter and certainly composed for this object, to be written along with the second Psalm, as it is even now found in mss. As, however, such a local citation of a passage is found neither in Paul's writings nor elsewhere in the N. T., it must be assumed that Paul did not himself utter the πρώτῳ, and that it was not even added by Luke; but that he took it over from his documentary source—into which it had doubtless come, because it was esteemed particularly noteworthy that this prophecy should be found written on the very front of the Psalter (v°). —  εἰς μὲν εἶ ὁ κ. τ. λ.] in the historical sense of the Psalm composed by Solomon on his anointing: My son, as the theocratic king, thou art; I, no other, have this day begotten thee, made thee by thine anointing and installation to be this my son. But, according to the Messianic fulfilment of this divine saying, so far as it has been historically fulfilled—it is otherwise in Heb. i. 5—especially by the resurrection of the Messiah: My Son, as the Messiah, thou art; I am He who has this day, on the day of the resurrection, begotten Thee, installed Thee into this divine Sonship by the resurrection, Rom. i. 4,—inasmuch, namely, as the

1 Erasmus, Luther, Hammond, Clericus, Heumann, Murus, de Wette, Baumgarten, Lange, and others.
3 See Wettstein.
resurrection was the actual guarantee, excluding all doubt, of that Sonship of
Christ. Thus has God by the resurrection, after His humiliation, although
He was from eternity God’s Son, constituted Him the Son of God, He has
begotten Him. Comp. ii. 36. The expression is not to be illustrated from
πρωτόκος εκ τ. ἐκρών, Col. i. 18; 1 because for denoting the installation
into the divine Sonship the figure begotten suits admirably; but as a new
beginner of life, as Baumgarten explains it. Christ would by the resurrec-
tion not be begotten, but born. Comp. also Rom. viii. 29. The σήμερον,
moreover, which to those interpreters, who explain the αναστήσεως generally
of the bringing forward Jesus, must appear without significance and in-
cluded in the quotation only for the sake of completeness, as is, however,
not the case even in Heb. i. 5, forms an essential element of the prophecy in
its relation to the connection.

Ver. 34. But that God raised Him from the dead as one who is no more to
return to corruption, He has thus said. The μηκτείς μελλόντα . . . διασφηρός is
the main element whereby the speech advances. Comp. Rom. vi. 9. — εἰς
dιασφηρόν] into corruption, is not, with Kuinoel, after Beza and Picator, to
be explained: in locum corruptionis, i.e. in sepulcrum, for which there is no
reason at all, as μηκτείς by no means requires the inference that Christ must
already have been once in the condition of corruption; for μηκτείς refers
logically to the general idea of dying present in the mind of Paul, which
he, already thinking on Ps. xvi. 10, expresses by ὅποιος εἰς διασφήρον. 2 Bengel
aptly says: “non amplius ibit in mortem, quam alias solet subsequi
diaphoreo.” The appeal to the LXX., which renders ἠμετρητοκτισθη has been inadmissible, for the translators actually so understood ἠμετρητοκτισθη, and thus
connected with their διασφηρόν no other idea than corruptio. 3 — δόξα ἵμιν τ. δό.
Δ. τ. πιστά] a free quotation of the LXX. Isa. lv. 3, in which Paul, instead
of διαθήκην ἵμιν διαθήκην αἰώνιον, gives δόξα ἵμιν, certainly not designedly,
because the text of the LXX. represents the appearance of the Messiah as
something future, as Olshausen thinks; for the words of the LXX., par-
ticularly the αἰώνιον, would have been very suitable as probative of our pas-
sage; nor yet by a mistake of memory, as the passage about the eternal
covenant certainly was very accurately known to the apostle; but because
he saw the probative force in τὰ δοσιν Δ. τὰ πιστά, and therefore, in introduc-
ing those words on which his argument hinged, with his freedom otherwise
in quotation he regarded it as sufficient only to prefix to them that verb,
the idea of which is really contained in διαθήκη μιν διαθήκην αἰών. I shall
give unto you the holy things of David, the sure; i.e. the holy blessings con-
ferred by me on David, the possession of which will be, federally, sure
and certain. By this is meant the whole Messianic salvation as etern-
ally enduring, which, in an ideal sense, for future realization by the Son
of David, the Messiah, belonged as a holy property to David, the Messianic
ancestor, and was to come to believers through Christ as a sacred inheri-
tance. The LXX. translates γὰρ ἡ θύσιν inexact by τὰ δοσιν Δαυὶ; but on this
very account the literal meaning beneficia is not, against Kuinoel and others,

1 Against Baumgarten. 2 Comp. Winer, p. 574 (B. T. 772). 3 Comp. on ii. 27.
to be assumed for σοια. It denotes veneranda, pie observanda.1—The historical meaning of the passage in Isaiah contains a promise of the Messianic times alluring the exiles to the appropriation of the theocratic salvation; but in this very Messianic nature of the promise Paul had reason and right to recognise the condition of its fulfilment in the eternal remaining-alive of the risen Christ, and accordingly to understand the passage as a prophetic promise of this eternal remaining-alive; because through a Messiah liable to death, and accordingly to corruption, those holy possessions of David, seeing they are to be παρά, could not be conferred; for that purpose His life and His government, as the fulfilling of the promises,2 must be eternal.3
As surely as God, according to this prophetic assurance, must bestow the σοια Δαυὶς παρά, so surely Christ, through whom they are bestowed, cannot again die. Less accurately Hengstenberg, Christol. II. p. 384.

Ver. 35. Διδ] therefore, namely, because the Messiah, according to ver. 34, after His resurrection will not again die, but live for ever. — εν εκτροφ.] sc. ψαλμο, which is still present to the mind of the speaker from the quotation in ver. 33. — άγετα] the subject is necessarily that of ειπρεκεν, ver. 34, and so neither David,4 nor the Scripture,5 but God, although Ps. xvi. 10 contains David’s words addressed to God. But David is considered as interpreter of God, who has put the prayer into his mouth.6 As to the passage quoted, see on ii. 25-27. Calvin correctly says: “Quod ejus corpus in seculero fuit conditum, nihil propertia juris habuit in ipsum corruptio, solum illic integrum non secus atque in lege jacuerit usque ad diem resurrectionis.”

Vv. 36, 37 give the explanation and demonstration (γάρ), that in Christ raised by God from the dead this language of the Psalm has received its fulfilment. Comp. ii. 29-31. — ιδία γενέα] Dativus commodi: for his own contemporaries. Others understand it as the dative of time: sua aetate,7 or tempore vitae sua8. Very tame and superfluous, and the latter contrary to the usus loquenti. ιδία γενέα is added in foresight of the future Messianic γενέα, viii. 38, for which the Son of David serves the counsel of God. "Davidis partes non extenduntur ultra modulum aetatis vulgaris," Bengel. —τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ βοῶν] may either be connected with έκμαζε,8 or with ἑπτετέρας:9 after he for his generation had served the counsel of God. The latter meaning is more in keeping with the theocratic standpoint of David and ver. 22. — προστήθη πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας αὐτῶν] was added to his fathers, namely, as regards his soul in Sheol, whither his fathers had preceded him. A well-known Hebrew expression, Judg. ii. 10; Gen. xv. 15, xxv. 8, and Knobel thereon.

Vv. 38-41. From the previously proved resurrection of Jesus, there follows (οὖν), what is now solemnly announced, γρωστον κ.τ.λ., and does not appear as a mere "passing hint"10 of the Pauline doctrine of justification—

1 Comp. Bremi, ad Lys. p. 269, Goth.
2 2 Cor. I. 10.
4 Bengel, Heinrichs, and others.
5 Hennemann.
6 Comp. on Matt. xix. 5.
7 Kninoel and the older interpreters.
8 Olehausen.
9 Erasmus, Castalo, Calvin, Vatablus, and others.
10 Vulgate, Beza, Luther, Wolf, Bengel, Kinoel, Olehausen, Baumgarten, and others.
11 Baur.
FORGIVENESS THROUGH CHRIST.

that precisely through Him, who was thus so uniquely attested by God to be the promised Messiah, the Messianic forgiveness and justification are offered, vv. 38, 39; and from this again follows (οὖν, ver. 40) with equal naturalness, as the earnest conclusion of the speech, the warning against despising this benefit. — Observe that Paul does not enter on the point, that the causa meritoria of forgiveness and justification lay in the death on the cross, or how it was so; this belonged to a further instruction afterwards; at this time, on the first intimation which he made to those who were still unbelievers, it might have been offensive and prejudicial. But with his wisdom and prudence, according to the connection in which the resurrection of the Lord stands with His atoning death, he has neither prejudiced the truth, nor, against Schneekenburger and Baur, exhibited an un-Pauline, an alleged Petrine reference of justification to the resurrection of Jesus.

Vv. 38, 39. Διὰ τούτου] through this one, i.e. through His being announced to you. — καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων . . . δικαιοίτω] and that from all things, from which ye were unable to be justified in the law of Moses, every one who believes in this One is justified. — ἀπὸ πάντων] is pregnant: justified and accordingly freed, in respect of the bond of guilt, from all things. — ἐν τῷ νόμῳ and the emphatic ἐν τούτῳ represent the δικαιωθῆναι as causally grounded, not in the law, but in Christ. But the proposition that one becomes justified in Christ by means of faith from all things, i.e. from all sins, from which one cannot obtain justification in the law, is not meant to affirm that already in the law there is given a partial attainment of justification and the remainder is attained in Christ, which would be un-Pauline and contrary to the whole of the N. T. On the contrary, Paul, when laying down that proposition, in itself entirely correct, leaves the circumstance, that man finds in the law justification from no kind of sins, still entirely out of account, with great prudence not adopting at once an antinomistic attitude, but reserving the particulars of the doctrine of justification in its relation to the law for eventually further Christian instruction. The proposition is of a general, theoretic nature; it is only the major proposition of the doctrine of justification, from all things from which a man is not justified in the law, he is justified in Christ by faith; the minor proposition, but in the law a man can be justified from nothing, and the conclusion, therefore only in Christ can all justification be obtained, are still kept back and reserved for further development. Therefore the shift of Neander, I. p. 145, is entirely unnecessary, who very arbitrarily assumes that πάντων is designed to denote only the completeness of the removal of guilt, and that, properly speaking, Paul has had it in view to refer the relative to the whole idea of δικαιωθῆναι, but by a kind of logical attraction has referred it to πάντων. — We may add that the view, according to which καὶ . . . δικαιοίτω is taken as an independent proposition, as it is also by Lachmann, who has erased καὶ, after A C* η, is also admissible, although

1 Rom. iv. 25.
2 ἐσ = ἐσ' ἐσ' see on ver. 2.
3 Rom. vi. 7; Ecclus. xxvi. 29; Test. XII. patr. p. 540.
4 Comp. before ἅφενε ἀμαρτών.
5 Schwegler, nachapost. Zeitf. II. p. 95 f.; admitted also by Zeller, p. 309.
6 Comp. also Schneekenburger, p. 181, and Lekebusch, p. 334.
7 Wolf and others, following the Vulgate.
less in keeping with the flow of the discourse, which connects the negative element (ἀπειρήμ. ὁμορρ.) and the positive correlative to it (δικαιονόμα) with one another; therefore καὶ is the simple and, not: and indeed. But it is contrary to the construction to attach καὶ ἀπὸ ... δικαιονόμα to the preceding; so Luther, also Bornemann, who, however, with D, inserts μετάνοια after καὶ. Lastly, that neither, with Luther, is ἐν τοῖς to be connected with πιστεύω, nor, with Morus, is ἐν τοῖς πᾶς ὁ πιστ. δικαιονόμα to be taken as a proposition, by itself, is evident from the close reciprocal relation of ἐν τῷ νόμῳ and ἐν τοῖς. — On the idea of δικαιονόμα, the essence of which here already, by πᾶς ὁ πιστεύω, most definitely emerges as the Pauline justitia fidei, see on Rom. i. 17.

Vv. 40, 41. Ἐν τοῖς προφητικοῖς in volumine prophetarum, Luke xxiv. 44; John vi. 45. — Hab. i. 5 is here quoted, according to the LXX., which, instead of Ἐλαζ, probably read Ἐλαζ, from memory with an unimportant deviation. In the announcement of the penal judgments to be executed by means of the Chaldaean, which are in Hab. i.c. threatened against the degenerate Jewish nation, the apostle sees a divine threatening, the execution of which, in the Messianic sense, would ensue at the impending last judgment by the punishment befalling the unbelieving Israelites. The divine threatening preserves its power and validity even to the end, and has then its last and highest fulfilment. This last Messianic judgment of God—not the ruin of the Jewish war¹—is here the ἐργον. — ἐρωσθήτω] vanis, come to nought.² The coming to nought through terror is meant. — ἐργάζωμαι] The present denotes what God was just on the point of doing. The ἐγὼ annexed, I, whom you despise, has the emphasis of divine authority. — ἐργον] A rhetorically weighty anaphora, and hence without δι.³ — ἐκείνητα] tells it quite to the end.⁴

Vv. 42, 43. After this speech Paul and Barnabas depart, and on their going out of the synagogue are requested by those present, the subject of παρεκάλ., to set forth these doctrines again next Sabbath. But after the assembly was dismissed (ληθείσας), many even follow them to their lodging, etc.—ἐξούσιας δὲ αὐτῶν] They consequently departed, as is indisputably evident from ver. 43, before the formal dismissal of the synagogue. Olshausen, indeed, thinks that the ἐξοικ. av. did not historically precede the ληθείσας τις συναγωγ, but is only anticipated as the chief point of the narrative, giving rise to the request to appear again. But this is nothing but an arbitrary device, which would impute to Luke the greatest clumsiness in his representation.— εἰς τὸ μεταξύ σάββατον] on the next following Sabbath. Instead of μεταξύ, D has what is correct as a gloss: ἐξῆς. In the N. T. this meaning is without further example, for Rom. ii. 15 is not a case in point. From the apostolic Fathers: Barnabas 18; Clemens, ad Cor. I. 44. For the few, but

¹ Wetzstein and others.
⁴ Comp. xv. 3; Job xii. 3; Ecclus. xxxix. 12, xlii. 31, xliii. 8; Joseph. Anti. v. 8. 3; Bell. v. 13. 7.
LABORS IN ANTIOCH.

quite certain examples from the other later Greek, see Krebs. Others — Camerarius, Calvin, Beza, Erasmus Schmid, Rosenmüller, Sepp, and others — render: "diebus sabbathica intercedentibus," by which, following the Recepta (see the critical remarks), those making the request are regarded as Gentiles, who would have desired a week-day. Comp. Luther: "between Sabbatiae." We should then have to explain σαββατον as week," that is: on the intervening week, so that it would require no conjectural emendation. But the evident connection in which ver. 43 stands with ver. 44 gives the necessary and authentic explanation: τω ἰχομένω σαββάτῳ. — τ. σεβομ. προσθ. the (God) worshipping proselytes. This designation of the proselytes occurs only here: elsewhere, merely προσήλυτοι, or merely σεβόμενοι with and without Θεόν. Yet there is here no pleonasm; but σεβομ. is added, because they were just coming from the worship, as constant partakers in which they were worshipping proselytes. — ἀριτειο] applies to Paul and Barnabas, who (quisque qui) made moving representations (ἐπειδον) to those following them to continue in the grace of God, which by this first preaching of the gospel had been imparted to them, because the apostles by the very following of the people, and certainly also by their expressions, might be convinced that the χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ had found an entrance into their souls. — προσλαμοῦντες speaking to them; xxviii. 20.

Vv. 44, 45. Τω δὲ ἰχομένω σαββάτῳ but on the following Sabbath. It is in itself, moreover, highly probable that the two apostles were not idle during the week, but continued their labours in private circles. — σφινχθη] As it was Sabbath, this assembly, at which also the Gentiles of the city were present, σχεδον πάσα ἡ πόλις, and see ver. 48, took place certainly in and near the synagogue, not, as Heinrichs supposes, "ante diversiorum apostolorum." The whole city = πάντες οἱ πολίται; see Valckenæer, ad Phoen. 382. — τοις δοχοιοι] which consisted in great part of Gentiles, whose admission to the preaching of the Messiah now stirred up the angry zeal (ξίλοι) of Israelitish pride; observe that here the Ἰουδαῖοι alone without the proselytes are named. — ἀντιλέγοντες is neither superfluous nor a Hebraism, but joined with καὶ βλασφημ., it specifies emphatically the mode of ἀντιλέγον, namely, its hostile and spiteful form: they contradicted, contradicting and at the same time blaspheming the apostle and his doctrine.

Vv. 46, 47. Ἦν ἰναγαγαιον] namely, according to the counsel of God and our apostolic duty. — οῖν ἰδοὺς κρίνετε κ.τ.λ.] This judgment of their unworthiness they, in point of fact, pronounced upon themselves by their zealous contradicting and blaspheming. — ido] "ingens articulus temporis magna revolutio," Bengel. As to the singular, comp. on Matt. x. 16. —

1 Plint. Hist. Lcc. 43, de discr. amici et adul. 22; Joseph. c. Ap. 1. 21; Bell. v. 4. 2. — but not Bell. ii. 11. 4.
3 Grotius: σαββάτῳ.
4 v. 10, vi. 3; Matt. xii. 21.
5 xvi. 14, xviii. 6.
6 xii. 50, xvii. 4, 17; [19]; Wisw. xiii. 17.
7 Lucian, Noct. 7. 11, 18; Theophr. Char. 8 Comp. xx. 15, xvi. 26; Luke xiii. 33; often also in classical writers.
9 See also ver. 48.
10 Ewald, Lehre. § 2905. [Judg. xvi. 24.
oúto γάρ ἐντείνεται κ.τ.λ.] a proof that the στρεφόμεθα εἰς τὰ ἑυθὺς occurred not arbitrarily, but in the service of the divine counsel. Isa. xlix. 6, according to the LXX., with slight deviation, referring to the servant of God, is by Paul and Barnabas, according to the Messianic fulfilment which this divine word was to receive, recognised and asserted as ἐντολή for the apostolic office; for by means of this office it was to be brought about that the Messiah (σε) would actually become the light of the Gentiles,1 for which, according to this oracle, God has destined Him. — τούτο εἰναι σε κ.τ.λ.] the final purpose: in order that thou mayest be, etc.

Vv. 48, 49. Τὸν λόγον τ. Κυρίου] see on viii. 25. — δοκεῖν ἢσαν πρεσβυτέρους εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον] as many of them as were ordained to eternal, Messianic, life.

Luke regards, in accordance with the Pauline conception,2 the believing of those Gentiles as ensuing in conformity to their destination, ordered by God already, namely, from of old, to partake of eternal life. Not all in general became believers, but all those who were divinely destined to this ζωή; and not the rest. Chrysostom correctly remarks: ἀμφισβητοῦσι τῷ Θεῷ. The τάξις of God in regard to those who became believers was in accordance with His προγνωσία, by means of which He foreknew them as creditores; but the divine τάξις was realized by the divine κλήσις effectual for faith, Rom. viii. 28–30—of which Paul, with his preaching, was the instrument. It was dogmatic arbitrariness which converted our passage into a proof of the decreetum absolutum.3 For Luke leaves entirely out of account the relation of “being ordained” to free self-determination; the object of his remark is not to teach a doctrine, but to indicate a historical sequence. Indeed, the evident relation, in which this notice stands to the apostle’s own words, ἐπειδὴ . . . ζωής, ver. 48, rather testifies against the conception of the absolute decree, and for the idea, according to which the destination of God does not exclude, comp. ii. 41, individual freedom, ὡς οὐ κατ’ ἄνεγκριν, Chrysostom; although, if the matter is contemplated only from one of those two sides which it necessarily has, the other point of view, owing to the imperfection of man’s mode of looking at it, cannot receive proportionately its due, but appears to be logically nullified. See, more particularly, the remark subjoined to Rom. ix. 33. Accordingly, it is not to be explained of the actus paedagogicos,4 of the praeestent gratiae operationem per evangelium,5 of the drawing of the Father, John vi. 44, 37, etc., with the Lutheran dogmatic writers; but the literal meaning is to be adhered to, namely, the divine destination to eternal salvation: ἑστο αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεός εἰς περίποικον αἰωνίας, 1 Thess. v. 9. Morus, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, and others, with rationalizing arbitrariness, import the sense: “quibus, dum fidem doctrinae habeant, certa erat vita beata et aesterna,” by which

---

1 Luke ii. 33, etc.
2 Rom. ix.; Eph. i. 4, 5, 11, iii. 11; 2 Thess.
3 In which case Besa, for example, proceeds with logical self-deception: “Ergo vel non omnes erant vitae aeternae destinati, vel omnes crediderunt.” Rather it is to be said: “Omnes erant vitae aeternae destinati, sed crediderunt.” This excludes from the divine τάξις of salvation those who reject the faith through their own fault. See Besa and Calvin in loc., and Cymon. Dordrac. p. 305, ed. Augusti.
4 Calovius.
5 Bengel.
the meaning of the word τεταγμένον is entirely explained away. Others take ἡσαν τεταγμ. in the middle sense, quotquot se ordinaverant ad vitam aeternam, as Grotius, Krebs, Loesner, and others, in which case τεταγμ. is often understood in its military sense (qui ordines servavit): "qui de agmine et classe erant sperantium vel contenduntiam ad vitam aeternam." But it is against the middle rendering of τεταγμ., that it is just seized on in order to evade an unpleasant meaning; and for the sensus militaris of τεταγμ. no ground at all is afforded by the context, which, on the contrary, suggests nothing else than the simple signification "ordained" for τεταγμ., and the sense of the aim for εἰς ως αἰών. Others join εἰς ως αἰώναν to εἰσητευον, so that they understand τεταγμ. either in the usual and correct sense destinati, or quotquot tempus constituerant, or congregati, in spite of the simple order of the words and of the expression πιστεύειν εἰς ως αἰώνων being without example; for in 1 Tim. i. 16 εἰς defines the aim. Among the Rabbins, also, the idea and expression "ordinati (דַּבְּרוּ) ad vitam futuri saeculi," as well as the opposite: "ordinati ad Gehennam," are very common. See the many passages in Wetstein. But Wetstein himself interprets in an entirely erroneous manner: that they were on account of their faith ordained to eternal life. The faith, foreseen by God, is subsequent, not previous to the ordination; by the faith of those concerned their divine τάξις becomes manifest and recognised. See Rom. viii. 30, x. 14; Eph. i. 11, 18, al.

Ver. 50. Παράγωνα τ. αεβ. γνω. τ. εὐαχ. they stirred up the female proselytes, of genteel rank. Heinrichs interprets αεβ. otherwise: "religiosas zeloque servandorum rituum ethnicorum ferventes." Against this may be urged the stated use of αεβ. in this narrative, vv. 16, 43, as well as the greater suitableness of the thing itself, that the crafty Jews should choose as the instruments of their hatred the female proselytes, who were sufficiently zealous for the honour of their adopted religion to bring about, by influencing their Gentile husbands, the intended expulsion of the apostles.

Ver. 51. 'Εκτίναξ. τ. κωνομ., as a sign of the greatest contempt. — ιτ' α'ινον against them, is to be understood either as denoting the direction of the movement of the feet in shaking off the dust, or, more significantly, in the sense of the direction, frame of mind, in which the action took place. Comp. Luke ix. 5. — 'Ιδονον, belonging at an earlier period to Phrygia, but at this time the capital of Lycaonia, and even yet, an important city.

1 Hofmann’s view, Schriften. I. p. 288, amounts to the same thing: "who, directed unto eternal life, were in a disposition of mind corresponding to the offer of it." The comparison of 1 Cor. xvi. 15 does not suit. Lange, ii. p. 173, in a similar manner evades the meaning of the words: "those who under God’s ordination were at that time ripe for faith." Comp. already Bresc schedler, "disposuit,"—that is to say, "apti facti oratione Pauli."

2 See Majl Obs. III. p. 81 ff.

3 Mede in Wolf.

4 Comp. on xx. 12.

5 So Heinrichs.

6 Markland.

7 Knatchbull.

8 Pind. Od. iil. 36; Lucian, Tnr. 35.

9 See xvii. 12, and on Mark xv. 49.

10 Comp. xviii. 6, and see on Matt. x. 14.


12 Strabo, xii. p. 566; Cic. ad Div. xiv. 4; Plin. N. H. v. 25.

13 Konia or Koniyah, see Ainsworth’s Travels in the Track of the Ten Thousand Greeks.
Ammian. Marc. xiv. 2, reckons it to belong to the neighbouring Pisidia, in opposition to the above witnesses,—an error easily committed. In Iconium the legend makes Thecla be converted by Paul.—From the Pisidian Antioch they did not move farther forward, but turned south-eastward, in order (xiv. 26) at a later period to return by ship to the Syrian Antioch.

Ver. 52. What a simple and significant contrast of the effect produced by the gospel, in spite of the expulsion of its preachers, in the minds of those newly converted! They were filled with joy, in the consciousness of their Christian happiness, and with the Holy Spirit! Πάθος γὰρ διδασκάλου παρέχοντο ὁικ. ἐγκόπτει, ἀλλὰ προθυμότερον ποιεῖ τὸν μαθητήν, as Chrysostom here says (εἰ)

**Notes by American Editor.**

(εἰ) Special documentary source. V. 1.

While there is nothing in the supposition of our author that the 13th and 14th chapters are a separate document, revised by Luke, inconsistent with the authenticity and authority of the record, yet there does not seem to be any necessity, from the style or the contents of the chapters, for any such supposition. Grote in reference to this says: "The narrative is pervaded throughout with Luke's peculiar style, and is not so unconnected with the preceding history as is asserted." Paul and Barnabas had returned to Antioch, and other distinguished teachers were assembled there, so that, as Meyer happily remarks, the mother church of the Gentiles became a seminary of missionaries.

Hitherto Luke has given an account of the progress of the gospel generally. Henceforth he treats almost exclusively of Saul—now and henceforth called Paul—his missionary labors and journeys, and the leading events of his life. The missionary character of the church is now brought prominently into view. The first two acts of the church at Antioch are characteristic of the gospel, and exemplify the unity of the Christian church. They first sent aims to the poor Jews in Jerusalem, and next sent the gospel far and wide to the ignorant Gentiles. This conduct furnishes a pattern for all churches to-day.

(ν) Prophets and teachers. Vs. 1, 2.

These office-bearers of the early church are frequently referred to in the Acts and in the Epistles of Paul. (1 Cor. xii. 28, and Eph. iv. 11.) The prophets were an order of men endowed with the Spirit, and recognized by the church as next to the apostles in dignity and authority, and superior to the teachers. They, when inspired by the Spirit, addressed the people in an exalted and impassioned state of mind—their conscious intelligence being informed by the Holy Spirit. They were only occasionally under this influence, and sometimes, as in the present instance, they foretold future events. The teachers were publicly appointed by the church to the work of instruction, and, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, using their own judgment, after due meditation, furnished instruction for the edification of others. A prophet might also be a teacher, as the higher gift usually included the lower; but the teacher
would not assume the function of the prophet. The mention of prophets and
teachers implies that the first Gentile church was large and flourishing. Some
of the prophets came from Jerusalem to minister to the Gentiles. "The
prophets in the New Testament stood to the early churches nearly in the same
relation as do our printed Bibles to our modern churches. They spoke by au-
thority and without error, and gave to their audience such details as occur in
the Gospels, and such illustrations and precepts as are found in the Epistles.
They were the "men of their counsel"—present oracles, whose lips keep
knowledge." (Radie.)

(2) John as an attendant. V. 5.

The two friends took with them John, surnamed Mark, the nephew of Bar-
nabas, and the author of the second gospel. He is styled in the narrative
"their minister;" but it is impossible to determine with precision the kind of
service he was expected to render them. Some suppose that he was simply a
personal attendant, as Elisha was upon Elijah, or Gehazi upon Elisha; others
believe that he was an assistant in their public duties—such as preaching and
the administration of the ordinance of baptism." (Taylor.) While it may be
readily imagined that Mark, as the younger man, would perform any kind of
service which would contribute to the personal comfort of his relative and his
distinguished companion, doubtless his functions were mainly of a spiritual
character. Soon, however, he left such noble companionship, and seriously
offended Paul by abandoning the arduous and perilous mission. His motives
for doing this were probably various, though cowardice did not necessarily con-
stitute one of them. Having passed through his mother's native isle, he prob-
ably felt a strong desire to visit her—or still more probably, being strongly
attached to Peter, through whose instrumentality he was converted, as Peter
affectionately calls him Marcus my son, and sympathizing more strongly with
his work than that of Paul, he may have returned to join him. Be this as it
may, Barnabas never lost confidence in him, and he was also at last reconciled
to Paul, and was with him when a prisoner in Rome (Col. iv. 10; Philemon,
24).

(2) Second psalm. V. 33.

"The majority of ms. are in favor of devripov; but critics have in general
preferred the reading πρωτος, as being more difficult and adverted to by the
Fathers. It is accounted for on the supposition that our first psalm was not
numbered, but was composed as an introduction to the psalter; and that the
second psalm was properly the first. In some Hebrew ms. this order occurs." (Gloag.) Some refer the words quoted to the incarnation of Christ, but the
reference clearly is, as our author shows, to his resurrection. Declared, by his
resurrection, to be the Son of God with power, it was the public inauguration
of his Sonship, a manifestation of his divinity (Rom. i. 4).

(3) Paul's sermon. V. 41.

Of this first recorded discourse of Paul very different judgments have been
formed. Some suppose it to be unhistorical—a mere imitation and repetition
of the speech of Peter. Another says it is but the echo of the speeches of
Peter and Stephen. The similarity between the discourses is just what might be expected, from the two apostles speaking on the same subject to similar audiences. Farther, says Gloag, there is nothing un-Pauline either in the form or the contents of the discourse. Neander says: "It is a specimen of the peculiar wisdom and skill of the great apostle in the management of men's dispositions, and of his peculiar antithetical mode of developing Christian truth."

The discourse is regularly constructed, and may be divided into four parts—the historical, the apologetic, the doctrinal, and the practical. In the discourse the preacher wins the attention of his audience by giving a sketch of the history of their forefathers. Then he proves the Messiahship of Jesus from the testimony of John, from the fulfilment of prophecy in him, and from his resurrection from the dead. Next he proclaims the forgiveness of sins through faith in this crucified and risen Messiah, announcing distinctly the doctrine which he discusses at so great length in his Epistles—justification through faith in Christ. Justification, as taught by Paul, means deliverance from condemnation, the claim of the law for punishment. Dr. Taylor gives in a note a striking and curious illustration of the use of the word justified in this sense, taken from Scott’s "Waverley,"—when Evan Maccombich, pleading for his master, says to the judge "that ony six o' the very best o' his clan will be willing to be justified in his stead." Here the word means hanged; a criminal being held to be set right with the law when he had suffered its penalty. The conclusion of the discourse is an earnest warning against rejecting Christ, lest something worse than the evils predicted by Habakkuk should come upon them. Startled and surprised by this solemn conclusion, they besought the apostles, as they left the synagogue, to come and preach again on the next Sabbath. Even after they had withdrawn, many followed and had an interview with the apostles.

During the week the excitement was great; nor were the apostles either idle or silent. And so next Sabbath almost the whole city came together to hear the word. But when the Jews saw the multitudes of the Gentiles listening to the truth and receiving it, they became enraged, and contradicted and insulted the apostles. On the other hand, the Gentiles, hearing that Jesus the crucified was set for a light and salvation to them, were glad and glorified God; and even though the apostles were driven off by the instigation of the Jews, the disciples were filled with joy and with the Holy Ghost.
CHAPTER XIV.

Ver. 2. ἀπεδοούντες] A B C W, min. have ἀπεδόθησαντες, which Lachm. Tisch. Born. have adopted; and rightly, partly on account of the preponderating authority (D, however, does not here concur, as it has an entirely different reading), and partly because ἀπεδοούντες most directly presented itself to the mechanical scribes as a contrast to those who had become believers. If they had conformed themselves to πιστεύσας, ver. 1, they would have written ἀπιστισαντες. — Ver. 3. Before διώκει Elz. has καί, against decisive evidence. — Ver. 8. After αὐτοῦ Elz. has ὑπάρχων, against greatly preponderating evidence. Added from iii. 2 as an unnecessary completion. — περιπεπάτησεν] So (not περιπεφυλίζετε, as Elz.) D E G H, min. Chrys. Lachm. and Tisch. have περιπεφυλίζεσαν, after A B C W, min. But the regular preference, which in relative sentences the Greeks give to the aorist over the pluperfect, here easily supplanted the latter. — Ver. 9. ἡκον] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read ἡκόνεν, after A D E G H W, min. Chrys. Theophr. An alteration, as the narrative continues in the aorist, and the intentional selection of the imperfect here was not understood. — Ver. 10. Lachm. Tisch. Scholz (Born. ἄνγκλαρο, after D) have ἄνγκλαρ. But Elz. has ἄγκλαρα, against decisive evidence. The aorist yielded to the imperfect on account of περιπεπάτησεν. — Ver. 12. μέν] is, after A B C D W, rightly erased by Lachm. Tisch. Born. as a customary insertion. — Ver. 13. After πόλεως Elz. has αὐτῶν. A current addition, condemned by the witnesses. — Ver. 14. ἔστησαν] Elz. has ἔστησέν, against decisive evidence. The less the reference of ἕν — was understood, the more easily would the better known ἔστη be inserted, corresponding to ἔστη τῶν δρόμων. — Ver. 17. καίοιτε] Others: καίζε (so D E, Born.). Others: καίζοι (so A B C W W, Lachm.). With this diversity καίοι, and also γέ, are to be considered as certainly and predominantly attested; and therefore καίοιτε, with C W W, H W, min. Chrys. Theophr. Occ., is to be retained. Besides καί often, sometimes the one particle and sometimes the other was omitted, as is also the case in xvii. 27. — ἡγαθοφυρέων] so to be read, with A B C W, min. Ath. Recommended by Griesb. and adopted by Lachm. Tisch. But Elz. Scholz, Born. have ἡγαθοφορεῖ, which, as the more usual word, was inserted. — ἵμων ... ἵμων] Elz. has ἥμιν ... ἥμων, against very important witnesses. The alteration arose, because the sentence had become a commonplace. — After ver. 18, C D E, min. vss. read διατριβάνων αὐτῶν κ. διασκαλίζων. So Born. with δέ after διατρ., and attaching it to what follows. An interpolation, by way of smoothing the transition from ver. 18 to its contrast in ver. 19, variously enriched by different insertions. — Ver. 19. νομίσαντες] Lachm. Tisch. and Born. have νομίζοντεις, after A B D W, min. The Recepta arose mechanically from the context. — τεθανάτο] Lachm. Tisch. read τεθηκάναι, after A B C W, min. Correctly, as the contracted form was the more usual. — Ver. 28. After διετριβήσαν δέ Elz. has ἔτει, which has been, after A B C D W, min. and several vss., erased or suspected since the time of Griesb. Insertion for the sake of more precise definition.
(μ'') Vv. 1, 2. Karα τὸ αὐτὸ] at the same time, simul (Vulg.), ὁμοι, Heaych. — 'Ελληνων] see on xi. 20. Comp. xviii. 4, 6. Yet here those Gentiles only are meant who were in connection with Judaism as proselytes of the gate, comp. xiii. 43, and thus had not by circumcision laid aside their Greek nationality. This limitation is required by the context; for they are present in the synagogue, and in ver. 2 the ἔθνη are distinguished from them, so that they occupy a middle place between the ἔθνη and the Ἰουδαῖοι. — οὕτως] in such a manner, so effectively. — διὰ] refers to the preceding οὕτως, as in John iii. 16. — ἀπειθήσαντες (see the critical remarks), having refused obedience, by unbelief. — ἵκα] they made evil-affected, put into a bad frame of mind, i.e. ad iracundiam concitaverunt (Vulg.), like the German phrase, "sie machten böse." This meaning, not in use with Greek writers, nor elsewhere in the N. T. or in the LXX. (Ps. cxi. 23) and Apocr., occurs in Joseph. Antt. xvi. 1. 2. 7. 3. 8. 6. — κατὰ τῶν ἄδελφον] refers to ἐπίγαγκα. k. ἵκακα] conjointly. Both were hostiley directed against the Christians.

Vv. 3, 4. ὁ ὡς represents vv. 3 and 4 as a consequence of vv. 1 and 2. "In consequence of that approval (ver. 1) and this hostility (ver. 2), they spent indeed (μετὰ) a considerable time in free-spoken preaching (ver. 3), but (ὁδὸν) there arose a division among the multitude." (ver. 4). — ἐν τῷ ἱερεῖō[states on what their bold teaching rested—had its stay and support. Hence as regards sense: fredi Domino. Elsewhere in the N. T. with ἱερεῖō may as well be Jesus as God, the mode of conception of the apostolic church admits both the former, Mark xvi. 20, and the latter. The latter, however, is preponderantly supported partly by Acts xx. 32, where τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ is to be referred to God, and partly by iv. 29, 30, where ἀδιόντα σημεῖα κ.τ.λ. likewise points to God. Comp. Heb. ii. 4. — τὸ μαρτυροῦντι . . . αὐτῶν] who gave practically confirmatory testimony to the word of His grace (to the gospel, xx. 24), in granting that signs and wonders should be done by their hands. The second participle ἀδιόντα, added without copula, denotes the form, in which the μαρτυροῦντι was presented. — ἱερεῖō] comp. John vii. 48. "Scinditur incertum studia in contraria vulgus." 17 Examples in Wetstein.

— καί] and indeed.

(ι'') Vv. 5—7. ὅρμη] impetus (Vulg.), but not exactly in the sense of an assault, nor yet a plot. The former meaning, according to the context, expresses too much; the latter is not sanctioned by linguistic usage, even in Jas. iii. 4. It denotes a strong pressure, a pushing and thronging. 19 — σὺν τοῖς ἀρχαῖοι αὐτῶν] joins on closely to Ἰουδαῖοι, whose rulers of the synagogue and elders are meant. Comp. Phil. i. 1. On ἔβρισα, comp. Luke xviii. 82; 1 Thess. ii. 2; Lucian, Soloe. 10. — συνμαρτυροῦσι] Comp. on xii. 12.

1 Comp. 1 Sam. xxxii. 6, and examples in Kypke, 11. p. 69 f.; Schaefer, ad Jos. Eli. p. 310.
2 Often so in Greek writers, e.g. Xen. Mem. i. 2. 1; Sturz, Lex. IV. p. 623.
3 See Bernhardy, p. 230.
4 Heinrichs, Oehleransen.
5 Groitzs, Morus, Kühnoel.
6 Comp. x. 43, xliii. 22, xv. 8.
7 Virg. Aen. ii. 29.
8 Luther, comp. Castalio, Calvin, and others.
9 Kühnoel, de Wette, and others.
10 Comp. Herod. vii. 18: ἐνὶ δαιμονίῃ τεχνίται ὄρμη, Plat. Phil. p. 35 D: ψυχὴ ἐν καιρίᾳ τῆς τα ὀρμήν καὶ ἐνθυμίαιαν. Dem. 389. 4: εἰς ὀρμήν τὸ τὰ δύντα ποιεῖν προτέρως. Xen. Mem. iv. 4. 2; Jas. iii. 4; 3 Macr. i. 33, iv. 3.
11 ήτοι πληγαῖς ἡ δεσμοῖς, καὶ ἀλλὰ τρόπον.
EVENTS AT ICONIUM.

It had become known to them, what was at work against them. — Αὐτρα, sometimes used as feminine singular, and sometimes as neuter plural, as in ver. 8, see Grothus, and Δερμι, two cities of Lycaonia (\(\text{a}^{\text{3}}\)), to the north of Taurus, and lying in a southeastern direction from Iconium. Ptol. v. 4 reckons the former to belong to the neighbouring Isauria; but Plin. v. 82 confirms the statement of our passage. On their ruins, see Hamilton's *Travels in Asia Minor*, II. pp. 501 f., 307 f.; Hackett, p. 228.

Vv. 8–10. Ἐκάθισεν he sat, because he was lame. Perhaps he begged, comp. John ix. 8, like the lame man in chap. iii. περιπτερ. Pluperfect without augment. Observe, moreover, the earnest circumstantiality of the narrative. ἦνοεν The imperfect denotes his persevering listening. ιδὼν] Paul saw in the whole bearing of the man closely scanned by him, in his look, gestures, play of features, his confidence of being saved, i.e. healed. This confidence was excited by listening to the discourse of the apostle; by which Paul appeared to him as a holy man of superior powers. Bengel aptly says: "dum claudus verbum audit, vim sentit in anima, unde intus movetur, ut ad corpus concludat." τοῦ σωθηκαί This genitive of the object depends directly on πίστιν. — μεγάλη τῇ φωνῇ thus, with the μέγ., predicatively prefixed only here and in xxvi. 24. — ὁδός ιτα ut erectus stes. ἦλθαν κ. περιπάτεις] Observe the exchange of the aorist and imperfect: ἦλθεν up, made a leap, and walked. Otherwise in iii. 8.

Ver. 11. Λυκανωστήρ Chrysostom has finely grasped the object of this remark: οὐκ ἤν τοῦτο οἰδέτω φθιν, τῇ γὰρ ὀίκεια φωνῇ ἐφέδρου τοις θεοῖς τ. τ. τ. τοῖς οἴκειοι αὐτοῖς ἔλεγον. The more surprised and astonished the people were, the more natural was it for them to express themselves in their native dialect, although Zeller reckons this very improbable and calculated with a view to make the homage go as far as possible. Nothing definite can be made out concerning the Lycaonian language; perhaps a dialect of the Lycian, which Jablonsky considered as derived from the Assyrian; Grothus, as identical with the Cappadocian; and Gübling, as a corrupt Greek. — ὁμωθένητας ἀνθρώπως] having become similar to men. Theophanies

The distinction there stated of ὑβρίζεσθαι with σε is groundless. See, on the contrary, e.g. Dom. 223. ult. 589. 14.

1 Although two cures of the same kind of infirmity and in a similar miraculous manner naturally enough produce two similar narratives, yet it cannot surprise us that, according to the criticism of Scheveckburger, Baur, and Zeller, the whole of this narrative is assumed to originate from an imitation of the narrative of the earlier Petrine miracle in chap. iii. "But with the miracle is withdrawn also the foundation of the attempted worship of the two apostles: this, therefore, cannot be regarded as historical, and so much the less, as it also is exposed to the suspicion of having arisen from an exaggerated repetition of a trait from the history of Peter." Zeller, p. 214. Comp. Baur, I. p. 112 ff. ed. 2.

In a corresponding manner have the miracles of Paul generally been placed in parallelism with those of Peter, to the prejudice of their historical truth. Comp., in opposition to this view, *Trip. Paulus nach d. Apostelgesch. p. 161 f.*


3 See, generally, Kähn, § 468. 1, and especially Schaeffer, ad Dionys. Comp. p. 359.

4 See on Matt. xii. 13, and Bornemann, *Schol. in Luc. p. 39 f.*


6 In *Iken's nos. Thes. II. p. 638 f.*

7 De *lingua Lycaon.,* Viteb. 1726.
in human form¹ belonged, at the instance of the myths of antiquity,² to
the heathen popular belief, in which such conceptions survived as an echo
of these ancient myths;³ although Baur (comp. Zeller) discovers here an
imitation, in which the author of the Acts shows himself as "acquainted
with mythology." Comp., moreover, the analogous conception which at-
tached itself to the appearance of Pythagoras, of Apollonius of Tyana, and
others.⁴ Such a belief was naturally rejected by philosophers;⁵ but just
as naturally it lingered among the people (κ).⁶

Ver. 12. The fact that Barnabas and Paul were declared to be Zeus and
Hermes, is explained partly and primarily from the well-known provincial
myth, according to which these gods were once hospitably entertained in
the same regions by Philemon and Baucis;⁷ but partly also from Zeus
having a temple in front of the city, ver. 13, and from its being the office
of Hermes, as the eloquent⁸ interpreter and messenger of the gods,⁹ to ac-
company his father when he came down to the earth.¹⁰ Paul was called
Hermes, because, in contrast to his companion, it was he who was "leader
of the word" (ἀιτως ἦν ὁ ἦγε κ. τ. λ.), as Hermes was considered θεὸς ὁ τῶν
λόγων ἔχεων.¹¹ Probably also his more juvenile appearance and greater
activity, compared with the calmer and older Barnabas, contributed to this;
b ut certainly not, as Neander conjectures, his insignificant bodily appear-
ance; for apart from the fact that this rests only on very uncertain tradition—in
the Acta Pauli et Theclas in Tischendorf, Act. apocr. p. 41, he is de-
scribed as μικρὸς τῷ μεγέθει, ψυλλός τῷ κεφαλῇ ἀγκίλως ταῖς κνήμισι—Hermes
is always represented as a handsome, graceful, very well-formed young man.¹²
But certainly Barnabas must have had a more imposing appearance, καὶ ἀνὰ
τῆς δόξης, ὀξιοπρεπῆς, Chrysostom.

Ver. 13. But the priest, then officiating, of the Zeus, who is before the city,
i.e. of the Zeus (ποιλεύς), who had his seat in a temple in front of the city.
ἱερὸς is not to be supplied, with Kuinoel and others,¹³ as τὸν Δίος is the
genitive directly belonging to hierois; but the expression τὸν ὄντος πρὸ τῆς πόλ.
is explained from the heathen conception that the god himself is present in
his temple, consequently is (ὄντος) at the place where his temple stands:
hence the classical expressions παρ' Δί (ad numum Jovis), παρ 'Ηρώ.¹⁴ Wolf
thinks that it is spoken "de Jove, cujus, simulacrum, and so not templum,
antepubem eructum erat." But mere statues had no special priests.¹⁵ It
does not, however, follow from this passage, that there was also a temple of Jupiter in the city (Olshausen). — ταύρους καὶ στέμματα bulls and garlands.

¹ Hom. Od. xviii. 485 ff.
² See also Nägelsbach, Homer. Theol. p. 158.
³ Comp. Themist. viii. p. 90, quoted by Wet-
sten on ver. 12.
⁴ Valckenaer, p. 506.
⁵ Plat. Rep. ii. p. 381 C-E; Cie. de Harusp. 38.
⁶ Ovid. Met. viii. 611 ff.
⁷ Vocke et sermones potens, Macrob. Sat. 1. 8.
⁸ λόγου προφήτης, Orph. H. 37. 4.
⁹ Apollod. iii. 10. 2.
¹¹ Jamblich. de myster. Aege. 1.
¹³ Comp. Müller, Archäol. § 378, 380.
¹⁴ See Bornhardy, p. 184 f.
¹⁵ Jacobs, ad Del. epigr. p. 299.
¹⁶ See Valckenaer, Ossus. II. p. 325, and
Schol. I. p. 509.
“Taurus tibi, summe Deorum,” Ovid. Metam. iv. 755. Beza, Calovius, Raphel, Erasmus Schmid, Palaiaret, Morus, Heinrichs, and others, have quite erroneously assumed a hendiadys for ταύρονς ἰστιμένονς. This would come back to the absurd idea: bulls and, indeed, garlands.\(^1\) The destination of the garlands is, moreover, not to be referred to the deified apostles, in opposition to Grotius and Valkensker, who, like statues,\(^2\) were to have been adorned; but to the animals that were to be adorned therewith at the commencement of the sacrifice,\(^3\) because the design of the garlands is included in the ἡθέλε ὑμῖν. — ἐπὶ τοὺς πυλῶνας] to the gates, doors of the gate, namely, of the city. This reference is required by the correlation in which ἐπὶ τοὺς πυλῶνας stands to τοῦ ἄνω πρὸ τῆς πόλεως. The alleged incarnate gods were in the city, and therefore the sacrifice was to be brought at the gates of the city. The reference to the doors of the temple,\(^4\) or of the house where the apostles lodged, is not in keeping with the context.

Vv. 14, 15. Ἀκούσαντες] Perhaps an inhabitant already gained by them for Christ brought intelligence of the design. — διαβρέζε. τ. ἰμ. αὐτ. ] from pain and sorrow. See on Matt. xxvi. 65. Not: as doing penance for the blinded people, as Lange imagines. — ἔξεπερφοραν] they sprang out from the gate, to which they had hastened from their lodging, among the multitude. The simple representation depicts their haste and eagerness. — τι γαίτα πωείτε;) see on Luke xvi. 2. — καὶ ἡμεῖς κ.τ.λ.] εἰθιως ἐκ προσθείμιν ἀνέτρεψαν τὸ κακόν, Chrysostom. — ἐωσιαπαθεῖς] of like nature and constitution.\(^5\) — εἰς αὐτὸν ὡμοίωμαν . . . ζωντα] contains what is characteristic of the otherwise ὤμοιοπαθεῖς ὑμῖν: we who bring to you the message of salvation, to turn you from these vain, i.e. devoid of divine reality, gods, to the living, true God. εἰς αὑτοῖς. does not thus mean cohortantes,\(^6\) but retains its proper import; and the epexegetical infinitive ἐν τοσοῦτον states the contents of the joyful news. It may be cleared up by supplying ὥν, but this conception is implied in the relation of the infinitives to the governing verb.\(^7\) — τοῖς τῶν ματαιῶν: masculine, not neuter, referring to the gods, present in the conception of the hearers, such as Zeus and Hermes, who yet are no real gods, 1 Cor. viii. 4 ff. — ἐς ἐπιγνώρισθαι] significant exegesis of the ζώντα, whereby the ἀμάτιστος of the polytheistic deification of the individual powers of nature is made very palpable. Comp. with the whole discourse the speech to the Athenians (“sublimiora audire postulantae,” Bengal), chap. xvii.

Vv. 16–18. Who in the past ages left the Gentiles to themselves, did not guide them by special revelation, although He withal made Himself known, doing good to them, by the blessings of nature—an indulgent description\(^8\) of the ungodly character of the heathen, with a gently reproving reference to the revelation of God in nature. ὅρα πώς λαυθάνοντες τὴν καταγορίαν τίθησι, Chrysostom. Grotius aptly remarks: “Egregiam hic habemus formam

---


\(^{2}\) Comp. ep. Jerem. 9.


\(^{4}\) οἱ μὲν ἰστι τοῦ νεῶν πυλῶνας, Plut. Thim. 12.


\(^{6}\) Heinrichs and Kunoel.

\(^{7}\) See Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 788 f.; Kühner, II. § 647, ad Xen. Anab. v. 7. 34.

\(^{8}\) Comp. xvii. 80.
orationis, quam imitari debeat, qui spuud populos in idololatria educatos evangelium praedican." — τοίς δοῦλοις local. dative: in their ways. What is meant is the development of the inward and outward life in a way shaped by themselves, without divine regulation and influence, and also without the intervention of the divine anger. Comp. Rom. iii. 10 ff., i. 22 ff., where the whole moral abomination and curse of this relation is unveiled, whereas here only alluring gentleness speaks. — καίνοιε οἷς ἀμάρτ. κ.τ.λ. An indication that they, nevertheless, might and should have known Him. Observe the relation of the three participle, of which the second is logically subordinate to the first, and the third to the second; as doer of good, in that He gives you rain, thereby filling, etc.—οἰπανόθεν not uselessly added. "Coelum sedes Dei," Bengel. Observe also the individualizing ἰμιν (see critical remarks). — εἰσφόροντες] joy generally. Arbitrarily, Grotius and Wolf suggest that τείνει is meant. — τός καρδίας ἰμιν] neither stands for the simple τείνει, nor is it to be taken with Wolf, of the stomach; but the heart is filled with food, insomuch as the sensation of being filled, the pleasant feeling of satisfaction, is in the heart. Comp. Ps. civ. 15; Jas. v. 5.—τοῦ μηθ ἰδεῖν αἰρεῖν comp. x. 47. The genitive depends on κατέκαυσαν, according to the construction κατατην. τείνᾳ τινος, to divert a person from a thing, to hinder him in it, and μή is the usual particle with verbs of preventing and hindering.

Vv. 19—22. This unmeasured veneration was by hostile Jews who arrived (ἐπιλήθον) from Antioch and Iconium, transformed in the fickle multitude into a participation in a tumultuous attempt to kill Paul. Between this scene very summarily related and the preceding no interval is, according to the correct text (see critical remarks), to be placed, in opposition to Ewald. The mobile vulgus, that στασάμπετσαντον πράγμα τών ἀπαντών, is at once carried away from one extreme to another. — καὶ πίεσαντες κ.τ.λ.] and after they, the Jews who had arrived, had persuaded the multitude to be of their party, and stoned Paul, the chief speaker! they dragged him, etc.—κυκλοσίνων] not sepelendi causa, Bengel, Kuinoel, and others,—a thought quite arbitrarily supplied; but in natural painful sympathy the Lystrians who had been converted to Christ surrounded him who was apparently dead. — ἀναστοις εἰσαῦθεν εἰς τ. π.] is certainly conceived as a miraculous result. — Ver 22. καὶ δει κ.τ.λ.] comp. ver. 27; but here so, that from παρακαλοῦντες a kindred

3 Comp. on 2 Cor. xii. 18; Jude 11; Judith xili. 16; Ecclus. xxxv. 20.
4 The announcement of the gospel forms the great epoch in the history of salvation, with the emergence of which the times of man's being left to themselves are fulfilled. See xvii. 30; Rom. iii. 26 f. Comp also Heb. xiii. 12. IV. Theol. d. Ap. Paul. p. 13. For judgment Jesus has come into the world.
5 Comp. Rom. i. 30, καίνοιει, as in John iv. 2, quanquam guidem, and yet. See also Baeumlein, Partik. p. 245 ff.; and Krüger, Dion. H. p. 287.
6 Ecclus. xxxi. 33.
7 Thuc. II. 40. 2.
8 Hom. Od. xxiv. 457; Plat. Polit. p. 294 E; frequently in the LXX.
10 xiii. 14, 55.
11 vv. 1, 5, 6.
13 Dem. 283, 5.
14 Consequently in the city. It was to be a φόνος δημολιγητος ειν πόλει (Soph. Ant. 55).
verb (κτόνωτες) must be borrowed.⁴ — δια] namely, ex decreto divino. Comp. ix. 16. — ἵματι see Christians must, through many afflictions, enter into the Messianic kingdom, ἀνῶ. τ. Θεοῦ, to be established at the Parousia. Comp. Matt. x. 38; Rom. viii. 17 f.; also the saying of Christ in Barnab. ep. 7: οἱ διδοντες με ἵκιν κ. ἀναστάτα μου τῆς βασιλείας διειλέναι διδοντες κ. παθόντες λαβεῖν με. "Si ad vitam ingredi cupis, afflictiones quoque tibi necessario sufferendae sunt." That, moreover, the stoning here narrated is the same as that mentioned in 2 Cor. xi. 25,⁵ is necessarily to be assumed, so long as we cannot wantonly admit the possibility that the author has here inserted the incident known to him from 2 Cor. only for the sake of the contrast, or because he knew not a more suitable place to insert it; so Zeller. It is, however, an entirely groundless fancy of Lange, that the apparent death in vv. 19, 20 is what is meant by the trance in 2 Cor. xii. 1 ff.

Ver. 28. Χειροτονίσαντες Erasmus, correctly: suffragiis electos. The ecclesiastical offices were ἅρχας χειροτονοῦσαι or aírētai.⁶ The analogy of vi. 2–6 requires this strict regard to the purposely chosen word, which, resting on the old method of choice by lifting up the hands, occurs in the N. T. only here and in 2 Cor. viii. 19,⁷ and forbids the general rendering constituidant,⁸ or eligebant,⁹ so that the appointment would have taken place simply by apostolic plenary power,¹⁰ although the word in itself might denote eligere generally without that special mode. Paul and Barnabas chose by vote presbyters for them, i.e. they conducted their selection by vote in the churches.¹¹ Entirely arbitrary and erroneous is the Catholic interpretation,¹² that it refers to the χειροτονία at the ordination of presbyters (L). — κατ’ ἰκαλεῖαν] distributively.¹³ Each church obtained several presbyters, xx. 17; Phil. i. 1. — προσευχ. μετὰ ναοτ.] belongs to παρεδόθηναι, not as Kiiinoi supposes, to χειροτ. See on xiii. 9. The committing¹⁴ of the Christians of those places to the Lord, commending them to His protection and guidance,¹⁵ which took place at the farewell,¹⁶ was done by means of an act of prayer combined with fasting. The Κύριος is Christ, as the specific object of faith, εἰς ὅν πεπιστ., not God (de Wette).

Vv. 25, 26. Πέργα] see on xiii. 13. — Attalia, now Adalia,¹⁷ was a seaport of Pamphylia, at the mouth of the Catarrhactes, built by Attalus Philadelphus, king of Pergamus.¹⁸ — Ἄντωξ.] They returned to Syria, to the


Lohe. ¹³ Comp. x. 41, Lucian. Philopse. 12, al.

¹⁵ Comp. Calvin in loc.; Rothe, Anf. d. Christi, Kirche, p. 150; Neander, I. p. 208. Against Schrader, V. p. 548, who finds in the appointment of presbyters a διάτομον πρότερον; see Lechler, apos. u. nachapos. Zeit.-l. 395 f. On the essence of the matter, Hitzig, altchrist. ¹⁶ K. p. 393, correctly remarks that the choice was only the form of the recognition of the charismas and of subscription to it; not the basis of the office, but only the medium, through which the divine gift becomes the ecclesiastical office. Comp. on Eph. iv. 11.

¹⁷ See Cornelius a Lapide, and Boellen still, not Sepp.


⁰ Comp. xx. 32. ¹ⁱ See on παρεδόθηναι, Kypke, II. p. 70. ¹² Comp. xx. 32.

¹³ See Fellows, Travels in Asia Minor, p. 193 ff.

¹⁴ Strabo, xiv. 4. p. 667.
mother church which had sent them forth. — θερν ἰδικὰς παραδεδ., κ.τ.λ.] from which they were commended to the grace of God for (the object) the work which they had accomplished. θερν denotes the direction outwards, in which the recommendation of the apostles to the grace of God had taken place at Antioch.¹

Vv. 27, 28. Συναγαγ.] expressly for this object. Comp. xv. 30. Calvin observes well: "quemadmodum solent, qui ex legatione reversi sunt, rationemactorum reddere." — μετ’ αἱρέων] standing in active connection with them.² As the text requires no deviation from this first and most natural rendering, both the explanation per ipse³ and the assumption of a Hebraism ἰδικ with Ἰς (Luke i. 72): quae ipse Deus fecisset,¹ are to be rejected. — και ὅτι] and, in particular, that, etc. — ἵνα ὑπερθέαν πιστεύον] a figurative designation of admission to the faith in Christ. Corresponding is the figurative use of ἵππα in 1 Cor. xvi. 9, 2 Cor. ii. 12, Col. iv. 3, of the fulfilling of apostolic work; comp. also eισοδος, 1 Thess. i. 9. — χρόνον ὑπὶ ὅλιγον] is the object of διήρμηθον, as in ver. 3; they spent not a little time in intercourse with the Christians.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(Ε) Iconium. V. 1.

This city was situated about sixty miles eastward of Antioch, on the road between Ephesus and Syrian Antioch. In the middle ages it was celebrated as the capital of the Seljukian Sutana. It is at present a town of considerable importance; retains its ancient name Konieh; contains a population of 30,000; and is the capital of the Turkish province of Cancariania. It is described by travellers as a scene of destruction and decay, with heaps of ruins. Scarcely anything remains of ancient Iconium save a few inscriptions and fragments of columns and sculpture built into the walls. How it appeared in the time of Paul we know not; but it was large and populous. "The elements of its population would be as follows: a large number of trifling and frivolous Greeks, whose principal places of resort would be the theatre and the marketplace; some remains of a still older population, coming in from the country, or residing in a separate part of the town; some few Roman officials, civil or military, holding themselves proudly aloof from the inhabitants of a subjugated province; and an old settlement of Jews, who exercised their trade during the week, and met on the Sabbath to read the law in the synagogue." Thither the two strangers, driven from Antioch by wicked, crafty, and violent opposition of the Jews, came in accordance with the injunction of the Master, that when rejected in one house or city, they should go into another.

¹ See xiii. 2 f. Comp. xv. 40.
² Beza, Placator, Heuvels.
³ Comp. x. 88; Matt. xxviii. 20; also 1 Cor. xv. 10; and Mark xvi. 20; του Κυρίου συνεργούντες.
⁴ Calvin, de DieU, Grotsius, Kuinoel, and many others; comp. also de Wette.
NOTES.

(1) An assault made. V. 5.

The word ὀπουδ, as explained by Meyer, does not mean just this; but an impetus or strong pressure, impulse or purpose. It implies here a state of mind of which some intimation was given: "There was a strong feeling among them" against the apostles—a movement of some kind. The success of the apostles in Iconium was very great; a multitude both of Jews and Greeks believed. They remained there several months. We have no account of what they preached; but doubtless in the synagogues, and from house to house, they preached that Jesus was the Christ, and that through him, and him alone, could be obtained the forgiveness of sins. They also wrought many miracles, as attestations of their divine commission and of the truth of their doctrine. Their success, however, aroused the hostility of the Jews, who were ever jealous of the old faith, and opposed to the admission of the Gentiles to like privileges with themselves. They looked upon Christianity, not as the outgrowth and perfection of Judaism, but as its antagonistic rival; hence their indignation at its success, and their embittered and continued hostility to its preachers. We are informed that the Jews sent out their emissaries everywhere to circulate falsehoods concerning the Christians, and to stir up the Gentiles against them. Of the many persecutions mentioned in the Acts, all were caused by the Jews except two. Tradition says that Paul frequently preached long and late—that his enemies brought him before the civil authorities, charging him with disturbing their households by his sorcery, and greatly troubling the city. It is probable that here, as suggested by Hackett, that they insinuated that the preachers were dangerous men, and disloyal to the empire.

In the apocryphal Acts of Paul and Thecla there is a legend given concerning Paul's visit to Iconium, the substance of which is this: that Thecla, who was espoused to Thamyris, was deeply affected by the preaching of the apostle; and when Paul was put in prison, accused of being a magician, she bribed the jailer, and was allowed to visit the prisoner, by whom she was more fully instructed in the Christian faith, which she heartily adopted. She was condemned to die because she refused to marry Thamyris, but was miraculously delivered; joined Paul in his missionary journeys; finally she made her home at Seleucia, where she lived the life of a nun, and died at the age of ninety years.

The Acts of Paul and Thecla gives a portrait-description of the apostle's person and physiognomy, which is by no means flattering. He is represented as "a man small in size, bald-headed, bandy-legged, stout, with eyebrows meeting, rather long-nosed, full of grace—for sometimes he seemed like a man, and sometimes he had the countenance of an angel." Other accounts add that he had small, piercing gray eyes. His manner was singularly winning. "The poverty of the casket served to assist the lustre of the jewel it contained; the plainness of the setting called attention to the worth of the gem."

(2) Cities of Lycacmia. V. 6.

Escaping threatened violence at Iconium, the apostles went into a wilder and less civilized region. The name, Lycacinia or Wyltand, indicates only too faithfully the character of the inhabitants. Few, if any, Jews were settled
there, and we read of no synagogue in either of the towns named. The region is described as wild, rugged, mountainous; an almost Alpine country, with numerous lakes and rivers, which, with the melting of the spring snows, become suddenly rapid and dangerous torrents; the roads were bad, and infested with brigands. Lycaonia is an elevated table-land, a great part of which is waterless and sterile, and described as a dreary plain, destitute alike of trees and fresh water. Ovid, writing of the place, says:

"Where men once dwell, a marshy lake is seen,
And coots and bitterns haunt the waters green."

Neither Lystra nor Derbe were large cities or places of any great importance; hence the apostles embraced the surrounding country and villages in their field of evangelistic labor. The difficulties and obstacles in the way of the apostles were very great. Yet with unwearied zeal they evangelized the whole region. To no part of Paul's life would the account he vividly gives to the Corinthians of his personal experience more fitly apply than to his labors here: "In perils," etc. (2 Cor. ii. 26). The sites of both Lystra and Derbe are uncertain. Lystra, however, has a post-apostolic history—the names of its bishops appearing in the records of early councils. It was the home of Timothy, who in all probability was converted under the preaching of Paul at this time. Here Paul performed a miracle in perfectly restoring, by a word, a man who had been a cripple from his birth. The people marvelled; and believing the power to be divine, they thought that two of their pagan gods had appeared in the persons of the apostles.


It was a general belief, long after the Homeric age, that gods visited the earth in the form of men. Such a belief with regard to Jupiter would be natural in such an inland rural district as Lystra, which seems to have been under his special protection, as his image or temple stood in front of the city gates. And as Mercury was the messenger and herald of the gods, especially of Jupiter, it was natural that he should be associated with him. He was also the god of eloquence; and as Paul was the chief speaker, they took him for Mercury; and the more quiet, and perhaps the more aged, venerable, and majestic looking Barnabas, they regarded as Jupiter.

"Jove with Hermes came, but in disguise
Of mortal men concealed their deities."

The pagan priests, true to the functions of their office, hasten to bring oxen and garlands of flowers to crown the victims and wreath the altars, to the temple at the gates, within which Jupiter was supposed specially to dwell, and there to offer sacrifices to Paul and Barnabas. The apostles, when they ascertained what the people and priests were about to do, were horror-stricken. Rending their clothes, they rushed out among the people and expressed their abhorrence of the proposed service. We can well imagine with what impassioned earnestness and vehemence Paul uttered the address of which we have only an outline. He exclaims: "We are not gods, but men of like nature and feelings as yourselves; that these supposed gods whom ye worship are mere vanities, and their worship debasing. We have come to declare to you the
one living and true God; that this living God made all things, in heaven above, and in the earth beneath; that this God has never left himself without a witness in the munificent gifts of nature and the benevolent dealings of his gracious providence. This clear and cogent address scarcely restrained the ignorant and superstitious people from their impious act. What a contrast between the inhabitants of Jerusalem and those of Lystra! When a miracle similar to this was performed by Peter, he was not deified but imprisoned. The reality of the miracle was admitted, but the apostles were straitly threatened. The minds of the instructed rulers of the Jews were hardened and blinded by prejudice, and they reasoned against the truth; the ignorant people at Lystra did not reason, but came at once to a conclusion, natural in their circumstances, which, though mistaken, rebukes the vaunted wisdom of the Jewish Sanhedrim. The people were disappointed in being hindered in their idolatrous design, and were all the more ready to listen to the vile insinuations and cruel instigations of those Jews who had, with evil purpose against the apostles, come from Antioch and Iconium. "The fickle and faithless Lycan- onians," excited and ignorant, and easily duped, listened to the Jews, and were induced to stone Paul on the very place where but just now they were ready to worship him. A similar sudden change, but in a different direction, subsequently occurred at Malta, among the barbarous people, who first thought Paul a murderer, and then immediately afterward a god. What had only been purposed by the people at Iconium was perpetrated by the inhabitants of Lystra. It is observable that we read of no injury done to Barnabas. Paul's intenser zeal and fiery eloquence doubtless provoked their special ire. He who had approved and assisted at the stoning of Stephen is now himself stoned for the same cause. Some suppose Paul to have been really dead; others that he was only stunned. It is clearly implied, however, that his restoration was supernatural. As soon as Paul recovered his strength the apostles proceeded to Derbe, distant about twenty miles. Paul, in writing to Timothy many years afterward, reminds him of his knowledge of his own persecutions "at Antioch, at Iconium, at Lystra;" and in his catalogue of sufferings given to the Corinthians is this instance: "Once was I stoned" (2 Cor. xi. 25, and 2 Tim. iii. 11). Paley, from the various references to this event, draws a forcible argument for the authenticity of the narrative by Luke: "Had the assault [at Iconium] been completed, had the history related that a stone was thrown, as it relates that preparations were made both by Jews and Gentiles to stone Paul and his companions; or even had the account of this transaction stopped, without going on to inform us that Paul and his companions were aware of their danger and fled, a contradiction between the history and the Epistles would have ensued. Truth is necessarily consistent; but it is scarcely possible that independent accounts, not having truth to guide them, should thus advance to the very brink of contradiction without falling into it." (Horae Paulinae, chap. IV. No. 9.)

(12) Chosen them elders. V. 23.

The meaning of the word rendered chosen has been disputed. χρηστονεω, compounded of χειρ, hand, and τεινω, to stretch or extend, means to stretch out the hand. Robinson gives: to stretch out or hold up the hand, hence to vote; to appoint; as also Liddell and Scott, to vote for, to elect. Bloomfield says:
"There is, indeed, no point on which the most learned have been so much agreed as this, that ἐξελεξαντες here simply denotes having selected, constituted, appointed. Alford says: "The word will not bear the sense of laying on of hands," and adds: "The apostles ordained the presbyters whom the churches elected." Gloag says the word admits of two meanings, to choose by election, or simply to choose. Meyer adopts the first of these meanings. Gloag decidedly prefers the second, as does also Hackett, who says: "That formality (election by extending the hand) could not have been observed in this instance, as but two individuals performed the act in question." Abbott says the word is used "as equivalent to select or appoint, and understands the declaration to be that the apostles appointed elders, without any indication whether the selection was made by themselves or first by the lay members of the church, and ratified by the apostles, or by the concurrent action of the two." While, as we learn from chap. vi., the seven were chosen by the whole church, it would appear, in this instance, that these elders were chosen by Paul and Barnabas alone. Clemens gives the following rule as handed down by tradition from the apostles: "That persons should be appointed to ecclesiastical offices by approved men, the whole church consenting." This is the second mention of elders in the Acts (xi. 30). "The ministers of the church were called πρεσβυτεροι (elders), with reference to the Jewish element in the church; and ἐπίσκοποι (overseers), with reference to the Greek element." (Gloag.)
CHAPTER XV.

VER. 1. περιτέμνουσθε] A B C D Μ, min. Constitut. Ath. Epiph. have περιτεμνήθητε. Approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born.; and rightly, as the witnesses are so preponderating, and the reference of the aorist easily escaped the notice of the transcribers. — Ver. 2. οὖ] Tisch. Born. read δέ. The witnesses for δέ preponderate. — [ζητήσεως] Elz. has ζωγράφους, in opposition to decisive testimony. From ver. 7. It is also in favour of ζητήσεως that it is inserted in ver. 7, instead of σωζάντως in A, M, min. vss., which evidently points to the originality of ζητήσεως in our passage. — Ver. 4. ἀπεδέχθη] Lachm. Tisch. and Born. read παρεδέχθη, according to A B D** (D' has παρεδέχθη) Μ, loc. These witnesses preponderate, and there are no internal reasons against the reading. — τὸ] Tisch. reads τό, following only B C, min. — Ver. 7. ἔν ἡμῖν] Lachm. Tisch. read ἐν ἡμῖν, according to A B C Μ, min. and several vss. and Fathers. But ἡμῖν is necessary; and on this account, and because it might easily be mechanically changed into ἡμῖν after the preceding ἐμεῖς, it is to be defended on the considerable attestation remaining to it. — Ver. 11. τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ] Elz. has Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, against preponderating evidence. Whilst the article was omitted from negligence, Χριστοῦ (which also Born. has) was added in order to complete the dogmatically important saying. — Ver. 14. τῷ δύσματι] so Lachm. Tisch. Born. But Elz. Scholz have ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι,—an exegetical expansion, against preponderating evidence. — Ver. 17. After ταῦτα Elz. has πάντα, which is wanting in A B C D Μ, min. and many vss. and Fathers. From LXX. Amos ix. 12, and hence it also stands before ταῦτα in E G, min.—Ver. 18, Griesb. Scholz, and Tisch. have only γνωστά ἂν' αἰώνος, so that this must be attached to ταῦτα in ver. 17. This reading appears as decidedly original, and so ἵστη... αὐτοῖς as decidedly interpolated: partly because B C Μ, min. Copt. Sahid. Arm. vouch for the simple γνωστά ἂν' αἰώνος, and those authorities which have ἵστη... αὐτοῖς present a great number of variations; partly because it was thought very natural to complete γνωστά ἂν' αἰώνος into a sentence, and to detach it from ver. 17, inasmuch as no trace of γνωστά ἂν' αἰώνος was found in Amos ix. 12; partly, in fine, because, if ἵστη... αὐτοῖς is genuine, ver. 18 contains a thought so completely clear, pious, and unexceptionable, so inoffensive, too, as regards the connection, and in fact noble, that no reason can be conceived for the omission of ἵστη... αὐτοῖς, and for the numerous variations in the words. Lachm. has γνωστοῦν ἂν' αἰώνος τῷ Κυρίῳ τῷ ἐργῷ αὐτοῦ, after A D, Arm. Vulg. Cant. Ir., which betrays a still later origin than the Recepta, as the genuine γνωστά ἂν' αἰώνοι first gave occasion to the casting of the sentence in the plural form, but afterwards, in order to bring forward the special reference to the ἐργῷ in question of the conversion of the Gentiles, the change into the singular form was adopted. Matth. has entirely erased ver. 18, without evidence. — Ver. 20. καὶ τοῦ πνεικτοῦ] is, following Mill, erased by Born. as a later addition: Ambrosiaster already explains the words as such, and, indeed, as proceeding from the stricter observance of the Greeks. But they are only
wanting in D, Cant. Ir. Tert. Cypr. Pacian. Fulgent. Hier. Gaudent. Eucher. Ambrosiast., of whom several omit them only in ver. 29. The omission is explained from Lev. xvii. 13, where the eating of things strangled generally is not forbidden, but only the pouring out of the blood is made a condition; and from the laxer view of the Latins. After ver. 20 (so, too, in ver. 29 after πορείας, D, min. vss. and Fathers have the entirely irrelevant addition from Matt. vii. 12: καὶ δὸς (οὗ δὲ ὄν) μὴ θέλωσιν ἑαυτοῖς γίνεσθαι, ἐπτεροῖς μὴ τοιεῖν (ποιεῖτε). — Ver. 22. ἐπικαλ.] Lachm. has καλοῦμενον, also commended by Griesb., according to decisive evidence, and adopted by Tisch. and Born. Rightly: the former is an interpretation. — Ver. 23. καὶ αἱ ἄδελφοι] A B C D Ξ* loth 13. Arm. Vulg. Cant. and some Fathers have merely ἄδελφοι, which Lachm. and Born. have adopted. But the omission of καὶ αἱ is on hierarchical grounds, for which reason also 34 Sahid. have omitted καὶ αἱ ἄδελφοι entirely. — Ver. 24. λέοντες περιτ. κ. τριείσιν τῶν νόμων is wanting in A B D Ξ, loth 13, Copt. Aeth. Sahid. Vulg. Cant. Constitut. Ath. Epiph. Vigil. Beda. Besides variations in detail. Deleted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. Probably a gloss; yet it remains surprising that it was drawn not from ver. 1, but from ver. 5, and so freely. Besides, λέοντες . . . νοΜΟΝ might be easily passed over after ἐμὼΝ. — Ver. 25. ἐκλεξαμένους] A B G min. read ἐκλεξαμένους. So Lachm. A stylistic correction. — Ver. 28. Instead of τῶν ἐπάναγκ. τοῦτων is to be written, with Lachm., according to preponderating evidence, τούτων τῶν ἐπ.; Tisch. has erased τοῦτων, yet only after A and some min. and Fathers. — Ver. 30. ἠθὼν] Lachm. and Born. read καθήθων, which is so decidedly attested (A B C D Ξ) that it may not be derived from ver. 1. The compounds of ἐρχέσθαι were often neglected. — Ver. 33. ἀποστείλαντας αὐτοῦ] Elz. reads ἀποστάλοντος, contrary to A B C D Ξ, min. and several vss. and Fathers. A more precisely defining addition, which, taken into the text, supplanted the original. — After ver. 33, Elz. Scholz, Born. have (ver. 34): ἐθάνει δὲ τῷ Σίλα ἐπιμενεὶν αὐτοῦ, to which D and some vss. and Cassiod. add: μνᾶς δὲ Ἰωάδας ἐπιμελεῖ (so Bornemann). Condemned by Mill, Griesb. Matthaei, also deleted by Lachm. and Tisch., according to A B E G H Ξ, min. Chrys. Theophyl. and several vss. A hasty addition on account of ver. 40. — Ver. 37. ἔβουλεναστα] Lachm. reads ἔβουλοντο, which also Griesb. recommended, after A B C E Ξ, min. Born., following D, reads ἔβουλενετο. While the two verbs are frequently (comp. on v. 33) interchanged, ἔβουλοντο is here to be preferred on account of its far preponderant attestation. — Ver. 40. θεῶ] A B D Ξ, min. vss. have Κυρίον. So Lachm. Tisch, also Born., who only omits τοῦ, following D*. Θεῶ is from xiv. 26.

Vv. 1, 2. The Jewish-Christian opinion, that the Gentiles could only in the way of circumcision and observance of the law—that is, in the way of Jewish Christianity—obtain the salvation of the Messianic kingdom, was by no means set aside by the diffusion of Christianity among the Gentiles, which had so successfully taken place since the conversion of Cornelius. On the contrary, it was too closely bound up with the whole training and habit of mind of the Jews, especially of those who were adherents of the Pharisees,* not to have presented, as the conversions of the Gentiles

---

1 Approved by Buttmann in the Stud. u. * Comp. Ewald, p. 464 f.

Krit. 1869, p. 358.
increased, an open resistance to the freedom of the Gentile brethren from the law,—a freedom which exhibited itself in their whole demeanour to the scandal of the strict legalists,—and to have made the question on which it hinged the most burning question of the time. This opposition—the most fundamental and most dangerous in the apostolic church, for the overcoming of which the whole further labour of a Paul was requisite—emerged in the very central seat of Gentile Christianity itself at Antioch; whither some from Judaea, τῶν πεπιστευκότων ἀπὸ τῆς αἵρεσεως τῶν Φαρισαίων, came down with this doctrine: If ye shall not have been circumcised (περιτυμήθητε), see the critical remarks) according to the custom ordered by Moses, and so have taken upon you the obligation of obedience to the whole law, Gal. v. 3, ye cannot obtain the salvation in Christ! (Mt). — στάσεως κ. ζητήσεως; division and disputation.—ἐραγαν] namely, the ἄδελφοι, ver. 1, the Christians of Antioch, comp. ver. 3. — Jerusalem was the mother-church of all Christianity; here the apostles had their abode, who, along with the presbyters of the church, occupied for the Christian theocracy a position similar to that of the Sanhedrim. Comp. Grotius. The recognition of this on the part of Paul is implied in Gal. ii. 1, 2. — καὶ τινας ἄλλους ἐς αἰῶν] among whom, according to Gal. ii. 1, was Titus, not named at all in the Acts, unless Paul voluntarily took him as companion, which is more suitable to the expression in Gal. ii. 1. — We may add that the commission of the church, under which Paul made the journey, is by no means excluded by the statement: κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, Gal. ii. 2; see on Gal. i.e. Subtilties against our narrative may be seen in Zeller, p. 224 f. — ζητήμα, quaestio, i.e. question in dispute, in the N. T. only in the Book of Acts; often in Greek writers.

Ver. 3. Προσευμβιντε] after they were sent forth, deduxi, i.e. escorted for a part of the way. Morus and Heinrichs: “rebus ad iter suscipiendum necessariis instructi.” That, however, must have been suggested by the context, as in Titus iii. 13. The provision with necessities for the journey is understood of itself, but is not contained in the words. — τοῖς ἄδελφοις] They caused joy by their visit and by their narratives, not only to the Jewish-Christians, but to all.

Vv. 4, 5. Παρέδεχθησαν (see the critical remarks) denotes, in keeping with the delegation in ver. 9 f., the reception, i.e. the formal receiving of the delegates as such. Observe the prefixing of ἐκκαλοῦσα; comp. Phil. i. 1. — μετ’ αἰών] see on xiv. 27; comp. δὲ αἰών, ver. 12. — Ver. 5 belongs to the narrative of Luke, who here records as worthy of remark, that at the very first meeting of the delegates with the church receiving them, the very same thing was maintained by some who rose up in the assembly (ἐξανέστησαν.),

1 According to Epiph. Haer. 26. Certinian is supposed to have been among them.
2 As Syr. p. has on the margin, and codd. 8. 137 in the text, as a certainly correct gloss, see ver. 5.
3 xxii. 7, 10; Soph. O. R. 634.
4 xxv. 30; John iii. 23.
5 Comp. 3 John 6; Herod. i. 111, viii. 194, 193; Plat. Menex. p. 326 D; Soph. O. C. 1663.
6 Although the travellers, on account of the hospitality of the churches, which they visited by the way, certainly needed but little.
7 Heinrichs.
8 Comp. 3 Macc. iv. 22.
and was opposed (ὅ) to the narration of Paul and Barnabas δοξα ὁ θεός ἐπιφάνης μετ’ αὐτῶν, as had been brought forward by Jews at Antioch and had occasioned this mission. Those mentioned in ver. 1, and those who here came forward, belonged to one and the same party, the Pharisee-Christians, and therefore ver. 5 is unjustly objected to by Schwanbeck. Beza, Piscator, Wakefield, and Heinrichs put ver. 5 into the mouth of the delegates; holding that there is a rapid transition from the oblique to the direct form, and that ἐγγυν is to be supplied after ἔγινεν. ὅ. A harsh and arbitrary view, as the change in form of the discourse must naturally and necessarily have been suggested by the words, as in i. 4 and xvii. 3. That the delegation had already stated the object of their mission, was indeed self-evident from ἀπεξερεχθον, and hence it was not requisite that Luke should particularly mention it. — αὐτοῖς] namely, the Gentile-Christians, as those to whom the narrative δοξα ὁ θεός ἐπ. μ. αὐτ. had chiefly reference; not the τίνες ἄλλως, ver. 2,1 which is erroneously inferred from Gal. ii. — They must be circumcised, etc., has a dictatorial and hierarchical tone.

Ver. 5. The consultation of the apostles and presbyters concerning this assertion (περὶ τοῦ λάγου τούτου, see ver. 5) thus put forward here afresh, was not confined to themselves — Schwanbeck, who here assumes a confusion of sources — but took place in presence, and with the assistance, of the whole church assembled together, as is evident from ver. 12, comp. with ver. 22, and most clearly from ver. 25, where the ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβυτεροί καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί ver. 23, write of themselves: ἠδέξει ἁμα γενομένως ἐμοθιμάδων. Against this it has been objected that no place would have sufficed to hold them, and therefore it is maintained that only deputies of the church took part;2 but this is entirely arbitrary, as the text indicates nothing of such a limitation, and the locality is entirely unknown to us. — This assembly and its transactions are not at variance with Gal. ii. 1 ff., in opposition to Baur, Zeller, Hilgenfeld, Hausrath, where, indeed, they are presupposed as known to the readers by αὐτοῖς in ver. 2, as well as by ver. 3 and ver. 5. Hofmann, N. T. I. p. 126, judges otherwise, but by a misinterpretation of Gal. ii. 4 ff. The words κατ’ ἱδιαν δὲ τοῖς δοκωσι, Gal. ii. 2, betoken a separate discussion, different from these public discussions3 (N_share).

Ver. 7. Πολλῆς ὅς αὐξησεὼν γενομένων] These were the preliminary debates in the assembly, before Peter, to whom the first word belonged, partly by reason of his apostolic precedence, partly and especially because he was the first to convert the Gentiles, rose up and delivered a connected address.4 In this previous πολλῆς αὐξησεὼν may have occurred the demand for the circumcision of Titus, indirectly mentioned in Gal. ii. 3. See on Gal. i.c. — ἁτ’ ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων] does not point to the conversion of Cornelius as to something long since antiquated and forgotten.5 But certainly that selection of

1 Lekebusch.
4 There is no further mention of Peter in the Book of Acts. — The reference to the conversion of Cornelius is introduced, according to Baur, simply in pursuance of the consistent plan of the author, who makes Peter thus speak after the manner of Paul.
5 Baur, I. p. 91, ed. 2.
Peter as the first converter of the Gentiles, viewed in relation to the entire period, during which Christianity had now existed, dated from ancient days, Acts. x. 11. — ἐν ἡμιν ἔπειτα κ. τ. λ. He made choice for Himself among us, that by my mouth, etc. Hence ἐν is not to be supplied, as Olhausen, following older commentators, holds. Others—Grotius, Wolf, Bengel, Heinrichs, Rosenmüller, Kinoel, and many others—unnecessarily take ἐν ἡμιν for ἡμιν as a Hebraism in accordance with 2 Ν. Beza aptly says: "habito inter nos delectu voluisse." — Luke has the word εἰναγγελίων only here and in xx. 24, not at all in the Gospel. John also has it not.

Vv. 8–10. God who knows the heart, whom thus could not be deceived in the matter, has, in reference to this their admission effected by my instrumentality into the fellowship of the gospel and of faith (ver. 7), done two things. He has (a) positively borne matter-of-fact witness for them, to their qualification for admission, by His giving to them the Holy Spirit, as to us; and (b) negatively, He made in no way distinction between us and them, after He by faith, of which He made them partakers through the gospel, had purified their hearts. God would have made such a distinction, if, after this ethical purification of the heart effected by faith, He had now required of them, for their Christian standing, something else, namely, circumcision and other works of the law; but faith, by which He had morally purified their inner life, was to Him the sole requisite for their Christian standing without distinction, as also with us. Observe on (a), that δοῦν αὐτοῖς κ. τ. λ. is contemporaneous with ἐμαρτύρουν, expressing, namely, the mode of it; and on (b), that ἡ παρασιάς is previous to τὸν ἀδικίαν. This is evident from the course of the speech, as the faith must have been already present before the communication of the Spirit.—Ver. 10. Accordingly as the matter now stands (ἐν ἡμῖν), — τί πειράζετε τὸν Θεόν; i.e. why do ye put it to the test, whether God will abandon His attestation of non-observance already given to the Gentiles, or assert His punitive power against human resistance? "Ἀποστροφεῖς ad Pharisäos et severus elenchus," Bengel. — ἐπιδείκνυς with the design to impose, etc. — ἦνον) comp. Gal. v. 1, and Chrysostom in loc.: τῷ τοῦ ἰσχοῦ ὁμοῖα τὸ μακαρία του πράγματος, of the complete observance of the law, αὐτοῖς ἐνδεικνυται. Contrast to this yoke: Matt. xi. 29, 30. — οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν] since the time of Moses.

Ver. 11. Ἀλλὰ] A triumphant contrast to the immediately preceding ὅν οὐλεὶ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν οὐλεὶ ἡμεῖς ἰσχύει. ἐκατ. — διὰ τῆς χάρ. τ. κυρ. 'Ἰ. Not elsewhere used by Peter. In triumphant contrast to the yoke of the law, it is here placed first. — καθ' ὅν τρόπον κάκεινον] sc. πιστεύουσι σωθήσαι διὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ κυρ. 'Ἰσχοῦ. The κεινοί are the Gentile-Christians, to whom the whole debate relates. Others, Calvin, Calovius, Wolf, and many older
commentators, following Augustine, against Pelagius, make it apply to πατέρες ἡμῶν. Incorrectly, as the salvation of the Jewish fathers, servati fuerunt is supplied, is quite alien from the question concerning the σωτηρία of the Gentile-Christians here. But the complete equalization of both parties is most fitly brought out at the close; after its having been previously said, they as well as we, it is now said, we as well as they. Thus the equalizing is formally complete.—That Peter in the doctrine of the righteousness of faith was actually as accordant with Paul as he here expresses himself, is, in opposition to Baur, Schwengler, Hilgenfeld, and Zeller, to be inferred even from Gal. ii. 15 ff., where Paul acknowledges his and Peter's common conviction, after he had upbraided the latter, ver. 14 for the inconsistency of his conduct at Antioch.¹

Ver. 12. The result of this speech was that the whole assembled multitude (πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος) was silent, so that thus a new συζητήσεις did not begin, and the agitation of the opponents was set at rest. A happy beginning for the happy issue. Now Barnabas and Paul could without contradictionconfirm the view of Peter by the communication of their own apostolic experiences among the Gentiles,—Barnabas first, on account of his older and closer relation to the church. Comp. on ver. 25. —συμεία κ. τίμη[σε] Comp. generally also Rom. xv. 19; 2 Cor. xii. 12, hence so much the less improbable (Zeller).

Ver. 13. When these had finished speaking (αἰτήσατο), James, not the son of Alphaeus, but the brother of the Lord (xii. 17), a strict legalist, and highly esteemed in Jerusalem as chief leader of the church, delivered his address having reference to these matters (ἐπεκρίθη). He first confirmed, by a prophetic testimony, the divine call of the Gentiles brought into prominence by Peter, vv. 13-17, and then made his conciliatory proposal for the satisfaction of both parties—in concise, but all the more weighty language (o²).

Vv. 14-17. Ἀμενῶν] formed after the Hebrew וַיָּשָׁב, while the more usual שֵׁם corresponds to the Rabbinical שֵׁם. In the Talmud also both forms of the name are used side by side. Moreover, the original name of Peter was still the current one in the church of Jerusalem.⁴ We are not to think of any intentional use of it in this passage, that Peter was not here to be regarded according to his apostolic dignity, Baumgarten.—ἐπεκρίσατο. ἵπτι ἐθν. ἱλαρὸν τῷ ὄν. αὐτοῦ] he looked to, took care for, the receiving from the Gentiles a people for His name, i.e. a people of God, a people that bore the name of God as their ruler and proprietor.

"Egregium paradoxon," Bengel.⁵ — Ver. 15. τοίτῳ] neuter: and with this, namely, with this fact expressed by λαβεῖν ἐξ ἐθνῶν κ.τ.λ., agree, etc,—καθὼς γέγραπται] He singles out from the λόγοι τῶν προφ. a passage, comp. xx. 35, in conformity with which that agreement takes place, namely, Amos ix. 11, 12, quoted freely by Luke after the LXX. Amos predicts

¹ Comp. on Gal. l.c.; also Baumgarten, p. 490 f.; Lekebusch, p. 800 f.
² 2 Pet. 1; LXX. Gen. xxix. 38; Luke ii. 83; ill. 30; Acts xiii. 1; Rev. vii. 7.
³ 1 Chron. iv. 30.
⁴ Comp. on Luke xxiv. 34.
⁵ Comp. on Luke xvii. 36; Rom. ix. 24-26.
the blessed Messianic era, in which not only the Davidic theocracy, fallen into decay by the division of the Kingdom, will be again raised up, ver. 16, but also foreign nations will join themselves to it and be converted to the worship of Jehovah. According to the theocratic character of this prophecy, it has found its Messianic historical fulfilment in the reception of the Gentiles into Christianity, after that thereby the Davidic dominion, in the higher and antitypical sense of the Son of David (Luke i. 32), was re-established. — μετὰ ταῦτα Hebrew and LXX. : ἐν τῷ ἡμέρᾳ ικείνυ. The meaning is the same: after the pre-Messianic penal judgments, in the day of the Messianic restoration. — ἀναστήσω καὶ ἀνακαταστήσω] Jehovah had withdrawn from His people; but now He promises by the prophet: I will return and build again the fallen, by desolation, tabernacle of David. Many assume the well-known Hebraism: iterum (אֵדַלְפָּד) aedificabo. This would only be correct were בּוּשָׁמ in the original; but there stands only בּוּשֶׁ, and in the LXX. only ἀναστήσω; and the idea of iterum is very earnestly and emphatically presented by the repetition of ἀνοικοδ. and by ἀνορθ. — τῷ σαφένει David] The residence of David, the image of the theocracy, is represented as a torn down and decayed tabernacle, "quia ad magnum tenuitatem res ejus redactae erant," Bengel. — ὅπως] not the result, but the design, with which what is promised in ver. 16 is to take place.— οἱ κατάληκτοι τῶν ἄνθρ. i.e. the Gentiles. The LXX., who certainly had before them another reading (Ῥωμ. Ἀναστάσεως και ἁπατίων), deviates considerably from the original text, which runs: μὴ ἔφεσιν τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, that they may possess the remainder of Edom; the remainder, for Amaziah had again subdued only a part of it, 2 Kings xiv. 7. Ας καὶ πάντα τὰ ἑθνοὶ κ.τ.λ. follows, James might have used even these words, as they are in the original, for his object, and therefore no set purpose is to be assumed for his having given them according to the reading of the LXX. Perhaps they were only known to him and remembered in that reading; but possibly also they are only rendered in this form by Luke, or the Greek document used by him, without being so uttered by James, who spoke in Hebrew. — καὶ πάντα τὰ ἑθνοὶ κ.τ.λ.] καὶ after οἱ κατάληκτοι ἄνθρ. is necessarily explicative, and indeed, and the emphasis of this more precise definition lies on πάντα; but the following ἐνορθ. οἰκ. has an argumentative purpose: they upon whom, i.e. seeing that, indeed, upon all the Gentiles, etc. — ὡς οἰκ. ἐπικελεύ. τ. ἐν. μον] quite a Hebrew expression: upon whom (ὤψ υμνικ. . . . ικείνυ) is named, is uttered as naming them, my name, namely, as the name of their Lord, after whom they are designated, so that they are called "God's people." They have the name already, inasmuch as the predicted future 4 is conceived as having already taken place, and as existing, in the counsel of God; a praeteritum propheticum, as in Jas. v. 2, 3. The view, in itself inadmissible, of Hitzig and

1 Comp. Hengstenberg, Christol. 1. p. 456.
2 Gesenius, Thes. III. p. 1926.
3 The Greek would say: οἱ κατάληκτοι (οἱ ἐπικελεύτων) τὸ ὄνομα μον, or οἰκ. κατάληκτο τὸ ὄνομα μον, or even ὡς οἰκ. κατάληκτο τ. ἐ. μ. On ἐπικελεύειν, to be distinguished from the simple καλεῖν as denoting an accessory naming, comp. especially Herod. viii. 14 (ὑποκαλείοντος . . . ἐκκελεύουσαν). Comp. Jas. 2. 7; Deut. xxvii. 10; Isa. liii. 19; Jer. xiv. 9; Dan. ix. 19; Bar. ii. 13; 2 Macc. viii. 15.
4 Comp. Rom. ix. 25 f.
others: "over whom my name, as that of their conqueror, has been formerly named," was certainly not that of James. — ἐν' αὐτοῖς is here to be explained not from the Greek use of the repetition of the pronoun, but as an imitation of the Hebrew. — ὁ παῖον ταῦτα γνωστά ἄν' αἰώνος] Such is to be considered as the original text; the other words, ver. 18, are to be deleted. See the critical remarks. The Lord who does these things, the rebuilding of the theocracy and the conversion of all Gentiles designed by it—known from the beginning. The γνωστά ἄν' αἰώνος added to the prophetic words are not to be considered as the speaker's own significant gloss accompanying the prophetic saying, for such a gloss would not have been so directly or so curtly added; but as part of the scriptural passage itself. The words must at that time either have belonged to the original text, as it presented itself to James, or to the text of the LXX., as Luke gives it, or to both, as a reading which is now no longer extant; whereas there is now at the conclusion of ver. 11, βλέπῃ τῆς (LXX.: καθὼς η' ἡμέρα τοῦ αἰώνος.) — γνωστά] equivalent to γνωστά δέντα, and therefore without an article. By whom they were known from the beginning, is evident from the context, namely, by God who accomplishes them (ποιῶν) in the fulness of time. He accordingly carries into effect nothing, which has not been from the beginning evident to Him in His consciousness and counsel; how important and sacred must they consequently appear! As Bengel well remarks: "ab aeterno scivit; quare non debemus id tanquam novum et mirum fugere." Erroneously de Wette renders: what was known of old, through the prophets. Opposed to this is ἄν' αἰώνος, which also means from the very beginning in iii. 21 and Luke i. 70; and how unimportant and superfluous would the thought itself be!

VV. 19, 20 (29). Ἑγώ] For my part I vote. — παρενοχλεῖν] to trouble them withal, at their conversion. — ἐπιστείλαι αὐτοῖς τοῦ ἀπίστωσαι] to despatch a writing to them that they should abstain—sim of the ἐπιστείλαι. — ἀν' τῶν ἀλασχημάτων] may be referred either to τῶν εἰδώλων only, or to all the following particulars. The latter, as ἀν' is not repeated with τῆς πορείας, is the more natural: therefore: from the pollutions, which are contracted through idols and through fornication, etc. ἀλασχήμα, from the Alexandrian ἀλασείν, polluere, is a word entirely foreign to the other Greek; therefore Hesychius explains it merely in reference to its present connection with τῶν εἰδώλων: ἀλασχημάτων τῆς μεταλήψεως τῶν μαρων θυσίων. — τῶν εἰδώλων] What James meant by the general expression, "pollutions of idols," was known to his hearers, and is evident from ver. 29, where the formally composed decree required as unambiguous a designation as possible, and therefore εἰδώλωσθησθαι is chosen; hence: pollutions occasioned by partaking of the flesh of heathen sacrifices (Ex. xxxiv. 15). The Gentiles were accus-

3 Comp. Ewald, p. 478, who would, however, read γνωστὸν ἄν' αἰώνος τὸ ἐργόν αὐτοῦ.
4 Dem. 248. 18; Polyb. i. 8. 1, iii. 28. 6; Plut. Timol. 3; frequently also in the LXX., both with the dative and the accusative.
5 Heb. xiii. 22; often with Greek writers, see Loesner, p. 307.
6 LXX. Dan. 1. 8; Mal. 1. 7, 12; Ecclus. xl. 29; Sturz, de Dial. Ai p. 145; Korai on lococ. p. 329.
tomed to consume so much of the sacrificed animals as was not used
for the sacrifice itself and did not belong to the priests, in feasts, in
the temple or in their houses, or even to sell it in the shambles. 1 Both
modes of partaking of flesh offered in sacrifice, for which the Gentile-
Christians had opportunity enough either by invitations on the part of their
heathen friends or by the usual practice of purchase, were to be avoided
by them as fellowship with idolatry, and thus as polluting Christian sanctity.
— καὶ τῆς πορνείας] As in the decree, ver. 29, the same expression is repeated
without any more precise definition, and a regulative ordinance, particularly
in such an important matter, proceeding from general collegiate deliberation,
presupposes nothing but unambiguous and well-known designations
of the chief points in question; no other explanation is admissible than
that of fornication generally, 2 and accordingly all explanations are to be
discarded, which assume either a metaphorical meaning or merely a single
form of πορνεία: namely: (1) that it denotes figuratively idolatry, and that
merely the indirect idolatry, which consists in the partaking of εἴδωλοντος,
so that τὸν εἴδωλα καὶ τῆς πορν., form only one point—so, entirely opposed to
the order in ver. 29, Beza, Selden, Schleusner; (2) that it is the fornication
practised at the heathen festivals, so Morus, Dindorf, Stolz, Heinrichs; (8)
that the πορνεῖα θνατικαί is meant, the gains of prostitution offered in sacrifice,
Heinsius and Ittig; or (4) the quot actus professionis meretriciae, in fornicare
stantis viri vel mulieris mercedes pacta prostitutae et omnium libidini
patentia, 3 Salmiasi; or (5) the concubinage common among the Gentiles,
Calvin; or (6) the nuptiae intra gradus prohibitas, 4 incest; 5 or (7) marriage
with a heathen husband; 6 or (8) deuterogamia. 7 Bentley has even recourse to
conjectural emendation, namely, χορειας or πορειας (seine's flesh). Such
expedients are only resorted to, because all the other particulars are not im-
moral in themselves, but ἀδιάφορα, which only become immoral through the
existing circumstances. But the association of πορνεία with three adiaphora
is to be explained from the then moral corruption of heathenism, by which
fornication, regarded from of old with indulgence and even with favour,
nay, practised without shame even by philosophers, and surrounded by
poets with all the tinsel of lasciviousness, had become in public opinion a
thing really indifferent. 8 Compare the system of Hetaerae in Corinth,

1 See on Corv. viii. 1; also Hermann, got.
ised. lilt. xxvii. 22-94.
2 But that the apostles had here in view a
sanctification of marriage by the cognizance
or approval of the rulers of the church, so
that the germ of the ecclesiastical nuptial
ceremony is to be found here, is very arbi-
trarily assumed by Lange, apost. Zeitalt. II.
p. 185.
3 Lightfoot, comp. Hammond.
4 Gieseler in Steudtla and Tschirmer's
Arch. IV. p. 518; Baur, I. p. 182, ed. 2;
246; Sepp, and others; also Wieseler, who,
however, on Gal. p. 149, takes it generally,
and only treats incest as included.
5 Hering in the Bibl. nov. Brem. IV. p. 209
ff.; Teller.
7 That even among the heathen the einful-
ness of sexual abuse was recognised (as Hof-
mann, hell. Schr. N. T. p. 181, objects),
makes no difference as regards the whole of
their moral attitude and tendency. Voices of
earnest and thoughtful men in Greece and
Rome were raised against all vices. Hofmann
attaches to the notion of πορνεία a width
which the word, as actually used, has not:
"Unbridledness of natural sexual conduct,
which neither knows nor desires to know
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Rome, etc., and the many forms of the worship of Aphrodite in the Greek world. 1 Baumgarten, Ewald, Bleek, Weiss have with reason retained the proper and in the N. T. prevailing literal sense of πορφεια. — και των πυρικων] i.e. the flesh of such beasts as are killed by strangling, strangulation by snares, and the like, and from which the blood is not let out. 2 This is based on Lev. xvii. 18, 14, Deut. xii. 10, 23, according to which the blood was to be let out from every hunted animal strangled, and without this letting out of blood the flesh was not to be eaten. 3 That the prohibition here refers to Roman epicurism (e.g. to the eating of fowls suffocated in Falernian wine), is very inappropriately assumed by Schnecklenburger, especially considering the humble position of most of the Gentile-Christians. — και των αιματος] denotes generally any partaking of blood, in whatever form it might be found. 4 The prohibition of eating blood, even yet strictly observed by the Jews, 5 is not to be derived from the design of the lawgiver to keep the people at a distance from all idolatry—as is well known, the sacrificing Gentiles ate blood and drank it mingled with wine 6—or from sanitary considerations, but from the conception expressly set forth in Gen. ix. 6, Lev. xvii. 11, xiii. 14, Deut. xii. 23, 24, that the blood is that which contains "the soul of all flesh." On this also depended the prohibition of things strangled, because the blood was still in them, which, as the vehicle of life, was not to be touched as food, but was to be poured out, 7 and not to be profaned by eating. 8 The very juxtaposition of the two points proves that Cyprian, Tertullian, and others, 9 erroneously explain aima of homicidium. With the deep reverence of the Hebrews for the sanctity of blood was essentially connected the idea of blood-sacrifice; and therefore the prohibition of partaking of blood, in respect of its origin and importance—it was accompanied with severe penalties—was very different from the prohibition of unclean animals. 10

The following general observations are to be made on ver. 20 compared with ver. 29: —1. The opinion of James and the resolution of the assembly is purely negative; the Gentile brethren were not to be subjected to παρενωγλειν, but they were expected merely ἀπεξετασμαι, and that from four matters, which according to the common Gentile opinion were regarded as indifferent, but were deeply offensive to the rigidly legal Jewish-Christians. The moral element of these points is here accordingly left entirely out of account; the design of the prohibition refers only to the legal strictness of the Jewish-Christians, between whom and the

1 Comp. Schoettgen in loc.
2 Lev. iii. 17, vii. 26, xvii. 10, xix. 26; Deut. xii. 16, 23 ff., xv. 23.
3 Saalschütz, Mos. R. p. 382 f.
6 See Wolf in loc.
7 Comp. also Bähr, Symbol. II. p. 340.
Gentile-Christs was the existing dispute was to be settled, and the fellowship of brotherly intercourse was to be provisionally restored. The Gentile-Christian, for the avoidance of offence towards his Jewish brother, was to abstain as well from that which exhibited the fundamental character of heathenism — pollutions of idols and fornication — as from those things by which, in the intercourse of Christian fellowship, the most important points of the restrictions on food appointed by God for Israel might be prematurely overthrown, to the offence of the Jewish-Christs.

— 2. That precisely these four points are adduced, and neither more nor other, is simply to be explained from the fact, that historically, and according to the experience of that time, next to circumcision these were the stumbling-blocks in ordinary intercourse between the two sections of Christians; and not, as Olshausen and Ebrard, following many older commentators, suppose, from the fact that they were accustomed to be imposed on the proselyte of the gate in the so-called seven precepts of Noah, and that the meaning of the injunction is, that the Gentile-Christs had no need to become proselytes of righteousness by circumcision, but were only obliged to live as proselytes of the gate, or at least to regard themselves as placed in a closer relation and fellowship to the Jewish people (Baumgarten). Were this the case, we cannot see why the decree should not have attached itself more precisely and fully to the Noahic precepts, to which not a single one of the four points expressed belonged; and therefore the matter has nothing at all in common with the proselytism of the gate. — 3. That the proposal of James, and the decree drawn up in accordance with it, were to have no permanent force as a rule of conduct, is clear from the entire connection in which it arose. It was called forth by the circumstances of the times; it was to be a compromise as long as these circumstances lasted; but its value as such was extinguished of itself by the cessation of the circumstances — namely, as soon as the strengthening of the Christian spirit, and of the Christian moral freedom of both parties, rendered the provisional regulation superfluous.

Therefore Augustine strikingly remarks (c. Manich. 82. 18): "Elegisse mihi videntur pro tempore rem facilem et negaquam observantibus onerosam, in qua cum Israelitis etiam gentes propter angularem illum lapidem duos in se condentem aliquid committer observarent. Transacto vero illo tempore, quo illi duo paries, unus de circumcisione alter de praeputo cenientes, quane mis in anguari lapide concordarent, tamen suis quibusdam propriatibus distintiis eminabant, ac ubi ecclesia gentium talis effecta est, ut in ea nullus Israelita carnaliam apparent: quis jam hoc Christianus observat, ut turdas vel minutiore aviculas non attingat, nisi quarum sanguis offusus est, aut leporem non edat,

1 Comp. on the latter, Rom. 1. 21 f.
2 Comp. also Ritschi, altkath. K. p. 192; Wissler, p. 185; Hoftzmann, Judench. v. Christentum, p. 271 f.
3 See the same in Sanh. 56 a b; Maimonides, Tr. Melacha, 9. 1.
4 These forbid: (1) idolatry; (2) blasphemy; (3) murder; (4) incest; (5) robbery; (6) disobedience to magistrates; (7) partaking of flesh cut from living animals.
5 Comp. also Oort, p. 242; Hofmann, A. Schriften d. N. T. I. p. 198 f.
6 Comp. Ritschi, altkath. K. p. 198 f.
Si manu a curvis percurrente cruento vulneris occlusus est? Et qui forte pauci tangere ista formidant, a censeris irritantur, ita omnium animos in hac re tenuit sententia veritatis." In contrast to this correct view stand the Canon. apost. 69 (e τις ἐπικακος ἤ πρεβεβδερος ἤ διακονος ἢ διδω τον καταλογον των ιερατικων φαγη κρα ἐν αἰματι ψυχις αὐτω, ἢ θηρίατων ἢ θυσιασων, καθαρει- σιω του ταρα ὁ νόμος ἀπειν φα. ν ἡ λατσ ἡ ἀφοριζω, and not less the Clementine Homilies, vii. 4, and many Fathers in Suicer, Thea. I. p. 118, as also the Concil. Trull. II. Can. 67, and exegetical writers cited in Wolf. It is self-evident withal, that not only the prohibition of πορνεία, but also the general moral tenor and fundamental thought of the whole decree, the idea of Christian freedom, to the use of which merely relative limits given in the circumstances, and not an absolute ethical limitation, must be assigned, have permanent validity, such as Paul exhibited in his conduct and teaching. — 4. The Tübingen criticism, finding in Gal. ii. the Archimedean point for its lever, has sought to relegate the whole narrative of the apostolic council and its decree to the unhistorical sphere; because the comparison with Gal. ii. exhibits contradictions, which cause the narrative of the Acts to be recognized as an ironic fiction. It is alleged, namely, that by its incorrect representation the deeply seated difference between the Jewish-Christianity of the original apostles and Paulinism free from the law was to be as much as possible concealed, with a view to promote union. Holtzmann* more cautiously weighs the matter, but still expresses doubt. The contradictions, which serve as premisses for the attack upon our narrative, are not really present in Gal. ii. 1 ff. For—and these are the most essential points in the question—in Gal. ii. Paul narrates the matter not in a purely historical interest, but in personal defence of his apostolic authority, and therefore adduces incidents and aspects of what happened at Jerusalem, which do not make it at all necessary historically to exclude our narrative. Moreover, even in Gal. ii. the original apostles are not in principle at variance, but at one; with Paul, as follows from ver. 6, from the reproach of hypocrisy made against Peter, vv. 12, 13, which supposes an agreement in conviction between him and Paul, from the

---

1 Comp. also the Erlangen Ztschr. f. Protest. u. K., July 1851, p. 53, where the abstinence from things strangled and from blood is reckoned as a "precipitate on the part of the external Levitical ordinances" to be preserved in the church.


3 Judenh. und Christenh. p. 568 ff.
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镱用自己的 eyes, vers. 14, and from the speech in common, vers. 19 ff. Further, in Gal. ii. Paul is not contrasted with the original apostles in respect of doctrine, for the circumcision of Titus was not demanded by them, but as regards the field of their operations in reference to the same gospel, ver. 9. By καρ' idios, again, Gal. ii. 2, is meant a private conference, which had nothing to do with the transactions of our narrative; nor is the care for the poor determined on, Gal. ii. 10, a matter excluding the definitions of our decree, particularly as Paul only describes an agreement which had been made, not in any sort of public assembly, but merely between him and the three original apostles; the observance of the decree was an independent matter, and was understood of itself. In fine, the absence of any mention of the council and decree in the Pauline Epistles, particularly in the Epistle to the Galatians, and even in the discussion on meats offered in sacrifice, 1 Cor. viii. 10, 23 ff., is completely intelligible from the merely interim nature and purpose of the statute; as well as, on the other hand, from the independence of his apostleship and the freedom of believers from the law, which Paul had to assert more and more after the time of the council in his special apostolic labours, and always to lay greater stress on, in opposition to the Judaism which ever raised itself anew. Indeed, the very circumstance that the proposals for the decree proceed from James, is in keeping with his position as the highly respected head of the Jewish-Christians, and is a testimony of his wise moderation, without making him answerable for the Judaistic narrowness and strictness of his followers. And there could be the less scruple to consent on the part of Paul, as, in fact, by this lenitio ad the non-circumcision of the Gentiles had completely conquered, and he thereby saw the freedom and the truth of the gospel securely established, while at the same time the chief vice of heathenism, πορνεία, was rejected, and the right application of the other three prohibitions, in accordance with the γυναικεῖς and ἀγάπη which his Gospel promoted, was more and more to be expected in confidence on the Lord and His Spirit. Ver. 21. θάνατον gives the reason why it was indispensable to enjoin this fourfold διπλωματικ—or-namely, because the preaching of the Mosaic law, taking place from ancient generations in every city every Sabbath day by its being read in the synagogues, would only tend to keep alive the offence which the Jewish-Christians, who still adhered to the synagogue, took to their uncircumcised brethren, in view of the complete freedom of the latter from the law, including even these four points. These words thus assign

1 See evasions, on account of εὑρέσεις, in Schwengler and Baur.
2 Comp. on ver. 6.
3 See on Gal., Introd. § 3.
4 Comp. Jus. 25, 25, 12.
5 Gal. ii. 12.
6 Gal. ii. 3 ff.
7 2 Cor. iii. 17; Rom. viii. 15. See, in addition, on Gal. ii.
8 See Dastardick in the Göttling Monatsschr.
9 1847, p. 288 ff.
10 Comp. Lechler, apost. Zeitalt. p. 221 f.
a ground for the proposal on the score of necessity, corresponding to the ἐπανάγεις in the decree, ver. 28, and, indeed, of the necessity that there must be, at least so far, accommodation to the Mosaic law. Others: περιτον τοις Ἰουδαίοις ταύτα ἐπιστέλλειν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου ταύτα μανδάνων κ.τ.λ., scholion in Matthaei, Chrysostom, Lyra, and many others, and recently Neander. Out of place, as there was no question at all about an instruction for the Jewish-Christians. Erasmus, Wetstein, Thiersch, and others still more arbitrarily import the idea: "Neque est metuendum, ut Moses propter ea antiquetur;" or: it is not to be feared that the Mosaic law generally will be neglected and despised. Still more freely Gieseler reads between the lines what is supposed to be meant: "The Mosaic law already has been so long preached, and yet there are few who submit to embrace it. Now, when the service of the true God is preached without the yoke of the law, many are turning to Him, and it is indisputable that the ceremonial law is the only obstacle to the universal diffusion of true religion." Lange, II. p. 183, likewise imports: "We have nothing further to do. To assert the statutes of Moses is not our office; there are already preachers for that." Similarly Hofmann, who, however, discovers under the words of James the presupposition as self-evident, that Gentiles, if they pleased, might along with the faith embrace also the law of Moses; to those, who wished to become Mosaic, nothing need be said about the law, because they would always have an opportunity to become acquainted with it. As if one could read-in such a very important presupposition as self-evident! And as if Paul and Barnabas could have been silent at a proposition so entirely anti-Pauline! Further, we cannot see how what Brenke finds as the meaning, considering the proselytes of the gate as those to whom the κρίσατον took place, is contained in the words: the κρίσατον has the notion of publicity and solemnity, but not of novelty (Brenke), which even passages such as Gal. v. 11, Rom. ii. 21, should have prevented him from assuming. Lastly, Wieseler finds in the words the designed inference: consequently these statutes have for long been not a thing unheard of and burdensome for these Gentiles, because there are among them many proselytes. But even thus the chief points are mentally supplied (r).

Ver. 29. Ἐκλεγάμενοι is not to be taken, with Beza, Er. Schmid, Kuinoel, and others, for ἐκλέχθαις, as the middle aorist never has a passive signification; on the contrary, the correct explanation is, accusative with the infinitive: after they should have, not had, chosen men from among them, of ἐκεί. It is the simple: he has them, they do not fail him.

1 So Grotius and Ewald, p. 472.

2 Thus in substance also Schneekenburger, Zeller, Baumgarten, Hilgenfeld. Peculiarly ingenious, but importing what is not in the text, is the view of Bengel: "Prophetas citavi, non Mosen, cujus consensum est aperior," holding that James had Deut. xxxii. 21 in view.

3 In Stuhlmann and Tischner's Archiv. f. Kirchengesch. IV. p. 319. Baur, ed. 1, also adopted the explanation of Gieseler. But in the second edition, I. p. 187, he interprets it as if James wished to say: "a worship so ancient as the Mosaic is perfectly entitled to such a demand." This, however, is in no way contained in the words, in which, on the contrary, the point is the ancient preaching and the constant reading.

4 Schriften, II. 2. p. 41.


6 On Gal. ii. 11 ff., p. 148.

7 Comp. ver. 40.
to send them, i.e. to choose and to send men. — Nothing further is known of Judas Barsabas, whom Grotius and Wolf consider as a brother of Joseph Barsabas, i. 23. Ewald considers him as identical with the person named in x. 23. Concerning Silas, i.e. Silvanus, the apostolic companion of Paul on his journeys in Asia Minor and Greece, see Cellar. de Sila viro apost., Jena, 1773; Leyrer in Herzog’s Encycl. XIV. p. 369. These two men, who were of the first rank and influence among the Christians, were sent to Antioch to give further oral explanation, ver. 27.

Vv. 23, 24. Γράψαντες] while they wrote, should properly agree in case with ἐκλέγαμένους. Anacoluthia in carrying out the construction by participles is frequent; here it conforms to the logical subject of ἐδόξη τοῖς κ. τ. λ.6 — διὰ χειρός αὐτῶν] so that they were to be the bearers of the letter. — As the letter was directed not only to Antioch and to Syria, whose capital and chief church was Antioch, but also to Cilicia, we are to infer that in this province also similar dissensions between Jewish and Gentile Christians had taken place, and had come to the knowledge of the apostolic assembly. — The genuineness of the letter is supported as well by its whole form—which, with all distinctness as to the things forbidden, the designation of which is repeated exactly in xxi. 25, yet has otherwise so little official circumstantiality, that it evidently appears intended to be orally supplemented as regards the particulars—as also by the natural supposition that this important piece of writing would soon be circulated in many copies (xxi. 25), and therefore might easily, in an authentic form, pass into the collection of Luke’s sources. — καὶ οἱ ἄδελφοι] i.e. the whole church, ver. 23 (q3). — Χαίρειν] the well-known epistolary salutation of the Greeks.7 The letter addressed to Greek Christians was certainly written in Greek. But that it was actually composed by James8 does not follow at least from Jas. i. 1, although it is in itself possible, and indeed from his position in Jerusalem even probable. The similarity in the expression of the decree with Luke i. 1, does not justify us in doubting the originality of that expression, as the subdivision in the protasis and apodosis was very natural, and the use of ἐδόξη almost necessary. — ἀνακεντιάσοντες] destroying, subverting, elsewhere neither in the N. T. nor in the LXX. and Apocrypha.10 — λέγοντες περὶ τῶν.] without δειν, because in λέγη. the sense of commanding is implied.11 — The τρεῖν τ. νόμον is the ζυγὸς, ver. 10, which was imposed with circumcision, Gal. v. 3. And the νόμος is the whole law, not merely the ceremonial part. — οἶς οὖν σωτηρία.] So arbitrarily had they acted.

1 Comp. Vulg., and see Kypke, II. p. 73; Winer, p. 239 (E. T. 319 f.).
2 See on 2 Cor. i. 19.
3 xvii. 4, x. 14 f., xviii. 5, also 1 Pet. v. 12.
5 See Bernhardt, p. 463; Winer, p. 527 (E. T. 709); also Phügk, ad Eur. Hec. 970.
6 According to Schwannebeck, the letter is derived from the "Memoirs of Silas." In this view, of course, it must be assumed that ἀνάρας ἤγουμι., ver. 22, did not stand in the text at all, or not here.
8 Bengel, Bleeck in the Stud. w. Erflm. 1866, p. 1037.
9 Schwegler, Zeller.
10 But see Xen. Cyr. v. 2. 25; Polyb. i. 21. 6, i. 33. 8; Dom. 893. 3. "Non curant ille, qui sublatae inveniunt," Bengel.
11 Küthner, ad Xen. Anab. v. 7. 34. Comp. on xiv. 14.
Vv. 25–28. Гενομένους ὁμοθυμαδῶν] after we had become unanimous. Thus it was not a mere majority of voices: "non parum ponderis addit decreto concors sententias," Grotius. On γίνεσθαι with an adverb in the sense of a predicate, see Bernhardy, p. 387. Comp. on John i. 15. — Βαρνάβας κ. Παύλω.] This order, after chap. xiii. almost always inverted, is justly regarded by Bleek as a proof of fidelity to the documentary source. The placing of Barnabas first was very natural to the apostles and to the church in Jerusalem, on the ground of the older apostolic position of the man who in fact first introduced Paul himself to the apostles. Also at xiv. 14, xv. 12, this precedence has its ground in the nature of the circumstances. — ἀνθρώπως κ.τ.λ.] men who have given up, exposed to the danger of death, their soul for the name, for its glorification, v. 41, of our Lord Jesus Christ. παραδίδων τὴν σωτηρίαν, the opposite of ἀδίκως σώον τ. ψυχήν, Luke ix. 24, is not to be identified with τιθέναι τ. ψ., and the two are not to be explained from the Hebrew פָּשַׁת דָּשַׁם, in opposition to Grotius, Kuinoel, Olshausen. The purpose of these words of commendation is the attestation of the complete confidence of the assembly in the Christian fidelity, proved by such love to Christ, of the two men who had been sent from Antioch, and who perhaps had been slandered by the Judaistic party as egotistic falsifiers of the gospel. Comp. Grotius. — καὶ αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ.] who also themselves, i.e. in person, along with this our written communication, make known the same thing orally. — ἀπαγγέλλω.] stands not for the future, against Grotius, Hammond, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, but realizes as present the time when Judas and Silas deliver the letter and add their oral report. — τὰ αὐτά] namely, what we here inform you of by letter. Neander takes it otherwise: the same, that Barnabas and Paul have preached to you, namely, that faith in the Redeemer, even "without the observance of the law, suffices," etc. Against this view διὰ λόγου is decisive, by which τὰ αὐτά necessarily retains its reference to what was communicated by letter. — τῷ ἄγιῳ πνεύματι καὶ ἡμῖν] The agreement of the personal activity of the advisers themselves with the illuminating and confirming influence of the Holy Spirit experienced by them when advising. Comp. v. 32. Well does Calovius remark: "Conjunctur causae principalis et ministerialis decerti." Olshausen supposes that it is equivalent to τῷ ἁγίῳ πν. εἰς ἡμῖν. Just as arbitrarily and erroneously, Grotius, Piscator, and many others hold that there is here a ἐν διὰ δούλοιν, nobis per Sp. St. Neander: through the Holy Spirit we also, like Paul and Barnabas, have arrived at the perception. To this is opposed εἰς οὖς, which, in accordance with ver. 22, must necessarily denote the determination of the council, and therefore forbids the reference of the καὶ ἡμῖν to Paul and Barnabas, which reference, at any rate, see before on τὰ αὐτά, is remote from the context. — ἡμῖν] includes, according to vv. 22, 28, also the church, to which, of course, Bellarmin and

---

1 Comp. Plat. Prot. p. 813 C.  
2 See on John x. 11.  
3 According to Zeller, p. 446, these commendatory words are calculated by the author for his readers, as indeed the whole book is held to be only a letter of commendation for Paul.  
4 διὰ λόγου, see Raphel, Pol.  
5 Ewald, p. 476, appropriately remarks: "The mention of the Holy Spirit, ver. 28, is the most primitive Christian thing imaginable."
other Catholics concede only the consensus tacitus. — τὰ ἑπάνωνες] the things necessary. 2 The conjectural emendations, ἐν' ἀδύνατον* and ἐν ἁγίασθαι* are wholly unnecessary. That ἑπάνωνες* is an adverb, see in Schaefer. 9 The necessity here meant is not a necessity for salvation (Zeller), but a necessity conditioned by the circumstances of the time. See on ver. 20 f.

Ver. 29. The points mentioned in ver. 20 are here arranged more accurately, so that the three which refer to food are placed together. — ἀπε-χεισαλ] is in ver. 20, as in 1 Thess. iv. 3, v. 22, Ecclus. xxviii. 8, and frequently in the LXX., joined with ἀνεῖ; but here, as usually among Greek writers, only with the genitive. The two differ "non quod rem ipsam, sed modo cogitandi, ita ut in priori formula sejunctionis cognitatio ad rem, in posteriori autem ad nos ipsum referatur." — τέ ὃν διαπρονεῖς εἰναικόν] from which, i.e., at a distance from, without fellowship with them, ye carefully keeping yourselves. 6 — εἰ τῇ πράξει not: ye shall do well — so usually, also de Wette, comp. x. 33 — but, as also Hofmann interprets it according to the usuus loquendi, ye shall fare well, namely, by peace and unity in Christian fellowship. Quite incorrectly, Elsner, Wolf, Krebs, Kuinoel have understood the meaning as equivalent to σωθείσθησθε, which egregiously and injuriously mistakes the apostolic spirit, that had nothing in common with the οὐ δώσατε σωθείσθαι of the strict legalists. — ἐρρωτησε] the epistolary valete. 10

Vv. 31, 32. 'Ἐνι τῇ παρακλήσει] for the consolation, which the contents of the letter granted to them. They now saw Christian liberty protected and secured, where the abrupt demand of the Jewish-Christians had formerly excited so much anxiety. The meaning cohortatio, arousing address, 11 is less suitable to the contents of the letter and to the threatening situation in which they had been placed. — καὶ αὐτοῖ] is to be explained in keeping with ver. 27; and so to be connected, not, as is usually done, with προς ὄντες, as they also, as well as Paul and Barnabas, were prophets, but with ᾧ λέγον p. παρεκλά. κ. ἡ. Judeas and Silas also personally, as the letter by writing, comforted and strengthened the brethren by much discourse, which they could the more do, since they were prophets. 12 The παρεκλήσεων must be interpreted like παρακλήσει, and so not συνεταβαντ, as usually. 13

Vv. 33–35. Ποιεῖν χρόνον] to spend a time. — μετ' εἰρήνησι] i.e. so that welfare (ΣΩΤΗΡ) was bidden to accompany them, amidst good wishes. A refer-

1 See, on the contrary, Calovius.
2 Bernhardy, p. 338; Kypke, II. p. 75 f.
3 Salmasius.
4 Bentley.
8 Comp. John xvii. 5; Prov. xxv. 33: διατηρεῖ ἐν ὁλίγοις τὴν ὁμοίου κύριο; also the corresponding connection with ἀνέ, Ps. xii. 8; Jaa i. 97.
11 Beza, Castalio, and others.
12 See on xi. 27.
13 Comp. Vulgate; and see ver. 27, τῇ αὐτῇ. 14 Dem. 392. 18. See Wetstein and Jacobs, ad Anth. ii. 3, p. 44; also Schaefer, ad Bos. Ead. p. 418.
ence to the formula of parting: παρείναι or ἔπαγε ἐις εἰρήνην, or ἐν εἰρήνῃ. The καὶ between ἄδικος. and εἰς ἱστ. is exopœgistical. — τῶν λόγ. τοῦ Κυρ.] see on viii. 25. — At this period, ver. 35, occurs the encounter of Paul with Peter (Gal. ii. 11 ff.) The quite summary statement, ver. 35, makes the non-mention of this particular incident intelligible enough, and therefore there is no reason for the fiction that Luke desired, by the narrative of the strife between Paul and Barnabas, merely to mask the far more important difference between him and Peter. This passing and temporary offence had its importance in the special interest of the Epistle to the Galatians, but not in the general historical interest of Luke, which was concerned, on the other hand, with the separation of Paul and Barnabas and of their working. The objections of Wieseler to the assumed coincidence of time have little weight. In particular, the indefinite statements of time, vv. 33, 35, 36, allow space enough. — As to the spuriousness of ver. 34, see on ver. 40 (a?).

Ver. 36. Δῆ] see on xiii. 2. — ἐν αἰσ] because πάσαν πόλιν contains a distributive plurality. — ἐν τῇ ἐκκλ. how their state is, their internal and external Christian condition. The reference to ἐπισκόπους, τοῖς ἀδελφ. depends on well-known attraction. Moreover, Bengel well remarks that πῶς ἐκκλ. is the nervus visitationis ecclesiasticae.

(a?) Vv. 38, 39. But Paul judged it not right to take with them this one who had fallen away from them from Pamphylia, etc. — Observe the μη συμπαραλαβεῖν standing in sharp opposition to the συμπαραλαβεῖν of ver. 37, and the τὸνων significantly repeated at the close. The purposely chosen ἀποστάνα, and the decisive rejection which Paul founded on this falling away, even in opposition to the highly esteemed Barnabas, who did not wish to discard his cousin, proves that the matter was not without grave fault on the part of Mark. Fickleness in the service of Christ was to Paul's bold and decided strength of character and firmness in his vocation the foreign element, with which he could not enter into any union either abstractly or for the sake of public example. — This separation was beneficial for the church, because Barnabas now chose a sphere of operation for himself. Ver. 39; 1 Cor. ix. 6. And as to Mark, certainly both the severity of Paul and the kind reception given to him by Barnabas were alike beneficial for his ministerial fidelity, Col. iv. 10, 2 Tim. iv. 11. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ Παύλου φοβερῶν ἐπέστρεψεν αὐτὸν τὸ δὲ Βαρνάβα χρηστὸν ἐποίει μικρές ἀπολειφθήναι. Ὡστε μάχανται μὲν, πρὸς ἐν δὲ τέλος ἀπαντᾷ τὸ κέρδος (Chrysos-

1 xvi. 36; Mark v. 34; Luke vii. 50, vili. 48; Jas. ii. 16.
2 The added μεν δὲ καὶ ἐριπ. πολλῶν, with yet many others, shows how very great the field of labour at Antioch was.
3 vv. 37 ff.
4 Schrader, Schneckenburger, Baur.
5 On Gal. ii. 11.
6 Winer, p. 194 (K. T. 177).
7 ἄγιον, comp. xxvili. 28; Xen. Anab. v. 5. 9; Mem. ii. 1. 9.
8 Comp. xiii. 13. Luke does not mention the later reunion (Col. iv. 11; Phil. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 11), which, if the view as to the book being intended as a reconciliation of Paulinism and Petrinism were correct, must occasion great surprise, as Mark was a disciple of Peter.
9 Col. iv. 10.
10 Mark had been of Χριστόν ἀρνεώμενος, ἀλλὰ τὸν δρόμον τοῦ πολεύν καὶ βαρύν παρατηρήμα-
μενος, Oecumenius.
tom). — παρεξήγητας] an exasperation. The expression is purposely chosen; it was οίκες ἔχοντας ὑήδε φίλονες (Chrysostom). But the thing itself had its ground in the ἀνθρωπίνη διανοηθ, according to its relation to the difference of the character confronting it, οὐ γὰρ ἴκαν λίθοι ἡ ζιλοι, Chrysostom.

Vv. 40, 41. Ἐπιλέγαμεν Σίλαν] after he had chosen Silas as his apostolic companion. It is accordingly to be assumed that Silas, ver. 27, after he had returned to Jerusalem, ver. 38, and had along with Judas given an account of the result of their mission, had in the meantime returned to Antioch. But the interpolation, ver. 34 (see the critical remarks), is incorrect, as the return of Silas to Jerusalem was a necessary exigency of the commission which he had received. ἰπιλέγεσθαι, in the sense sibi eligere, only here in the N. T.; often in Greek writers, the LXX., and Apocr. — παραδοθ. τῇ χάρ. τ. Κυρίου] committed to the grace of Christ (see the critical remarks). Comp. ver. 11. Not different in substance from xiv. 38, but here expressed according to a more specifically Christian form. Moreover, the notice, compared with ver. 39, leads us to infer, with great probability, that the church of Antioch in the dispute before us was on the side of Paul. — τὴν Συρ. κ. Καλαμ.] as Barnabas, ver. 39, so Paul also betook himself to his native country; from their native countries the two began their new, and henceforth for ever separated, missionary labours. Barnabas is unjustly reproached, by Baumgarten, with repairing to his own country, instead of to the wide fields of heathenism; in point of fact, we know not the further course which he adopted for his labours.

Notes by American Editor.

(m*) Except ye be circumcised. V. 1.

These words introduce one of the most exciting and important controversies in the history of the Christian Church—the first famous controversy, which threatened the disruption of the church into two sections—a Jewish and a Gentile church—or, as Meyer designates them, Pharisee Christians and Gentile Christians. The only other topics of equal moment which have arisen are the doctrine of the Trinity, which shook the church to its foundation in the fourth century—a question concerning the person of Christ; and the doctrine of justification by faith, which was the grand central truth of the Protestant Reformation—a question concerning the work of Christ. The question which so early and so long agitated the primitive church was whether the law of circumcision was still obligatory or abrogated? whether it was necessary to require all to enter the church through the gate of Judaism? or, regarding these rites as superseded by a new dispensation, to open the door for all who simply believed on the Lord Jesus. The conservative party held that circumcision was a divine ordinance, and asked by what authority these new teachers set aside or changed what God had established? Not only did they make circumcision a condition of church communion, but excluded the uncircumcised from the hope of salvation. So that the real question at issue between the disputants

1 Dem. 1105. 94; Deut. xxix. 29; Jer. xxxii. 87.
was whether Christianity should be confined to the narrowness of a Jewish sect, or be propagated as the religion of the world?—the distinction, in this respect, between Jew and Gentile being forever done away.

The Judaizing teachers declared that it was necessary for the Gentiles "to be circumcised and to keep the law of Moses." Paul and Barnabas asserted that this was directly opposed to the principles of the Gospel—that the true Christian doctrine is, "that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself," and that "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." The controversy waxed warm at Antioch, and, as the church at Jerusalem was the mother church, and many of the apostles were there, the congregations desired to know what was the view of the question entertained there; so a deputation of enquiry was sent. Paul and Barnabas, and Titus also (Gal. ii. 1), were of the embassy.

(n°) Apostles and elders. V. 6.

We know not how many of the apostles were present. Peter, John, and James the Lord's brother, and probably others were there; as were also Paul and Barnabas, Silas, Titus, and Judas. With the apostles and elders gathered the brethren for counsel, and the decision arrived at was announced in the name of all. After some preliminary and exciting discussions, Peter arose and addressed the assembly. Partly on account of his age and eminent position, and partly because he first admitted the Gentiles to the church without circumcision, he speaks first. His position was one of authority, but not of primacy. And his authority was that of personal character and practical experience, nothing more. In his cogent and conclusive address Peter shows that the question had already been decided by God himself, since by the effusion of his Spirit he had manifested his acceptance of the Gentiles. Now therefore why tempt ye God? Seeing that we all believe that Jew and Gentile alike are saved by the grace of God through faith in Christ Jesus, it is neither reasonable, nor in harmony with the will of God, to fetter that grace with superfluous and vexatious conditions. "The Spirit of God, through the apostle, now put an end to the 'much disputing,' and the decisive reply derived from God's testimony had been made perceptible to all." (Stier.) All the assembly kept silent and listened to the account given them by Barnabas and Paul of the wonders of divine grace among the Gentiles.

(o°) James answered. V. 13.

"We, as many others, consider that this James was not the apostle James, the son of Alpheus, but James the brother of the Lord, who was not one of the twelve, but was regarded the head of the church at Jerusalem, mentioned in xii. 17, and Gal. ii. 9." (Stier.) See also note on i. 14. It is generally supposed that he was president of the council. He was, at least, the last to speak, and delivered the judgment of the assembly. He is spoken of in ecclesiastical history as bishop of Jerusalem, and also as a legalist or strict observer of the Mosaic law. In his address he confirms all that Peter had said, and shows from prophecy that God had a purpose of mercy toward the Gentiles; and to insist on making a partial and temporary ritual a condition of
church membership was an attempt to frustrate the purposes of God. For his part, he was prepared to admit the Gentiles, even in uncircumcision. His opinion would carry great weight, both from his reputed sanctity and sagacity, but also from his well-known Hebrew sympathies. He proposed that the Gentiles should not be troubled on the question of circumcision, but simply enjoined to abstain from certain things, which were either indifferent in themselves, or immoral, and therefore to be avoided. The great end sought in this deliverance which was adopted by the assembly was the reconciliation of the hostile parties and the peace of the church. "The true meaning appears to be that the Gentiles should abstain from these things in order to avoid giving offence to the Jews; for in every city the law is preached every Sabbath, and so these matters are brought prominently forward; and thus, unless there be an abstinence from these particulars, the preaching of the law would perpetuate the offence of the Jewish to the Gentile Christians. In order, then, to maintain peace, let the Gentile Christians abstain from those actions which are regarded by the Jews as causing pollution." (Gloag.) These are substantially the views of Meyer presented in the text. And Alford says: "Living, as the Gentile converts would be, in the presence of Jewish Christians who heard those Mosaic prohibitions read, as they had been from generations past, in their synagogues, it would be well for them to avoid all such conduct and habits as would give unnecessary offense."

(π) Paul's visits to Jerusalem. V. 21.

In the Acts five visits of Paul to Jerusalem are mentioned—ix. 26, xi. 30, xv. 4, xviii. 22, and xxi. 15. In the Epistle to the Galatians two visits are mentioned—Gal. i. 18, and ii. 1. The first in each case is clearly identical. There are, however, different opinions as to the second referred to in the Epistle. All admit it cannot be either the first or the fifth mentioned in the Acts. Some suppose Paul to have made a visit which is not recorded in Luke's narrative—possible, but not probable. Others think that in the Epistle reference is made to the second visit. But the date—fourteen years after his conversion—precludes the possibility of that conjecture being correct. The fourth visit has also its advocates, but their arguments are not at all clear or satisfactory.

It is almost certain that in the Epistle the apostle refers to this visit to the council, as Meyer indicates. The result of the whole discussion is thus stated by Conybeare: "If the Galatian visit be mentioned at all in the Acts, it must be identical with the visit at which the (so-called) council took place." "The Galatian visit could not have happened before the third visit; because, if so, the apostles at Jerusalem had already granted to Paul and Barnabas the liberty which was sought for the ἑγερέλων τῆς ἄκροδοστίας; therefore there would have been no need for the church to send them again to Jerusalem upon the same cause. And, again, the Galatian visit could not have happened after visit third; because almost immediately after that period Paul and Barnabas ceased to work together as missionaries to the Gentiles; whereas, up to the time of the Galatian visit they had been working together." This conclusion is clear and satisfactory, and is adopted not only by Meyer, but by many able commentators.
The word used means to rejoice or be glad. It is only found elsewhere in N. T., James i. 1. As this letter was, in all probability, either written or dictated by James, this coincidence certainly suggests that he also wrote the Epistle that bears his name. The letter written and sent to the churches was of the nature of a compromise, framed with great sagacity and foresight as a concordat between the contending parties. The advocates of freedom would be satisfied, because circumcision and the rites of the Mosaic law were not to be insisted on; the other party, influenced by the discussion, and specially by the speeches of James and of Peter, the apostle of the circumcision, would accept the allowance made to their scruples in other matters. But their acquiescence in the decision was only temporary. They did not relinquish their opinions, and were soon more active than ever in disseminating them. They followed Paul everywhere; and to the end of his life he maintained a fearless and forceful protest against their persistent attempts to infringe the liberty wherewith Christ makes his people free. "The decision of the council at Jerusalem was a great step in advance. Had it been otherwise, had they decided that circumcision and the observance of the law of Moses were necessary, the progress of Christianity would have been impeded. But now Gentile Christianity could be freely propagated without let or hindrance: all the obstacles which stood in the way of its diffusion were removed, and the apostolic church was delivered from legal bondage. We see the immediate effects of this decision in the joy and confidence which the reading of the decree imparted to the Christians at Antioch, and in the great success of Paul in his second missionary journey. The triumph of the free Christian over the Judaizing party was one great element in the success of the Gospel." (Gloag.)

This verse is wanting in the best mss. See critical notes by Meyer, who characterizes the verse as spurious. Alford says: "On every account it is probable that the words forming this verse in the received version are an interpolation." Bloomfield writes: "This verse is omitted in several mss. and versions, and is rejected" by many. Hackett says: "Griesbach, Lachman, Tischendorf, and others strike out this verse. Most of the mss. omit it or read it variably. It is a gloss probably, supposed to be required by verse 40." Gloag says: "Verse 34 is considered by the best critics as an interpolation, designed to account for the presence of Silas in Antioch." There is no difficulty, but even the highest propriety, in supposing that Silas first went to Jerusalem to make his report, and then returned to Antioch, of his own accord or at Paul's desire. This verse is omitted in the revised version.

The contention of Paul and Barnabas. V. 39.

They could not agree about the character of Mark and his fitness to accompany them on their missionary tour. Barnabas, influenced by the kindness and generosity of his disposition, and by his natural affection for Mark, as his sister's son, was disposed to take Mark; but Paul, viewing the matter, not on
any personal grounds, and constitutionally intolerant of vacillation or weakness, thought it was not right or fitting to take with them one who had previously been guilty of a serious dereliction of duty in leaving them and the work several years before. Barnabas insisted; Paul would not yield; and so they agreed to part. In this dispute both doubtless were at fault; both were angry and under undue excitement; nor is it ours to determine how far each was to be blamed, or which should be most censured. Nor need we inquire “whether Paul was chargeable with undue severity or Barnabas with nepotism, or both, or neither, all which alternatives have been maintained.” The contention or paroxism was of short duration, and produced no lasting effects on the mutual relations of the three men concerned. The warmth of their previous friendship, commenced probably in boyhood, fostered by mutual acts of kindness, and confirmed by common labors and dangers, made the breach between them all the more painful. This variance, however, did not in any degree diminish their zeal in their work, or permanently affect their regard for each other; and it was overruled for the wider diffusion of the Gospel. Paul took Silas and went his way; Barnabas took Mark and went his. But, as Alford observes: “It seems as if there were a considerable difference in the character of their setting out. Barnabas appears to have gone with his nephew without any special sympathy or approval; whereas Paul was commended to the grace of God by the assembled church.” Too much, however, may be inferred from the seeming difference, as Luke had no occasion to speak particularly of the departure of Barnabas and Mark. Barnabas henceforth disappears from the narrative of Luke altogether. But Paul in his Epistles speaks of him with the highest respect and affection; he also afterwards commends Mark, mentions him among the number of his fellow-laborers, and in his last letter to Timothy, the last he wrote, he expresses a wish to have Mark with him, as one who was profitable to him for the ministry (1 Cor. ix. 6, Gal. ii. 9, Col. iv. 10, Phil. 24, and 2 Tim. iv. 11). Taylor says: “These allusions, after all that had occurred, are equally creditable to both parties. They show that Mark had grown steady and brave, and was not above ministering to Paul; and they prove that Paul was not so mean as to keep up an old grudge, when all that caused it had been perfectly removed.” The fact that the dispute with Peter had occurred just before this, and that even Barnabas had been carried away with the temporizing spirit, may have had some influence on the mind of Paul. Stier favors Paul in this sad matter, as does also Calvin; Renan takes the part of Barnabas very strongly, and accuses Paul of pride, love of pre-eminence, and ingratitude. “Barnabas,” says he, “had not Paul’s genius, but who can say whether in the true hierarchy of souls, which is regulated by the degree of goodness, he would not occupy a more elevated rank?”
CHAPTER XVI.

Ver. 1. After γνωστὸς Elz. has τιμοῦ, which is decidedly spurious according to the evidence. — Ver. 3. τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ, δει τιμ. υπήρχεν] Lachm. reads δει τιμ. υπήρχεν according to A B C D E Ν, min. Rightly; the Recepta is a mechanical or designed transposition into the usual mode of expression by attraction. If the reading of Lachm. were a resolution of the attraction, 'Ελλην would not have been placed first. — Ver. 6. θελόντες] A B C D E Ν, min. and several vss. and Fathers have δει θελον, and in ver. 7 for the most part δε after θελόντες. Both are adopted by Lachm. and Born. The attestation of this reading is so preponderating, that it cannot be held as an emendation to avoid the recurrence of participial clauses. The Recepta, on the contrary, appears to have risen because of a wish to indicate that the hindrance of the Spirit took place only after passing through Phrygia and Galatia, which appeared necessary if Asia was understood in too wide a sense. The reading of the Vulg. presents another corresponding attempt: "transuenes autem... sed sunt." — Ver. 7. εἰς τ. Β.] Elz. has κατὰ τ. Β., against decisive evidence. Either a mere error of a copyist after the preceding κατά, or an intentional interpretation). — Προσέφυξι] is wanting in Elz., but supported by decisive evidence. If only προσέφυξε were original, the gloss added would not have been Προσέφυξι (for πν. Προσέφυξι is not elsewhere found in the N. T.), but, from the preceding, τὸ ἄγων. — Ver. 9. The order best attested and therefore to be adopted is: ἀνὴρ Μακεδῶν τίς ἦν. So Lachm., also Tisch., and Born.; the latter, however, has deleted τίς according to too weak evidence (it was superfluous), and, moreover, has in accordance with D adopted ἐν ὀράματι... ὢνθεὶ ὠτε ἤν τ. λ., an explanatory gloss, as also are the words κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ added after Ιστός (Born.). — Ver. 10. ὁ Γόριος] A B C D E Ν, min. Copt. Vulg. Jer. have ὁ Γόριος. Recommended by Griesb. and adopted by Lachm. The Recepta is a gloss in accordance with ver. 7 (προσέφυξι Ἰστό), comp. xiii. 2, or written on the margin in accordance with ii. 39. — Ver. 13. προσέφυξι] Approved already by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. instead of the usual πόλεως, against which A B C D Ν, min. Copt. Sahid. Vulg. Cant. witness. τις πόλεως was written by the side of τίς πόλης as a gloss (as some vss. have still τ. πόλης τ. πόλεως), and then supplanted the original. — ἐνομίζετο προσεφυξ[ι] A Β C D Ν, loth. 13, 40, Copt. Aeth. have ἐνομίζομεν προσεφυξ[ι]. So Lachm. An alteration, because the reading of the text was not understood. From the same misunderstanding the reading in D, Epiph. έδόκει προσεφυξ[ι] (so Born.) arose, and the translation of the Vulg., "ubi videbatur oratio esse." — Ver. 16. τήν προσεφυξ[ι] In Elz. the article is wanting, but is supported by preponderating evidence and by its necessity (ver. 13). — Προσέφυξ[ι] A B C D (?) Ν, loth. 33, Vulg. Cant. and some Fathers have προσέφυξ[ι]. Adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. Correctly; the accusative, not understood, was changed for the genitive as the more intelligible case, which was well known to the transcribers with προσέφυξ[ι] (comp. especially, Luke iv. 33). — Ver. 17. Instead of the second ἐμὸν, Tisch.
Born. have ἤπιον, contrary to A C G H, min. vs. and Fathers. But ἤπιος appeared less suitable, especially as a demoniacal spirit spoke from the παιδίσκη. — Ver. 24. Instead of ἐλπίδως read, with Lachm. and Born., λαβων on decisive evidence. — Ver. 31. Χριστόν] is with Lachm. and Tisch. to be deleted as a usual addition (comp. on xv. 11), on the authority of Α Β Κ, min. Copt. Vulg. Lucif. — Ver. 32. καὶ πάσιν] Α Β Σ Δ Κ Ω, min. Vulg. Cant. Lucif. have σών πᾶσιν. Approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. The καὶ easily crept in, because with it the dative πᾶσι τοῖς remained, and because καὶ ὁ οἰκὸς σου (ver. 31) preceded. — Ver. 34. ἡγαλλιώσας] C* (?), D, min. Chrys. Oec. Theophyl. have ἡγαλλιάγο. Approved by Griesb. and adopted by Born. and Tisch. With this weak attestation it is to be regarded as an easily committed error of a transcriber. — Ver. 39. ἔβαλεν τῆς πόλ. Lachm. and Tisch. read ἄπελθεν ἀπὸ τ. πόλ., according to Α Β Κ, min. A more definite and precise statement. — Ver. 40. πρὸς] Elz. has εἰς against decisive evidence.

Ver. 1, 2. Δέρμης κ. Λυστρ.] See on xiv. 6. — ἰκεῖ] does not refer to both cities, as Otto, Pastoralbr. p. 58, strangely assumes, but to the last named, Lystra. Here Timothy, whose conversion by Paul is to be referred to xiv. 6 f., was at that time residing (ὥν ἰκεῖ); probably it was also his native place,1 as may be inferred from ver. 2 (ἐμαρτύρειτο ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν Δίνστροις) compared with ver. 8 (ὑδέσσαι γὰρ ἄπαντες κ.τ.λ.). Usually, even by Olhausen and Neander, but not by de Wette and Baumgarten, Timothy is supposed to be a native of Derbe, on account of Acts xx. 4;2 ἰκεῖ is referred to Δέρμην, very arbitrarily, and ver. 2 is explained to mean that, besides the presupposed good report of his native city, Timothy had also the good report of the neighbouring cities of Lystra and Iconium; a very forced explanation, which Theophilus and the other first readers certainly did not hit upon! — γνωρίζει. Ἰουσ. πιστ.] The name of this Jewish-Christian was Eunice.3 Ἰουνίας is the adjective, John iii. 22, as also Ἐλληνος and Μακεδόν, ver. 9. Whether the father was a pure Gentile or a proselyte of the gate, the language employed 4 and the lack of other information leave entirely undecided. — ἐμαρτύρ.] as in vi. 8. — Ἰουνία] see on xii. 51. What were the peculiar circumstances, which had made Timothy honourably known in Iconium as well as in the place of his birth, we do not know.

Ver. 3. Apart from his superior personal qualifications, fostered by a pious education,4 Timothy was also well adapted to be the coadjutor of the apostle from the peculiar external relation in which he stood as belonging by parentage both to the Jewish and to the Gentile Christians. — λαβὼν περὶερευν] he took and circumcised. There is no reason whatever to suppose that Paul should not have himself performed this act, which might in fact be done by any Israelite.5 — διὰ τούτῳ Ἰουνίαος] namely, to avoid the offence which the Jews in the region of Lystra and Iconium would have taken, had Paul associated with himself one who was uncircumcised to go forth

1 With this Köhler also agrees in Hernog’s Ενοχλ. XVI. p. 169; Huther and Wiesinger leave it undecided; but Wieseler, p. 25 f., endeavours to uphold the usual view. But see on xx. 4.

2 But see remarks on that passage.

3 See 2 Tim. i. 5.

4 See on xx. 10.

5 See on xx. 15.

6 2 Tim. i. 5, iii. 15.

7 Comp. on Luke i. 59.
(ἐξῆλθεν) as his colleague in proclaiming the Messianic salvation. Paul acted thus according to the principle of wise and conciliatory accommodation, and not out of concession to the Judaistic dogmas of the necessity of circumcision for obtaining the Messianic salvation. He acted thus in order to leave no cause of offence at his work among the yet unconversed Jews of that region, and not to please Christian Jews, to whom, if they had demanded the circumcision of Timothy, as they did that of Titus at Jerusalem, he would as little have yielded as he did in the case of Titus. This entirely non-dogmatic motive for the measure, which was neither demanded by others nor yet took place with a view to Timothy’s own salvation or to the necessity of circumcision for salvation generally, removes it from all contradiction either with the apostolic decree, xv. 28, or with Gal. ii. 8; for in the case of Titus circumcision was demanded by others against his will, and that on the ground of dogmatic assertion, and so Paul could not allow that to be done on Titus, which he himself performed on Timothy. This we remark in opposition to Baur and Zeller, who attack our narrative as unhistorical, because it stands radically at variance with the apostle’s principles and character, so that it belongs “to the absolutely incredible element in the Book of Acts.”

Chrysostom has hit in the main on the correct interpretation: οὐδὲν Παῦλου συνετότερον ὥστε πάντα πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον ἔφερα . . . περίετεμεν ἵνα περιτομὴν καθῆλη. But the canon insisted on in the Talmud: partus sequitur ventrem, can hardly have been taken into consideration by the apostle, because Timothy was already a Christian, and thus beyond the stage of Judaism; and therefore it is not to be assumed, with Ewald, p. 482, that Paul had wished merely to remove the reproach of illegitimacy from Timothy—even laying aside the fact that Jewesses were not prohibited from marrying Gentiles, with the exception only of the seven Canaanitishe nations. The circumstance: νῦς γυναικὸς κ.κ., ver. 1, serves only to explain whence it happens that Timothy, whose Christian mother was known to be a Jewess, was yet uncircumcised; the father was a Gentile, and had in his paternal authority left him uncircumcised. — Observe, according to the correct reading ὡς Ἠλλην ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ ἔτηρχεν (see the critical remarks), the suitable emphasis with which the predicate is placed first: that a Greek his father was. ἔτηρχεν in the sense of εἶναι is used most frequently in the N. T. by Luke. An antithesis to φαίνεσθαι is arbitrarily and unsuitably imported by Otto.

Vv. 4, 5. Παρεδίδον ὀραλῶς, perhaps also partly in writing, by delivering to them a copy of the decree, xv. 23 ff.—αὐτοῖς] namely, to the Gentile-Christians in the towns, which the connection requires by φολασσεῖν. — ὁ

1 I Cor. ix. 19.
2 Erasmus in his Paraphrase (dedicated to Pope Clement VII.) observes: Non quod credere circumcisionem confère salutem, quam sola fides adferret, sed ne quid tumultus oríretur a Judæis. — Observe this distinctively Lutheran sola fides.
3 Gal. ii. 8 f.
4 Comp. Gal. v. 2.
6 See Wetstein.
7 In opposition to Thiersch and Lange, apost. Zeitalt. I. p. 108 f.
8 Ex. xxiii. 16; Deut. vii. 1 ff.
Luke ii. 1, the ordinances. — ἐν τῶν ἀυτοῖς κ.τ.λ. the mention of the leaders was sufficient; the co-operation of the church is, according to xv. 29 f., obvious of itself. — τῶν ἐν Ἱερουσ. belongs only to τ. πρεσβυτ. — Ver. 5. They developed themselves internally in steadfastness of faith, and externally in the daily increasing number of their members. On the former, comp. Col. ii. 5; καθ' ἰσορρ. belongs to ἐπηρεαστ. τ. ἀφοῦμο, comp. ii. 46.

Vv. 6, 7. According to the reading ἀπελθον and, ver. 7, ἐλθόντες δὲ (see the critical remarks): Now they went through Phrygia and Galatia, after they had been withheld by the Holy Spirit from preaching in Asia; but having come toward Mysia, they attempted, etc. Observe (1) that this hindrance of the Spirit to their preaching in Asia induced them, instead of going to Asia, to take their route through Phrygia and Galatia, and therefore the founding of the Galatian churches is correctly referred to this period; indeed, the founding of these may have been the immediate object aimed at in that hindrance. The fact that Luke so silently passes over the working in Phrygia and Galatia, is in keeping with the unequal character of the information given by him generally—an inequality easily explained from the diversity of his documents and intelligence otherwise acquired — so that it appears arbitrary to impute to him a special set purpose—Olshausen: he was hastening with his narrative to the European scene of action; Baumgarten: because the main stream of development proceeded from Jerusalem to Rome, and the working in question lay out of the line of this direction; and quite erroneously Schneckenburger: because there were no Jews to be found in those regions, and therefore Luke could not have illustrated in that case how Paul turned first to the Jews. Further, (2) Asia cannot be the quarter of the world in contrast to Europe, but only the western coast of Asia Minor, as in ii. 9, vi. 9. To that region his journey from Lycaonia—Derbe and Lystra, ver. 1—was directed; but by the hindrance of the Spirit it was turned elsewhere, namely, to Phrygia and Galatia, the latter taken in the usual narrower sense, not according to the extent of the Roman province at that time, as Böttger, Thiersch, and others suppose. — The hindering of the Spirit, taken by Zeller in the sense of the apostle's own inward tact, is in vv. 6, 7 to be regarded as an influence of the Holy Spirit — that is, of the objective Divine Spirit, not of "the holy spirit of prudence, which judged the circumstances correctly," de Wette—on their souls, which internal indication, they were conscious, was that of the Spirit. — κατὰ τ. Μυσίαν not: at (see ver. 8), but toward Mysia, Mysia-wards, in the direction of the border of that land. They wished from this to go northeastward to Bithynia; for in Mysia, which, along with Lydia and Caria, belonged to Asia, they were forbidden to preach. — τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰκονοῦ] i.e. the ἀγιὸν πνεῦμα, ver. 6; see on Rom. viii. 9.

Remark. According to the Received text (ἀπελθον ... ἐλθόντες), the rendering must be: having journeyed through Phrygia and Galatia, they endeavoured, after they had been withheld by the Holy Spirit from preaching in Asia, on coming

1 Whether he also planted churches in Phrygia, is unknown to us. The founding of the church in Colossae and Laodicea took place by means of others, Col. ii. 1.
2 Comp. also Zeller, p. 388.
3 Comp. on Gal. Introd. § 1.
Vv. 8-10. They were now between Mysia and Bithynia. To Bithynia the Spirit suffered them not to go; in Mysia they were not to preach, because it belonged to Asia. In this position of things they saw themselves directed to the West, away from all their former sphere of action, and across to Greece. This the Spirit now willed. Accordingly they had first to make for the Asiatic sea-coast, and therefore they went directly westward along the southern border of Mysia, of course without preaching, for this they were not permitted to do, and thus, having passed by Mysia (παρελθόντες τὴν Μυσίαν), they came down to Troas on the Hellespont, in order there to determine more precisely their further journey to the West, or to receive for this purpose a higher determination, which they might expect in accordance with the previous operations of the Spirit. And they received this higher determination by a visionary appearance \(^1\) which was made to the apostle during the night (ἡ δε νυκτός, as in v. 10). This vision \(^9\) is not to be considered as a dream, \(^8\) as is evident from the expression itself, and from the fact that there is no mention of a κατ’ ὄναρ or the like, or afterwards of an ἀνάστασις or other similar expression, but after the seeing of the vision the ἔζησαμεν κ. τ. λ. comes in without further remark. Olshausen, however, very hastily lays it down as a settled point, that revelation by dreams, as the lowest form of revelation, \(^4\) was no longer vouchedsafed to the apostles who were endowed with the Holy Spirit, but that they must have had their visions in ecstasy, always in a waking condition. We have far too little information as to the life of the apostles to maintain this.\(^6\)—Macedon] is used adjectively.\(^9\) As Macedonian the appearance announced itself, namely, by διὰβας ἐκ Macedonia. βοηθ. ἡμῖν. It is arbitrary in Grotius to say that an angel had appeared, and indeed “angelus curator Macedonum.” Something objectively real is not indicated by ἃρμα ὄφη.\(^7\) —ἔζησαμεν] we sought, directed our view to the necessity of procuring, first of all, the opportunity of a ship, etc. Here Luke, for the first time, includes himself in the narrative, and therefore it is rightly assumed that he joined Paul at Troas. He does not enter further on his personal relations, because Theophilus was acquainted with them. Olshausen arbitrarily thinks: from modesty. On and against the assumptions that Timothy \(^*\) or Silas* wrote the portions in which “we” occurs, see Intro. § 1. —

\(^1\) ἀρμα, ix. 10, x. 3, xviii. 9.
\(^9\) Taken by Baur, I. p. 166, ed. 2, only as an embellishment of the history, namely, as symbolizing the desire of salvation, with which not only the Macedonian population, but the men of Europe in general, called upon the apostle to come over to them. This view Zeller also, p. 251, considers as possible. It is in the connection of the entire narrative impossible, and simply tends to obscure the further occurrences as regards their historical character.
\(^8\) Heinrichs, Keilnoel, Zeller.
\(^4\) See Delitassch, Psychol. p. 264.
\(^6\) Comp. also ii. 17.
\(^9\) Comp. on v. 1 f. as in Thuc. i. 63. 3, 1. 63. 2.
\(^7\) Comp. x. 17.
\(^*\) Schleiermacher, Mayerhoff, Ulrich, Breeck.
\(^*\) Schwanbeck.
CALL TO MACEDONIA.

συμβιβάζοντες κ. α. λ.] because we gathered (colligebamus) as the meaning of that appearance, drew from it the conclusion,1 that in it there was issued to us the call of God (see the critical remarks), and the in itself indefinite βοήθησον ἡμῖν was the call for help to be afforded by communication of the gospel (προφητείας &c.).

Ver. 11. Εὐθυραμοῦ.] having sailed from Troas, see ran by a straight course, xxii. 1. The word is not preserved in Greek writers, who have, however, εὐθύραμος and as a verb, εὐθυράμω. — Samothrace, a well-known island off the coast of Thrace, in the Aegean Sea. — τῇ ἐποιέσθη διὸ προστερά, used by Greek writers both with (vii. 26) and without ἕμερα.2 In the N. T. it occurs only in Acts. — Neapolis, at an earlier period Datos,3 a seaport on the Strymonian Gulf, opposite the island of Thasos, at that time belonging to Thrace, but after Vespasian to Macedonia.4 On Philippi, formerly Krenides, named from the Macedonian Philip, who enlarged and fortified it, see the Introd. to Philipp. § 1. — πρῶτη τῆς μερίδος Μακεδ. κοινωνία πόλεως] As in that district of Macedonia, divided by Aemilius Paulus into four parts, Amphipolis was the capital, and πρῶτη πόλεως cannot therefore in a strict sense mean capital;5 all difficulty is removed simply by connecting, and not, as is usually done,6 separating, πόλεως κοινωνία: which is the first, in rank, colony-town of the part concerned of Macedonia.7 Thus it is unnecessary, with Kuinoel, Hug, and others,8 who separate πόλεις from κοινωνία, to take πρῶτη πόλεως in the sense of a city endowed with privileges—Bertholdt compares the French use of bonne ville—inscriptions on coins being appealed to, in which the formal epithet πρῶτη is given to Greek cities which were not capitals.9 In the case of Philippi itself no special privileges are known, except the general colonial rights of the jus Italicum; nor is the title πρῶτη found on the coins of Philippi, it is met with only in the case of cities in Asia Minor.10 Others take πρῶτη of local situation, so that they too separate πόλεως from κοινωνία: “Philippi was the first city of Macedonia at which Paul touched in his line of travel.” So Olshausen and Wieseler, following Erasmus, who, however, appears to join πόλεις κοιν., Cornelius a Lapide, Calovius, Raphael, Wolf, Bengel, Eckermann, Heinrichs. In this case we have not to consider Neapolis as the mere port of Philippi (Olshausen), but with Rettig, van Hengel, ad Phil. p. 4 ff., and De Wette, to lay stress on the fact that Neapolis at that time belonged to Thrace, and to take πρῶτη

2 See Lobek, ad Phryn. p. 464.
4 Sueton. Vesp. 8; Dio Cass. xiv. 35; Ptol. iii. 18. 9.
5 Niv. xiv. 20.
6 Without any reason, Wetstein imagined that after the battle at Philippi this city was raised to the capital. From the erroneous interpretation capital arose the reading γένοις κοινωνίας κατά τῆς Μακ., πόλεως κοινωνίας, which Bornemann regards as original.
7 Thus also Ewald, p. 405, according to whom Philippi, on account of its flourishing condition at that time, is assumed to be named “the first city of the province of Macedonia.” But μερίς does not mean province (κοινωνία, xxii. 34, xxv. 1).
8 Comp. also Baumgarten, who elaborately explains μερίς, as if τῆς οἰκειοσύνης stood alongside of it, so that τῆς Μακεδ. would be in apposition to τ. μερίδος. See also Credner, Diss. ii. p. 418 f.; Minyster, k. d. theol. Schr. p. 170.
9 See Eckhel. doctr. rer. num. i. 4. 289; Bockh, Corpus inscr. i. 2, No. 386.
10 See Rettig, Quaest. Phil. p. 5 ff.
(Luke did not write ἵππος) as an expression of the admitted state of things, that Philippi from that side is the first city, consequently the most easterly. But what reason could Luke have to make such an exact geographical specification, especially with regard to such a well-known city as Philippi? It is quite at variance with his manner elsewhere. And that too with the argumentatively (quīppe quae) emphatic ἵππος? This applies also in opposition to Grotius, who takes πόλις κολῷνια together, the first colonial city, but understands πρωτή also of the geographical situation. According to our view, there is conveyed in ἵππος an explanation of the motive for their going to Philippi in particular, seeing that it is, namely, the most noteworthy colonial-city of the district, so that the gospel might at once acquire a very considerable and extensive sphere of action in Macedonia. If in itself ἄξιωμα εὐτεποιεῖ ἑκατοντά τὸ φυλή (Chrysostom), this is yet more heightened by πρωτή. — On the combination of two substantives like πόλις κολῷνια, comp. Lobeck, Paralip. p. 344. Instead of κολῳνια, the Greek uses ἀποκρια or εὐπορία; instead of πόλις κολῳνια, πόλις ἀποκρια. — Philippi was colonized by Octavianus through the removal thither of the partisans of Antonius, and had also the jus Italicum conferred on it.  

Ver. 13. Πηγαίνων | i.e. not, as Bornemann and Bleek suppose, the Strymon, which is distant more than a day’s journey, but possibly the rivulet Gangas, or some other stream in the neighbourhood which abounded with springs. — οὐ ἐνοικίζετο προσευχῆ εἰναι | where a place of prayer was accustomed to be, i.e. where, according to custom, a place of prayer was. On νομιζέων, in more ease, to be wont. Not: where, as was supposed, there was a place of prayer (Ewald), in which case we should have to supply the thought that the place did not look like a synagogue, which, however, is as arbitrary as it is historically unimportant. The προσευχαῖ | were places of prayer, sometimes buildings, and at other times open spaces—so most probably here, as may be inferred from οὐ ἐνοικίζετο εἰναι—near to streams, on account of the custom of washing the hands before prayer, to be met with in cities where synagogues did not exist or were not permitted, serving the purposes of a synagogue. —ταῖς συνελθότις γυναιξι | the women who came together, to prayer. Probably the number of Jewish men in the city was extremely small, and the whole unimportant Jewish population consisted chiefly of women, some of them doubtless married to Gentiles, ver. 1; hence there is no mention of men being present. More arbitrary is the explanation of Calvin: ‘Vel ad coetus tantum muliebres destinatus erat locus ille, vel apud viros frigebat religio, ut saltem tardius adessent;’ and of Schrader: the Jews had been expelled from the city.

Ver. 14. Καὶ τις κ.τ.λ. | Also a woman was listening, etc. Ἀνδρία was a common female name, and therefore it remains doubtful whether she re-

---

1 See Wieseler, p. 27 f.
2 See Dio Cass. ii. 4; Plin. H. N. iv. 11; Digest. Leg. x. 6.
3 So Zeller, Hackett.
6 Hor. Od. i. 8, iii. 9, vi. 39.
LYDIA BAPTIZED AT PHILIPPI. 311

cieved her name "a solo natali."1 — πορφυρόπωλις] ἐ τὰ πορφυρα, fabrics and
clothes dyed purple, πωλοῦσα.2 The dyeing of purple was actively carried
on,3 especially in Lydia, to which Thyatira belonged,4 and an inscription
found at Thyatira particularly mentions the guild of dyers of that place.5
— αεβου. τ. θεού] A female proselyte. See on xiii. 16, 43. — ἤι ὑ Κύρ. ἀθυμοῖ τ
καρδ.] Luke recognises the attentive interest, which Lydia with her heart
unclosed directed to the word, as produced by the influence of the exalted
Christ (ὁ Κύριος) working for the promotion of His kingdom, who opened
(ἀνοίξε) the heart of Lydia, i.e. wrought in her self-consciousness, as the centre
and sphere of action of her inner vital energy, the corresponding readiness, in
order that she might attend to what was preached (προσέχεις τοίς λαλομένοις). The
fidei habere6 followed, but still was not the προσέχειν itself. Comp. on viii.
6. Moreover, Chrysostom correctly remarks: τὸ μὲν οὖν ἀνοίξαι τοῦ θεοῦ: τὸ δὲ
προσέχειν αὐτῆς: ὡστε καὶ θείον καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἄν.7 She experienced the motus
inventibles of grace, to which she offered no resistance, but with willing
submission rendered the moral self-conscious compliance by which she
arrived at faith.8

Ver. 15. Καὶ ὁ ἵκος αὐτῆς] Of what members her family consisted, cannot
be determined. This passage and ver. 38, with xviii. 8 and 1 Cor. i. 16,
are appealed to in order to prove infant baptism in the apostolic age, or at
least to make it probable. "Quis credat, in tot familiis nullum fuisse in-
fantem, et Judaeos circumcidentis, gentiles lustrandis illis assuetos non
etiam obtulisse eos baptismo?" Bengel. See also Lange, apost. Zeitalt. II.
p. 504 ff. But on this question the following remarks are to be made: (1)
If, in the Jewish and Gentile families which were converted to Christ, there
were children, their baptism is to be assumed in those cases, when they
were so far advanced that they could and did confess their faith on Jesus
as the Messiah; for this was the universal, absolutely necessary qualifica-
tion for the reception of baptism.9 (2) If, on the other hand, there were
children still incapable of confessing, baptism could not be administered to
those to whom that, which was the necessary presupposition of baptism for
Christian sanctification, was still wanting. (3) Such young children, whose
parents were Christians, rather fell under the point of view of 1 Cor. vii.
14, according to which, in conformity with the view of the apostolic church,
the children of Christians were no longer regarded as ἀκάθαρτοι, but as ἅγιοι,
and that not on the footing of having received the character of holiness by
baptism, but as having part in the Christian ἁγίασθε by their fellowship
with their Christian parents. See on 1 Cor. l.c. Besides, the circumcision
of children must have been retained for a considerable time among the
Jewish-Christians, according to xxi. 21. Therefore (4) the baptism of the
children of Christians, of which no trace is found in the N. T.,10 is not to be

1 Grotius, de Wette, and others.
2 Hesychius, Phot. Bibl. 301. 41.
Tyr. xl. 2.
4 Ptol. v. 2; Plin. v. 31.
6 Grotius, Kuinoel, Heinrichs.
7 Comp. 2 Macc. i. 4; Luke xxiv. 45; Eph.
l. 18. 487 f.
8 Comp. Luthardt, vom freien Willen p.
9 Comp. also vv. 31, 33, 35, xviii. 8.
10 Not even in Eph. vi. 1, in opposition to
Hofmann, Schriften. II. 2, p. 196.
held as an apostolic ordinance, as, indeed, it encountered early and long resistance; but it is an institution of the church, which gradually arose in post-apostolic times in connection with the development of ecclesiastical life and of doctrinal teaching, not certainly attested before Tertullian, and by him still decidedly opposed, and, although already defended by Cyprian, only becoming general after the time of Augustine in virtue of that connection. Yet, even apart from the ecclesiastical premise of a stern doctrine of original sin and of the devil going beyond Scripture, from which even exorcism arose, the continued maintenance of infant baptism, as the objective attribution of spiritually creative grace in virtue of the plan of salvation established for every individual in the fellowship of the church, is so much the more justified, as this objective attribution takes place with a view to the future subjective appropriation. And this subjective appropriation has so necessarily to emerge with the development of self-conciousness and of knowledge through faith, that in default thereof the church would have to recognise in the baptized no true members, but only membra mortua. This relation of connection with creative grace, in so far as the church is its sphere of operation, is a theme which, in presence of the attacks of Baptists and Rationalists, must overstep the domain of exegesis and be worked out in that of dogmatics, yet without the addition of confirmation as any sort of supplement to baptism. — ei κεκρίκατε] if ye have judged. This judgment was formed either tacitly or openly on the ground of the whole conduct of Lydia even before her baptism,—the latter itself was a witness of it; hence the perfect is here entirely in order, in opposition to Kuinoel, Heinrichs, and others, and is not to be taken for the present. —ei, in the sense of inti, is here chosen with delicate modesty.—με παρ. τ. Κυρ. ειλαι] that I am a believer in the Lord (Christ), i.e. giving faith to His word and His promise, which ye have proclaimed, vv. 18, 14. Comp. ver. 34, xviii. 8, where Bengal well remarks: "Ipse dominus Jesus testabatur per Paulum." — παρεβίδασατο]. The use of this purposely-chosen strong word, constraining, is not to be explained from the refusal at first of those requested, but from the vehement urgency of the feeling of gratitude (v2).

Ver. 16. That Paul and his companions accepted this pressing invitation of Lydia, and chose her house for their abode, Luke leaves the reader to infer from καὶ παρεβίδασατο ἡμᾶς, ver. 15, and he now passes over to another circumstance which occurred on another walk to the same προσευχὴ mentioned before. What now follows thus belongs to quite another day. Heinrichs and Kuinoel assume that it attached itself directly to the pre-

1 Origen, in ep. ad Rom. lib. v.: "Ab apostolis traditum accept eccle-ia."
2 It is the most striking example of the recognition of hiliarical tradition in the evangelical church. Comp. Holtzmann, Kuron u. Tradit. p. 298 ff.
5 Matt. xviii. 14; Mark x. 13 2 f.; Mat l. xxviii. 19; John iii. 6; Rom. vi. 3 f.; Col. ii. 12; Tit. iii. 5; 1 Pet. iii. 21. See also Richter in the Stud. u. Krit. 1861, p. 295 ff.
6 Comp. Dissen, ad Dom. de cor. p. 195.
7 Comp. Luke xxiv. 39; 1 Sam. xxviii 23.
8 Chriszorsten, Bengal, comp. Evang.
ceding: that the conversion and baptism of Lydia had occurred while the women, ver. 18, were waiting at the προσευχή for the commencement of divine worship; and that, when they were about to enter into the προσευχή, this affair with the soothsaying damsel occurred. In opposition to this it may be urged, first, that ver. 15 would only interrupt and disturb the narrative, especially by καὶ παρεβίβασον ἡμᾶς; secondly, that the beginning of ver. 16 itself (ἐγένετο δὲ) indicates the narration of a new event; and thirdly, that the instruction and baptism of Lydia, and still more of her whole house, cannot naturally be limited to so short a period.—According to the reading ἐκουσαν πνεῦμα πνύων (see the critical remarks), the passage is to be interpreted: who was possessed by a spirit Python, i.e. by a demon, which prophesied from her belly. The damsel was a ventriloquist, and as such practised soothsaying. The name of the well-known Delphic dragon, Πύθων, became subsequently the name of a δαμάδων μαντικῶν, but was also, according to Plut. de def. orac. 9, p. 414 E, used appellatively, and that of soothsayers, who spoke from the belly. So also Suidas: ἐγαστριμύνος, ἐγαστριμαντίς, ὥς τιμες νῦν πύθων, Σωφικός δὲ στερνόμαντιν. This use of πύθων, corresponding to the Hebrew בּי, which the LXX. render by ἐγαστριμύνος, Lev. xix. 31, xx. 6, 27, and also passing over to the Rabbins, is to be assumed in our passage, as otherwise we could not see why Luke should have used this peculiar word, whose specific meaning (ventriloquist-soothsayer) was certainly the less strange to him, as the thing itself had so important allusions in the O. T. and LXX. suggesting it to those possessed of Jewish culture, just as among the Greeks the jugglery which the ventriloquists practised was well enough known. Without doubt, the damsel was considered by those who had their fortunes told by her as possessed by a divinity; and that she so regarded herself, is to be inferred from the effect of the apostolic word, ver. 18. Hers was a state of enthusiastic possession by this fixed idea, in which she actually might be capable of a certain clairvoyance, as in the transaction in our passage. Paul, in his Christian view, regards this condition of hers as that of a demoniac; Luke also so designates it, and treats her accordingly. — τοῖς ἐν συνελεύσεις. There were thus several, who in succession or conjointly had her in service for the sake of gain.

Vv. 17, 18. The soothsaying damsel, similar to a somnambulist, reads in the souls of the apostle and his companions, and announces their characteristic dignity. But Paul, after he had first patiently let her alone for many days, sees in her exclamation a recognition on the part of the demon dwelling within her, as Jesus Himself met with recognition and homage from demons; and in order not to accept for himself and his work demoniacal

1 Apolod. 1 4. 1.
2 Suidas, who has the quotation: τάς τε πνέματα Πύθωνος ἐκθαυμασίας . . . ἥδιν τῷ ἐκήμουν παραγερηθέντα.
3 See Schleusner, Thes. II. p. 222.
4 R. Salomo on Deut. xviii. 11.
5 1 Sam. xxviii. 7.
6 The Εὐσεβεία or Εὐσεβείας.
7 See Hermann, gotth. Alterth. § xii. 16.
8 Comp. 1 Cor x. 20. [1781].
9 Comp. Walch. de secretis et falsid. Luc. [1781].
10 But she was not a somnambulist. See Delitzsch, Psychol. p. 510.
11 Mark iii. 11.
testimony, which would not of itself be hushed, at length being painfully grieved, and turning to her as she followed him, he, in the name of Jesus Christ, commands the demon to come out of her. Now, as the slave considered Paul to be the servant of the most high God, who thus must have power over the god by whom she believed herself possessed, her fixed idea was at once destroyed by that command of power, and she was consequently restored from her overstrained state of mind to her former natural condition. Of a special set purpose, for which the slave made her exclamation, οὐτοὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι κ.τ.λ.—Chrysostom: the god by whom she was possessed, Apollo, hoped, on account of this exclamation, to be left in possession of her; Walch: the damsel so cried out, in order to get money from Paul; Ewald: in order to offer her services to them; Camerarius, Morus, Rosenmüller, Heinrichs, Kuinoel: in order to exalt her own reputation—there is no hint in the text; it was the involuntary and irresistible outburst of her morbidly exalted soothsaying nature.

Vv. 19–21. The first persecution which is reported to us as stirred up on the part of the Gentiles. — ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων . . . τῶν στρατηγῶν] When they saw that with the departure of the god from the slave their hope of further gain had departed (ἐξῆλθεν), they dragged Paul and Silas, not Timothy and Luke along with them, but only the two principal persons, to the market, where, according to the custom of the Greeks, the courts of justice were erected, to the archons. But these, the city-judges, must have referred the matter to the στρατηγοί; and therefore the narrative proceeds: ἐκ προσεγγιωτές αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ. The accusation amounted to revolt against the Roman political authority.—The στρατηγοί are the praetores, as the two chief Roman magistrates in towns which were colonies called themselves. The name has its origin from the position of the old Greek strategoi. — ἡμῶν τ. πόλ. ἡμῶν prefixed with haughty emphasis, and answering to the following "though they are Jews!" — Ρωμαῖοι οἶνοι] proud contrast to the odious ὑπάρχοντες. Calvin aptly says: "Versute composita fuit saec crimination ad gravandos Christi servos; nam ab una parte obtendunt Romanum nomen, quo nihil erat magis favorabile: rursum ex nomine Judaico, quod tunc infame erat, confvant illis invidiam; nam quantum ad religionem, plus habebant Romanii affiliitas cum aliis quibuslibet, quam cum gente Judaica."—The introduction of strange religious customs and usages (ἐν ἡμέραν), in opposition to the native religion, was strictly interdicted by the Romans. Possibly here also the yet fresh impression of the edict of Claudius co-operated.

1 Διασχέσεως, see on Iw., 2.
8 Comp. ill. 5, iv. 7.
8 Comp. in Thess. II. 2.
4 Not different from πολέμαρχος, xvii. 6.
6 The dux et imperator. Cl. de leg. apr. 25.
9 See on ἐκαταλήμμενος, xiii. 23; Plut. Cestil. 10: "Suberat utilitates privatae; publica obtentit." Bengel.
10 See Wetstein in loc.
11 See on xvii. 2.
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Vv. 22, 23. And at the same time ("cum ancillae dominia," Bengel) the multitude rose up, in a tumultuary manner, against them; therefore the praetors, intimidated thereby, in order temporarily to still the urgency of the mob, commanded the accused to be scourged without examination, and then, until further orders, to be thrown into strict confinement. — περιγυμνασμένον τα ἰμάτια | after having torn off their clothes. The form of expression of ver. 23 shows that the praetors did not themselves, in opposition to Bengel, do this piece of work, which was necessary and customary for laying bare the upper part of the body, but caused it to be done by their subordinate lictors. Erasmus erroneously desired to read αἰθίων, so that the praetors would have rent their own clothes from indignation. Apart from the non-Roman character of such a custom, there may be urged against this view the compound περιγυμνασμένον, which denotes that the rending took place all round about the whole body. — ἵκτιέμον] The reference of the relative tense is to the personal presence of the narrator. — Paul and Silas submitted to this maltreatment, one of the three mentioned in 2 Cor. xi. 25, with silent self-denial, and without appealing to their Roman citizenship, committing everything to God; see on ver. 37. Men of strong character may, amidst unjust suffering, exhibit in presence of their oppressors their moral defiance, even in resignation. We make this remark in opposition to Zeller, who finds the brutal conduct of the praetors, and the non-employment by the apostles of their legal privilege in self-defence—which Paul, moreover, renounced not merely on this occasion, 2 Cor. xi. 25—inexplicable. Bengel well remarks: "Non semper omnibus praesidiis omni modo utendum; divino regimini auscultandum." In a similar plight, xxii. 25, Paul found it befitting to interpose an assertion of his privilege, which he here only used for the completion of his victory over the persecution, ver. 37,—a result which, in xxii. 25, according to the divine destination which he was aware of, he recognised as unattainable.

Ver. 24. The zealous jailor fulfilled the command ἄσφαλέως τηρεῖν by a two-fold measure; he not only put the accused into the prison-ward situated, more than the other wards, in the interior of the house (ἰς τὴν ἵσωτέραν οὐλακήν), but also secured their feet in the stocks. — ἵν τὸ κῆλον, ἐν πεντεύοις, i.e. in the wooden block in which the feet, stretched apart from each other, were enclosed, called also ποδικίαν and ποδοστράβη in Heb. "Ω" (w).

Vv. 25, 26. In joyful consciousness of suffering for the glorification of Christ, v. 41, they sing in the solemn stillness of the night prayers of praise to God, and thereby keep their fellow-prisoners awake, so that they listened to them (ἰππηρομοι). Whether these are to be conceived as confined in the same ἵσωτεραν φιλακήν, or possibly near to it but more to the front, or whether they were in both localities, cannot be determined.

1 Grotius and Wolf in loc.
3 See Winer, p. 250 (E. T. 357).
4 Comp. Baur.
5 Plant. Capit. iii. 5. 71; Liv. xvi. 28.
6 Esch. xix. 27, xxxiii. 11. See Herod. vi. 75, ix. 37, and later writers, Grotius and Weisstain in loc.
7 "Nihil cruze sentit in nervo, quum animus in coelo est." Tertull.
Then suddenly there arises an earthquake, etc. God at once rewards—this is the significant relation of vv. 25 and 26—the joy of faith and of suffering on the part of Paul and Silas by miraculous interposition. The objection, which Baur and Zeller take to the truth of this narrative, turns on the presupposed inconceivableness of miracles in general. In connection with the fiction assumed by them, even the ἐπικρόνον... ὀσμον is supposed only to have for its object "to make good the casual connection between the earthquake and the prayer" (Zeller). — πᾶντων thus also of those possibly to be found in other parts of the prison. The reading ἀνελύθη (Bornemann) is a correct gloss.

Vv. 27, 28. The jailer, aroused by the shock and the noise, hastens to the prison, and when he sees the doors which, one behind another, led to it open, and so takes it for granted that the prisoners have escaped, he wishes, from fear of the vengeance of the praetors, to kill himself—which, in opposition to Zeller's objection, he may have sufficiently indicated by expressions of his despair. Then Paul calls, etc.—μαχαίραν a sword, which he got just at hand; with the article it would denote the sword which he was then wearing, his sword. — ἀπαντησ[...] Thus the rest of the prisoners, involuntarily detained by the whole miraculous event, and certainly also in part by the imposing example of Paul and Silas, had not used their release from chains (ver. 26) and the opening of the prison for their own liberation. The ἐνθάδε does not affirm that they had all come together into the prison of Paul, but only stands opposed to ἐπικρόνον... ὀσμον. None is away; we are, all and every one, here! — The loosening of the chains, moreover, and that without any injury to the limbs of the enchained, is, in view of the miraculous character of the event, not to be judged according to the laws of mechanics, in opposition to Gfrörer, Zeller, any more than the omission of flight on the part of the other prisoners is to be judged according to the usual practice of criminals. The prisoners were arrested, and felt themselves sympathetically detained by the miracle which had happened; and therefore the suggestion to which Chrysostom has recourse, that they had not seen the opening of the doors, is inappropriate.

Vv. 29, 30. Φωτα] Lights, i.e. lamps, several, in order to light up and strictly search everything. — ἐντρομος γενομ. προσεπτ. ] He now saw in Paul and Silas no longer criminals, but the faavourites and confidants of the gods; the majesty which had been maltreated inspired him with terror and respectful submission. — ἐν ὑστερω] in order that I may obtain salvation. Ie means the σωτηρία, which Paul and Silas had announced; for what he had heard of them, that they made known ὅτι σωτηρίας, ver. 17, was now established in his conviction as truth. This lively conviction longs to have part in the salvation, and his sincere longing desires to fulfill that by which this participation is conditioned. Morus, Stolz, Rosenmüller render it: "in order that I may escape the punishment of the gods on account of your
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harsh treatment." But, if Luke desired to have σωθῶ and σωθήσῃ, ver. 31, understood in different senses, he must have appended to σωθῶ a more precise definition; for the meaning thus assigned to it suggests itself the less naturally, as the jailer, who had only acted as an instrument under higher direction, could not reasonably apprehend any vengeance of the gods.

Vv. 31, 32. The ἐπανορθοθήσασθαι καὶ ὁ ὄντος σου εὐθύνεται to πιστεύειν καὶ σωθήσῃ. — They lay down faith on Jesus as the condition of σωτερία, and nothing else; but saving faith is always in the N. T. that which has holiness as its effect, Rom. vi, not "a human figure and opinion which the depths of the heart never get to know," but "a divine work in us which transforms and begets us anew from God," without, however, making justification, which is the act of the imputation of faith, to include sanctification. — For the sake of this requirement of believing, they set forth the gospel to the father of the family and all his household.

Vv. 33, 34. Παραλαβόντα αὐτοῖς . . . ἐλούσαν] he took and washed them (χαλουσα). Vividness of delineation. Probably he led them to a neighbouring water, perhaps in the court of the house, in which his baptism and that of his household was immediately completed. — ἀπὸ τῶν πληγῶν] a pregnant expression: so that they were cleansed from the stripes—from the blood of the inflicted wounds, ver. 22 f. — παραχρῆμα] the adverb emphatically placed at the end. — ἀναγήγαγον] We are to think of the official dwelling of the jailer as being built above the prison cells. — παρέδωκεν πράτευσαν] quite the Latin approvantis mensam, i.e., he gave a repast; to be explained from the custom of setting out the table before those who were to be entertained. — πανοκρατία] σὺν δὲ ὥρᾳ ὅλῳ, Phavorinus. It belongs to πείσται. A more classical form, according to the Atticists, would have been πανοκρατία or πανοκρατία. — πείσται καὶ καὶ θεῷ] because he had become and was a believer on God (perfect). He, the Gentile, now believed the divine promises of salvation announced to him by Paul and Silas. — That this his πιστεύειν was definitely Christian faith, and accordingly equivalent to πιστεύειν τῷ Κυρίῳ, was self-evident to the reader. — That, after ver. 34, Paul and Silas had returned to prison, follows from vv. 36–40.

Vv. 35, 36. The news of the miraculous earthquake, perhaps also the particulars which they might in the meantime have learned concerning the two prisoners, may have made the praetors have scruples concerning the hasty maltreatment. They consider it advisable to have nothing further

1 Comp. Chrysost.
2 Luther's Preface to the Epistle to the Romans.
3 See on Rom, i. 17.
4 See on viii. 25.
5 This is confirmed by the fact that baptism took place by complete immersion,—in opposition to Baumgarten, p. 515, who, transferring the performance of baptism to the house, finds here "an approximation to the later custom of simplifying the ceremony," according to which complete immersion did not take place. Immersion was, in fact, quite an essential part of the symbolism of baptism (Rom. vi.).
7 Comp. on Matt. ii. 10, and Köhner, § 863. 1.
8 Comp. ix. 29; Luke iv. 5, xxii. 67.
9 Rom. Od. v. 93, xxi. 29; Polyt. xxxix. 2. 11.
10 Yet see Plat. Eryx. p. 302 C.
12 Ver. 28; comp. ver. 16, xviii. 5.
13 See also ver. 33.
to do with them, and to get rid of them forthwith by releasing them. Curtly and contemptuously (ῥοῖς ἀνθρ. ἱκείνοις), in order to maintain at least thereby their stern official attitude, they notified the order by their lictors (καβδοίχοις, bearers of the fasces) to the jailer, who, with congratulatory sympathy, announces it to the prisoners. According to Baumgarten, the motives for the severity of the previous day had lost their force with the praetors during the night—a point in which there is expressed a distinction from the persistent enmity of the Sanhedrists in Jerusalem. But this would furnish an adequate ground for a proceeding running so entirely counter to the course of criminal procedure. The praetors must have become haunted by apprehension and ill at ease, and they must therefore have received some sort of information concerning the miraculous occurrences. — ἐν εἰσήγησιν] happily.¹

Ver. 37. Ἰδὼν αὐτοῖς] to the jailer and the lictors; the latter had thus in the meantime come themselves into the prison. — δείπνως ηὗτος, etc.] after they had beaten us publicly without judicial condemnation,—we who are Romans. This sets forth, in terse language precisely embracing the several elements, their treatment as an open violation, partly of the law of nature and nations in general,² partly of the Roman law in particular. For exemption from the disgrace of being scourged by rods and whips was secured to every Roman citizen by the Lex Valeria in the year 254 B.C.,³ and by the Lex Porcia in the year 500 B.C.,⁴ before every Roman tribunal;⁵ therefore Cicero, in Verr. v. 57, says of the exclamation, Civis Romanus sum: "saepè multis in ultimis terris opem inter barbaros et salutem tulit." — That Silas was also a Roman citizen, is rightly inferred from the plural form of expression, in which there is no reason to find a mere synecdoche. The distinction, which was implied in the bestowal of this privilege, cannot be adduced against the historical character of the narrative (Zeller), as we know not the occasion and circumstances of its acquisition. But how had Paul, by his birth, xxii. 18, Roman citizenship? Certainly not simply as a native of Tarsus. For Tarsus was neither a colonia nor a municipium, but an urbs libera, to which the privilege of having governing authorities of its own, under the recognition, however, of the Roman supremacy, was given by Augustus after the civil war, as well as other privileges,⁶ but not Roman citizenship; for this very fact would, least of all, have remained historically unknown, and acquaintance with the origin of the apostle from Tarsus would have protected him from the decree of scourging.⁷ This much, therefore, only may be surely decided, that his father or a yet earlier ancestor had acquired the privilege of citizenship either as a reward of merit⁸ or by purchase,⁹ and had transmitted it to the apostle. According to Zeller's arbitrary preconceptions, the mention of the Roman citizenship

---

¹ See on Mark v. 34; comp. on xv. 33
² δείπνως ηὗτος, found neither in the LXX. or Apocrypha, nor in Greek writers.
³ Liv. ii. 8; Valer. Max. iv. 1; Dion. Hal. v. p. 392.
⁴ Liv. x. 9; Cic. pro Rabir. 4.
⁵ Dio Chrys. ii. p. 36, ed. Reiske.
⁶ See xxii. 29, comp. with xxii. 24 ff.
⁷ Suet. Aug. 47.
here and in chap. xxii. had only the unhistorical purpose in view "of recommending the apostle to the Romans as a native Roman." — καὶ νῦν λάθρα ἡμᾶς ἐκβάλλα.] is indignantly opposed to διειρρυγες ἡμᾶς δημοσίᾳ ... ἐβαλον εἰς φυλακῆν: and now do they cast us out secretly? The present denotes the action as already begun, by the order given. Paul, however, for the honour of himself and his work, disdains this secret dismissal, that it might not appear—and this the praetors-intended!—that he and Silas had escaped. On the previous day he had, on the contrary, disdained to avert the maltreatment by an appeal to his citizenship, see on ver. 23. The usual opinion is1 that the tumult in the forum had prevented him from asserting his citizenship. But it is obvious of itself that even the worst tumult, at ver. 22 or ver. 23, would have admitted a "Civis Romanus sum," had Paul wished to make such an appeal. — οὐ γὰρ, ἄλλα] not so, but. It is to be analyzed thus: for they are not to cast us out secretly; on the contrary (ἄλλα) they are, etc. γὰρ specifies the reason why the preceding, indignant question is put, and ἄλλα answers adversatively to the οὐ.2 — αὐτοὶ] in their own persons they are to bring us out.

Vv. 38, 39. Ἐφεδρήσαν] The reproach contained in ἀκατακράτεσιν did not trouble them, but the violation of citizenship was an offence against the majesty of the Roman people, and as such was severely punished.3 — Ver. 39. What a change in the state of affairs: ἐλθόντες ... παρεκάλεσαν, namely, to acquiesce, ... ἐξαγαγόντες ... ἡρώτων! — ἐξερχεσθαι with the simple genitive, as in Matt. vi. 14. Very frequent with Greek writers since subsequent to Homer. On παρακαλεῖν, to give fair words, comp. on 1 Cor. iv. 13.

Ver. 40. Before they comply with the ἐξελθεῖν τῆς πόλεως, ver. 39, the apostolic heartfelt longing constrains them first to repair to the house of Lydia, to exhort (παρεκάλεσαν) the new converts assembled there that they should not become wavering in their Christian confession. And from this house grew the church, to which, of all that Paul founded, he has erected the most eulogistic monument in his Epistle—in this sense also the first church which he established in Europe. — ἐξελθὼν] Only Paul and Silas, as they alone were affected by the inquiry, appear now to have departed from Philippi. Luke at least, as the use of the third person teaches us, did not go with them. Paul left him behind to build up the youthful church. Whether, however, Timothy (vv. 1 ff.) also remained behind, cannot be determined. He is not again named until xvii. 14, but he may nevertheless have already departed from Philippi, and need not necessarily have rejoined them till in Beroea or Thessalonica.

Remark.—In the rejection of the entire history as history Baur and Zeller (comp. Hausrath) essentially agree; it is alleged to be formed in accordance with xii. 7 ff., as an apologetic parallelism of Paul with Peter. But as Philippian persecutions are mentioned also in 1 Thess. ii. 2, the opinions formed by them concerning the relation of the two passages are opposite. Baur makes 1

---

1 See also de Wette.
3 Protag. p. 343 D, and the examples in Wetstein.
4 Dion. Hal. xi. p. 725; Grotius in loc.
Thess. ii. 2 to be derived from the narrative before us; whereas Zeller, considering the Epistles to the Thessalonians as older, supposes the author of the Acts to have "concotted" (p. 258) his narrative from 1 Thess. ii. 2.

**NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.**

(τα) *We endeavored to go.* V. 10.

"It is observable that the first person is here introduced for the first time, the author thus intimating his presence. From this it appears that Luke joined Paul's company at Troas." Meyer supposes the reason why Luke never mentions his own name throughout the entire history to be that Theophilus was well acquainted with his personal relations to Paul. Olshausen suggests, Meyer says arbitrarily, we think with great probability, a feeling of modesty on the part of Luke. Some, in view of the fact that the apostle had only recently recovered from a severe illness (see v. 6, and Gal. iv. 13), suppose "that Luke, the beloved physician," accompanied him, to watch over his health. From this time till the last imprisonment at Rome, with but two brief intervals, he was the great apostle's constant attendant. In the very last of his Epistles the apostle, writing in full view of a violent death, and forsaken by many, touchingly says: "Only Luke is with me" (2 Tim. iv. 11). Another hypothesis is that Luke makes use of a history written by Silas or Timothy; but this is not probable in itself, and if true would have produced an earlier change in the form of the narrative. These four, then—Paul, Silas, Timothy, and Luke—after a brief voyage from Troas, landed at Neapolis, and so the first Christian apostle landed in Europe. It is probable, however, ere this time that the gospel had been preached in Rome by some of the dispersion, but not by an apostle. Dr. Taylor writes: "That voyage stands out by itself as unique as it is glorious. They went to plant a seed from which have sprung liberty, law, progress, and religion on that continent, and all the blessings which, in this western land, we now enjoy. The gigantic trees in the Mariposa grove sprung each from a seed no bigger than a grain of wheat, though it took them centuries to grow. Here, in the landing of Paul with the gospel at Neapolis, we have the germ out of which European and American Christianity has been developed."

(τα) *The chief city.* V. 12.

Various opinions are held as to the meaning of this description of Philippi, πρωτη πόλις—the obvious meaning is chief city or capital; but Thessalonica was the capital, or capital of that part of Macedonia where Paul then was; but Amphipolis held that position. Some would change the reading from πρωτη της to πρωτης, a city of the first part of Macedonia; but the authority of the ms. is against such change. Others understand the phrase to mean a chief town. Others, with Meyer, unite the two words πρωτη πόλις with Κολοβωσία—the first colonial city of the district—the most distinguished in point of importance. Many others render it the first city of Macedonia proper at which Paul arrived; and this appears to be the correct idea. "The purpose of the narrator is to define the geographical position, and not the political importance of Philippi. He means to say that to one entering Macedonia from the Thracian frontier in that district, Philippi is the first city on his route." (Taylor.)
NOTES.

(v*) She was baptized and her household. V. 15.

This verse has often been quoted as evidence that infant baptism was the practice of the apostolic age. Commentators are divided in opinion on the force of the evidence afforded. The passage in itself cannot be adduced either for or against infant baptism. It might be a presumption in favor of it. "The practice itself rests on firmer grounds than a precarious induction from a few ambiguous passages." (Plumptre.) The subject, however, does not properly fall under the domain of exegesis, but must be, as Meyer says, "worked out in that of dogmatics."

(w*) Into the inner prison. V. 24.

In the Roman prisons there were usually three distinct stories, one above another—the communiora, or upper flat, where the prisoners had light and fresh air; the interiora, or lower flat, shut off with strong iron gates, with bars and locks; the tullium, or lowest flat or dungeon, the place for one condemned to die. Into this dark, damp, underground, filthy, stifling pit, after having been stripped, beaten with great severity, and bound with an instrument of torture, the unoffending preachers were thrust with unfeeling alacrity. "Yet over all this complication of miseries the souls of Paul and Silas rose in triumph. With heroic cheerfulness they solaced the long black hours of midnight with prayer and hymns. To every Jew, as to every Christian, the psalms of David furnished an inexhaustible storehouse of sacred song." "Never, probably, had such a scene occurred before in the world’s history, and this perfect triumph of the spirit of peace and joy over shame and agony was an omen of what Christianity would afterwards effect. And while they sang, and while the prisoners listened, perhaps, to verses which ‘out of the deeps’ called on Jehovah, or ‘fled to him before the morning watch,’ or sang—

'The plowers plowed upon my back and made long furrows, But the righteous Lord hath hewn the snares of the ungodly in pieces,' or triumphantly told how God had ‘burst the gates of brass, and smitten the bars asunder.’ Suddenly there was felt the great shock of earthquake, which rocked the very foundation of the prison." (Farrar.) This is the first instance recorded of a persecution against the Christians by the Roman authorities. Hitherto either the Jews themselves, or the multitude instigated by them, had persecuted the disciples; but there had been no interference on the part of the Roman government. The accusation against them was not on religious grounds, or because they preached Jesus and the resurrection; but it was based on political grounds, charging them with being disturbers of the peace, and teaching practices contrary to Roman customs. On this charge against the apostles Calvin writes: "This accusation is craftily composed to burden the servants of Christ. For on the one side they pretend the name of the Romans, than which nothing was more favorable; on the other, they purchase hatred and bring them in contempt by warning the Jews, which name was at that time infamous; for, as touching religion, the Romans were more like to any than to the Jewish nation. For it was lawful for one which was a Roman to do sacrifice either in Asia or in Grecia, or in any other country where were idols and superstitions. They frame a third accusation out of the crime of sedition, for
they pretend that the public peace is troubled by Paul and his company. In like sort was Christ brought into contempt (odiose traductus fuit)."

(xvi) And washed their stripes. V. 33.

The twofold washings—that which evidenced the true repentance, awakened gratitude, and kindly reverence of the jailer for his prisoners, and that which they administered to him, as the sign of the washing of regeneration—are placed in close and suggestive juxtaposition. As Chrysostom beautifully expresses it: "ἐλωσεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐλωσεν ἐκρίνοντα μὴν ἀπὸ τῶν πληγῶν ἐλωσεν, αὐτὸς δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμαρτίων ἐλωσε—He washed them, and he was washed; he washed them from their stripes, he himself was washed from his sins."
CHAPTER XVII.

VER. 2. διελέγετο] A B Ν, min. have διελέγετο (so Lachm.). D E, min. have διελέγη, which Griesb. has recommended and Born. adopted. Different alterations of the imperf. into the aor. (in conformity with εἰσῆλθε). — Ver. 4. After σεβομ. Lachm. has καὶ (A D loth. Vulg. Copt.). Offence was taken at the combination σεβομ. Ἐλλήν., and therefore sometimes Ἐλλήν. was omitted (min. Theophyl. 1.), sometimes καὶ was inserted. — Ver. 5. προσλαβ. δὲ οἱ ἱερον.] So Griesb. But Elz. has χριστάνες δὲ οἱ ἄπειθοντες ἱερον. καὶ προσλαβ. Lachm.: χριστάνες δὲ οἱ ἱερον. καὶ προσλαβ., which also Rinck prefers. Matthaei: προσλαβ. δὲ οἱ ἱερον. οἱ ἄπειθ. So Scholz and Tisch. Still other variations in codd. vss. and Fathers (D: οἱ δὲ ἄπειθοντες ἱερον. καὶ προσλαβ., so Born.). The reading of Lachm. has most external evidence in its favour (A B Ν. min. Vulg. Copt. Sahid. Syr. u. t.), and it is the more to be preferred, since that of Griesb., which otherwise, on account of its simplicity, the others might have arisen as amplifications in the form of glosses, is only preserved in 142, and consequently is almost entirely destitute of critical warrant; the ἄπειθοντες in the Recepta betrays itself as an addition (from xiv. 2), partly from its being exchanged in several witnesses for ἄπειθάνειτε, and partly from the variety of its position (E has it only after πνευμάτως). — ἄγαγειν) So H, min. Chrys. Theoph. Oec. But D, 104, Copt. Sahid. have ἔξαγαγειν (so Born.); A B Ν, min. Vulg.: προσαγαγείν (so Lachm.); E: προσαγαγεῖν; G, 11: ἄγαγειν. All of them more definite interpretations. — Ver. 13. After σαλἀλωντες, Lachm. and Born. have καὶ ταράσσαντες. So A B D, Ν, min. and several vss. But σαλ. was easily explained after ver. 8 by ταρ. as a gloss, which was then joined by καὶ with the text. — Ver. 14. ὡς] A B E Ν, min. have ὡς, which Lachm. has adopted. But ὡς was not understood, and therefore was sometimes changed into ὡς, sometimes omitted (D, min. vss.). — Ver. 15. After ἡγαγον, Elz. Scholz have αὐτόν, against preponderating testimony. A familiar supplement. — Ver. 16. θεωροῦντες] Lachm. and Tisch. read θεωρούντες, which also Griesb. recommended, after A B E, Ν, min. Fathers. Rightly; the dative is adapted to the αὕτω. — Ver. 18. Instead of αὐτοῖς (which with Lachm., according to witnesses of some moment, is to be placed after εἰσῆλθεν.) Rinck would prefer αὐτῷ, according to later codd. and some vss. A result of the erroneous reference of the absolute την ἀνάστασιν to the resurrection of Jesus. The pronoun is entirely wanting in B G Ν, min. Chrys. So Tisch.; and correctly, both on account of the frequency of the addition, and on account of the variety of the order. In D the whole passage ὁτι... εἰσῆλθεν εἰσῆλθεν is wanting, which Born. approves. — Ver. 20. Instead of τῷ ἁντ. A B Ν, min. vss. have τῷ, and instead of θέλω: θέλει. Lachm. has adopted both. But TIAN was the more easily converted after the preceding τῷ into ΤΙΝΑ, as ταῦτα follows afterwards. The removal of the ἁντ then occasioned the indicative. — Ver. 21. καὶ ἀκούοις] Lachm. Tisch. Born read ἐκ ἀκούοις, which according to A B D Ν, Vulg. Sahid. Syr. p. is to be adopted. — Ver. 23. Instead of ἁντ and τῷ τῷ, A B D Ν.

Ver. 1. Amphipolis, an Athenian colony, at that time the capital of Macedonia prima, comp. on xvi. 12, around which on both sides flowed the Strymon. Apollonia, belonging to the Macedonian province Mygdonia, was situated 80 miles to the south-west. It is not to be confounded with Apollonia in Macedonian Illyria. Thessalonica lay 36 miles to the west of Apollonia—so called either, and this is the most probable opinion, by its rebuilder and embellisher, Cassander, in honour of his wife Thessalonica, or earlier by Philip, as a memorial of his subjection of Thessaly, at an earlier period Therme,—on the Thermaic gulf, the capital of the second district of Macedonia, the seat of the Roman governor, flourishing by its commerce, now the large and populous Saloniki, still inhabited by numerous Jews. * — ἡ συναγωγή] Beza held the article to be without significance. The same error occasioned the omission of ἡ in A B D Σ, min. Lachm. But the article marks the synagogue in Thessalonica as the only one in all that neighbourhood. Paul and Silas halted at the seat of the synagogue of the district, according to their principle of attempting their work in the first instance among the Jews (v*).

Vv. 2–4. Κατὰ δὲ τὸ εἰςθ. τῷ δ.] Comp. Luke iv. 16. The construction is by way of attraction (κατὰ δὲ τ. εἰςθ. αὐτῶ εἰσήλθεν ὁ Παύλος), with anticipation of the subject. — διελέγετο αὐτοῖς] he carried on colloquies with them.

1 Dionys. Hal., Strabo, Zonaras.
2 Stephan. Byz., Tzetzes.
3 See Lüsemann on 1 Thess. Introd. § 1.
4 Approved by Buttmann in the Stud. u. Krit. 1890, p. 300.
Thus frequently in and after Plato, with the dative or \(\pi\rho\cup\rho\), in which combinations it is never the simple \textit{facere verbis ad aliquem}, in opposition to de Wette, not even in xvii. 19, xx. 7, nor even in Heb. xii. 5, where the paternal \(\pi\rho\alpha\lambda\kappa\phi\rho\varsigma\) speaks \(\iota\varepsilon\iota\lambda\) the children.\(^1\) The form of dialogue, Luke ii. 46 f., was not unsuitable even in the synagogue; Jesus Himself thus taught in the synagogue, John vi. 25–59; Matt. xii. 9 ff.; Luke iv. 16 ff. — \(\alpha\pi\delta\tau\ \gamma\rho\alpha\phi\eta\) \textit{starting from the Scriptures, deriving his doctrinal propositions from them}.\(^3\) Is \(\alpha\pi\delta\tau\ \gamma\rho\alpha\phi\eta\) to be connected with \(\delta\iota\epsilon\lambda\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\iota\varsigma\varsigma\) or with \(\delta\iota\alpha\nu\alpha\iota\varsigma\gamma\omicron\ \kappa\tau\iota\lambda\nu\) ?\(^4\) The latter is, on account of the greater emphasis which thus falls on \(\alpha\pi\delta\tau\ \gamma\rho\rho\) , to be preferred. — \(\delta\iota\alpha\nu\alpha\iota\gamma\varsigma\ \kappa\tau\alpha\pi\alpha\gamma\tau\iota\delta\) . Upon what Paul laid down as doctrine, theologically, he previously gave information, by analytical development.\(^6\) Bengel well remarks: "Duo gradus, ut si quis nucleum fracto cortice et recludat et exentum ponat in medio." — \(\delta\iota\tau\nu\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\iota\nu\ \iota\delta\iota\) (Luke xxiv. 36) \(\kappa\tau\iota\lambda\nu\) is related to \(\kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\iota\tau\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\iota\varsigma\varsigma\ \kappa\tau\iota\lambda\nu\) , as a general proposition of the history of salvation to its concrete realization and manifestation. The latter is to be taken thus: and \textit{that this Messiah, no other than He who had to suffer and rise again, Jesus is, whom I preach to you}. Accordingly, \(\iota\nu\gamma\iota\nu\ \varepsilon\iota\ \kappa\alpha\tau\ \iota\mu\nu\) is the subject, and \(\alpha\upsilon\tau\iota\varsigma\varsigma\ \delta\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\iota\nu\) the predicate. By this arrangement the chief stress falls on \(\iota\nu\gamma\iota\nu\ \kappa\tau\iota\lambda\nu\) , and in the predicate \(\alpha\upsilon\tau\iota\varsigma\varsigma\), which, according to the preceding, represents the only true \textit{Scriptural Messiah}, has the emphasis, which is further brought out by the interposition of \(\epsilon\sigma\iota\) between \(\alpha\upsilon\tau\iota\varsigma\varsigma\) and \(\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\iota\nu\). — \(\epsilon\gamma\omega\) \textit{emphatic: I for my part. As to the oratio variata, see on i. 4. — \textit{proseuklupn.} is not to be taken as middle,} but as passive: they were assigned by God to them, as belonging to them, as \(\mu\alpha\beta\iota\tau\alpha\) . Only here in the N. T.\(^6\) — \(\tau\iota\nu\iota\ \pi\alpha\lambda\nu \pi\lambda\iota\phi\omicron\) \(\ldots\) The proselytes were more free from prejudice than the native Jews.

Vv. 5, 6. \(\zeta\nu\lambda\omega\alpha\varsigma\alpha\nu\zeta\varsigma\) (see the critical remarks): \textit{filled with zeal, and having taken to themselves}, namely, as abettors towards producing the intended rising of the people. — \(\alpha\gamma\omicron\varphi\alpha\iota\iota\varsigma\) are \textit{market-loungers, idlers}, a rabble which, without regular business-avocations, frequents the public places, \textit{substratani, subbasilicanii}.\(^8\) The distinction which old grammarians make between \(\alpha\gamma\omicron\varphi\alpha\iota\iota\varsigma\) and \(\alpha\gamma\varphi\alpha\iota\iota\varsigma\) appears to be groundless from the conflicting character of their statements themselves.\(^9\) — Whether \textit{Jaswn} is an originally Hellenic name, or only a Hellenic transformation of the Jewish \textit{Jesus}, as according to Joseph. \textit{Antt.} xii. 5. 1 was certainly the case with the high priest in 2 Macc. i. 7, iv. 7 ff., remains entirely undecided from our want of knowledge as to the man himself. It was his house before which they suddenly

\(^1\) Mark ix. 34; Acts xvii. 17.
\(^2\) Comp. Delitzsch \textit{in loc.} p. 612.
\(^3\) Comp. xxviii. 83; Winer, p. 849 (E. T. 465).
\(^4\) So Vulg., Luther, and many others, Winer and de Wette.
\(^5\) Photius, Grotius, Elymer, Morus, Rosenmüller, Valkenaer, Kuinoel, Ewald.
\(^6\) \(\alpha\iota\nu\gamma\iota\nu\), Luke xxiv. 38.
\(^7\) Comp. Eph. i. 11.
\(^8\) But see Plat. \textit{Mor.} p. 788 D; Lucian. \textit{Amor.}
\(^9\) Loesner, p. 309 f.
\(^10\) See Herod. ii. 141; Plat. \textit{Prot.} 847 C, and \textit{Antt.} \textit{in loc.}

\(^11\) Suidas: the former is \(\iota\nu\ \gamma\omicron\varphi\alpha\iota\iota\varsigma\) \(\alpha\nu\sigma\tau\rho\phi\alpha\iota\varsigma\) \(\alpha\nu\sigma\tau\rho\phi\alpha\iota\varsigma\) \(\alpha\nu\sigma\tau\rho\phi\alpha\iota\varsigma\) \(\alpha\nu\sigma\tau\rho\phi\alpha\iota\varsigma\), the latter \(\iota\ interpolated \gamma\omicron\varphi\alpha\iota\iota\varsigma\). Whereas Ammonius says: the former denotes \(\tau\omicron\nu\ i\nu\gamma\omicron\varphi\alpha\iota\iota\varsigma\) \(\tau\omicron\nu\ i\nu\gamma\omicron\varphi\alpha\iota\iota\varsigma\) \(\tau\omicron\nu\ i\nu\gamma\omicron\varphi\alpha\iota\iota\varsigma\) ; see Göttling, \textit{Acanth.} p. 297. Comp. Stephens, \textit{Theo.}, p. 490, ed. Paris.
appeared, because this was known to them as the place where Paul and Silas were lodged. These two, however, were absent, either accidentally, or designedly after receiving information. — τὸν Ἰάσωνα κ. τινὰς ἀδελφ. as accomplices, and Jason also as such, and at the same time as the responsible host of the insurgents. — πολιτάρχεας like τοῖς ἄρχοντας, xvi. 19. Designation of the judicial personages acting as magistrates of the city. — οἱ τὴν οἰκουμ. ἀναταρακαὶ ἔχοντες ἔρημος; The exaggerated character of the passionate accusation, especially after what had already taken place amidst public excitement at Philippi, is a sufficient reason to set aside the opinion that the accusation bears the colouring of a later time, Baur, Zeller; comp. xxiv. 5. — ἀναστράφω, exicto, belongs to Alexandrian Greek.

Ver. 7. Ἀπαντήθητε not secretly, which Erasmus finds in ἀπαντήθητε, but as in Luke x. 88, xix. 6. — As formerly in the case of Jesus the Messianic name was made to serve as a basis for the charge of high treason, so here with the confessors of Jesus (οὗτοι πάντες) as the Messiah. Comp. xix. 12. Perhaps the doctrine of the Parousia of the risen (ver. 8) Jesus had furnished a special handle for this accusation. — οὗτοι πάντες] "Eos qui fugerant, et qui aderant notant," Bengel. — οὗτοις τῶν δογμάτων. Καίνα.] in direct opposition to the edicts of the emperor, which interdicted high treason and guarded the majesty of the Caesar. — ἐβασιλ. λέγ. ἐνεργών εἰναι] βασιλ. in the wider sense, which includes also the imperial dignity.

Vv. 8, 9. Ἐπόραξαν This was alarm at revolutionary outrage and Roman vengeance. Comp. Matt. ii. 3. — λαβόντες τὸ ἰκανὸν] Comp. Mark xv. 15, where τὸ ἰκανὸν ποιεῖν τινὶ is: to satisfy one, so that he can demand nothing more. Therefore: after they had received satisfaction, so that for the present they might desist from further claims against the persons of the accused, satisfactiones accepta. Comp. Grotius. But whether this satisfaction took place by furnishing sureties or by lodging a deposit of money, remains undecided; certainly its object was a guarantee that no attempt against the Roman majesty should prevail or should occur. This is evident from the relation in which λαβόντες τὸ ἰκανὸν necessarily stands with the point of complaint, ver. 7, and with the disquietude (ἐπόραξαν) excited thereby. Therefore the opinions are to be rejected, that λαβ. τ. ἰκ. refers to security that Paul and Silas would appear in case of need before the court, or that they would be no longer sheltered, or that they should immediately depart. Moreover, it is erroneous, with Luther and Camerarius, to suppose that by τὸ ἰκανὸν is meant a satisfactory vindication. Luke would certainly have brought out this more definitely; and λαβόντες denotes an actual receipt of the satisfaction (τὸ ἰκανὸν), as the context suggests nothing else.

— Observe, too, how here—it is otherwise in xvi. 20—the politarchs did not
prosecute the matter further, but cut it short with the furnished guarantee, which was at least politically the most prudent course.

Vv. 10–13. Δια τ. ἐκκλ. As in xvi. 9. — Beroea, a city in the third district of Macedonia,1 to the south-west of Thessalonica.2 — ἀνέστησαν ἀπεματοσκόπω, so frequent in Greek writers, only here in the N. T.3 They separated, after their arrival, from their companions, and went away to the synagogue. — εἰς εἰσόδος τοῦ νεούς of a nobler character.4 Theophyl. after Chrys.: ἐπεικέτεος. An arbitrary limitation; tolerance is comprehended in the general nobleness of disposition. — τῶν ἐν Θεσσαλ. than the Jews in Thessalonica. — τὸ καθ’ ἡμέραν daily.5 — ἀνακρίνοντες τὸς γρ., searching the Scriptures (John v. 39), namely, to prove: εἰ ἔχοι ταύτα, which Paul and Silas stated, ὡς τάκτα, as they taught, "Character verae religionis, quod se dijudicari patitur," Bengel. — εἰς ἔκχωμα. see on xiii. 50. — The Hellenic women and men are to be considered partly as proselytes of the gate who had heard the preaching of Christ in the synagogue, and partly as actual Gentiles who were gained in private conversations. Comp. on xi. 20. — Ἔλληνισθων] construed with γυναικών, but also to be referred to ἀνδρῶν.6 — That the church of Beroea soon withered again, is quite as arbitrarily assumed by Baumgarten, as that it was the only one founded by Paul to which no letter of the apostle has come down to us. How many churches may Paul have founded of which we know nothing whatever! (z).7

Vv. 18–15. Κακία is to be connected, not with ἤλθον, so that then the usual attraction would take place,8 but with σαλέωσας; for not the coming, but the σαλέω, had formerly taken place elsewhere. — Ver. 14. Then immediately the brethren sent Paul away from the city, that he might journey ὡς ἐν τῷ δῆμῳ. Neither here nor elsewhere is ὡς redundant, but it indicates the definitely conceived purpose of the direction, which he had to take toward the sea, the Thermaic gulf.9 Others10 render it: as if toward the sea; so that, in order to escape the snares, they took the road toward the sea only apparently, and then turned to the land-route. But in that case Luke, if he wished to be understood, would not have failed to add a remark counter to the mere semblance of the τοῦ. ἐν τῷ θάλασσα, especially as in what follows nothing necessarily points to a journey by land to Athens,10 — δ. Τιθεο. Where Timothy, supposing him to have remained behind at Philippi,11 again fell in with Paul and Silas, is uncertain. — ἤμεν in Beroea. — Ver. 15. κατηστάθηναί] to bring to the spot; then, to transport, to escort one.12 — ην ὡς τάχιστα κ.τ.λ.] See xviii. 5, according to which, however, they

---

1 Liv. xiv. 50. 
2 See Forbiger, Geogr. III. p. 1081. Now}
3 Comp. 4 Macc. vili. 8; 2 Macc. xii. 1. 
5 Aj. 453; 4 Macc. vi. 5, ix. 37. [299. 
6 Comp. Luke xi. 8, xiv. 47; Bernhardy, p. 
7 See Matthew, § 441. 
8 See on Matt. ii. 22. 
9 See Winer, p. 574 f. (E. T. 771); Hermann, 
10 Beza, Piscator, Grotius, Er. Schmid, Bengel, Olsenaen, Neander, Lange. 
11 Erasmus correctly observes: "probabilius est cum navigasse . . . quia nulla at mentio eorum, quae P. in itinere serenit, cui fuerint tot civitates peragrandae." 
12 See on xvi. 40. 
13 Not: who brought him in safety (Beza and others): Hom. Od. xiii. 397: τοις άρματων τούτων πιολογος (thus also by ship) καταστάθη. Thuc. 
14 iv. 78, vi. 108. 8; Xen. Anab. iv. 8. 8.
only joined Paul at Corinth. But this, as regards Timothy, is an incorrect statement, as is clearly evident from 1 Thess. iii. 1.—a point which is to be acknowledged, and not to be smoothed over by harmonistic combinations which do not tally with any of the two statements. According to Baumgarten, Luke has only mentioned the presence of the two companions again with Paul, xviii. 5, when their co-operation could again take an effective part in the diffusion of the gospel. But it is not their being together, but their coming together, that is narrated in Acts xviii. 5 (A').

Ver. 16. Παρωκείνητο was irritated at the high degree of heathen darkness and perversion which prevailed at Athens. — τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αἰτίῳ comp. John xi. 33, 38. — The genitive θεωρούντος, mentally attached to αὐτοῦ (see the critical remarks): because he saw. — κατειδωλοῦ], full of images, of idols, not preserved elsewhere in Greek, but formed according to usual analogies (κατάμπελος, καταδιάκονος, κατάξαρος, καταλιθος, al.). — Athens, the centre of Hellenic worship and art, united zeal for both in a pre-eminent degree, and was—especially at that period of political decay, when outward ritual and show in the sphere of religion and superstition flourished among the people alongside of the philosophical self-sufficiency of the higher scholastic wisdom among people of culture—full of temples and altars, of priests and other persons connected with worship, who had to minster at an innumerable number of pompous festivals.

Ver. 17. ὅν] impelled by that indignation to counteract this heathen confusion. He had intended only to wait for his companions at Athens, but "in signi et extraordinario zelo stimulatus rem gerit miles Christi," Bengel. And this zeal caused him, in order to pave the way for Christianity in opposition to the heathenism here so particularly powerful, to enter into controversial discussions with Jews and Gentiles at the same time, not first with the Jews, and, on being rejected by them, afterwards with Gentiles. — ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ favours the view that, as usual in Greek cities, there was only one market at Athens. If there were two markets, still the celebrated ἀγορὰ καὶ ἐξοχή is to be understood, not far from the Pnyx, the Acropolis, and the Areopagus, bounded by the στοὰ ποικίλη on the west, by the Stoa Basileios and the Stoa Eleutherios on the south, rich in noble statues, the central seat of commercial, forensic, and philosophic intercourse, as well as of the busy idleness of the loungers (n)

Ver. 18. That it was Epicureans and Stoics who fell into conflict with him, and not Academics and Peripatetics, is to be explained—apart from the greater popularity of the two former, and from the circumstance that they were in this later period the most numerous at Athens—from the greater contrast of their philosophic tenets with the doctrines of Christianity. The one had their principle of pleasure, and the other their pride of virtue!

1 Such as Otto, Pastoralbr. p. 61 f., makes.
2 See Lünnemann on 1 Thess. iii. 1.
3 1 Cor. xiii. 5; Dem. 514. 10: ἀρχηγόναι καὶ
4 Rom. i. 21 ff. [καταξιούμενη.
5 See Paus. i. 34. 3; Strabo, x. p. 472; Liv. xiv. 97; Xen. Rep. Ath. iii. 2; and Wetstein in loc.
6 See on ver. 2.
7 Forchhammer, Forbiger, and others.
8 So Otfrid Müller and others.
9 Not the Eretria (ἡ νῦν ἐστὶν ἀγορὰ, Strabo, x. 10. p. 447).
and both repudiated faith in the Divine Providence. — The opinion of these philosophers was twofold. Some, with vain scholastic conceit, pronounced Paul’s discourses, which lacked the matter and form of Hellenic philosophy, to be idle talk, undeserving of attention, and would have nothing further to do with him. Others were at least curious about this new matter, considered the singular stranger as an announcer of strange divinities, and took him with them, in order to hear more from him and to allow their fellow-citizens to hear him, to the Areopagus, etc. — τί ἐν θείοι . . . λέγων] if, namely, his speaking is to have a meaning. — ὁ σπερμολόγος] originally the rook. Then in twofold figurative meaning: (1) from the manner in which that bird feeds, a parasite; and (2) from its chattering voice, a babbler. So here, as the speaking of Paul gave occasion to this contemptuous designation. — δαμονίων] divinities, quite generally. The plural is indefinite, and denotes the category, see on Matt. ii. 20. According to de Wette, it is Jesus the Risen One and the living God that are meant in contrast to the Greek gods,—an element, however, which, according to the subjoined remark of Luke, appears as imported. The judgment of the philosophers, very similar to the charge previously brought against Socrates, but not framed possibly in imitation of it, in opposition to Zeller, was founded on their belief that Jesus, whom Paul preached and even set forth as a raiser of the dead, must be assumed, doubtless, to be a foreign divinity, whose announcer—καταγγελέω, not elsewhere preserved—Paul desired to be. Hence Luke adds the explanatory statement: ἐστὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν κ. τ. ἀνάστ. εἰσάγγ. Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Alexander Morus, Selden, Hammond, Spencer, Heinrichs, Baur,1 Lange, and Baumgarten, strangely imagine that the philosophers meant the Ἀνάστασις as a goddess announced by Paul. But if Luke had aimed at this by his explanatory remark, he must have indicated it more precisely, especially as it is in itself improbable that the philosophers could, even in mere irony, derive from the words of the apostle a goddess Ἀνάστασις, for Paul doubtless announced ὁ who would raise the dead. Olearius referred τ. ἀνάστ. not to the general resurrection of the dead, but to the resurrection of Jesus; so also Bengel. But Luke, in that case, in order not to be misunderstood, must have added αἰνοῖ, which (see the critical remarks) he has not done.

Vv. 19, 20. Ἐπιλαβθεῖσαν] Grotius aptly says: “manu leniter prehensum.” Adroitly confiding politeness. Ver. 21 proves that a violent seizure and carrying away to judicial examination is not indicated, as Adami and others imagined, but that the object in view was simply to satisfy the curiosity of the people flocking to the Areopagus. And this is evinced by the whole proceedings, which show no trace of a judicial process, ending as they did partly with ridicule and partly with polite dismissal, ver. 31,

1 Comp. Hermann, Culturae Grec. d. Gr. u.
2 See on ii. 12.
3 Aristoph. Aæ. 293, 579.
4 Dem. 266, 19; Athen. viii. p. 344 C.
5 See also Dissen, ad Dem. de cor. p. 297.
6 Xen. Mem. i. 1. 1.
7 See his Præl. I. p. 162, ed. 2: the ironical popular wit had cut out of Jesus and the Ἀνάστασις made a pair of divinities.
8 Comp. also Ewald, p. 494 f.
9 Comp. ix. 27, xxiii. 19.
10 See in Wolf.
after which Paul departed unhindered. Besides the Athenians were very indulgent to the introduction of foreign, particularly Oriental, worship, provided only there was not conjoined with it rejection of the native gods, such as Socrates was formerly accused of. To this the assertion of Josephus, c. Ap. 2, is to be limited: "νῦν δὲ ἕν τῶν παρ' αὐτῶι κεκληρυκένων και τιμωρία κατὰ τῶν ξένων εἰσαγόντων θεῶν ἔμαστο βάναυσος,"—which, perhaps, is merely a generalization from the history of Socrates. And certainly Paul, as the wisdom of his speech attests, prudently withheld a direct condemnatory judgment of the Athenian gods. Notwithstanding, Baur and Zeller have again insisted on a judicial process in the Areopagus—alleging that the legend of Dionysius the Areopagite, as the first bishop of Athens, had given rise to the whole history; that there was a wish to procure for Paul an opportunity, as solemn as possible, for the exposition of his teaching, an arena analogous to the Sanhedrin (Zeller), etc. — Concerning the "Ἀρχιερεῖος πάγος, οὐσία Μαρτυρίος so called ὅτι πρῶτος Ἀρχη ἐνταῦθα εἱκρίνη," the seat of the supreme judicature of Athens, situated to the west of the Acropolis, and concerning the institution and authority of that tribunal, see Meursius.— ὁ δεψάμενα γυνώσκει κ.τ.λ.] invitation in the form of a courteous question, by way of securing the contemplated enjoyment. — τις ἥ καίνη κ.τ.λ.] what, as respects its more precise contents, this new doctrine, namely, that which is being announced by you. In the repetition of the article there is here implied a pert, ironical emphasis. — εὔνοιαν starting. εὔνοιας οὐ μόνον το ξένοιν ὑποδέχομαι, ἄλλα καὶ ἐκπλήττων." — εἰσφερεῖσ] namely, whilst you are here, hence the present. — τί ἂν θέλως οὐκαίνει see on ver. 18, ii. 12, and Tittmann, Synon. Ν. Τ. p. 129 f. The plural ταύτα indicates the individual points, after the collective character of which τί inquires.  

Ver. 21. A remark of Luke added for the elucidation of vv. 19, 20. But Athenians, Ἀθηναῖοι, without the article: Athenian people, collectively, and the strangers resident there, had leisure for nothing else than, etc. εἰκαστέον, vacare alicui rei, belongs to the later Greek. The imperfect does not exclude the continuance of the state of things in the present, but interweaves it with the history, so that it is transferred into the same time with the latter. According to Ewald, Luke actually means an earlier period, when it had still been so in Athens, "before it was plundered by Nero." But then we should at least have expected an indication of this in the text by τότε or πάλαι, even apart from the fact that such a characteristic of a city is not so quickly lost. — καὶνότερον] The comparative delineates more strongly
and vividly. The novelty-loving1 and talkative2 Athenians wished always to be saying or hearing something *never* than the previous news.3

Ver. 22. *Σταθεῖς ἐν οὐσίᾳ* denotes intrepidity. — The wisdom with which Paul could become a Gentile to the Gentiles, has been at all times justly praised. There is to be noted also, along with this, the elegance and adroitness, combined with all simplicity, in the expression and progress of thought; the speech is, as respects its contents and form, full of sacred Attic art, a vividly original product of the free apostolic spirit. — κατὰ πᾶντα in all respects. Comp. Col. iii. 20, 22. *δεισιδαιμονεῖτον* A comparison with the other Greeks, in preference over whom Athens had the praise of religiousness.4 Δεισιδαιμονεῖτον means divinity-fearing, but may, as the fear of God may be the source of either, denote as well real piety5 as superstition.6 Paul therefore, without violating the truth, prudently leaves the religious tendency of his hearers undetermined, and names only its source — the fear of God. Chrysostom well remarks: *προσδοσεῖ· τῷ λόγῳ· διὰ τοῦτο εἰς· δεισιδαιμονεῖτον· οὐάς· Θεῷ·.*7 Mistaking this fine choice of the expression, the Vulgate, Erasmus, Luther, Castalio, Calvinus, Suicer, Wolf, and others explained it: *superstitiosiores.* ά· I perceive you as more God-fearing, so that you appear as such.8 — *οὐάς· Θεῷ.* "Magna perspicacia et parhesis; unus Paulus contra Athenas," Bengel.

Ver. 23. *Διερχόμενι* belongs jointly to τα σεβασμε. *ι.μ.· ἀναθέτω· τα σεβ. ι.μ.* attentively contemplating* the objects of your worship, temples, altars, images.9 — *ἀγνωστῷ· Θεῷ.* That there actually stood at Athens at least one altar with the inscription: "to an unknown god," would appear historically certain from this passage itself, even though other proofs were wanting, since Paul appeals to his own observation, and that, too, in the presence of the Athenians themselves. But there are corroborating external proofs: (1) Pausan. i. 1. 4. (comp. v. 14. 6) says: in Athens there were βωμοὶ θεῶν τε ὑμνουμένους ἀγνώστους καί ἱδρῶν; and (2) Philostr. *Vit. Apollon. vii. 2: συμφωνεύοντος περὶ πάντων θεῶν ἐν λέγειν, καί ταῦτα Ἀθήνας· οὐ καὶ ἀγνώστων θεῶν βωμοὶ ἱδρύονται.* From both passages it is evident that at Athens there were several altars, each of which bore the votive inscription: *ἀγνώστω Θεῷ.*10 The explanation of the origin of such altars is less certain. Yet Diog. Laert. Epim. 3 gives a trace of it, when it is related that Epimenides put an end to a plague in Athens by causing black and white sheep, which he had let loose on the Areopagus, to be sacrificed on the spots where they lay down τῷ προσήχοντι Θεῷ, i.e. to the god concerned, yet not known by

1 Thuc. iii. 38. 4.
2 Wetstein and Valckenaer in loc.
3 See Winer, p. 298 (5. T. 305). Comp. Plat. Phaed. p. 115 B; Dem. 43. 7; 190. 2.
5 Xen. Cyr. iii. 3. 66, Apoll. 11. 8.
6 Theophr. Char. 16: Diod. Sic. 1. 62; Lucian. Alex. 9; Plutarch, and others.
7 See on this word, Hermann, gottessed.
8 See Bernhardy. p. 333. [Allerth. § 8. 6.
9 Heb. xiii. 7; Diod. Sic. xii. 15; Pint. Lerr. P. 1; Lucian, Vit. cunct. 2; comp. ἀναθεμάτως, Cicero. ad Att. i. 19. xiv. 18 f.
10 2 Thess. 11. 4; 1 Wad. xiv. 20, xv. 7; Hist. Drag. 27; Dion. Hal. Ant. i. 30, v. 1; Suerer, Theor. ii. p. 942.
11 Lucian, Philop. 9 and 59, is invalid as a proof, for there the reference of the pseudo-Lucian to the Ἀγνώστου ἐν Ἀθήναις is based on this very passage.
name, namely, who was the author of the plague; and that therefore one may find at Athens βομοίοι ἄνωνύμοι, i.e. altars without the designation of a god by name, not as Kuinoel, following Olearius, thinks, without any inscription. From this particular instance the general view may be derived, that on important occasions, when the reference to a god known by name was wanting, as in public calamities of which no definite god could be assigned as the author, in order to honor or propitiate the god concerned (τῶν προοίμωντα) by sacrifice, without lighting on a wrong one, altars were erected which were destined and designated ἄγνωστοι θεοί. Without any historical foundation, Eichhorn supposed that such altars proceeded from the time when the art of writing was not yet known or in use; and that at a later period, when it was not known to what god those altars belonged, they were marked with that inscription in order not to offend any god. Against this may be urged the great probability that the destination of such altars would be preserved in men’s knowledge by oral tradition. Entirely peculiar is the remark of Jerome on Tit. 1. 13: “Inscriptio arae non ita erat, ut Paulus asseruit: ignoto Deo, sed ita: Diis Asiacis et Europae et Africanae, Diis ignotis et peregrinis.” Verum quia Paulus non pluribus Diis ignotis indigebat, sed uno tantum ignoto Deo, singulari verbo usus est,” etc. But there is no historical trace of such an altar-inscription; and, had it been in existence, Paul could not have meant it, because we cannot suppose that, at the very commencement of his discourse, he would have made a statement before the Athenians deviating so much from the reality and only containing an abstract inference from it. The ἄγνωστοι θεοί could not but have its literal accuracy and form the whole inscription; otherwise Paul would only have promoted the suspicion of σπερματοζυία. We need not inquire to what definite god the Athenians pointed by their ἄγνωστοι θεοί. In truth, they meant no definite god, because, in the case which occasioned the altar, they knew none such. The view (see in Wolf) that the God of the Jews—the obscure knowledge of whom had come from the Jews to Egypt, and thence to the Greeks—is meant, is an empty dogmatic invention. Baur, p. 202, ed. 2, with whom Zeller agrees, maintains that the inscription in the singular is unhistorical; that only the plural, ἄγνωστοι θεοὶ, could have been written; and that only a writer at a distance, who “had to fear no contradiction on the spot,” could have ventured on such an intentional alteration. But the very hint given to us by Diogenes Laertius as to the origin of such altars is decisive against this notion, as well as the correct remark of Grotius: “Cum Pausanias ait aras Athenis fuisset θεῶν ἄγνωστων, hoc vult, multas fuisses aras tali inscriptione: θεῶν ἄγνωστων, quamquam potuere et alias esse


2 But, according to Oecumenius: θεῶν Ἀσίας καὶ Εὐρώπης καὶ Λιβύης θεῶν ἄγνωστων καὶ ξένων. Comp. Isidor. Polus. in Cramer, Cat. p. 299. According to Ewald, this is the more exact statement of the inscription; from it Paul may have borrowed his quotation. But the exactness is suspicious just on account of the singular in Oecumenius; and moreover, Paul would have gone much too freely to work by the omission of the essential term Λιβύης (“the unknown and strange god of Libya”); nor would he have had any reason for the omission of the ξένων, while he might, on the contrary, have employed it in some ingenious sort of turn with reference to ver. 18.
plurality inscriptae, aliae singulariter." Besides, it may be noted that
Paul, had he read ἄγνωστος θεός on the altar might have used this plural
expression for his purpose as suitably as the singular, since he, in fact, con-
tinues with the generic neuter ὁ . . . τινος. — On the Greek altars without
temples, see Hermann, gottesd. Allth. § 17. — ὁ θεός ἀγνωστος εἰσεβείτε,
τοῦτο κ.τ.λ.] (see the critical remarks) what ye therefore, according to this
inscription, without knowing it, worship, that, this very object of your wor-
ship, do I, ἰδίω, with a self-conscious emphasis, make known unto you. Paul
rightly inferred from the inscription that the Athenians, besides the gods,
Zeus, Athene, etc., known to them, recognised something divine as existing
and to be worshipped, which was different from these, however, after the
manner of heathenism, they might conceive of it in various concrete forms.
And justly also, as the God preached him was another than those known
heathen gods, he might now say that this divinity, which served them in
an unknown manner as the object of worship, was that which he announced
to them, in order that it might now become to them γνωστὸς θεός. Of
course, they could not yet take up this expression in the sense of the apostle
himself, but could only think of some divine being according to their usual
heathen conception, but, most suitably to the purpose he had in view, re-
serving the more exact information for the further course of his address,
he now engaged the religious interest of his hearers in his own public an-
nouncement of it, and thereby excited that interest the more, as by this
ingeniously improvised connection he exhibited himself quite differently
from what those might have expected who deemed him a καταγεγελέος ἐξων
λαμμονίων, ver. 18. Chrysostom aptly remarks in this respect: ὥμα πώς
dεῖκνυ θεοληπτός αὐτῶν ὁ θεός ἐξων, φθοίρ, οὐδὲν καίνων εἰσφέρων. — Observe,
also, the conciliatory selection of εἰσεβείτε, which expresses πιστὸς worship.
εἰσεβεί, with the accusative of the object, is in classical writers, though
rare, yet certainly vouched for, in opposition to Valckenaer, Porson,
Seidler, Eiendt4 (c³).

Vv. 24—29. Paul now makes that unknown divinity known in concreto,
and in such a manner that his description at the same time exposes the
nullity of the polytheism deifying the powers of nature, with which he
contrasts the divine affinity of man. Comp. Rom. i. 18 ff.

Vv. 24, 25. Comp. vii. 48; Ps. 1. 10 ff.; also the similar expressions
from profane writers. — ἡ παραπτώματα is served, by offerings, etc., namely, as
regards the actual objective state of the case. — ἡ προσέλεως. τινός] as one, who
needed anything in addition, i.e. to what He Himself is and has. Erasmus,
Paraphr.: "cum . . . nullius bosi desideret accessionem." — αὐτὸς ἰδίως

1 Rom. i. 22, 23; 1 Cor. viii. 4 ff., x. 30.
2 Comp. Lange in the Stud. und Krit. 1850, p. 584 f.
3 1 Tim. v. 4; 4 Macc. v. 23, xii. 5.
4 See Hermann, ad Soph. Ant. 727. Compare also the Greek ἐσπεὶρεῖν τι or τινα.
5 In Gröntin and Wetstein, Kypke, II. 69, and the passages cited from Porphyry by
Ullmann in the Stud. u Krit. 1879, p. 388; likewise Philo, leg. alleg. II. p. 1087.
6 Luther takes τινὸς as masculine, which
likewise excellently corresponds with what precedes, as with the following ὥστε. But
the neuter rendering is yet to be preferred, as affecting everything except God (in the vi
there is also every ὅστε.) Comp. Clem. ad Cor. I. 29.
7 Comp. 2 Macc. xiv. 25, and Grimm in loc.
a confirmatory definition to οἶδα. . . τινὸς: seeing that Ηε Himself gives, etc. — πᾶσιν to all men, which is evident from the relation of αὐτῶς ... πάντα to the preceding οἶδα. . . τινὸς. — ζωῆν κ. πνεῦν] the former denotes life in itself, the latter the continuance of life, which is conditioned by breathing. 'Εσπεννος εἰ' εἰμι κ. πνεῦς, θερμάς πνεῦμα.1 The dying man φροστεῖ εἰπεν εἰμι. Erasmus correctly remarks the jucundus consentus of the two words.2 Others assume a hendiadys, which, as regards analysis—life, and indeed breath—and form, namely, that the second substantive is subordinate, and must be converted into the adjective, Calvin has correctly apprehended: vitam animalem. But how tame and enfeebling! — καὶ τὰ πάντα] and, generally, all things, namely, which they use. — Chrysostom has already remarked how far this very first point of the discourse, vv. 24, 25, transcends not only heathenism in general, but also the philosophies of heathenism, which could not rise to the idea of an absolute Creator. Observe the threefold contents of the speech: Theology, ver. 24 f.; Anthropology, vv. 26-29; Christology, ver. 30 f.

Vv. 26, 27. "The single origin of men and their adjusted diffusion upon the earth was also His work, in order that they should seek and find Him who is near to all." — ἐποίησεν . . . κατοικεῖν] He has made that from—proceeding from—one blood, every nation of men should dwell upon all the face of the earth, comp. Gen. xi. 8. Castalio, Calvin, Beza, and others: "fecitque ex uno sanguine omnes genus hominum, ut inhabitaret" (after ἀνθρ. a comma). Against this is the circumstance that ὁρίασας κ.τ.λ. contains the modal definition, not to the making, to the producing, of the nations, but to the making-them-to-dwell, as is evident from τῆς κατοικίας αὐτῶν; so that this interpretation is not according to the context. — ἐξ ἀνδριῶν αἰμαριῶν] See, respecting αἷμα as the seat of life propagating itself by generation, on John i. 13. Paul, by this remark, that all men through one heavenly Father have also one earthly father, does not specially oppose, as Stolz, Kuinoel, and others, following older interpreters, assume, the belief of the Athenians that they were aἱρέχθοντες; 4 the whole discourse is elevated above so special a polemical bearing. But he speaks in the way of general and necessary contrast to the polytheistic nature-religions, which derived the different nations from different origins in their myths. Quite irrelevant is what Olshausen suggests as the design of Paul, that he wished to represent the contempt in which the Jews were held among the Greeks as absurd. — ἐπὶ πᾶν τὸ πρόως. τ. γῆς] refers to the idea of the totality of the nations dwelling on the earth, which is contained in πᾶν ἡνὸς, every nation. — ὁρίασας] Aorist participle contemporaneous with ἐποίησεν, specifying how God proceeded in that ἐποίησεν κ.τ.λ.: inasmuch as He has fixed the appointed periods and the definite boundaries of their, the nation’s, dwelling. τῆς κατοικίας αὐτ. belongs to both—to προστετ. καρπ., and τῷ τὰς ὀροθ. God has deter-

p. 190. See on this meaning of the verb especially, Dem. xiv. 22; Plat. Phil., p. 80 B; and on the distinction of προστετασθαὶ πνεος and τε, St. Amb. ad Plat. Rep. p. 342 A.
2 Plin. Nat. x. 140.
3 Comp. Lobeck, Paural. p. 88; Winier, p. 501 (Ε. τ. 703).
4 See Wetstein in loc.
mined the dwelling\(^1\) of the nations, according both to its duration in time and to its extension in space. Both, subject to change, run their course in a development divinely ordered.\(^8\) Others take προστατ. καρπ. independently of τ. κατωκ. αἰών., so Baumgarten; but thereby the former expression presents itself in perplexing indefiniteness. The sense of the epochs of the world set forth by Daniel\(^2\) must have been more precisely indicated than by the simple καρποφόρος. Lachmann has separated προστατεύμα, into προς τεταγμένου unnecessarily, contrary to all versions and Fathers, also contrary to the reading προστατεύμ. in D* Iren. interpr. — ἡ ὁρθεσία is not elsewhere preserved, but τὸ ὁρθεσίου; see Bornemann.

Ver. 27. The divine purpose in this guidance of the nations is attached by means of the telic infinitive: in order that they should seek the Lord, i.e. direct their endeavours to the knowledge of God, if perhaps they might feel Him, who is so palpably near, and find Him. Olshausen thinks that in ζητεῖν is implied the previous apostasy of mankind from God. But the seeking does not necessarily suppose a having lost; and since the text does not touch on an earlier fellowship of man with God, although that is in itself correct, the hearers, at least, could not infer that conclusion from the simple ζητεῖν. The great thought of the passage is simply: God the Author, the Governor, and the End of the world’s history: from God, through God, to God. — ψηλαφ. . . εἰροεῖν] Paul keeps consistently to his figure. The seeker who comes on his object touches and grasps it, and has now in reality found it. Hence the meaning without figure is: if perhaps they might become conscious of God and of their relation to Him, and might appropriate this consciousness as a spiritual possession. Thus they would have understood the guidance of the nations as a revelation of God, and have complied with its holy design in their own case.\(^4\) The problematic expression, εἰ ὁραεί, if they at least accordingly,\(^6\) is in accordance both with the nature of the case—Bengel: “via patet; Deus inveniri potest, sed hominem non cogit”—and with the historical want of success;\(^7\) for the heathen world was blinded, to which also ψηλαφ. points—a word which, since the time of Homer, is very frequently used of groping in the dark or in blindness.\(^5\) — κατώτερος κ.τ.λ.] although certainly He\(^8\) does not at all require to be first sought and found, as He is not far\(^10\) from every one of us. Comp. Jer. xxiii. 28. This addition makes palpably evident the greatness of the blindness, which nevertheless took place.

Ver. 28. Reason assigned (γάρ) for εἰ μακρ. ἀπὸ εὐδ. κ.τ.λ., for in Him we live, we move, and we exist. Paul views God under the point of view of His immanence as the element in which we live, etc.; and man in such intimate connection with God, that he is constantly surrounded by the Godhead and embraced in its essential influence, but, apart from the Godhead, could

---

\(^1\) καρποφόρος, Polyb. v. 73. 5; Strabo, v. p. 166.

\(^2\) Comp. Job xii. 22.

\(^3\) Baumgarten.


\(^5\) Comp. Luther, com. friseen Willen, p. 415.

\(^6\) See Klotz, ad Devar. pp. 173, 192.

\(^7\) See Rom. i. 18 ff., and comp. Baumg. p. 550 ff.

\(^8\) Od. ix. 416; Job v. 14; comp. here esp. specialy, Plato, Phaed. p. 80 B.

\(^9\) xiv. 17; John iv. 2.

\(^10\) For see ver. 28.
Neither live, nor move, nor exist. This explanation is required by the relation of the words to the preceding, according to which they are designed to prove the nearness of God; therefore in autó must necessarily contain the local reference—the idea of the divine περιχώρος, which Chrysostom illustrates by the example of the air surrounding us on all sides. Therefore the rendering per eum, or, as de Wette more correctly expresses it, “resting on Him as the foundation,” which would yield no connection in the way of proof with the οὐ μακράν εἶναι of the Godhead, is to be abandoned. In opposition to the pantheistic view, see already Calvin. It is sufficient to urge against it—although it was also asserted by Spinoza and others—on the one hand, that the transcendence of God is already decidedly attested in vv. 24–26, and on the other, that the in autó ζωέν κ.τ.λ. is said solely of men, and that indeed in so far as they stand in essential connection with God by divine descent, see the following, in which case the doctrine of the reality of evil excludes a spiritual pantheism. — ζωέν κ. κινούμενα κ. ἐσμέν a climax: out of God we should have no life, not even movement, which yet inanimate creatures, plants, waters, etc., have, nay, not even any existence, we should not have been at all. Heinrich and others take a superficial view when they consider all three to be synonymous. Storr, on the other hand, arbitrarily puts too much into ζωέν; victimus beate ac hilare; and Olshausen, after Kuinoel, too much into ἐσμέν: the true being, the life of the spirit. It is here solely physical life and being that is meant; the moral life-fellowship with God, which is that of the regenerate, is remote from the context. — τινες τῶν καθ ἐμάς ποιητ. Namely, Aratus, of Soli in Cilicia, in the third century B.C., and Cleantius of Assæ in Mysia, a disciple of Zeno. For other analogous passages, see Wetstein.—The acquaintance of the apostle with the Greek poets is to be considered as only of a dilettante sort; his school-training was entirely Jewish, but he was here obliged to abstain from O. T. quotations. — τῶν καθ ἐμάς ποιητ. Of the poets pertaining to you, i.e. your poets. — τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν] The first half of a hexameter, verbatim from Aratus l.c.; therefore γὰρ καί is not to be considered in logical connection with the speech of the apostle, but as, independently of the latter, a component part of the poetical passage, which he could not have omitted without destroying the verse. Nam hujus progenies quoque sumus: this Paul adduces as a parallel (ὡς καὶ τινες . . . ἵπποις) confirm—

2 Beza, Grothus, Heinrichs, Kuinoel.
3 Comp. already Chrysostom: οὐκ εἶναι δὲ αὐτὸ, ἀλλ’ ἐγγύτερον ἐν, ἐν αὐτῷ.
4 Comp. Olshausen.
5 Opusc. III. p. 95.
6 Phaenom. 5.
7 Ephm. in Jed. 5.
8 That Paul after his conversion, on account of his destination to the Gentiles, may have earnestly occupied himself in Taurus with Greek literature (Baumgarten), to which also the βιβλία, 2 Tim. iv. 13, are supposed to point, is a very precarious assumption, especially as it is Aratus, a fellow-countryman of the apostle, who is quoted, and other quotations (except Tit. i. 13) are not demonstrable (comp. on 1 Cor. xv. 33). The poetical expression itself in our passage is such a common idea (see Wetstein), that an acquaintance with it from several Greeks poets (τινες) by no means presupposes a more special study of Greek literature. See Introduction to the Epistle to the Romans, § 1.
9 See Bernhardy, p. 941.
ing to his hearers his own assertion, ἐν αὐτῷ ζῶμεν . . . ἡμέν. As the offspring of God, we men stand in such homogeneity to God, and thus in such necessary and essential connection with God, that we cannot have life, etc., without Him, but only in Him. So absolutely dependent is our life, etc., on Him. — τοῦ Here, according to poetical usage since the time of Homer, in the sense of νῦν. Paul has idealized the reference of the τοῦ to Zeus in Aratus.—In the passage of Cleanthes, which was also in the apostle’s mind, it is said: ἵνα σοὶ γὰρ γίνοις ἡμέν, where γίνοις is the accusative of more precise definition, and means, not kindred, as with Aratus, but origin.

Ver. 29. Since, then, we, according to this poetical saying, are offspring of God, so must our self-consciousness, kindred to God, tell us that the Godhead has not resemblance to gold, etc. We cannot suppose a resemblance of the Godhead to such materials, graven by human art, without denying ourselves as the progenies of God. Therefore we ought not (οὶκ ὁφειλομεν). What a delicate and penetrating attack on heathen worship! That Paul with the reproach, which in οἰκ ὁφειλομεν κ.τ.λ. is expressed with wise mildness, does no injustice to heathenism, whose thinkers had certainly in great measure risen above anthropomorphism, but hits the prevailing popular opinion, may be seen in Baumgarten, p. 566 ff. — γίνοις] placed first and separated from τ. Θεοῦ, as the chief point of the argument. For, if we are proles Dei, and accordingly homogeneus with God, it is a preposterous error at variance with our duty to think, with respect to things which are entirely heterogeneae to us, as gold, silver, and stone, that the Godhead has resemblance with them. — χαράγματι τέχν. κ. κ. ἐνθυμ. ἀνθρώπων] a graven image which is produced by art and deliberation of a man, for the artist made it according to the measure of his artistic meditation and reflection: an opposition to χαραγμός κ.τ.λ., not in the ablative (Bengel). — τὸ θείον] the divine nature, divinum numen. The general expression fitsly corresponds to the discourse on heathenism, as the real object of the latter. Observe also the striking juxtaposition of ἀνθρώπων and τὸ θείον; for χαράγμα τέχν. κ. κ. ἐνθυμ. ἀνθρ. serves to make the οἰκ ὁφειλομεν νομίζειν still more palpably felt; inasmuch as metal and stone serve only for the materials of human art and artistic thoughts, but far above human artistic subjectivity, which wishes to represent the divine nature in these materials, must the Godhead be exalted, which is not similar to the human image, but widely different from it.*

Vv. 30, 31. It is evident from ver. 29 that heathenism is based on ignorance. Therefore Paul, proceeding to the Christological portion of his discourse, now continues with μὲν οὖν: the times, therefore, of ignorance, for such they are, according to ver. 29, God having overlooked, makes known at present to all men everywhere to repent. — ἵππος] without noting them with a view to punishment or other interference. The idea of contempt, although

---

1 See Kühner, § 480, 5; Eilenb., Lex. Soph. II. p. 108.
2 Graf views it otherwise, but against the clear words of the passage, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1859, p. 232.
3 Bengel: “clemens locutio, praeestimia in prima persona pluram.”
4 πρὸς τοὺς παλαιοὺς ὁ λόγος ἦν αὐτῷ, Chrysostom.
6 Comp. Wied. xxv. 15 ff.
7 Comp. Dion. Hal. v. 23. Opposite of ἀφοράς. See also on Rom. iii. 28; Acts xiv. 16.
8 Vulg.: desplicite.
otherwise linguistically suitable, which Castalio, de Dieu, Gataker, Calovius, Seb. Schmid, and others find in the expression, partly even with the observation: "indignatione et odio temporum . . . corruptus," 1 is at variance with the cautiousness and moderation of the whole speech. — πάντα πανταξῶν] a popular hyperbolical expression; yet not incorrect, as the universal announcement was certainly in course of development. 2 — καθ' μι (see the critical remarks): in accordance with the fact that He has appointed a day. It denotes the important consideration, by which God was induced ταύτων παραγγέλλειν κ.τ.λ. Comp. ii. 24. — ἐν δικαιοσ. ] in rightousness, so that this is the determining moral element, in which the κρίνειν is to take place, i.e. δικαίως, 1 Pet. ii. 23. Paul means the Messianic judgment, and that as not remotely impending. — ἐν ἀνθρώποις i.e. in the person of a man, who will be God's representative. — ψ ως κ.τ.λ.] a well-known attraction: whom He ordained, namely, for holding the judgment, having afforded faith, in Him as a judge, to all, by the fact that He raised Him from the dead. The πίστιν παρέχειν 3 is the operation of God on men, by which He affords to them faith, — an operation which He brought to bear on them historically, by His having conspicuously placed before them in the resurrection of Jesus His credentials as the appointed judge. The resurrection of Jesus is indeed the divine σημεία, 4 and consequently the foundation of knowledge and conviction, divinely given as a sure handle of faith to all men, as regards what the Lord, in His nature and destination was and is; and therefore the thought is not to be regarded as "not sufficiently ideal" for Paul. 5 The ἀριετίν is not, as in x. 42, the appointment which took place in the counsel of God, but that which was accomplished in time and fact as regards the faith of men, as in Rom. i. 4. Moreover, the πίστιν παρέχειν, which on the part of God took place by the resurrection of Jesus, does not exclude the human self-determination to accept and appropriate this divine παρέχειν. 6 Πίστιν παρέχειν may be rendered, with Beza and others, 7, according to likewise correct Greek usage: to give assurance by His resurrection, but this commends itself the less, because in that case the important element of faith remains without express mention, although it corresponds very suitably to the παραγγέλλει μετάνοια, ver. 30. The conception and mode of expression, to afford faith, is similar to μετάνοια διάνοια, v. 31, xi. 18, yet the latter is already more than παρέχειν, potestatem facere, ansem praebere credendi.

Ver. 32. As yet Paul has not once named Jesus, but has only endeavoured to gather up the most earnest interest of his hearers for this the great final aim of his discourse; now his speech is broken off by the mockery of some, and by a courteous relegation to silence on the part of others. — ἀναστάσιν νεκρῶν] a resurrection of dead persons, as Paul had just asserted such a case. The plural denotes the category. 8 To take it of the general rising of the

1 Wolf.
2 Comp. Col. i. 22. On the juxtaposition of πάντα πανταξῶν, see Lobbeck, Paralip. p. 62 f.
3 See Weinstein and Kypke in loc.
4 Comp. John ii. 18 f.
5 De Wette. Comp. on ii. 35, iv. 27, x. 39, xiii. 33.
6 Comp. on Rom. ii. 4.
7 See especially Raphel, Psigö. in loc.
8 Comp. on Rom. i. 4.
dead at the day of judgment, is quite at variance with the context. That,
moreover, the αἱ πάντες were all Epicureans, and the αἱ τέλειοι, as Grotius,
Wolf, and Rosenmüller supposed, cannot be proved. Calvin, Grotius,
Wolf, Rosenmüller, Alford, and others hold ἀκονθωμεθα σου πάλ. ἐπὶ τοῦ τούτου
as meant in earnest. But would not Paul, if he had so understood it, have
remained longer in Athens? See xviii. 1. — The repellent result, which
the mention of the resurrection of Jesus brought about, is by Baur sup-
pposed to be only a product of the author, who had wished to exhibit very
distinctly the repulsive nature of the doctrine of the resurrection for edu-
cated Gentiles; he thinks that the whole speech is only an effect fictitiously
introduced by the author, and that the whole narrative of the appearance
at Athens is to be called in question — “a counterpart to the appearance of
Stephen at Jerusalem, contrived with a view to a harmless issue instead of
a tragical termination,” Zeller. But with all the delicacy and prudence,
which Paul here, in this Ἐλλάδος Ἐλλάς, had to exercise and knew how to
do so, he could not and durst not be silent on the resurrection of Jesus, that
foundation of apostolic preaching; he could not but, after he had done all
he could to win the Athenians, now bring the matter to the issue, what effect
the testimony to the Risen One would have. If the speech had not this
testimony, criticism would the more easily and with more plausibility be
able to infer a fictitious product of the narrator; and it would hardly have
neglected to do so.

Vv. 33, 34. ὅτοις i.e. with such a result. — κολληθήσεται αὐτῷ] having more
closely attached themselves to him. Comp. v. 13, ix. 28. — ὁ Ἀρεοπαγ.] the
assessor of the court of Areopagus. This is to be considered as the well-known
distinctive designation, hence the article, of this Dionysius in the apostolic
church. Nothing further is known with certainty of him. The account of
Dionysius of Corinth in Eus. H. E. iii. 4, iv. 23, that he became bishop of
Athens, where he is said to have suffered martyrdom, is unsupported. The
writings called after him, belonging to the later Neoplatonism, have been
shown to be spurious. According to Baur, it was only from the ecclesiastical
tradition that the Areopagite came into the Book of Acts, and so
brought with him the fiction of the whole scene on the Areopagus. —
Δαμαρίς] wholly unknown, erroneously held by Chrysostom to be the wife
of Dionysius, which is just what Luke does not express by the mere γυνή.
Grotius conjectures Δαμαλίς (jusurca), which name was usual among the
Greeks. But even with the well-known interchange of λ and ρ, we must
assent to the judgment of Calovius: “Quis nescit nomine varia esse, ac
plurima inter se vicina non tamen eadem.” As a man’s name we find
Δαμαρίων in Boeckh, Ἰσορ. 2393, and Δαμάρτα, 1241, also Δαμάρτας in Pausan.
v. 5. 1; and as a woman’s name, Δαμαρίτη, in Diod. xi. 26.

1 Comp. Zeller. [102. 1 Nicseph. iii. 11.
2 Thucyd. epigr., see Jacobs, Anthol. i. p.
3 Comp. Constit. ap. vili. 66. 3.
4 Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 179.
Notes by American Editor.

(1) Thessalonica.  V. 1.

Having been "shamefully entreated" and then honorably dismissed from Philippi, Paul and two of his companions, leaving Luke at Philippi, passing through other cities, came to Thessalonica. This celebrated city, distant about one hundred miles south-west from Philippi, was beautifully situated on the slope of a hill, at the northern end of the Thermaic Gulf. It was a great commercial city, the capital of the province and residence of the proconsul. After the battle of Philippi, on account of its attachment to the cause of Anthony, it was made a free city. Strabo mentions it as the largest city in Macedonia. It has always been a city of importance; at present it is considered the second city of European Turkey, and has a population of 70,000. Here the missionaries rested, as there was a synagogue of the Jews, probably the only one in that district. After finding the means of earning his daily bread by manual toil, and a home in the house of Jason, the apostle, as was his custom, went to the synagogue, and for three consecutive Sabbaths preached to the Jews that Jesus was the promised Messiah. Some of them believed, and formed the nucleus of what became a large and useful church. But the Jews as a class, from first to last, were the plague of his suffering life, and a great hindrance to his ministry. "At Antioch and Jerusalem, Jews, nominally within the fold of Christ, opposed his teaching and embittered his days; in all other cities it was the Jews who contradicted and blasphemed the holy name which he was preaching. In the planting of his churches he had to fear their deadly opposition; in the watering of their yet more deadly fraternity. The Jews who hated Christ sought his life; the Jews who professed to love him undermined his efforts. The one faction endangered his existence, the other ruined his peace. Never, till death released him, was he wholly free from their violent conspiracies or their insidious calumnies. Without, they sprang upon him like a pack of wolves; within, they hid themselves in sheep's clothing to worry and tear his flocks." (Furrar.) Here in Thessalonica he was assaulted by a mob, instigated and led on by the Jews; and he and his friends deemed it prudent that he should privately and hastily depart, lest the liberty and the lives of the brethren who had given surety for him might be imperilled.

(2) Honorable women.  V. 12.

The term employed indicates that the women were of high rank and social position—among the chief people of the city. Arnot, on this passage, writes: "And is there ground for gladness there? Are the upper ten thousand more precious in God's sight than the myriads who occupy a lower place? No; this word comes from heaven, and does not shape itself by the fashion of the world. But though poor and rich are equally precious, there are times and circumstances in which conversion in high places is more noted and noteworthy than conversion in a low place. The common people heard the Master gladly; but the rulers held aloof, and boasted that they were not tinged with any trust
in Jesus of Nazareth. On this very account there was great joy in their circle when a magnate joined their band. Even the Lord longed to have some of them, and looked fondly on the young rich man who came running and kneeling and calling him Master." At Antioch in Pisidia the Jews enlisted the services of women of similar rank and position, and characterized by superstitious devoutness and ignorant zeal, to counteract the influence and usefulness of the apostles. "This is an agency that has from the beginning been sought and used both for good and evil. Women were employed by our Lord himself for certain appropriate ministries in the establishment of his kingdom. But false teachers have in all times availed themselves of the combined weakness and strength of the female nature for their own ends. The Romish hierarchy have always made much of female agency, and especially the agency of women in high social rank. But as Christ himself employed their tenderness and patience and perseverance in his own cause, he has encouraged his disciples in all ages to go and do likewise. Let woman stand on her true foundation—the family; and forth from that citadel let her go to her daily task, wherever the Lord hath need of her daily service; but back to the family let her ever return, as to her refuge and rest. Colonies of women, cut off from family relations and affections and duties, and bound by vows, are mischievous to themselves, and, notwithstanding superficial apparent advantages, in the long run, dangerous to the community. God made the family; man made the convent. 'God's work! behold it is very good; man's is in this case a snare.'" (Armot.) Lately, in the Christian church in this land, the place and power of woman, both at home and abroad, has been more generally acknowledged and felt—among the young and the poor and afflicted amidst ourselves; and in the schools and zenanas of foreign lands, her work is greatly blessed. And as a large proportion of the membership of the Protestant churches in this country are women, their work and their worth in every field of religious and charitable enterprise cannot be overestimated.

(a³) Timothy. V. 15.

This is the first time Timothy is mentioned in the narrative since Paul left Philippi. The probability is, however, that he was with the apostle at Thessalonica, as he appears to have been intimately connected with that church. (1 Thess. i. 1, iii. 2, and 2 Thess. i. 1.)

Comparing xviii. 5 and 1 Thess. iii. 1, 2 our author and others suppose that there is a mistake in Luke's narrative which cannot be explained or removed. On this Gloag writes: "But certainly the mere omission by Luke of Timothy's visit to Athens and return to Thessalonica is no discrepancy, as the circumstance had no bearing on his narrative. If Timothy had remained with the apostle, and thus had not rejoined him at Corinth, the case would have been different. But after all, the fact that Timothy came to Athens at all is a mere supposition; it is not asserted in 1 Thess. iii. 1. The probability is that he was sent by Paul to Thessalonica from Berea, and not from Athens; and that after his return he and Silas went directly from Berea to Corinth." Those who had accompanied Paul to Athens when they returned brought back a request from him that Silas, who had remained at Berea, and Timothy, who had in the meantime gone back to Thessalonica, either from Berea or from Athens, should
go to him with all speed. "But Silas and Timothy do not seem to have re-
joined Paul until he reached Corinth. We have no direct information what
became of Luke in the meantime." (Abbott.) Plutarch says: "As far as we
can gather from 1 Thess. i. 1-3, Timothy came by himself to Athens, probably
after the scene at the Areopagus, and was sent back at once with words of coun-
sel and comfort to those whom he reported as suffering much tribulation."

Alford gives this explanation: "When Paul departed from Berea, he
sent Timothy to exhort and confirm the Thessalonians and determined to be left
at Athens alone, Silas meanwhile remaining to carry on the work at Berea.
Then Paul, on his arrival at Athens, sends a message to both to come to him
as soon as possible. They did so, and find him at Corinth."

(a) The market-place. V. 17.

The Agora, or market-place, in any Greek city, was the centre of its life. The
market-place of Athens was at once its Exchange, its Lyceum, and its lounge.
Men of all ranks and classes, of all callings and professions, met and jostled
each other in the eager, bustling throng which daily crowded it. In this same
market-place, more than four centuries before, Socrates had conducted his
wonderful conversational discussions. Hither Paul, after having addressed the
Jews in their synagogue, went, with stirred heart, to address the idolatrous
multitudes. Among the throng of curious listeners mingled many philosophers
of every shade of opinion. Special mention is made of the Epicureans and
Stoics. Epicurus, the founder of the one school, lived a long and tranquil
life at Athens, and died at the age of 72. The leading tenet of his philosophy
was that the highest good is pleasure. But as experience taught that what are
called pleasures are often more than counterbalanced by the pains which they
incur, he taught that all excess in sensuous delights should be avoided. His
own life seems to have been characterized by generosity, general kindliness, and
self-control; many of his followers, however, adopted a life of ease and self-
indulgence; sometimes restrained by the calculations of prudence, and some-
times sinking into mere voluptuousness.

"Quid sit futurum cres fuges querere. et
Quem foris diernum canque dabit, lucro appone."

"Strive not the morrow's chance to know,
But count what'er the Fates bestow
As given thee for gain." (Horace.)

The other school took its name, not from its founder, Zeno, but from the
Stoa pericilis, the painted porch, where Zeno was accustomed to teach. This
school held as their chief tenet, that the highest source of pleasure is to be
found in virtue. They taught that true wisdom consisted in controlling cir-
cumstances and not being affected by them; that men should be alike indifferent
to pleasure and pain. They aimed at obtaining a complete mastery, not
only over their passions, but even over their circumstances. There was much
that was good in each system, and the highest and noblest of the schools ex-
hibited a moral and manly life. But each, in most cases, tended to degrade
and degenerate the race. "In their worst degeneracies Stoicism became the
apotheosis of suicide, and Epicureanism the glorification of lust." (Furrar.)
NOTES.

The one school was designated the school of the garden; the other the school of the porch. The one was atheistic, the other pantheistic. Neither believed in a divine personal Providence. To them, the message of this new teacher, enforced by his fiery eloquence and informal logic, concerning Jesus and the resurrection, seemed but as idle tales and garrulous chatterings. But as it was something new, they all wished, from curiosity, to hear something farther from him; at least it might amuse them, if nothing more. So they led him to Mars' Hill, where he might more fully unfold his strange doctrines.

(3°) An unknown God. V. 23.

Paul standing in the midst of a vast, curious, sneering, or indifferent throng, announced as his text an inscription he had seen on one of their numerous altars. As to the pulpit he occupied and its surroundings, Bishop Wordsworth observes: "He stood on that hill in the centre of Athens, with its statues and altars and temples around him. The temple of the Enmenides was immediately below him, behind was the temple of Theseus; and he beheld the Parthenon of the Acropolis fronting him from above. The temple of Victory was on his right and a countless multitude of temples and altars in the Agora and Ceramicus below him. Above him, towering over the city from its pedestal on the rock of the Acropolis, was the bronze colossus of Minerva, the champion of Athens." With deep earnestness, undaunted composure, and sublime faith in the message he had to utter, and in the Master he served, the apostle addressed the mixed and multitudinous assemblage. And a most remarkable address he gave. His manner was courteous and winning; his style natural and adapted to his audience; his arguments clear and conclusive; his illustrations ample and appropriate; his application personal and pointed, solemn and impressive.

"In expressions markedly courteous, and with arguments exquisitely conciliatory, recognizing their piety toward their gods, and enforcing his views by an appeal to their own poets, he yet manages, with the readiest power of adaptation, to indicate the errors of each class of his listeners. While seeming to dwell only on points of agreement, he yet practically rebukes, in every direction, their national and intellectual self-complacency." (Purrr.) From the nature and dignity of man, he infers and declares the spirituality and unity of God, and the obligations under which all men are laid to worship him alone, as the Creator of all things, and in whom "we live and move and have our being." Then he urges all to repentance for the past, in view of a coming general judgment, which will be held by Jesus Christ, whereof indisputable assurance has been given by God, in raising his Son from the dead. The apostle was here interrupted by a burst of derision, and the apostle went sorrowfully away, mourning over their intellectual pride and spiritual incapacity. Some, however, believed, among whom was a member of the court, who must have occupied a high position, and a woman, also probably of some distinction. Tradition tells us that this Dionysius became Bishop of Athens, and died a martyr. The success of the apostle was less in Athens than in any other city he visited, and he makes no allusion to the city or the church in it, in any of his epistles. He left Athens a despised and lonely man, yet his visit was not in vain—in its effects on his own mind, and in the results that followed from the planting of
the grain of mustard-seed. He founded no church there, but one grew up in that city, which furnished its martyr bishop, and able apologists to the church, in the next century. "Of all who visit Athens, many connect it with the name of Paul who never so much as remember that, since the days of its glory, it has been trodden by the feet of poets and conquerors and kings. They think not of Cicero, or Virgil, or Germanicus, but of the wandering tent-maker." (Furrer.)

The report of this able, eloquent, powerful speech, and the results which followed, was probably written by Paul's own hand.
CHAPTER XVIII.

VER. 1. ὁ Παῦλος is wanting in important witnesses. Rightly deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. With χαριστεῖς a church-lesson begins. — Ver. 2. ἔκ A B D E G Ζ, min. Vulg. have ἀντά. So Lachm. Tisch. Born., and rightly, on account of the decisive attestation. — On preponderating evidence, τῷ τέχνῃ is, in ver 3, to be adopted, with Lachm. and Tisch., instead of τῷ τέχνῃ. — Ver. 5. τῷ λόγῳ] Elz. has τῷ πνεύματι, in opposition to A B D E G Ζ, min. several vss. and Fathers. Defended by Rinck on the ground that τῷ λόγῳ is a scholion on διάμαρτ. But it was not διάμαρτ., but συνείχο, that needed a scholion, namely, τῷ πνεύματι, which, being received into the text, displaced the original τῷ λόγῳ. — Ver. 7. Ἰωάννου] Syr. Erp. Sahid. Cassiod. have Τίτου; E Ζ, min. Copt. Arm. Syr. p. Vulg. have Τίτου Ἰωάννου; B D** Ζ: Τίτου Ι. A traditional alteration. — Ver. 13. ἀνθυπατήσαντος] Lachm. Born. read ἀνθυπατήσων δυτος after A B D Ζ, min. An explanatory resolution of a word not elsewhere occurring in the N. T. — Ver. 14. οὖ] Lachm. and Born. have deleted it according to important testimony. But it was very easily passed over amidst the cumulation of particles and between μν η and η, especially as οὖ has not its reference in what immediately precedes. — Ver. 15. γίγαμα] A B D** Ζ, min. Theophyl. and several vss. have γίγαμα. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. The singular was, in spite of the several objects afterwards named, very easily introduced mechanically as an echo of ἀδίκημα and ἄδιψοργημα. — γάρ] is to be deleted, with Lachm. Tisch. Born. in accordance with A B D Ζ, Vulg. Copt., as a connective addition. — Ver. 17. After πάντες, Elz. Born. read οὗ Ἑλληνες, which is wanting in A E Ζ, Erp. Copt. Vulg. Chrys. Bod. Some more recent cod. have, instead of it, οὗ Ἰουδαῖοι. Both are supplementary additions, according to different modes of viewing the passage. See the exegetical remarks. — Ver. 19. κατήγγελα] Lachm. Tisch. read κατήγγελαν, after A B E Ζ, 40, and some vss. The sing. intruded itself from the context. — αὐτῶν] ἐκεῖ, which Lachm. and Born. have according to important evidence, was imported as by far the more usual word. — Ver. 21. ἀπετάσατο αὐτ. εἰπὼν] Lachm., Tisch. Born. read ἀποτάσα-μενος καὶ εἶπὼν (with the omission of καὶ before ἀνέχθη), after A B D Ζ, min. vss. Rightly ; the Recepta is an obviously suggested simplification. — οἱ μὲ πάντος . . . εἰς Ἱεροσ.] is wanting in A B E Ζ, min. Copt. Sahid. Aeth. Arm. Vulg., as well as ὃς after πιλίν. Both are deleted by Lachm. and Tisch., and condemned already by Mill and Bengal. But the omission is far more easily accounted for than the addition of these words,—occasional possibly by xix, 21, xx, 16, or by the πιλίν διναὶ, presumed to be too abrupt,—as in what directly follows copyists, overlooking the reference of ἀναβαίνει in ver. 22, found no journey of the

1 Occasioned by the circumstance that Justus does not elsewhere occur alone as a name, but only as a surname; and that the person here meant must be a different person from those named in i. 28 and Col. iv. 11. Wieseler judges otherwise, on Galat. p. 573, and in Herzog's Enzykl. XXI. 278; he prefers Τίτον Ιουντον.
apostle to Jerusalem, and accordingly did not see the reason why Paul declined a longer residence at Ephesus verified by the course of his journey. — Ver. 25. ἔτοιμον] Elz. has κατοικία, against decisive testimony. — Ver 26. The order προστ. και ἀκαίρα. (Lachm.) is attested, no doubt, by A B E Ψ 13, Vulg. Copt. Aeth., but is to be derived from ver. 18. — τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ὀδὸν] A B Ψ, min. vsa. Lachm. have τὴν ὀδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ; E, vsa. have τ. ὀδ., τοῦ κυρίου; D has only τὴν ὀδόν (so Born.). With the witnesses thus divided, the reading of Lachm. is to be preferred as the best attested.

Vv. 1, 2. In Corinth, at which Paul had arrived after his parting from Athens,¹ he met with the Jew Ἀκύλας, Greek form of the Latin Aquila, which is to be considered as a Roman name adopted after the manner of the times instead of the Jewish name,² a native of the Asiatic province of Pontus, but who had hitherto resided at Rome, and afterwards dwelt there also,³ and so probably had his dwelling-place in that city—an inference which is rendered the more probable, as his temporary removal to a distance from Rome had its compulsory occasion in the imperial edict. We make this remark in opposition to the view of Neander, who thinks that Aquila had not his permanent abode at Rome, but settled, on account of his trade, now in one and then in another great city forming a centre of commerce, such as Corinth and Ephesus. The conjecture that he was a freedman of a Pontius Aquila,⁴ so that the statement ἐντικὸς τῷ γένει is an error,⁵ is entirely arbitrary. Whether Πρισκίλλα—identical with Priscus, Rom. xvi. 3, for, as is well known, many Roman names were also used in diminutive forms, see Grotius on Rom. i.e.—was a Roman by birth, or a Jewess, remains undecided. But the opinion—which has of late become common and is defended by Kuinoel, Olshausen, Lange, and Ewald—that Aquila and his wife were already Christians, having been so possibly at starting from Rome, when Paul met with them at Corinth, because there is no account of their conversion, is very forced. Luke, in fact, calls Aquila simply Ἰουδαῖος, he does not say, τίνα μαθητὴν Ἰουδαίων, whereas elsewhere he always definitely makes known the Jewish Christians; and accordingly, by the subsequent πάντας τοίς Ἰουδαίοις, he places Aquila, without any distinction, among the general body of the expelled Jews. He also very particularly indicates as the reason of the apostle’s lodging with him, not their common Christian faith, but their common handicraft, ver. 8. It is therefore to be assumed that Aquila and Priscilla were still Jews when Paul met with them at Corinth, but through their connection with him they became Christians.⁶ This Luke, keeping in view the apostolic labours of Paul as a whole,⁷ leaves the reader to infer, inasmuch as he soon afterwards speaks of the Christian working of the two, ver. 26. We may add that the reply to the question, whether and how far Christianity existed at all in Rome before the decree of Claudius,⁸ can here be of no consequence,

¹ χαματια, comp., l. 4.
² See Eust. ad Dion. Per. 361.
³ Rom. xvi. 3.
⁴ Cie. ad Familt x. 33. 4; Suet. Cass. 73.
⁵ Reiche on Rom. xvi. 3, de Wette.
⁶ See also Herzog in his Enzykl. I. p. 426.
⁷ Comp. Baumgarten, p. 578.
⁸ See on Rom., Introd. § 3.
seeing that, although there was no Christian church at Rome, individual Christians might still at any rate be found, and certainly were found, among the resident Jews there. — προσφόρων [πρόςφορον], which properly signifies fresh, == just slaughtered or killed, then generally new, of quite recent occurrence. — διὰ τοῦ διατεταχθέν, κ. η. τ. άρ. — Judeus, impulsum Christo assiduum tumultuantes Roma expulit. As Christus was actually a current Greek and Roman name, it is altogether arbitrary to interpret impulsum Christo otherwise than we should interpret it, if another name stood instead of Christo. Christus was the name of a Jewish agitator at Rome, whose doings produced constant tumults, and led at length to the edict of expulsion. This we remark in opposition to the hypothesis upheld, after older interpreters in Wolf, by most modern expositors, that Suetonius had made a mistake in the name and written Christo instead of Christo—a view, in connection with which it is either thought that the disturbances arose out of Christianity having made its way among the Jewish population at Rome, and simply affected the Jews themselves, who were thrown into a ferment by it, so that the portion of them which had come to believe was at strife with that which remained unbelieving; or it is assumed that enthusiastic Messianic hopes excited the insurrection among the Jews, and that the Romans had manufactured out of the ideal person of the Messiah a rebel of the same name. While, however, the alleged error of the name has against it generally the fact that the names Christus and Christiani were well known to the Roman writers, it may be specially urged against the former view, that at the time of the edict the existence of an influential number of Christians at Rome, putting the Jewish population into a tumultuous ferment, is quite improbable; and against the latter view, that the Messianic hopes of the Jews were well enough known to the Romans in general, and to Suetonius in particular. Hence the change of Christus into Chrestos (Χρήστος) and of Christianus into Christianus, which pronunciation Tertullian rejects by perseveram, may not be imputed to the compiler of a history resting on documentary authority, but to the misuse of the Roman colloquial language. Indeed, according to Tacit. Ann. xv.

1 Polyb. iii. 37. 11, lii. 46. 6; Aeliphr. i. 39; Judith 4. 5; 2 Macc. xiv. 89.
3 Sueton. Claud. 95.
4 Philost. in Suppl. ii. 11; Inserc. 194; Cie. ad Fam. xl. 8.
5 Herzog, in the Jahrb. f. D. Theol. 1887, p. 541, rightly defends this explanation (against Pressensé). The objection is entirely unimportant, which Mangold also (Röm. Jahrb. 1886) has taken, that short work would have been made with an insurgent Christus at Rome. He might have made a timely escape. Or may he not have been actually seized and short work made of him, without thereby quenching the fire? See also Wieseler, p. 192, and earlier, Ernesti, in Suet., i.e.
7 Paulus, Relche, Neander, Lange, and others.
8 Tacitus, Pliny, and Suetonius himself, Ner. 18.
9 Probably in the year 59, see Anger, de temp. rot. p. 118; Wieseler, p. 135 f.
10 Tacit. Hist. v. 18.
11 Suet. Vesp. 4.
12 Attested by Tertull. Apol. 3, ad nat. l. 3, and by Lactant. Inst. cl. iv. 7. 3.
44: "Nero . . . poeniss affectione, quos . . . vulgus Christianos appellabat; auctor nominis ejus Christus," etc., it must be assumed that that interchange of names only became usual at a later period; in Justin, Apol. I, 4, τὸ Χριστιανὸν is only an allusion to Χριστιανοῖ. The detailed discussion of the point does not belong to us here, except in so far as the narrative of Dio Cass. ix. 6 appears to be at variance with this passage and with Suet. l.c.: τοῖς τε Ιουδαίοις πλεονάσαντάς αίδις, ὅστε χαλεπῶς ἦν ἀνεν ταραχή ὑπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου σφῶν τῆς πόλεως εἰρήκηναί, οὐκέτι ἐξήκοντο μεν, ὁ ὅτε οὖν πατρίδι νόμῳ βιω χρωμένοις ἐκέλευον μη συναθροίζεσθαι. This apparent contradiction is solved by our regarding what Dio Cassius relates as something which happened before the edict of banishment, and excited the Jews to the complete outbreak of insurrection. The words ὅστε . . . εἰρήκηναί, which represent the ordinance as a precautionary measure against the outbreak of a revolt, warrant this view. From xxviii. 15 ff., Rom. xvi. 3, it follows that the edict of Claudius, which referred not only to those making the tumult, but, according to the express testimony of this passage, to all the Jews, must soon either tacitly or officially have passed into abeyance, as, indeed, it was incapable of being permanently carried into effect in all its severity. Therefore the opinion of Hug, Eichhorn, Schrader, and Hemsen, that the Jews returned to Rome only at the mild commencement of Nero's reign, is to be rejected.—πάντας τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις] with the exception of the proselytes, Beyschlag thinks, that only the national Jews were concerned. But the proselytes of righteousness at least cannot, without arbitrariness, be excluded from the comprehensive designation.

Vv. 3, 4. It was a custom among the Jews, and admits of sufficient explanation from the national esteem for trade generally, and from the design of rendering the Rabbins independent of others as regards their subsistence, that the Rabbins practised a trade. Olschhausen strangely holds that the practice was based on the idea of warding off temptations by bodily activity. Comp. on Mark vi. 3, according to which Christ Himself was a τέκτων. — διὰ τὸ ὀμότεχνον εἶναι] καὶ ἀναφέρει, because he (Paul) was of the same handicraft. Luke might also have written διὰ τὸ ὀμότεχνον εἶναι. — ἡσαυ] the two married persons.—σχολοιοῖς] is not with Michaelis to be interpreted makers of art-instruments, which is merely based on a misunderstanding of

---

1 Ewald, p. 343, wishes to insert αὐτῷ before χρωμένοις, so that the words would apply to the Jewish-Christian. [It otherwise.

2 Wieseher, p. 123, and Lehmann, p. 5, view to place the prohibition mentioned by Dio Cassius as early as the first year of Claudius, A.D. 41 (Laurent, neust. Stud. p. 69 f.), does not suit the peculiar mildness and favour which the emperor on his accession showed to the Jews, according to Joseph. Ant. xix. 5. 2 f. The subsequent severity supposes a longer experience of need for it. Laurent, after Ospr. vi. 7, places the edict of expulsion as early as the ninth year of Claudius, A.D. 49; but he is in consequence driven to the artificial explanation that Aquila indeed left Rome in A.D. 49, but remained for some time in Italy, from which (ver. 2: ἀνὴρ τῆς Ἰταλίας) he only departed in A.D. 53. Thus he would not, in fact, have come to Corinth at all as an immediate consequence of that edict, which yet Luke, particularly by the addition of προσφάτως, evidently intends to say.

3 Credner, Ew. p. 390.


5 Köhner, II. p. 332; but comp. on the accusative Luke xi. 8, and see on the omission of the pronoun, where it is of itself evident from the preceding noun, Köhner, § 586 b, and ad Xen. Mem. i. 2, 49.
Pollux, vii. 189, nor yet with Hug and others makers of tent-cloth. It is true that the trade of preparing cloth from the hair of goats, which was also used for tents (κάλυμα), had its seat in Cilicia; but even apart from the fact that the weaving of cloth was more difficult to be combined with the unsettled mode of life of the apostle, the word imports nothing else than tent-maker, tent-tailor, which meaning is simply to be retained. Such a person is also called σωπορθώς; and so Chrysostom designates the apostle, whilst Origen makes him a worker in leather, thinking on leathern tents.—ἐπιθετικ. is the result of διελέγετο, xvii. 2, 17. He convinced, persuaded and won, Jews and Greeks, here—as it is those present in the synagogue that are spoken of—proselytes of the gate.

Ver. 5. This activity on his part increased yet further when Silas and Timothy had come from Macedonia, in whose fellowship naturally the zeal and courage of Paul could not but grow.—The element of increased activity, in relation to what is related in ver. 4, is contained in συνεξετο τῳ λόγῳ: he was wholly seized and arrested by the doctrine, so that he applied himself to it with assiduity and utmost earnestness. Against my earlier rendering: he was pressed in respect of the doctrine, he was hard-beset, it may be decisively urged, partly on linguistic grounds, that the dative with συνεξετο is always the thing itself which presses, partly according to the connection, that there results in that view no significant relation to the arrival of Silas and Timothy. — τόν Ἡροδον Ἰωσίφων, as in ver. 28.

Ver. 6. The refactoriness and reviling, which he experienced from them amidst this increased activity, induced him to turn to the Gentiles. — εἰχὼν τῇ ἑαυτῷ.] he shook out his garments, ridding himself of the dust, indicating contempt, as in xiii. 51.—τῷ αἷῳ ἵνων . . . ἵνων] sc. ἠλθὼν, Matt. xxiiii. 35, i.e. let the blame of the destruction, which will as a divine punishment reach you, light on no other than yourselves. The expression is not to be explained from the custom of laying the hands on the victim, as Elsner and others suppose, or on the accused on the part of the witnesses; but in all languages the head is the significant designation of the person himself. The significance here lies particularly in the conception of the divine punishment coming from above, Rom. i. 18. — What Paul intends by the destruction

---

2 Pollux, i.e. Stob. ad phys. i. 52, p. 1084.
3 Ael. V. H. nii. 1.
4 See also Theodoret, on 2 Cor. ii. 6: τον τουρκον του θεον του γηρασμον του σημερανιστον.
5 Hom. 17 in Num.
6 Comp. de Dieu.
7 xvii. 14 f.
8 Comp. Wied. xvii. 90, and Grimm in loc.
9 So in the main, following the Vulgate (“externat verbo”), most modern interpreters, including Olshausen, de Wette, Baumgarten, Lange, Ewald.
10 Comp. on Phil. i.
11 Comp. Chrysostom, reading τῷ συνετσάτοις.
12 Comp. xxvill. 8; Luke viii. 37. Comp.
13 also Thuc. ii. 49, 3, iii. 98, 1; Arrian, vi. 24, 6; Stat. Soph. p. 250 D; Xen. Occ. i. 21, and many other passages: Heliod. ad Plat. Soph. 46; particularly Wied. xvii. 90; Herodian i. 17, 30; Ael. V. H. xiv. 29.
14 Rom. xiii. 2.
15 Comp. 2 Sam. i. 16; 1 Kings ii. 33; Essek. iii. 16 ff.; xxxvill. 4, 7 ff. On ἵνων see Lidd. and Scott, ad loc., 185, 18. On the elliptical mode of expression, see Matt. xxvill. 95; 2 Sam. i. 16; Plat. Euthyd. p. 283 E; Aris. Plat. 598.
16 Lev. xvi. 51; comp. Herod. ii. 99.
17 So Pliscator.
18 Comp. Helias, ad Ot. Etr. xx. 137.
which he announces as certainly coming, and the blame of which he adjudges to themselves, is not moral corruption, but eternal άνώτετα, which is conceived as διανοια, and therefore symbolized as αἰμα to be shed, because the blood is the seat of life. The setting in of this άνώτετα occurs at the Parousia, 2 Thess. i. 8. Thus Paul, as his conduct was already in point of fact for his adversaries an ενδεεις άπωλειας, expressly gives to them such an ενδεεις. — καθαρός εγώ] comp. xx. 26. — ἄρτοι τω νόθῳ τ. Ι. ] as in iii. 46.

Ver. 7. Paul immediately gave practical proof of this solemn renunciation of the Jews by departing from the synagogue, and went, not into the house of a Jew, but into that of a proselyte, the otherwise unknown Justus, who is not to be identified with Titus. That Paul betook himself to the non-Jewish house nearest to the synagogue, is entirely in keeping with the profoundly excited emotion under which he acted, and with his decision of character. — σώματος] to border upon, is not found elsewhere; the Greeks use σώματος in that sense. Observe, moreover, that a change of lodging is not mentioned.

Ver. 8. This decided proceeding made a remarkable impression, so that even Crispus, the president of the synagogue, whom the apostle himself baptized, with all his family, believed on the Lord, and that generally many Corinthians, Jews and Gentiles, for the house of the proselyte was accessible to both, heard him and received faith and baptism.

Vv. 9-11. But Jesus Himself, appearing to Paul in a night-vision, infused into him courage for fearless continuance in work. — λάει κ. μὴ σιωπ.] solemnly emphatic. — διότι is both times simply propter quod. — εγώ] Bengel well says: “fundamentum fiduciae.” — ἐπιθυμεῖται σου τοῦ κακ. αὐτῷ] will set on thee (aggreidi) to injure thee. On the classical expression ἐπιθυμεῖσθαι τινί, to set upon one, i.e. impetum facere in aliq., see many examples in Wetstein and Kypke. The attempt, in fact, which was made at a later period under Gallio, signally failed. — διότι λαὸς κ. τ. λ.] gives the reason of the assurance, εγώ εἰμι μετὰ σου, κ. σόι. ἐπιθυμεῖσθαι τινί τοῦ κακ. αὐτῷ. Under His people Jesus understands not only those already converted, but likewise proleptically those who are destined to be members of the church purchased by His blood, the whole multitude of the τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον at Corinth. — ἐναντίον κ. μήνας εἰς] The terminus ad quem is the attempt of the Jews, and not the departure of Paul, ver. 18. For after Luke in v. 9, 10 has narrated
the address and promise of Jesus, he immediately, ver. 11, observes how long Paul in consequence of this had his residence, i.e. his quiet abode, at Corinth, attending to his ministry; and he then in vv. 12-18 relates how on the other hand an attack broke out, indeed, against him under Gallio, but passed over so harmlessly that he was able to spend before his departure yet a considerable time at Corinth, ver. 18. — ἐν ἀνθρώποις i.e. among the Corinthians, which is undoubtedly evident from the preceding ἐν τῷ πάλιν τῷ.

Vv. 12, 13. Achaia, i.e. according to the Roman division of provinces, the whole of Greece proper, including the Peloponnesus, so that by its side Macedonia, Illyria, Epirus, and Thessaly formed the province Macedonia, and these two provinces comprehended the whole Grecian territory, which originally had been a senatorial province, but by Tiberius was made an imperial one, and was again by Claudius converted into a senatorial province, and had in the years 53 and 54 for its procurator Jun. Ann. Gallio, who had assumed this name — his proper name was M. Ann. Novatus — from L. Jun. Gallio, the rhetorician, by whom he was adopted. He was a brother of the philosopher L. Ann. Seneca, and was likewise put to death by Nero. — κατείχοντος ἵππος; they stood forth against him, is found neither in Greek writers nor in the LXX. — παρὶ τῷ νόμῳ i.e. against the Jewish law. To the Jews the exercise of religion according to their laws was conceded by the Roman authority. Hence the accusers expected of the proconsul measures to be taken against Paul, whose religious doctrines they found at variance with the legal standpoint of Mosaicism. Luke gives only the chief point of the complaint. For details, see ver. 15.

Vv. 14, 15. The mild and humane Gallio refuses to examine into the complaint, and hands it over, as simply concerning doctrine, to the decision of the accusers themselves — to the Jewish tribunal — without permitting Paul, who was about to begin his defence, to speak. — ὁ νόμον] namely, in pursuance of your accusation. — ἰδον ἐν ὑμῖν I should with reason bear with you, i.e. according to the context: give you a patient hearing. "Judaean Gallion sibi molestos inuitavit," Bengel. — εἰ δὲ ἔστησα . . . νόμοι but if, as your complaint shows, there are questions in dispute, xv. 2, concerning doctrine and names — plural of category; Paul’s assertion that the name of Messiah belonged to Jesus, was the essential matter of fact in the case, see ver. 5 — and of your, and so not of Roman, law. — τοῦ καθ᾽ ἑαυτόν νόμον See on xvii. 28. — καθ᾽ ἑαυτόν κ.τ.λ.] Observe the order of the words, judge will I for my part, etc. Thus Gallio speaks in the consciousness of his political official po-

1 See Luke xxiv. 49.
2 So, ver. 12, marks a contrast to ver. 11.
3 Observe this ὃν, ver. 13.
4 Dio Cass. III. p. 104.
5 Tacit. Ann. I. 76.
6 Suet. Claud. 95.
7 See Hermann, Staatsethik. § 190, I-2.
8 See Hermann, Staatsethik. § 190, I-2.
9 See Hermann, Staatsethik. § 190, I-2.
10 See Hermann, Staatsethik. § 190, I-2.
11 See on ver. 15. They do not mean the law of the state; nor yet do they express themselves in a double sense (Lange, apost. Zeitalt. II. p. 240). Gallio well knew what ὁ νόμος signified in the mouth of a Jew.
12 Stat. Silv. II. 7, 39; Seneca, Q. Nat. 4 proae.
sition; and his wise judgment—which Calovius too harshly designates as ἀμφιβολία atheisticæ—is after a corresponding manner to be borne in mind in determining the limits of the ecclesiastical power of princes as bearing on the separation of the secular and spiritual government, with due attention, however, to the circumstance that Gallio was outside the pale of the Jewish religious community.

Vv. 16, 17. 'Ἀπήλασον] he dismissed them as plaintiffs, whose information it was not competent to him to entertain.' Under the legal pretext of the necessity of supporting this ἀπήλασον of the proconsul, all the bystanders—πάντες, partly perhaps Roman subordinate officials, but certainly all Gentiles, therefore οἱ Ἑλληνες is a correct gloss—used the opportunity of wreaking their anger on the leader and certainly also the spokesman of the hated Jews; they seized Sosthenes, the ruler of the synagogue, even before the tribunal, and beat him. —Σωσθήνης is by Theodoret, Erasmus, Calvin, and others, also Hofmann, very arbitrarily, especially as this name was so common, considered as identical with the person mentioned in 1 Cor. i. 1; hence also the erroneous gloss οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι added to πάντες has arisen from the supposition that he either was at this time actually a Christian, or at least inclined to Christianity, and therefore not sufficiently energetic in his accusation. Against this may be urged the very part which Sosthenes, as ruler of the synagogue, evidently plays against Paul; and not less the circumstance, that the person mentioned in 1 Cor. i. 1 was a fellow-labourer of Paul out of Corinth; according to which, for the identification of the two, a more extended hypothesis would be necessary, such as Ewald has. Chrysostom considers him even identical with Κρισπυς. —τὸν ἀρχισυν.] Whether he was a colleague of the above-named Κρισπυς, ver. 8, or successor to him on his resignation in consequence of embracing Christianity, or whether he presided over another synagogue in Corinth, remains undetermined. —καὶ φιλοῦν τοῦτον κ.τ.λ.] and Gallio troubled himself about none of these things, which here took place; he quite disregarded the spectacle. The purpose of this statement is to exhibit the utter failure of the attempt. So little was the charge successful, that even the leader of the accusers himself was beaten by the rabble without any interference of the judge, who by this indifference tacitly connived with the accused.

Ver. 18. 'Ἀποσάσεσθαι τινι] to say farewell to one. See on Mark vi. 46. —καὶ ἀρχιμνος τ. κεφ.] is not to be referred to Paul, as Augustine, Beda, Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Calovius, Spencer, Reland, Wolf, Bengel, Rosenmüller, Moraus, Olshausen, Zeller, de Wette, Baumgarten, Lange, Hackett, Lechler, Ewald, Scpp, Bleek, and others connect it, but to Aquila, with character would thus be the result! And what reader could from the simple words put together for himself traits so odious! How entirely different were Joseph and Nicodemus! See on xiii. 15. [and others. —Olshausen, de Wette, Baumgarten, Ewald, Grotius.}
sition; and his wise judgment—which Calovius too harshly designates as ἀμφιβολία atheisticæ—is after a corresponding manner to be borne in mind in determining the limits of the ecclesiastical power of princes as bearing on the separation of the secular and spiritual government, with due attention, however, to the circumstance that Gallio was outside the pale of the Jewish religious community.

Vv. 16, 17. 'Ἀπήλασον] he dismissed them as plaintiffs, whose information it was not competent to him to entertain.'—Under the legal pretext of the necessity of supporting this ἀπήλασον of the proconsul, all the bystanders—πάντες, partly perhaps Roman subordinate officials, but certainly all Gentiles, therefore οἱ Ἑλληνες is a correct gloss—used the opportunity of wreaking their anger on the leader and certainly also the spokesman of the hated Jews; they seized Sosthenes, the ruler of the synagogue, even before the tribunal, and beat him. —Σωσθήνης is by Theodoret, Erasmus, Calvin, and others, also Hofmann, very arbitrarily, especially as this name was so common, considered as identical with the person mentioned in 1 Cor. i. 1; hence also the erroneous gloss οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι added to πάντες has arisen from the supposition that he either was at this time actually a Christian, or at least inclined to Christianity, and therefore not sufficiently energetic in his accusation. Against this may be urged the very part which Sosthenes, as ruler of the synagogue, evidently plays against Paul; and not less the circumstance, that the person mentioned in 1 Cor. i. 1 was a fellow-labourer of Paul out of Corinth; according to which, for the identification of the two, a more extended hypothesis would be necessary, such as Ewald has. Chrysostom considers him even identical with Κρισπυς. —τὸν ἀρχισυν.] Whether he was a colleague of the above-named Κρισπυς, ver. 8, or successor to him on his resignation in consequence of embracing Christianity, or whether he presided over another synagogue in Corinth, remains undetermined. —καὶ φιλοῦν τοῦτον κ.τ.λ.] and Gallio troubled himself about none of these things, which here took place; he quite disregarded the spectacle. The purpose of this statement is to exhibit the utter failure of the attempt. So little was the charge successful, that even the leader of the accusers himself was beaten by the rabble without any interference of the judge, who by this indifference tacitly connived with the accused.

Ver. 18. 'Ἀποσάσεσθαι τινι] to say farewell to one. See on Mark vi. 46. —καὶ ἀρχιμνος τ. κεφ.] is not to be referred to Paul, as Augustine, Beda, Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Calovius, Spencer, Reland, Wolf, Bengel, Rosenmüller, Moraus, Olshausen, Zeller, de Wette, Baumgarten, Lange, Hackett, Lechler, Ewald, Scpp, Bleek, and others connect it, but to Aquila, with character would thus be the result! And what reader could from the simple words put together for himself traits so odious! How entirely different were Joseph and Nicodemus! See on xiii. 15. [and others. —Olshausen, de Wette, Baumgarten, Ewald, Grotius.
AQUILA AND PRISCILLA.

Vulgate, Theophylact, Castalio, Hammond, Grotius, Alberti, Valckenaer, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Wieseler, Schneckenburger, also Oertel. A decisive consideration in favour of this is the order of the names Πριακμαία καὶ Ἀκίλας, which appears as designedly chosen. Luke, if he had meant the κεφάλη of Paul, would, by placing the wife first, have led the reader himself into error, whereas, with the precedence naturally given to the husband, no one would have thought of referring κεφάλη to any other than Paul as the principal subject of the sentence. If, accordingly, κεφάλη is to be referred to Aquila, Luke has with design and foresight placed the names so; but if it be referred to Paul, he has written with a strange, uncalled for, and misleading deviation from v. 2 and 26. On the other hand, appeal is no doubt made to Rom. xvi. 3, where also the wife stands first; but Paul here followed a point of view determining his arrangement, which was not followed by Luke in his history, as is evident from v. 2 and 26. Accordingly, we do not need to have recourse to the argument, that it could not but at all events be very strange to see the liberal Paul thus, entirely without any higher necessity or determining occasion given from without, voluntarily engaging himself in a Jewish votive ceremony. How many occasions for vows had he in his varied fortunes, but we never find a trace that he thus became a Jew to the Jews! If there had been at that time a special reason for accommodation to such an exceptionally legal ceremony, Luke would hardly have omitted to give some more precise indication of it, and would not have mentioned the matter merely thus in passing, as if it were nothing at all strange and exceptional in Paul's case. Of Aquila, a subordinate, he might throw in thus, without stating the precise circumstances, the cursory notice how it happened that the married couple joined Paul on his departure at the seaport; regarding Paul as the bearer of such a vow, he could not but have entered into particulars. Nothing is gained by importing suggestions of some particular design; e.g. Erasmus here discovers an obsequium charitatis toward the Jews, to whom Paul had appeared as a despiser of their legal customs; Bengel supposes that the purpose of the apostle was: 'ut necessitatem sibi imponeret celeriter peragendi iter hoc Hierosolymitanum;'. Neander presupposes some occasion for the public expression of gratitude to God in the spirit of Christian wisdom; and Baumgarten thinks that 'we should hence infer that Paul, during his working at Corinth, lived in the state of weakness and self-denial ap-

1 Chrysostom and Oecumenius do not clearly express to whom they refer κεφάλη. But in the Vulgate ("Aquila, qui sibi totundatur in Cenchrēs capt") the reference is undoubted.
3 Comp. with vv. 2 and 26.
4 Comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 19. it is true that A B E F have also in vers. 25 Πριακμαία, Ακίλας (so Lachm.), but that transposition has evidently arisen from our passage.
5 See especially, Neander, p. 349, and Zeller, p. 304.
6 See on Rom. xvi. 3.
7 The case in xxi. 28 f. is different.
8 Comp. xvi. 3.
9 And so in substance Lange, apost. Zetzelt. l. p. 946 f.
10 With Bengel agrees in substance Ewald, p. 502, who supposes that Paul, in order, perhaps, not to be fettered by Priscilla and Aquila in Ephesus, made the solemn vow of his desire to be at Jerusalem even before Easter, and in sign thereof shaved his head, which had no connection with the Nazarite vow, and is rather to be compared to fasting.
pointed by the law and placed under a special constitution;" 1 whereas Zeller uses the reference to Paul in order to prove a design of the writer to impute to him Jewish piety. — in Kexyrexaiς Keyχρεαί (in Thuc. Kexyrexai) κώμη καὶ λιμῆν ἀπέχων τῆς πάλεως δοον ἐβδομάκουτα στάδα. Τότε μὲν οὖν χρῶναι πρὸς τὸν εἰς τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς, πρὸς δὲ τῶν εἰς τῆς Ἰταλίας τῷ Δεσθρῷ, Strabo, viii. 6, p. 380. — εἶχε γὰρ εἰχῆν] states the reason of κεραμ. τ. κεφ. ἐν Κ.: for he had a vow on him, which he discharged by having his head shorn at Cenchreae.

— The vow itself is not to be considered as a Nazarite vow, 2 called by Philo εἰχῆν μεγάλη, according to which a man bound himself, for the glory of Jehovah, to permit his hair to grow for a certain time and to abstain from all intoxicating drink, "Tres species sunt prohibitae Nasiraeis, immunditiae, tonsura et quicquid de vite egreditur," 3 and then after the lapse of the consecrated time to have his hair shorn off before the temple, and to present a sacrifice, into the flames of which the hair was cast. 4 For the redemption of such a vow had to take place, as formerly at the tabernacle, so afterwards at the temple and consequently in Jerusalem; 5 and entirely without proof Grotius holds: "haec praeccepta... eoe non obligabant, qui extra Judæaem agebant." 6 If it is assumed 7 that the Nazarite vow had in this case been interrupted by a Levitical uncleanness, such as by contact with a dead person, according to Lange, by intercourse with Gentiles, and was begun anew by the shearing off of the hair already consecrated but now polluted, 8 this is a mere empty supposition, as the simple εἶχε γὰρ εἰχῆν indicates nothing at all extraordinary. And even the renewal of an interrupted Nazarite vow was bound to the temple. 9 Therefore a proper Nazarite vow is here entirely out of the question; it is to be understood as a private vow (votum cívile) which Aquila had resting upon him, and which he discharged at Cenchreae by the shaving of his head. On the occasion of some circumstances unknown to us,—perhaps under some distress, in view of eventual deliverance,—he had vowed to let his hair grow for a certain time; this time had now elapsed, and therefore he had his head shorn at Cenchreae. 10 The permitting the hair to grow is, in the Nazarite state, according to Num. vi. 7, nothing else than the sign of complete consecration to God, 11 not that of a blessed, flourishing life, which meaning Bähr 12 imports; 13 nor yet, from the later view of common life, 1 Cor. xi. 14, a representation of man's renunciation of his dignity and of his subjection to God, 14 which is entirely foreign to the matter. In a corresponding manner is the usage in the case of the vow to be understood. For the vow was certainly analogous to the Nazarite state, 15 in so far as one idea lay at the root of

1 [This is a literal rendering. The meaning seems to me obscure.—Ed.]
2 Num. vi.
3 Machna Nasir, vi. 1.
4 See Num. i.e.; Ewald, Alterth. p. 112 ff.
5 Comp. on xxii. 35 ff.
7 Wolf, Stolz, Rosenmüller.
8 Num. vi. 10.
9 See Num. vi. 10.
11 Whence also Judg. xvi. 17 is to be explained. Comp. Ewald, Alterth. p. 118.
12 Symbol. II. p. 462 f.
13 Comp., in opposition to this, Kell, Ar-uchōl. § lxvii. 11.
14 Baumgarten.
15 See Ewald, Alterth. p. 28 f.
both; but it was again specifically different from it, as not requiring the official intervention of the priests, and as not bound to the temple and to prescribed forms. Neander correctly describes the \( \text{ἐν χρῷ} \) in this passage\(^2\) as a modification of the Nazarite vow; but for this very reason it seems erroneous that he takes the shearing of the head as the commencement of the redemption of the vow, and not as its termination.\(^3\) See Num. vi. 5, 18; Joseph. Bell. Jud. ii. 15, 1: τὸς γὰρ ἡ νόσῳ καταπνοομένους, ἡ τισιν ἄλλας ἄναγκας, ἠθος εὐχεσθαι πρὸ τριάκοντα ἡμερῶν, ἣς ἀποδώσαν μέλλον τιθεῖσας, ὁ ἵνα τε ἁρξασθαι καὶ ἐμφάσασθαι τὰς κόμας, where the meaning from ἠθος onwards is thus to be taken: “They are accustomed, thirty days before the intended presentation of the offering, to vow that they will abstain from wine and, at the end of that period, have the head shorn.” — A special set purpose, moreover, on the part of Luke, in bringing in this remark concerning Aquila, cannot be proved, whether of a conciliatory nature,\(^4\) with the assumed object of indirectly defending Paul against the charge of antagonism to the law, or by way of explaining the historical nexus of cause and effect,\(^5\) according to which his object would be to give information concerning the delay of the departure of the apostle, and concerning his leaving Ephesus more quickly.

Vv. 19, 20. Κατέλειπεν αὐτοῖς \( \text{he left them there}, \) separated himself from them, so that he without them — \( \text{αὐτῶς}, \) he on his part — went to the synagogue, there discoursed with the Jews,\(^6\) and then, without longer stay, pursued his journey. The shift, to which Schneckenburger has recourse, that \( \text{αιτοῦς} \) \( \text{dί} \) properly belongs to \( \text{ἀπετάξῃ}, \) \( \text{αὐτοῖς}, \) is impossible; and that of de Wette, that Luke has written \( \text{κατέλειπεν κατέλειπ} \) \( \text{αὐτῆς}. \) \( \text{aντίθες} \) \( \text{in anticipation}, \) “in order, as it were, to get rid of these secondaries figures,” is arbitrarily harsh. — We may remark, that within this short abode of the apostle at Ephesus occurred the first foundation of a church there, with which the visit to the synagogue and discussion with the Jews are appropriately in keeping as the commencement of his operations. So much the less, therefore, is an earlier presence there and foundation of the church to be assumed.\(^7\) — \( \text{ἐπὶ πλ. } \) \( \text{εἰρ. \ for a longer time}. \) It was to take place only at a later period, chap. xix.

Ver. 21. What feast was meant by \( \text{τὴν ἐκείνη τὴν ἐρχομ.} \) must remain undetermined, as \( \text{dί e μὲ παντοὺς} \) does not allow us absolutely to exclude the winter season dangerous for navigation, and as the indefinite \( \text{ἡμερὰς ἱερωνάς}, \) ver. 18 — which period is not included in the one and a half years\(^8\) — prevents an exact reckoning. It is commonly supposed to be either Easter or Pentecost. The latter by Anger.\(^9\) The former\(^9\) is at least not to be inferred from the use of the article “\( \text{the feast}, \)” which in general,\(^10\) and here specially on account of the addition \( \text{τὴν ἐρχομ.}, \) would be an uncertain ground. The

\(^1\) Comp. Bengel.
\(^2\) Comp. Calovius: “Causa redditur, cur Paulus navigavit in Syriam, quia se votum fecerat, quod explerit debetab in templo Hierosolimitano.”
\(^3\) Schneckenburger, p. 66.
\(^4\) Wieseler, p. 205, conjecturally.
\(^5\) Ver. 4, xvii. 2, 17.
\(^6\) As Märker (Stellung d. Pastoralbriefs, 1861, p. 4 f.) places the same between ix. 30 and x. 20.
\(^7\) See on ver. 11.
\(^8\) De temp. vult. p. 60 ff., and Wieseler, p. 48 ff.
\(^9\) Ewald.
motive, also, of the determination indicated by ὁσι is completely unknown. — νομεῖ] as in ver. 23; see on xv. 33. — εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα] — πάλιν ὃ ὑ ὑ. ὑ. ὑ. [which took place, xix. 1.

Vv. 22, 23. Fourth journey to Jerusalem, according to chap. ix., xi., xv. — From Ephesus Paul sailed to Caesarea—i.e. Caesarea Stratonis, the best and most frequented harbour in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem; not, as Jerome, Beda, and Lyra suppose, Caesarea in Cappadocia, against which the very word ἄναβης serves as a proof—and from thence he went up to Jerusalem, whence he proceeded down to Antioch. — ἄναβης] namely, to Jerusalem. So Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Bengel, Rosenmüller, Heinrichs, Olshausen, Neander, Anger, 3 de Wette, Weiseler, Baumgarten, Lange, Ewald, and others. Others refer it to Caesarea, so Calovius, Wolf, Kuinoel, Schott, and several others, and think that the word is purposely chosen, either because the city was situated high up from the shore, 4 or because the church had its place of meeting in an elevated locality. 4 The reference to Caesarea would be necessary, if ὁσι με πᾶντως κ.τ.λ., ver. 21, were not genuine; for then the reference to Jerusalem would have no ground assigned for it in the context. But with the genuineness of that asseveration, ver. 21, the historical connection requires that ἄναβης κ. ἄναβεια τ. ἐκκλ. should contain the fulfilment of it. In favour of this we may appeal both to the relation in meaning of the following κατέβη to this ἄναβης, and to the circumstance that it would be very strangely in contrast to the hurried brevity with which the whole journey is despatched in ver. 22, if Luke should have specially indicated in the case of Caesarea not merely the arrival at it, but also the going up (μ) to it. In spite of that hurried brevity, with which the author scarcely touches on this journey to Jerusalem, and mentions in regard to the residence there no intercourse with the Jews, no visit to the temple, and the like, but only a salutation of the church, 4 the fidelity of the apostle to the Jewish festivals has been regarded as the design of the narrative, 4 and the narrative itself as invented. 7 The identification of the journey with that mentioned in Gal. ii. 1 8 is incompatible with the aim of the apostle in adducing his journeys to Jerusalem in that passage. See on Galatians. Nor can the encounter with Peter, Gal. ii. 11, belong to the residence of Paul at that time in Antioch. 9 — τὴν Γαλατ. χ. τ. Φων.] certainly, also, Lycaonia, xiv. 21, although Luke does not expressly name it. On ἐπιστημονίων, comp. xiv. 23, xv. 2, 41.

Vv. 24–28. Notice interposed concerning Apollos, who, during Paul's absence from Ephesus, came thither as a Messianic preacher proceeding from the school of the disciples of John, completed his Christian training there, and then before the return of the apostle, xix. 1, departed to Achaia.

1 See Winer, p. 387 (E. T. 516).
2 De temp. rur. p. 60 f.
3 Kustner and others.
4 De Dieu and others.
5 The so short residence of the apostle in Jerusalem is sufficiently intelligible from the certainly even at that time (comp. xxii. 21 f.) very excited temper of the Judaists, with whom Paul now recognised it as incompatible with his more extended apostolic mission to meddle. See Ewald, p. 506 f.
6 Schneckeburger.
8 Wieseler.
9 Neander, Wieseler, Lange, Baumgarten.
Ver. 24. "Ἀπολλώνιος," the abbreviated "Ἀπολλόνως," as D actually has it. His working was peculiarly influential in Corinth.—λόγος] may mean either learned or eloquent. Neander, also Vatianus, takes it in the former signification. But the usual rendering, eloquens, corresponds quite as well with his Alexandrian training, after the style of Philo, and is decidedly indicated as preferable by the reference to vv. 25 and 28, as well as by the characteristic mode of Apollo's work at Corinth. Besides, the Scripture-learning is particularly brought forward alongside of λογίας by ὑνικος ἐν ἐν τ. γραφ. : he had in the Scriptures, in the understanding, exposition, and application of them, a peculiar power, for the conviction and winning of hearts, refutation of opponents, and the like.

Ver. 25. Ἀπολλώνιος τ. ὀδ. τ. Ἐφ. ] Apollos was instructed concerning the way of the Lord, i.e. concerning Christianity as a mode of life appointed and shaped by Christ through means of faith in Him, doubtless by disciples of John, as follows from ἐπιστάμαι, μόνον τ. βάπτ. Ἰωάννου. How imperfect this instruction had been in respect of the doctrinal contents of Christianity, appears from the fact that he knew nothing of a distinctively Christian baptism. He stood in this respect on the same stage with the μαθηταί in xix. 2; but, not maintaining the same passive attitude as they did, he was already—under the influence of the partial and preliminary light of Christian knowledge—full of a profound, living fervour, as if seething and boiling in his spirit, i.e. in the potency of his higher self-conscious life, so that he ἐλάληκαί καὶ ἑθέλακαν ἀκριβώς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. What had reference to Jesus, to whom as the Messiah John had borne witness, was naturally that concerning which he had in his Johannean training received most information and taken the deepest interest. He must have regarded Jesus—His historical person—actually as the Messiah, not merely as a precursor of Him, which Bleek erroneously denies, contrary to the express words of the passage; but he still needed a more accurate Christian instruction, which he received, ver. 26. The incompleteness and even the lack to some extent of correctness in his Christian knowledge, made him, with his might in the Scriptures and fervour in spirit—which latter was under the control of the former—not incapable to teach, according to the measure of his knowledge, with accuracy concerning Jesus, although he himself had to be instructed yet ἀκριβέστερον, ver. 26, in opposition to Baur and Zeller, who find here contradictory statements. In a corresponding manner, for example, a missionary may labour with an incomplete and in part even defective knowledge of the way of salvation, if he is mighty in the Scriptures and of fervent spirit. — ἐλάληκαί κ. ἑθέλακαν are simply to be distinguished as genus and species; and

1 On Apollos, see Heymann in the Säk. Stud. 1862, p. 322 ff.; Bleek on Hebr. Introd. p. 394 ff.; Ewald, p. 515 ff. We should know him better, if we were the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which, however, remains a matter of great uncertainty.


4 See on ix. 2.

5 Eranus, Paraph.; "hic Apollos erat semichristianus."

6 ζηταὶ τῆς ἕρμηνευως, see on Rom. xii. 11.

7 Baumbarten.

8 Not to be taken in a subjective sense; carelessly (Beza and others), which the comparative in ver. 28 does not suit.
accurate, exactly, receives its limitation by εἰσιν. μόν. τ. β. τ. — εἰσιν. μόν. τ. βαπτ. ἤτοινων although, etc. The view, that by this an absolute ignorance of Christian baptism is expressed, is incredible in itself, and not to be assumed on account of John iii. 26. Notwithstanding, the simple literal sense is not to be interpreted, with Lange, as though Apollos was wanting only in "complete Christian experience of salvation and maturity;" but, inasmuch as he did not recognise the characteristic distinction of the Christian baptism from that of John, he knew not that the former was something superior to the latter; he knew only the baptism of John.

Ver. 26. Tῇ to which δὲ afterwards corresponds.—ηδόμενοι] beginning of the παρηγορ. εἰς τῇ συναγ. Immediately afterwards Aquila and Priscilla, who had temporarily settled in Ephesus, and had heard him speak — from which they could not but learn what he lacked — took him to themselves for private instruction. — τῆν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὄνομα] the same as τὴν ὄνομα τ. Κυρίου, ver. 25, inasmuch as the whole work of Christ is the work of God. That, also Christian baptism was administered to Apollos by Aquila, is neither to be assumed as self-evident, nor is it to be arbitrarily added, with Olshausen, that he first received the Holy Spirit at Corinth by Paul (?). Ewald correctly remarks: "there could be no mention of a new baptism in the case of a man already, in a spiritual sense, moved deeply enough." The Holy Spirit had already taken up His abode in his fervent spirit — a relation which could only be furthered by the instruction of Aquila and Priscilla.

Ver. 27. Διελθεῖν εἰς τ. Ἀχαίαν] probably occasioned by what he had heard from Aquila and Priscilla concerning the working of Paul at Corinth. — προτερψ. oi. ἐγερα. τοίς μαθητ. ἀφην. αὑτ. The Christians already at Ephesus wrote exhorting, issued a letter of exhortation, to the disciples, the Christians of Achaia, to receive him hospitably as a teacher of the gospel. So Luther, Castalio, and others, also de Wette and Ewald. The contents of their letter constituted a λόγος προτερψικός. But many others, as Erasmus, Beza, Grotius, Bengel, following Chrysostom (προσέπνισκει δ. γράμματα ἐπιστολάς), refer προτερψ. to Apollos as its object, not to the μαθητ. of its contents, as its object, not to the μαθητ. of its contents, "sua exhortatione ipsum magis incitaverunt fratres et currenti addiderunt calcar." Calvin; according to which we should necessarily expect either a defining αὐτῶν with προτερψ., or previously βούλομεν ὤλ. αὐτῶν. — συνεβάλει] he contributed much, helped much. This meaning, not dissipuit, is required by the following γὰρ. — τοῖς πεπιστευκόσι] Bengel appropriately remarks: "rigavit Apollos, non plantavit." — ἐν τῇ τῆς χάριτος] is not to be connected with τοῖς πεπιστ., but with συνεβ. πολύ; for the design of the text is to characterize Apollos...
and his workings, and not the πεπιστευκ. The χάρις is to be explained of the divine grace sustaining and blessing his efforts. Not only is the view of Hammond and Bolten, that it denotes the gospel, to be rejected, but also that of Raphel, Wetstein, and Heinrichs, that it signifies facundia discendique senustas, in which case the Christian point of view of Luke, according to which he signalizes that οὐνσώλην πολύ, is entirely mistaken. Apollos thus laboured, not by his art, but by grace. But the reception of baptism is not presupposed by this χάρις, in opposition to Grotius; see on ver. 26.

Ver. 28. Εἰρήνων] nervously, vigorously, also in Greek writers used of orators. Comp. Luke xxiii. 10. — διακατηγ.] stronger than κατηγ.; not preserved elsewhere. The dative of reference 1 is to be rendered: for the Jews, i.e. over against the Jews, to instruct them better, he held public refutations, so that he showed, etc. — δημοσία] The opposite is ἱδία. 2 It comprehends more than the activity in the synagogue. 3 — διὰ τῶν γραφ.] by means of the Scriptures, whose expressions he made use of for the explanation and proof of his proposition that Ιησοῦς was the Messiah, Ἰησοῦν is the subject, comp. ver. 5. —The description of the ministry of Apollos, vv. 27, 28, entirely agrees with 1 Cor. iii. 6.

**NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.**

(59) Corinth. V. 1.

Corinth, distant from Athens about 45 miles, was situated on an isthmus, between two seas, the Egean and the Ionian, on each of which, respectively, were the ports of Cenchrea and Lechæum. Hence called "The City of the Two Seas," Its favorable position rendered it a vast commercial emporium. It was also a city of great military importance, as it commanded the entrance into the peninsula. In ancient and in modern times, armies have contended for the possession of the lofty citadel of this city, called by Xenophon "The Gate of the Peloponnesus," and by Pindar the "Bridge of the Sea."

This city differed much in almost every respect from Athens. Athens was a Greek free city, Corinth was a Roman colony. Athens was a seat of learning, Corinth a mart of commerce. At Corinth, more than anywhere else, the Greek race could be seen in all its life and activity.

The ancient city, so renowned in Grecian history, and which rivalled even Rome, had been destroyed and for a century lay in ruins; but, nearly a century before the time of Paul's visit, the city was rebuilt by Julius Cesar, and it quickly surpassed its former opulence and splendor. "Splendid buildings, enriched with ancient pillars of marble and porphyry and adorned with gold and silver, soon began to rise side by side with the wretched huts of wood and straw, which sheltered the mass of the poorer population. The life of the wealthier inhabitants was marked by self-indulgence and intellectual restlessness, and the mass of the people, even down to the slaves, were more or less affected by the prevailing tendency. Corinth was the Vanity Fair of the Roman Empire, at once the London and the Paris of the first century after Christ." (Farrar.)

---

1 Comp. Symm., Job xxxix. 28: ἀλειγχύσαις τοῖς ὀφεί.
2 Xen. Hec. xl. 9.
3 See xix. 9.
It was no less notorious for vice and licentiousness than it was famous for its magnificence and refinement. For while Cicero calls it "totius Graeciae lumen," the light of all Greece, and Florus designates it "Graeciae decus," the glory of Greece," so low had it sunk in morals, that to live like a Corinthian became proverbial for a course of wanton licentiousness and reckless dissipation. It was "a populous city, rich, brilliant, frequented by numerous strangers, centre of an active commerce. The characteristic feature which rendered its name proverbial was the extreme corruption of manners displayed there." (Renan.) To this vast city, with its teeming mixed population of Jews, Greeks, and Romans, where strife and uncleanness prevailed, the apostle came to preach the gospel of peace and purity, and he did so with great power and success.

(3rd) Gallo. V. 15.

Gallo was the brother of Seneca, the celebrated moralist, who dedicated two of his books to him. He possessed those qualities which render a man a general favorite. He was characterized as the "dulcis Gallo."

"He was a man of fine mind and noble soul, the friend of the poets and celebrated writers. Such a man must have been little inclined to receive the demands of fanatics, coming to ask the civil power, against which they protest in secret, to free them of their enemies." (Renan.)

Seneca says: "Nemo mortalium uni tam dulcis est, quam hic omnibus." And the narrative of Luke represents him as acting in harmony with such a disposition. In the matter brought before him, he acted the part of a wise and upright judge. The question was one which did not fall under his jurisdiction. He was unwilling to be made a party to a Jewish prejudice, or the executioner of an alien code. Paul and his accusers as religionists stood on an equality in the eye of the law. His conduct is often reproached severely, as if he had been wholly indifferent on matters of religion. Whether he was so or not is not manifested here. He simply declined to interfere in such matters. In this he was right; though he should surely have kept the peace, and prevented the attack on Sostratus. The view of Meyer is probably correct, that he favored the accused.

The Romans regarded the Jews with mingled feelings of curiosity, disgust, and contempt. Their orators and satirists heap scorn and reproach upon them for their low cunning, their avarice, mendicancy, turbulence, superstition, cheatery and idleness. And they viewed Christianity in the light of a Jewish faction.

"It took the Romans nearly two centuries to learn that Christianity was something infinitely more important than the Jewish sect, which they mistook it to be. It would have been better for them, and for the world, if they had tried to get rid of this disdain, and to learn wherein lay the secret power of a religion, which they could neither eradicate nor suppress. But while we regret this unphilosophic disregard, let us at least do justice to Roman impartiality. In Gallo, in Lysias, in Felix, in Festus, in the centurion Julius, even in Pilate, different as were their degrees of rectitude, we cannot but admire the trained judicial insight with which they at once saw through the subterranean injustice and virulent animosity of the Jews in bringing false charges against innocent men." (Farrar.)
NOTES.

(38) Having shorn his head. V. 18.

It is a matter of dispute whether this shaving of the head refers to Paul or to Aquila. Meyer is decidedly of the opinion that it was Aquila who had the vow. He argues strenuously in favor of this view, but he very candidly gives a list of authorities on both sides.

On the statement Plumptre writes thus: "The grammatical structure of the Greek sentence makes it possible to refer the words to Aquila as well as St. Paul, but there is hardly the shadow of a doubt that the latter is meant."

Alford says: "There are, from verse 18 to 23—a section forming a distinct narrative, and complete in itself—no less than nine aorist participles, eight of which indisputably apply to Paul as the subject of the section; leaving it hardly open to question that karḳýnevov also must apply unto him." Taylor quotes this passage and concurs with it. On the other hand Bloomfield writes: "All who were distinguished for knowledge of Greek and almost every editor of the N. T. have adopted the view that it refers to Aquila, which is supported by the ancient versions, and, as it invokes far more probability, and avoids the difficulties attendant on supposing Paul to be meant, it deserves the preference." Hessey also, in "The Life of Paul," says: "Aquila had bound himself by one of those vows which the Jews often voluntarily took, even when in foreign countries," and "had been for some time conspicuous, even among the Jews and Christians at Corinth, for the long hair, which denoted that he was under a peculiar religious restriction; and before accompanying the apostle to Ephesus, laid aside the tokens of his vow." He also in a note quotes Heinrichs: "Praelectione mihi videtur, qui constructio suæ facilior, propiusque fidem est, notissim hanc, quae lereviter nonisset et quasi per transseunam additur, de homine ignitume adjunctam esse." Gloag thinks the view which refers the shaving of the head to Paul is the more correct. Since the time of Augustine, opinion on this question has been divided; among the scholars and commentators of the present day diversity of sentiment still exists, nor can we expect unanimity in the future. In view of the whole discussion, we are disposed to agree with Meyer, that it was Aquila and not Paul who shaved his head.


Nothing is known of the previous history of Apollos, only that he was born in Alexandria, of Jewish parents. He was doubtless trained from his childhood in the knowledge of the O. T. Scriptures; and thoroughly disciplined by the culture of the best schools in a city where literature, philosophy, and criticism excited the utmost intellectual activity, and which at that time was second only to Athens in influence over the current thought of the age. The philosophy of Alexandria exerted an important influence, both for good and evil, over primitive Christianity.

Apollos was not only learned and mighty in the Scriptures, but he was endowed with a most fascinating and persuasive eloquence, and, both before and after his acquaintance with Paul, rendered good service to the cause of Christ, in Corinth and in Ephesus. He was with Paul when he wrote the first Epistle to the Corinthians, and Paul mentions him many years afterward, in his
Epistle to Titus. Luther suggested the idea that he was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and many have agreed with him. The term λόγιον, applied to Apollos, may mean skilled in history, learned, or eloquent, the last is best suited to the context; but, in all its senses, the word was applicable to the distinguished Alexandrian.

(n²) Baptism of John. V. 25.

Besides his early Biblical and literary training, Apollos had probably been instructed by some disciple of John, if not by John himself, and had been imbued with the spirit of the trumpet-toned preacher of the Jordan, and sought to lead men to repentance, and to the reception of the Messiah, who had already come, as he proved from the received Scriptures. He had been instructed in the way of the Lord—that is, the divine purpose to redeem Israel through the Messiah, whom he believed Jesus of Nazareth to be; for with great fervor of spirit and force of speech he taught accurately the things concerning the Lord Jesus, as far as he knew them. It is not to be supposed that Apollos was ignorant of the fact that Jesus was the Christ, the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world; for this was the keynote of John's ministry; nor that he did not know anything about Christian baptism, but only that he did not distinguish between it and that of John. The disciples of John, who were numerous and scattered, may be divided into three classes: those, including a large majority, who became disciples of Christ; those, who formed a small sect of their own, holding that John was the Messiah; and those who, being removed from Palestine, held just what John taught. To this last class Apollos and the twelve disciples at Ephesus belonged. They had not yet heard of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, though they were personally led into the truth by Him. The pious couple, who had left Corinth with Paul, took the fervent, eloquent preacher to their home, and gave him more full and accurate instruction in the gospel of Christ, its distinctive doctrines, and, though no mention is made of the fact, Aquila in all probability baptized him. Meyer thinks he was not rebaptized; but both Hackett and Plumptre think it more probable that he was rebaptized, and we agree with them.
CHAPTER XIX.

Vv. 1, 2, εὑρίσκων] A B N, min. Copt. Vulg. Fulg. have εὑρεῖν, and then τε (or δέ) after εἰπε. So Lachm. Tisch. But how easily might εὑρίσκων, after ἐλθεῖν, be changed by transcribers into εὑρεῖν! — εἰπον, ver. 2, and πρὸς αὐτούς, ver. 3 (both deleted, after important witnesses, by Lachm. Tisch. Born.), have the character of an addition for the sake of completion. — Ver. 4. μὴν] is wanting in A B D N, min. Vulg. Deleted by Lachm. and Born. The want of a corresponding δὲ occasioned the omission. — Before Ἰησοῦν Elz. Scholz read χριστίν, which is deleted according to preponderating testimony. A usual addition, which was here particularly suggested by ἐκ τ. ἐχρ. — Ver. 7. ἀπεκάθαρσι] Lachm. Born. read ὀδεξα, it is true, according to A B D E N, min., but it is a change to the more usual form. — Ver. 8. τὰ περὶ] B D, min. vss. have περί. So Lachm. Tisch. Born. See on viii. 12. — Ver. 9. τινύς] is wanting in A B N, min. vss. Lachm. Tisch., but was, as appears unnecessary, more easily omitted than inserted. — Ver. 10. After Κυρίων Elz. has, against decisive testimony, Ἰησοῦ, which Griesb. has deleted. — Ver. 12. ἀποφέρ.] recommended by Griesb., and adopted by Lachm. and Tisch., after A B E N, min. But Elz. Scholz, Born. read ἵπποφέρ. Occasioned by τῷ τ. ἀσθ. — ἐκπορευόμενοι] Elz. reads ἐκσκοπεσθαί ἀν' αὐτῶν, against preponderating evidence. The usual word for the going out of demons! and ἀν' αὐτῶν was added from the preceding. — Ver. 13. καὶ] after τινύς, is approved by Griesb. and adopted by Lachm. Tisch., according to A B E N, min. Syr.; Elz. Scholz read ἄνω, according to G H, min.; Born. reads ἐκ, after D. Accordingly something, at all events, originally stood after τινύς. But had ἄνω or ἐκ stood, no reason can be perceived why they should be meddled with; καὶ, on the other hand, might be found perplexing, and was sometimes omitted and sometimes exchanged for ἄνω or ἐκ. — ὀρκίζων] So A B D E N, min. Copt. Arm. Cassiod. But Elz. has ὀρκίζομεν. Correction to suit the plurality of persons. — Ver. 14. τινύς νιὸν Σκ. Ἰ. ἀρχ. ἐπτά] Lachm. reads τινος Σκ. Ἰ. ἀρχ. ἐπτά νιὸν. Both have important evidence, and the latter is explained as a correction and transposition (Tisch. has τινύς indeed, but follows the order of Lachm., also attested by Ν), the transcribers not knowing how to reconcile τινύς with ἐπτά. — νιὸν is deleted by Lachm., according to insufficient evidence. Superfluous in itself; and, according to the order of Lachm., it was very easily passed over after νιὸν. — Ver. 16. ἐφαλλόμενα] A B N, 104. Lachm. reads ἐφαλλόμενα. Correctly; the Recepta arises from the inattention of transcribers. — Before κατάκερα. Elz. Scholz have καὶ, which is deleted according to predominant testimony. An insertion for the sake of connection. — ἀμφοτέρων] Elz. has αὑτῶν, against A B D N, min. Theophyl. 2, and some vss.; ἀμφ., which is recommended by Griesb., and adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born., was objectionable, as before there was no mention of ἰω. — Ver. 21. ἀλλήλων] Lachm. Born. read διάλειν, according to A D E. Resolution of the construction, by which καὶ became necessary before πορεύεσθαι, which, also, D has (so Born.). — Ver. 24. παρείσχετο] Lachm. reads παρείσχετο, according to A D E; yet D places δέ before, and has previously ἦν...
after ῥίς (so Born.). The middle was less familiar to transcribers. — Ver. 25. Elz. Scholz have ἡμῶν; Lachm. Tisch. Born. read ἡμῖν, according to A B D E Ψ, min. Vulg. Copt. Sahid. Theophyl. 2. The latter is to be received on account of the preponderance of testimony, and because ἡμῶν would more easily suggest itself to unskilful transcribers. — Ver. 26. ἀλλα] Lachm. Born. read ἀλλὰ καὶ, after A B G, min. vss. Chrys. Both suitable in meaning; but καὶ would more easily after οὗ μόνον be mechanically inserted (comp. ver. 27) than omitted.

—Ver. 37. λογοθητὰς μὲλλειν] Lachm. Born. read λογοθηταζέται, μὲλλειν, according to weighty evidence; but certainly only an emendation of a construction not understood. — τὴν μεγάλ.] Lachm. reads τῆς μεγαλιοῦστος, A B E Ψ, min. Sahid. Correctly; the genitive not being understood, or not having its meaning attended to, yielded to the more naturally occurring accusative. — Ver. 29. ἑλλάς] is wanting in A B Ψ, min. Vulg. Copt. Arm., and is deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. An addition which easily suggested itself. — Ver. 33. προεῖθασαν] Lachm. reads προεῖθασαν, according to A B E Ψ, min.; Born. reads κατείβασαν, after D*. In this diversity προεῖθασαν is indeed best attested by Cod., but yet is to be rejected as completely unsuitable. As, further, κατείβασα has only D* for it, the reading of the Recepta, which was glossed in a variety of ways, is to be retained. — Ver. 34. ἐπιτέλεσα] Elz. has ἐπιτέλεσαν, against decisive evidence. A correction in point of style. — Ver. 35. ἀνθρώπων] Lachm. Tisch. read ἀνθρώπων, according to A B E Ψ, min. vss. The Recepta came in mechanically. — After μεγάλ. Elz. has θέα. Condemned by decisive testimony as an addition. — Ver. 37. θεόν] Elz. reads θεᾶν, against decisive testimony. — Instead of θημῶν, Griesb. approved, and Lachm. and Born. read ἡμῖν, according to A D E** Ψ, min. vss. But with the important attestation which ἡμῖν also has, and as the change into ἡμῶν was so naturally suggested by the context, the Recepta is to be defended. — Ver. 39. περὶ ἐπερω] B, min. Cant. have περατέρω. Preferred by Rinck, adopted by Lachm. and Tisch.; and correctly, as alterations easily presented themselves for a word not occurring elsewhere in the N. T. (E has περὶ ἐπερων), and which is hardly to be ascribed to the transcribers. — Ver. 40. After περὶ οὗ Griesb. and Matth. have adopted ὅ, which, however, has more considerable authorities against it than for it (A G H Ψ). Writing of the ὅ twice. — περὶ before τῆς συντα. is found in A B E Ψ, min. vss.; it is, with Lachm., to be adopted, because, being superfluous and cumbrous, it ran the risk of being omitted, but was not appropriate for insertion.

Ver. 1. Ἄπολλών] Concerning this form of the accusative, see Winer, p. 61 (E. T. 72). — τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ] the districts lying more inland from Ephesus, as Galatia and Phrygia, xviii. 28.¹ The reading Theophylact, τὰ ἀνατολικὰ, is a correct gloss. A more precise definition of the course of the journey through the regions of Hierapolis, Philadelphia, and Sardes, is not to be attempted. — μαθητὰς i.e. as no other definition is added, Christians. It is true that they were disciples of John,² who had been, like Apollos, instructed and baptized by disciples of the Baptist,³ but they had joined the fellowship of the Christians, and were by these regarded as fellow-disciples, seeing that they possessed some knowledge of the person and doc-

¹ Comp. Kypke, II. 95.
² Böthiger, Beltr. I. p. 30, and de Wette.
³ Comp. xlvii. 26.
trine of Jesus and a corresponding faith in Him, though of a very imperfect and indefinite character,—as it were, misty and dawning; therefore Paul himself also considered them as Christians, and he only learned from his conversation with them that they were merely disciples of John.¹ Heinrichs² thinks that they had received their instruction³ and baptism of John from Apollos, and that Paul was also aware of this. But the very ignorance of these disciples can as little be reconciled with the energetic ministry of Apollos as with any already lengthened residence at Ephesus at all, where, under the influence of the Christians, and particularly of Aquila and Priscilla, they must have received more information concerning the πνεῦμα ἄγιον. Therefore it is most probable that they were strangers, who had but just come to Ephesus and had attached themselves to the Christians of that place. As disciples of John they are to be regarded as Jews, not as Gentiles, which ver. 2 contains nothing to necessitate.⁴—Observe, also, that the earlier keeping back of the apostle from Asia on the part of the Spirit⁵ had now, after his labours thus far in Greece, obtained its object and was no longer operative. Of this Paul was conscious. Cod. D has a special address of the Spirit to this effect,—an interpolation which Bornemann has adopted.

Ver. 3. The want of the distinctively Christian life of the Spirit in these disciples must have surprised the apostle; he misses in their case those peculiar utterances of the Holy Spirit, commencing with Christian baptism, which were elsewhere observable.⁶ Hence his question,—εἰ] The indirect form of conception lies at the foundation, as in i. 6.—πνεῦμα· sauer] after ye became believers, i.e. Christians, which Paul considered them to be.'—ἀλλ' εἰσὶν εἰ πν. ἄγιον. ἐκ τῆς ἡδονῆς.] as the existence of the Holy Spirit at all cannot have been unknown to the men, because they were disciples of John and John’s baptism of water had its essential correlate and intelligible explanation in the very baptism of the Spirit—even apart from the O. T. training of these men, according to which they must at least have been aware that the Holy Spirit was something existing—τόιαύτα, to be so accented, must necessarily be taken as adest, as in John vii. 39: No, we have not even heard whether the Holy Spirit is there, already present on the earth. Accordingly, they still remained ignorant whether that which John had announced, namely, that Jesus would baptize with the Holy Spirit, had already taken place, and thus the πνεῦμα ἄγιον had become present. The supplements, δοθῇ, ἐκήρυξεν, and the like, give the sense, just as in John vii. 39, but are quite unnecessary. The view which it takes of existence generally has misled Olshausen to import the here inappropriate dogmatic assertion: that God still stood before their minds as a rigid, self-contained, immediate unity, without their knowing anything of the distinctive attributes of the Father, Son, and Spirit, necessarily conditioned by the nature of the

¹ verse 2.
² Comp. Wetstein, also Lange, II. p. 264.
³ xvii. 25, 26.
⁴ xvi. 6.
⁵ 1 Cor. xii. 13; Tit. II. 5.
⁶ In opposition to Baumgarten, II. p. 3.
⁷ See on ver. 1.
Spirit; and, with Baumgarten, has given rise to the supposition that they were Gentiles. 1 —The question occurred to them as surprising.

Ver. 3. Eiς τί] reference of the baptism: 'unto what, then, as the object of faith and confession, to which you were referred, were ye baptized? —οίων] accordingly, since the matter so stands, since ye have not even heard of the existence of the Holy Spirit. The presupposition in this eις τί οίων is, that they, baptized in the name of Christ, could not but have received the Holy Spirit. —eις τον Ἰωάννην, βαπτιστὴν] in reference to the baptism administered by John, so that thus the baptism performed in our case was to be the baptism of John, in relation to which we were baptized.

Ver. 4. Μήν] See on i. 1. Instead of following it up by an apodosis, such as: “but Jesus is the coming One, on whom John by his baptism bound men to believe,” Paul already inserts this idea by τούτων, ἐστὶν eις τ. 'I. into the sentence begun by μέν, and, abandoning the μέν, entirely omits to continue the construction by δὲ. —ἐβαπτισθησαν, βαπτιστὴν, μεταν.] he baptized, administered, a baptism which obliged to repentance. See Mark i. 4. On the combination of βαπτισθησαν with a cognate noun. 4 —eις τ. ἰδιχ.] is with great emphasis prefixed to the ἰδι. 5 —ἰδον ἰδιχ.] is to be understood purely in the sense of design; saying to the people: that he administered a baptism of repentance, in order that they should believe on Him who was to come after him, i.e. on Jesus. This terse information concerning the connection of the baptism of John, which they had received, with Jesus, decided these disciples to receive Christian baptism. The determining element lay in τούτων, ἐστὶν eις τὸν Ἰωάννην, which Paul must have more precisely explained to them, and by which they were transplanted from their hitherto indistinct and non-living faith into the condition of a full fides explicita—from the morning dawn of faith to the bright daylight of the same.

Ver. 5. Eiς τὸ διαφωμα τ. Κυρ. Ἱ.] on the name of the Lord Jesus, which they were to confess, namely, as that of the Messiah. 6 These disciples of John thus received—whether from Paul himself, or from a subordinate assistant, the text leaves undetermined —Christian baptism, for it had appeared that they had not yet received it. The Anabaptists have from the first wrongly appealed to this passage; for it simply represents the non-sufficiency of John’s baptism, in point of fact, for Christianity, and that purely in respect of the twelve persons, but does not exhibit the insufficiency of the Christian baptism of infants. Many, moreover, of the orthodox, 7 in a controversial interest —both against the Roman Catholic doctrine of the distinction between the Johannean and the Christian baptism, 8 and also against the Anabaptists,—have wrongly attached ver. 5 to the address of the apostle: “but after they had heard it they were baptized (by John), etc.”

1 On ἄλλα, in the reply, see Klotz, Ad Devar, p. 11 f.
3 Matt. iii. 11, xxviii. 19; Rom. vi. 3; 1 Cor. i. 13, x. 3, xii. 13; Gal. iii. 37.
4 Comp. Luke vii. 39, xii. 50; Mark x. 38.
Comp. on Gal. ii. 10; Eph. iii. 18.
5 Comp. on Matt. xxviii. 19.
6 But see for the latter view 1 Cor. i. 17; comp. Acts x. 48.
7 Comp. Beza, Calixtus, Calovius, Suller, Glass, Buddeus, Wolf, and several of the older commentators.
BAPTISM OF JOHN’S DISCIPLES.

But against this it may be urged, that John did not baptize in the name of Jesus, and that δε, ver. 5, stands in no logical connection at all with μία, ver. 4. On the other hand, Calvin and others have maintained, against the Anabaptists, that ver. 5 is meant not of the baptism of water, but of the baptism of the Spirit, which ver. 6 only more precisely explains; but this shift is just another, quite as utterly unexegetical, error of dogmatic presupposition. We may add, that it may not be inferred from our passage that the disciples of John who passed over to Christianity were uniformly rebaptized; for in the case of the apostles who passed over from John to Jesus, this certainly did not take place;¹ and even as regards Apollos, the common opinion that he was baptized by Aquila is purely arbitrary, as in xvi. 26 his instruction in Christianity, and not his baptism, is narrated. Indeed, in the whole of the N. T., except this passage, there is no example of the rebaptism of a disciple of John. Hence the baptism of the disciples of John who passed over to Christianity was not considered as absolutely necessary; but it did or did not take place according as in the different cases, and in proportion to the differences of individuals, the desire of the persons concerned, and the opinion of the teachers on the matter determined. With those twelve, for example, Paul regarded it as conducive to his object and requisite that they should be baptized, in order to raise them to the elevation of Christian spiritual life; and therefore they were baptized, evidently according to their own wish and inclination, as is implied in δωσάντες δὲ ἔβαπτον, whilst Apollos, on the other hand, could dispense with rebaptism, seeing that he with his fervid spirit, following the references of John to Christ and the instruction of his teachers, penetrated without any new baptismal consecration into the pneumatic element of life. If, however, among the three thousand who were baptized at Pentecost² there were some of John’s disciples,—which is probable,—it was their desire to be baptized, and apostolic wisdom could not leave this unfulfilled. Accordingly, the opinion of Ziegler,³ that those twelve were rebaptized, because they had been baptized by some disciple of John not unto the ἐρχόμενος, but unto John himself, and thus had not received the true Johnannean baptism, is to be rejected. They did not, in fact, answer, in ver. 8, εἰς τὸν Ἰωάννην!

Vv. 6, 7. After the baptism the imposition of the hands of the apostle⁴ became the vehicle of the reception of the πνεῦμα ἁγίου on the part of the minds opened by the apostolic word. The Spirit descended upon them, and manifested Himself partly by their speaking with tongues,⁵ and partly in prophetic inspiration.⁶ These two must, according to the technical mode of reference to them in the apostolic church attested by 1 Cor. xii.–xiv., be distinguished, and not treated as equivalent, with van Hengel, who⁷ finds here merely in general an expression of the inspired praising aloud of God in Christ.⁸ The analogy of the phenomenon with what occurred in the

¹ John iv. 2.
² H. 88, 41.
⁴ See on viii. 15, remark.
⁵ See on x. 46.
⁶ See on xi. 97.
⁷ Comp. on chap. ii. 10.
⁸ See his ‘Gesch d. talen,’ p. 84 ff.; Trew, p. 185, follows him.
history of Cornelius serves Baur for a handle to condemn the whole narrative as unhistorical, and to refer it to the set purpose of placing the Apostolic Paul, by a new and telling proof of his apostolic dignity and efficiency, on a parallel with the Apostle Peter. The author had, in Baur's view, seeing that the first γλώσσας λατρεία, chap. ii., is exhibited in the person of Jews, and the second, chap. x., in that of Gentiles, now chosen for the third a middle class, half-believers, like the Samaritans! With all this presumed refinement of invention, it is yet singular that the author should not have carried out his parallelism of Paul with Peter even so far as to make the descent of the Holy Spirit and the speaking with tongues take place, as with Cornelius, before baptism, on the mere preaching of the apostle. People themselves weave such fictions, and give forth the author of the book, which is thus criticised, as the ingenious weaver. — Ver. 7. A simple historical statement, not in order to represent the men "as a new Israel." 7

Ver. 8. Πεθών is not equivalent to διδάσκων, but contains the result of διαλεγόμενος. He convinced men's minds concerning the kingdom of Messiah.

Ver. 9. But when some were hardened and refused belief, he severed himself from them, from the synagogue, and separated the Christians, henceforth discovering daily in the school of a certain Tyrannus. Tyrannus is usually considered as a Gentile rhetorician, who had as a public sophist possessed a lecture-room, and is perhaps identical with the one described by Suidas: Τυραννος σοφίτης περί στάσεως κ. διαφύσεως λόγου βιβλία δέκα. But as the text does not indicate a transition of the apostle wholly to the Gentiles, but merely a separation from the synagogue, and as in the new place of instruction, 1 Ἰουδαίος, and these are named first, ver. 10, continued to hear him; as, in fine, Tyrannus, had he been a Gentile, would have to be conceived of as σεβόμενος τῶν θεῶν, like Justus, xviii. 7,—an essential point, which Luke would hardly have left unnoticed: the opinion of Hammond is to be preferred, that Tyrannus is to be considered as a Jewish teacher who had a private synagogue. 8 Paul with his Christians withdrew from the public synagogue to the private synagogue of Tyrannus, where he and his doctrine were more secure from public annoyance. The objection, that it would have been inconsistency to pass from the synagogue to a Rabbinical school, 9 is of no weight, as there were also Rabbins like Gamaliel, and Tyrannus must be considered, at all events, as at least inclined to Christianity.

— τ. ἰδών] see on ix. 2, xviii. 25.

1 x. 44 ff.
2 I. p. 218 f., ed. 2 (with whom Zeller agrees; and see earlier, Schneckenburger, p.
3 See Schweger, [56 ff.
4 So Baumgarten, II. p. 7, whom the very σπείρει ought to have preserved from this fancy.
5 Comp. on σεβόμενος with the mere accusative of the object (Plat. Pol. p. 304 A; Soph. O. C. 1444), Valckenaer, ad Eur. Hipp. 1033.
6 The same name in Apollod. ii. 4. 5; Boeckh, Corp. Inscr. 1723; 2 Macr. iv. 40: Joseph. Anti. xvi. 10. 3, Bell. i. 26. 8; and among the Rabbis see Drusius in loc. [Ewald, p. 518.
7 As by Lange and Baumgarten, comp. See, on the other hand, xviii. 6, 7, xiii. 46.
8 ἱδών, a teaching-room, often in Plutarch.
9 Comp. xviii. 7.
11 Baumgarten.
Ver. 10. 'Ἐνι ἐτη δύον] for two years. The three months, ver. 8, are to be reckoned in addition to this for the whole residence at Ephesus. This statement of the time is not at variance with xx. 31, if only we take the διέραξ in our passage, and the τριερία in xx. 31, not as documentarily strict, but as approximate statements. There is not, therefore, sufficient reason to suppose, nor is there any hint in the narrative, that we are to reckon the ἐτη δύο as not extending further than ver. 20.—Ὡτε πάντας κ.τ.λ.] a hyperbolical expression. In Ephesus, flourishing by commerce and art, with its famous temple of Diana and festivals, strangers were continually coming and going from all parts of Asia Minor, Jews and Gentiles, the latter particularly for the sake of worship. The sensation which Paul made excited very many to hear him; a great sphere of labour was opened up to him, 1 Cor. xvi. 9.—"Ελληνας] comprehends here both proselytes of the gate and complete Gentiles. The private school, which Tyrannus had granted to Paul, was made accessible by the latter also to the Gentiles, which could not have been the case with a public synagogue.

Vv. 11, 12. Οὐ τάς τυχοίδον,] not the usual, i.e. distinguished, not to be compared with those of the Jewish exorcists. The opposite: μυραί καὶ αἱ τυχοίδοι πρόξεις. On τυχόν, in the sense of vulgaris, see generally, Vigerus, ed. Hermann, p. 364; and on the very frequent connection by way of lutos with oi, see Wetstein in loc. —Ὄτε καὶ κ.τ.λ.] so that also, among other things, towels and aprons were brought to the sick from his skin, and thereby the ailments were removed from them, etc. —σμυκίου, not preserved elsewhere, the Latin semicinctium, is explained either as a handkerchief, or usually as an apron, in favour of which is the etymology, and Martial, Epigr. xiv. 151. Very probably it was a linen apron which workmen or waiters wore after laying aside their upper garment, and which, when they had it on, they likewise used for the purpose remarked by Oecumenius. —ἄπο τοῦ χρυσοῦ αὐτοῦ] so that they had just been used by him and been in contact with his skin. Luke, who also here distinguishes the ordinary sick from the possessed, represents the healing of the former and the deliverance of the latter as an effect, which was brought about by the cloths laid on them; for ὡστε down to ἐκπρ. forms together the description of a peculiar kind of those unusual miraculous ὄνομας. Purely historical criticism, independent of arbitrary premises laid down ἀ πριν, has nothing to assail in this view, as the healing power of the apostle, analogous to the miraculous power of Jesus, might through his will be transmitted by means of cloths requested from him to the suffering person, and received by means of the faith of the latter. The truth of the occurrence stands on the same footing with

---

1 As ver. 8, xvili. 30, and frequently.
2 Comp. Anger, de temp. ral. p. 59.
3 Schrader, Wieseler, and others.
5 Comp. on xi. 20.
6 Ver. 13. Comp. xxviii. 2.
7 Polyb. i. 26. 6.
8 Velikensper, p. 559 f.; from Philo, Loesner, p. 319. Comp. 2 Macc. iii. 7.
9 Oecumenius: οἱ ταῖς χεραίς κατάχωνι... πρὸς τὸ ἀνωμάτευτον τὰς ἄρτιστὰς τοῦ προ-
10 σώτου, τοῖς ιδρώσιν, υπὲρλύγοι, δέκριντον κ. τ. λ.
12 ἀκομφατος λυτοδή εἰς, Schol. ap. Matth.
13 Pignor. de temp. p. lxxv.
14 Comp. Luke iv. 40 f. al.
the N. T. miraculous cures in general, which took place through the will of the worker of miracles, partly with and partly without sensible transmission. By relegating the matter from the historical domain of miracles, which is yet undoubtedly to be recognized in the working of Paul, to the sphere of legends as to relics, with comparison of v. 15, or to that "of the servants' rooms and houses behind," the narrative of our passage is easily dismissed, but not got rid of, although a more special embellishment of it by the importunity of those seeking help, and by the pouring out of the sweat of the apostle as he worked, of which the text indicates nothing, is to be set aside.

Ver. 18. But some, also, of the itinerant Jewish demon-exorcisers — sorcerers, who, for the healing of demoniacs, used secret arts derived from Solomon, and charms — undertook, in expectation of greater results than their own hitherto had been, and provoked by the effects which Paul produced by the utterance of the name of Jesus, to use this formula with the demoniacs: I conjure you to come out, ye evil spirits, by Jesus, who, besides, will punish you, whom Paul announces. — ἐπὶ τῶν ἔχων] denotes the local direction: towards the possessed, not, as Kuinoel proposes, on account of the possessed, perhaps with a design towards, of the direction of the will, in which case the vivid form of the representation is entirely overlooked. — τὰ πνεύματα τὰ σωματ] are the demons concerned, then and there to be expelled.

— τῶν Ἰησοῦν.] Equivalent to τῷ ὑμάτῳ τῶν Ἰ., 3 Esdr. i. 48.

Ver. 14. 'Ἀρχιερ.] Whether he was a former head of one of the twenty-four priestly classes, or a past de facto high priest, remains undecided, as this Skeus — according to A: Skeuías, according to Ewald, perhaps Νικηφόρος — is otherwise entirely unknown. — τινὲς . . . ἵπτα] is by many, including Kuinoel and Olshausen, taken as some seven, i.e., about seven; but then Luke would have placed the pronoun close to the numeral, either before or after it; and the merely approximate expression would not be in keeping with the significance of the number seven. The correct mode of taking it is: but there were certain sons of Skneas, a Jewish high priest, and indeed seven, who did this. The number, not thought of at the very beginning, instead of τινὲς, is introduced afterwards. Baur converts the sons into disciples, without any ground whatever in the text.

Ver. 15. But how entirely did ἰπτεῖτερον fail of success in the very first instance of its application! Bengel well remarks on ver. 13: "Si semel successisset, sacius ausuris fuerant." — τὰ πνεύματα] the demon, who had taken possession of the individual consciousness in the man. — By τῶν Ἰησοῦν . . . ἵπτασαν he recognises the power of Jesus and of the apostle over him; by ἰπτεῖες ἐπὶ τίνας, what sort of men! ἵπτε he shows his contempt for the presumption of his powerlessness—not empowered by Jesus and Paul—opponents. ἰπτεῖες is with depreciating emphasis placed first.

1 Rom. xv. 19 ; 2 Cor. xii. 12.
2 Baur, Zeller.
3 Hauerath.
4 Baumgarten.
5 See Joseph. Antt. viii. 2. 5, Bell. Jud. i. 1. 2; Matt. xii. 27.
6 ἰπτεῖτερον, see on Luke i. 1.
7 Ver. 15.
8 Comp. Mark v. 7; 1 Thess. v. 27.
9 xxii. 8; Thuc. vii. 84. 4, ἐπὶ τῶν, and see Kühner, § 639. 5; Krüger, § li. 16. 4.
10 I. p. 215, ed. 2.
SONS OF SCEVA.

Ver. 16. Ἐφαλάμβανος (see the critical remarks) ἐν' αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ.] having leaped upon them, after overpowering both he so prevailed against them, that, etc. The mode of representation is not exact, as we only see from ἀμφότερον that here of those seven but two were active, whom Luke has already conceived to himself in αὐτοῖς. According to Ewald, ἀμφότερος is neuter; on both sides, i.e. from above and from below. This would be ἀν' ἀμφότερον, παρ' ἀμφότερον, ἀμφότερης, ἀμφότερωσιν. — γυμνοὶ] whether entirely naked, or merely divested of their upper clothing, remains an undecided point.

Vv. 17, 18. The first impression of this signal miscarriage of that application of the name of Jesus was in the case of the Ephesian multitude naturally fear, dread on account of its extraordinary nature; and then followed universal praise of that name. And many who, through this event now, were believers (τῶν πεπιστευσ.) came, to Paul, and confessed and made known, an exhaustive description, their deeds. This open confession of their previous practices, which had been entirely alien and opposed to the faith in Christ, was the commencement of their new life of faith. In πολλοὶ and τὰς πράξεις ait. the converted sorcerers and their evil tricks are meant to be included, but not they only; for it is not till ver. 19 that these exclusively are treated of. As to πράξεις in a bad sense, comp. on Rom. viii. 18.

Ver. 19. On περιεργος, often joined in Greek writers with ἀτόμος, μάταιος, ἄνφορος, and the like, μαλακοὶ, καύσιμοι, and on τὰ περιεργα, what is useless, especially employed of the practices of sorcerers, see Kypke and Wetstein. — The article here denotes that which is known from the context. — τὰς βιβλίον] in which the magical arts were described, and the formulae were contained. Such formulæ of exorcism, carried on slips as amulets, proceeded in large quantities from the sorcerers at Ephesus; hence the expression Ἐφεσίων γράμματα. — ἀνεφθήσον] The sorcerers themselves reckoned up the prices, which, indeed, others could not do. From this is partly explained the greatness of the sum. — τὸν ἄργυρον μν. πέντε] they found in silver money fifty thousand, namely, drachmæ. As the word is not ἀργυριον, but ἀργυριον (comp. Dem. 949. 1: τρισακχιας ἑκατέριας ἀργυριον δραχμάδες); as Luke did not write for a Hebrew, and as the scene of the transaction was a Greek city, the opinion of Grotius, Hammond, and Drusius, that shekels are meant, is to be rejected. The statement of a sum, without naming the sort of money of the drachmæ, was usual with the Greeks. An Attic

1 See on John xxi. 7.
2 See on ii. 43.
4 Comp. Luke viii. 16.
5 This rendering of τῶν πεπιστευσ. is justified by ἐμπεριεργοί κ.τ.λ., ver. 17. Others, as Baumgarten, understand those who had already previously been believers, but who had not yet arrived at such a confession. This, however, is not reconcilable with μετέφθης as the necessary moral condition of faith and baptism, which condition must have at an earlier period been fulfilled by those who had already at an earlier time become believers. Luther (see his gloss) has misunderstood the verse.
6 ἀγαθ., see on Matt. iii. 6.
7 In opposition to Heinrichs and Olhausen.
8 Π. P. 95. [B.]
9 Comp. περιεργογραφεια, Plat. Apol. S. p. 19
11 Got out as the sum, see Raphel in loc.
12 The silver drachma stands, as is well known, to the gold drachma in the proportion of 10 to 1 [Bernhardy, p. 187.]
13 See Bus, Edips, ed. Schaefer, p. 119 f.;
drachma, — 6 oboli, is about 24 kreuzers, accordingly the sum is about 20,000 Rhenish guilder. — Baur, according to his presupposition, cannot but reject the whole history of the demoniac, etc., as unhistorical; he holds even the judgment in ver. 20 as itself unworthy of the associates of an apostle; and the following history, vv. 21-40, appears to him only to have arisen through an a priori abstraction, the author wishing to give as splendid a picture as possible of the labours of Paul at Ephesus. Zeller declares himself more neutrally, yet as suspecting the narrative (p. 265), as does also Haurath, p. 30 ff.

Ver. 20. So (so much) with power (par force) grew, in external diffusion, and displayed itself powerful, in the production of great effects, the doctrine of the Lord. — καὶ Κράτος. The reference of κράτος to the power of Christ has occasioned the, order τοῦ Κυρίου. ὁ λόγος.

Vv. 21, 22. Ταῦτα] these things hitherto reported from Ephesus. Schraeder would strangely refer it to the entire past labours of Paul, even including what is not related by Luke. An arbitrary device in favour of his hypothesis, that after ver. 20 a great journey to Macedonia, Corinth, Crete, etc., occurred. — ηὐθὺς ἐν τῷ πνεύματι he determined in his spirit, he resolved. — τῷ Μακεδ. κ. Ἀχ.] see on xvii. 12. — πορεύομαι εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ.] The special object of the journey is known from 1 Cor. xvi. 1 ff.; 2 Cor. viii.; Rom. xv. 25 ff. The non-mention of this matter of the collection is so much the less to be set down to the account of a conciliatory design of the book as if it made the apostle turn his eyes toward Jerusalem on account of the celebration of the festival since the very aim of the collection would have well suited that alleged tendency. — ἐσ] in the consciousness of the divine determination, which is confirmed by xxiii. 11. From this consciousness is explained his earnest assurance, Rom. i. 10 ff. And towards Rome now goes the whole further development of his endeavours and of his destiny. He was actually to see Rome, but only after the lapse of years and as a prisoner. — Εραστὸν] 2 Tim. iv. 20. Otherwise unknown and different from the person mentioned in Rom. xvi. 23. — ἵπτετο χρόνον he kept himself, remained, behind for a time. — εἰς τ. Ἀσίαν] does not stand for ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ, in opposition to Grotius, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and many others, but it denotes the direction in which this keeping back took place, toward Asia, where he was. Considering the frequency of this construction generally, and in the N. T., it is not to be rendered, with Winer: "for Asia, in order to labour there."

1 About £1875, or $3000.

2 vi. 7, xli. 24.

3 See Valckenaer, p. 565; Bernhardt, p. 241; Bornemann, ad Xen. Cyrl. i. 48. 28.

4 Eph. i. 19. [B W.]

5 Lachmann and Tischendorf, following A.

6 vv. 1-19.

7 Der Apostel Paulus, II. p. 85 f.

8 See, on the contrary, Anger, de temp. ra. p. 64 f.

9 Comp. on v. 4.

10 Schneckenburger, p. 67; Zeller, p. 267.

11 xx. 16, xxiv. 11, 17.

12 Comp. 2 Cor. ix. 12 ff.; see Lekeburch, p. 280. How underrately the work of the collection remained here unmentioned, is evident from xxiv. 17. [36 ff.

13 Compare Klostermann, Vindiciae Lac. p. 36 f. See examples in Wetstein, and from Philo in Loezner, p. 219.

14 Comp. the well-known εἰς ἱερὰν μάρτυρα, Soph. Aj. 80.

15 Comp. xviii. 21.

MANY CONVERTED.

Ver. 24. The silver-beater (ἀργυρωκότως) Demetrius had a manufactory, in which little silver temples (ἀργυροκότως) representing the splendid temple of Diana⁵ with the statue of the goddess, ὥς καὶ ὁμαρμ. μικρά,⁶ were made. These miniature temples must have found great sale, partly among Ephesians, partly among strangers, as it was a general custom to carry such miniature shrines as amulets with them in journeys, and to place them in their houses;⁷ and particularly as the Ἀρτέμις Ἐφεσία was such a universally venerated object of worship.⁸ We are not to think of coins with the impression of the temple, in opposition to Beza, Scaliger, Piscator, Valckenaer, as the naming of coins after the figure impressed on them⁹ is only known in reference to living creatures; nor can the existence of such coins with the impress of the Ephesian temple be historically proved.

Vv. 25, 26. Demetrius assembled not only the artifices (διάτης) who worked for him, but also the other workmen who were occupied in similar industrial occupations (τὰ τοιαῦτα). Bengel correctly remarks: “Alii erant τεχνίται, artifices nobiliores, alii ἵνα τεχνίται operari.” — οἱ μόνοι . . . ἀλλά] without καί, like the Latin non modo . . . sed, contains a climax.⁷ — μετά.⁷] namely, from the worship of the gods. — δι’ οὗ εἶναι θεοί] The people identified the statues of the gods with the gods themselves, or at least believed that the numen of the divinity filled them.⁶ Observe the order of the words, accordant with their emphasis, marked also by a dislocation in ver. 26, and the scornful and bitter ὅ παινος οὐρός: that Paul there! — theos is predicate. How Paul looked on the heathen gods, may be seen at 1 Cor. viii. 4, x. 20. The gods, = images, were to him of course only the work of men, without any reality of that which they were intended to represent. Comp. xvn. 29.

Ver. 27. And not only this matter,⁶ this point, namely, our lucrative trade, is in danger for us of coming into contempt, but also⁶ the temple of the great goddess Artemis is in danger of being regarded as nothing, and there will also, he added, be brought down the majesty of her, whom, etc. — ἡμῖν] dative of reference, i.e. here incommunic. — εἰς ἄν. ἑλθ.] i.e. to come into this credit; ἀπέλευσε not is not preserved elsewhere; but comp. ἀγαζάντως, frequent in the LXX. and Apoc. — τῆς μεγάλης] a habitually employed epithet, as of other gods, so particularly of the Ephesian Artemis.¹¹ With μελέτου the oratio recta passes into the oratio obliqua.¹² — τῆς is and, simply annexing; καί is also,

---

¹ Callimach. Hymn. in Dian. 366.
² See concerning this temple, burned by Herodotus on the night in which Alexander the Great was born, and afterwards built with greater magnificence, Hirt, d. Temp. d. Diana s. Ephes., Berlin 1800.
³ Chrysostom.
⁴ Dio Cass. xxxix. 20; Diod. Sic. i. 15; Amm. Marc. xxii. 13; Doug. Anal. II. 91.
⁶ Bowes, quellen, pulch. testidines; see Beza.
⁷ See Mact. ad Antiph. p. 120; Bremi, ad Iser. Ero. IX.; Buttman, neut. Gr. p. 817 (B. T. 309).
⁹ μενος, see on Col. II. 16.
¹⁰ “Efficax sermo, quem utilitates et superstitione acuit,” Bengel. Comp. xvi. 19.
¹¹ Xen. Eph. 1. 11; Alberti, Obs. p. 259.
¹² Still meléte may also be governed by καίν. ημῖν. But in that case meléte would itself simply appear very unnecessary, and the passage would more fittingly after the preceding be continued: καταφρονθαται τῷ καί καί κ. κ. Α. See Buttman, neut. Gr. p. 320 (B. T. 888).
climactic: "destructum quæ stiam iri majestatem," etc. — τῆς μεγαλευστὴς (see the critical remarks) is to be taken partitive, as if τι stood with it; there will be brought down something of her majesty. Nothing of this magnificence will they sacrifice. On καθαρτιν of the lowering of the honour of one, comp. Herodian. iii. 3. 4. vii. 9. 24. καθαρτιν again the direct form of address. See on such mixing of direct and indirect elements, Kühner. The relative applies to αὐτής.

Vv. 28, 29. Μεγάλη ἡ Ἀρπ. Ἐπ.] An enthusiastic outcry for the preservation of the endangered, and yet so lucrative! majesty of the goddess. — ἡμομενα] namely, those who ran together along with Demetrius and his companions. — ὁμοθυμαδων] here also: with one mind, in opposition to Deyling, Krebs, Loesner, and others, who think that, on account of ver. 32, it must be rendered simul; for they were at one on the point, that in the theatre something in general must be determined on against Paul and his companions for the defence of the honour of the goddess, although specially the most might not know τίνος ἐνεκεν συνελησθείσιν. — It is well known that the theatre was used for the despatch of public transactions and for popular assemblies, even for such as were tumultuary. Consequently the more easy it is to understand, why the vehement crowd poured itself into the great theatre. — αὐτάρκασ.] First, they drew along with them the two fellow-travellers (συνεκ.) of the apostle, and then rushed into the theatre. But it may also be conceived as simultaneous; while they carried along with them, they rushed, etc. Whether they fetched these two men from their lodgings, or encountered them in the streets, cannot be determined. — Caius is otherwise unknown, and is not identical with the Caius mentioned in xx. 4, or with the one mentioned in Rom. xvi. 23; 1 Cor. i. 15. — Ἀρίσταρχ.] See xx. 4, xxvii. 2; Col. iv. 10; Phil. 24.

Vv. 30, 31. Παιδων] whom doubtless the rioters had not found present at his usual place of abode. "Nulla militiaus audacia par huic fortitudini," Bengel. — εἰς τ. δήμον] among the people that ran together into the theatre. δήμος is also among Greek writers very often the multitude. Contrary to the whole course of proceeding as narrated, Otto understands a formal assembly of the people, of which we are not to think even in the case of ἐκκλησία, ver. 32 — The ten presidents of sacred rites as well as of the public games in proconsular Asia were called Ἀσιαρχαῖ, corresponding to whom in other provinces were the Γαλαταρχαὶ, Βασιλεῖς, Σωμαρχαὶ κ.τ.λ. They had to celebrate, at their own expense, these games in honour of the gods and of the emperor. Each city annually, about the time of the autumnal equinox, delegated one of its citizens, and these collective dele-

1 Comp. xxii. 28; Buttmann, p. 309 (R. T. 360).
2 Comp. Xen. Hell. iv. 4. 13: τῶν ναυῶν καθαλίσειν, also II. 2. 11.
3 Ad Xen. Anab. i. 8. 14; Duseen, ad Dem. de cor. p. 303.
4 Ver. 34.
5 Ver. 32. [alterth § 128 9.
6 See Wetstein in loc.; Hermann, cœnas.
7 It was one of the largest, as its ruins show. See Otfr. Müller, Archäol. d. Kranz, p. 391.
8 See in loc.
9 Ver. 31.
11 Pastor. p. 108.
gutes then elected the ten. It was natural that one of these—perhaps chosen by the proconsul—should preside, and hence may be explained the remark in Eusebius, H. E. iv. 15, that Polycarp was executed under the Asiarch Philip. But the inference from our passage is historically indemonstrable, that only one was really Asiarch, and that the plural is to be explained from the fact that the other nine, but particularly the retired Asiarchs, like the past high priests of the Jews, bore the title,1 which is in itself improbable on account of the enormous expense which in that case would have been laid on one.2 —μὴ δὲναι εἰσαύρον] apprehension of danger to life. On the expression with εἰς of a dangerous locality, comp. Polyb. v. 14. 9.

Vv. 32, 33. ὅν] joins on, by way of inference, the description of the concourse, ver. 29, interrupted by vv. 30 and 31. —ἀλλὰ . . . ἀλλὰ.] 3 The following τι might have been left out,4 but it is only wanting in D.5 —ἡ ἐκκλησία] It was no ἐννομὸς ἐκκλ., ver. 39, and accordingly, no legal popular assembly, neither an ordinary one (νόμιμος), nor an extraordinary (συνέλλησα), but simply an assemblage of the people, who had flocked together of their own accord,—a concio plebis et alae et abusea. —συγκεχυμ.] confused, in an uproar.6 It lacked all order, guidance, self-restraint, discipline, etc.—προέβλεσ. Ἀλέξ. προβάλλω. aor. t. 'Ἰουδ.] a vivid description of its tumultuous character. The Jews shoved (pushed) him forward from behind (προβάλλω.), and others, standing in front, brought or drew him out of the crowd.7 Grotius, Wetstein, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others take προβάλλειν = to propose,8 but this does not at all suffice for the lively picture of the tumult. Alexander, otherwise entirely unknown, was certainly a Christian, since only to such a one is the subsequent ἄπολυτος suitable, not a Jew.9 He is commonly, but arbitrarily, especially considering the frequency of the name, considered as identical with the Alexander mentioned in 1 Tim. i. 20, 2 Tim. iv. 14, in which case it is in its turn presupposed that the name occurring at those two passages denotes one person. Such completely indemonstrable assumptions cannot serve to prove the genuineness and time of the composition of the Epistles to Timothy, in opposition to Otto. The Alexander in our passage had, in the Christian interest, mixed among the crowd, and was pushed forward by the malicious Jews that he might make a public address and, if possible, become a sacrifice to the fury of the multitude. If we hold him to be a non-Christian Jew, which does not result from ver. 34, it is to be supposed that the Jews would be afraid that, on this occasion, they also might be attacked, and therefore pushed forward Alexander, an eloquent man and hostile to Paul, that he might main-

1 Salmassius, Valerius, Tillemont, Harduin, and Deyling.
3 Comp. Chart. i. 5: ὁ δὲνος ἔστω σις τῶν ἄγαν μνήμερον ἀλλὰ ἂν εἰς εἰς τὰ ἄγαν μνήμερον ἀλλὰ εἰς εἰς τὰ ἄγαν μνήμερον. Plat. Cherm. p. 139 D: ἡμῶν ἀλλὰ ἂν ἀλλὰ ἂν ἀλλὰ ἂν ἂ

1 Kühner, § 386. note 5.
2 Bornemann.
3 Comp. ver. 25.
4 Ex τ. ἄνθρο προεβλέσ.
5 See Xen. Anthol. vi. 1. 25, vi. 2. 6; Dem. 519. 15; Kyrkh. ii. p. 101 f.
6 Beza, Grotius, Ewald, and others.
tain the innocence of the Jews to the destruction of the Christians. But Luke must have called attention to such a connection, and that the more as the simple ἀπολογισθαι, to make a defence, points quite naturally to the accusation of the Christians referred to. — κατασταλεῖον moving his hand up and down, for a sign that he wished to speak. — τῷ ὅμω] before the people. — ὅμω is as in ver. 30, and the ἀπολογισθαι cannot therefore be meant to be a defence of the Jews and of the ἄλλον. —

Vv. 84, 85. 'Οτι Ἰουώδαιος ἔστι] Alexander was a Jewish Christian; but his Christian position was either unknown to the mob, or they would listen to nothing at all from one belonging to the Jewish nation as the hereditary enemy of the worship of the gods. — ἐπιγνώστηκες Nominatives participle, having reference to the logical subject. — κατασταλεῖον after he had quieted. — The γραμματεῖος, who had come up in the meantime, perhaps being sent for, is the city-secretary, to whose office belonged the superintendence of the archives, the drawing up of official decrees, and the reading of them in the assemblies of the people. — τίς γὰρ κ.τ.λ. ὃς is there then, etc. With γὰρ the speaker glances back on his efforts to calm them as completely justified, since there is certainly no one who does not know, etc. The question introduced with γὰρ therefore states the motive of the κατασταλεῖον. Thus vividly does the question fit into the position of affairs. — τὴν Ἑφέσου πόλιν with patriotic emphasis. — On νεωκόρος, properly temple-sweeper, temple-keeper, as an honourable epithet of cities, particularly in Asia, in which the temple-service of a divinity or of a deified ruler has its principal seat. — τῷ ὅμω] that which fell from heaven, was obvious of itself. The image of Artemis in the temple of Ephesus—according to Vitruvius, ii. 9, of cedar; according to Plin. xvi. 40, of the wood of the vine; according to Xen. Ἀραβ. v. 3, 12, of gold, or at least gilt; and according to others of ebony—was given out as such. On the figure of the image, see Creuzer, Symbol. II. p. 176 ff. It represented the goddess with many breasts. According to our passage it must have been rescued at the burning of Herostratus, at least according to general opinion.

1 Otto, p. 108, makes up the scene more artificially, and that so as to make Alexander even the soul and the secret spring of the whole uproar. According to Hauerath, the author gives designedly only a fragmentary account of the Jewish-Christian Alexander, because the conduct of the Jewish-Christians at that time did not suit the conciliatory object of his book.

2 Comp. xii. 17, xlii. 16, xxi. 49, where, however, the verb is joined with the datum, which, therefore, also D. cf. (Bornemann) have here.

3 Herod. vii. 161; Plut. Ἰούκ. p. 259 A; Lucian. Gall. 3. See Bernhardy, p. 79.

4 Bengel, Ewald.

5 Otto.

6 See Winer, p. 268 (E. T. 710); Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 256 (E. T. 298).

7 Plut. Mor. p. 207 E; Joseph. Anti. xiv. 9 1, i. 1. 2.

8 Thuc. vii. 19, ὅ γραμματεῖον ὃ τοῦ πόλεως.

9 See van Dale, i.e., p. 493 f.; Hermann, Sotuse. Relig. § 27. 20, 147. 6.

10 Comp. Nagelsbach on the Illud, p. 59, ed. 3.

11 Xen. Ἀραβ. v. 3. 6; Plut. Legg. 6, p. 759

12 See van Dale, i.e., p. 300 ff.; Vaickenser, p. 570 f.; Krause, de civit. necorost. Hal. 1944; Hermann, Gott. All. § 12. 7.

13 Enfr. Hyg. T. 977: Hero clad. i. 11. 2.

14 See Spanheim, ad Cult. in Dian. 268; Weitstein in loc.

15 With enigmatical words on forehead girdle, and feet; see upon it Ewald, Jahrh., II. p. 175 f.

16 Multimamiam, Jerome.
TUMULT QUELLED BY THE TOWN CLERK.

Ver. 37. Γάρ] justifies the expression used, προτετικα, rashly, without consideration.

Ver. 38. Οὖν] accordingly, since these men are neither robbers of temples, etc. On ἔχειν πρὸς τινὰ λόγον, an utterance, i.e. complaint, see examples in Kyrie, II. p. 108. — ἁγγοραία] by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Bornemann, following Suidas, accented ἁγγοραία, are judicial assemblies; in construing it, σύνοδον is to be conceived as supplied. — καὶ ἀνθίπατοι εἰσίν] and there are proconsuls. The plural is here also the plural indefinite of the category. Arbitrarily Calvin and Grotius hold that the proconsul and his legate are meant. Bengel correctly says: “de eo quod nunquam non esse soleat.”

Vv. 39, 40. But if you desire anything further thereupon, beyond matters of private law, it will be discussed, cleared up, in the lawful assembly of the people. On περαιτέρω see the critical remarks. — καὶ γάρ κυνὸν.] for we even run the risk of being charged with tumult — στάσεως: genitive of accusation — on account of this day. γάρ gives the reason why the speaker in the latter case, ver. 39, has relegated the matter to the ἐννομος ἐκάλης. τῆς σήμερον is not to be connected with στάσεως. — μήδενος aitio... ταύτης] there being no reason, on the ground of which we shall be in a position to give account of this concourse. μήδ. aitio, taken as masculine, would less accord with the prudence of the speaker, who with wise forbearance clothes the threatening in a form embracing others, including his own responsibility. — Very wisely, on the whole, has the politically adroit man of business, in the first instance, by way of capitatio benevolentiae praised the Ephesian worship of Diana in its unendangered world-wide fame; then from this inferred the unseemliness of such a hasty proceeding; further, pointed Demetrius and his companions to the legal form of procedure in their case; and finally, put on the people the lasting curb of the fear of Roman punishment. — καὶ ταῦτα εἰς... κ.τ.λ.] ὡσοι ἔβαζες τὸν ὁμον. ὡσπερ γάρ ῥαδίως ἐξάπτεται, ὡσοι καὶ ῥαδίως αἵτινοι, Chrysostom. — How lightly Baur deprives this whole history of its historical character, may be seen in his Paulus, I. p. 217, ed. 2.

1 But see on xvii. 5.

2 Comp. Strabo, xiii. p. 629; Vulg. : conventus forensis.

3 Comp. xvii. 18.

4 "Quis a magisteratu civitatis convocatur et regitur," Grotius; in contrast to this illegal concorreae, comp. on vv. 32, 30.


6 Vulgate, Luther, Calvin, and others. So also Buxtorf, n. eut. Gr. p. 154 (E. T. 177). Certainly the στάσεως νερίς is in keeping with ὑγιαλίσθαι νερί τινος, xxiii. 30, xxvi. 7. But it may be urged, on the other hand, that such a position of the preposition after the noun (Krüger, § lxviii. 4. 2; Kühner, § 626) is not usual in the N. T., and also that the γραμματεύς in his speech was too diplomatically prudent to designate, on his part, the affair exactly as a tumult (στάσεις). In his mouth it is only a concourse (συντροφί). We may add, that in Greek writers ροσκελιοθείσαι, with the simple genitive, is the usual expression.

7 Vulgate.

8 vv. 39-40.
Notes by American Editor.

(14) Ephesus. V. 1.

Ephesus was the greatest city of Asia Minor, and the metropolis of a province said to embrace no less than five hundred cities. It was situated on the Cayster, and built partly on the two mountains Prion and Coressus, and partly on the valley between them. It had a commodious harbor, and lay on the main road of traffic between the east and the west, a position favorable alike to inland and maritime commerce. It was a free city of the Roman Empire, and self-governed. It was full of elegant buildings; and its markets were supplied with the choicest products of all lands, and adorned with works of art of every kind. They supplied the writer of the Apocalypse with the vivid and glowing description given in Rev. xviii. 12,13. Its theatre was one of the largest ever erected, said to be capable of holding 30,000 persons. The city was the resort of all nations, and its population was numerous and multifarious.

"It was more Hellenic than Antioch, more Oriental than Corinth, more populous than Athens, more wealthy and refined than Thessalonica, more sceptical than Ancyr[a] or Pessinus. It was, with the single exception of Rome, by far the most important scene of the apostle's toils, and was destined in after years to become not only the first of the seven churches of Asia, but the seat of one of those great Ecumenical Councils which defined the faith of the Christian world." (Farrar.)

The temple of Diana, built of white marble, was magnificent in extent, 435 feet in length and 220 feet in breadth, with 127 columns 60 feet high, each said to be the gift of a king, and many of them adorned with rich ornamentation in bas-relief. It was the glory of the city, and one of the wonders of the world. The sun in his course, it was said, shone on nothing more splendid.

Ephesus was specially famous for two things—the worship of Diana and the practice of magic—and it was the headquarters of many defunct superstitions, which owed their continuance to various orders of priests. The general character of the inhabitants was in very bad repute. Reman, basing his views upon numerous ancient authorities, writes: "It might have been called the rendezvous of courtesans and vendeurs. The city was full to repletion of magicians, diviners, mimics, and flute-players, eunuchs, jewellers, amulet and metal merchants, and romance writers. The expression, Ephesian novels, indicated, like that of Milesian fables, a style of literature, Ephesus being one of the cities in which they preferred to locate the scenes of love stories. The mildness of the climate, in fact, disinclined one to serious things. Dancing and singing remained the sole occupation; public life degenerated into bacchanalian revels. Good studies were thrown aside." Nothing now remains of the magnificent metropolis of Asia but a miserable Turkish village. The once thronged harbor is now a malarious marsh. The ruins alone are grand. The vast theatre may still be traced, but of the proud temple not one stone remains above another. It is said that some of the pillars may still be seen in the Mosque of St. Sophia at Constantinople.
NOTES.

(3) Whether there be any Holy Ghost. V. 2.

The persons referred to were believers in Jesus as the Messiah, but they were imperfectly instructed, and had as yet a very imperfect Christian experience. From the fact that they seem to hold the same relation to John and Jesus as Apollos did, they were probably converts under his first ministry. It is not conceivable that they could have received even the baptism of John without knowing something of the Holy Spirit, his existence and personality; as Bengel justly remarks, "They could not have followed either Moses or John the Baptist without hearing of the Holy Ghost." The words then must mean that they believed in the Lord Jesus Christ as the Messiah, and were baptized into that faith, but they had not heard anything about the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, and the marvels that followed. That the question and answer both had reference to the special rather than ordinary gifts of the Spirit is obvious when we refer to verse 6, where we are told that "the Holy Ghost came upon them; and they spake with tongues and prophesied." The baptism of John was simply provisional and preparatory. He taught his disciples to believe in Jesus as the Messiah already come; and belief implied obedience; and obedience baptism in his name. Archbishop Sumner gives the following paraphrase of the passage: "You are the disciples of Christ. Have the gifts of the Spirit been bestowed on you as on other congregations of disciples? Have any prophesied? Any spoken with tongues? Any done wonderful works? Their answer signifies that they had not heard whether such a power of the Holy Ghost was granted at all. The Holy Ghost they knew. But they had not heard of such an effusion of the Spirit as Paul alluded to, or known that they were to expect it."

(3) Exorcists. V. 13.

"Such professed exorcists were numerous in the days of the apostles. Our Lord himself alludes to them, when he says, 'If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out?' The Ephesians were specially addicted to astrology, sorcery, incantations, amulets, exorcisms, and every kind of magical imposture, and persons of this class flocked to the city. They professed that their magical arts were derived from Solomon. Josephus refers to this, and also mentions a certain root which, being brought to those who were possessed, quickly expelled the demons from their bodies. Seven sons of Sceva, who was probably a chief ruler of the synagogue, practised this art, and impiously pronounced as a cabalistic sign the sacred name of Jesus. About this time, also, the celebrated thaumaturgist, Appolonius of Tyana, is supposed to have visited Ephesus. The worship of Diana and the practice of magic were almost indis solubly connected, and a species of writings were manufactured and sold to the credulous purchaser, which when pronounced were used as a charm, and when written carried as an amulet. "Among them were the words ascion, kalaschion, lie, tetras, donnameneus, and astepa, which for sense and efficiency were about on a par with the daries, derdaries, astateries or ista pista ista, which Cato, the elder, held to be a sovereign remedy for a sprain, or the shaviri, uriri, iriri, iri, ri, which the rabbies taught as efficacious for the expulsion of the demon of blindness." (Rimcr.) Among such a people Paul preached the gospel of Jesus, and wrought many real miracles in his name."
(v) *He dismissed the assembly.* V. 41.

There is a striking resemblance between the tumult at Ephesus and that at Philippi. They were both distinguished from all other persecutions mentioned in the Acts, in that they were not caused by the Jews, but by Gentiles; both also originated in interested motives, the loss of gain; both were characterized by senseless rioting and cruel violence, and in both the actors were restrained from proceeding to extreme measures. At Ephesus, when the mob was at the height of excitement, wild uproar, and blind fury, the town clerk by a well-timed and admirable address appeased their wrath and dismissed the crowd. He showed them that such senseless and noisy conduct was *undignified*, as the universality and magnificence of their worship was unimpeachable; that their course with regard to these men was *unjustifiable*, as they could prove nothing illegal or criminal against them; that it was entirely *unnecessary*, as other means of redress were open to them; and that it was *hazardous*, as it might involve them in difficulty with the Roman government. *Dick* suggests the following reflections on this passage: That opposition to the gospel arises from the depraved passions of men—avarice, ambition, and love of pleasure; that the sacred name of religion has often been prostituted to serve the most infamous purposes; that the concurrence of a multitude in support of a cause is no proof of its justice; and that God reigns and carries on the designs of his government amid all the commotions of the world, and constrains the very wrath of man to praise him. *Taylor* gives these: That self-interest perverts the judgment, and that it speaks ill for a trade when its prosperity is destroyed by the success of the gospel. *Schaff* adds another lesson: That which profits the purse may injure the soul.
CHAPTER XX.

VERS. 1. καὶ ἀσπασά. A B D E Μ, min. vss. have καὶ παρακαλέσα, ἀσπασ. So Lachm. Yet D has παλλά before παρακαλ. (so Born.), and E καὶ before ἀσπασ. Other witnesses have καὶ παρεκ. ἀσπασ, τε. So Rinck. παρακαλ, has certainly preponderant attestation in its favour, but against the internal decisive consideration, that no reason is apparent for its subsequent omission, whereas it might very easily suggest itself from vers. 2 and xvi. 40 as a pious marginal remark to ἀσπασ. — Ver. 4. Πώλησαν is wanting in Elz., and is condemned by Mill as an addition from tradition. But it has greatly preponderant attestation, and might be passed over quite as well on the ground of a varying tradition, as by mistake of the transcribers on account of the similar sound of the initial syllable in the following name. — Ver. 5. ἀνείρω] Lachm. reads ανείρω δέ, after A B E Μ, min. A connective addition. — Ver. 7. ημῶν] Elz. has τῶν μαθηρῶν, in opposition to A B D E, min. Chrys. Aug. and most vss. An interpolation on account of the following αὐτοὶς. Still stronger witnesses support ημῶν in ver. 8, for which Elz. has ἠγαν. — Ver. 9. καθήμενος] Instead of this, καθήκομεν (Lachm. Tisch. Born.) is preponderantly attested. Comp. on ii. 2. — Ver. 11. ἀπορον] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read τῶν ἄπορων, according to A B C D* Μ*. Rightly; the article was neglected after ver. 7, because its force was overlooked. — Ver. 15. καὶ μείν. εἰς Ἴρησον. τῇ A B C E Μ, min. have merely τῇ δέ. So Lachm. Several vss. and some more recent cond. have καὶ τῇ. But there was no occasion for the insertion of μείν. εἰς Ἴρησον, whereas its omission is very capable of explanation, because Trogyllum was not situated in Samos, as the context seemed to say. — Ver. 16. εἰκονεῖ] Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born., according to greatly preponderating evidence. But Elz. Scholz have εἰκανε. A church-lesson begins at ver. 16, and therefore the tense, which has its reference in what precedes, was altered. — τῇ] Lachm. reads εἰς, following considerable witnesses. A grammatical improvement. — Ver. 18. After πρὸς αὐτῶν A has ὁμοιόν ὄντων αὐτῶν, which Lachm. adopted; others have ὁμοθυμαδύον; and others ὁμοῖος ὄντων αὐτῶν (so Born., according to D). Different additions for the sake of completion. — Ver. 19. Before ἂν κρ. Elz. has παλλάων, which already Griesb. rejected, according to decisive testimony. A strengthening addition from 2 Cor. ii. 4. — Ver. 22. According to decisive testimony read ἐγὼ, with Lachm. Tisch., after δεδωκα. — Ver. 23. μοι] is wanting in Elz., but is decidedly attested, and was easily passed over as quite unnecessary. — με] is, according to decisive evidence, to be placed after θλίψεις (Lachm. Tisch.). Born. has μοι ἐν Ἴρησολόγων, according to D, vss. Lucif., and that only after μένουσαν. But μοι is a mechanical repetition from the preceding, and ἐν Ἴρησολόλεγος is an addition by way of a gloss; the two, moreover, are not equally attested. — Ver. 24. ἀλλ' ὁδεγώς . . . ἐμαυτῷ] very many variations. Lachm. has ἀλλ' οδεγώς λόγον ἔχω, οὐδὲ ποιοῦμαι τῷ ψυχῷ τιμίαν ἐμαυτῷ. Tisch. reads ἀλλ' οδεγώς λόγον ποιοῦμαι τῷ ψυχῷ τιμίαν ἐμαυτῷ, according to B C D* Μ*, vss. Lucif. Born. reads essentially as Lachm., yet adding μοι after ἔχω, and μοι after ψυχήν. The
Recepta is founded on E G H, Chrys. Theophyl. Oec.; but G, Chrys., have not μου. The reading of Lachm. (A D* K, min. Vulg.), as well as the Recepta, are to be considered as alterations and expansions of the reading of Tisch., which was not understood. — After δρήμον μου Elz. Scholz have μετὰ χαράζ, which is wanting in A B D M, min. Lucif. Ambr. and several vss. A scholion. — Ver. 25. τοῦ Θεοῦ] is wanting in A B C M, 13, 15*, 36, Copt. Syr. p. Arm. Chrys. Rightly deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. A supplementary addition. D has τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. So Born. — Ver. 26. ἐγώ] Considerable witnesses have εἰμι, which Griesb. has recommended and Lachm. adopted. Rightly; ἐγὼ came from xviii. 6. — Ver. 28. τοῦ Κυρίου] Elz. has τοῦ Θεοῦ, which is adhered to among recent critics (following Mill, Whitby, Wolf, Bengel, and others), by Scholz, Alford, Rinck, Lucabr. crit. p. 82 f. The weight of evidence is externally decisive for τοῦ Κυρίου; A C* D E, 13, 15, 18, 36, 40, 69, 73, 81, 95*, 130, 156, 163, 180, Copt. Sahid. Syr. p. (on the margin) Arm. Aeth. Constitut. (ii. 61), Ir. (iii. 14), Eus. (on Isa. xxxv.), Ath. (ad Serap. 1 in ma.), Didym. (de Ξπ. St. 11), Chrys. Lucif. Aug. Jer. al. τοῦ Θεοῦ is found among uncial mss. only in B M, and, besides, only in about twenty more recent and inferior codd., and among vss. in the Vulg. Syr. p. (in the text); but among the Fathers in none before Epiph. and Ambros. See the more detailed statement of the evidence in Tisch. The internal decisive argument for τοῦ Κυρίου lies in the fact that in the Pauline Epistles ἐκκλ. τ. Κυρίου never occurs, but ἐκκλ. τ. Θεοῦ eleven times; hence at our passage the Pauline expression was written on the margin as a parallel, and then, welcome to hyper-orthodoxy (already in Ignat. ad Eph. 1, and in Tert. ad ux. ii. 3, there is found the expression blood of God, which others, even Ath., censured as unbiblical; see Wetstein and Tisch.), was taken into the text and transmitted. This appears far more accordant with the dactylic tendency of those times and the monastic spirit than the usual justification of τοῦ Θεοῦ: "Probabilius est ob sequentia mutatum, quam e scriptis Pauli illatam esse" (Rinck, i.c.). The readings τοῦ Κυρίου Θεοῦ, τοῦ Θεοῦ κ. Κυρίου, and τοῦ Κυρίου κ. Θεοῦ (this latter Griesb. recommends, without, however, approving it, but Matth. received it), are combinations of the original reading with the Pauline parallel written on the margin. Teller's and van Hengel's proposal to read only τῦν ἐκκλ., is destitute of all critical support. — τοῦ αἰματος τοῦ ιδίου] Elz. has τοῦ ιδίου αἰματος, in opposition to A B C D E M, min. vss. Ir. Lucif. An alteration, which arose from the adoption of τ. Θεοῦ, in order to establish the interpretation of the blood of God. — Ver. 29. After ἐγώ Elz. Scholz, Tisch. have γάρ, against A C* D M, min. Vulg. Fathers. The more to be rejected, as others read δρέεν ἐγώ (B), others ἐγώ δέ (N*), others still καὶ ἐγώ. A connective addition. τοῦτο also, which Elz. Scholz, Tisch. have after αἶδα, has such preponderating evidence against it, and in such essential agreement with those witnesses which condemn γάρ, that it cannot be considered as original, although, taken by itself, it might be more easily omitted than added. — Ver. 32. After ὑμᾶς Elz. Scholz have ἄδελφοι, which Lachm. Tisch. Born. have deleted, according to A B D M, 33, 34, 68, Syr. Erp. Copt. Sahid. Vulg. Jer. If it had been original, there is no apparent reason for its omission; on the other hand, its insertion at this solemn passage was very natural. — αἰκόν:] Approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Born. But Elz. Scholz, Tisch. have ἐπικοίνων, against decisive testimony. A more precise definition corresponding to the persons in question: and therefore, also, D E, vss. add ὑμᾶς. — Ver. 35. τῶν λόγων] G and more than thirty min. Vulg. Sahid. Arm.
Aest. Chrys. Theophyl. have τὸν λόγον. So Rinck. Others have τὸν λόγον after min.; so Bengel. Both are alterations, because only one saying of Christ afterwards follows. — The order μᾶλλον διδόναι (Elz. inverts it) is decidedly attested.

Vv. 1–3. Μερὰ δὲ τὸ πατρὸς. τ. θάρυσὶ.] is simply a statement of time, not, as Michaelis, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, and Hug hold, the motive of departure, for which there is no hint in the text,¹ and against which the resultless character of the tumult testifies. — ἀποσαφέμυνε] here of the farewell salutation, combined with kissing and embracing, vale diecere.² — αὐτοῖς] the Macedonian Christians. — Ἐλλάδα] i.e. Ἀχαΐα, xix. 21. Luke alternates in his use of the appellations well known as synonyms, which, after xix. 21, could occasion no misunderstanding. This against Schrader, who understands Ἐλλάδα here of the districts lying between the Peloponnesus and Thesaly and Epirus, especially of Attica, and would have the journey to Corinth only inferred from xix. 31. — ποιήσας τε μὴνα τρεῖς] certainly for the most part in Corinth.⁴ That Luke, moreover, gives us no information of the foundation of the church at Corinth, and of the apostle’s labours there, is just one of the many points of incompleteness in his book. — τοῖς ἱστοροῦμεν.] namely, to Αἰσια (ver. 4), from which he had come. The genitive depends directly on γνώμην.

Ver. 4. Ἀχρί τῆς Ἀσίας⁵] excepting only the short separation from Philippi to Troas, ver. 5, where those companions (συνείπερον), having journeyed before the apostle, waited for him. The statement is summary, not excluding the sailing before from Philippi to Troas, the Asiatic emporium; but Tittmann⁶ erroneously judges: “eos usque in Asiam cum Paulo una fuisset, deinde praevirem seseque expectasse.” Vv. 5, 6 are at variance with this. Nor is there, with Wieseler, p. 293, and Baumgarten, to be artificially deduced from Ἀχρί τῆς Ἀσίας the meaning: “‘up to that point from which people crossed to Asia;’” so that Luke would oddly enough have indicated nothing else than as far as Philippoi. On συνείπερον, only here in the N. T., comp. 2 Macc. xxv. 2; 3 Macc. v. 48, vi. 21; very frequent in the classics. — Οἱ Σοπάτερ, the son of Pyrrhus, of Beroea, and whether he is identical with Sophater, Rom. xvi. 21, nothing is known. The other companions were two Thessalonians, Aristarchus⁷ and Secundus, entirely unknown; further, an inhabitant of Derbe, Caius, thus different from the Macedonian, xix. 29; for Derbe belonged to Lycaonia;⁸ Timotheus, whose dwelling is supposed as known and therefore is not specified;⁹ and lastly, the two Asiatics, Tychicus¹⁰ and Trophimus.¹¹ It was nothing but arbitrary violence, when Eresti, Valckenaer, and Kuinoel, in order to identify

¹ See on the contrary, xix. 21.
² As Xem. Aristh. vii. 1. 8, 46; Hell. iv. 1. 3; Cyp. ii. 1. 1.
³ The anakinolotic nominative, as in xix. 34.
⁴ As in xiv. 9, xxvi. 50. Comp. 1 Cor. ix. 5.
⁵ The omission of Ἀσία] Ἀσία is not strongly enough attested by Bk. 13, Volg. Aeth. Erp. Beda, particularly as it might easily have taken place for the sake of ver. 5. It is, however, approved by Lassiebusch.
⁷ xiv. 29.
⁸ See on xiv. 6.
⁹ See on xvi. 1.
¹⁰ Eph. vi. 21; Col. iv. 7; 2 Tim. iv. 12; Tit.
¹¹ xxi. 29; 2 Thess. iv. 29.
Caius—how extremely frequent was the name!—with the Caius of xix. 12 and to make Timothy a native of Derbe, wished to put a comma after Γαίος and then to read Δερβ. δτ Τμ. Following the same presupposition, Ols-hausen contents himself with merely putting a point after Γαίος and then taking καί in the signification of also! And for this even-Wieseler has declared himself, appealing to the parallelism of the language, according to which, from Θεσαλονικ. onwards, the nomen gentilitium is always placed first. But the parallelism is rather of this nature, that the nomen gentilitium first follows after, Βεροία, then precedes, Θεσαλονικ., then again follows after, Δερβ., and lastly, again precedes, Ασίαν., thus in regular alternation.

We may add, that no special reason for such a numerous escort is indicated in the text, and hypotheses referring to the point amount to mere subjective fancies.

Vv. 5, 6. 'Ημᾶς] Luke had remained behind at Philippi, xvi. 40. Now, when Paul, on his present journey back through Macedonia, came to Philippi, Luke again joined him. But the above-mentioned seven companions (οὗτοι) journeyed before—wherefore is unknown; possibly to make preparations for the further sea voyage—to Troas, and there waited the arrival of Paul and Luke. For οὗτοι cannot, without arbitrariness, be otherwise referred than to all the seven above mentioned, which is not precluded by xxi. 29, xxvii. 2, and thereby, no doubt, our passage is decisive against the hypothesis that Timothy speaks in the ήμεις. Hence the supporters of that hypothesis are necessarily reduced to refer, as already Beza and Wolf have done, οὗτοι merely to Tychicus and Trophimus.—μετὰ τὰς ήμερ. τῶν άς.] Paul remained over the Paschal days in quietness, keeping holy the festival of his people in Christian freedom. —ἄχρι ήμερ. πέντε] specifies άχρι τίνος; i.e. how long the ἔρχεσθαι lasted from the sailing from Philippi, namely, up to five days. The reading πεμπταίοι is a correct gloss. — ἡμέρας ἐπτά] a full week. More is not to be sought behind this simple statement of time, in opposition to Baumgarten, II. p. 48 f.

Ver. 7. But on the first day of the week. That the Sunday was already at this time regularly observed by holding religious assemblies and Agape, cannot, indeed, be made good with historical certainty, since possibly the observance of the Agape in our passage might only accidentally occur on the first day of the week, because Paul intended to depart on the following

---

1 Hefnerichs: καὶ Τμ. Δερβ. Lachmann, Praf. p. ix., conjectured καὶ Δερβ. Τμῶν. He places a point after Τμῶν, and makes the δι, read by him after οὖτοι, ver. 6, to be reump- line (repeating the δι after Ασιανοί), which, as the discourse is not interrupted by parentheses, would be without motive and forced.
2 p. 26, and in Herzog’s Encycl. XXI. p. 276.
3 According to Schneckenburger, they are the collection—commissioners of the chief churches; according to Baumgarten, they appear, in their number corresponding to the deacons in Jerusalem, as representatives of the whole Gentile church; comp, also Lange, II. p. 291. Such inventions are purely fanciful.
4 See Introduction, § 1.
6 A. D. 69.
7 Comp. Chrys.
8 Heliol. iv. 19. 65.
9 Comp. on Luke ii. 37; Plat. M. i. 791 E.
10 D. Born.
11 Comp. xxi. 4.
12 See on Matt. xxviii. 1; 1 Cor. xvi. 2.
13 εἰςαίοι ἄρτος; see on ii. 42.
day, and since even 1 Cor. xvi. 9, Rev. i. 10, do not necessarily distinguish this day as set apart for religious services. But most probably the observance of Sunday is based on an apostolic arrangement—yet one certainly brought about only gradually and in the spirit of Christian freedom—\(^1\) the need of which manifested itself naturally, importance of the resurrection of Jesus and of the effusion of the Spirit at Pentecost, and indeed necessarily, in the first instance, when the gospel came to be diffused among the Gentiles who had no Sabbath festival; and the assumption of which is indispensable for the explanation of the early universal observance of that day, τῷ τῶν ἡλίου λεγόμενα χρόνα πάντων κατὰ πάλιν ἡ ἄγονις μενόντων ἐπὶ τό αὐτό συνέλευνες γίνεται,\(^2\) although for a long time the observance of the Sabbath along with it was not given up by the Jewish Christians and even by others—\(^3\)—a circumstance which was doubtless connected with the antinomistic interest. Rightly, therefore, is the μια τῶν σαββάτων, in our passage regarded as a day of special observance.\(^4\) The observance of Sunday was not universally introduced by law until A.D. 321 by Constantine.\(^5\)—αὐτός] to the assembled. Luke changes his standpoint, previously ἡμέραν, as the discourse was held with the Christians of that place. —μέχρι μεσον.\(^6\)] On Sunday, not Saturday, evening they had assembled for the love-feast. On τελευταῖο and its compounds, used of long speaking, see Heind.\(^8\)

Vv. 8–10. Ἡσιὼ δὲ λαμπρ. Ι.κ.\(^9\)] therefore the fall of the young man could at once be perceived. The lamps served for the lighting up of the room, for it was night; but perhaps at the same time for heightening the solemnity of the occasion. According to Ewald, Luke wished to obviate the evil reports concerning the nocturnal meetings of the Christians;\(^1\) but they remained withal nocturnal and thereby exposed to suspicion.—Whether ἐντυχεσθα, a young man serving,\(^7\) which at least is not to be inferred from the occurrence of the name among slaves and freedmen,\(^8\) the text does not say. —ἐνὶ τῆς ὥρᾳ,\(^9\)] on the open window, i.e. on the window-seat. The openings of the windows in the East, having no glass, were sometimes with and sometimes without lattice-work.\(^10\) So they are still at the present day. —καταφέρθην, καταφέρθηναί, falling into a deep sleep. καταφέρθηναί is the proper word for this among Greek writers,\(^11\) usually with εἰς ὥραν.\(^12\) Observe the logical relation of the participles: But as there sat (καθεξῆς), see the critical remarks a young man, falling, in his sitting there, into deep sleep during the prolonged discourse of Paul, he fell, overpowered by the sleep, from the third story, etc.\(^13\)—The discourse continued for a longer time\(^14\) than the young man

---

\(^1\) See Neander in the Deutsch. Zeitschr. 1850, p. 303 ff.
\(^2\) Justin, Apol. I. 67; comp. c. Tryph. p. 34.; Ignat. ad Magnes. 9; Barnab. 15.
\(^3\) Constitt. ap. II. 59. 2, vii. 88. 2, can. 66; Orig. Hom. 38; Eus. iii. 37.
\(^5\) See Gieseier, K. G. I. 1, p. 274, ed. 4.
\(^7\) Comp. Calvin and Bengel.
\(^8\) Rosenmüller, Heinrichs.
\(^9\) Artem. Ill. 38; Phaedr. 3, pros.
\(^10\) See Winer, Reallex.
\(^11\) Comp. also Aquila, Ps. lxv. 6.
\(^12\) Luctan, Dial. mer. II. 4; Herod., II. 1.
\(^14\) As to εἰς ὥραν comp. on 17. xviii. 20.
had expected. — ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπινοῦν] ἀπὸ denotes the proceeding from, the power producing the effect, \(^1\) and the article denotes the sleep already mentioned. \(^2\) — ἡρῴη νεκρός] he was taken up dead. The words affirm nothing else than that the young man actually fell down dead and was taken up dead, Chrys.: διὰ τοῦτο ἀπεθανόν, ἵνα Παῦλον ἀκούσῃ, Calvin, Beza, and others; recently Schneckenburger, Schwengel, Zeller, and Baumgarten; and only so understood has the fall, as well as the conduct of the apostle in ver. 10 and the result, the significance which can have induced its being narrated, namely, as a raising from the dead. \(^3\) This we remark in opposition to the view which has become common, as if ὃς νεκρός were used, "apparently dead." \(^4\) — ἐπέσαν ἀντὶ ὁστακ. k.t.l.] not in order to examine him, but in order to revise him by his contact, in a way similar to the procedure of Elisha and Elijah. \(^5\) — μὴ ἰθοβεβεβεθε· ἢ γάρ ψυχή k.t.l.] Thus he speaks, obviating the consternation of those present, \(^6\) when he had convinced himself of the successful intervention of his miraculous influence. His soul is in him, i.e. he is living! ἡ ψυχή ἀνεκοί, not ἐν ἀντὶ, has the emphasis, not spoken without a lively feeling of victory. The young man had, in fact, been but now ἀναρχ. Accordingly there is no ambiguity of the words, in which Lekebusch asserts that we desiderate an added "again," and would explain this ambiguity on the ground that the author himself was not quite convinced of the miraculous nature of the incident. \(^7\)

Vv. 11, 12. On account of the discoursings the intended partaking of the Agapæ \(^8\) had not yet taken place. But by the fall of the young man these discoursings were broken off; and now, after Paul had returned to the room, he commences, as the father of a family among those assembled, the so long deferred meal — he breaks the bread, and eats, and discourses at table \(^9\) until break of day, whereupon he thus, ὁδωρ, after all that is mentioned in ἀνάβας . . . ἀνάγης,\(^10\) leaves the place of meeting. After his departure, they, "qui remanerant apud adolescentem," \(^11\) brought the lad alive into the room, and they, those assembled, were by this greatly \(^12\) comforted over their separation from the apostle, who had left behind such a σημεῖον of his miraculous power. — κλάσας τὸν (see the critical remarks) ἅρτον stands in definite reference to κλάσαυ ἅρτ., ver. 7, and therefore the article is put. Piscator, Grotius, Kuinoel, and others erroneously hold that a breakfast is meant, which Paul partook of to strengthen him for his journey, and that therefore γενιάμ. is subjoined. But the Agape was, in fact, a real meal, and that therefore γενιάμ. denotes nothing else than that Paul had begun to partake of it. It is only added to bring more prominently

---

\(^1\) Bernhardy, p. 223; Buttman, neut. Gr. p. 277 (E. T. 323).

\(^2\) Matt. 1. 24.

\(^3\) Baur's criticism in the case, however, converts an event which was in itself natural into a parallel in a miraculous form with the raising of the dead narrated of Peter in chap. ix.

\(^4\) De Wette; comp. Ewald.

\(^5\) 2 Kings iv. 34; 1 Kings xvii. 17 ff.

\(^6\) Comp. on μὴ θορυβ., Dem. de cor. 35.

\(^7\) See, on the other hand, Oertel, Paulus in d. Apostelgesch. p. 147.

\(^8\) Ver. 7.

\(^9\) Comp. Chrysostom.


\(^11\) Erasmus.

\(^12\) οὐ μετρίως, often so with Plutarch, also in Isocrates and others.
forward this partaking as having at length taken place. — ὑμῖλήσας, as in Luke xxiv. 14; more familiar than διαλέγη, ver. 9. — ἔγαγον they brought him, so that he came into the midst of them; but only now, so that thus subsequently to his revival, he must have gradually recovered, in order to be able to return into the room. — τὸν παιδή he must consequently have been still very young. — ζώντα] Opposed to νεκρός, ver. 9, and for the joyful confirmation of the words of the apostle, ver. 10.

Ver. 13. Ἡμείς] without Paul. — Ἀσσὸς, a seaport in Mysia, south of Troas, opposite Lesbos, ἐν ὑψηλῶ κ. ὑπέρτος κ. δυσανιδού τόπου, Steph. Byz. — ἤν διατετάγαμ.] middle, for he had so arranged, namely, that they should from thence (ἐκείθεν) receive him on board (ἀναλαμβάνει). — αἰτῶ] He for his part chose the route by land, probably because he had a particular official object in view. More arbitrary are the suggestions of Calvin, that it took place σαλατουδίνις causa; of Michaelis and Stolz, that he wished to escape the snares of the Jews; of Lange, that he acted thus in order to withdraw himself from the circle of his too careful protectors; and of Ewalt, that he did so in order to be solitary.

Vv. 14, 15. Εἰς τὴν Ἀσσὸν] The element of the previous movement — the notion of coming-together — still prevails. So also the landing eis Σάμον, ver. 15. — Μιλησία, the beautiful capital of Lesbos, on the east coast. — ἄνωστοι over against. — καὶ μείν. εἰς Τρωγ.] Thus on the same day they had sailed over from Samos, where they had touched (παραβάλλω), to Trogyllium, a town and promontory on the Ionian coast, distant only forty stadia, and there passed the night. On the different modes of writing the name Τρωγ., see Bornemann.

Vv. 16, 17. The ship was thus entirely at his disposal, probably one hired specially for this voyage. — παραπλ. τ. Ἐφεσον] he sailed past Eph.; for in the chief church of Asia, to which Paul stood in such intimate relation, and where he also would encounter his opponents, he would have been under the necessity of tarrying too long. In order to avoid such prolonged contact with friend and foe, because on account of the aim of his journey he might not now spend the time in Asia, he arranged the interview with the presbyters, which was to subserve the longings of his parting love as well as the exigency of the threatening future, not at the very near Trogyllium, but at Miletus, distant about nine geographical miles from Ephesus. — εἰ δύνατον. ἤν αἰρεῖν] if it should be possible for him. Direct form of expression. Of another nature is the conception in xxvii. 39: εἰ γενέθη] in the sense of coming, as in John vi. 25. — πέμψας] as in Matt. xiv. 10, and in the classical writers. He caused them to be summoned to him by an embassy to Ephesus.

Vv. 18, 19. "In hac concisione" praecipue hic insistit Paulus, ut, quos
Ephesi creaverat pastores, *suo exemplo hortetur ad munus sumum fidelter peragendum,* Calvin. It is a clear and true *pastoral mirror.* — Only the Ephesian ¹ presbyters were assembled; not, as Iren. iii. 14. 2 relates, those also of the neighbouring churches, — an error which arose, perhaps, on account of ver. 28, from the later episcopal dignity. — ἀπὸ πρωτείας . . . 'Ἄνθρωπος belongs to the following πῶς . . . ἐγενόμην, to which it is emphatically prefixed,' not to ἐνστάσει; for the point was not the continuity of the knowledge of those addressed, but that of the apostolic conduct. Tholuck, with justice, here calls attention to the frequency and force of the self-witness, which we meet with in Paul. ² The reason thereof lies in his own special consciousness; ³ and it is wrong to find in the self-witness of this speech the apologetic fabrication of a later adorer. — The first day; see xviii. 19. On μεθ' ἐμ. ἐγενώμι, comp. vii. 38. — τῷ Κυρίῳ] to Christ, as His apostles. — μετὰ πᾶσας ταπεινωσίας] with all possible humility, πολλὰ γὰρ εἶδο τῆς ταπεινωσισμοῦς. ⁴ — δικαστοῦ.] See on ver. 31.

Vv. 20, 21. 'Ὡς οὖν κ. τ. λ.] sets forth more precisely the πῶς. — τοῦ μὴ ἀναγγ.'] contains the design which would have been present in the ὑποστ. : *how I have held back (disimulaveri) nothing of what was profitable, in order not to preach and to teach it to you, etc.* So also ver. 27: for I have not been holding back, in order not, etc. The μὴ extends to both infinitives. That *disimulare* might have taken place from the fear of men, or in order to please men. — On οὖν ὑποστελέμην, comp. Dem. 54, ult. : πάντ' ἀπλώς, οὖν ὑποστελέμενος παπαρρήσια, and 990. 22 : μηδὲν ὑποστελέμενον μηδὲ ἀειχθεῖμενον, also 415. 2: μετὰ παραρθυμίας διαλεγχθήτω μηδὲν ὑποστελέμενον, according to Becker. — τῶν συμπερακτών] "Haec docenda sunt; reliqua praecidenda," Bengel. — τῷ εἰς τ. θεόν μετάν.] the repentance, by which we turn to God. ¹⁰ It is not, with Beza, Bengel, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, to be referred only to the Gentiles, and πάντων κ. τ. λ. to the Jews; for the call to this μετάνοια was addressed also to the Jews, inasmuch as they were unfaithful to God, not indeed by idolatry, but by immorality and hypocrisy. ¹¹ Bengel, moreover, aptly remarks: Repentance and faith are the "summa eorum quae utilia sunt."

Ver. 22. 'Ἰδοὺ] Singular, although addressed to several. ¹² — ἐγώ] apostolic sense of personal significance in the consciousness of his important and momentous destiny. — ἐκδιδόμενος τῷ πνεύματι] cannot denote the shutting off of any

990, see Tholuck in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1889, p. 305 ff.; Neander, p. 473 ff. According to Baur and Zeller, the whole speech (according to Schneckenburger, only part of it) is an apologetic fiction. Ewald correctly remarks: *"to doubt its historical character in general, is folly itself."* — Precisely this speech, and that to the Athenians, chap. xvii., bear most decidedly and most directly the impress of vivid originality. See also Klostermann, *Vindictae Luct. p.* 40 ff.; Trip, *Paulus*, p. 300 ff.

¹ Comp. on 1 Cor. xv. 2; Winer, p. 522 (B. T. 703).

² 1 Cor. iv. 16. xi. 1.; 9 Cor. I. 12.; Phil. iii. 17. al.; comp. Trip. p. 214 ff.
³ 1 Cor. iv. 4, xv. 10.
⁴ See particularly, Zeller, p. 273.
⁵ Oecumenius. See also Thelie, *ad Ep. Jac.* p. 6 ff. [Cor. iv. 8. al.]
⁶ But see Gal. ii. 14. i. 10.; Rom. i. 16.; i
⁸ Comp. 1 Cor. vii. 35. xii. 7.
⁹ Comp. ili. 19. viii. 22. xxvi. 39.
¹⁰ Rom. ii. 3. Comp. Mark i. 15.
¹¹ See on Matt. x. 16.
inward glimpses into the future, which is first expressed afterwards and in plain terms. Since, moreover, the Holy Spirit first comes in at ver. 28, and since the being fettered was first to befall the apostle in Jerusalem, ver. 28, those views are to be rejected, which explain το πνεύμα of the Holy Spirit and δεσμεύσεως of the being fettered. Accordingly, the words are neither to be taken as: bound to the Holy Spirit, i.e. dependent on Him, my first edition; nor: constrained by the Holy Spirit; nor: fettered, i.e. already as good as fettered, I go at the instigation of the Holy Spirit; nor yet: fettered, i.e. vincula praestentia, in my spirit; but Paul expresses his consciousness of internal binding: bound, i.e. compelled and urged in my spirit, dative of more precise limitation. He knows, that as regards his journey to Jerusalem, he follows a necessity present to his higher self-consciousness and binding its freedom,—an irresistible internal drawing of his higher personal life. — τα εν αντη... ειδως] The relation to ver. 23 is as follows: Paul knew not specially what was to befall him at Jerusalem, but only in general it was testified to him by the Holy Spirit in every city, that bonds and afflictions were awaiting him there.

Ver. 23. Πλην ὧν] except that, only knowing that. — το πνεύμα το ἀγαύν] namely, by prophets, who made this known to me. This explanation, and not any reference to an internal intimation of the Spirit, is required by κατὰ πόλιν, city by city, at which I arrive on this journey. That Luke has not as yet mentioned any such communication, does not justify the supposition of an unhistorical prolepsis, as he has related the journey, ver. 14 ff., only in a very summary manner.

Ver. 24. According to the reading ἀλλ' οὐδὲνς λόγον ποιοῦμαι τὴν ψυχὴν τιμῶν ἡμαῖς (see the critical remarks), this verse is to be interpreted: But of no word do I account my soul, my life, worthy for myself, i.e. the preservation of my life for my own personal interest is not held by me as worth speaking of. According to the Recepta, as also according to Lachmann, it would have to be taken as: but to nothing do I take heed, I do not trouble myself about any impending suffering, even my life is not reckoned to me valuable for myself. — ἐς τελειώσεως κ.τ.λ.] purpose in this non-regarding of his own life: in order, not to remain stationary half-way, but to finish my course, etc.
sion. — τὸ εἰαγγ. τ. χάρ. τ. Θεοῦ] the knowledge of salvation, whose contents is the grace of God, manifested in Christ. Comp. xiv. 3.

Ver. 25 points back to ver. 22, now representing the separation there announced, for which vv. 23, 24 have prepared them, as one of perpetuity for the life in time. — ἐγὼ] emphatic, as in ver. 22,—and with deep emotion.—The olda, δικ εὐνόης κ.τ.λ., 1 rests, according to ver. 23, on the conviction which he has now (νῦν) obtained by the communications of the Holy Spirit received from city to city concerning the fate impending over him at Jerusalem, that the imprisonment and affliction there awaiting him would terminate only with his death. And he has not deceived himself! For the assumption that he was liberated from Rome and returned to the earlier sphere of his labours, is unhistorical. 2 But precisely in connection with the unfold of his destination to death here expressed by him with such certainty, there passed into fulfilment his saying pointing to Rome, 3 however little he himself might be able at this time to discern this connection; and therefore, probably, the thought of Rome was again thrown temporarily into the background in his mind. The fact, that he at a later period in his imprisonment expected liberation and return to the scene of his earlier labours, 4 cannot testify against the historical character of our speech, 4 since he does not refer his olda in our passage to a divinely-imparted certainty, and therefore the expression of his individual conviction at this time, spoken, moreover, in the excited emotion of a deeply agitation moment, is only misused in support of critical prejudices. With this certainty of his at this time,—which, moreover, he does not express as a sad foreboding or the like, but so undoubtedly as in ver. 29,—quite agrees the fact, that he hands over the church so entirely to the presbyters as he does in ver. 26 ff.; nor do we properly estimate the situation of the moment, if we only assume, with de Wette, that Luke has probably thus composed the speech from his later standpoint after the death of the apostle. According to Baumgarten, II. p. 85 ff., who compares the example of King Hezekiah, the olda κ.τ.λ. was actually founded on objective certainty: God had actually resolved to let the apostle die in Jerusalem, but had then graciously listened to the praying and weeping of the Gentile churches. But in such passages as Philem. 22, there is implied no alteration of the divine resolution; this is a pure fancy. — ὑμεῖς πάντες, ἐν οίς διήλθον] all ye among whom I passed through. In his deep emotion he extends his view; with this address he embraces not merely those assembled around him, nor merely the Ephesians in general, but at the same time, all Christians, among whom hitherto he had been the itinerant herald of the kingdom. In ver. 26 the address again limits itself solely to those present.

Vv. 26, 27. Διὸ] because, namely, this now impending separation makes such a reckoning for me a duty. — μαρτίρομαι] I testify, I affirm. 5 — ἐν τῷ σημ. ἡμερίᾳ] “hoc magnam declarandi vim habet,” Bengel: it was, in fact, the

---

1 He does not say: that I shall not see you. but he says: that you shall not see me. He has not his own interest in view, but theirs.

2 See on Rom. Introd. § 1.

3 Philem. 29; Phil. ii. 24.

4 Baur, Zeiller.

5 See on Gal. v. 3.
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parting day. — ὅτι καθαρός εἰμι (see the critical remarks): that I am pure from the blood of all, i.e. that I am free of blame in reference to each one, if he, on account of unbelieving, falls a prey to death, i.e. to the eternal ἀπώλεια. Each one is affected by his own fault; no one by mine. καθαρός ἁπάντων καθαρός is not a Hebraism, ἄλλῳ ἤπειρῳ; even with Greek writers καθαρός is not merely, though commonly, joined with the genitive, but also sometimes with ἀναφορα... — ὅτι γὰρ ἐπεστείλα] brought forward once more in accordance with ver. 20; so extremely important was it to him, and that, indeed, as the decisive premiss of the καθαρός εἰμι κ.τ.λ. — τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ] the divine counsel κατ’ ἠκρίβην, i.e. the counsel of redemption, whose complete realization is the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, the Messianic kingdom; hence here ἀναγγέλλου... Θεοῦ, in ver. 24 διαμαρτή... Θεοῦ, and in ver. 25 κηρύσσου. τ. βασιλ. τ. Θεοῦ, denote one and the same great contents of the gospel, although viewed according to different aspects of its nature. — πᾶσαν] the whole, without suppressing, explaining away, or concealing aught of it.

Ver. 28. ὅτι] Therefore, since I am innocent, and thus the blame would be chargeable on you. — ἓν τοὺς κ. τ. ποιμέων] in order that as well ye yourselves, as the whole church, may persevere in the pure truth of the gospel.

On the prefixing of ἓν τοὺς, comp. 1 Tim. iv. 16. — τῷ πνε. τ. ἁγ. ἐκθέσεω] This was designed to make them sensible of the whole sacredness and responsibility of their office. The Holy Spirit ruling in the church has Himself appointed the persons of the presbyters, not merely by the bestowal of His gifts on those concerned, but also by His effective influence upon the recognition and appreciation of the gifts so bestowed at the elections. — ἐπισκόποιος, also very common with classical writers, as overseers, as stewards, denotes the official function of the presbyters, ver. 17, and is here chosen, not πρεσβυτέρους, because in its literal meaning it significantly corresponds to the ποιμέων. "Ipso nomine admonet velut in specula locatos esse," etc., Calvin. The figurative τοὺς ποιμέων comprehends the two elements, of official activity in teaching, further specially designated in Eph. iv. 11; and of the oversight and conduct of the discipline and organization of the church. For the two together exhaust the ἐπισκόπων. — On τ. ἐκκλήσ. τοῦ Κυρίου see the critical remarks. With the reading τοῦ Θεοῦ this passage was a peculiarly important locus for the doctrine of the divinity of Christ and the communicatio idiomatum against the Socinians. See especially Colovius. — ἣν περιποίησατο κ. τ. λ.] which He has acquired, for His possession, by His own blood, by the shedding of which He has redeemed believers from

1 Comp. on xvii. 6.
2 Tob. iii. 14.
3 Bernhardy, p. 174.
4 Kypke, II. p. 108 f.
5 Luke xii. 22; John x. 1 ff.
6 See vv. 29, 30.
7 See on xiv. 23. Comp. xiii. 2, 4.
8 The comparison of the Athenian ἐπισκόπων in dependent cities, with a view to explain this official name (Rothe, p. 219 f.; see on these also Hermann, Staatsalterth. § 157. 8), introduces something heterogeneous.
9 How little ground this passage gives for the hierarchical conception of the spiritual office, see on Eph. iv. 11; Höfing, Kirchenwerk. p. 299 f.
10 Isa. xi. 11; Jer. ii. 8; Ezek. xxxiv. 2; John x 14, xxxi. 15; and see Dissen, ad Pind. Ol. x 9, p. 194.
11 Comp. 1 Tim. iii. 2.
12 1 Pet. v. 2.
13 Comp. Rom. xvi. 16; Matt. xvi. 18.
14 Eph. i. 14; Tit. ii. 14; 1 Pet. ii. 9.
the dominion of the devil and acquired them for Himself as heirs of His eternal salvation. "Hic ergo grex est pretiosissimus," Bengel.¹

Vv. 29, 30. τῇ γῇ with similar emphasis, as in ver. 25: After my departure—I know it—not only will enemies from without intrude among you—Ephesian Christians, as whose representatives the presbyters were present—who will be relentlessly destructive to the welfare of the church; but also within the church itself, out of the midst of you, will men with perverse doctrines arise. — That by the very common figure of ravenous volubles² is not meant, as Grotius supposes, persecutio sub Nerone, but false teachers working perniciously, is rendered probable by the very parallelism of ver. 30, and still more certain by the relation of εἰσελθὼν, τῷ μετὰ τὴν ἀφετίν μου, according to which Paul represents his presence as that which has hitherto withheld the intrusion of the ἄικα,—a connection which, in the case of its being explained of political persecutors, would be devoid of truth. — ἀφετίς is here not arrival, as almost constantly with Greek writers, but departure, going away. ³ Paul does not specially mean his death, but generally his removal,⁴ on which the false teachers necessarily depended for the assertion of their influence. Moreover, his prediction without doubt rests on the observations and experiences⁵ which he had made during his long ministry in Ephesus and Asia. He must have known the existence of germs in which he saw the sad pledge of the truth of his warning; and we have no reason to doubt that the reality corresponded to this prediction. At the time of the composition of the Epistle to the Ephesians, the false teachers may not yet have been working in Ephesus itself, but in Colossae and its neighbourhood these—they were Judaists of an Essene-Gnostic type—had made themselves felt,⁶ and in Asia Minor generally the heretics of the First Epistle of John and probably also of that of Jude are to be sought, not to mention those of the Apocalypse and Pastoral Epistles. The indefinite and general expressions, in which the false teachers are here described, correspond to the character of prophetica foresight and prediction. According to Zeller, a later writer has by these sought to conceal his otherwise too glaring anachronism; whereas Baur finds the sectarian character, such as it existed at most toward the close of the first century, so definitely delineated, that he, from this circumstance, recognizes a eaticinium post eventum! Thus the same expression is for the one too indefinite, and for the other too definite; but both arrive at the same result, which must be reached, let the Paul of the Book of Acts speak as he will. — ἀφοποστάνειν κ.τ.λ.] to draw away, from the fellowship of true believers, after them. "Charac-
ter falsi doctoris, ut velit ex se uno pendere discipulos," Bengel.⁷

Ver. 31. Γρηγορεῖτε "verbum pastoral," Bengel,—and that, encouraged by the recollection of my own example, μνημονευόμενοι, ὡς κ.τ.λ.—τρεῖτανιν

¹ Comp. on Eph. i. 14; 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23; 1 Pet. i. 7, 19.
² The preterites, comp. βασιλέας ἀντειμνηκοῖς, Xen. Ages. 11, 12.
³ Matt. vii. 15; Luke x. 3; John x. 12.
⁴ Dem. 58, pen.; Herod. vii. 58.
⁵ See Introduction to Colossians, § 3.
⁶ On δικαιοσύνη, comp. v. 57.
⁷ Comp. εικοστός ἐκατοντάκατοι καὶ πάντες τῷ ποιμήνι, ver. 39.
⁸ Dissensionem, Vulgate.
⁹ Comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 9.
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See on xix. 10. — μετὰ δακρύων] extorted both by afflictions and by the sympathetic fervour with which Paul prosecuted his quite special (ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ) pastoral care. — νῦντα κ. ἡμέρ.] See on Luke ii. 37. νῦντα is here placed first, because it most closely corresponds to the figurative γρηγορεῖτε.

— As to the idea of νοητία, admonition, see on Eph. vi. 4.

Ver. 32. And now I commend you to God (xiv. 28) and to the word of His grace (ver. 24), — entrust you to Him to protect and bless you, and to the gospel to be the rule of your whole conduct, — to Him who is able to build up, to promote the Christian life, and to give you inheritance, a share in the Messianic blessedness, among all who are sanctified, consecrated to God by faith. — τῷ δυναμένῳ] is, with the Vulgate, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Wolf, Bengel, de Wette, and others, to be referred to God; so that a very natural hypobaton occurs, according to which καὶ τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ appears as an inserted annexation to the general and main element τῷ Θεῷ of an accessory idea, which was not to be separated from τῷ Θεῷ, but which also does not prevent the continuance of the address by a more precise description of τῷ Θεῷ bearing on its object. We should, in reading, lay the emphasis on τῷ Θεῷ, and pass on more quickly over καὶ τῷ λόγῳ . . . αὐτοῦ. Others refer τῷ δυναμ. to τῷ λόγῳ, and understand the λόγος either correctly of the doctrine, or erroneously, opposed to Luke’s and Paul’s mode of conception, of the personal, Johannean, Logos. But such a personification of the saving doctrine, according to which even the δομαὶ κληρονομίαν, evidently an act of God! is assigned to it, is without scriptural analogy. — As to κληρονομία, transferred from the allotted share in the possession of Palestine (ἤγερσι) to the share of possession in the Messianic kingdom, see on Matt. v. 5; Gal. iii. 18; Eph. i. 11.

Vv. 33—35. Paul concludes his address, so rich in its simplicity and deeply impressive, by urging on the presbyters the complete disinterestedness and self-denial, with which he had laboured at Ephesus, as a τίμιος for similar conduct. — Reason for this: not the obviating of a Judaistic reproach, not a guarding of the independence of the church in the world; but the necessity of the ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι τῶν ἀσθενών, ver. 35. — ἄριστον ἔχων. ἡ ἑαυτοῦ.] specification of what are usually esteemed the most valuable temporal possessions. — αὐτοῖς without my needing to say it to you. — καὶ τοῖς οὖσι μερί κατοικ. Thus also for his companions, to their necessities, he applied the gain of his manual labour. — αὐτοῖς he shows them, and certainly they were not soft and tender. — πάντα ἑαυτοῦ οἴνημα, ὑπὲρ] either in all points. I have shown to you, by my example, that; or, all things
I have showed to you, by my example, in reference to this, that, etc. The former is simpler. — οἰνοὶ, so labouring, as I have done, so toiling hard. Not: my fellow-labourers in the gospel, which, at variance with the context, withdraws from οἰνοὶ its significance. It is the example-giving οἰνοὶ. — τῶν ἀθέουσαντων] is, with Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Calovius, Er. Schmid, Bengel, and others, including Neander, Tholuck, Schneckenburger, Baumgarten, to be explained of those not yet confirmed in Christian principles and dispositions. These might easily consider the work of one teaching for pay as a mere matter of gain, and thus be prejudiced not only against the teacher, but also against the doctrine. But if, on the other hand, the teacher gained his livelihood by labour, by such self-devotion he obviated the fall of the unsettled, and was helpful to the strengthening of their faith and courage. This is that ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι τῶν ἀθέουσων, in which Paul wished to serve as a model to other teachers and ecclesiastical rulers. Others render it: that they should help the poor and needy by support; which meaning would have to be derived not from the unus loquendi of ἀσθεν. taken by itself, but, with Kuinoel, "qui non possunt laborando sibi ad vitam tuendam necessaria comparare," from the context. But the recommendation of liberality is remote from the context; the faithfulness and wisdom of the teacher manifesting itself in gaining his own support by labour, of which the text speaks, must have a spiritual object, like the teaching office itself—not the giving of alms, but the strengthening of the weak in faith. The more naturally this meaning occurs, the less would Paul, if he had nevertheless meant the poor, have expressed himself by ἀθέουσαντων, but rather by πτωχῶν or a similar word.—μηνοείνειν... λαμβάνειν] and to be mindful of the saying of the Lord Jesus, namely, that He Himself has said: It is blessed—i.e. bliss-giving; the action itself according to its moral nature, similarly to the knowing in John xviii. 3, is conceived as the blessedness of the agent—rather (potius) to give than receive. "The two being compared, not the latter, but rather the former, is the μακάρων." The special application of this general saying of Christ is, according to the connection in the mind of the apostle, that the giving of spiritual benefits, compared with the taking of earthly gain as pay, has the advantage in conferring blessedness; and the μακάρων itself is that of eternal life according to the idea of the Messianic recompense, Luke vi. 20 ff., 38, xiv. 14. — The explanatory ἔτι, dependent on μηνοείν., adduces out of the general class of τῶν λάχ. τ. Κυρ. a single saying instead of all bearing on the point.—Whether

so, Paul, in ver. 24, would evidently have said so much, especially on account of καὶ τοῦτο ὥσα μετ᾽ ἐμοὶ.
1 ὦν = εἰς ἑκάστῳ, ὥν, as in John ii. 18, ix. 17; 2 Cor. i. 18; Mark xvi. 14, et al.
9 Comp. 1 Cor. iv. 12.
Klostermann.
6 Comp. 1 Cor. ix. 24, 26; Phil. iii. 17.
8 Comp. Rom. xiv. 1, xv. 1; 1 Cor. ix. 22; 1 Thess. v. 14; 2 Cor. xi. 21.
7 Comp. 2 Cor. xii. 14.
8 Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, et al., including Wetstein, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Olschans, de Wet, Hackett.
9 Comp. Eph. iv. 28.
10 Comp. Arist. Pol. 633; Eur. Suppl. 433; Herod ii. 88. See Valckenier, ad Herod. viii. 81; and Raphel, Herod. in loc.
11 1 Cor. ix. 12.
12 Comp. xv. 15.
Paul derived this saying, not preserved in the Gospels, from oral or written tradition, remains undecided. — References to the same saying: Constitt. ap. iv. 3. 1: ἐπει καὶ δ Κύριος μακάρων εἰπεν εἰναι τὸν διδόντα ἣπερ τὸν λαμβάνοντα, perhaps also Clem. 1 Cor. 2: ἕδων διδόντες ἢ λαμβάνοντες. Analogous profane sayings may be seen in Wetstein. The opposite: ἀνόητος ὁ διδόσ, εὐτυχῆς δ' ὁ λαμβάνων, in Athen. viii. 5.

Vv. 36–88. What a simple, true, tender, and affecting description! — κατέφιλον] denotes frequent and fervent kissing. — θεωρεῖν] to behold, is chosen from the standpoint of the ὄδυνώμενοι. On the other hand, in ver. 25, ἁρπάζει.] of giving a convoy, as in xv. 3, xxi. 5.

Notes by American Editor.

(m²) After the uproar. V. 1–3.

Meyer correctly remarks this statement indicates the time, but not the motive, of the apostle's departure, as he had previously determined to leave Ephesus, where he had remained longer than at any other city—three years. The extent of his success is attested by the conduct of Demetrius and his fellow-craftsmen. The brief record given by Luke may be supplemented by a reference to the Epistles to the Corinthians, written about this time. The narrative condenses months of active labor into a single verse. The apostle having sent a deputation to Corinth, and also written a letter to that church, took an affectionate farewell of the church at Ephesus. He sailed from Ephesus to Troas, where, a door being opened, he preached for a time, while he awaited the arrival of Titus with tidings from Corinth. Titus came not, and the apostle, filled with anxiety as to the effects his severe letter might produce, crossed over into Macedonia, where he met Titus, who brought tidings which relieved and gladdened the faithful, yet tender-hearted apostle, and was the occasion of a second letter to Corinth. Six years had elapsed since Paul first visited Macedonia, and was beaten and imprisoned at Philippoi. He doubtless now revisited the scenes of his former labor; and also during this period evangelized the western part of Macedonia, as he formerly had done the eastern. The entire province of Macedonia was evangelized, as the apostle had visited each of the four districts into which it was divided. The three months he was in Greece—the province of Achaia—was spent mainly at Corinth, its capital. At this time and from this place he wrote the Epistle to the Romans, and probably the Epistle to the Galatians. When about to leave Corinth, the Jews entered into a conspiracy to take his life, probably when he was leaving the port. The plot being discovered, the apostle left by land, accompanied by several companions, among whom Luke seems to have been one, as the first person again appears in the narrative. When it is said that

2 Artemidor. iv. 3.
3 It borders on wantonness to affirm that this impression of the speech is not so much that which the presbyters received from it, as that which "the reader of the Book of Acts is meant to receive from the previous narrative," Zeller, p. 274.
4 Comp. on Matt. xxvi. 49; Luke xv. 30.
his companions went into, or as far as Asia, "it is not implied that they went
no farther than to Asia; Trophimus and Aristarchus and probably others ac-
accompanied him to Jerusalem." (Alford.) Luke remained with Paul at Phi-
lippi till after the Passover. Whether Paul, in the exercise of his Christian
liberty, kept the festival, as Meyer states, cannot be determined, though we
do not think it probable. The rest of the company preceded the apostle to
Troas, probably for the purpose suggested by Meyer.

(ο*) Τὴν εκκλησίαν τοῦ Κυρίου. V. 28.

In his critical remarks Meyer discusses this reading at considerable length,
and concludes that the evidence is in favor of κυρίου. On the text he remarks:
"With the reading τοῦ Θεοῦ, this passage was a peculiarly important locus for
the doctrine of the divinity of Christ." Gloag uses the reading of Tischendorf,
κυρίου, but adds "not that, in itself, it seems preferable." Six different
readings of this passage are given by Davidson; only the two already mentioned are
entitled to consideration. Alford, who formerly approved of the reading
κυρίου, writes: "On the whole then, weighing the evidence on both sides, see-
ing that it is more likely that the alteration should have been to κυρίου than
to Θεοῦ; more likely that the speaker should have used Θεοῦ than κυρίου; and
more consonant to the evidently emphatic position of the word, I have, on
final revision, decided for the received reading, church of God, which on first
writing I had rejected."

Bloomfield gives the reading, Θεοῦ, and prefixes the words κυρίου καί. Plumpt-
tre favors the received reading. Wordsworth inclines to Θεοῦ. Hackett thinks
the external testimony preponderates in favor of κυρίου; but Θεοῦ agrees best with
the usage of Paul. The phrase "church of God" occurs in the Epistles of Paul
eight times, and "churches of God" three times; but the expressions "church
of the Lord" and "church of Christ" never occur in his epistles, and "churches of
Christ" only once. Alexander, Abbot, Jacobus, and Schaff approve the received
reading, and it is retained in the Revised Version. "Θεοῦ is now the undoubted
reading of the Vatican, and of the newly discovered Sinaitic ms. Upon the
whole, we are disposed to think that the preponderance of evidence is in favor
of the reading τὴν εκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ." (Gloag.) Though authorities are very
evenly divided, we may unhesitatingly receive the text as in our English ver-
sions.

(ο*) Paul's farewell address at Miletus. V. 18–38.

This address seems to be recorded just as it was delivered, in the words, we
had almost said the tones, of the speaker. Taylor, speaking of this address,
says: "For depth of pathos and fervor of appeal it seems to me to be well-nigh
unrivalled, even in Holy Writ. It quivers all through with emotion. There is
love in every sentence, and a tear in every tone. We cannot read it without a
choking utterance and a moistened eye." Farrar writes thus: "After these
words, which so well describe the unwearied thoroughness, the deep humility,
the perfect tenderness of his apostolic ministry, he knelt down with them all
and prayed. They were overpowered with the touching solemnity of the
scene. He ended his prayer amid a burst of weeping, and as they bade him
farewell—anxious for his future, anxious for their own—they each laid their heads on his neck and passionately kissed him." "If Paul inspired intense hatreds, yet, with all disadvantages of person, he also inspired intense affection."

Renan says: "Then they all knelt and prayed. There was naught heard but a stifled sob. Paul's words, 'Ye shall see my face no more,' had pierced their hearts. In turn, the elders of Ephesus fell on the apostle's neck and kissed him." "Tears are thrice mentioned in this short passage—tears of suffering (19); of pastoral solicitude (31); and of personal affection (37)." (Monod.) Paul was a man of strong convictions and great force of character; but also possessed of exquisite tenderness and a wealth of affection. If he had to endure the strongest enmities he also won for himself the deepest and most enduring friendships. At once so gigantic and so gentle, his personality was a great power, and seemed wholly to overshadow his companions and followers, though, in themselves, men of great excellence and worth, such as Timothy, Titus, Silas, Luke, and others. No man holds a higher place in the esteem and affection of the Christian world than Paul.
CHAPTER XXI.

Ver. 3. κατηχηθησαν] A B E W, 34, Vulg. al. have κατηλθομεν. So Lachm. A gloss. — Ver. 4. Both ἀνευρ. δὲ (Tisch.) and τοὺς before μαθ. (which Beng. Matth. Rinck condemn) have decided attestation. — αὕτω] A E G, 68, 73 have αὕτως; so Lachm. Alteration to suit αἰνεῖν. "Ubicunque in a. a. αὕτω repertum est, sorupulum legentibus injicit," Born. — ἀναβ.] Lachm. Tisch. read ἐπιβ., according to important testimony. Rightly; the more usual word was inserted. — Vv. 5, 6. προσευχήμεθα. Καὶ ἀπασακομενοι] Lachm. and Tisch. read προσευχάμενοι ἀπασακομενοι, and then καὶ before ἐπεβ. So A B C E W, min. Rightly. The Reception has arisen partly through a simplifying resolution of the participle προσευχήμενοι, and partly through offence at the compound ἀπασακομενοι not elsewhere occurring. — Ver. 6. ἐπεβημεν] Lachm. reads ἐπεβ., and Tisch. ἐπεβ. The witnesses are much divided. As, however, a form with ἐπεβ. having ἐπαβ., and B E W** ἐπαβ.; ἐπεβημεν is to be preferred, instead of which ἐπεβ., the more usual word for embarking, slipped in, and ἐπεβ. was inserted from ver. 2, comp. xviii. 2. — Ver. 8. After ἐξελθ. Elz. has οἱ πελ τ. Παυλον (comp. xiii. 13), against decisive testimony. With ἐξελθ. there begins a church-lesson. — Ver. 10. ἤμων is condemned by A B C H, min., as an addition. — Ver. 11. τοι αὐτοῦ] A B C D E W, min. have ἄνωτον. Approved by Griesb. Rinck, and adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born., and rightly on account of the decisive testimony. Orig. also testifies for it (ἐνοντοι χειρῶν κ.τ.λ.). — ταὶ χειρας κ. τ. πόλεως] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read τ. πόλ. κ. τ. χ. preferred also by Rinck, following important witnesses (not A), but evidently a transposition, in accordance with the natural course of the action. — τοι ἱερον.] Born. reads εἰς ἱερον., but only according to D, min. Chrys. Epiph. It arose from a gloss (Orig. : απελθοντα εἰς ἱερον.). — Ver. 14. On decisive evidence read with Lachm. and Tisch. τοι Κυριος τὸ βίβλιον γνωσθα.— Ver. 15. ἐπισκ.] Elz. Scholz read ἀποσκ., only according to min.; so that it must be regarded as a mere error of transcription. The decidedly attested ἐπισκ. is rightly approved or adopted by Mill. Beng. Griesb. Matthaei, Knapp, Rinck, Lachm. Tisch. The readings παρασκ. (C, 7, 69, 73) and ἀποτασίμ. (D, Born.) are interpretations. — Ver. 20. θεσι] Approved by Griesb., and adopted by Lachm. Tisch., according to A B C E G W, min. Chrys. Theophyl. and most vss. Elz. Scholz, Born. read κύριον, against these decisive witnesses. — Ἰωναϊων] Lachm. Tisch. read ἐν τοις Ἰωναιοις, which is to be adopted, according to A B C E, min. Vulg. Aeth. Copt. The ἐν τῇ Ἰωναιᾳ in D, Syr. Sahid. Jer. Aug. speaks also for this (so Born.). The Reception was occasioned by the following τῶν πεπτατουκῶν, after which accordingly in some Fathers Ἰωναιοιων has found its place. W, Oec. and some min. have merely τῶν πεπτατ., which makes all these additions suspicious, yet the testimony is not sufficiently strong for their deletion. — Ver. 21. πνευμα] deleted by Lachm., according to A D* E, 13, Vulg. Copt. Jer. Aug. The omission appears to be a historical emendation. — Ver. 24. γράφεσαν] Elz. reads γράψα, in opposition to A B C D E W, min. Aug. Jer.
and some vss. A continuation of the construction of tva. — Ver. 25. ἵππεστιλαμένη] Lachm. Born. read ἵππεστιλαμεν, according to B D, 40, and some vss. Rightly; the Recpeta is from xv. 20. — μῦθον to μὴ is wanting in A B N, 13, 40, 81, and several vss. Condemned by Mill and Bengel, and deleted by Lachm. But if it had been added, the expressions of xv. 28 would have been used. On the other hand, the omission was natural, as the direct instruction μῦθον τοιοῦτον τηρεῖν is not contained in the apostolic decree. — Ver. 28. The form παναξιὰ is, with Lachm. and Tisch., to be adopted according to decisive evidence; it is not elsewhere found in the N. T. — Ver. 31. συγκεχοτη] Lachm. and Born. read συγκευτηται, according to A B D N (in C. ver. 31 to xxii. 30 is wanting). With this preponderating testimony (comp. Vulg.: confunditur), and as, after ver. 30, the perfect easily presented itself as more suitable, the present is to be preferred. — Ver. 32. παράλαβ.] Lachm. reads λαβῶν, only according to B. — Ver. 34. ἰδὼν] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read ἐπεφώνων, according to A B D E N, min., which witnesses must prevail. — μὴ συνάμενος δὲ] Lachm. Tisch. Born. (yet the latter has deleted δὲ) read μὴ συναίσθητον δὲ αὐτοῦ, according to decisive testimony. The Recpeta is a stylistic emendation. — So κρύζου, ver. 36, is to be judged, instead of which κρύζοντες is, with Lachm. and Tisch., to be preferred.

Vv. 1, 2. Ἀποσπασθ.] denotes the painful separation, wrung from them by the consciousness of necessity. — On the small island Cos, now Co, or Blanchio in the Aegean Sea, celebrated for its wine and manufacture of costly materials for dress, see Kuster. — τὰ Πάραρα] a great seaport of Lycia, with an oracle of Apollo active only during the six winter months. — διαπερῶν] which was in the act of sailing over. For ἀναξιθηναι, comp. on xiii. 13.

(p²). Ver. 3. Ἀναφανέντες δὲ τὴν Κύπρ. but when we had sighted Cyprus. The expression is formed analogously to the well-known construction πειστηματία το εἰσαγάλλων and the like. — εἰσόνημον] an adjective to αὐτὴν. — εἰς Συρίαν] towards Syria. — κατάγεσθαι, to run in, to land, the opposite of ἀναγεσθαι, often with Greek writers since the time of Homer. — ἐκεῖσε γὰρ . . . γόμον] for thither the ship unladen its freight; ἐκεῖσε denotes the direction toward the city which they had in view in the unloading in the harbour. — ἀποφορτικ.] does not stand pro futuro, in opposition to Grotius, Valckenaer, Kuinoel, and others, but ἦν ἀποφ. means: it was in the act of its unloading.

Ver. 4. Ἀνευρώντες] See on Luke ii. 16. The Christians there (τοῦ μαθ.) were certainly only few, so that they had to be sought out in the great city of Tyre. πάνων . . . τέκνων, ver. 5, also points to a small number of Christians. — διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος] so that the Holy Spirit, speaking within them, was the mediating occasion. The Spirit had testified to them that a fate full of suffering awaited Paul in Jerusalem, and this in their loving

---

1 See on Luke xxii. 41.
2 De Co inedia, Hal. 1839. On the accusative form, see Locella, ad Xen. Ep. p. 185 f.
3 For its ruins, see Fellows, Asia Minor, p. 219 f.
4 Winer, p. 244 (E. T. 225); Buttmann, neut.
5 Gr. p. 164 (E. T. 182).
6 See Stein, p. 385, and examples in Wet.
7 See on Gal. i. 21.
8 v. 1. 2. xxvil. 2. xxviii. 12; Luke v. 11.
10 See xi. 19, xv. 8.
zealous care they took as a valid warning to him not to go to Jerusalem. But Paul himself was more fully and correctly aware of the will of the Spirit; he was certain that, in spite of the bonds and sufferings which the Spirit made known to him from city to city, he must go to Jerusalem, xx. 22 (q\(^5\)).

Vv. 5, 6. 'Εξαρτήσατο cannot here denote to fit out, \(^1\) to provide the necessaries for the journey, partly because the protasis: "but when we fitted out in those days"—not: had fitted out—would not suit the apodosis, and partly because in general there was no reason for a special and lengthened provisioning in the case of such a very short voyage. Hence we must adhere to the rendering usual since the Vulgate (expleitis diebus) and Chrysostum (πληρώσω): but when it happened that we completed the seven days of our residence there, \(i.e.\) when we brought these days to a close. And that εξαρτήσατο was really so used by later writers, is to be inferred from the similar use of ἀναρχίζως. \(^2\) —σῶν γνώσετι κ. τέκν. \(^3\) the more readily conceivable and natural in the case of the small body of Christians after so long a stay. Baumgarten finds here the design of a special distinction of the church. — ἔτι τῶν αὐτῶν. \(^4\) on the shore, because this was the place of the solemn parting. Hammond, overlooking this natural explanation, imagined quite arbitrarily that there was a προσεύχη \(^5\) on the shore. — ἀποσπασάμεθα (see the critical remarks) we took leave of one another. \(^6\) Lachmann \(^7\) unnecessarily conjectures ἀποσπασάμεθα. — εἰς τὰ ἱδία to their habitations. \(^8\) Whether the ship prepared for the voyage (τὸ πλοῖον) was the same in which they had arrived, cannot be determined.

Ver. 7. Διανύσατο to complete entirely, only here in the N. T., but very often in classical writers, particularly of ways, journeys, and the like. But we, entirely bringing to an end (διανύσαντες is contemporaneous with κατηγορήσαμεν) the voyage, arrived from Tyre, from which we had sailed for this last stage, at Ptolemais, from which we now continued our journey by land. — τὸ πλοῖον \(^9\) from Macedonia, xx. 6. Πτολεμαίς, the ancient \(\Sigma\), even yet called by the Arabs \(\Sigma\), by the Europeans St. Jean d’Acre, on the Mediterranean Sea, belonging to the tribe of Asher, \(^1\) but never possessed by the Jews, \(^2\) reckoned by the Greeks as belonging to Phoenicia, \(^3\) and endowed by Claudius with the Roman citizenship.

Vv. 8, 9. Καθάρος.] See on viii. 40. — What induced the travellers to make their journey by way of Caesarea? Baumgarten thinks that, as representatives of the converted Gentiles, they wished to come in contact on the way only with Gentile churches. No; simply, according to the text, because Philip dwelt in Caesarea, and with this important man they purposed to spend some time in the interest of their vocation. — τὸν εἰς Ἰαγγ. ὄπιστος ἐκ τῶν ἱπταν. \(^5\) Since it was not his former position as overseer of the poor, but his

---

1 Lucian, V. H. i. 33; Joseph. Antt. iii. 9.
2 ; comp. 2 Tim. iii. 17.
3 Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 447.
4 See on xvi. 18.
5 Himerius, p. 364.
6 Praef. p. IX.
7 Judg. i. 13.
8 Hence Hier. Glitter. f. 43. 8: "In Acon est terra Israelitica et non." [v. 17.]
9 Ptol. v. 10; Strabo, xvi. p. 758; Plin. N. H. i. 20; Joseph. Antt. iii. 9.
present position as evangelist, that made him so important to the travellers, namely, through his participation in the calling of a teacher, the words are not to be rendered: because he was one of the seven, vi. 5;¹ but the comma after εἰκαγγ. is to be deleted (so also Tisch. Born.), and the whole is to be taken together: who was the evangelist out of the seven. He was that one of the seven, who had embraced and prosecuted the calling of an evangelist. The fact that he now dwelt at Caesarea presupposes that he no longer filled the office which he held in Jerusalem. Perhaps the peculiar skill in teaching which he developed as an emigrant ² was the reason why he, released from his former ministry, entered upon that of an evangelist. To regard the words ὡς τος εκ τ. ἐπτά as an addition of the compiler,³ and also to suspect ὃ εἰκαγγελισθής,⁴ there is no sufficient reason. Evangelists were assistant-missionaries, who, destined exclusively for no particular church, either went forth voluntarily, or were sent by the apostles and other teachers of apostolic authority now here and now there, in order to proclaim the εἰκαγγίλην of Jesus Christ, and in particular the living remembrances of what He taught and did,⁵ and thereby partly to prepare the way for, and partly to continue, the apostolic instruction.⁶—Euseb. iii. 31, 39, v. 24, following Polycrates and Cuius, calls this Philip an apostle, which is to be regarded as a very early confusion of persons, going back even to the second century and found also in the Constitt. ap. vi. 7. 1, and is not to be disposed of, with Olshausen, to the effect that Eusebius used ἀπόστολος in the wider sense, which considering the very sameness in name of the apostle and evangelist, would be very inappropriate. But Gieseler’s view also ⁷ that the apostle Philip had four daughters, and that ver. 9 is an interpolation by one who had confounded the apostle with the deacon, is to be rejected, as the technical evidence betrays no interpolation, and as at all events our narrative, especially as a portion of the account in the first person plural, precedes that of Eusebius. —θυατερὸς παρθένων virgin daughters.⁸ —προφήτης, who spoke in prophetic inspiration, had the χάριμα of προφητεία.⁹—The whole observation in ver. 9 is an incidental remarkable notice, independent of the connection of the history;¹⁰ to the contents of which, however, on account of

¹ Comp. Winer, p. 127 (E. T. 169), de Wette.
² viii. 5 ff., 30 ff.
³ Zeller.
⁵ They had thus in common with the apostles the vocation of the εἰκαγγελίζεσθαι: but they were distinguished from them, not merely by the circumstance that they were not directly called by Christ, and so were subordinate to the apostles, 2 Tim. iv. 5 and did not possess the extraordinary specifically apostolic χαιρετισμοι; but also by the fact that their ministry had for its object less the summing up of the great doctrinal system of the gospel (like the preaching of the apostles) than the communication of historical incidents from the ministry of Jesus. Pelagius correctly remarks: “Omnis apostolus evangelista, non omnis evangelista apostolus, sicut Philippus.” See generally, Ewald, p. 385 f., and Jahrb. II. p. 151 ff.—Nothing can be more perverse han, with Sepp, to interpret the appellation evangelist in the case of Philip to mean, that he had brought the Gospel of Matthew into its present form. The evangelists were the oral bearers of the gospel before written gospels were in existence.
⁶ Eph. iv. 11; Eus. H.E. iii. 37.
⁸ Intactae.
⁹ On the adjective παρθένων, comp. Xen. Mem. i. 5. 9: θυατερος παρθενων, Cyrop. iv. 6. 9; Lobeck, ad Afr. 1190.
¹⁰ See on xi. 27.
¹¹ If this circumstance was meant to be regarded (in accordance with Joel iii. 1 [II. 28])
its special and extraordinary character, the precept in 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 1 Tm. ii. 12, is not to be applied; nor yet is any justification of the life of nuns to be founded on it, with the Catholics. Baumgarten thinks that the virginity of the daughters corresponds to the condition of the church, which looks forward to her betrothal only in the future. This is exegetical trifling.* (n1).

Vv. 10, 11. Επιμενόντων] without a subject (see the critical remarks). — Ἀγαθος] There is no reason against the assumed identity of this person with the one mentioned in xi. 28. Luke’s mode of designating him, which does not take account of the former mention of him, admits of sufficient explanation from the special document giving account of this journey, which, composed by himself before his book, did not involve a reference to earlier matters, and was left by him just as it was; nor did it necessarily require any addition on this point for the purpose of setting the reader right. — δράς] he took it up, from the ground, or wherever Paul had laid it. — δίκαιος . . . πός] as also the old prophets often accompanied their prophecies with symbolic actions. On the symbol here, comp. John xxi. 18. — ἰκνοί] his own; for it was not his girdle, but Paul’s. This self-binding is to be conceived as consisting of two separate acts. — τῷ πν. τ. ἀγ.] whose utterance I, namely, as His organ express (a2).

Vv. 12–14. Οἱ ἐνότοιοι] the natives, the Christians of Caesarea, only here in the N. T., but classical. — τί ποιεῖτε κλαίοντες;] What do ye, that ye weep? Certainly essentially the same in sense with τί κλαίετε; but the form of the conception is different. Comp. Mark xi. 5, also the classical οἷον ποιείς with the participle.* — κ. συνήρ. μ. τ. καρδ.] and break my heart, make me quite sorrowful and disconsolate. The ανδρίττεν had actually commenced on the part of those assembled, but the firm εἰσίμως ἡχείς κ.τ.λ. of the apostle had immediately retained the upper hand over the enervating impressions which they felt. “Vere incipit actus, sed ob impedimenta caret eventum.” The verb itself is not preserved elsewhere, yet comp. δράταιν τήν ψυχήν, and the like, in Plutarch and others. — γὰρ] refers to the direct sense lying at the foundation of the preceding question: “do not weep and break my heart,” for I, I for my part, etc. Observe the holy boldness of consciousness in this ἡγ. — εἰς Ἰερουσαλημ.] Having come to Jerusalem.* — ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀν.] See on v. 41, ix. 16. — ἠπεκχάσαμεν] we left off further address.* — τ. Κυρίου] not “quod Deus de te decretit,” but the will of Christ. The submission of

as “a sign of special grace with which the Holy Spirit had honoured this church in the unclean Caesarea” (Baumgarten), Luke must of necessity have indicated this point of view. The suggestion, that we ought to be finding purposes everywhere without hint in the text, leads to extravagant arbitrariness. 1 See Cornelius a Lapidea. Comp. Luke ii. 38. 2 According to Clem. Al. Strom. vi. 39 (and in Euseb. iii. 30. 1), some of the daughters at least were married. 3 Matthias, § 553; Buttman, neut. Gr. p. 271 (E. T. 316). 4 Isa. xx.; Jer. xiii.; Ezek. lv., al. See Grotius; Ewald, Prophec. I. p. 38. 5 Heind. ad Plat. Charm. p. 166 C. 6 Schaefer, ad Eur. Phoen., Porph. 79. Comp. on Rom. ii. 4. 7 Comp. viii. 40. Isaeus, de Dionasog. hæredit. p. 55: πολίματος, eis ἄνω . . . ἀνασφάλειαν. Buttman, neut. Gr. p. 287 (E. T. 384). 8 Comp. xi. 18. 9 Kunoel and de Wette, following Chrysostom, Calvin, and others.
his friends expresses itself with reference to the last words of the apostle, ver. 18, in which they recognised his consciousness of the Lord’s will.

Vv. 15, 16. Ἐπισκευασάμενοι. after we had equipped ourselves — praeparati, Vulg. — made ourselves ready; i.e. after we had put our goods, clothes, etc., in a proper state for our arrival and residence in Jerusalem. The word, occurring here only in the N. T., is frequent in Greek writers and in the LXX. Such an equipment was required by the feast, and by the intercourse which lay before them at the holy seat of the mother church and of the apostles. Others arbitrarily, as if ἐπισκευάζαμαι stood in the text; "sarcinas jumentis imponere," Grotius. τῶν μαθητῶν. ec. τινές. — ἀγωνιζόμεθα ἐν ἐμετρατικόν Μνασών.] who brought us to Mnason, with whom we were to lodge in Jerusalem. So correctly Luther. The dative Mnaso. is not dependent on ἀγωνιζόμεθα, but to be explained, with Grotius, from attraction, so that, when resolved, it is: ἀγωνιζόμεθα παρὰ Mnásono, παρ'] ἐν συμμ. σ. ἡμῶν not merely wishad (infinitive), but at the same time did: they came with us and brought us, etc. — Others' take the sense of the whole passage to be: adducentes secum apud quem hospitaremur Mnasonem. Likewise admitting of justification linguistically from the attraction; but then we should have to suppose, without any indication in the context, that Mnason had been temporarily resident at Caesarea precisely at that time when the lodging of the travellers in his house at Jerusalem was settled with him. — Nothing further is known of Mnason himself. The name is Greek, and probably he was, if not a Gentle-Christian, at any rate a Hellenist. Looking to the feeling which prevailed among the Jewish Christians against Paul, it was natural and prudent that he should lodge with such a one, in order that he should enter into further relations to the church. — ἔρχομαι μαθά.] So much the more confidently might Paul and his companions be entrusted to him. He was a Christian from of old, not a νεώφυτος, 1 Tim. iii. 6; whether he had already been a Christian from the first Pentecost, or had become so, possibly through connection with his countryman Barnabas, or in some other manner, cannot be determined.

1 The erroneous reading ἄρωσις, though defended by Olshausen, would at most admit the explanation: after we had conveyed away our baggage (Polyb. IV. 81. 11; Diod. Scl. xiii. 91; Joseph. Anti. xiv. 16. 3), according to which the travellers, in order not to go as pilgrims to the feast at Jerusalem encumbered with much baggage, would have sent on their baggage before them. The leaving behind of the superfluous baggage at Caesarea (Wolf, Olshausen, and others), or the laying aside of things unworthy for their entrance into and residence in Jerusalem (Swaid), would be purely imported ideas. Valckenaer, p. 584, well remarks: "Posticum est lectiones tam aperte mendaces, ubi verae repertae fuere, in sanctissimi libris reliqui." 3 Winer, p. 548 (E. T. 737); Buttman, Newst. Gr. p. 158 (E. T. 156). 4 In opposition to Knatchbull, Winer, p. 301 (E. T. 306 f.), and Fritzsche, Conject. p. 42; and see on II. 33. 5 See on Rom. IV. 17. Bornemann, Scho. in Lex. p. 177 (comp. on Rosenmüller, Reper. II. p. 935); Buttman, p. 344 (E. T. 284); Diessen, ad Dem. de cor. p. 283 f. 6 See Hermann, ad Viger. p. 773; Bernhardt, p. 477. 7 Volgate, Erasmus, Castalio, Beza, Calvin, Wolf. 8 Kühner, II. 508; Valckenaer, Scho. I. p. 585; Hermann, ad Isp. 22. 648. 651. 9 Ael. v. 3. iii. 19; Athen. vi. p. 504 C, 572 B; Lactan,Philop. 32. 10 vv. 80, 21.
Vv. 17–19. Ἱηοῦ.] having arrived at; xiii. 5. — οἱ ἄρχοντας the Christians, to whom we came.—Mnason and others who were with him. It was not until the following day, ver. 18, that they, with Paul at their head, presented themselves to the rulers of the church. Accordingly, there is not to be found in this notice, ver. 17, any inconsistency with the dissatisfaction towards Paul afterwards reported; and οἱ ἄρχονται is not to be interpreted of the apostles and presbyters. — σὺν ἡμῖν] witnesses to the historical truth of the whole narrative down to ver. 26: those who combat it are obliged to represent this σὺν ἡμῖν as an addition of the compiler, who wished "externally to attach" what follows to the report of an eye-witness.—πρὸς Ἰάκωβων] the Lord's brother, xii. 17. xv. 18. Neither Peter nor any other of the Twelve can at this time have been present in Jerusalem; otherwise they would have been mentioned here and in the sequel of the narrative.—ἐν τοῖς ἄστροις. Usual attraction.

Vv. 20, 21. The body of presbyters—certainly headed by its apostolic chief James as spokesman—recognizes with thanksgiving to God the merits of Paul in the conversion of the Gentiles, but then represents to him at once also his critical position towards the Palestinian Jewish-Christians, among whom the opinion had spread that he taught all the Jews living in the diaspora among the Gentiles, when preaching his gospel to them, apostasy from the law of Moses. This opinion was, according to the principles expressed by Paul in his Epistles, and according to his wisdom in teaching generally, certainly erroneous; but amidst the tenacious overvaluing of Mosaism on the part of the Jews, ever fomented by the anti-Pauline party, it arose very naturally from the doctrine firmly and boldly defended by Paul, that the attainment of the Messianic salvation was not conditioned by circumcision and the works of the law, but purely by faith in Christ. What he had taught by way of denying and guarding against the value put on Mosaism, so as to secure the necessity of faith, was by the zealous Jews taken up and interpreted as a hostile attack, as a direct summons to apostasy from the Mosaic precepts and institutions. See Ewald, p. 568 ff., on these relations, and on the greatness of the apostle, who notwithstanding, and in clear consciousness of the extreme dangers which threatened him, does not sever the bond with the apostolic mother-church, but presents himself to it, and now again presents himself precisely amidst this confluence of the multitude to the feast, like Christ on his last entrance to Jerusalem. — δυνατός] is not, with Olshausen, to be referred to the number of the presbyters present, who might represent, as it were, the number of believers: for only the presbyters of Jerusalem were assembled with James, but to the Judaean Christians themselves, Christians of the Jewish land, the view of

1 Baur.
2 Kuinoel.
3 Zeller, p. 528. See, in opposition to this wretched shift, Ewald, Jahrb. IX. p. 66.
4 Nevertheless, on the part of the Catholics (see Cornelius a Lapide), the presence of all the apostles is assumed; Mary having at that time died, and risen, and ascended into heaven. According to other forms of the variously-coloured legend, it occurred twelve years after the death of Jesus. See Sepp, p. 68 ff.
5 Gal. I. 19.
6 See especially Rom., Gal., and 1 Cor.
7 Ver. 18.
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whose many myriads might present itself to Paul at Jerusalem in the great multitude of those who were there, especially at the time of the feast. — πώς οὐραίς] a hyperbolical expression of a very great indefinite number, the mention of which was to make the apostle the more inclined to the proposal about to be made; hence we are not, with Baur, to understand orthodox Jews as such, believing or unbelieving. The words, according to the correct reading (see the critical remarks), import: how many myriads among the Jews there are of those who are believing, i.e. to how many myriads those who have become believers among the Jews amount.

— ζηλωταὶ τ. νόμου] zealous observers and champions of the Mosaic law. — κατηχηθσαν] they have been instructed by Judaistic anti-Pauline teachers. Actual instruction, not generally audierunt, nor bare suspicion, is expressed.

— μὴ περιτέμνειν αὐτοίς κ.τ.λ.]* according to the notion of commanding, which is implied in λέγων. — τοῖς ἐδεικνύον] observing the Mosaic customs. — The antagonism of Judaism to Paul is in this passage so strongly and clearly displayed, that the author, if his book were actually the treatise with a set purpose, which it has been represented as being, would, in quite an incomprehensible manner, have fallen out of his part. In the case of such a cunning inventor of history as the author, according to Baur and Zeller, appears to be, the power of historical truth was not so great as to extort "against his will" such a testimony at variance with his design.

Vv. 22, 23. Ti oiv istori:] What is accordingly the case? How lies then the matter? The answer tò oiv poíson has the reason for it in the first instance more precisely assigned by the preliminary remark, πάνως . . . ἐκλεισθας: a multitude, of such Jew-Christians, must, inevitably will, come together, assemble around thee, to hear thee and to observe thy demeanour, for, etc. That James meant a tumultuary concourse, is not stated by the text, and is, on the contrary, at variance with the sanguine dei; but Calvin, Grotius, Calovius, and many others erroneously hold that πληθ. συνελθ. refers to the convoking of the church, or to the united body of the different household-congregations—in that case τὸ πληθ. must at least have been used. — εἰ χεῖν ἐκριν] having a vow for themselves. This εἰ psaiv represents the having of the vow as founded on the men's own wish and self-interest, and accordingly exhibits it as a voluntary personal cove, in which they were not dependent on third persons. The use of εἰ psaiv in the sense of for oneself, at one's own hand,—and the like, is a classical one, and very common.
A yet more express mode of denoting it would be: αἰτῶ ἵππ. εἰς ἱερών. With this position of the vow there could be the less difficulty in Paul’s taking it along with them; no interest of any other than the four men themselves was concerned in it. Moreover, on account of ver. 26, and because the point here concerned a usage appointed in the law of Moses, otherwise than at xviii. 18, we are to understand a formal temporary Nazarite vow, undertaken on some unknown occasion.1

Ver. 24. These take to thee, bring them into thy fellowship, and become with them a Nazarite—ἀγνοήθητε, be consecrated, LXX. Num. vii. 3, 8, corresponding to the Hebrew גָּזְפָה— and make the expenditure for them, εἰς αἰτῶν, on their account,2 namely, in the costs of the sacrifices to be procured.3 “More apud Iudaicis receptum erat, et pro insigni pietatis officio habebatur, ut in pauperum Nazaricorum gratiam dixeres summus erogaret ad sacrificia, quae, dum illi tonderentur, offerre necesse erat,” Kypke.4 The attempt of Wieseler,5 to explain away the taking up of the Nazarite vow on the part of the apostle, is entirely contrary to the words, since ἀγνοήθητε, in its emphatic connection with στὶς αἰτῶν, can only be understood according to the context of entering into participation of the Nazarite vow, and not generally of Israelitish purification by virtue of presenting sacrifices and visiting the temple, as in John xi. 55. — εἰς ἱερών. εἰς αἰτῶν in order that they, after the fulfilment of the legal requirement had taken place, might have themselves shorn, and thus be released from their vow. The shearing and the burning of the hair of the head in the fire of the peace-offering, was the termination of the Nazaritic vow.6 — καὶ γυναικο-ται κ.τ.λ. and all shall know: not included in the dependence on εἰς, as in Luke xxii. 80. — ω διὸ as in ver. 19. — ὅπως εἰς τούτοις that nothing has a place, is existent, so that all is without objective reality.7 — καὶ αἰτῶ, also for thy own person, whereby those antinomistic accusations are practically refuted.

On στοιχεῖον, in the sense of conduct of life, see on Gal. iv. 25.

Ver. 25. “Yet the liberty of the Gentile Christians from the Mosaic law remains thereby undiminished; that is secured by our decree,” chap. xv. The object of this remark is to obviate a possible scruple of the apostle as to the adoption of the proposal. — ὅμως ἀπεστείλαμεν (see the critical remarks), we, on our part, have despatched envoys, after we had resolved that they have to observe no such thing, nothing which belongs to the category of such legal enactments. The notion of δεῖν is implied in the reference of κρίνοντες, necessarium esse separare.8 — εἰ μὴ συλλαβοῦσαι κ.τ.λ. except that they should guard themselves from, etc.9 On συλλαβοῦσαί τιν αὐτήν, to guard oneself from, comp. 2 Tim. iv. 15.10 — This citation of the decree of the

1 Num. vii., and see on xviii. 18. See on such vows, Kiel, Archiæol. L. § 67; Oehler in Herzog’s Rhedol. X. p. 205 ff.
2 See Bernhardy, p. 536.
3 Num. vi. 14 ff.
6 See Num. vi. 18.
7 Comp. on xxv. 11.
9 Comp. ver. 21.
10 See xv. 28.
11 Wisd. i. 11; Ecles. xix. 9; Herod. i. 108.
apostolic synod told Paul what was long since accurately known to him, but was here essentially pertinent to the matter. And for Paul himself that portion of the contents of the decree which was in itself indifferent was important enough, in view of those whose consciences were weak, to make him receive this reminiscence of it now without an express reservation of his higher and freer standpoint, and of his apostolic independence,—a course by which he complied with the δουλείαν τῷ καιρῷ, Rom. xii. 11.

Vv. 26, 27. James had made his proposal to Paul,—by a public observance of a custom, highly esteemed among the Jews, and consecrated by Moses, practically to refute the accusation in question,—in the conviction that the accusation was unfounded, and that thus Paul with a good conscience, without contradiction of his principles, could accept the proposal. And Paul with a good conscience accepted it; in which case it must be presumed that the four men also did not regard the Nazarite vow as a work of justification; otherwise Paul must at once on principle have rejected the proposal, in order not to give countenance to the fundamental error, opposed to his teaching, of justification by the law, and not to offer resistance to Christ Himself as the end of the law. In fact, he must have been altogether convinced that the observance of the law was not under dispute, by those who regard him as an opponent of it, in the sense of justification by the law; otherwise he would as little have consented to the proposal made to him as he formerly did to the circumcision of Titus; and even the furnishing of explanations to guard his action, which Schneckenburger supposes that we must assume, would not have sufficed, but would rather have stamped his accommodation as a mere empty show. Moreover, he was precisely by his internal complete freedom from the law in a position, without moral self-offence, not only to demean himself as, but really to be, a φιλάσιον τῶν νόμων, where this φιλάσιον was enjoined by love, which is the fulfillment of the law in the Christian sense, as here, seeing that his object was as μη ὁν ἀιτώς ὑπὸ νόμων, but as ἐννοούσαν Χριστὸν—to become to the Jews ὡς Τούτανος, in order to win them. Thus this work of the law,—although to him it belonged in itself to the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου—became a form, determined by the circumstances, of exercising the love that fulfils the law, which, however different in its forms, is imperishable and the completion of the law. The step, to which he yielded, stands on the same footing

1 1 Cor. viii. 1 ff.; Rom. xiv. 1 ff.
2 For if James had, in spite of Gal. ii. 9, regarded Paul as a direct adversary of Mosesism, he would, on account of what he well knew to be Paul’s decision of character, have certainly not proposed a measure which the latter could not but have immediately rejected. It remains possible, however, that, though not in the case of James himself, yet among a portion of the presbyters there was still not complete certainty, and perhaps even different views prevailed with regard to what was to be thought of that accusation. In this case, the proposal was a test bringing the matter to decisive certainty, which was very correctly calculated in view of the moral steadfastness of the apostle’s character.
3 They were still weak brethren from Judaism, who still clave partially to ceremonial observances. Calvin designates them as noviti, with a yet tender and not fully formed faith.
4 Rom. x. 4.
5 p. 65.
6 Rom. xiii. 8, 10.
7 1 Cor. ix. 19 ff.
8 Gal. iv. 3; Col. ii. 8.
9 Matt. v 17.
with the circumcision of Timothy, which he himself performed,¹ and is subject essentially to the same judgment. The action of the apostle, therefore, is neither, with Trip, following van Hengel,² to be classed as a *weak and rash obscuriousness*, this were indeed to Paul, near the very end of his labours, the moral impossibility of a great hypocrisy; nor, with Thiersch, are we to suppose that he in a domain not his own had to follow the direction of the bishop;³ nor, with Baumgarten,⁴ are we to judge that he, by here externally manifesting his continued recognition of the divine law, "presents in prospect the ultimate disappearance of his exceptional standpoint, his thirteenth apostleship,"⁵ which there is nothing in the text to point to, and against which militates the fact that to the apostle his gospel was the *absolute* truth, and therefore he could never have in view a re-establishment of legal customs which were to him merely σκιά τῶν μελλόντων.⁶ Not by such imported ideas of interpreters, but by a right estimate of the free standpoint of the apostle,⁷ and of his love bearing all things, are we prevented from regarding his conduct in this passage, with Baur, Zeller, and Haurath, as un-Pauline and the narrative as unhistorical.⁸—σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀγυμνοῖς consecrated with them, i.e. having entered into participation of their Nazarite state, which, namely, had already lasted in the case of these men for some considerable time, as ver. 23 shows. They did not therefore only now commence their Nazarite vow,⁹ but Paul agreed to a personal participation in their vow already existing, in order, as a joint-bearer, to bring to a close by taking upon himself the whole expense of the offerings. According to *Nasir*. i. 3,¹⁰ a Nazarite vow not taken for life lasted at least thirty days, but the subsequent accession of another during the currency of that time must at least have been allowed in such a case as this, where the person joining bore the expenses. —εἰσεθει εἰς τ. ἱερ.] namely, toward the close of the Nazarite period of these men, with which expired the Nazarite term current in pursuance of the σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀγυμνοῖς for himself. —διαγγέλλω notifying, namely, to the priests,¹¹ who had to conduct the legally-appointed sacrifices,¹² and then to pronounce release from the vow.¹³ The connection yields this interpretation, not: *omnibus edicens*,¹⁴ or¹⁵ with the help of friends spreading the news, which in itself would likewise accord with linguistic usage.¹⁶—τὴν ἐκπλήρωσιν τῶν ἡμερ. τ. ἁγν. i.e. he gave notice that the vowed number of the Nazarite days had quite expired, after which only the concluding offering was required. This idea is expressed by ἐν ὧν προσ- πευχὴν κ.τ.λ., which immediately attaches itself to τὴν ἐκπλήρωσιν κ.τ.λ.: the

¹ xvi. 8. [961 ff.
² In the *Godvogelord*. Bjeldraen, 1899, p. 8. But see Gal. ii. 6.
³ II. p. 149.
⁴ Rom. xi. 85 ff.
⁵ Col. ii. 17.
⁶ 1 Cor. iii. 21 ff.
⁷ See, on the other hand, Neander, p. 465 ff.
⁹ Neander.
¹¹ Comp. Thuc. vii. 73. 4; Herodian, i. 2. 5;
¹² Xen. *Anab.* i. 6. 2.
¹³ Num. vi. 13 ff.
¹⁴ The compound (internuntiari) is purposely chosen, because Paul with his notice acted as internuntius of the four men. So commonly διαγγέλλω is used in Greek writers, where it signifies to notify, to make known. Comp. also 9 *Macc.* i. 33.
¹⁵ Grotius.
¹⁶ Bornemann.
¹⁷ Luke ix. 60; Rom. ix. 17.
FULFILMENT OF THE VOW.

fulfilment of the Nazarite days, until the offering for each individual was presented by them, so that ἔως οὗ προσπέπτειν κατὰ τὸν ἡμισεβείαν contains an objective more precise definition of the ἰκασται of added from the standpoint of the author: which fulfilment was not earlier than until there was brought, etc. Hence, Luke has expressed himself not by the optative or subjunctive, which Lachmann, Praef., p. ix., has conjectured, but by the indicative aorist, "the fulfilment up to the point that the presentation of the offering took place." Wieseler arbitrarily makes ἔως οὗ dependent on εἰσήγαι τῷ ἵερῳ, supplying "and remained there."—Observe, further, that in αὐτῶν Paul himself is now included, which follows from αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ ἁγιασθήσεται, as well as that ἵερος ἰκαστον is added, because it is not one offering for all, but a separate offering for each, which is to be thought of (τ'). — Ver. 27. αἱ ἐν τῇ ἡμερᾷ is commonly taken as: the seven days, which he up to the concluding sacrifice had to spend under the Nazarite vow which he had jointly undertaken, so that these days would be the time which had still to run for the four men of the duration of their vow. But against this may be urged, first, that the ἰκασται of τῶν ἡμισεβείων, ver. 26, must in that case be the future fulfilment, which is not said in the text; and, secondly and decisively, that the αἱ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, with the article, would presuppose a mention already made of seven days. Textually we can only explain it as: the well-known seven days required for this purpose, so that it is to be assumed that, as regards the presentation of the offerings, very varied in their kind, the interval of a week was usual. Incorrect, because entirely dissociated from the context, is the view of Wieseler, that the seven days of the Pentecostal week, of which the last was Pentecost itself, are meant. So also Baumgarten, and Schaff. See, on the other hand, Baur, who, however, brings out the seven days by the entirely arbitrary and groundless apportionment, that for each of the five persons a day was appointed for the presentation of his offering, prior to which five days we have to reckon one day on which James gave the counsel to Paul, and a second on which Paul went into the temple. On such a supposition, besides, we cannot see why Luke, in reference to what was just said, ἐπὶ ἀντὶ ἵερος ἰκαστον αἰτήθων, should not have written: αἱ πάντες ἡμέρας.—οἱ αἵ τε Ἰσραήλ. "Paulus, dum fidelibus—the Jewish-Christians—placandis intentus est, in hostium—the unconverted Asiatic Jews—furorem incurrit," Calvin. How often had those, who were now at Jerusalem for the feast of Pentecost, persecuted Paul already in Asia!—ἐν τῷ ἵερῳ To see the destroyer of their ancestral religion in the temple, goaded their wrath to an outbreak.

—σωτέρον] xix. 32.

Vv. 28, 29. T. τότον τοῦτον. vi. 14. — το τε καὶ "Ελληνας κ.τ.λ.,] and, besides, he has also, further, in addition thereto, brought Greeks, Gentiles, into the temple. As to τε καὶ, see on xix. 27. That by τὸ ἵερον we have to under-

1 Comp. xxii. 12.
2 Comp. already Erasmus, Paraph.
3 Comp. Judith viii. 15; comp. vii. 20.
4 Comp. Erasmus, Paraphrase: "Totum hoc septem diebus erat peragendum; quibus jam paene expellet," etc.; also Ewald, p. 571.
5 According to Num. vi. 13 ff.
7 p. 348 ff.
8 In the theol. Jahrb. 1849, p. 458 ff.
stand the court of the Israelites,\textsuperscript{1} is self-evident, as the court of the Gentiles was accessible to the Greeks.\textsuperscript{2} — Ἐλληνοῖς the plural of category, which ver. 29 requires; so spoken with hostile intent. — Ver. 29 is not to be made a parenthesis. — ἧσαν γὰρ προεωρακότες κ.τ.λ.] there were, namely, people, who had before, before they saw the apostle in the temple, ver. 27, seen Trophimus in the city with him. Observe the correlation in which the προεωρ.\textsuperscript{5} stands with ἰδεῖσινοι, and the ἐν τῇ πόλει with ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ on the one hand, and with εἰς τὸ ἱερόν on the other. So much the more erroneous is it to change the definite πρὸ, before, into an indefinite formerly, which Otto\textsuperscript{6} dates back even four years, namely, to the residence in Jerusalem mentioned in xviii. 22. Beyond doubt the πρὸ does not point back farther than to the time of the present stay in Jerusalem, during which people had seen Trophimus with Paul in the city, before they saw the latter in the temple. — Τρόφιμον τὸν Ἐφέσιον] see xx. 4. Among those, therefore, who accompanied the apostle ἄρχω τῆς Ἀσίας, Trophimus must not have remained behind in Asia, but must have gone on with the apostle to Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{6} — ἐνόμιζον] The particular accusation thus rested on a hasty and mistaken inference; it was an erroneous suspicion expressed as a certainty, to which zealotry so easily leads! — ὃν ἐνόμιζον ὑπ’] comp. John viii. 54.

Ver. 30. — Ἐξὼν τῷ ἱερῷ] in order that the temple enclosure might not be defiled with murder; for they wished to put Paul to death, ver. 32. Bengel and Baumgarten hold that they had wished to prevent him from taking refuge at the altar. But the right of asylum legally subsisted only for persons guilty of unintentional manslaughter.\textsuperscript{6} — ἵκλεισθα] by the Levites. For the reason why, see above. Entirely at variance with the context, Lange\textsuperscript{7} holds that the closing of the temple intimates the temporary suspension of worship. It referred only to Paul, who was not to be allowed again to enter.

Vv. 31–33. But while they sought to kill him, to beat him to death, ver. 32, information came up, to the castle of Antonia, bordering on the north-west side of the temple, to the tribune of the Roman cohort.\textsuperscript{6} — τῷ χίλιαρχῳ] a simple dative, not for πρὸς τὸν χ.\textsuperscript{10} — ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς] upon them.\textsuperscript{11} — ἵκλεισθα because he took Paul to be an at that time notorious insurgent,\textsuperscript{3} abandoned to the self-revenge of the people. In order, however, to have certainty on

\textsuperscript{1} On the screen of which were columns, with the warning in Greek and Latin: μὴ δειν ἀλλάφθων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ προεωρακότες. Joseph. Bell. v. 5. 2.

\textsuperscript{2} Lightfoot, ad Matth. p. 58 f.

\textsuperscript{3} The πρὸ is not local, as in li. 25 (my former interpretation), but, according to the context, temporal. The usu legunti alone cannot here decide, as it may beyond doubt be urged for either view; see the lexicons. So also is it with προεωρακότες. The Vulgate, Erasmus, Luther, Castalio, Calvin, and others neglect the πρὸ entirely. Besser correctly renders: ante vaiderant.

\textsuperscript{4} Pastoratbr. p. 284 ff.

\textsuperscript{5} Comp. on xxvii. 2.

\textsuperscript{6} Therefore they would hardly suppose that Paul would fly to the altar. Besides, they had him sure enough! See Ex. xxii. 13, 14; 1 Kings ii. 38 ff. Comp. Ewald, Alterth. p. 238 f.

\textsuperscript{7} Apostol. Zeitalt. II. p. 306.

\textsuperscript{8} Claudius Lysias, xxiii. 26.

\textsuperscript{9} On φάσασθαι, comp. Dem. 799. 16. 1323. 6; Pollux, vili. 6. 47 f.; Susannah 55; and see Wetstein. [II. p. 233.\textsuperscript{10}]

\textsuperscript{10} See Bornemann and Rosenmüller, Repr. 11.

\textsuperscript{11} On κατερχέσθαι, to run down, comp. Xen. Anab. v. 4. 22, vii. 1. 20.

\textsuperscript{12} Ver. 38.
the spot, he asked, the crowd: 'τις ἀν εἰς καὶ τι ἔστι πεπονεμ.,] who he might be, subjective possibility, and of what he was doing—that he had done something, was certain to the inquirer.\footnote{1}—εἰς τὴν παρεμβολὴν in castra,\footnote{2} i.e. to the fixed quarters of the Roman soldiery, the military barracks of the fortress.\footnote{3}

Vv. 35, 36. Ἐπὶ τ. ἀναβασθ. when he came to the stairs leading up to the fortress.\footnote{4} See examples of the form βασιλεύς, and of the more Attic form βασιλέως, in Lobeck.\footnote{5}—συνέβη βασιλεύς αὐτὸν brings forward what took place more markedly than the simple ἐβασιλεύη. Either the accusative, as here, or the nominative may stand with the infinitive.\footnote{6}—αἴρε αὐτὸν The same cry of extermination as in Luke xxiii. 18.\footnote{7} On the plural κράτοις, see Winer.\footnote{8}

Vv. 37, 38. Ἐξεστι κ.τ.λ. as in xix. 2; Luke xiv. 3; Mark x. 2. "Modeste alloquitor." Bengel. —Εὐλημνεῖτα γινόμενοι understandest thou Greek? A question of surprise at Paul’s having spoken in Greek. The expression does not require the usually assumed supplement of λαλεῖν,\footnote{9} but the adverb belongs directly to the verb γινόμενοι.\footnote{10}—οἶκ ὁ παρὰ εἰς κ.τ.λ. Thou art not then, as I imagined, the Egyptian, etc. The emphasis lies on oík, so that the answer would again begin with oík.\footnote{11} Incorrectly, Vulgate, Erasmus, Beza, and others: nonne tu es, etc. —The Egyptian, for whom the tribune had—probably from a mere natural conjecture of his own—taken Paul, was a phantastic pseudo-prophet, who in the reign of Nero wished to destroy the Roman government and led his followers, collected in the wilderness, to the Mount of Olives, from which they were to see the walls of the capital fall down, Defeated with his followers by the procurator Felix, he had taken to flight;\footnote{12} and therefore Lysias, in consequence of his remembrance of this event still fresh after the lapse of a considerable time,\footnote{13} lighted on the idea that the dreaded enthusiast, now returned or drawn forth from his long concealment, had fallen into the hands of popular fury. —τερασμοικ.\footnote{14} Josephus\footnote{15} gives the followers of the Egyptian at τρισιματίας; but this is only an apparent inconsistency with our passage, for here there is only brought forward a single, specially remarkable appearance of the rebel, perhaps the first step which he took with his most immediate and most dangerous followers, and therefore the reading in Josephus is not to be changed in accordance with our passage, in opposition to Kuinoel and Olshausen.\footnote{16} How greatly under the worthless

\footnotesize{\begin{itemize}
\item[\footnote{1}]{Comp. Winer, p. 381 (E. T. 375) : Kähner, ad Xen. Anad. v. 3. 14.}
\item[\footnote{2}]{See Sturz, Dial. Al. p. 30; Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 377.}
\item[\footnote{3}]{So xxii. 94, xxiii. 10, 16, 32.}
\item[\footnote{4}]{Joseph. Bell. Jud. v. 5, 8.}
\item[\footnote{5}]{Ad Phryn. p. 394.}
\item[\footnote{6}]{See Stullb, ad Plat. Phaed. p. 67 C.}
\item[\footnote{7}]{Comp. Acts xxii. 32.}
\item[\footnote{8}]{p. 490 (E. T. 660). Comp. v. 16.}
\item[\footnote{9}]{Neh. xiii. 34.}
\item[\footnote{10}]{Comp. Xen. Anad. vil. 6, 8, Cyrop. vil. 5. 31 : τὸν ἤτοι ἐπιστατήσας, comp. Græci neceire in Cic. p. Flacco, 4.}
\item[\footnote{11}]{See Klotz, ad Deser. p. 184. Comp. Bärnlein, Partik. p 281.}
\item[\footnote{12}]{Joseph. Bell. ii. 13, 5, Antt. xx. 8, 6.}
\item[\footnote{13}]{For different combinations with a view to the more exact determination of the time of this event, which, however, remains doubtful, see Wieseler, p. 76 ff.; Stölting, Behr. s. Eroges u. Paul. Br. p. 190 ff.}
\item[\footnote{14}]{Bell. Ic.}
\item[\footnote{15}]{But there remains in contradiction both with our passage and with the τρισιματίας of Josephus himself, his statement, Antt. xx. 8, 6, that 400 were slain and 200 taken prisoners; for in Bell. ii. 13, 5, he informs us that the}
\item[\footnote{16}]{Horace.

}}
Felix the evil of banditti prevailed in Jerusalem and Judaea generally, see in Joseph. Antt. xx. 6 f.

Vv. 39, 40. I am indeed (μετ')—not the Egyptian, but—a Jew from Tarsus, and so apprehended by thee through being confounded with another, yet I pray thee, etc. — ἀνθρωπος] In his speech to the people Paul used the more honourable word ἄνηρ.—οἰκ ἡμῖν] See examples of this litotes in the designation of important cities, in Wetstein ad loc. A conscious feeling of patriotism is implied in the expression. — κατά. τ. χ.] See on xii. 17. — πολλὴς δὲ σιγῆς γενομ.] "Conticueron omnes intentique ora tenebant." — τοῦ Ἐβρ. διαλ. thus not likewise in Greek, as in ver. 37, but in the Syro-Chaldaic dialect of the country,* in order, namely, to find a more favourable hearing with the people. — We may add, that the permission to speak granted by the tribune is too readily explainable from the unexpected disillusion which he had just experienced, ver. 39, to admit of its being urged as a reason against the historical character of the speech,* just as the silence which set in is explainable enough as the effect of surprise in the case of the mobile vulgus. And if the following speech, as regards its contents, does not enter upon the position of the speaker towards the law, it was, in presence of the prejudice and passion of the multitude, a very wise procedure simply to set forth facts, by which the whole working of the apostle is apologetically exhibited.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

Rhodes and Patara. V. 1.

The island of Rhodes was famous for its natural beauty and great fertility. So genial was its climate, that it was proverbially said the sun shone every day in Rhodes. Its chief city, of the same name, which signifies rosy, was celebrated for its excellent schools and extensive commerce. Cicero and other young noble Romans made it their university. There stood the colossal brazen statue of Apollo, one hundred and twenty-seven feet in height, which was regarded as one of the wonders of the world. It long remained a place of importance, and, in the middle ages, was famous as the residence of the Knights of St. John, by whom it was rescued from the Saracens in 1310, and held by them until it was conquered in 1523 by Solyman the Magnificent. It now belongs to the Turks, who have long oppressed the people, and its prosperity has ceased. Its gardens still, however, are filled with delicious fruits, and there are the ruins of an old fortress and the cells of the knights to be seen.

greater part were either captured or slain. But this contradiction is simply chargeable to Josephus himself, as the incompatibility of his statements discloses a historical error, concerning which our passage shows decisively that it was committed either in the assertion that the greater part were captured or slain, or in the statement of the numbers in Antt. l.c.
At Patara, a seaport of Lycia, near the mouth of the river Xanthus, was a famous oracle of Apollo, which was held as scarcely inferior to that at Delphi, hence Horace describes the god as the "Delius et Patareus Apollo." Here the apostle landed, and embarked in another vessel. The place is now in ruins, its harbor filled with sand-banks, its temple demolished, and its oracles dumb.

"The oracles are dumb;
No voice nor hideous hum
Runs through the archèd roof in words deceiving;
Apollo from his shrine
Can no more divine,
With hollow shriek the steep of Delphi's leaving;
No nightly trance or breathed spell
Inspires the pale-eyed priests from the prophetic call."

(Milton.)

(p2) Disciples at Tyre. V. 4.

A small church had been gathered here, probably through the labors of some of the dispersion, possibly by the preaching of Philip. While waiting for the departure of the vessel, the apostle spent a week with these disciples, and we can well imagine what a precious season they enjoyed, and we wonder not that they all—men, women, and children—came to the shore with him, nor that, having intimation of the trials and sufferings which awaited the apostle at Jerusalem, they sought to dissuade him from going. We must ever distinguish between the divine intimations and human inferences. These disciples at Tyre had received some foreshadowings of coming affliction to Paul, yet had not received so full a revelation of the divine mind, as was given to Paul, hence their counsel was opposed to his decision. The period of seven days "mentioned at Troas, and again at Puteoli, seems to indicate that Paul arranged to be at Troas, Puteoli, and Tyre over the Sabbath, and to partake with them of the Lord's Supper."

(p2) Philip's four daughters. V. 9.

The remarks of Meyer on this verse are just. Gloag observes: "This remark does not seem to be merely incidentally introduced; but is probably an indication that the daughters of Philip, influenced by the spirit of prophecy, foretold the sufferings which awaited the apostle at Jerusalem." Houson says: "There seems to have been an organization at Ephesus of 'widows' of an advanced age, who spent their days in charitable work in connection with the church. But we find no trace of any order of virgins in the early church." Hackett writes: "Luke mentions the fact as remarkable, and not as in any way related to the history. It is hardly possible that they too foretold the apostle's approaching captivity." Alford says: "To find an argument for the so-called 'honor of virginity' in this verse only shows to what resources those who have failed to apprehend the whole spirit and rule of the gospel in the matter." Alexander remarks: They "were inspired, literally, prophesying, not as public teachers, but in private, perhaps actually prophesying in the strict sense, at the time of Paul's arrival, i.e. predicting what was to befall him, like the Tyrian disciples." "Their virginity is probably referred to only as a
reason for their being still at home, and not as having any necessary connection with their inspiration. We concur fully in the remarks of Dr. Taylor: "At this time his four unmarried daughters, who were possessed of the gift of prophecy, were living under his roof; and though it is not said in so many words that they foretold what was to happen to the apostle, yet it seems likely that they also renewed the warnings which he had already so frequently received," and he justly adds in a note, there seems no foundation whatever for the notion of [Name] that they were under a vow. Farrar says: "The house of Philip was hallowed by the gentle ministries of four daughters, who, looking for the coming of Christ, had devoted to the service of the gospel their virgin lives."

(s3) Tarried many days. V. 10.

The phrase is literally more days, rendered by the words some, several, implying that he spent a longer time there than in other places on the way, or than he had intended to spend at least a number of days—probably two weeks. He left Philippi with the design of reaching Jerusalem before Pentecost. He was at Philippi during the Passover. And from the Passover to Pentecost there are fifty days. We may reckon the time thus: From Philippi to Troas 5 days, at Troas 7, To Assos and Mitylene 1, to Chios, Samos, and Miletus 3; at Miletus and to Cos about 3; Rhodes and Patara 2; to Tyre 2; at Tyre 7; Ptolemais 2; to Cesarea 1. Making 33 days in all, leaving 17 to spend at Cesarea; and to go to Jerusalem, which would not require more than 2 days.

(r3) Paul purifying himself. V. 26.

The views of Meyer on this act of the apostle are fully expressed, and commend themselves to general acceptance—that the apostle acted in full view of the absolute truth of the gospel, and in the exercise of Christian freedom and condescending charity. Alford says: "James and the elders made this proposal, assuming that Paul could comply with it salvâ conscientiâ; perhaps also as a proof to assure themselves and others of his sentiments; and Paul accepted it salvâ conscientiâ. But this he could only have done on one condition, that he was sure by it not to contribute in these four Nazarites to the error of justification by works of the law." Paul, in compassion to the weak faith of his Jewish brethren, associated himself with four members of the church who had a vow, and this he did, without implying that it was necessary for any, and certainly not for the Gentile Christians, to do the same thing. Neander writes: "Let us recollect that the faith in Jesus as the promised Messiah was the fundamental doctrine, on which the whole structure of the church arose. Accordingly the first Christian community was formed of very heterogeneous materials. It was composed of such as differed from other Jews only by the acknowledging of Jesus as the Messiah; of such as still continued bound to the same contracted Jewish notions, which they had entertained before; and of such as by coming to know Jesus more and more as the Messiah in the higher spiritual sense, were becoming more completely freed from their besetting errors. As Christ himself had faithfully observed the Mosaic law, so the faithful observance of it was adhered to at first by all believers." Farrar re-
marks: "Still there were two great principles which he had thoroughly grasped, and on which he had consistently acted. One was acquiescence in things indifferent for the sake of charity, so that he gladly became as a Jew to Jews that he might save Jews; the other that, during the short time which remained, and under the stress of the present necessity, it was each man's duty to abide in the condition wherein he had been called. His objection to Levitism was not an objection to external conformity, but only to that substitution of externalism for faith, to which conformity might lead. He did not so much object to ceremonies as to placing any reliance on them. He might have wished that things were otherwise, and that the course suggested to him involved a less painful sacrifice." Gloag observes: "According to Paul's views the ceremonies of the law were matters of indifference; he himself appears to have observed them, though with no great strictness; hence he felt himself at liberty to accommodate himself to the conduct of others in these indifferent things. And it was this very liberality of spirit, this freedom of action, that enabled him to comply with the request of James and the elders. Christian love, which was the grand moving principle of his conduct, caused him to accommodate himself to the views of the Jews, when he could do so without any sacrifice of principle, in order to remove their prejudices."

Schaff says: "And as to Paul, he was here not in his proper Gentile-Christian field of labor. His conduct, on other occasions, proves that he was far from allowing himself from being restricted in this field. He reserved to himself entire independence in his operations. But he stood now on the venerable ground of the Jewish-Christian mother church, where he had to respect the customs of the Fathers, and the authority of James, the regular bishop or presiding elder. Clearly conscious of already possessing righteousness and salvation in Christ, he accommodated himself, with the best and noblest intentions, to the weaker brethren."
CHAPTER XXII.

Ver. 1. νῦν] is decided by its attestation. Elz. has νῦν. — Ver. 2. προσεφώνει] Tisch. Born. read προσφώνει, following D E min. Theoph. Oec. Rightly; the Recepta is a mistaken alteration in accordance with xxi. 40, from which προσφώνησεν is inserted in G. min. — Ver 3. μέν] is wanting in important witnesses; deleted by Lachm. Born. But its non-logical position occasioned the omission. — Ver 9. καὶ ἐφοβοί ἐγένοντο] is wanting in A B H K, min. and several vss. Deleted by Lachm. But the omission is explained by the homoeoteleuton. Had there been interpolation, ἐντοὺς from ix, 7 would have been used. — Ver. 12. εὐσεβής] is wanting in A, Vulg. Condemned by Mill. On the other hand, B G H K, and many min. Chrys. Theophyl. have εὐσεβής, which Lachm. and Tisch. read. The omission of the word is to be considered as a mere transcriber’s error; and εὐσεβής is to be preferred, on account of the preponderance of evidence. — Ver. 16. αὐτοί] Elz. has τοὺς Κυρίου, against decisive attestation. An interpretation, for which other witnesses have Ἰσχοῦ. — Ver. 20. Ἀσφάλον] is wanting only in A, 68, and would fall, were it not so decidedly attested, to be considered an addition. But with this attestation the omission is to be explained by an error in copying (Ἀσφάλον τοῦ). — After συνενόθων Elz. has τῇ ἀναφες αὐτοῖ, which, however, is wanting in A B D E K, 40, and some vss., and has come in from viii. 1 (in opposition to Reiche, nov. descript. cod. N. T. p. 28). — Ver. 22. καθήκην] Elz. has καθήκων, supported by Rinck, in opposition to decisive testimony. — Ver. 23. αἰρα] D, Syr. Cassiod. have αἰράτων. Recommended by Griesbach, adopted by Born. But the evidence is too weak, and ὅψ bears the character of a more precise definition of αἴρα. — Ver. 24. εἰσίαγορα] Elz. has ἀγορά, against greatly preponderating evidence. Elz. was absorbed by the preceding ΟΣ. εἴπας is to be read instead of εἰπὼν, according to decisive testimony, with Tisch. and Lachm. — Ver. 25. προσέτεινον] has, among the many variations, — προσετείνειν (Elz.), προσετείναντα, προσετείναντα, προσετείναντα, — the strongest attestation. The change of the plural into the singular is explained from the fact that the previous context contains nothing of a number of persons executing the sentence, and therefore δ ἀκρόασις was still regarded as the subject. — Ver. 26. Before τῇ Elz. has ὑπα, against A B C E K, min. Vulg. and other vss. So also Born., following D G H, min. vss. Chrys. Certainly “vox innocentissima” (Born.), but an addition by way of gloss according to these preponderating witnesses. — Ver. 30. παρὰ] Lachm. and Born. read ἐπά, according to A B C E K, min. Theophyl. Oec. The weight of evidence decides for ἐπά. — After ἐλπίσαν αὐτ. Elz. has ἀπὸ τ. ἐκείνων. An explanatory addition, against greatly preponderating testimony. — Instead of συνελθεῖν Elz. has ἐλθεῖν, against equally preponderant evidence. How easily might ΣΥΝ be suppressed in consequence of the preceding ΣΕΝ! — πῶν τὸ συνέθησον] Elz. has ἔλθων τὸ συνέθηρ. αὐτῶν, against decisive evidence, although defended by Reiche, I. c. p. 28.
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Vv. 1-3. Αἵλοις κ. πατήρ, quite a national address.1 Even Sanhedrists were not wanting in the hostile crowd; at least the speaker presupposes their presence. — ἀκούσατε κ. τ. λ.] hear from me my present defence to you (w). As to the double genitive with ἁκούνειν, comp. on John xii. 46. — After ver. 1, a paran. — εἰγώ μέν] Luke has not at the very outset settled the logical arrangement of the sentence, and therefore mistakes the correct position of the μέν, which was appropriate only after γεγένην. Similar examples of the deranged position of μέν and ὅς often occur in the classics.3 — ἀνατεθραμμένος . . . νόμον.] Whether the comma is to be placed after ταύτη8 or after Γαμαλίηλ,4 is—seeing that the meaning and the progression of the speech are the same with either construction—to be decided simply by the external structure of the discourse, according to which a new element is always introduced by the prefixing of a nominative participle: γεγενημένος, ἀνατεθραμμένος, πεπαιδευμένος: δοσών at Tarsus in Cilicia, but brought up in this city, Jerusalem, at the feet of Gamaliel,5 instructed according to the strictness of the ancestral law. The latter after the general ἀνατεθραμμ. κ. τ. λ. brings into relief a special point, and therefore it is not to be affirmed that παρὰ τ. πόδ. Γαμ. suits only πεπαιδ.6 — παρὰ τοῖς πόδας] a respectful expression, τὴν πολλὴν πρὸς τὸν ἀνδρα αἰτῶ δεικτιζόντος,7 to be explained from the Jewish custom of scholars sitting partly on the floor, partly on benches at the feet of their teacher, who sat more elevated on a chair.8 The tradition that, until the death of Gamaliel, the scholars listened in a standing posture to their teachers,9 even if it were the case,10 cannot be urged against this view, as even the standing scholar may be conceived as being at the feet of his teacher sitting on the elevated cathedra.11—κατὰ ἀκριβ. τοῖς πατρῴοις νόμον] i.e. in accordance with the strictness contained in, living and ruling in, the ancestral law. The genitive depends on ἀκριβ. Erasmus, Castalio, and others connect it with πεπαιδ., held to be used substantively:12 carefully instructed in the ancestral law. Much too tame, as careful legal instruction is after ἀνατεθρ. . . . παρὰ τ. πόδ. Γαμαλ. understood of itself, and therefore the progress of the speech requires special climactic force. — The πατρώοι νόμοι in the law received from the fathers,13 i.e. the Mosaic law, but not including the precepts of the Pharisees, as Kuinoel supposes—which is arbitrarily imported. It concerned Paul here only to bring into prominence the Mosaically orthodox strictness of his training;
the other specifically Pharisaic element was suggested to the hearer by the mention of Gamaliel, but not by τ. πατρ. νόμον. Paul expresses himself otherwise in Phil. iii. 5 and Gal. i. 14: — ἠλοθῆς ἐνάρξ. τοῦ Θεοῦ] so that I was a sealot for God, for the cause and glory of God, contains a special characteristic definition to πεπαιδευμένος . . . νόμον. 1 "Uterque locus quiddam ex mimesi habet; nam Judaei putabant se tantum tribuere Deo, quantum detrherent Jesu Christo," Bengel.

Vv. 4, 5. Taüv. τ. δοὺς] for Christianity was in his case the evident cause of the enmity. — ἀχρ. θανάτου] Grotiuss appropriately remarks: "quantum scil. in me erat." It indicates how far the intention in the ἐδόξα went, namely, even to the bringing about of their execution. — ἔ ἀρχηρ.] The high priest at the time, still living. — μαρτυρεῖ.] not futurum Atticum, but: he is, as the course of the matter necessarily involves, my witness. — καὶ πᾶν τὸ πρεσβυτ.] and the whole body of the elders. — πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς] i.e. to the Jews. — Bornemann: against the Christians. Paul would in that case have entirely forgotten his pre-Christian standpoint, in the sense of which he speaks; and the hostile reference of πρὸς must have been suggested by the context, which, however, with the simple ἐπιστ. δεξιόμ. πρὸς is not at all here the case. — καὶ τοὺς ἐκεῖ, i.e. εἰς Δαμασκόν, ὁταν] also those who were thither. Paul conceives them as having come thither, since the persecution about Stephen, and so being found there; hence ἐκεῖ does not stand for ἐκεί, so still de Wette, but is to be explained from a pregnant construction common especially with later writers.  —

Vv. 6-11. See on ix. 3-8. Comp. xxvi. 18 ff. ἰκανόν] i.e. of considerable strength. It was a light of glory' dazzling him; more precisely described in xxvi. 12. — Ver. 10. ὅν τῆταν τοῦ ποιήμαν] what is appointed to thee to do; by whom, is left entirely undetermined. Jesus, who appeared to him, does not yet express Himself more precisely, but means: by God, ver. 14. — Ver. 11. ὡς δὲ σὺν ἐνέβλεπον] but when I beheld not, when sight failed me; he could not open his eyes, ver. 13.  —

Vv. 12-15. But Ananias, a religious man according to the law, attested 9 by all the Jews resident in Damascus, thus a mediator, neither hostile to the law nor unknown! — ἀνάβλεψαν . . . ἀνάβλεψα εἰς αἵτων] ἀνάβλεπεν, which may signify as well to look up, as also visum recuperare, 10 has here 11 the former meaning, which is evident from εἰς αἵτων: look up! and at the same hour I looked up to him. We are to conceive the apostle as sitting there blind with closed eyelids, and Ananias standing before him. — προεκποι.] has appointed thee thereto. — τὸν δὲ ἰκανόν] Jesus, on whom, as the righteous, 12

1 Comp. Rom. x. 2.
2 Comp. on ἱδρ. ix. 2, xviii. 25, xix. 23.
3 See on ix. 2.
5 See ix. 2.
6 Lobbeck, ad Phryn. p. 44; comp. ii. 39, xxi. 3.
7 Ver. 11.
8 Comp. on the absolute ἐνέβλεπον, Xen. Mem. iii. 11. 10; 2 Chron. xx. 24.
9 Praise, comp. x. 22, vi. 8.
10 See on John ix. 11, and Fritzche, ad Marc. p. 238.
11 It is otherwise in ix. 17, 18.
12 See on iii. 90; comp. xxvi. 16.
13 § Cor. v. 21.
the divine will to save, τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ, was based.¹ — πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους.²

Direction of the λόγος μάρτυρ, as in xiii. 31: to all men.³

Ver. 16. Τι μέλει σοι? Why tarriest thou? μέλειν so used only here in the N. T.; frequent in the classics. The question is not one of reproach, but of excitement and encouragement. — ἀπόλογους τάς ἁμαρτίας σου let thyself be baptized, and thereby wash away thy sins. Here, too, baptism is that by which means of which the forgiveness of the sins committed in the pre-Christian life takes place.⁴ Calvin inserts saving clauses, in order not to allow the grace to be bound to the sacrament. As to the purposely-chosen middle forms, comp. on 1 Cor. x. 2. — ἐπικαλ. τὸ ὅνομα αὐτοῦ] Wolf appropriately explains: "postquam invocaveris atque ita professus fueris nomen Domini, as the Messiah. Id eicicet antecedere olim debebat initiationem per baptismum faciendam."

Vv. 17, 18. With this the history in ix. 26 is to be completed. — καὶ προσκυνεῖς σοι a transition to the genitive absolute, independent of the case of the substantive.⁵ — ἰστάς] see on x. 10. The opposite: γίνεσθαι ἐν ἑαυτῷ, xii. 11. Regarding the non-identity of this ecstasy with 2 Cor. xiii. 2 ff., see in loc. — συν παραδίδ. σ. τ. ἁμαρτ. περὶ ἐμοῦ] per ἐμόν is most naturally to be attached to τ. ἁμαρτηρ., as ἁμαρτηρίων περί is quite usual, very often in John. Winer⁶ connects it with παραδίδ. Observe the order: thy witness of me.

Vv. 19–21. "I interposed by way of objection the contrast, in which my working for Christianity, my ἁμαρτηρία, would appear toward my former hostile working, which contrast could not but prove the truth and power of my conversion and promote the acceptance of my testimony, and — Christ repeated His injunction to depart, which He further specially confirmed by θεὶ ἀγαθῷ εἰς θεὸν μακρὰν ἔχοντες σε." — "Commemorat hoc Judaeis Paulum, ut eis declararet summum amorem, quo apud eos cupivit manere iisque praedicare; quod ergo iis relictis ad gentes iverit, non ex suo voto, sed Dei justi compulsum fuisse," Calovius. — ἀνιώκαί ἐστι.] is necessarily to be referred to the subject of παραδίδοντας, ver. 18, to the Jews in Jerusalem, not to the foreign Jews.⁷ — ἐγὼ ἡμῖν κ. ἔτος.] I was there, etc. — καὶ ἀνίωκα εἰς εἰς]. as well as other hostile persons. On συμμετοχ. comp. viii. 1. — Ver.

¹ Comp. iii. 14, vili. 58.
² That is, according to the popular expression: before all the world. Frequently so in Isocrates. See Bremi, ad Panegyr. 28, p. 29. But the universal destination of the apostle is implied therein. Comp. ver. 21.
³ Comp. the Homeric ἀναλαμβάνω, H. l. 118 f., and Nägeliach in loc. Comp. ii. 38; Eph. v. 22; and see on 1 Cor. vi. 11.
⁴ See Bernhardy, p. 474; Kühner, § 651; Stabib. ad Plat. Rep. p. 518 A.
⁵ p. 120 (E. T. 172).
⁶ Ewald, p. 438, understands ver. 19 f. not as an objection, but as committing: "however humanly intelligible it might strictly be, that the Jews would not hear him." But the extraordinary revelation in itself most naturally presupposes in Paul a human conception deriving from the intuition contained in it, to which the heavenly call runs counter, as often also with the prophets (Moses, Jeremiah, etc.), the divine intimation encounters human scruples. If, moreover, the words here were meant as committing, we should necessarily expect a hint of it in the expression (such as: καὶ εἴπατε, etc.)
⁷ In which I was engaged in bringing believers to prison (φυλακαί, Wisd. xvii. 4), and in scourging them (Matt. x. 17), now in this synagogue, and now in that (ἐν τῇ τοῖς συναγωγαῖς, etc.).
⁸ Ver. 21.
⁹ Heinrichs.

Vv. 23. Ἀχρι τοῦτον τοῦ λόγου] namely, ver. 21, εἰς πρός με· πορείαν, οὗ εἰς έθνη μακρ. ἐξαποστ. σε. This expression inflamed the jealousy of the children of Abraham in their pride and contempt of the Gentiles, all the more that it appeared only to confirm the accusation in xxi. 28. It cannot therefore surprise us that the continuation of the speech was here rendered impossible, just as the speech of Stephen and that of Paul at the Areopagus was broken off on analogous occasions of offence, which Baur makes use of against its historical character. — οὐ γάρ καθήκεν κ.τ.λ.] for it was not fit that he should remain in life; he ought not to have been protected in his life, when we designed to put him to death.¹

Ver. 23. They cast off their clothes, and hurled dust in the air, as a symbol of throwing stones,—both as the signal of a rage ready and eager personally to execute the alpe ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς τοῦ τοιοῦτον! The objection of de Wette, that in fact Paul was in the power of the tribune, counts for nothing, as the gesture of the people was only a demonstration of their own vehement desire. Chrysostom took it, unsuitably as regards the sense and the words, of shaking out their garments—τὰ ἱματια ἐκτίμασσων καὶ πορευόμενον ἔβαλον· ὡστε χαλκωτέραν γενέσθαι τὴν σταίνον τούτο ποιήσαν, καὶ καὶ φοβήσαν βουλόμενοι τὸν ἄρχοντα. Wetstein, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Hackett, and others explain it of waving their garments, by which means those at a distance signified their assent to the murderous exclamations of those standing near; and the throwing of the dust at all was only signum tumultus. But the text contains nothing of a distinction between those standing near and those at a distance, and hence this view arbitrarily mutilates and weakens the unity and life of the scene. The μίστος. τ. ἱμάτ. is not to be explained from the waving of garments in Lucian;² but—in connection with the cry of extermination that had just gone before—from the laying aside of their garments with a view to the stoning,³ to which, as was well known, the Jews were much inclined.⁴

Ver. 24. It is unnecessarily assumed by Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and de Wette that the tribune did not understand the Hebrew address. But the tumult, only renewed and increased by it, appeared to him to presuppose some secret crime. He therefore orders the prisoner to be brought into the barracks, with the command κατὰ,⁵ to examine him by the application of scourging,⁶ in order to know on account of what offence they so shouted to him—to Paul.⁷—αἰνοὶ] for the crying and shouting were a hostile reply to him, 22, 23.¹ Bengel well remarks: "acclamare dicuntur auditores verba

PLEA OF ROMAN CITIZENSHIP.

Moreover, it was contrary to the Roman criminal law for the tribunal to begin the investigation with a view to bring out a confession by way of torture, 8 not to mention that here it was not a slave who was to be questioned. 9 As in the case of Jesus, 4 it was perhaps here also the contentment of the people that was intended. Comp. Chrysostom: ἀπλῶς τῇ ἔρωσε, χράται (the tribunal), καὶ ἐκεῖνος πρὸς χάριν τουτε... ὅπως παύετε τὸν ἐκείνων θυμὸν ἀδικών αὐτα.

Vv. 25–27. ὡς δὲ προτείνων αὐτῶν τοῖς μιᾶσ. But when they had stretched him before the thongs. Those who were to be scourged were bound and stretched on a stake. Thus they formed the object stretched out before the thongs, the scourge consisting of thongs. 9 Comp. Beza: "quum autem eum distendissent loris, caedendum." 9 The subject of προετρ. is those charged with the execution of the punishment, the Roman soldiers. Following Henry Stephanus, most expositors, among them Grotius, Homberg, Loesner, Heinrichs, Kunoel, Olshausen, take προτείνων as equivalent to προβάλλων (Zonaras: προτείνων· ἀντί τοῦ προτιδέασαι καὶ προβάλλοντα): cum loris cum abstulissent a tradidissent. But προτείνων never means simply tradere, but always to stretch before, to hold before, sometimes in the literal, sometimes in a figurative sense. But here the context, treating of a scourging, quite demands the entirely literal rendering. Others take τοῖς μιᾶσ instrumentally, of the thongs with which the delinquent was either merely bound, 8 or, along with that, was placed in a suspended position. 10 But in both cases not only would τοῖς μιᾶσ be a very unnecessary statement, but also the προ in προετρ. would be without reference; and scourging in a suspended position was not a usual, but an extraordinary and aggravated, mode of treatment, which would therefore necessarily have been here definitely noted. — εἰ ἄνθρ. Ρωμ. κ. ἀκατάκρ. κ. τ. λ.] See on xvi. 37. The problematic form of interrogation: whether, etc., 1 has here a dash of irony, from the sense of right so roughly wounded. The καὶ is: in addition thereto. Δυο τὰ ἐγκλήματα καὶ τὸ ἄνευ λόγου καὶ τὸ Ῥωμαίον οὗτο, Chrysostom. On the non-use of the right of citizenship at Philippi, see on xvi. 23. — Ver. 27. Thou art a Roman? A question of surprise, with the emphatic contemptuous σίν (v5).

Vv. 28, 29. Ἐγὼ πολλοῦ κεφαλ. κ. τ. λ.] The tribunal, to whom it was known that a native of Tarsus had not, as such, the right of citizenship, thinks that Paul must probably have come to it by purchase, and yet for this the arrested Cicilian appears to him too poor. With the sale of citizenship, it was sought at that time 11—by an often ridiculed abuse—to fill the imperial

1 Com. xii. 22; Luke xxii. 21; 3 Macc. 8 L. 1. D. 48. 18. [vii. 13. 9 L. 8. ibid. 4 John xix. 1. 8 Comp. bubali cobbili, Plant. Prin. iv. 3 4. 6 On ἀδικών of the leathern whip, comp. already Hom. L. xxiii. 353; Anthol. vi. 194; Artemidor. ii. 33. 7 For example, of the holding forth or offering of conditions, of a gain, of money, of the hand, of friendship, of a hope, of an enjoyment, and the like, also of pretexts. See Bornemann, Schol. in Luc. p. 181 f.; Valesiner, ad Calim. fragm. p. 224. lorter." 8 Comp. Vulg.: "cum adstrinuissent cum 9 Erasmus, Castalio, Calvin, de Dieu, Hammond, Bengel, Michaelis, also Luther. 10 Scaliger, Ep. ii. 146, p. 302. 11 Comp. on i. 6. 12 Dio Cass. ix. 17.
chest. — ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ γεγένημαι] But I am even so (καὶ) born, namely, as ἐφοβοῦσθον, so that my πολιτεία, as hereditary, is even γεγένημαι! a bold answer, which did not fail to make its impression. — καὶ ὁ χαλ. δὲ ἐφοβ.] and the tribune also was afraid. On καὶ . . . δὲ, atque etiam, see on John vi. 51. "Facinus est, vinciri civem Romanum; scelus, verberari; prope parricidium necari." And the binding had taken place with arbitrary violence before any examination. It is otherwise xxiv. 27, xxvi. 29. See on these two passages. Therefore δεδέκως, which evidently points to xxi. 38, is not to be referred, with Böttger to the binding with a view to scourging, on account of ver. 30; nor, with de Wette, is the statement of the fear of the tribune to be traced back to an error of the reporter, or at all to be removed by conjectural emendation. And that Paul was still bound after the hearing, was precisely after the hearing and after the occurrences in it in due order.—καὶ δὲν] dependent on ἐφοβ.: and because he was in the position of having bound him.

Ver. 30. Τὸ τί κατηγ. παρὰ τ. ίνδου.] is an epegegetic definition of τὸ ἀσφαλεῖας. The article, as in iv. 21. The τί is nominative.—ἐλονσεν αὐτῶν] Lysias did not immediately, when he learned the citizenship of Paul, order him to be loosed, but only on the following day, when he placed him before the chief priests and in general the whole Sanhedrin. This was quite the proceeding of a haughty consistency, according to which the Roman, notwithstanding the ἐφοβόθην, could not prevail upon himself to expose his mistake by an immediate release of the Jew. Enough, that he ordered them to refrain from the scourging not yet begun; the binding had at once taken place, and so he left him bound until the next day, when the publicity of the further proceedings no longer permitted it. Kuinoel's view, that ἐλονσεν refers to the releasing from the custodia militaris, in which the tribune had commanded the apostle to be placed, bound with a chain to a soldier, after the assurance that he was a Roman citizen, is an arbitrary idea forced on the text, as ἐλονσεν necessarily points back to δεδέκως, ver. 29, and this to xxi. 38.—καταγαγὼν] from the castle of Antonia down to the council-room of the Sanhedrin. Comp. xxiii. 10.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(τοῦ) Paul's defence. V. 1.

In this speech to the multitude, the apostle gives a skilfully arranged account of his past experience and conduct with the view of allaying the fanati-
cal excitement of many of the Jews, and of replying to their unfounded accusations against him. He avows himself to be a Jew, both by birth and training; refers to his former fierce persecutions of the Christians; gives an account of his wonderful and memorable conversion; explains how he was baptized and admitted into the fellowship of the disciples by a pious Jew, and refers to his labors among the Gentiles. Throughout the address, he depreciates himself, exalts Christ, and makes conversion to him an epoch in a man's life. It is interesting to note how the addresses delivered by Paul on this occasion, and when brought before Agrippa, differ from each other, and from the narrative given by Luke, and yet how they harmonize in all material points. The discrepancies in the several statements present no serious difficulties to any, except those who seek to find and multiply contradictions in Scripture. A careful consideration of the object which the apostle had in view in each of his addresses will furnish a natural explanation of the various changes in the narrative of the events. In the ninth chapter we have a historical outline of the main facts of the case, and in his speeches, the apostle, drawing upon his own distinct recollection of the facts, gives prominence to such aspects of the event as were best adapted to the emergency of the occasion. Henson remarks: "If indeed there were, in these instances"—the accounts of the conversion of Cornelius and of Paul—"mere reiteration in the speeches of Peter and Paul of narratives previously given, we should have no ground for casting any imputation on the authority of the Acts of the Apostles. But, in fact, there is much more than reiteration. The same story is told more than once, but so retold as to have in the retelling a distinct relation to the speaker and the audience." It is observable that in speaking to the Jews from the stairs of the castle, Paul not only uses the Hebrew dialect, but gives a Jewish coloring to the entire narrative; while, when addressing Agrippa and his associates in the royal hall, in keeping with the place and the parties, he gives the story a strong Gentile coloring, speaking of the hostility of the Jews, and of the persecuted Christians as saints.

(v2) *Art thou a Roman?* V. 27.

When the apostle in his address referred to his being sent to the Gentiles, the national pride of the Jews was wounded, and their intense bigotry aroused. With a wild and cruel fanaticism, they shouted, "Away with him, away with such a fellow from the earth; for it is not fit that he should live." "Thus began one of the most odious and despicable spectacles which the world can witness, the spectacle of an Oriental mob, hideous with impotent rage, howling, yelling, cursing, gnashing their teeth, flinging about their arms, waving and tossing their blue and red robes, casting dust into the air by handfuls, with all the furious gesticulations of an uncontrolled fanaticism." Paul was rescued from the maddened mob by Lysias, the chief captain, who, however, ordered him to be examined under the scourge. When bound and ready for the torture, Paul quietly asked whether it were lawful to scourge a Roman citizen. The centurion, to whom this question was addressed, hastened to inform and warn the commandant, who came immediately to Paul, and said to him, "Art thou a Roman?" as if the fact were almost incredible, and added, "The privilege of citizenship cost me much." To this Paul, with great dignity replied, "I
have been a citizen from my birth." By the Lex Porcia, Roman citizens were exempted from all degrading punishment, such as that of scourging. The words, *civis Romanus sum*, acted like a magical charm in disarming the violence of provincial magistrates. It was the heaviest of all the charges brought by Cicero against Verres, that he had violated the rights of citizenship. "Facinus est vincere civem Romanum, sclerus verberare, proper parricidium necare; quid dicam in crucem tollere?"—It is a crime to bind a Roman citizen; a heinous iniquity to scourge him; next to parricide to kill him; what shall I say to crucify him?—and further, "Whoever he might be whom you were hurrying to the cross, were he even unknown to you, if he but said he was a Roman citizen, he would necessarily obtain from you, the pretor, by the simplest mention of Rome, if not an escape, yet at least a delay of his punishment." According to the Roman law, it was death for any one falsely to assert a claim to the immunities of citizenship, one of which was exemption from the lash. "Lex porcia virgas ab omnium civium Romanorum corpore amovit"—The Porcian law removes the rod from the bodies of all Roman citizens. The claim of Paul was acknowledged. It is probable that in return for some important service rendered, or sum of money paid, Paul's father or grandfather had obtained this distinction, hence Paul received it by inheritance.
CHAPTER XXIII.

Ver. 6. ὑδός Φαρσαίων] approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born., according to A B C Θ, min. Syr. Vulg. Tert. But Elz. and Scholz have ὑδός Φαρσαίων. The sing. was inserted, because people thought only of the relation of the son to the father. — Ver. 7. λαλήσαντος] Lachm. reads εἰσάντος, only according to A E Θ, min. — τῶν Σαλδ.] The article is to be deleted with Lachm. Tisch. Born. on preponderating evidence. — Ver. 9. οἱ γραμματεῖς τοῦ μέρους τῶν Φαρσ.] A E, min. Copt. Vulg. have τινὲς τῶν Φαρσ.; so Lachm. But B C Θ, min. vs. and Fathers have τινὲς τῶν γραμματέων τοῦ μέρ. τ. Φαρσ.; so Born. Lastly, G H, min. Aeth. Oec. have γραμματεῖς τοῦ μέρ. τ. Φαρσ.; so Tisch. At all events, τινὲς is thus so strongly attested that it must be regarded as genuine. It was very easily passed over after ἀναστάσες. But with τινὲς the genitive τῶν γραμμάτων κ.τ.λ. originally went together, so that the omission of τινὲς drew after it the conversion of τῶν γραμμάτων into γραμματεῖς (Tisch.) and οἱ γραμματεῖς (Elz.). The reading of Lachm. is an abbreviation, either accidental (from homoeoteleuton) or intentional (from the deletion of the intervening words superfluous in themselves). We have accordingly, with Born., to read: τινὲς τῶν γραμμάτων τοῦ μέρ. τῶν Φαρσ.—After ἄγγελος Elz. has, against greatly preponderating testimony, μὴ θεοπλακῶν, which was already rejected by Erasm. and Mill as an addition from v. 39, and following Griesb., by all the more recent editors (except Reiche, l.c. p. 28). — Ver. 10. εὐλαβθείς] Preponderant witnesses have indeed φοβθείς, which Griesb. has recommended and Lachm. adopted; but how easily was the quite familiar word very early substituted for εὐλαβη, which does not elsewhere occur in that sense in the N. T.! — Ver. 11. After δόρων Elz. has Παντίκες, in opposition to A B C Θ, min. vs. Theophyl. Oec. Cassiod. Ambrosiast. An addition for the sake of completeness. Ver. 12. συντομοφών οἱ Ἰουδαῖ] Elz. Rinck read τινὲς τῶν Ἰουδαίων συντρ., in opposition to A B C Θ, min. Copt. Syr. p. Aeth. Arm Chrys. Occasioned by ver. 13. — Ver. 13. παρασῶνοι is to be read instead of παρασήκοτες, with Lachm. Tisch. Born., on decisive testimony. — Ver. 15. After ὅπως Elz. has ἀφίσιον. An addition from ver. 20, against decisive evidence. — πῶς ὑμᾶς] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read εἰς ὑμᾶς, following A B E Θ, løv. Sahid. Rightly; πῶς is the more usual. — Ver. 16. τὴν ἑνέδραν] B G H, min. Chrys. Theophyl. Oec. have τὸ ἑνέδρον, which Griesb. and Rinck have recommended, and Tisch. and Born. (not Lachm.) have adopted. But the preponderance of the Codd. is in favour of τὴν ἑνέδραν. The neuter was known to the transcribers from the LXX., therefore the two forms might easily be interchanged. — Ver. 20. μελέτοις] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read μελέτων, after A B E, min. Copt. Aeth. The very weakly attested Rec. is from ver. 15. Θ has μέλλων, Θ'' μελέτων. — Ver. 25. περίεχουσαν] Lachm. Born. read ἐχουσαν, according to B E Θ, min. Neglect of the (not essential) compound. — Ver. 27. αὐτῶν] is wanting in A B E Θ, min. Chrys. Oec. Deleted by Lachm. and Born. But how easily was the quite unessential word passed over! — Ver. 30. μελέτων ἑσοθα] Lachm. Born. have only ἑσοθα, according to
A B E Ν, min. But the future infinitive made μελέτειν appear as superfluous; there existed no reason for its being added. — After ἐκείνος. Elz. Scholz have ὁπρὸς τῷ ἰδιωτάτῳ, which is deleted according to preponderant evidence as a supplementary addition. Instead of it, Lachm and Born. have ἐξ αὐτῶν (with the omission of ἐξαιρήθη), following A B E Ν, min. vss. But ἐξ αὐτῶν is also to be regarded as a marginal supplement (as the originators of the ἐπιστολή are not mentioned), which therefore displaced the original ἐξαιρήθη. — The conclusion of the letter ἐλλογοσ is wanting in A B 13, Copt. Αευθ. Sahid. Vulg. ms. Deleted by Lachm. Tisch. Born.; and rightly, as it is evidently an addition from xv. 29, from which passage H, min. have even ἐρρωσθε.—Ver. 34. After ἀναγνώ. de Elz. has ὁ ἡγεόμενος, against decisive testimony. — Ver. 35. ἐκείνος τε] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read κελεύωσα, after A B E Ν* Ν* has κελεύωσαντος) min. Syr. p. The Recepta is a stylistic emendation.

Vv. 1, 2. Paul, with the free and firm look, ἄτενίσας τῷ συνεργ., in which his good conscience is reflected, commences an address in his own defence to the Sanhedrim, and that in such a way as—without any special testimony of respect1 for the sacred court, and with perfect freedom of apostolic self-reliance, which is recognisable in the simple ἀνάφλεξ ἀδελφοί—to appeal first of all to the pure self-consciousness of his working as consecrated to God. The proud and brutal2 high priest sees in this nothing but insolent presumption, and makes him be stopped by a blow on the mouth from the continuance of such discourse. — πάσας συνειδ. ἁγ.] with every good conscience, so that in every case I had a good conscience, i.e. agreeing with the divine will.3 — In the ἰγώ at the commencement is implied a moral self-consciousness of rectitude. — παπολυτεινα, τῷ Θεῷ] I have administered—and still administer, perfect—mine office for God, in the service of God;4 dative of destination. He thus designates his apostolic office in its relation to the divine polity of the church.5 — ὁ δὲ ἀργειρεῖς Ἀνανίας] Ver. 4 proves that this6 was the high priest actually discharging the duties of the office at the time. He was the son of Nebedaeus,7 the successor of Joseph the son of Camythus,8 and the predecessor of Ishmael the son of Phabi.9 He had been sent to Rome by Quadratus, the predecessor of Felix, to answer for himself before the Emperor Claudius;10 he must not, however, have thereby lost his office, but must have continued in it after his return.11 As ver. 4 permits for ὁ ἀρχερ. only the strict signification of the high priest performing the duties, and not that of one of the plurality of ἀρχερεῖς,12 and as the deposition of Ananias is a mere supposition, the opinion defended since the time of Lightfoot,13 by several more recent expositors, particularly Michaelis, Eichhorn, Kuinoel, Hildebrand, Hemsen, is to be rejected,—namely, that Ananias, deposed from the time of his suit at Rome, had at this time only

1 Comp. iv. 8, vll. 2.
2 Joseph. Ant. xx. 8 f. [xx. 19.
3 1 Tim. i. 5, 19; 1 Pet. iii. 16. Comp. on
4 Rom. i. 9.
5 See on Phil. i. 27.
6 See Krebs, Obs. Flavi. p. 244 ff.
7 Joseph. Ant. xx. 8 2. 8 Ant. xx. 3 5 2.
9 Ant. xx. 8 3 11.
10 Ant. xx. 6 2, Bell. ii. 12 6.
11 See Anger, de temp. rat. p. 98 ff.
temporarily administered (usurped) the office during an interregnum which took place between his successor Jonathan and the latter’s successor Ishmael. Against this view it is specially to be borne in mind, that the successor of Ananias was Ishmael, and not Jonathan, who had been at an earlier period high priest; 1 for in the alleged probative passages, 2 where the murder of the ἀρχιερεύς Jonathan is recorded, this ἀρχιερ. is to be taken in the well-known wider titular sense. Lastly, Basnage 3 quite arbitrarily holds that at this time Ishmael was already high priest, but was absent from the hastily (?) assembled Sanhedrin, and therefore was represented by the highly respected 4 Ananias. — τοῖς παροστ. αὐτῷ] to those who, as officers in attendance on the court, stood beside him, Luke xix. 24. — τίπτ. αὐτῷ τὸ στ. | to smite him on the mouth. 6

Ver. 3. The words contain truth freely expressed in righteous apostolic indignation, and require no excuse, but carry in themselves (καὶ σὺ κάθη κ.τ.λ.) their own justification. Yet here, in comparison with the calm meekness and self-renunciation of Jesus, 7 the ebullition of a vehement temperament is not to be mistaken. — τίπτειν σὲ μελλεῖ ὁ Θεὸς is not to be understood as an imprecation, 8 but—for which the categorical μελλεῖ is decisive—as a prophetic announcement of future certain retribution; although it would be arbitrary withal to assume that Paul must have been precisely aware of the destruction of Ananias as it afterwards in point of fact occurred—he was murdered in the Jewish war by sicarii. 9 — τοῖς κεκοινοῖς] figurative designation of the ἄσπορος, inasmuch as he, with his concealed wickedness, resembles a wall beautifully whitened without, but composed of rotten materials within. 10 — καὶ σὺ] thou too, even thou, who yet as high priest shouldest have administered thine office quite otherwise than at such variance with its nature. — χριστὸς] comprises the official capacity, in which the high priest sits there; hence it is not, with Kuinoel, to be taken in a future sense, nor, with Henry Stephanus, Pricaeus, and Valckenbaer, to be accepted χριστός. The classical παρανομεῖν, to act contrary to the law, is not elsewhere found in the N. T.

Vv. 4, 5. Παροστῶν] as in ver. 2. — τῶν ἀρχιερ. τ. Θεοῦ] the holy man, who is God’s organ and minister. — σὺν φίλιν κ.τ.λ.] I know not that he is high priest. It is absolutely incredible that Paul was really ignorant of this, as Chrysostom, 10 Oecumenius, Lyra, Beza, Clarus, Cornelius a Lapide, Calovius, Deyling, Wolf, Michaelis, Sepp, and others 11 assume under vari-

1 Joseph. Αντ. x. 11. 4. 3. 3.
2 Ant. xx. 8. 3. Bull. ii. 13. 3.
3 Ad an. 55, § 24.
4 Ant. xx. 9. 2.
5 Comp. as to the αὐτῶ placed first, on John ix. 15, xi. 32, al.
7 Cameraeus, Bolten, Kuinoel. Observe the prefixing of the ρητον, which returns the blow just received in a higher sense on the high priest. That the command of the high priest was not executed (Baumgarten, Trip), is an entirely arbitrary assump-
8 tion. Luke would have mentioned it, because otherwise the reader could not but understand the execution as having ensued.
10 See Seme. de provid. 26; Ep. 115; Suidas, Thes. ii. p. 144. Comp. Matt. xxiii. 27.
11 Rej. the ironic view, Chrysostom says: καὶ σφέδερα πυρείον, μὴ σφέδερα αὐτῶν, ὥσιν ἄρχιερεύς ἄστιν διὰ μακρὸν μὴ ἐπαραγεῖ αὐτὸν, μὴ συγκέχουσάν ὃς συνεχῶς Ἰδού δεῖ, ὃ ἔφασεν ἐν τῷ μισή μετὰ πολλῶν καὶ ἕτερων. [Trip.
12 Comp. also Ewald, Holtzmann, p. 234.
ous modifications. For, although after so long an absence from Jerusalem he might not have known the person of the high priest—whose office at that time frequently changed its occupants—by sight, yet he was much too familiar with the arrangements of the Sanhedrin not to have known the high priest by his very activity in directing it, by his seat, by his official dress, etc. The contrary would be only credible in the event of Ananias not having been the real high priest, or of a vacancy in the office having at that time taken place, or of such a vacancy having been erroneously assumed by the apostle, or of the sitting having been an irregular one, not at least superintended by the high priest, and perhaps not held in the usual council-chamber,—which, however, after xxii. 30, is the less to be assumed, seeing that the assembly, expressly commanded by the tribune, and at which he himself was present, was certainly opened in proper form, and was only afterwards thrown into confusion by the further sagacious conduct of the apostle, ver. 6 ff. Entirely in keeping, on the other hand, with the irritated frame of Paul, is the ironical mode of taking it, according to which he bitterly enough—and ἀδικεῖσθαι makes the irony only the more sharp—veils in these words the thought: “A man, who shows himself so unholy and vulgar, I could not at all regard as the high priest.”

Comp. Erasmus. What an appropriate and cutting defence against the reproach, ver. 4! It implies that he was obliged to regard an ἀρχιερέας, who had acted so unworthily, as an οἶκος ἀρχιερέας. Others, against linguistic usage, have endeavoured to alter the meaning of οἶκος Ἰωάννου, either: non agonoco, so, with various suggestions, Cyprian, Augustine, Beda, Pisca-tor, Lightfoot, Keuchen, and others, or non reputabam, so Simon Episcopius, Limborch, Wetstein, Bengel, Morus, Stolz, Kuinoel, Olshausen, and others, also Neander, so that Paul would thus confess that his conduct was rash. This confession would be a foolish one, inconsistent with the strong and clear mind of the apostle in a critical situation, and simply compromising him. Baumgarten has the correct view, but will not admit the irony. But this must be admitted, as Paul does not say οἶκος ἴων, or the like; and there exists a holy irony. Lange imports ideas into the passage, and twist it thus: “Just because it is written, Thou shalt not curse the ruler of thy people, and ye have cursed the high priest of our people, Christ, for that reason I knew not that this is a high priest.” Zeller understands the words, left by de Wette without definite explanation, as an actual untruth, which, however, is only put into the mouth of the apostle by the narrator. But such a fiction, which, according to the

1 But see on ver. 2.
2 This hypothesis cannot be accepted, as Paul had already been for so many days in Jerusalem; therefore the interpretation of Beelen: “Je ne savais pas, qu’il y eût un souverain Pontife,” is a very unfortunate expedient. ἀρχιερέας did not require the article any more than in John xviii. 13, xi. 49, 51.
3 Ver. 10.
4 τίμιος already in Chrysostom, further, Calvin, Camerarius, Lorus in Calovius, Marnixius, in Wolf, Thies, Heinrichs; comp. also Grotius.
5 Baur also, I. 237, ed. 2, recognizes the admissibility of no other view than the ironical; but even thus he sees in it an element of the unworthiness of the (fictitious) story.
6 2 Mac. iv. 13.
7 Comp. on vii. 18.
naked meaning of the words, would have put a *hie* into the mouth of the holy apostle, is least of all to be imputed to a *maker* of history. The *exceptionableness* of the expression helps to warrant the certainty of its *originality*. —γυροπαται γὰρ] gives the reason of our *ovik* ἤδειν. In consequence, namely, of the scriptural prohibition quoted, Paul would not have spoken *κακῶς* against the high priest, had not the case of the *ovik* ἤδειν occurred, by the conduct of the man. The passage itself is *Ex. xxii. 28*, closely after the LXX.: a *ruler of thy people thou shalt* 1 not *revile* = μακολογεῖν, *xix. 9*. The opposite: εὖ *eistin*, to praise, εὖ *λέγειν*. 2 The senarian metre in our passage is accidental 3 (w').

Vv. 6, 7. Whether the irony of ver. 5 was understood by the Sanhedrists or not, Paul at all events now knew that here a plain and straightforward defence, such as he had begun, 4 was quite out of place. With great presence of mind and prudence he forthwith resorts to a means—all the more effectual in the excited state of their minds—of bringing the two parties, well known to him in the council, into collision with one another, and thereby for the time disposing the more numerous party, that of the Pharisees, in favour of his person and cause. He did not certainly, from his knowledge of Pharisaism and from his previous experiences, conceive to himself the possibility of an actual "internal crisis" among the Pharisees; 5 but by the enlisting of their sectarian interests, and preventing their co-operation with the Sadducees, much was gained in the present position of affairs, especially in presence of the tribunal, for Paul and his work. —ἐν τῷ συνεδρ. 6] so that he thus did not direct this exclamation (ἐκραζεῖν) to any definite individuals. —ἐγὼ Φαρισ. εἰμι, νῦν Φαρισ. 7 i.e. I for my part *am a Pharisee, a born Pharisee*. The plural *Φαρισαῖον* refers to his male ancestors, father, grandfather, and perhaps still further back, not, as Grotius thinks, to his father and mother, as the mother here, where the *sect* was concerned, could not be taken into account. 8 We may add, that Paul's still affirming of himself the *Φαρισαῖον εἶναι* is as little untrue as Phil. iii. 5, in opposition to Zeller. He designates himself as a *Jew*, who, *as such*, belonged to no other than the religious society of the Pharisees; 9 and particularly in the doctrine of the resurrection, Paul, as a Christian, continued to defend the confession of the Pharisees, in opposition to all Sadduceeism, according to its truth confirmed in the case of Christ Himself. 10 His contending against the legal righteousness, hypocrisy, etc., of the Pharisees, and his consequent labouring in an anti-Pharisaical sense, were directed not against the *sect in itself*, but against its moral and other perversions. Designated a *Jew*, Paul still remained what he was from his birth, a *Pharisee*, and as such an *orthodox Jew*, in contrast to Sadducean naturalism. —περι ἑλπ. καὶ ἀναστ. νεκρ. ἐγὼ κριν.] on account of hope, etc.; *hope and—and indeed*, as regards its object—resurrection of the dead it is, on account of which I (ἐγὼ has the emphasis of the aroused consciousness of unjust treatment) am *called in question*. 11

---

1 Future, see on Matt. 1. 21.  
2 Hom. Od. i. 303; Xen. Mem. ii. 3. 8.  
3 Winer, p. 596 (E. T. 769).  
4 Ver. 1.  
5 It is otherwise with Phil. iii. 5, δὲ Ἐκρ.  
6 iv. 1 f.  
7 Comp. xxiv. 15, xxvi. 6-8.  
8 Baumgarten.
As the accusations contained in xxi. 28, ὁ νέος . . . διδάσκων, were nothing else than hateful perversions of the proposition: "This man preaches a new religion, which is to come in place of the Mosaic in its subsisting form;" and as in this new religion, in point of fact, everything according to its highest aim culminated in the hope of the Messianic salvation, which will be realized by the resurrection of the dead: so it follows that Paul has put the cause of the κρίνασαι in the form most suited to the critical condition of the moment, without altering the substance of the matter as it stood objectively.—στάσεις τῶν Φαρίσ. καὶ Σαδδ.] without repetition of τῶν (see the critical remarks): the Pharisees and Sadducees, the two parties conceived of together as the corporation of the Sanhedrin, became at variance, and the mass — the multitude of those assembled — was divided (xv).

Ver. 8. For the Sadducees, indeed, maintained, etc. — μὴ δὲ ἀγγελον μὴ τρίτη πνεύμα not even angel or spirit, generally. The μὴ τρίτη πνεύμα is logically subordinate to the μὴ δὲ ἀγγ., inasmuch as πνεύμα is conceived as being homogeneous with ἀγγελός; for ὁ ἀρμόδιος divides the objects named into two classes, namely (1) ἀνάστασις, and (2) ἀγγελός and πνεύμα. Hence μὴ δὲ before ἀγγελός is to be defended, and not, in opposition to Fritzsch, ad Marc. p. 158, and Lachmann, to be changed into μὴ τρίτη. In the certainly very important codd. which have μὴ τρίτη, this is to be viewed as a grammatical correction, originating from the very old error, which already Chrysostom has and Kuinoel still assumes: ἀρμόδιον . . . καὶ περὶ τρίτων λαμβάνεται. — The Sadducees denied — as materialists, perhaps holding the theory of emanations — that there were angels and spirit-beings, i.e. independent spiritual realities besides God. To this category of πνεύματα, denied by them, belonged also the spirits of the departed; for they held the soul to be a refined matter, which perished (συναφανίσκεται) with the body. But it is arbitrary, with Bengel, Kuinoel, and many others, to understand under πνεύμα anima defuncti exclusively. Reuss has a view running directly counter to the clear sense of the narrative.

Ver. 9. The designed stirring up of party-feeling proved so successful,
CONSPIRACY TO SLAY PAUL.
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that some scribes,\footnote{1} who belonged to the Pharisaic half of the Sanhedrim, rose up and not only maintained the innocence of Paul against the other party, but also, with bitter offensiveness towards the latter, added the question: But if a spirit has spoken to him, or an angel? The question is an aposiopesis,\footnote{8} indicating the critical position of the matter in the case supposed, without expressing it, quid vero, si, etc. We may imagine the words uttered with a Jesuitically-treacherous look and gesture toward the Sadducees, to whom the speakers leave the task of supplying in thought an answer to this dubious question. — πνεῦμα is not, with Calovius and others, to be taken of the Holy Spirit, but without more precise definition as: a spirit, quite as in ver. 8, where Luke by his gloss prepares us for ver. 9. — ηδήσθην giving him revelation concerning the ἑλπις and ἀνάστασις, ver. 6. A reference precisely to the narrative, which Paul had given of his conversion at xxii. 6 ff., is not indicated.

Ver. 10. Μη διασωθῇ] that he might be torn in pieces.\footnote{6} The tribune saw the two parties so inflamed, that he feared lest they on both sides should seize on Paul — the one to maltreat him, and the other to take him into their protection against their opponents — and thus he might at length even be torn in pieces, as a sacrifice to their mutual fury! — ινελ. τὸ στρατ. καταβ. κ.τ.λ. he ordered the soldiers to come down from the Antonia, and to draw him away from the midst of them. The reading καταβομαι καὶ is a correct resolution of the participial construction.\footnote{4}

Vv. 11–14. Whether the appearance of Christ encouraging Paul to further stedfastness was a vision in a dream, or a vision in a waking state, perhaps in an ecstasy, cannot be determined, in opposition to Olshausen, who holds the latter as decided\footnote{6} (τά). — εἰς Ἰερον. and εἰς Πόμ. The preacher coming from without preaches into the city.\footnote{8} Observe also, that Jerusalem and Rome are the capitals of the world, of the East and West. But a further advance, into Spain, were it otherwise demonstrable, would not be excluded by the intimation in this passage, since it fixes no terminus ad quem.\footnote{13} — Ver. 12. συντηροῦν a combination,\footnote{6} afterwards still more precisely described by συμποιοεῖν, a conspiracy. That the conspirators were zealots and sicarii, perhaps instigated by Ananias himself, concerning whom, however, it is not demonstrable that he was himself a Sadducee, as Kuinoel thinks, is not to be maintained. Certainly those Asiatics in xxii. 27 were concerned in it. — οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι the Jews, as the opposition. This general statement is afterwards more precisely limited, ver. 13. — ἀνέβημε. εἰναυτοῖς]

ly quite blind vehemence of passion, when suddenly and unexpectedly aroused, in parties whose mutual relations are strained. As this vehemence, particularly in the presence of the tribune, before whom the sore point of honour was touched, might easily overstep the boundaries of discretion and prudence; so might the prudent concert for a joint accusation subsequently take place, when the fit of passion was over. Comp. also Baumgarten, II. p. 197 f.

\footnote{1} "Os partis susa," Bengel.
\footnote{2} Comp. on John vi. 53; Rom. ix. 33.
\footnote{3} Comp. Symm., 1 Sam. xv. 35; Herod. iii. 13; Dem. 136. 15; Lucian, Asia. 22.
\footnote{4} See Hermann, ad Vig. p. 774.
\footnote{5} See on xvi. 9.
\footnote{6} Comp. Mark xiv. 9. See on Mark i. 30, also on ix. 28, xxvi. 20.
\footnote{7} In opposition to Otto, Pastorator. p. 171.
\footnote{8} xix 49; 1 Macc. xiv. 44; Polyb. iv. 24. 6.
they cursed themselves, pronounced on themselves, in the event of transgression, the OY, the curse of divine wrath and divine rejection, declaring that they would neither eat nor drink until, etc. See on similar self-imprecations, which, in the event of the matter being frustrated, without the person's own fault, could be removed by the Rabbins, Lightfoot in loc., Selden. — εἰς] with the subjunctive, because the matter is contemplated directly, and without ἀν. — Ver. 14. τοῖς ἀρχ. κ. τ. προεβ. That they applied to the Sadducean Sanhedrists, is evident of itself from what goes before. — ἀναθήματος. ἀναθηματικός.] Winer, p. 434 (E. T. 584).

Ver. 15. Τυμία] answering to the subsequent ἴμείς δὲ. Thus they arrange the parts they were to play. — σὺν τῷ συνεδρίῳ] non seu soli, sed una cum collegis vestris, of whom doubtless the Pharisees were not to be allowed to know the murderous plot, quorum majori significatiun si tauroritas. Grotius. — δι' ως αὐτοῦ κ. τ. λ.] design of the εἰμφανισάτε τ. χλ. From this also it follows what they were to notify, namely, that they wished the business of Paul to be more exactly taken cognisance of in the Sanhedrim than had already been done. — τοῦ ἀνωτ. αὐτ.] The design of ἔτοιμοι ἐγκυρ. — πρὸ τοῦ ἐγκύρων αὐτ.] so that you shall have nothing at all to do with him.

Vv. 16–20. Whether the nephew of Paul was resident in Jerusalem; whether, possibly, the whole family may have already, in the youth of the apostle, been transferred to Jerusalem, as Ewald conjectures, cannot be determined (ζ'). — παραγεν.] belongs to the vivid minuteness with which the whole history is set forth. — Ver. 18. The centurion on military duty, without taking further part in the matter, simply fulfils what Paul has asked. — οἱ δὲ οἱ Παῦλος] he is now, as a Roman citizen, to be conceived in custodia militaris. — Ver. 19. ἐπιλαβ. δὲ τῆς χειρ.] "ut fiduciam adolescentis confirmaret," Bengel. — ἀναρχω. καί ἵδιαυ] in order to hold a private conversation with him, he withdrew, with him, without the addition of a third person, perhaps to a special audience-chamber. — Ver. 20. οὗ] recitative. — αὐτοθεν] have made an agreement to request thee. — ὡς καὶ.] i.e. under the pretext, as if they would.

Vv. 21, 22. And now they are in readiness to put into execution the αὐνελείαν αὐτοῦ, expecting that on thy part the promise, to have Paul brought on the morrow to the Sanhedrim, will take place. — ἔπαγγελμα is neither iudicium nor nuntius, but, according to its constant meaning in the N. T., promissio. — ἐκλαλ.] he commanded to tell it, to divulge it, to no one. — ἐνεπ. πρὸς με] Oratio variata. See on i. 4.

Ver. 23. Αἶνοι τις] some two; see on xix. 14. It leaves the exact num-
ber in uncertainty. — So considerable a force was ordered, in order to secure against any possible contingency of a further attempt. — στρατιώτατον] is, on account of the succeeding ἵππους, to be understood of the usual Roman infantry; mîtes gravis armaturae, distinguished also from the peculiar kind of light infantry afterwards mentioned as δεξιόλαβος. — δεξιόλαβος] a word entirely strange to ancient Greek, perhaps at that time only current colloquially, and not finding its way into the written language. It first occurs in Theophylactus Simocatta, and then again in the tenth century. At all events, it must denote some kind of force under the command of the tribune, and that a light-armed infantry, as the δεξιολ. are distinguished both from the cavalry and from the στρατιώτες. That they were infantry, their great number also proves. It is safest to regard them as a peculiar kind of the light troops called ravarii or velites, and that either as jactatores, javelin-throwers, or funditores, slingers, for in Constant. Porphyry, they are expressly distinguished from the sagittarii, or bowmen, and from the targeters, the peltae, or cetrati. Detailed grounds are wanting for a more definite decision. The name δεξιολ., those who grasp with the right hand, is very naturally explained from their kind of weapon, which was restricted in its use to the right hand, it was otherwise with the heavy-armed troops, and also with the bowmen and peltastae. This word has frequently been explained halberdiers, life guardsmen, who protect the right side of the commander, to which, perhaps, the translation of the Vulgate: lancearios, from the spear which the halberdiers carried, is to be referred. Already the Coptic and Syriac p. translate stiptores. Meursius, on the other hand: military lictors. But even apart from the passages of Theophyl. Simocatta, and Constant. Porphyry, of whom the latter particularly mentions the δεξιολ. alongside of the purely light-armed soldiers, and indeed alongside of mere ordinary soldiers: the great number of them is decisive against both views. For that the commander of a cohort should have had a body-guard, of which he could furnish two hundred men for the escort of a prisoner, is just as improbable, as that he should have had as many lictors at his disposal. On the whole, then, the reading δεξιοβάλλον in A, approved by Grotius and Valckenaer, is to be considered as a correct

1 Krüger, § 11. 16. 4.
2 οἱ δὲ λεγόμενοι τῷ παραφίλεχου τῇ καταφερίστῃ τὸν παραφίλεχον μετά τόν υποπλοκέντην εἰναὶ ἵπποιν. Συνεικεὶ δὲ τοιοῦτον ἡμέραν τὴν ἱππίτην ὑπ' ἰσούντων στρατεύσεις τοξοτοφόρους παραφιλικοὺς, καὶ πελταστὰς τρακτοσιούς, καὶ δεξιολάβους ἱππίτου.
3 οἱ δὲ λεγόμενοι τῷ παραφίλεχου τῷ στρατεύομεντος ἱππεῖν. Συνεικεὶ δὲ τοιοῦτον ἡμέραν τὴν ἱππίτην ὑπ' ἰσούντων στρατεύσεις τοξοτοφόρους παραφιλικοὺς, καὶ πελταστὰς τρακτοσιούς, καὶ δεξιολάβους ἱππίτου.
4 See Liv. xxxi. 25.
5 Ewald, p. 577, now explains it from λαθά, grasp of the sword; holding that they were spiculatorum cum lanceis (Sueton. Claud. 33); and that they carried their sword, not on the left, but on the right. But we do not see why this was necessary for the sake of using their spears by the right hand. The sword on the left side would, indeed, have been least a hindrance to them in the use of the spear. Earlier, Ewald took them to be slingers.
6 Following Suidas: παραφιλικαὶ.
7 Syr. jactantes dextra; Ep. jactatores.
interpretation, whether they be understood to be javelin-throwers or slingers. — ἀπὸ τρίτης ὥρας τῆς νυκτὸς [from this time, about nine in the evening, they were to have this force in readiness, because the convoy was to start, for the sake of the greatest possible security from the Jews, at the time of darkness and of the first sleep.

Ver. 24. Κτήνη τε παραστήγου] still depends on εἰπέω, ver. 23. The speech passes from the direct to the indirect form. — κτήνη] saecinaria jumenta. Whether they were asses or pack-horses, cannot be determined. Their destination was: that they, the centurions to whom the command was given, should make Paul mount on them, and so bring him uninjured to Felix the procurator. The plural number of the animals is not, with Kuinoel, to be explained "in usum Pauli et militiae iuvenis custodia," but, as iva εἰπέω. τ. Παύλ. requires, only in usum Pauli, for whom, as the convoy admitted of no halt, one or other of the κτήνες was to accompany it as a reserve, in order to be used by him in case of need. — On Felix, the freedman of Claudius—by his third wife son-in-law of Agrippa I. and brother-in-law of Agrippi II., and brother of Pallas the favourite of Nero,—that worthless person, who "per omnem saevitiam ac libidinem jus regium servili ingenio in Judaea provincia exercuit," and after his procuratorship was accused to Nero by the Jews of Caesarea, but was acquitted through the intercession of Pallas, see Walch. 6

Vv. 25, 26. Γράφως] adds to εἰπέω, ver. 23, a contemporaneous accompanying action. Such passports, given with transported prisoners, were called at a later period, in the Cod. Theodos., elogia. — περὶ Χ. τ. τίπον τούτ.] which contained the following form; τίπος, the same as τρόπος, elsewhere, corresponds entirely to the Latin exemplum, the literal form, the verbal contents of a letter. — The lie in ver. 27 is a proof that in what follows the literal expression is authentically contained; therefore there is no reason, with Olshausen, to regard the letter as a literary production of Luke. A documentary source, it is true, from which the verbal form came to him, cannot be specified, although possibilities of this nature may well be imagined.—τῷ κρατίατῳ] See on Luke, Intro., § 3. 10

Vv. 27—30. 11 συλλέξας.] without the article: after he had been seized. Observe, that Lysias uses not τὸν ἀνθρώπον, but with a certain respect, and that not only for the Roman citizen, but also for the person of his prisoner, τ. ἀνδρα. — ἐξειλάμην αὐτὸν, μαθὼν ὑπὶ Ἠρω. ἑστ.] contains a cunning falsification of the state of the facts; 12 for ver. 28 comp. with xxii. 80 proves that the tribune did not mean the second rescue of the apostle, xxii. 10. Therefore the remark of Grotius is entirely mistaken, that μαθὼν denotes "nul-
lum certum tempus” but merely καὶ μαθὼν generally; and so is Beza’s proposal to put a stop after αὐτόν, and then to read: μαθὼν δὲ δὲ τι κ.τ.λ. — αὐτόν. — Ver. 30. μεταδίδεις . . . ἔσσεθαι] The hurried letter-writer has mixed up two constructions: (1) μεταδίδεις δὲ με ἐπιβολῆς τῆς μελλόσος ἔσσεθαι, and (2) μεταδίδεινος δὲ με ἐπιβολῶν μέλλειν ἔσσεθαι. Similar blendings are also found in the classics. As to the import of μνίσειν, see on Luke xx. 37.

Vv. 31–34. Antipatris, on the road from Jerusalem to Caesarea, built by Herod I., and named after his father Antipater, was 26 miles, thus 5½ geographical miles, distant from Caesarea. — διὰ τῆς νυκτὸς] as in xvii. 10. Inexact statement a poliori; for, considering the great distance between Jerusalem and Antipatris, about 8 geographical miles, and as they did not set out from Jerusalem before nine in the evening, besides the night a part of the following forenoon must have been spent on the journey to Antipatris, which must, moreover, be conceived of as a very hurried one; yet the following night is not, with Kuinoel, to be included. — Ver. 32. ἐὰν αὐτῆς κ.τ.λ.] thus from their own foresight, because such a strong force was unnecessary at the distance which they had reached, and might be required in case of an uproar at Jerusalem, not according to the literal command of the tribune, ver. 28. — τοῦτο ἰππαῖ] not also the δεξιολάβος, whom they took back with them, as may be concluded from their not being mentioned. — Ver. 33. αἰτηθεὶς] “ad remotius nomen, secus atque expectaveris refertur.” — καὶ τ. Παύλ.] simul et Paulum. — Ver. 34. Felix makes only a preliminary personal inquiry, but one necessary for the treatment of the cause and of the man, on a point on which the elogium contained no information. — ποια is qualitative: from what kind of province. Cilicia was an imperial province.

Ver. 35. Διακοσμοῦμαι] denotes the full and exact hearing, in contrast to what was now held as merely preliminary. — τὸ πραιτόριον τοῦ Ἰερ.] was the name given to the palace which Herod the Great had formerly built for himself, and which now served as the residence of the procurators. From our passage it follows that the place, in which Paul was temporarily kept in custody, was no common prison, but was within the praetorium. The determination of the manner of the custodia reorum depended on the procurator, and the favorable elogium might have its influence in this respect.

1 Nor does it mean, as Otto suggests: “on which occasion (in consequence of which) I learned.” The Valgate, Krasmus, and Calvin correctly render: cognito, comp. Phil. H. 19. Beza also correctly renders by ecodon, with the remark: “Dissimulat ergo tribunis id, de quo reprehendit juræ potissimum.” Castalio anticipated the misinterpretation of Gro- tius and Otto: “eripit ac Romanum esse dididit.” And so also Luther. The μαθὼν ἐν κ.τ.λ. is nothing else than ἐπιγραφῆς ἐν "Pom- pāsio" Χ. Χ. x. 20. Comp. xvi. 28.

2 Compare on this resumption after a long intervening sentence, Plat. Rep. p 368 A; and see, moreover, Matthiae, § 472; Winer, p. 139 f. (E. T. 184.)

3 Comp. Polyaen. ii. 14 1.

4 See Grotius in loc.; Frizache, Conjectur. I. p. 89 f.; Winer, p. 596 (E. T. 710.)

5 Bornemann, ad Xen. Anab. iv. 4. 18.

6 See Robinson, III. p. 357 f.; Ritter, Zv. 22.

7 Ver. 35.

8 Against ver. 23.


10 Xen. Oec. 11. 1. Cyrop. iv. 4. 1; Polyb. iii. 15. 4; Dorvill. ad Char. p. 670.

11 v. 18.

12 L. 1, D. xlvii. 3.
NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(w*) I did not know that he is the high priest. V. 5.

Scarcely had the apostle commenced his defense before the Jewish council, when Ananias, the high priest, in a spirit of injustice and brutality which characterized his general conduct, ordered him to be smitten on the mouth. "Stung by an insult so flagrant, an outrage so undeserved, the naturally choleric temperament of Paul flamed into that sudden sense of anger, which ought to be controlled, but which can hardly be wanting in a truly noble character." And he exclaimed, "God shall smite thee, thou whitened wall." His attention being directed, by some one standing by, to his severe utterance, he immediately "apologized with exquisite urbanity and self-control." Meyer thinks the apostle's reply was ironical; but this seems inconsistent with the character of the apostle, and the appeal to Scripture would in that state of mind be akin to irreverence. Numerous other explanations have been offered, the most satisfactory, though not free from objections, is that given by Bengel, Neander, Hackett, Schaff, Hoursen and others; which supposes that Paul meant that he did not recollect or consider that it was the high priest whom he was addressing. Gloag also approves, generally, of this solution. Farrar suggests that "in a crowded assembly he had not noticed who the speaker was. Owing to his weakened sight, all that he saw before him was a blurred white figure, issuing a brutal order, and to this person, who, in his external whiteness and inward worthlessness, thus reminded him of the plastered wall of a sepulchre, he had addressed his indignant denunciation. That he should retract it, on learning the hallowed position of the delinquent, was in accordance with that high breeding of the perfect gentleman, which in all his demeanor he habitually displayed." This is the view which Alford, though not entirely satisfied with it, prefers. We concur with Taylor, who adopts this view, that Paul did not know what person had given the command to smite him, and adds, "If I am asked for an explanation of this ignorance of Paul, I find it in one or other of three suppositions: either the high priest did not wear the official robes by which he was usually distinguished; or he was not at that time president of the council; or, more simply still, the near-sightedness of the apostle prevented him from recognizing the official dignity of the man who spoke so roughly." After discussing at length the various hypotheses concerning the meaning of the words used by Paul, Eadie comes to the conclusion: "that the apostle had not the knowledge present to his mind that it was the high-priest whom he was addressing. He does not formally apologize, but perhaps he intimates that the words might have been differently couched, that he might have uttered the malediction more solemnly, and with less of personal feeling mingled up with it. Nor does he retract it, though he may regret that it did fall upon a successor of Aaron."

(x*) Pharisees and Sadducees. V. 7.

The apostle, perceiving from the interruption which had already taken place, that all hope of a full hearing or fair treatment was vain, with commendable policy threw an apple of discord into the council. He knew that
the council was composed of Pharisees—with whom he held many things in common, such as the resurrection of the dead, the coming of the kingdom of God, the advent of the Messiah, and the intercourse of God with men, by means of angels, visions, and dreams—and of Sadducees, who denied all these doctrines and the idea of the supernatural generally. Therefore he said, "I am a Pharisee, and am being judged about the hope of the resurrection." The two parties, which had long entertained toward each other an internecine enmity, now disagreed, and the strife became so violent that the apostle's life was again in jeopardy; but the chief captain interfered, and rescued him out of their hands. Josephus says: "The Pharisees are those who are esteemed most skilful in the exact explication of their laws. These ascribe all to fate and to God, and yet allow that to act what is right, or the contrary, is principally in the power of men. They say that all souls are incorruptible, but that the souls of good men only are removed into other bodies, but that the souls of bad men are subject to eternal punishment. The Sadducees take away fate entirely, and suppose that God is not concerned in our doing or not doing what is evil, and they say that to act what is good or what is evil is at men's own choice. They also take away the belief of the immortal duration of the soul, and the punishment and reward in Hades."

Some, as Farrar, question the propriety of the course pursued by Paul at this crisis. But Alford justly says, "Surely no defence of Paul for adopting this course is required, but all admiration is due to his skill and presence of mind." Thomas writes: "Do not get a wrong impression of Paul's policy. Though we have seen him on various occasions displaying great accommodativeness—now taking part in a Nazarite's vow, in order to disarm the unreasoning hostility of his countrymen; now putting forward all the considerations which truth would authorize, in order to conciliate the mind of his Jewish audiences; now availing himself of his Roman citizenship, in order to avoid the infliction of a cruel and unjust torture; and now, in the case before us, taking advantage of the doctrine that divided his judges, in order to avoid their verdict of condemnation—in none of these strokes of policy is there the slightest approach to the disingenuous, the evasive, the shifting. In all there is an unbending honesty and an invincible courage."

("a") The Lord stood by him. V. 11.

We have in the Acts the record of three such experiences in the life of Paul, after the Lord Jesus was seen of him on his way to Damascus. One in Corinth, when he was "in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling;" one on board the vessel during a long severe storm at sea; and another in the present instance. On this passage Alford has the following excellent remarks: "By these few words, the Lord assured him of a safe issue from his present troubles, of an accomplishment of his intention of visiting Rome, of the certainty that he should preach the gospel and bear testimony there. So that they upheld and comforted him in the uncertainty of his life from the Jews, in the uncertainty of his liberation from prison at Caesarea, in the uncertainty of his surviving the storm in the Mediterranean, in the uncertainty of his fate on arriving at Rome. So may one crumb of divine grace and help be multiplied to feed five thousand wants and anxieties." Jacobus says on this verse: "It was a personal appearing of our Lord to Paul, not in a dream, but in an
apparition, in which he was seen by Paul, as standing beside him, and was heard as addressing him." *Alexander* says: "Standing by, or over, him, perhaps as he lay upon his bed, though not necessarily in a dream, but rather in a waking vision." He regards this divine message to Paul as an unqualified approval of the course he had been led to take before the council. In this opinion *Barnes* concurs: "The appearance of our Lord in this case was a proof that he approved the course which Paul had taken before the Sanhedrin."

(*a*) *Paul's sister's son.* V. 16.

This is the only direct reference in Scripture to Paul's family. It is uncertain whether Paul's sister resided in Jerusalem, or whether the young man may have come up to Jerusalem with Paul, or had been sent thither for his education, as his uncle was before him. We know not even whether the act of kindness was prompted merely by natural affection, or by Christian sympathy as well. All that we know is that this obscure youth, probably only a lad, rendered to his celebrated uncle a very important service, the mention of which has immortalized his memory.
CHAPTER XXIV.

VXX. 1. τῶν προεδρ.] Lachm. and Born. read προεδρ. τῶν, according to A B E ἅ, min. Sahid. Arm. Sahid. Arm. Syr. p. Vulg. Theophyl. τῶν was written on the margin as a gloss (see the exegetical remarks). — Ver. 3. κατορθωμάτων] Lachm. and Born. (following A B E ἅ) read διορθωμάτων, which already Griesb. recommended. Neither occurs elsewhere in the N. T. The decision is given by the preponderance of evidence in favour of διορθώμ., which, besides, is the less usual word. — Ver. 5. στάσιν] A B E ἅ, min. Copt. Vulg. Chrys. Theophyl. Oec. have στάσεις. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Born. And rightly; στάσιν was easily enough occasioned by the writing of στάσεις instead of στάσεις (comp. ἅ). — Vv. 6-8. From καὶ κατά to ἐπὶ σε is wanting in A B G H ἅ, min. vss. Beda. And there are many variations in detail. Condemned by Mill, Beng., Griesb., and deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. Rightly; it is a completion of the narrative of the orator. Had the words been original (Matth. and Born. defend them), no reason can be assigned for their omission. For κατὰ τ. ἑμετ., τῷ ἡσαλ. κρίνειν in the mouth of the advocate who speaks in the name of his clients could be as little offensive as the preceding ἐκπατήσαμεν; and the indirect complaint against Lysias, ver. 7, was very natural in the relation of the Jews to this tribune, who had twice protected Paul against them. But even assuming that this complaint had really caused offence to the transcribers, it would have occasioned the omission of the passage merely from παρελθὼν, not from καὶ κατά. — Ver. 9. συνεπιθέντο] is decidedly attested, in opposition to the Ρεχερτά συνεθέντο. — Ver. 10. εἰσιθαμάτων] A B E ἅ, min. Vulg. Ath. have εἰσώρισε. Approved by Griesb., following Mill and Bengel; adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. But how much easier it is to assume that the reference of the comparative remained unrecognised, than that it should have been added by a reflection of the transcribers! — Ver. 11. εἰς Ἰερούσαλ. I Lachm. Tisch. Born. have, and also Griesb. approved, εἰς Ἰερούσαλ., according to A B E ἅ, min. This weight of evidence is decisive, as according to the difference in the relation either preposition might be used. Ver. 12. εἰσίστασαι] Lachm. reads εἰποστασιν, according to A B E ἅ, min. A transcriber’s error. — Ver. 13. After δύνανται Lachm. and Born. have σου, according to A B E ἅ, min., and several vss. Some have it before δύν. ; others have, also before δύν., sometimes μοι and sometimes με (so Mill and Matth.). Various supplementary additions. — Ver. 14. τοῖς εἰς τοῖς] Elz. has merely εἰς τοῖς. But against this the witnesses are decisive, which have either τοῖς εἰς τοῖς (so Griesb., Scholz, and others) or simply τοῖς (so Lachm. Tisch. Born., following Matth.). If τοῖς εἰς τοῖς were original (so ἅ), then it is easy to explain how the other two readings might have originated through copyists—in the first instance, by oversight, the simple τοῖς (A G H ἅ vss. Theophyl. Oec.), and then by way of explanation εἰς τοῖς (B). If, on the other hand, τοῖς were original, then indeed the resolution of the dative construction of the passive by εἰς might easily come into the text, but there would be no reason for the addition of τοῖς before εἰς. — Ver. 15. After
CHAP. XXIV., 1-3.

ἐόσθαι. Elz. Scholz have νεκρῶν which, in deference to very important evidence, was suspected by Griesb. and deleted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. A supplementary addition. — Ver. 16. καὶ αὐτῶν] so A B C E G Μ, min. vss. Approved by Griesb., and adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. But Elz. Scholz have δὲ αὐτῶ. The reference of καὶ was not understood, and therefore sometimes δὲ, sometimes δὲ καὶ was put. — Ver. 18. ἐν αἰτὶ Α B C E Μ, min. have ἐν αἰτί, which Griesb. recommended, and Lachm., Scholz, Born. adopted. But the fem., in spite of the preponderance of its attestation, betrays its having originated through the preceding προσφυγῆς. — τιν ἔδει Elz. has merely τιν ἔδει, against decisive testimony. The δὲ was perplexing. — Ver. 19. ἔδει] B G H, min. Sahid. Ath. Slav. Chrys. 1, Oec. have ἔδει. Recommended by Griesb., and adopted by Beng. and Matth. But ἔδει is preponderantly attested by A C E Μ, min. Syr. utr. Copt. Vulg. Chrys. 1, Theoph., and is much more delicate and suitable to the demanding ἔδει. — Ver. 20. τι] Elz. has εἰ τι, against decisive witnesses. From ver. 19. — Ver. 22. ἀνεβαίνει, δὲ αὐτὸν. Ὁ Φῖλιππι] Adopted, according to decisive testimony, by Griesb. and all modern critics except Matth. But Elz. has ἀκοινοῦσα δὲ ταῦτα ὁ Φ., ἀνεβάλει, αὐτῶν, which Rinck defends. An amplifying gloss. — Ver. 23. αὐτῶν] Elz. has τὸν Παῦλου, against decisive attestation. — Ἢς προσφυγῆς] wanting in A B C E Μ, min., and several vss.; amplifying addition, perhaps after x. 28. — Ver. 24. After τῇ γυναικί Elz. has αὐτῶν, and Lachm. : τῇ ἱδιᾳ γυναικί. The critical witnesses are much divided between these three readings; indeed several, like Α, have even ἴδια and αὐτῶν. But in view of this diversity, both ἴδια and φυτῶν appear as additions, in order to fix the meaning eνηγιζ on τῇ γυναικι. — After Χριστῶν B Ε G Μ* min. Chrys. and several vss. have Ἰσραήλ, which Rinck has approved, and Lachm., Scholz, Born. adopted. A frequent addition, which some vss. have before Χριστῶν. — Ver. 25. τοῦ μελλόντος κρίματος] τοῦ κρίματος τοῦ μελλόντος (Lachm. Tisch. Born.) is preponderantly attested, and therefore to be adopted. So also Elz., which, however, adds ἐστοβα (deleted by Scholz); and Tisch. has again inserted it, following G H min. and some Fathers. The word, just as being in itself quite superfluous, would have to be received, if it were more strongly attested. — Ver. 26. After Παῦλος Elz. has ὅπως λίσσα αὐτῶν, against preponderating testimony. A gloss. — 27. χάριτα] Lachm. and Born. read χάριτα, according to A B C Μ* and some min.; E G Μ** min. have χάριν. Thus for χάρις there remains only a very weak attestation (H, min. and some Fathers; no vss.). The best attested reading, χάριν, is the more to be adopted, as this accusative form, not elsewhere used in the N. T. (although to be read also in Jude 4), could not but occasion offence.

Ver. 1. Μετὰ δὲ πέντε ἡμερ.] The point of commencement is not to be reckoned, with Cajetanus, Basnage, Michaelis, Stolz, Rosenmüller, Morus, Hildebrand, as the arrest of Paul in Jerusalem,—an opinion which has arisen from an erroneous computation of the twelve days in ver. 11,—nor yet with Calovius, Wetstein, and others, as the arrival of Paul at Caesarea, but as his departure for Caesarea. We may add that the popular mode of expression does not necessarily denote that the fifth day had already elapsed, but may just as well denote on the fifth day.¹ That the latter view is to be assumed here, see on ver. 11. — ἐκαὶ τῶν πρεσβευ.] of course, not the whole

¹ See on ver. 11.
² Comp. Matt. xxvii. 63, and see on Matt. xii. 40.
Paul accused by Tertullus.

Sanhedrists, but deputies who represented the council. It is obvious, withal, that the two parties in the Sanhedrin, after the variance temporarily aroused between them,¹¹ had in the interval betheought themselves of the matter, and united against the common enemy, in order to avert his eventual acquittal by the Roman authority.—Tertullus, a common Roman name,¹² was an orator forensis,¹³ a public causidicus. Such speakers, who were very numerous in Rome and in the provinces, bore the classical name of the public orators: ἀρχήν, in the older Greek συνήγορος,¹⁴ the advocates of the accusers. —ἐνεργ. τι ἢ γ. κατὰ τοῦ Π. | they laid information before the procurator against Paul. That this took place in writing, by a libel of accusation,¹⁵ is not affirmed by the text, which, by κατῆκε and the κληρονομὸς δὲ αὐτοῦ immediately following, does not point to more than oral accusation.¹⁶ The reciprocal rendering, comparuerunt,¹⁷ is an unnecessary deviation from the usage in the N. T., xxiii., 15, 22, xxv. 2, 15; John xiv. 21 f.; Heb. xi. 14, and elsewhere also not capable of being made good.¹⁸

(Vv. 2, 3. After the accusation brought against Paul the accused is summoned to appear, and now Tertullus commences the address of accusation itself, and that, after the manner of orators,¹⁹ with a captatio benevolentiae, yet basely flattering, to the judge. — The speech, embellished with rhetorical elegance, is to be rendered thus: As we are partaking, continuously, of much peace through thee, and as improvements have taken place for these people on all sides and in all places through thy care, we acknowledge it, most excellent Felix, with all thanksgiving. Observe here, (1) that the orator with πολλῆς εἰρήνης κ.τ.λ. praises Felix as pacator provinciarum, which it was a peculiar glory of procurators to be;¹¹ (2) that the object of ἀποδεξήμεθα is evident of itself from what precedes; (3) that πάντη τε καὶ πανταχοῦ is not to be referred, as usually, to ἀποδέχας, but, with Lachmann, to γινομένῳ, because, according to the flattering character of the speech, διορθῶμ. γινομ. requires a definition of degree, and it is arbitrary mentally to supply πολλῶν. — διορθώματα (see the critical marks) are improved arrangements in the state and nation.¹¹ κατορθώματα would be successes, successful accomplishments.¹² — πάντη] only here in the N. T., not semper,¹³ but towards all sides, quaequeversus, as in all classical writers; with iota subscriptum, in opposition to Buttman and others.¹⁴ — On ἀποδίχεσθα, probare, "admittere cum assensu, gaudio, congratulatione."¹¹ — How little, we may add, Felix, although he waged various conflicts with sicarii, sorcerers, and rebels,¹⁷ merited this

¹ See Tertullus in loc.
² See Wetstein.
³ See Barth, ad Claudian. p. 70.
⁴ See Photius, p. 488, 19; Thomas Mag., Suidas.
⁶ Camerarius, Grotius.
⁷ Comp. xxii. 15 xxv. 2, 15.
⁸ Beza, Luther, Castello, Wolf, and others, following the Vulgate.
⁹ Comp. Bornemann in Rosenmüller, Repert. II. p. 271; Krebs, p. 258 f.
¹⁰ See Grotius in loc.
¹¹ See Wetstein.
¹³ See Raphael, Polyb. in loc.; Lobeck, Lc.
¹⁴ Vulgate and others.
¹⁵ See Eichardt, Lex. Soph. II. p. 493.
¹⁶ Reiske, Ind. Dem. p. 66; see Loesener, p. 299; Krebs in loc.
praise on the whole, may be seen in Tacitus;¹ and what a contrast to it was the complaint raised against him after his departure by the Jews before the emperor!²

Ver. 4. That, however, I may not longer, by a more lengthened discourse than I shall hold, detain thee, keep thee from thy business.³ — λέγοντων is not to be supplied with συντόμως,⁴ but it contains the definition of measure to ἀκόνωσι. The request for a hearing of brief duration is, at the same time, the promise of a concise discourse. — τῷ σῷ ἵππει τῇ with thy, thine own peculiar, clemency.⁶

Vv. 5–8. Καὶ κατὰ . . . ἐπὶ στὶ is to be deleted. See the critical remarks (B).—εἰρήνεις γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] The structure of the sentence is anacoluthic, as Grotius already saw. Luke has departed from the construction; instead of continuing, ver. 6, with ἐκρατήσασθαι αὐτόν, he, led astray by the preceding relative construction, brings the principal verb also into connection with the relative.⁶ — The γὰρ is namely.¹ — Examples of λογιστὸς and πεσίς, as designating men bringing destruction, may be seen in Grotius and Wetstein.¹⁰ — τῶν Ναζωραίων] a contemptuous appellation of Christians as the followers of Jesus of Nazareth, whose presumed descent from Nazareth stamped Him as a false Messiah.¹¹ — δὲ καὶ τ. ἵππον κ.τ.λ.] who saw the temple, etc.¹² — Ver. 8. παρ' οὗ] refers, as the preceding mention of Lysias is spurious, to Paul, to whom, however, it could not have been referred, were the preceding portion genuine, in opposition to Cornelius a Lapide, Grotius, Limborch, Rosenmüller, who have, moreover, arbitrarily understood ἀνακρίνας of a quaestio per tormenta; it denotes judicial examination generally. — ὁ] = ὅ by attraction.—That we have not before us the speech of Tertullus, in a quite exact reproduction is obvious of itself, as the source of the narrative could only be the communication of Paul. The beginning, so much in contrast with the rest, is doubtless most faithfully reproduced, impressing itself, as it naturally did, alike as the commencement of the imposing trial and by reason of the singularly pompous flattery, with the most literal precision on the recollection of the apostle and, through his communication, on the memory of Luke.

Ver. 9. Συνεπέδεντο κ.τ.λ.] but the Jews also jointly set upon him; they united their attack against Paul with that of their advocate, inasmuch as they indicated the contents of his statements to be the true state of the case.¹³ — φασκοῦντες] comp. xxv. 19; and see on Rom. i. 22.

¹ Hist. v. 9, Ann. xii. 54.
² Joseph, Antiq. xx. 8. 9 f.
⁵ See on 2 Cor. x. 1.
⁶ Comp. Winer, pp. 589, 598 (E. T. 442, 710); Buttmann, p. 262 (E. T. 298). Comp. on Rom. xvi. 27.
⁷ See on Matt. i. 18.
⁸ Grimm on 1 Mace. x. 61.
¹⁰ Thuc. v. 71, 2, and Krüger in loc.
¹¹ John vii. 43.
¹² Comp. ἐν τῷ καλ., xxl. 28.
¹³ Comp. on συνεπέδεντο, Plat. Phil. p. 16 A; Xen. Cyrop. iv. 2. 3; Polyb. i. 31. 2. 2. 6; also in the LXX.
Ver. 10. In what a dignified, calm, and wise manner does Paul open his address! — ἵνα πολλὰς εἰρήνας therefore thou hast an ample judicial experience as regards the circumstances of the nation and their character. "Novus aliquis praeses propter inscitiam forte percussus esset tam atroci delatione," Calvin. — Felix entered on the procuratorship after the banishment of his predecessor Cumanus, in the year 52. Even in the time of Cumanus he had great influence, particularly in Samaria, without, however, being actually governor of that country, as is incorrectly stated in Tac. Ann. xii. 54 in contradiction to Josephus, or of Upper Galilee, as is erroneously inferred by Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Hildebrand, and others. He was thus at this time probably in the seventh year of his procuratorship. — ἀπετράπ] is not, with Beza, Grotius, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others (after WDB), to be taken generally as praefectus, rector, but specially as judge; for the judicial position of Felix in his procuratorship was the point here concerned. — εἰς ὑμᾶς ἄφησεν] the more cheerfully, namely, than I would be able to do if thou wert still new in this judicial office. — τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν ἀπολογίαμαι] I bring forward in defence the things concerning myself.

Ver. 11. Paul adds a more special reason subordinate to the general one (ver. 10), for his εἰς ὑμᾶς ἄφησεν ... ἀπολογίαμαι. Since he had returned from abroad only twelve days ago, and accordingly the ground of facts on which they wished him condemned was still quite new, the procurator, with his long judicial experience among the Jewish people, could the less avoid the most thorough examination of the matter. — οὐ πλείον ... ἡμερας δεκαύω] without ἤ, which Elz. has as a gloss. — ἄφις ὡς ἀνεβην] from the day on which I had come up. This is the day of the accomplished ἀναβαίνειν, the day of the arrival, not of the departure from Caesarea. As to the reckoning of the twelve days, it is to be observed: (1) That by the present εἰς the inclusion of the days already spent at Caesarea is imperatively required. Hence the assumption of Heinrichs, Hildebrand, and others is to be rejected as decidedly erroneous: "Dies, quibus P. jam Caesareae fuerat, non numerantur; ibi enim (!) in custodia tumultum movere non poterat." (2) That οὐ πλείον εἰς permits us to regard as the current day on which the discussion occurred, either the twelfth or the (not yet elapsed) thirteenth;

1 According to Wieseler, 58; see Joseph. Antiq. xx. 7. 1.
2 From Joseph. Bell. ii. 12. 8. See Anger, de temp. rad. p. 88; Wieseler, p. 67 f.; comp. also Gerlach, i.c., p. 75; Ewald, p. 549.
4 To reduce the ἡκὼλαν ἴδων to three years (Bödting, Beltr. s. Erg. d. Paul. Br. p. 190), even apart from the duration of the government of Felix being thereby assumed as much too short (ver. 37), is rendered exegetically impossible by the expression itself. For a capitale benedictiones, so definite (τῶν) a statement of time, if by ἡκὼλαν were meant only three years, would be very inappropriate, as the words would contain a flat untruth. How easily would a more flexible expression have presented itself for such a purpose, such as ἐκ ἡκὼλαν χρόνων, or ἐὰν εἰς ὅλας (οὐχ ἐκ) ἡκὼλαν! 
5 On the participle with ἔστωμα, see Winer, p. 324 (E. T. 436).
7 τῷ ἵλῳ ἡκὼλαν βεβηλωθέν, comp. xxx. 28.
8 See on iv. 28.
9 ἄπι κ. c. ημέρας, comp. on l. 2, 58.
10 Wieseler. Comp. xx. 2; Kühlner, § 444; Winer, p. 256 (E. T. 343).
11 Kuinoel.
as, however, Paul wished to express as short a period as possible, the latter view is to be preferred. There accordingly results the following calculation:

I. Day of arrival in Jerusalem, xxi. 15–17.
II. Meeting with James, xxi. 18 ff.
III. Undertaking of the Nazarite vow and offerings, xxi. 26.
IV. 
V. The seven days' time of offering broken off by the arrest, xxi. 27.
VI. 
VII. Arrest of the apostle, xxi. 27 ff.
VIII. Paul before the Sanhedrin, xxii. 30, xxiii. 1–10.
IX. Jewish conspiracy and its disclosures, xxiii. 12 ff. On the same day Paul, before midnight, is brought away from Jerusalem, xxiii. 28, 31.
X. Metà δὲ πέντε ἡμέρας κ.τ.λ., xxiv. 1.
XI. 
XII. 
XIII. The current day.

It further serves to justify this calculation: (1) that it sufficiently agrees with the vague statement in xxi. 27: ἡς δὲ εἴμελλον αἰ ἑπτά ἡμέραι συνετελείσθαι, to place the arrest on the fifth day of that week; (2) that, as terminus a quo for μετὰ πέντε ἡμέρας, xxiv. 1, the ninth day may not only be assumed generally, because the immediately preceding section of the narrative, xxiii. 31 ff., commences with the departure of Paul from Jerusalem, but is also specially indicated by the connection, inasmuch as this μετὰ πέντε ἡμέρας corresponds to the τῇ δὲ ἐπαίρων, xxiii. 32, that there is presented for both statements of time one and the same point of commencement, namely, the day on which the convoy, after nine in the evening, left Jerusalem. Anger deviates from this reckoning in the two points, that he places as the first of the five days, xxiv. 1, the day of the arrival at Caesarea; and he does not include at all in the reckoning the day on which Paul came to Jerusalem, because Paul reached it, perhaps, only after sunset. But the former is unnecessary, and the latter would not only be at variance with Paul’s own words, ἃς ἡς ἀνέβησα προσκυνήσῃ ἐν Ἰερουσαλημ, ver. 11, by which the day of arrival was included, but also would bring the reckoning of the apostle into contradiction with xxi. 17, 18 (τῇ δὲ ἐπαίρων). Wieseler has reckoned the days in an entirely different manner—but in connection with his opinion, not to be approved, that the έπτά ἡμέραι in xxi. 27 are to be understood of the Pentecostal week—namely: two days for the journey to Jerusalem; the third day, interview with James; the fourth, his arrest in the temple, Pentecost; the fifth, the sitting of the Sanhedrin; the sixth, his removal to Caesarea; the seventh, his arrival there; the twelfth, the departure of Ananias from Jerusalem, xxiv. 1; the thirteenth, the hearing before Felix. — προσκυνήσων] thus with quite an innocent and legally religious design. — εἰς Ἰερουσαλημ.] (see the critical remarks) belongs to ἀνέβησα.

1 De temp. rat. p. 110. 2 See above. 3 p. 108 f., and on Gal. p. 588.
Paul's Defence.

Vv. 12–21. In the following speech Paul first disclaims the accusations of his opponents generally and on the whole as groundless; then gives a justifying explanation of the expression πρωτοστάτην τῆς τῶν Ναζωρ. αἵρεσι, by which they had maliciously wished to bring him into suspicion; and lastly refutes the special accusation: καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν ἑπειρ. βεβηλώσαι.

Vv. 12, 13. Ἐπιστολαὶ διαφορα. — Both after ὁποίες ἐν ταῖς σωμαγ. and after ὁποίες κατὰ τὴν τόλμην, throughout the city, εἰρήνω με τρές τῶν διαλεγόμενων, ἡ ἐπιστολαὶ παρουσία ἅχου is mentally to be supplied.

Vv. 14, 15. Αὐτ] opposes the positive confession, which now follows, to the preceding merely negative assurance; but, doubtless, I confess: “As a Christian I reverence the same God with the Jews, follow the same rule of faith, and I have the same hope on God, that there shall be a resurrection,” etc. Thus, notwithstanding that malicious πρωτοστάτην τῆς τῶν Ναζωρ. αἵρ., I am in nowise an enemy of the existing religion, protected by the Roman laws! And with full truth could this “confessio ingenua, voluntaria, plena” be furnished by Paul, as he recognised in Christianity the completion of the divine law and the fulfilment of the prophets; and this recognition, as regards the law, necessarily presupposes the belief in all that is written in the law, namely, in its connection with the fulfilment effected by Christ, although the law as a rule of justification has reached its end in Christ. — κατὰ τὴν ὄνομα κ. τ. λ. according to the way, which, etc., according to the Christian mode of life, — ἔν λέγ. αἱρεσι.] for Tertullus had, ver. 5, used αἱρεσι, in itself a νομ μινιν, school, party, in a bad sense, a schismatic party; sect. — τῷ παράγωγῳ Θεῷ] the God worshipped by the ancestors of my nation and from them received. How inviolable were even to the heathen their ancestral gods! — πιστεύων κ. τ. λ. is now that which is emphatically indicated by ὁποῖο : in this way: namely, believing all things, etc. — κατὰ τῶν νόμων throughout the law-book. — ἐπτάδα ἐχων contains a characteristic circumstance accompanying πιστεύων πάσι κ. τ. λ. — καὶ αὐτοῖς ὅταν even they themselves there, is spoken δεικτικός to those present as the representatives of the nation in the transaction. It was natural that this point of view in its generality, should admit no reference to the Sadducean deviation from the national belief of the resurrection, or at all to special differences concerning this dogma. It is just as certain that Paul understood δικαιον and ὀλίγων morally, and not according to the sense of the self-conceit of the descendants of Abraham. — προσδέχονται expectant. The hope is treated as objective.
Ver. 16. 'Ev τοῦτον] on this account, as in John xvi. 20. It refers to the whole contents of the confession just expressed in vv. 14, 15, as that on which the moral striving, which Paul constantly (διαπαντε,) has, has its causal basis. — και αὐτός] et ipse, like other true confessors of this faith and this hope. — ἄσκο] I exercise myself, i.e. in eo laboro, studeo;¹ often also in classical writers with the infinitive.² — πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν κ.τ.λ.] ethical reference.³ The good conscience, xxiii. 1 is conceived as having suffered no offence,⁴ i.e. as unshaken, preserved in its unimpaired equilibrium.

Ver. 17. Δι' ἵνα δὲ πελείσων] interjectis autem pluribus annis. The δὲ leads over to the defence on the special point of accusation in ver. 6. Regarding διὰ, after.⁵ Paul means the four years, which had elapsed since his last visit to Jerusalem.⁶ How does the very fact of this long alibi, preceding the short period of my present visit, witness against that accusation! — εἰς τὸ ἔδώρος μου] for my nation. What a contrast in this patriotic love to the hostile calumnies of his accusers! And Paul might so speak, for the Greek and Asiatic contributions which he had brought⁷ were destined for the support of the Jerusalem Christians, who for the most part consisted of native Jews. If he conveyed aims for these, he assisted in them his nation, in doing which he cherished the national point of view, that the Gentiles, having become partakers of the spiritual blessings of the Jews, owed corporeal aid to these in turn.⁸ — προσφοράς] i.e. festival offerings. The performance of these had been among the objects of the journey. The taking on him the Nazarite offerings was only induced after his arrival by circumstances. Whether Paul defrayed the expenses of the Nazarite offerings from the contribution-moneys,⁹ is neither here nor elsewhere said, and cannot be determined.

Vv. 18, 19. 'Εν εἰς, during which, applies to the προσφοράς, during which sacrificial occupations.'¹⁰ "Graeci, licet aliquis generis nomen praecesserit, saepe neutro plurali nominis utuntur, generalem vocabuli notionem respicientes."¹¹ — ἐναρκτήσω] purifying, as a Nazarite,¹² thus, in an unobjectionable and holy condition, without multitude and without tumult. — A point is not, with Griesbach, Scholz, and de Wette, to be placed after δομήθησον, because otherwise τινὲς δὲ κ.τ.λ. would be an imperfect sentence, which the simplicity of the structure of the discourse¹³ does not justify our assuming. Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Bornemann have correctly put only a comma. It is accordingly to be explained in such a way, that Paul with τινον...
HIS CONFINEMENT.

τινὸς ὃς κ.τ.λ. glances back to what was said in ver. 5 f., which had sounded as if the Sanhedrists had found him. On the other hand, τινὸς ὃς forms the contrast, introducing the actual position of the matter, in which ὃς withal refers to suppressam aliquid partem sententiae, thus: Thereupon there found me—not these, as they asserted, ver. 5,—but doubtful certain Asiatic Jews. — ἔδει] The sense of the præterite, and that without ἄν, is here essential; for the Asiatics must have appeared, like the Sanhedrists, before the procurator, if they, etc. That this did not happen, is a fact of the past. — εἰ τι ἔχουν, in so far as they should have ought, subjective possibility. On εἰ with the optative, and in the following sentence the indicative, see Bernhardy.

Vv. 20, 31. Or else let these there, pointing to the Sanhedrists present, say what wrong they found in me, while I stood before the Sanhedrim, unless in respect to this one exclamation, which I made, etc. — στάντος μοι κ.τ.λ. forbids us to refer oίνου to the Asiatic Jews, ver. 18.—ἡ περὶ μιᾶς ταύτης φωνῆς] The comparative ἡ after τι without ἄλλο is found also in the classics. The article is not placed before φωνῆς, because the sense is: περὶ ταύτης μιᾶς ὀνόματος φωνῆς. The exclamation, xxiii. 6, was really the only one which Paul had made in the Sanhedrin. περὶ refers back to ἀδίκημα. In respect of this exclamation I must have offended, if they have found an ἀδίκημα in me! In this one exclamation must lie the crime discovered in me! A holy irony. — ἡς instead of ἄν, attracted by φωνῆς.

Ver. 22. With the frank challenge to his accusers Paul closes his speech. But Felix, who declares that he wished still to institute a further examination of the matter with the assistance of Lyaias, decides for the present on an adjournment: ἀνεβάλετο αὐτοῖς, ampliavit eis, both parties. He pronounced until further investigation the non liquet, and for the time being adjourned the settlement of the accusation. — ἀκριβεστέρον εἰδός τὸ περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ] The only correct interpretation is: because he knew more exactly what referred to Christianity. As Felix had been procurator for more than six years, and as Christianity was diffused everywhere in Judaea, even in Caesarea itself, it was natural that he should have an ἀκριβεστέρον knowledge of the circumstances of that religion than was given to him in the present discussion; therefore he considered it the most fitting course to leave the matter still in suspense. In doing so he prudently satisfied, on the one hand, his regard for the favour of the Jews by not giving Paul his liberty; while, on the other hand, he satisfied his better intelligence about

1 Hermann, ad Philoctet. 16.
2 Comp. Bornemann, Schoo. in Luk. p. 184, and in Rosenmüller, Repert. II. p. 276.
3 Comp. Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 187 (E. T. 216 f.).
5 As certainly those absent can make no statement, comp. Baeumlein, Partik. p. 126 f.
6 Ewald. Comp. ver. 15.
10 vv. 20, 21.
11 Sic. Chusel. 29, Bрисon. formul.
12 See on the judicial term ἀνεβάλλεσθαι (Dem. 1048 ult.), Wetstein, and Kypke, II. p. 136 f.
13 Ver. 14.
14 Comp. ver. 37.
Christianity, by which, notwithstanding his badness in other respects, he felt himself precluded from pleasing the Jews and condemning the apostle. This connection, which in essentials the Vulgate, Chrysostom, Erasmus, Luther, Castalio, Wolf, and others have expressed, has been often mistaken. Beza and Grotius, followed by Rosenmüller, Heinrichs, and Ewald, regard ἀφοῦ δέσποτας . . . ὁ δὲ as part of the speech of Felix: "ubi exspectius didicero, quid sit de hac secta, et ubi Lysias venerit, causam illam terminabo." But so late a bringing in of the εἰπὼν is entirely without precedent in the N. T. Michaelis and Morus resolve εἰδῶς by quamquam; notwithstanding his better knowledge of Christianity, Felix did not release Paul. But this resolution is the less suggested by the relation of the participle to the verb, as afterwards, ver. 23, the specially mild treatment of the apostle is expressly stated. According to de Wette, the sense is: "As he needed no further hearing of the accused, and it was only necessary now to hear the tribune." But the reference to the tribune is only to be regarded as a welcome pretext and evasion: an actual hearing of Lysias would have been reported in the sequel of the history. Lastly, Kinoel erroneously renders: when he had inquired more exactly, which εἰδῶς does not mean. — τὰ καθ' ὕματα] your matters, not: your misdeeds, as if it were τὰ καθ' ἓνων.

Ver. 23. Διαφασ.] belongs, like εἰπὼν, to ἀνεβάλετο; and, yet τέ has preponderant testimony against it, having given orders. — τρεις δέ αὐτοὺς κ.τ.λ.] that he should be kept in custody and should have relaxation. He was to have rest, to be spared all annoyance. Usually ἀνεσω is understood of release from chains, custodia libera, φιλακι ἀ δεσμος; but without indication of this special reference in the text, and against ver. 27. From τὰ ἐκατοντάρχα it is rather to be inferred that the present custody was the usual custodia militaris, in which, however, Paul was to be treated with mildness and to be left without other molestation. — καὶ μηδὲν καθεῖν] the construction is active; and that he, the centurion, should hinder no one. — τῶν ἰδίων] is not to be understood of the Jewish servants of the procurator, but of those belonging to the apostle. They were his friends and disciples, among whom were perhaps also relatives. They were allowed to be at hand and serviceable for the satisfaction of his wants.

Ver. 24. Παραγεν. [denotes the coming along of Felix and Drusilla to the prison, where they wished to hear Paul. Grotius thinks that it refers to the fetching of Drusilla as his wife, which took place at this time. But this must have been more precisely indicated, and is also not chronologically

1 Comp. Bengel: "concellia dilatoria, tuta mundo in rebus divinis."
2 Grotius.
3 See also Bornemann, and Rosenmüller, Repert. II. p. 281 f.
4 Comp. Wetstein.
5 So Böttiger, Beltr. II. p. 12, as a threat to the Jews.
6 On δεισον, comp. xxiii. 15.
7 Comp. κελεῦσαι, xxiii. 35.

9 "Requiem," Vulgate.
10 Arrian. II. 15. 7; see on II. Gebh. Gesch. d. Röm. Criminalprozess, p. 552 f.
11 xxiii. 16.
12 xxiii. 35.
suitable, as the marriage of Felix with Drusilla occurred much earlier.1
—On the beautiful Drusilla, the third wife of Felix,2 the daughter of
Agrippa i. and sister of Agrippa ii., who was at first betrothed to Antiochus
Epiphanes, the prince of Commagene, but afterwards, because the latter
would not allow himself to be circumcised, was married to Azizus, king of
Emesa,3 and lastly was, with the help of the sorcerer Simon, estranged from
her husband and married by Felix, whose first wife, according to Tac.
Hist. v. 9, the granddaughter of Antony and Cleopatra,4 is said to have been
also called Drusilla.5 —μετενυμ. τ. Π. ] certainly at the desire of his Jewish
wife, whose curiosity was interested about so well-known a preacher of
Christ.

Vv. 25, 26. What a sacrdly bold fidelity to his calling! Before one,
who practised all manner of unrighteousness and incontinence—the victim of
his lust sat beside him!—4 cunta malefacta sibi impune ratus,6 Paul, his
defenceless prisoner, discourse on righteousness, continence, and the impending
last judgment. Such is the majesty of the apostolic spirit in its ἀπόθεσις.7
The extraordinary phenomenon strikes even the heart of Felix; he trembles
(cf). But his ruling worldliness quickly suppresses the disturbing
promptings of his conscience; with the address of a man of the world, the
conference is broken off; Paul is sent back to his prison; and Felix—remains
reprobate enough to expect from such a man, and in spite of the Lex
Julia de repetundis, a bribe, and for this purpose in fact subsequently to hold
several conversations with him. —τὸ νῦν ἔχον] for the present.8 —καρπὸν δὲ
μεταλ.] tempus opportunum nactus. Here consequently Paul had spoken
άκαρπος.9 —A comma only is to be placed after μετακαλ. σε, as ἐλικών, ver.
26, does not stand for the finite verb, but is a further definition to ἀπεκρίθη.
Also before διά, wherefore, a comma only is to be placed. —χρήσαται] Certainly
Felix had not remained in ignorance how the love of the Christian had
their money in readiness for Paul. "Sic thesaurum evangelii omits infelix
Felix," Bengal.

Ver. 27. Διετικ δὲ παραθε. ] namely, from the commencement of the imprisonment
at Caesarea.—On the time of the accession of Festus, 61; see Introd. § 4.10
—χάριτα (see the critical remarks) καταθέσθαι, to lay down, deposit, thanks for
himsel, i.e. to earn for himself thanks,11 to establish claims to their gratitude.
An old classical expression.12 Grotius aptly says: "Est locutio bone Graeca

1 53 or 54. See Wieseler, p. 60.
2 Suet. Claud. 36.
3 Joseph, Ant. Ix. 7. 1.
4 Suetonius, I. c., calls him "Trium regnorum maritum." We know only the two.
6 Tac. Ann. xii. 54.
7 1 Cor. ii. 4.
8 See Kypke, II. p. 194; Bornemann and Rosenmüller, Repra. II. p. 288.
9 S Tim. iv. 2.
10 What Wieseler has further urged in favour of the year 60 in his most recent
learned investigation (Beitr. a. Würdig. d. Evang. p. 523 ff.) does not remove the
chief objection that, according to Josephus, Poppaea, about the time (και ὁ παρθενὸν)
that Festus succeeded, was no longer the mistress, but the wife of Nero. Especially
when the discourse is of an empress, it never is least of all to be lightly passed over; on
the contrary, it is to be presumed that the expression is meant, and is to be understood,
strictly.
11 xxv. 9.
12 Herod. vi. 41. See Krüger on Thuc. i. 28. 1.
... quales locutiones non paucas habet Lucas, ubi non alios inducit loquentes, sed ipse loquitur, et quidem de rebus ad religionem non pertinentibus." The form χάρια, only here and in Jude 4 in the N. T., is also found in classical poets and prose writers, although less common than χάρις.

According to what was remarked on ver. 23, Paul had not hitherto been released from chains; and therefore we have not to suppose that Felix on his departure changed the captivity of the apostle, which was previously free from chains, into the custodia militaris allowable even in the case of Roman citizens, in which the prisoner was bound by a chain to the soldier who kept him. This period of two years in the life of the apostle, we may add, remains to us, as far as the Book of Acts goes, so completely unknown, that we are not in a position to maintain that no letters of his from that interval could be in existence. — Of Porcius Festus, the better successor of Felix, little is known except his energetic measures against the sicarii. He died in the following year, and was succeeded by Albinus, whose knavery was yet surpassed by that of his successor, Gessius Florus.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(14) Tertullus began to accuse. V. 2.

Lysias, the chief captain, had sent Paul under a strong military escort to Cesarea to appear before the Roman governor Felix. Thus Paul returned to that city in a very different style from that in which he left it, a short time before. Then he was attended by a little caravan of humble disciples, now in the midst of a Roman body-guard, with all the pomp of martial display. Then, however, as a preacher bound, but only in spirit, to go to Jerusalem; now, as a prisoner bound in chains, destined to a long imprisonment. The officer in charge took Paul at once to the governor, and delivered the letter which had been intrusted to him by Lysias. Felix read the letter, inquired to what province the prisoner belonged, and intimated his intention of trying the case when his accusers arrived.

The Jews, probably because ignorant of Roman law, engaged the services of a Roman barrister of eminent ability, persuasive eloquence, and probably of great reputation, to make the charges against the apostle. From the outline given of his speech, he was evidently a practised pleader, and a voluble, plausible orator. "Augustine says: "Eloquence is the gift of God, but the eloquence of a bad man is like poison in a golden cup." He commences with a fulsome and flattering compliment to Felix, which he certainly little deserved, since, though he suppressed some bands of brigands with much vigor and decision, he kept a number of sicarii in his employment, and inflamed the dissatisfaction and fanned a spirit of sedition among the Jews. He was both covetous and cruel, and was one of the worst governors ever placed over Judea. He is reported to have been more criminal than the very robbers whom he put to

---

1 But see on ver. 23.
2 With Ewald and Otto.

See Joseph. Ant. xx. 8. 9 f. to xx. 9. 1,
Bell. i. 14. 1.
death, "ipse tamen his omnibus erat nocentior." Next Tertullus apologizes for intruding even for a brief space upon the time and attention of the governor, and proceeds to make his charges against Paul, which were threefold: First, he accuses him of sedition; as being a pest in the community, a disturber of the peace, and one who excited factions among the Jews. The next count in the indictment was heresy; as being a ringleader in the sect whom he contemptuously calls the Nazarenes—a term of reproach, here first used, which has been often applied to the followers of Christ. Jews and Mohammedans both still use it. This charge had at least the merit of truth, as Paul was unquestionably a standard-bearer among those thus stigmatized. The last accusation was, sacrilege; as going about to profane the temple—a serious charge, but utterly unfounded. Having thus made an orderly and formal indictment against the apostle of treason against Rome, schism against Moses, and profanity against the gods, the clever and crafty advocate insinuates that the Sanhedrin would have judged Paul righteously had Lysias not interposed, and further gets the elders to assent to all he had stated. The governor intimated to Paul that he might now reply to the charges laid against him. "Nou ignoravit Paulus artem rhetorarum movere laudando." He first states that he could proceed with his defence more cheerfully and hopefully because, for so long a period, his judge had been cognizant of affairs in Judea. He replies to each of the charges and refutes them in succession. He had not caused any disturbance of the public peace, or raised any opposition to the Roman law; he had only been a few days in the country, and he challenged any one to prove that he had said or done anything contrary to the law: he had excited no tumult in the temple, in the synagogues, or in the city. As to the charge of schism, he frankly avowed that after the way they called the sect of the Nazarenes he worshipped the God of his fathers, the God of the Jews. As Lange expresses it. "By these words Paul maintains that, along with his Christian faith, he was a true Jew; for Christianity is the fulfilment and truth of Judaism."

As to the charge of polluting the temple, it was utterly baseless, as after an absence of years he had gone thither, had purified himself, for the purpose of presenting offerings, and had been guilty of no act of impropriety whatever; and he closed by challenging any member of the Sanhedrin present to say whether, when on trial before that council, any such accusation had been laid against him, and stated further that the only disturbance arose among themselves concerning the doctrine of the resurrection, which the majority of them believed in, as he did. The reply of the apostle was conclusive and triumphant, and he ought to have been acquitted at once, but Felix reminded him to jail for further examination.

(2d) According to our law, etc. V. 6.

On the genuineness of this passage Alford encloses it in brackets and writes: "The phenomena are common enough in the Acts of unaccountable insertions. But in this place it is the omission which is unaccountable, for no similarity of ending, no doctrinal reason can have led to it." Hackett says: "The passage is of doubtful authority." "It is urged for the words that their insertion answers no apparent object, and that they may have been dropped accidentally." Plumptre remarks: "The word may have been either the interpolation of a
scribe, or a later addition of the writer." Gloag observes: "The genuineness of the entire passage has been called in question. The external evidence is decidedly against its reception. On the other hand the internal evidence is rather in favor of the words. Without them the speech of Tertullus is apparently defective, and awkward in point of construction." Wordsworth considers the passage genuine and Jacobson says: "The clause is recognized by the Syriac and the Vulgate, and the report of the speech is exceedingly brief and meagre without it."


Felix by vile means had seduced the wife of Azizas, the daughter of Herod Agrippa, from her allegiance to her husband, and had married her. Probably at her request, as she could scarcely be entirely ignorant of the events connected with the disciples and their persecutions, Felix sent for Paul, to hear from him concerning his beliefs; and right nobly did the dauntless apostle discharge his duty. Paul had been often summoned before Felix. Now Felix is arraigned before Paul. And as the prisoner reasoned before the governor and his princess, both of them notoriously and consciously guilty, the cruel, rapacious, and blood-stained ruler was profoundly stirred and agitated. Looking back on his stained past, and constrained for a moment to peer into the future certain retribution, he trembled. And well he might, for testimony the most irrefragable from both Jewish and Pagan sources show "how greedy, how savage, how treacherous, how unjust, how steeped with the blood of private and public massacre" he had been during his government of Samaria and Palestine. Tacitus says that in "the practice of all kinds of lust, crime, and cruelty, he exercised the power of a king, with the temper of a slave." He trembled, but he trifled with his awakened conscience and said, "Go." Better far that a man's conscience should never be awakened at all, than that it should be awaked with its reproofs, and be disobeyed. Dr. Taylor deduces the following lessons from the incident: The twofold power in conscience to sustain and condemn, as illustrated by Paul and Felix; the danger of stifling conviction; the hypocrisy of procrastination, the fettering influence of sin.

"'To-morrow and to-morrow, and to-morrow, Creeps in this petty pace from day to day To the last syllable of recorded time, And all our yesterdays have lighted fools The way to dusty death."
CHAPTER XXV.

Ver. 2. ὁ ἀρχηγός οἱ ἀρχηγεῖς is decidedly attested. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. The singular arose from xxiv. 1. — Ver. 4. εἰς Καραμάρ. so Lachm. Tisch. Born., according to preponderating testimony. Elz. Scholz have ἐν Καραμάρᾳ. An interpretation. — Ver. 5. τοῦτον] A B C E Μ, min. Arm. Vulg. Lucifer, have ἄτοπον. So Lachm. and Born. But how easily, with the indefiniteness of the expression εἰ τι ἐστὶν ἐν κ. τ. λ., was ἄτοπον suggested as a gloss, perhaps from a recollection of Luke xxiii. 41! This then supplanted the superfluous τοῦτον. Other codds. have τοῦτον ἄτοπον. And ἄτοπον is found variously inserted. — Ver. 6. οὐ πλείον ὁκτὼ ἢ δέκα] so Griesb. Lachm. Tisch. Scholz, Born. But Elz. has πλείον ἢ δέκα, in opposition to A B C Μ, min. Copt. Arm. Vulg. As the oldest codd., in which the numbers are written as words, likewise all the oldest vs. (of which, however, several omit οὐ, and several οὐ πλείον), have ὁκτὼ, it is very probable that in later witnesses the number written by the numeral sign η was absorbed by the following δέκα. Finally, the omission of οὐ was suggested by ἐν τάξει, ver. 4, as it was thought that διατρίψας δὲ . . . δέκα must be taken as a contrast to ἐν τάξει (he promised to depart speedily, yet he tarried, etc.). — Ver. 7. αἰτῶματα] Griesb. Scholz, Lachm. Tisch. read αἰτῶματα, which is so decidedly attested that, notwithstanding that this form does not occur elsewhere, it must be adopted. — φρονεῖς κατὰ τοῦ Παῦλου] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read καταφερόντες, following A B C Μ, Io. 40, Vulg. Lucifer. The Recepta is one interpretation of this; another is ἔπιφερεν τῷ Π. in E. — Ver. 11. γὰρ] A B C E Μ, min. Copt. Slav. Chrys. Theophyl. 2, have οὖν, which Griesb. has approved, and Lachm. Tisch. Born. have adopted. Rightly; εἰ μὲν οὖν ἄδικον seemed entirely at variance with the preceding αὖθιν ἃδικα. — Ver. 15. δίκην] A B Μ, min. Bas. have καταδίκην. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Born. An interpretation. — Ver. 16. Αὐτοὶ ἄνθρωποι Elz. Scholz have εἰς ἀπωλείαν. It is wanting in preponderating witnesses, and is an addition of the nature of a gloss. — Ver. 18. ἐπιφέρον] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read ἐφέρον, according to decisive testimony. — After ἐν ν. ἐγὼ Α C* have πωνηράν (so Lachm.), and B E Μ** πωνηρῶν (so Born.). Two different exegetical additions. — Ver. 20. τοῦτον] has decisive attestation. But Elz. Scholz have τοῦτον, which (not to be taken with Grotius and others as the neuter) was occasioned by the preceding ὁ Παῦλος and the following εἰ διδολοτος. — Ver. 21. ἀναπτύσψα is to be adopted, with Lachm. Tisch. Born., according to preponderating testimony, instead of πέμψα. The reference of the compound was overlooked. — Ver. 22. ἐφη, and afterwards ὁ δὲ, are deleted by Lachm. Tisch. Born., according to A B Μ; and rightly. They were added by way of completion. — Ver. 25. καταλαβόμενος] Lachm. and Born. read κατελαβόμενν, following A B C E Μ** Io. 40. Vulg. Copt. Syr., which witnesses also omit καὶ before αὐτοῦ. A logical emendation. — Ver. 26. σχῶ, τι γράφατι] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read σχῶ, τί γράφατο according to A B C, min. The Recepta is a mechanical repetition from the preceding.
Ver. 1. Naturally it was the interest of Festus, both in his official and personal capacity, after he had entered upon his province as procurator of Judea, i.e. after having arrived in it, soon to acquaint himself more fully with the famous sacred capital of the nation which he now governed. — εἰπεῖναιν, with the dative. 1 — τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ; 2 for the procurators were also called ἐπαρχοι. 3

Vv. 2, 3. 'Ενεργίνοισιν κ.τ.λ.] See on xxiv. 1. — oi ἀρχιερεῖς] see the critical remarks, as in xxii. 30; consequently not merely the acting high priest, 4 who at that time was Ισχαιμ, son of Phabi, and successor of Ananias. 5 — καὶ oι πρῶτοι τῶν Ἰουδαίων] thus not merely the πρεσβύτεροι, xxiv. 1. The opposition now came forward in a larger spiritual and secular representation of the nation against the enemy of the national religion. It is true that most of these πρῶτοι were without doubt Sanhedrists, and therefore also Festus names them directly a potiori πρεσβύτεροι; 6 but this does not justify the assertion of Grotius, that Luke here uses πρῶτοι as equivalent to πρεσβύτεροι. So also de Wette and Ewald. Ver. 5 is opposed to this view. — αὐτοίμακοι χάριν κ.τ.λ.] desiring for themselves favour against him. 7 — ἤπειρκ κ.τ.λ.] The design of παρεκάλεσθαι. αὐτ. — εὑρέθην ποιόντες κ.τ.λ.] an accompanying definition to παρεκάλουν . . . Ἰρωνοσαλίμ, giving a significant explanation of the peculiar nature of this proceeding: inasmuch as they thereby formed a snare, in order to put him to death, through assassins, by the way.

Ver. 4. For the reasons of the decision, see ver. 16. — By τηρεῖσαι . . . ἐκπορεύεσθαι, the reply of refusal: "Paul remains at Caesarea," is expressed indirectly indeed, but with imperative decidedness. Observe in this case the τηρεῖσαι emphatically prefixed in contrast to μετεκάλεσθαι, ver. 3. — τις Κασαπ. In Caesarea, whither he was brought in custody. 8 — Notice the contrast between the Jewish baseness and the strict order of the Roman government.

Ver. 5. The decidedly attested order of the words is: oi oin in ἵμαν φηνών δναροί 9 — oi διωκόταi ἐν ὑμ. are: the holders of power among you, i.e. those who are invested with the requisite official power, for making a public complaint in the name of the Jewish nation. Thus the usual literal meaning of δναροί is to be retained, and it is neither to be explained, with Erasmus, as idonei; nor, with Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Homberg: quibus commodum est; nor, with Bengel: those who are strong for the journey; nor, with Er. Schmid and Wolf: 10 quibus in promptu sunt accusandi capita. Certainly if oi πρῶτοι, ver. 2, were the same as oi πρεσβύτεροι, then oi διωκόταi ἐν ὑμῖν would be unsuitable, as those persons in power were just the Sanhedrists; wherefore oi πρῶτοι must include also other prominent persons. — συνήκασθαι having gone down with me. 11 — τι τοίνυν] namely, an object of accusation.

1 See Thuc. vii. 70. 5; Diog. L. i. 19; Diod. xvi. 66; Plut. Nemi. iii. 19.
2 xxix. 84.
3 See Krebs in loc.
4 As in xxiv. 1.
5 See Joseph. Ant. xx. 8. 8, 11.
6 Ver. 15.
7 Com. ver. 15.
8 xix. 22, xxii. 13.
9 Lachmann, Tischendorf, Bornemann, See on similar interposing insertions of φηνών. Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. iii. 5. 13; Bornemann, ad loc.; Stallb. ad Plat. Rep. p. 473 D.
10 Comp. Castaldo, de Dicen, and others.
11 Thuc. vi. 30. 2; Diod. xii. 50; Wied. x. 13; Lobbeck, ad Phryn. p. 596.
Vv. 6, 7. Διατρίφασ... βία] includes the whole brief stay of Festus at that time among the Jews at Jerusalem (ἐν αἰείς), not merely the time that had elapsed since the rejection of that proposal. — πεπερασμένον] stood round Paul, as is evident from the preceding παραγ. δὲ αἰτοῦ. 1 Grotius and Kuinoel incorrectly hold that it is to be referred to τὸ βῆμα. — πολλὰ καὶ κ.τ.λ.] as in John xx. 80.—αἰτιώματα (see the critical remarks), instead of αἰτιώματα, accusations, is not elsewhere preserved. 2 — καταφέροντις (see the critical remarks), they brought against him. 3

Ver. 8. They were not in a condition to prove them, seeing that he stated for his vindication, that, etc. 4 — οίτε κ.τ.λ.] These were consequently the three principal points to which the πολλὰ καὶ βαρέα αἰτιώματα of the Jews referred, 5 to which they now added the political accusation, as formerly against Jesus.

Ver. 9. Χάριμ παραθίσθαι] see on xxiv. 27. — θέλεις... ἐπὶ ἐμοῖ; Grotius correctly renders: visse a Synedrio judicari me praesente! For that Festus meant κρίνωσθαι by the Sanhedrin, is evident of itself from εἰς Ἰεροο. καί... ἐκα. — ἐπὶ ἐμοῖ] coram me. Bengel aptly observes: hoc Festus speciosse addit.—Paul must be asked the question, θέλεις, because he had already been delivered over to the higher Roman authority, and accordingly as a Roman citizen could not be compelled again to renounce the Roman tribunal.—If Festus had previously 6 without ceremony refused the request of the Jews, which was at variance with the course of Roman law, he now shows, on the other hand, after they had conformed to the ordinary mode of procedure, that he was quite willing to please them. Certainly he could not doubt beforehand that his θέλεις would be answered in the negative by Paul; yet by his question he made the Jews sensible at least that the frustration of their wish did not proceed from any indisposition on his part.

Ver. 10. Paul gives a frank and firm refusal to that request, both positively—ἐπὶ τοῦ βῆμ. Καίσ. κ.τ.λ.—and negatively—Ἰουδαίους οἴδαι κ.τ.λ., to the Jews I have committed no offence. — ἐπὶ τ. βῆμ. Καίσαρος] for “quae acta gestaque sunt a procuratore Caesaris, sic ab eo comprobantur, atque si a Caesaris ipso gesta sint.” — κάλλιον] namely, than appears to follow from your question. Paul makes his judge feel that he ought not to have proposed that θέλεις κ.τ.λ. to him at all, as it could not but conflict with his own better conviction.

Ver. 11. From his preceding declaration that he must be judged before the imperial tribunal, and not by Jews, Paul now reasons 8 that he accordingly by no means refuses to die, if, namely, he is in the wrong; but in the opposite case, etc. In other words: “Accordingly, I submit myself to the penalty of the Roman law, if I am guilty; but, if,” etc. And, in order to be sure of the protection of Roman law, amidst the inclination of

---

1 Comp. ver. 18.
2 Yet Eust. p. 1438, 21, has aivianos instead
3 Gen. xxxvii. 2; Deut. xxii. 14.
4 On διαλογίζεσθαι with ἐπὶ (more frequently with ἐν), comp. Xen. Oec. xl. 22.
5 Comp. xxi. 28, xxiv. 5 f.
6 Ver. 4.
7 Ulpian L. I. D. de offic. procuratoris.
8 ὅσον, as the correct reading instead of γάρ, see the critical remarks.
Festus to please the Jews, he immediately adds the appeal to the Emperor (δ' — ηι... ἄδικο:] If I am at fault.1 The idea of the word presupposes the having done wrong,2 therefore the added καὶ δέξιον θαν. πένθρ. contains a more precise definition of ἄδικο, and that according to the degree. — οὖ παρατίθεμαι κ.τ.λ.] non despequant.3 — τὸ ἀποδανεῖν] "id ipsum agi, notat articulus."4 — ei δὲ οἰδέν ἵστων ὡτ] but if there exists nothing of that, of which they, etc. ὡτ is by attraction for τοίτων ᾧ.5 — διναται] namely, according to the possibility conditioned by the subsisting legal relations. — αἰτοῖς λόγοισι] to surrender me to them out of complaisance.6 — Καισαρα ἀπικαλ.] I appeal to the Emperor.7 Certainly the revelation, xxiii. 11, contributed to Paul's embracing this privilege of his citizenship.8 "Non vitae suae, quam ecclesiae consultus," Augustine accordingly says, Ep. 2.

Ver. 12. The conference of Festus with the council acting as his advisers, as may be inferred from the answer afterwards given, referred to the question whether the ἐπίκλησις of the Emperor was to be granted without more ado. For in cases of peculiar danger, or of manifest groundlessness of the appeal, it might be refused.9 The consiliarii10 of the provincial rulers were called also πρεσβυτοὶ, assessores.11 — After ἐπικάλ., the elsewhere usual note of interrogation, which simply spoils the solemnity and force of the answer, is already condemned by Grotius.—Baumgarten thinks that, from the appeal to Caesar, which in his view will not have been pernicious to Paul, and from xxvii. 24, it may be inferred that the Acts of the Apostles is decidedly favourable to the supposition of a liberation of Paul from the Roman imprisonment. Too rash a conclusion. Neither the appeal nor xxvii. 24 points beyond Rome. To Rome he wished to go (appeal), and was to go, xxvii. 24.

Ver. 13. This Marcus Agrippa was the well-meaning, but too weak, Herod Agrippa II., son of the elder Agrippa, grandson of Aristobulus, and the great-grandson of Herod I. Soon after the death of his father 12 he received from Claudius, at whose court he was brought up,13 the principality of Chalcis, and instead of this, four years afterwards,14 from the same emperor, the former tetrarchy of Philip and Lysanias, along with the title of king;15 and at a later period, from Nero, a further considerable increase of territory. He did not die till the third year of Trajan, being the last-reigning prince of the Herodian house.16 — Беовник, also Беронис и Беро-
nice, was his sister, formerly the wife of her uncle Herod the prince of Chalcis, after whose death she lived with her brother,—probably in an incestuous relation,—a state of matters which was only for a short time interrupted by a second marriage, soon again dissolved, with the Cilician king Psephon. At a later period still she became mistress of the Emperors Vespasian and Titus. It was quite in keeping with the relation of a Roman vassal, that he should welcome the new procurator soon after his accession to office.

Ver. 14. The following conversation between Festus and Agrippa most naturally appears not as a communication by an ear-witness, but as drawn up by Luke himself as a free composition; for he had the materials for the purpose in his accurate information, received from Paul, as to the occurrence set forth in ver. 7 ff. — άνεξάντα [he set forth, enarravit, Gal. ii. 2. His design in this was to learn the opinion of the king; for Agrippa, as an Idumean, as belonging himself to Judaism, and especially as chief overseer of the temple and of the election of high priest, was accurately acquainted with the state of Jewish affairs.

Vv. 15, 16. Αἰτοῦμεν κ.τ.λ.] asking for punishment against him. That δίκαιος is so to be taken, according to its very frequent use by the classical writers, is shown by ver. 16. — πρίν ἦ] refers to the conception of condemnation contained in [χαῖρε ἑσσαίαμ. As to the principle of Roman law here expressed, see Grotius. On the optative with πρίν after a negative clause, when the matter is reported "ut in cogitatione posita," see Klotz, ad Devar. p. 726.

Vv. 17-20. After they had therefore come together here, I made no delay, etc. — Ver. 18. πρίν ὁ] belongs to σταθερεῖς. — αἰταῖα εἴρειν (see the critical remarks): they brought no accusation. The classical expression would be αἰτεῖν ἐρεῖν. — ὐν], instead of ἐκεῖνος ὃ, ὅ τε κενοῦ ἐγὼ] In the case of a man already so long imprisoned, and assailed with such ardent hostility, Festus very naturally supposed that there existed some peculiar capital crimes, chiefly, perhaps, of a political nature. It is true that political charges were also brought forward, but "hinc iterum conjicere licet, imo aperte cognoscere, adeo futilesuisse calumnias, ut in judicii rationem venirom non debuerint, perinde ac si quis convicium temere jactet," Calvin. — Ver. 19. πρίν τής ἰδίας δεσποινι.] concerning their own religion. Festus prudently uses this vox media, leaving it to Agrippa to take the word in a

1 i.e. equivalent to Φερεμία, Sturz, Dial. Muced. p. 81.
2 Joseph. Anti. xx. 7. 3.
3 Joseph. Anti. xx. 7. 5.
4 See Gerlich, l.c.
5 Riehm, Kuhnol.
6 See ver. 36 f.
7 Comp. xxvi. 27; also Schoettig, Hor. p. 481.
8 Joseph. Anti. xx. 1. 3.
9 Comp. 2 Thees. i. 9; Jude 7.
11 Comp. the passages with aīr. xix. in Wetstein.
12 in loc., and on xvi. 37. Likewise as to the Greek law, see Diessen, ad Dem. de cor. p. 160.
13 To Caesarea, just as in ver. 24.
14 See examples of ἐναόλησθαι, ἐναβληθέναι, xxiv. 22) in Wetstein.
15 Comp. ver. 7.
16 Herod. i. 36; Thuc. vi. 75; Plat. Legg. ix. p. 234 E; and often in the orators, or ἐναλθεῖν Dem. 375. 4).
17 Ver. 8.
good sense, but reserving withal his own view, which was certainly the
Roman one of the Judæica superstition. — ζην] that he lives, namely, risen and
not again dead. Moreover, the words καὶ περὶ τινος 'Ισραήλ ἢ... ζην bear
quite the impress of the indifference and insignificance which Festus
attached to this very point, inasmuch as, in regard to the τεθνημένος, he
does not even condescend to designate the mode of death, and, as regards
the ζην, sees in it an empty pretense. — Ver. 20. ὁ προφητής] but I, uncer-
tain on my part. Quite in accordance with the circumstances of the case—
for before the king Festus might not lay himself open to any imputation
of partiality—Luke makes the procurator keep silence over the real motive
of his proposal, ver. 9. — eἰς τὴν περὶ τοῖς ἔθνων ζητ.] regarding the investigation
to be held on account of these to me so strange matters. Instead of eἰς τὴν
κ.τ.λ., Luke might have written only τὴν κ.τ.λ.," οὐ τῆς κ.τ.λ."  
Ver. 21. After, however, Paul had appealed to be kept in ward7 for the co-
niscance8 of Augustus, etc. — τηρηθῆναι,] is not equivalent to eἰς τὸ τεραθθ.,9
but it is the contents of the expressed appeal, namely, the legal demand
which it contained. After this appeal had been in law validly made, no
further proceedings might be taken by the authorities at their own instance
against the appellant.10 — αἰτῶν] is not to be written αἰτῶν, as there is no
reflexive emphasis. — Σεβαστός  Venerandum, the Lat. Augustus, the well-
known title of the emperors since the time of Octavianus.11 — ἐν ό ἄνα-
πτυσσω (see the critical remarks15) is direct address.18  
Ver. 23. The narrative of Festus has excited the Jewish interest of the
king, so that he also, on his part (κ. αἰτῶν), wishes to hear the prisoner. —
ἔδωκά ὁμών] quite like our: I wished,14 namely, if it admitted of being done.15
Calvin erroneously infers from the imperfect that Agrippa had previously
cherished a wish to hear Paul, but had hitherto refrained from expressing
it, in order not to appear as if he had come for any other reason than to
salute Festus. — αὐτῶν ἀκοῆς... αἰτῶν] The wish of the king is very
Ver. 23. Ψαντασία, δούλο, ῥομπ, παραπομπή.18 — τὸ ἀκροατήριον17 is the audience-
chamber appointed for the present occasion. That it was, as is assumed,
just the usual judgment-hall, is at least not conveyed in the words. —
σὺν τε τοῖς κ.τ.λ.] τέ is placed after σὺν, not after χιλιάρχης, because the σὺν

1 Quint. lil. 5. Comp. on xvi. 22.
2 ἐκσκέψεως, comp. xxiv. 9. [v]. 16. 2.
3 ζητιμέναι, in the judicial sense, as in Pol.
4 Comp. Soph. Tract. 1233.
5 As A. H actually read. Heind. ad Plat. Oenu. p. 409 C.
6 Statll. ad Plat. Rep. p. 557 D.
7 Ver. 4.
8 Judicial decision, Wied. iii. 18, and often in the classical writers.
9 Grotius, Wolf, Heinrichs, and others.
10 See Wetstein on ver. 11.
11 See generally, Fincke, de appellatid. Caesalum, honorif. et adulatores, quam ad Hadriam, Regiom. 1587. — αἰτῶν γενόμενος ἡρῴω συνήθως καὶ τοῖς ἵππα, Philo, Leg. ad Ca-
13 On ἀναπρέπειν, to send up, of the trans-
port of prisoners to Rome, comp. Polyb. i. 7. 19, xxix. 13. 9; Lucian, Taz. 17; and Jacob in loc. See also on Luke xxiii. 7.
14 Comp. on xxiii. 12.
15 Germ.: ἵππων.
16 Comp. Rom. ix. 5; Gal. iv. 20. See Wi-
17 Mac. ixi. 87, ambito (Nep. x. 2. 9). See Polyb. xv. 28. 5; xvi. 21. 1; xxxii. 13. 6; Dion.
L. iv. 53; Jacobs, ad Del. epigr. p. 192; and Wetstein.
18 Plat. Moral. p. 45 F, 987 D. Cat. 22.
is again mentally supplied before ἀνδράσι. By τοῖς χιλιάρχοις, there were five cohorts, and therefore five tribunes in Caesarea—and by ἀνδράσι ... πάλιν are meant the principal military and the prominent civil personages of the city. Instead of τοῖς κατ` ἐξουσίας οὖσι, a classical writer would say τοῖς ἐξουσίοις or ἐξουσιῶ.¹

VV. 24, 25. Ὑπομνήματα] Indicative.—πᾶν τὸ πλήθος] appears to conflict with vv. 2 and 15, and is at all events an exaggeration. But how natural is it to suppose that the persons there named were accompanied by an impetuous crowd! Hence also ἐπιβουλέως. On ἐνέργησιν μου, they have approached me, in a hostile spirit towards him.² On ἠνδοχάσα, comp. xxv. 17. — καὶ αὐτοῦ δὲ τούτου] and, on the other hand,³ this person himself, itemque ipsa ille.

VV. 26, 27. Ἀσφαλῆς τι] something trustworthy, whereby the emperor, ὁ κύριος, Dominus, the appellation declined by Augustus and Tiberius, but accepted by their successors,⁴ may inform himself certainly concerning the state of matters. Such a fixing of the real aitia had not been possible for the procurator, who had to draw up the literae dimissoriae, so long as the proceedings were constantly disturbed and confused by intentional fabrications of the Jews. — ἀνακρίσι.] A preliminary examination, "judicis edocendi causa."—In σαρακεν ἐπαύω (see the critical remarks) ἐπαύω is the future: what I am to write. — ἀλογον] unreasonable, absurd.⁵ Without εἰσα. — τὰς κατ` αὐτοῦ οἰνιας] This was just the ἀσφαλῆς, which was still wanting to the procurator. Without having made himself clear as to the contents of the charges brought against Paul, he would have been obliged frankly to report to the emperor that he was in ignorance of them. Olshehausen, however, is hasty in holding that, with the placing of the apostle before Agrippa the prediction of the Lord⁶ was now for the first time fulfilled. We know far too little of the previous history of the other apostles to take this ground. Perhaps the elder James and Peter had already stood before Herod. But Paul stood here for the first time before a king, who, however, is by no means to be considered as the representative of the power of the heathen world, as Baumgarten supposes, as Agrippa was himself a Jew,⁷ ruled over the Jews, was by Paul addressed as a Jew,⁸ and was, in fact, even regarded as representative of the Jews.⁹

¹ See Schoemann, ad Joes. p. 235 f.; Stallb. ad Plat. Ort. p. 43 B.
² On the periphrastic κατά, see Winer, 286 (E. T. 548).
³ Comp. 1 Mac. viii. 23, x. 61; 2 Mac. iv. 36.
⁴ See Wolf and Weistein, also Doutg. Anal. p. 96; Fincke, i.e.⁵ Grotius. See also Heind. ad Plat. Phaedr. p. 277 B.; Hermann, Staatslehrer. § 140. 1.
⁶ See on Phil. i. 28.
⁷ Thuc. vi. 35. 1, Plat. Gorg. p. 519 B, Apol. p. 16 C.
⁸ See Sauppe, and Kühner ad Xen. Mem. i. 1. 5.
⁹ Matt. x. 18; Mark xiii. 9.
¹⁰ Agrippa I., xii. 2, 3 f.
¹¹ See on ver. 14.
¹² xxvi. 27.
¹³ See also ὧπερ xxvi. 8.
Notes by American Editor.

(D^4) I appeal to Cæsar. V. 11.

For two years the mercenary and unprincipled Felix kept Paul in prison at Cæsarea. It has been supposed by some that during this period, Luke, having free access to Paul, wrote his gospel, and perhaps a part of the Acts under his direction. On account of a formal impeachment by the Jews, Felix was recalled to Rome to answer their accusations, and Festus, a man of a very different character, was appointed as his successor. He seems to have been an upright and honorable man, who entered upon the duties of his office with energy, activity, and decision. Owing to the excited state of mind among the Jews at the time, and their embittered feelings against Paul, his case was at once brought before Festus. The new governor without delay visited Jerusalem, the ancient capital of the province, with a view to become acquainted with the characteristics of the people whom he had been appointed to govern.

When there, the chief men among the Jews came to him, and asked, as a special favor, that he would give judgment against Paul at once, or order him to be sent to Jerusalem for trial. This was done with the sinister design of assassinating him while on the way. The answer of Festus was dignified and worthy of the office he held: "Let his accusers come to Cæsarea, and he shall be tried there." As soon as Festus returned Paul is brought again before the court. The Jews passionately and clamorously reiterate their former charges of treason, heresy, and sacrilege, which the apostle meets with a calm and emphatic denial. With the view of putting an end to a scene so disorderly and offensive to his sense of Roman decorum, Festus asks Paul whether he was willing to transfer the question from Roman back to Jewish jurisdiction. Paul's reply is prompt and decided, and reveals the dauntless and heroic spirit of the man. "I am either guilty or not; if guilty, I fear not the sentence of death from the tribunal at which I now stand; but if I am innocent, as a Roman citizen, no man can deliver me into the hands of the Jews; I appeal to Cæsar." The right of appeal from a subordinate court to the emperor was one of the privileges of citizenship; and no unnecessary impediment could be interposed against such appeal. Festus therefore, having consulted his counsellors, granted the appeal and said, "Unto Cæsar thou shalt go"—"Cæsarem appellasti; ad Cæsarem ibis." So Paul was again remanded to prison until arrangements could be made to forward him to Rome. Particular importance was attached to the right of appeal from the judgments of provincial magistrates. The magic power of this one word appello is described as similar to that of the talismanic phrase, Civis Romanus sum. Indeed the two things coincided. (Alexander.)

(Ε^4) Unto my lord. V. 26.

'O κυρίος—dominus—lord. Gloag says: "In the use of this title we have an instance of the extreme accuracy of the historian of the Acts." This title was declined by the first two emperors, Augustus and Tiberias. Caligula accepted it, but it was not a recognized title of any emperor before Domitian. Of
Augustus, Tertullian writes: "Augustus imperii formator ne dominum quidem dici se volebat"—Augustus, the founder of the empire, did not wish any one to call him lord. And Suetonius writes: "Dominum se appellari, ne a liberis quidem, aut nepotibus, vel serio vel joco, passus est"—He suffered not himself to be addressed as lord, even by his own children or grandchildren, whether in jest or earnest.

Antoninus Pius was the first who put this title on his coins. Polycarp, who was a contemporary of some of the apostles, and who suffered martyrdom at an advanced age, refused to utter it.
CHAPTER XXVI.

Ver. 1. τες[π] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read τες, upon decisive evidence. — Ver. 3. After δέομαι Elz. Scholz have σο, which is deleted by Lachm. Tisch. Born., according to A B E N, min. Aeth. Syr. p. Arm. Vulg. A supplementary addition. — Ver. 6, εἰς] Elz. Scholz have πρὸς. εἰς has A B E N, min. in its favour; is recommended by Griesb., and adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born.; πρὸς is explanatory, in accordance with xiii. 32. — After παρ. A B C E N, min. Chrys. Theophyl. and many vss. have ἦμων. Adopted by Griesb. Scholz. Lachm., and in view of the considerable preponderance of testimony, rightly. The unnecessary pronoun was easily passed over. — Ver. 7. The critically established order of the words is: ἐγκαλεῖμαι εἰς Ἰουδαίων (not εἰς τῶν Ἰουδ., as Elz. has) διακεῖσθαι. So Lachm. Born. Tisch. Ἄγω[ν]πα, which Elz. and Scholz have after θαυμεῖν, is an addition opposed to greatly preponderant testimony. — Ver. 10. φιλακατις[ς] decisive witnesses have εἰς φιλ. ; so Griesb. Scholz. Lachm. Tisch. Born. — Ver. 12. εἰς οἱ καὶ] καὶ is wanting in A B C E J N, min. and several vss. Deleted by Lachm. and Born.; and on that preponderating testimony with the more right, as the frequent καὶ after the relative was easily added mechanically. — τῆς παρὰ τῶν] Lachm. and Born. have merely τῶν, according to A. E J, min. vss. (B N omit only παρὰ). But τῆς might be just as easily left out after the syllable πης, as παρὰ might be overlooked as superfluous. If only τῶν stood originally, there was no reason why it should be completed from ver. 10. Therefore the Recepta is to be retained. — Ver. 14. λαλοῦσαν πρὸς μὲ κ. λέγουσαν] Lachm. and Born. read λέγουσαν πρὸς μὲ, following A B C J N, min. vss., to which also E, min., having ωρις λεγοῦσας πρὸς μὲ, are to be added. But the comparison of ix. 4, xxii. 7, occasioned the abbreviation. — Ver. 15. ἄ[τρ] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read ἄ τρισ[τ] Κύριος, according to very considerable testimony. The Recepta is from ix. 5 (see the critical remarks thereon). — Ver. 16. εἰ[δέ] B C* (?) 137, Arm. Syr. p. Armbr. Aug. have εἰδέ με. More precise definition, although defended by Buttmann in the Stud. u. Krit. 1860, p. 360. — Ver. 17. Instead of ἄρι, Elz. Scholz have νῦν, against decisive testimony. — Ver. 20. After πρῶτον Lachm. Born. Tisch. have τε as in A B N. Inserted for closer connection with καὶ Ἰεροσ. Comp. the following τε . . . καὶ. — εἰς πάσαν] εἰς is wanting in A B N, and is deleted by Lachm., but is indispensable, and might be easily enough passed over after the syllable αἰς. — Ver. 21. The article is wanting before Ἰουδαῖοι in B G N, which Buttmann approves: it was easily overlooked on account of the similarity of the following syllable, but would hardly be added, comp. νν. 2, 3, 7. — Ver. 29. παρὰ] ἀπὸ has the stronger attestation (Lachm. Tisch. Born.). — μαρτυροῦμαι A B G H N, min. Chrys. Theophyl. have μαρτυροῦμενος. Approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. A correction. See the exegetical remarks. — Ver. 25. ἄ[τρ] Lachm. and Born. read ἄ τρισ[τ] Παῦλος, which, indeed, has important attestation, but has the suspicion of having arisen from the very usual practice of writing the name on the margin. — Ver. 28. εἰ[ν] is to be deleted, with Lachm.

Vv. 1–3. 'Επταύσεται σοι] it is, herewith, permitted to thee to speak for thyself, i.e. to defend thyself.² — ἵκτηνας τὴν χειρα] after stretching forth his hand, is not equivalent to the καταστίσας τῇ χειρα, xii. 17, xiii. 16, in opposition to Er. Schmid and Hammond, because this latter had for its object the σκέψεως of the hearers;³ but it conveys a trait descriptive of the solemnity of this moment: Paul comes forward in the attitude of an orator, with all the ingenuousness and candour of a good conscience, although the chain hung on his hands.⁴ Comp. in contrast to the simple gesture of Paul, the artificially rhetorical one in Apuleius:⁵ "Porrigit dextram et ad instar oratorum conformat articulum, duobusque inmis conclusis digitis ceteros emerentes porriget." According to Lange's fancy, it is an intimation that "he stretched out his hand at length for once to an intelligent judge." — How true and dignified is also here the conciliatory exordium, with which Paul commences his speech! — ἀνέσθη Ἰουδαίων] by Jews, generally, not: by the Jews, comp. xxiv. 10. In regard to Jewish accusations, Paul esteemed himself fortunate that he was to defend himself before Agrippa, as the latter was best informed about Jewish customs and controversies. — Ver. 3. μᾶλιστα γνώσεσθαι οὐκ οὐ] as thou art most, more than all other authorities, cognizant. The speech, continuing by a participial construction, is joined on in an abnormal case, as if an accusative expression had been previously used.¹ The view of Bornemann is very harsh, as διὸ δὲ θεωμ encompasses the previous construction, and commences a new sentence of the speech: that Paul has put the accusative, because he had it in view to continue subsequently with αἰτῶ . . . ἄκοψαι μον, but omitted to do so on account of πάνω . . . ζητημάτων. — κατὰ Ἰουδ.] among Jews throughout.⁶

Vv. 4, 5. Μὲν οὖν] introduces, in connection with the preceding exordium, the commencement now of the defence itself.⁷ — βίοι] manner of life.¹⁰ Not preserved in Greek writers. — τὴν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς . . . ἱεροῦ.] a significant exegesis of τὴν ἐκ νεότητος, for the establishment of the following ἰδαν κ.τ.λ. — προχρισάσκοντες . . . καὶ Παρίσιων] my manner of life . . . know all Jews, since they knew me from the outset, since the first time of my be-


coming known—namely, that I, according to the strictest sect of our religion (θρησκείας), have lived as Pharisee. This Φαρισαίος, calling that ἀκριβ. αἵρεσιν by its name, stands with great emphasis at the close. Notice generally the intentional definiteness with which Paul here describes all the circumstances of the case, to which belongs also the emphatic repetition of τῆς. — In προ-γίνεσθαι, προ, before, contains the same conception, which is afterwards still more definitely denoted by ἀνοβεν. They knew Paul earlier than merely since the present encounter, and that indeed ἀνοβεν, from the beginning, which therefore, as it refers to the knowing and not to ἰδεα, may not be explained: from my ancestors; — ἵνα θελῶμεις μαρτυρεῖν] if they do not conceal or deny, but are willing to testify it. “Nolebat autem, quia persentis-cebant, in conversione Pauli, etiam respectu vitae antequae actae, efficacissimum esse argumentum pro veritate fidei Christianae,” Bengel.

Vv. 6, 7. As I was known from of old by every one as a disciple of the strictest orthodoxy, so it is also now far from being anything heterodox, on account of which I stand accused (ἰστηκα κρινόμενος), — it is the universal, ardently-cherished, national hope, directed to the promise issued by God to our fathers. — εἰς ἐλπίδα] on account of hope toward the promise, etc. That Paul means the hope of the Messianic kingdom to be erected, the hope of the whole eternal κρίσιν, not merely the special hope of the resurrection of the dead, the following more precise description proves, in which the universal and unanimous solicitude of the nation is depicted. He had preached of this hope, that the risen Jesus would realize it, and this was the reason of his persecution. — εἰς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν] issued to our fathers. On the order of the words, the participle after the substantive, see Kühner. — εἰς ἐκεῖ refers to the ἐπαγγελία. — τὸ ὀδελκάφυλον ἡμῶν] our twelve-tribe-stock, a theocratically honourable designation of the nation as a whole. The word is also found in the Protevangel. Jacob, 1:18 τὸ ὀδελκάσκεπτρον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. To understand the expression historically, it need only be remarked, that even after the exile the collective body of the people actually consisted of the twelve tribes; in which view the circumstance, that ten tribes did not return from the exile, did not alter anything in the objective relation, and could not destroy the consciousness, deeply interwoven and vividly bound up by history and prophecy with the whole national character, that every Jew, wherever he was, belonged to the great unity of the ὀδελκάφυλον, — to say nothing of the fact that all the members of the ten tribes did not go into exile, and of the exiled all did not jointly and severally remain in exile. The question, therefore, as to the later fate of the ten tribes does not belong to this place. — εἰς ἐκκενείας κ.τ.λ.] with constancy attending to the
worship of God, as well by the ἱερό, sacrificium júge,1 as by prayer and every kind of adoration. Comp. on Luke ii. 87, where also, in order at once to give prominence to the earnestness of the constant worship, νόμον precedes. — κατανυσθήσα] to arrive, as if at a goal, which is the contents of the promise.2 The conception ἁμβάλεις τὴν ἐπαγγελματίαν is analogous. The realization of the Messianic promise is also here represented as attaching itself to the pious preparation of the nation.3 — ὑπὸ Ἰσθανόντων] by Jesus placed at the end, brings into emphatic prominence the contrast. The absurdity and wickedness of being impeached by Jesus concerning the hope of the Messianic kingdom were to be made thoroughly palpable.

Ver. 8. The circumstance that Paul made the resurrection of Jesus the foundation of his preaching of the Messianic kingdom, had specially provoked the hatred of the Jews. This resurrection they would not recognize,4 and therefore he continues—in his impassioned address breaking away from what had gone before, and in the person of the Jewish king addressing the Jews themselves as if present (παρ' ὑμῖν)—with the bold inquiry: Why is it esteemed as incredible with you? etc. Beza and others, also de Wette and Lange, place after τι a note of interrogation: How? Is it incredible? etc. But it tells decisively against this view that the mere τι is not so used; τι γάρ, τι οὖν, or τι δέ would be employed. — ei ο θεὸς νεκρ. εν νεκρῷ] if God, as He has done in the instance of Jesus, raises the dead.5 ei is neither equivalent to ἄρα, nor is it the problematic whether;6 the more especially as the matter under discussion is not that of doubt or uncertainty on the part of the Jews, but that of their definite unbelief, which is absurd.

Vv. 9, 10. In consequence of this unbelief (μεν οὖν), I myself was once a decided opponent of the name of Jesus.— ἵδοι ἐμαυρώ] mihi ipsi videbam. See examples in Wetstein. The view of Erasmus, Calovius, de Dieu, and Vater, who connect ἐμαυρῷ with δειν, is to be rejected; for δειν with the dative, although not without example in classical writers,8 is foreign to the N. T. ἐμαυρώ has the emphasis of his own personal opinion: I had the self-delusion, that I ought to exert myself. "Tanta vis errantis conscientiae," Bengel. — πρός το δόξαν] in reference to the name, namely, in order to suppress the confession and invocation of it. Observe how Paul uses Ἰησοῦ} τοῦ Ναζωρ. according to his standpoint as Saul. — ἃ] which πολλὰ ἐναντία πράζα I also actually did.10 This is then more particularly set forth by καὶ (and indeed) πολλάς κ.τ.λ. Mark the difference between πράζας and πολλάς.11 — τῶν ἄγιων] spoken from the Christian standpoint of the apostle, with grief. The ἐγὼ also has painful emphasis—ἀναμαρτ. τε αὐτ. καθήμενα καθήμενα] and when they were put to death, when people were on the point of executing them, I have given voice thereto, calculus adjeci, i.e. I have as-

---

1 See Ewald, Alterth. p. 171.
2 Comp. on Phil. iii. 7.
3 It. 28; Gal. iii. 14; Heb. ix. 15, xi. 18.
4 Comp. iii. 30 f.
5 xxv. 19.
6 Comp. Vulgate, Erasmus, and others.
7 Luther, Beza, Grotius, and others.
8 De Wette and others.
9 Xen. Mem. iii. 3, 10, Anab. iii. 4, 85, Oecom. vii. 30; see Köhner, § 551, note 5; Schoene.
10 Comp. Gal. ii. 10. [ad Is. p. 580.]
11 See on John iii. 30.
CHAP. XXVI., 11-20.

The plural ἀναιρ. aëtr. is not, with Grotius, Kuinoel, and others, to be referred merely to Stephen, but also to other unknown martyrs, who met their death in the persecution which began with the killing of Stephen. Elsmere and Kypke make the genitive dependent on κατήγεια, and in that case take κατα- in a hostile reference. Harsh, and without precedent in linguistic usage; ἀναιρ. aëtr. is the genitive absolute, and κατήν is conceived with a local reference, according to the original conception of the ψήφος, the voting-stone, which the voter deposits in the urn. Classical authors make use of the simple σώφρινος ψήφον, also of διαφέρειν, or ἐπιφέρ., or ἀναφέρ., or ἐκφέρ. ψ. But to καταφέρειν in our passage corresponds the classical τιθέναι ψήφον.

Vv. 11-13. Ὑπάτας τ. συναγ. throughout all the synagogues in Jerusalem, going from one to another and searching out the Christians in all. — πνευματικός τοὺς τιμήσας, taking vengeance on them, dragging them to punishment. The middle is more usual. — βλασφήμειν, namely, τὸν Ἱσραήλ, which is obvious of itself, as the object of the specific reverence of Christians. Whether and how far this θνάγκας, βλασφ. was actually successful, cannot be determined. — εἰς καὶ εἰς τὰς τέω πόλεις till even unto the extraneous cities, outside of Palestine. By this remark the following narrative has the way significantly prepared for it. — in oic.] in which affairs of persecution. — μετί ἐνομ. κ. ἐπιτρ. with power and plenary authority. "Paulus erat commissarius," Bengel. — ἡμέρας μέσας ἦν πνευμάτων, see Lobeck. 10 genitive of the definition of time. On the non-classical Greek expression μετί ἡμέρα, see Lobeck. 11 κατὰ τὴν ὅδον] along the way. — υπὲρ τ. λαμπρ. τ. ἡλίου surpassing the brightness of the sun. 12

Vv. 14, 15. See on ix. 4 ff.; comp. xxii. 7 f. — τῇ Ἑβρ. διαλ.] It was natural that the exalted Christ should make no other language than the native tongue of the person to be converted the medium of his verbal revelation. Moreover, these words confirm the probability that Paul now spoke not, as at xxi. 40, in Hebrew, but in Greek. — σκληρῶν σου πρὸς κέντρα λακτιζων] hard for thee, to kick against goods! i.e. it is for thee a difficult undertaking, surpassing thy strength, and not to be accomplished by thee, 16 that thou, as my persecutor, shouldest contend against my will. "H αὐτῇ ἁτῶ τῶν βοῶν τῶν γάρ οἱ ἀτακτοι κατὰ τὴν γεωργίαν κεντριζόμενοι ὑπὸ ἀροῦτους, λακτιζονταί τὸ κέντρον καὶ μᾶλλον πλήττονται. 16

Vv. 16-18. Ἀλλὰ] "Prostravit Christus Paulum, ut eum humiliaret; nunc eum erigit ac jubet bono esse animo," Calvin. — εἰς τούτο γάρ] εἰς τοῦτο...
points emphatically to what follows, προξευρίσασθαι κ.τ.λ., and γὰρ assigns the reason for what precedes, ἀνάστηθι κ.τ.λ.—προξευρ. in order to appooint thee. He was, indeed, the σκένος ἐκλογής, ix. 15. — ὡς τε ὀφθήσομαι σοι] ὡς is to be resolved into τοῖς ἀ; but ὀφθήσομαι is not, with Luther, Bengel, and others, including Bornemann, to be taken as causative, videre faciam, but purely passive, I shall be seen. The ἀ contained in ὡς is equivalent to de' ἀ, on account of which. Consequently: and of those things, on account of which I shall appear to thee, tibi videbor.—εἰς αἰωνιοῖς σε] is an accompanying definition to ὀφθήσομαι σοι: recepting thee, as thy deliverer, from the people, i.e. καὶ εἰς χήραν, the Jewish nation, and from the Gentiles, from their hostile power. Calvin appropriately says: "Hic armatur contra omnes metus, qui eum manebant, et simul praeparatur ad crucis tolerantiam."—εἰς οἷς is not, with Calvin, Grotius, and others, to be referred merely to τῶν ἔθνων, but, with Beza, Bengel, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, de Wette, to τῶν λαῶν κ. τ. ἔθνων together, which is required by the significant bearing of vv. 19, 20. — ἀποστηλλούσι not future, but strictly present. — ἀνωτέρω οὐδαμῶς αὐτῶν] contains the aim of the mission. And this opening of their eyes, i.e. the susceptibility for the knowledge of divine truth, which was to be brought to them by the preaching of the gospel, was to have the design: τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι, that they may turn themselves; on account of ver. 20, less admissible is the rendering of Beza and Bengel: ut convertas, ἀπὸ σκότους εἰς φῶς, from darkness to light, i.e. from a condition, in which they are destitute of saving truth, and involved in ignorance and sin, to the opposite element, καὶ [ἀπὸ] τῆς εξωσιας τῶν Σατανᾶ κ.tau.L. The two more precise definitions of ἐπιστρέψαι apply to both, to the Jews and Gentiles; but the latter has respect in its predominant reference to the Gentiles, who are ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, under the power of Satan, the ἄρχων τῶν κόσμων τῶν, Eph. ii. 2. — τῶν λαβεῖν αὐτῶν ἄσειν ... εἰς εἰμὶ] This now contains the aim of τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι κ.τ.λ., and so the ultimate aim of ἀνωτέρω οὐδαμῶς αὐτῶν.—εἰμὶ ἐν τοῖς ψηλαῖς.] See on xx. 32. —πίστει τῆς εἰμὶ belongs to λαβεῖν. Faith on Christ, as the subjective condition (causa apprehendens) of the forgiveness of sins and the attainment of the Messianic salvation, is with great emphasis placed at the close; the form also of the expression has weight.

Vv. 19, 20. "ὅθεν] Hence, namely, because such a glorious ministry has been promised to me. —συν ἐγένομη] i.e. non praestiti me. — Observe the address to the king, as at ver. 18 in the narrative of the emergence of the Christophany, so here immediately after its close; in both places, for the purpose of specially exciting the royal interest. — τῆς ωφρανίας ὑπαστασκά] the heavenly vision, because it came ωφρανόθεν. — εἰς παῖς τοῦ χῶρος τ. 'Ἰουδ.
The statement is threefold: I preached, (1) to them in Damascus; (2) to the city Jerusalem, Ἰερουσαλήμ, simple dative, no longer dependent on in, and unto all the land of Judaea. 1 (3) to the Gentiles. 8 Thus Paul indicates his whole ministry from his conversion till now. Consequently there is here no contradiction with Gal. i. 22. 4 It was also the interest of the apostle, persecuted by the Jews, to put his working for the Jews into the foreground. The shift to which Hofmann, i.e., resorts, that the apostle does not at all say that he has preached in all Judaea—he certainly does say so—but only that his preaching had sounded forth thither, is the less required, as he here summarily comprehends his whole working. — πράσοντας accusative. 8 — Paul certainly gives the contents of his preaching in a form reminding us of the preaching of the Baptist; 8 but he thus speaks, because he stands before an assembly before which he had to express himself in the mode most readily understood by it, and after a type universally known and venerated, for the better disclosure of the injustice done to him (ἐνεκα τούτων, ver. 21!); to set forth here the μυστηριον of his gospel, with which he filled up this form, would have been quite out of place. Without reason, Zeller and Baur 6 find here a denial of the doctrine of justification by faith alone; an opinion which ought to have been precluded by the very πιστεύειν τῷ εἰς ἐμί, ver. 18, which leaves no doubt as to what was in the mind of the apostle the specific qualification for μετανοεῖν . . . πράσοντας.

Vv. 21, 22. Ἐνεκα τούτων.] because I have preached this μετανοείν and ἐνεργείαν among Jews and Gentiles. — διεξήγην. Beza correctly explains: "manibus interfaceretur." 9 — ἐπικοινωνίας oṁ . . . Θεοῦ] This oṁ infers from the preceding ἐνεργ. διεξήγην that the ἑστήκα ἀξία τῆς ἡμέρας τάνης is effected through help of God, without which no deliverance from such extreme danger to life could come. Observe withal the triumphant ἑστήκα, I stand, keep my ground! — μαρτυροῦμενος μικρῷ τε καὶ μεγάλῳ] as one witnessed to by small and great, i.e. who has a good testimony from young and old. Accordingly, μαρτυροῦμενος is to be taken quite regularly as passive, and that in its very current sense; 10 while μικρῷ and μεγάλῳ are the datives usual with the passive construction. 11 The usual rendering, following the Vulgate: witnessing to small and great, 12 i.e. "instituens omnis generis homines," 13 arbitrarily assumes a deviation from linguistic usage, as μαρτυρεῖσθαι is always used passively, on which account, in 1 Thess. ii. 12, the reading

1 εις, as in Luke viii. 34, and frequently; see on ix. 28, xxiii. 11.
2 The ἐνεκα belongs only to ἐνεκα Ἰερουσαλήμ, not also to Ἰερουσαλήμ. (Hofmann, N. T. I. p. 110), as between Damascus and Jerusalem, in the consciousness of the apostle (Gal. i. 23), there lay an interval of three years.
3 See ver. 21.
4 Zeller.
5 See Bornemann, ad Xen. Anab. i. 2. 1; Ktöhner, ad Mem. i. 1. 9; Bredtenb. ad Oscon. i. 4.
7 See also his newest. Theol. p. 388.
8 See on v. 30. Comp. xxi. 30, 51.
9 viii. 10.
10 As in vi. 3, x. 29 al.
11 See on Matt. v. 21, instead of which ὤν is used in x. 22, xxi. 2, xxii. 12.
12 Erasmus, Castalio, Calvin, Bengel, and others take μικρῷ τ. κ. μεγάλῳ, in the sense of rank: to persons of low and of high degree. This is historically unsuitable to the correct view of μαρτυροῦμεν, as Paul was despised and persecuted by the great of this world. The wisdom, which he preached, was not at all theirs, 1 Cor. ii. 6 ff.
13 Kuinoel.
Paul's Reply to Festus.

μαργαρόμενος is necessarily to be defended. See Rinck, who, however, as also de Wette, Baumgarten, Ewald, declares for the reading μαργαρόμου; this, although strongly attested (see the critical remarks), is an old, hasty emendation, which was regarded as necessary to suit the dative. But in what a significant contrast to that deadly hatred of his enemies appears the statement: "By help of God I stand till this day, well attested by small and great!" The following words then give the reason of this μαργαρόμενος: because I set forth nothing else than what (ἡν = τούτων ἃ) the prophets, etc.—μελλόντων] On the attraction, see Lobeck; and on the expression τὰ μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι, Jacobs.

Ver. 23 is to be separated simply by a comma from the preceding: What the prophets and Moses have spoken concerning the future, whether—namely—the Messiah is exposed to suffering, etc. Paul expresses himself in problematic form (ἐκ), because it was just the point of debate among the Jews whether a suffering Messiah was to be believed in, as in fact such an one constantly proved an offence unto them. "Res erat liquida; Judaei in quaestionem vocarant," Bengel. Paul in his preaching has said nothing else than what Moses and the prophets have spoken as the future state of the case on this point; he has propounded nothing new, nothing of his own invention, concerning it. παθήσεως, passible, not, however, in the metaphysical sense of susceptibility of suffering, but of the divine destination to suffering: subjected to suffering. The opposite ἀπαθῆς in classic writers since the time of Herodotus.—The other point of the predictions of Moses and the prophets, vividly introduced without a connecting particle, in respect of which Paul had just as little deviated from their utterances, is: whether the Messiah as the first from the resurrection of the dead, as the first for ever risen, as πρωτότοκος εἰ τῶν νεκρῶν, will proclaim light to the Jewish people and to the Gentiles. The chief stress of this sentence lies on πρωτότοκος εἰς ἀναστ. νεκρῶν; for, if this was, in accordance with the O. T., appropriated to the Messiah as characteristic, thereby the σκόνδον of the cross of Christ was removed. After His resurrection Jesus proclaimed light to all the Gentiles by his self-communication in the Holy Spirit, whose organs and mediate agents the apostles and their associates were.

Ver. 24. While he was thus speaking in his defence, Festus said with a loud voice, Thou art mad, Paul! ταῦτα is to be referred to the whole defence, now interrupted by Festus—observe the present participle—but in which certainly the words spoken last (οὐδέν ἐκ τῶν κ. τ. Λ.) were most unpalatable...

---

1 See Liddell & Scott, p. 51.
2 Ver. 21.
3 Ad Aj. 1006; Böttger, neut. Gr. p. 261 (St. T. 205).
4 Ad Philo, p. 650.
5 John xii. 34.
6 1 Cor. i. 23; Gal. v. 11.
7 Vulgate.
8 Plut. Pelop. 16: τὰ θυμία καὶ παθήσεως
9 ἀνασκόντος.
11 Col. i. 18; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 32.
12 As in ver. 18.
13 See on Eph. ii. 17.
14 Comp. on Col. i. 12.
15 Matt. vii. 8, see on xiv. 10.
16 As to ἀνωτέρων, see on Luke xii. 11.
to the cold-hearted statesman, and at length raised his impatience to the point of breaking out aloud. His profane mind remained unaffected by the holy inspiration of the strange speaker, and took his utterances as the whims of a mind perverted by much study from the equilibrium of a sound understanding. His μαῦρυ was indignant earnestness; with all the more earnestness and bitterness he expressed the idea of eccentricity by this hyperbolical μαῦρυ, the more he now saw his hope of being enlightened as to the true state of matters grievously disappointed. That solicitude of the procurator, which naturally governed his tone of mind, was much too anxious and serious for a jest, such as Olshausen takes it to be. Nor does μεγάλη τῇ φωνῇ suit this, on which Chrysostom already correctly remarks: οὕτω ἣν κ. ὄργης ἤ φωνῆς. The explanation, thou art an enthusiast! is nothing but a mistaken softening of the expression. However the furor propheticius may be nourished by plunging into πολλά γράμματα, the μαῦρυ in this sense is far less suited to the indignation of the annoyed Roman; and that Paul regarded himself as declared by him to be a madman, is evident from ver. 25 (ἀληθείας κ. σωφροσ.). — τὰ πολλὰ σε γράμματα multis litteris, the much knowledge, learning, with which thou busiest thyself. Not: the many books, which thou readest, for, if so, we cannot see why the most naturally occurring word, βιβλία or βιβλιον, should not have been used.—The separation of πολλά from γράμμαυμα by the interposition of σε puts the emphasis on πολλά. Bengel correctly adds: “Videbat Festus, naturam non agere in Paulo; gratiam non vidit.”

Ver. 25. ‘O δέ] μετὰ εἰπεικείας ἀποκριμένονς, Chrysostom.—ἀληθείας κ. σωφροσ. βήματα] words, to which truth and intelligence, sound discretion, belong. ἀληθεία may doubtless accompany enthusiastic utterance, but it is a characteristic opposed to madness. For passages in the classics where σωφροσύνη is opposed to μαῦρα, see ELSNER AND RAPHEL.—ἀποφθέγγομαι] “aptum verbum,” Bengel. See on ii. 4.

Ver. 26. In proof (γάρ) that he spoke truly, and in his sound mind, Paul appeals to the knowledge of the king, in quo plus erat spei, Calvin.—peri τοῦτων and τι τούτων refer to what Paul had last said concerning the Messiah, which had overwhelmed the patience of Felix and drawn from him the μαῦρα. τοῦτο is the same, but viewed together as an historical unity. ἐπιστάμαι with peri is not found elsewhere in the N. T., but often in Greek writers.—οὐδὲν] like nihil, in no respect. Taken as accusative of object, it would be inappropriate, on account of τι; 10 while, on the other hand, B has not τι.—Observe also the correlates εἰπότατοι and λανθάνειν placed at the beginning.—οὐ . . . ἐν γνώσει] A litotes: not in a corner (ἐν κρυπτῷ), but publicly in the sacred capital of the nation. 11

1 Comp. Soph. O. R. 1300: τις σ', δ' τάλμον, πρεσβύτη χαλκία.
2 xxv. 26.
3 So Kuhn (in Wolf), Majus (Obs. IV. p. 11 ff.), Loesner, Schleusner, Dindorf.
4 Vulgate.
5 See on John vii. 15.
6 Helnrichs, Kühnoel, Hildebrand.
8 Comp. on raibra, ver. 21.
9 KüHner, ad Xen. Anab. vi. 6. 12.
10 Hence A διὶ ** min. omit it (so Zachmann and Bornemann).
11 See examples in Wetstein.
Paul’s Appeal to Agrippa.

Ver. 27. Instead of adding to the “for this was not done in a corner” as a second reason, “and the prophets in whom the king believes have foretold it,” in the increased vehemence of his impassioned discourse Paul turns to the king with the question: Believeth thou the prophets? and immediately himself answers the question with confidence: I know that thou believest! Thus with fervent earnestness he suddenly withdraws the sacred subject from merely objective contemplation, and brings it as a matter of conscience home to the king’s consciousness of faith. Paul could reasonably say without flattery, oida, bi παρεις, since Agrippa, educated as a Jew, could not have belief in the truth of the prophecies otherwise than as a heritage of his national training, although it had in his case remained simply theory, and therefore the words of the apostle did not touch his heart, but glanced off on his polished and good-natured levity.

Ver. 28. The king is of course well-meaning enough not to take amiss the burning words, but also, as a luxurious man of the world, sufficiently estranged from what is holy instantly to banish the transiently-felt impression with haughtily contemptuous mockery. The conduct of Pilate in John xviii. 38 is similar to this and to ver. 82. — ἐν ὀλίγῳ is to be taken as neuter, and without supplement, namely: With little (ἐν, instrumental) thou persuadest me to become a Christian! This sarcasm is meant to say: “Thus summarily, thus brevi manu, you will not manage to win me over to Christianity.” Appropriately, in substance, Occumenius: ἐν ὀλίγῳ τοντες δι’ ὀλίγων ῥημάτων, ἐν βραχέω λόγω, ἐν ὀλίγῃ διδασκαλίᾳ, χωρὶς πολλοῦ πάνω καὶ συνεχώς διαλέξεως. Most expositors either adopt the meaning sometimes with and sometimes without the supplement of χρόνῳ: in a short time; or: propemodum, parum absentee, quin. So also Ewald, who calls to his aid the 3 of value, for a little, i.e. almost. But in opposition to the view which takes it temporally, may be decisively urged the reading μεγάλῳ, to be adopted instead of πολλῷ in ver. 29 (see the critical remarks), an expression which proves that Paul apprehended ἐν ὀλίγῳ in a quantitatively sense; and there is no reason in the context for the idea, to which Calvin is inclined, following Chrysostom, that Paul took the word in one sense and the king in another. The same reason decides against the explanation propemodum, which also is not linguistically to be justified, for there must have been used either ὀλίγου, or ὀλίγου δει or παρ’ ὀλίγου. — Lastly, that the words of the king are to be taken ironically. and not, with Heinrichs and many other expositors, as an earnest confession, is evident even from the very improbability in itself of such a confession in view of the luxurious levity of the king, as well as from the name Χριστιανόν, which, of Gentiles origin, carries with it in the mouth of

1 Comp. Dionen, ad Dem de cor. pp. 126.
2 As in Eph. ii. 8 (see in loc.).
3 Calvin, Wetstein, Kalnoel, Olshausen, Neander, de Wette, Lange.
4 Pind. Pyth. vili. 131; Plat. Apol. pp. 28 B; and see the passages in Phot. Polyb.; comp. the analogous δι’ ὀλίγου, Thuc. i. 77. 4, ii. 55. 2, iii. 43. 8; Schaefer, ad. Eus. Eus. pp. 101, 533; and see on Eph. iii. 8.

* Chrysostom, Valla, Luther, Castello, Beza, Piscator, Grotius, Calvin, and others, to which also the moutas ex partis of Erasmus comes in the end.


* Bernhardy, p. 256.

* See on xl. 28.
a Jew the accessory idea of heterodoxy and the stain of contempt. Schneek-enauber also would have the expression to be earnestly meant, but in favour of the apologetic design imputed to the Book of Acts (r+).

Ver. 29. In the full consciousness of his apostolic dignity, Paul now upholds the cause of the despised Χριστιανὸν γενόσθαι as that which he would entreat from God for the king and all his present hearers, and which was thus more glorious than all the glory of the world. — eἰς ἐμέναν ἐν τῷ Θεῷ | I would indeed, in case of the state of the matter admitting it, pray to God.3 Ῥέξοσθαι; with the dative, to pray to any one, only here in the N. T., but very frequently in classical writers. — In what follows σήμερον belongs to τ… ἀκομαντάς μ., not to γενόσθαι,5 as is to be inferred from εἰς μεγάλην. — καὶ εἰς ὁλίγῳ καὶ εἰς μεγάλων ἀν κ.τ.λ. that as well by little as by great,—whether in the case of one, little,4 and in the case of another, much,6 may be employed as a means for the purpose,—not merely thou, but also all… were such also as I am, Christians. On κας, comp. 1 Cor. vii. 7. — παρεκτός τῶν διεσύνεσιν τοῖς] The chains which had bound him in prison, and were again to bind him,8 chaining him, namely, after the manner of the custodia militaris to the soldiers who watched him, he bore now hanging down freely on his arm.9 The παρεκτός κ.τ.λ., although to the apostle his chains were an honour,10 is ‚suavissima ἐπιθέραπεια et exceptio,'11 in the spirit of love.

Vv. 30—33. Perhaps this bold, grand utterance of the singular man had made an impression on the king’s heart, the concealment of which might have occasioned embarrassment to him, had he listened any longer: Agrippa arose and thereby brought the discussion at once to a close. With him arose, in the order of rank, first the procurator, then Bernice, then all who sat there with them (οἱ συγκαθήμενοι αὐτοῖς). After they had retired from the audience chamber (ἀνα χωρήσαντες), they communicated to each other their unanimous opinion, which certainly amounted only to the superficial political negative: this man, certainly by the most regarded as a harmless enthusiast, practises nothing which merits death or bonds. But Agrippa delivered specially to Festus his opinion to this effect: this man might, already, have been set at liberty,13 if he had not appealed unto Caesar, by which the sending him to Rome was rendered irreversible.13 — πράσοι] practises.
Grotius rightly remarks: "agit de vitæ instituto:" hence in the present. —The "recognition of the innocence of the apostle in all judicatures" is intelligible enough from the truth of his character, and from the power of his appearance and address; and, in particular, the closing utterance of Agrippa finds its ground so vividly and with such internal truth in the course of the proceedings, that the imputation of a set purpose on the author’s part can only appear as a frivolously dogmatic opinion, proceeding from personal prepossessions tending in a particular direction. The apostle might at any rate be credited, even in his situation at that time, with an ἀπόδειξις πνεύματος κ. ὀνείματος, 1 Cor. ii. 4.

Notes by American Editor.

(*) Almost thou persuadest me. V. 28.

While Festus was in a state of perplexity in respect to Paul, a distinguished visitor came to congratulate him on his accession to his exalted position. This was Agrippa, the great grandson of Herod the Great, and at that time King of Chalcis. Subsequently his kingdom was greatly enlarged. He was the brother of the infamous Drusilla, who lived with Felix, and of the equally infamous Bernice, who lived with himself, and who accompanied him at this time to the city which their great-grandfather had built, and where he miserably perished. During their visit Festus took occasion to refer to the perplexing case of the prisoner Paul; he informed Agrippa of the madness which seemed to inspire the Jewish people at the mere mention of the name of Paul, and of the futile results of the trial just concluded. He stated further that the questions at issue pertained to their own religious or superstitious observances, and to one Jesus, who had been crucified by them, but whom Paul affirmed to be alive, and further that the prisoner had declined to be tried again by the Sanhedrim and had appealed to the emperor.

On hearing this recital Agrippa expressed a wish to hear the man. So Festus, willing to gratify his princely guests, ordered the auditorium in the palace to be prepared, and invited the officers of the army and the chief men of the city to attend; and as the Herods were vain and fond of show, he arranged a gorgeous procession, so that Agrippa and Bernice came in royal state, "she, doubtless, blazing with all her jewels, and he in his purple robes, and both with the golden circlets of royalty around their foreheads." Into the presence of this vain, weak king and his radiantly beautiful but notoriously profligate companion, and the vast, brilliant assemblage Paul, shackled and pale from long imprisonment, is brought.

Festus opened the proceedings, which were in no sense a trial, as the appeal to Cæsar arrested all further legal proceedings, with stating the reasons for calling such an assembly, and by making some complimentary allusions to Agrippa, stating also clearly that he found the prisoner had done "nothing worthy of death."

1 Comp. John iii. 30; Rom. i. 23 al.; John v. 51.
3 "In order that, with the Gentile testimonies, xxv. 18, 25, a Jewish one might not be wanting," Zeller.
The king intimated that Paul might now make his address. The apostle, undaunted by the pompous inanities of reflected power around him, with calm dignity and perfect self-possession makes his own defence against the charge of heresy, and specially offers a powerful plea for the truth of Christianity. He expressed himself as pleased to have the privilege of speaking in the presence of one who, from his training, was a competent judge of the questions at stake. He asked for a patient hearing, and once more narrated the familiar story of his wonderful conversion from the bigoted, fiery, persecuting spirit he had formerly manifested against Christ and his followers, to a firm belief that the Messianic hopes of his people had been actually realized in Jesus of Nazareth, who had risen from the dead. He showed that he was no heretical schismatic, but had kept the law of Moses, and firmly believed that the promise given to the Jews of a Messiah was now fulfilled; that the very thing for which he was accused was the great hope of the Jewish nation; that the cause he now espoused he once hated, and conscientiously and violently persecuted with a zeal and bitterness more intense than their own; that this change in his convictions and the commission he received to preach Jesus and the resurrection were divine; and that his work was in strict accordance with the prophets of the Old Testament.

Festus, struck by the earnest enthusiasm of the eloquent prisoner, interrupts him with the excited exclamation, "Paul, thou art mad; these writings have turned your brain!" Paul with perfect calmness and exquisite courtesy replies, "I am not mad, most noble Festus; what I have said is the sober, well-attested truth, as the king himself can witness, for these marked events did not take place in a corner." Then turning to the king he asked, "Believeth thou the prophets? I know that thou believest." Agrippa, unwilling to be led into a discussion of this kind, replied with good-natured contempt, a scarcely suppressed smile, and courtly wit, perhaps with derisive irony, "You will soon be making me a Christian!" Paul, casting his eye over the splendid and numerous audience, gave a most earnest and sincere reply to the bantering jest of the king. Raising his manacled hand, he said: "I would have wished God, both in little and in much, not only thee, but also all those hearing me to-day, to become such as I also am, except these bonds."

"No more he feels upon his high-raised arm
The ponderous chain, than does the playful link;
The bracelet, formed of many a flowery link;
Useless of self, forgetful that his life
Is now to be defended by his words,
He only thinks of doing good to them
That seek his life."

(Graham.)

After a brief consultation with each other Festus and Agrippa agreed that Paul might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed to Caesar; but now, to Caesar he must go.

The answer of Agrippa to Paul has been variously rendered as the language of sincere conviction, bitter irony, or courtly jest. Some render the phrase ἐν ἐκλειστῷ, almost; others, with Meyer, render the clause, with few words, or lightly; some render: in a little time, which may be taken either in earnest or in jest; others render: in a small measure, or somewhat. As to the spirit of the reply, the general opinion of recent critics concurs with Meyer, that the words were ut-
tered in irony or jest. Alford, Eudie, Lange, Abbott, Piemtre, Schaff, Bloomfield, Hackett, and Taylor substantially agree with Meyer; on the other hand, Calvin, Bengel, Stier, Alexander, Jacobus, Barnes, and Thomas, with some variations, agree in regarding the language as sincere. The Revised Version is decidedly in favor of Meyer's view, "With but little persuasion thou wouldst fain make me a Christian."
CHAPTER XXVII.

Ver. 2. μελλοντι.] So A B Ν, min. and most vss. Approved by Mill., Bengel, and Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Born. The usual μελλοντες is an alteration in accordance with the preceding ἐπιθύμετεσ. — τοὺς] Lachm. reads ei τοὺς, following A B Ν min. Other codd. have εἰπ. Different supplementary additions. — Ver. 3, περευθέντα] Lachm. reads περευθέντα, following A B Ν min. A hasty correction on account of ἐπιτρέπει. — Ver. 12. κυκείθεν] Lachm. and Scholz read κυκείθεν, following A B G Ν min. vss. Chrys. But the want of a reference of the καὶ in what goes before easily occasioned the omission. — Ver. 19. ἔφηψαν] Approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Born., after A B C Ν, min. Vulg. The Recpepsia is ἔφηψαμεν. As this might just as easily be inserted on account of αὐτόχερες, as ἔφηψαν on account of ἐπισείντο, the preponderance of witnesses has alone to decide, and that in favour of ἔφηψαν. — Ver. 23. The order ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτί (Lachm. Tisch. Born., also Scholz) is decidedly attested. ἀλγγελος is to be placed, with Lachm. Tisch. Born., only after λατρεύω (A B C Ν, min.) and ἔγω is to be adopted (with Lachm. and Born.) after εἰπ. on the evidence of A C* Ν, min. vss.; it might very easily be suppressed before φ. — Ver. 27. ἐγένετο] A, loth 68, Vulg. have ἐγένετο. So Tisch. and rightly, as the very unusual compound (only again in xxviii. 13) was easily neglected by the transcribers. — According to preponderating attestation, κατά (instead of εἰς) is to be read in ver. 29 with Lachm. Tisch. Born.; comp. vv. 17, 26, 41. — ἐπισέωμεν] Elz. has ἐπίσεωμεν, against decisive testimony. Alteration to suit the following ἔχοντο. — Ver. 33. προσλαβάδημεν] Lachm. reads προσλαμβάδημεν, merely in accordance with A, 40. But the part. pres. is to be viewed as an alteration to suit προσδοκώντεσ. — Ver. 34. μεταλαβείν] Elz. has προσαβείν against preponderant testimony. From ver. 33. — πεπείται] Griesb. Lachm. Scholz. Tisch. Born. read ἀπολείπα, which indeed has weighty attestation in its favour, but against it the strong suspicion that it was borrowed from Ὑλκ. xxii. 18. This tells likewise against the Recpepsia εκ, instead of which ἀπό is to be read, with Lachm. Tisch. Born. It is less likely that πεπείται should have been taken from the LXX. 1 Kings i. 52; 1 Sam. xiv. 45; 2 Sam. xiv. 11. — Ver. 39. ἐβουλεύσαντο] Lachm. and Born. read ἐβουλεύσαντα after B C Ν, min. But on account of the preceding imperfects, the imperfect here also was easily brought in; and hence is to be explained the reading (explanatory gloss) ἐβουλευτο in A, min. — Ver. 41. τῶν κυμάτων has in its favour C G H Ν* and all min. Chrys. and most vss., and is wanting only in A B Ν*. Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. There is, however,—especially as with τῆς βιας a definition, although not necessary, is probable,—amidst such strong attestation less a suspicion of its being a supplementary addition, than a probability that the transcribers confounded this τῶν with the τῶν of ver. 42 and thus overlooked τῶν κυμάτων. Besides, it would have more naturally suggested itself to a glossator to write on the margin τῆς βιας, than τῶν κυμάτων, which does not again occur in the whole narrative of this voyage. — Ver. 42. Elz. has διαφύγας. But Griesb. Lachm.
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Tisch. read ὀπολεῖν ἡμᾶς] which is attested, indeed, by A B C K, min., but has arisen from the usual custom of the N. T. in such combinations to put not the optative, but the subjunctive. — On the variations in the proper names in this chapter, see the exegetical remarks.

Ver. 1. Ταῦ ἀπολεῖν ἡμᾶς] contains the aim of the ἐκρίθη. "But when, by Festus, decision was made, to the end that we should sail away." The nature of the "becoming resolved" (κρίνοντας) implies that the object—the contents of the resolution—may be conceived as embraced under the form of its aim. The modes of expression: κελεύειν ἵνα, εἰπεῖν ἵνα, θέλειν ἵνα, and the like, are similar; comp. ver. 42, βουλῆ ἐγένετο ἵνα. ἡμᾶς] Luke speaks as a fellow-traveller. παρεδίδων] namely, the persons who were entrusted with the execution of the ἐκρίθη. ἐκρίθης is purposely chosen, not ἀλλοις, to intimate that they were prisoners of another sort, not also Christians under arrest. ἔτερος in xv. 35, xvii. 84, also is to be similarly taken in the sense of another of two classes, in opposition to de Wette. σπείρας Σεβαστ.] cohors Augustae, perhaps: the illustrious, the imperial, cohors. Σεβαστ. is an adjective. Probably, for historical demonstration, it is not possible, it was that one of the five cohorts stationed at Caesarea, which was regarded as body-guard of the emperor, and was accordingly employed, as here, on special services affecting the emperor. We have no right, considering the diversity of the names used by Luke, to hold it as identical with the σπείρα Ἰταλική, x. 1, so Ewald. Weiseler finds here the cohors Augustanorum, imperial body-cohort, at Rome, consisting of Roman equites, of the so-called coscati, whose captain, Julius, he supposes, has been at this very time on business at Caesarea, and had taken the prisoners with him on his return. In this way the centurion would not have been under the command of Festus at all, and would have only been incidentally called into requisition, which is hardly compatible with the regulated departmental arrangements of Rome in the provinces; nor is there in the text itself, any more than in the σπείρα Ἰταλική, x. 1, the least intimation that we are to think of a cohort and a centurion, who did not belong at all to the military force of Caesarea. Schwarz, with whom Kuinoel agrees, conceived that it was a cohort consisting of Sebastenes, from Sebastae, the capital of Samaria, as in fact Sebastene soldiers are actually named by Josephus among the Roman military force in Judea. But the calling a cohort by the name of a city, the cohort of Sebastae, is entirely without ex-

1 Comp. on chap. xxvii. the excellent treatise of James Smith, The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul, London 1848, ed. 2, 1850; Wömel, Progr., Frankf. 1850; In respect of the language, Klostermann, Vindicatae Luc. VII. In Baumgarten there is much allegorizing and play of fancy; he considers the apostle as the true Jonah, and the ship's crew as a representative of the whole heathen world. — Hackett treats chap. xxvii. with special care, having made use of many accounts of travels and notes of navigation.

2 See also Luke iv. 10.

3 Comp. Luke xxiii. 32; Tittmann, Synon. N. T. p. 155 f.; and see on Gal. i. 7.

4 Comp. Λυκὸς Σεβαστ. in Joseph. Ant. xvii. 5. 1 : the imperial harbour (in Caesarea).


7 De cohorte Ital. et Aug., Altorf, 1730.

8 Antt. xx. 6. 2, Bell. ii. 12. 5.
ample; we should necessarily expect Σεβαστήνων, or an adjective of locality, such as Σεβαστήνη, after the analogy of Ἰταλική, x. 1. — Nothing further is known of the centurion Julius. Tacitus mentions a Julius Priscus as centurion of the Praetorians; but how extremely common was the name!

Ver. 2. 'Επιβάνεις] with dative, see on xxv. 1. — πλωιτέραν Ἀδραμύττιον, a ship which belonged to Adramyttium, had its home there, the master of which resided there. Ἀδραμύττιον, or Ἀδραμύττισσα, was a seaport of Mysia, and is not to be confounded with Adrumetum on the north coast of Africa, because amidst all the variations in the cod. (Ἀδραμύττιον, Ἀδραμύττισσα, Ἀτραμύττιον, Ἀτραμύττισσα) the ν in the middle syllable is decidedly preponderant. — μελέτοι πλείον κ.τ.λ.] The ship, certainly a merchant-ship, was thus about to start on its homeward voyage. The prisoners were by this opportunity to be brought to the Asiatic coast, and sent thence by the opportunity of another vessel to Italy. — τοὺς κατὰ τ. Ἀσίαν τόπους] to navigate the places situated along Asia, on the Asiatic coast. — Ἀριστάρχου] Thus he also had from Asia come again to Paul; Tropheus already joined him at Jerusalem. But whether Aristarchus accompanied Paul as a fellow-prisoner does not follow with certainty from Col. iv. 10.

Ver. 3. Εἰς Σιδῶνα] unto Sidon, into the seaport. — χρηστὰς τινί] to have intercourse, fellowship, with any one. The fact that the centurion treated Paul so kindly may be sufficiently explained from the peculiar interest, which a character so lofty and pure could not but awaken in humane and unprejudiced minds. It may be also that the procurator had specially enjoined a gentle treatment. — παρευθέντα is to be analysed as accusative with infinitive. — πρὸς τ. φίλους] Without doubt Paul had told the centurion that he had friends, namely, Christian brethren, in Sidon. Still the centurion would not leave him without military escort, as indeed his duty required this.

Vv. 4, 5. 'Τετελέσατο. τ. Κύπρου] We sailed under Cyprus, so that we remained near the shore, elevated above the level of the sea, because the (shifting) winds were contrary, and therefore made a withdrawal to a distance from the northern shore not advisable. — κατὰ τ. Κυλίκ.] along. Just so ver. 7. — κατὰ Σαλμώνην; comp. ver. 2. — Μύρα] or, as Lachmann, following B, reads, Μύρα — it is neuter, yet the feminine form was also used — was a seaport of Lycia, only twenty stadia from the coast. The

1 Joseph. Bell. ii. 12. 5: "ιδοὺ ἑκατον πληθυναί καλούσαν, Σεβαστήνων.
2 Hist. ii. 26. iv. 11.
3 For several other modes of writing the name, see Steph. Byz. s.v.; Poppe, ad Thuc. l. 2, p. 441 f.
4 Grotius, Drusius, Richard Simon.
5 Ver. 6.
6 On the accurate, see Winer, p. 210 (E. T. 283); Thuc. vi. 68. 2: πλῆθυς τα τε ἐπίκειναι τῆς Ἰσραήλ. Pausan. l. 35.
7 See xli. 29, xx. 4; Col. iv. 10; Phil. 24.
8 xx. 4.
9 See on xxxi. 29.
10 Ewald.
11 See in loc.
12 Comp. xxx. 3, xxxvi. 12.
15 ix. 12.
16 Comp. Grotius, "cum militae."
readings Ἀστρα or Λάστραν, and Σμύρναν, are explained from want of acquaintance with that name of a town.

Vv. 6, 7. Whether the Alexandrian ship was freighted with grain, which at least is not to be proved from ver. 38, or with other goods, cannot be determined; as also whether it was by wind and weather, or affairs of trade, that it was constrained not to sail directly from Alexandria to Italy, but first to run into the Lycian port. — πλοῦν] It was already on its voyage from Alexandria to Italy. — ἐν β. ἡμῖν] he embarked us, put us on board, a voc. nautica (α'). See examples in Palairet and Wolf. — Ver. 7. But when we had made slow way for a considerable number of days, and had come with difficulty toward Cnidus, into its neighbourhood, thus in the offing, having passed along by Rhodes, so that the wind did not allow us to land at Cnidus, we sailed under Crete, near Salamine. The wind thus came from the north, so that the vessel was drawn away from Cnidus and downward towards Crete. — ἑρεμέωνος] finds a definite reference in the immediately preceding κατὰ τῆν Κνίδον, and hence the view of Grotius, following the Peshito, that rectum tenerere cursum should be supplied, is to be rejected. — Cnidus was a city of Caria on the peninsula of Cnidia, celebrated for the worship of Aphrodite and for the victory of Cimon over Pisander. — The promontory Σαμυώνος, on the east coast of Crete, is called in Strabo, Σαμυώνος, and in Dionysus, Σαμυώνις.

Ver. 8. Παραλέγσεσβαι] corresponds entirely to the Latin legera, oram, to sail along the coast. This keeping to the coast was only with difficulty (μόλις) successful. — αὐτὴν refers to τ. Κρήτην. — Nothing is known from antiquity of the anchorage Καλόι λιμένις — Fair Havens (α'). — The name is perhaps, on account of ver. 12 (ἀνευθείαν κ.τ.λ.), to be considered as euphemistic. The view that the place is identical with the town called by Stephanus Byzantinus Καλή ἀκτή, is improbable, because the Fair Havens here was not a town, as may be inferred from the appended remark: φίλος ἦν πόλις Λασ. — ἦν] not ἐστί. The preterite belongs to the graphic description. They saw the neighbouring city. — The town Λασαία also is entirely unknown; hence the many variations, Λασάτν, Άλασσα, Thalassa, Thessala. The evidence in support of these other forms is not strong enough to displace the Recepta, seeing that it is also supported by B, which has Λασαία. Beza conjectured 'Ελαία; but such a conjecture, especially in the case of Crete with its hundred cities, was uncalled for.

1 A Copt. Vulg. Fathers.
2 St. Beda. e
3 Baumgarten, II. p. 373 f., collects the nautical expression of this chapter, adducing, however, much that belongs to the general language.
4 See Forbiger, Geogr. II. p. 221.
5 s. p. 727.
6 Perieg. 110.
7 Diod. Sic. xiii. 3, xiv. 55.
8 It is certainly the bay still called Limenas ka I. Pococke, Mory, II. p. 361. Comp. Smith, p. 38, ed. 2. See, moreover, on the above localities generally, Hocck, Kreta, I. p. 429 ff.
10 Yet see on ruins with this name, Smith, p. 362.
11 R. mln.: so Tischendorf.
12 A, 40, 95, Syr. p. on the margin; so Grotins, Lachmann, Edward.
13 Vulg., Aethiopic.
14 Codd. Lat., et al.
15 G. H.
Ver. 9, 'Ikanow de cr. dya.], namely, since the beginning of our voyage.
— πλοῖο] See on this late form, instead of πλοῖο, Lobbeck. 1 — διὰ τὸ καὶ τ. ναυσίαν ἀδίκημα] because also, even, the fasting was already past. 2 The ναυσία, καὶ ἑξοχή, is the fasting of the great day of atonement, which occurred on the 10th of Tisri. 3 It was thus already after the autumnal equinox, when navigation, which now became dangerous (εἰπωμαλ.), was usually closed. 4 — παρέβαλε δὲ Π. 5] He had experience enough for such a counsel. 6

Vv. 10, 11. Θεσμωρ] when I saw the tumult of the sea. — δις . . . μέλλων ἀνουθαί] A mixing of two constructions, of which the former is neglected as the speech flows onward. 7 — μετὰ ὑβρισ] with presumption. Paul warns them that the continuance of the voyage will not take place without temerity. Accordingly μετὰ ὑβρισ contains the subjective, and (μετὰ) πολλῆς ζημίας οὐ μόνον κ.τ.λ. the objective, detriment with which the voyage would be attended. The expositors—Ewald, however, takes the correct view—understand μετὰ ὑβρισ of the injuria or saevitia tempestatis. But as the definition tempestatis has no place in the text, the view remains a very arbitrary one, and has no corresponding precedent even in poets. 7 The whole utterance is, moreover, the natural expression of just fear, in which case Paul could say Ἰμων without mistrusting the communication which he received in xxiii. 11; for by πολλῆς the ζημία τῶν ψυχῶν is affirmed, not of all, but only of a great portion of the persons on board. He only received at a later period the higher revelation, by which this fear was removed from him. 8 He speaks here in a way inclusive of others (Ἰμων), on account of their joint interest in the situation. A special "entering into the fellowship of the Gentiles" 9 is as little indicated as is the assumption that he did not preach out of grief over the Jews. The present time and situation were not at all suitable for preaching. — ἐπειθέτο μᾶλλον] τοίς ἐμπερὶ ἴκονι μᾶλλον πρὸς τὸ πλεῖον, ἤ ἐπιβαθὴ ἀπεῖρῳ ναυτικής, Occumenius. So the opposite view of the steersman and captain of the ship, ναυκληρος, prevailed with the centurion. By reason of the inconvenience of the haven for wintering, the majority of those on board came to the resolution, etc., ver. 12.

Ver. 12. 'Ανεικεθεν] not well situated, Hesychius and Suidas, elsewhere not found; the later Greeks have διεκεθετο. They ought, according to the counsel of Paul, to have chosen the least of two evils. — πρὸς παρα-χεμασιαν] for passing the winter. 10 — κακεθεν] also from thence. As they had not hitherto lain to with a view to pass the winter, the resolution come to by the majority was to the effect of sailing onward from thence also. 11 —

2 According to Bleek and de Wette, this Jewish definition of time, as well as that contained in xx. 6, betrays a Jewish-Christian author. But the definitions of the Jewish calendar were generally, and very naturally, adopted in the apostolic church. Comp. Schm ckenburger, p. 18.
3 Lev. xvi. 29 ff., xxiii. 26 ff.
4 See Wetstein.
5 3 Cor. xi. 25.
6 See Heind. ad Plat. Phaed. p. 63 C; Winer, p. 318 (B. T. 439); Raphel, Polybl. in loc. Comp. on xix. 27, xxiii. 23 f.
8 See vv. 23, 24.
9 Baumgarten.
10 Diol. Sic. xix. 68, and more frequently in Polybius. Comp. xxviii. 11.
11 On ἰδεῖνον βούλει, comp. Judg. xix. 30; Ps. xiii. 8.
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1 See Hartung, Partikel II. p. 205.
2 In opposition to Smith, p. 88, see Hackett.
3 See Alberti, Odes p. 274; Kypke, II. p. 134 f.
4 See Kapp, ad Aristol. de mundo Exc. III.
5 voiraregr., Arist. probb. vili. 6; Heliodor. 11. 8.
7 Herod. iii. 58, iv. 5; Joseph. Ant. i. 90.
8 al.
10 Kähner, II. p. 904.
11 Luther.
12 See Weisse.
14 λίδων καλλίτεια.
according to the analogy of εἰρωκρέαν, εἰρωκίδων, εἰρωκίνης, etc., would certainly be more suitable to the explanation broad-surfing; but on this very account the reading Εἰρωκλήδων in B* 40, 138, is not to be approved with Griesbach, but to be considered as a correction. Lachmann and Bornemann, followed by Ewald, Smith, and Hackett, have Εἰρωκίλων, according to A (Vulg. Cassiod. : Euroagulio), which also Olshausen, after Erasmus, Grocius, Mill, Bengel, and others, approves; the best defence of this reading is by Bentley, in Wolf, Cur. This would be the east-north-east wind; the compound formed, as in εὐρωστής, Εὐρωστερ, Euroafrica. But the words of the text lead us to expect a special actual name (καλόβυ.) of this particular whirlwind, not merely a designation of its direction. It is difficult also to comprehend why such an easily explicable name of a wind as Euroagulio, Εἰρωκίλων, should have been converted into the difficult and enigmatic Εἰρωκλήδων. Far more naturally would the converse take place, and the Εἰρωκλήδων, not being understood, would be displaced by the similar Εἰρωκίλων formed according to the well-known analogy of Εὐρωστής κ.τ.λ.; so that the latter form appears a product of old emendatory conjecture. Besides, Εἰρωκίλων, if it were not formed by a later hand from the original Εἰρωκλήδων, would be an improbable mixture of Greek and Latin, and we do not see why the name should not have had some such form as Εἰρωκλήδως; ἀκίλων = aquila, is nowhere found (f).

Ver. 15. Συναρπασθ. but when the ship was hurried along with the whirlwind. — On ἀντωρθάλαμεν, to look in the face, then to withstand. — ἐπιδοντες may either, with the Vulgate, data nave flatibus ferebamur, Luther, Elsner, and many others, be referred to τὸ πλοῖον, or be taken in a reflexive sense: * vel gave ourveloes up and were driven. * The former is simpler, because τὸ πλοῖον precedes.

Ver. 16. Κλαῦθ, or according to Ptol. iii. 7 Κλαῦθα, or according to Mela ii. 7 and Plin. iv. 20 Gaudos, according to Suidas Καῦθα, was the name of the modern Gason to the south of Crete. From the different forms of the name given by the ancients must be explained the variations in the codd. and vss., among which Καῦθα is attested by B Ν*** Syr. Aeth. Vulg., adopted by Lachmann, and approved by Ewald. We cannot determine how Luke originally wrote the name; still, as most among the ancients have transmitted it without λ, the λ, which has in its favour A G H Ν* vss. and the Greek Fathers, has probably been deleted by subsequent, though in itself correct, emendation. — τοὺς σκάφης they could scarcely become masters of the boat, belonging to the ship, which swam attached to it, when they wished to hoist it up, * that it might not be torn away by the storm.

Ver. 17. And after they had drawn this up, they applied means of protection; undergirding the ship. This undergirding took place, in order to diminish

---

1 Gel. ii. 22. 10.
3 Raphel, Wolf, Bengel, Kypka.
4 Comp. Lobeck, ad A. 250.
5 *περικερασία, Simmias in the Anthol. I. p. 187, Jacobs.
6 Vy. 17, 30.
7 Polyb. xxvii. 3. 3.
the risk of foundering, by means of broad ropes, which, drawn under the ship and tightened above, held its two sides more firmly together. By βοθτίας is to be understood all kinds of helpful apparatus which they had in store for emergencies, as ropes, chains, beams, clamps, and the like. The referring it to the help rendered by the passengers, which was a matter of course amidst the common danger, makes the statement empty and unnecessary. — φοβομενοι τε κ.τ.λ. and fearing to strike on the nearest Syrtis. It is entirely arbitrary to understand τὴν Σύρτιν, without linguistic precedent, in the wider sense of a sandbank, and not of the African Syrtis. Of the two Syrtes, the Greater and the Lesser, the former was the nearest. As the ship was driven from the south coast of Crete along past the island of ClauSa, and thus ran before the north-east wind, they might well, amidst the peril of their situation, be driven to the fear lest, by continuing their course with full sail, they might reach the Greater Syrtis; and how utterly destructive that would have been! — ἐκκόπτως, of ships and shipwrecked persons, which are cast, out of the deep, navigable water, on banks, rocks, islands, shoals, or on the land, is very common from Homer onward. — τὸ σκεῖος] the gear, the tackle, is the general expression for all the apparatus of the ship. The context shows what definite tackle is here meant by specifying the aim of the measure, which was to prevent the ship from being cast upon the Syrtis, and that by withdrawing it as far as practicable from the force of the storm driving them towards the Syrtis. This was done by their lowering the sails, striking sail, and accordingly choosing rather to abandon the ship without sails to the wind, and to allow it to be driven (ὁ οὖν ἔφθωρος), than with stretched sails to be cast quickly, and without further prospect of rescue, on the Syrtis. Already at a very early date τὸ σκεῖος was justly explained of the sails, and Chrysostom even read τὰ ἱστία. According to Smith, the lowering of the rigging is meant, by which the driving of the ship in a straight direction was avoided. But this presupposes too exact an acquaintance with their position in the storm, considering the imperfection of navigation in those times; and both the following description, especially ver. 20, and the measure adopted in ver. 29, lead us to assume that they had already relinquished the use of the sails. But the less likely it is that in the very exact delineation the account of the striking of the sails, which had not hitherto taken place, in opposition to Kypke and Kuinoel, should have been omitted, and the more definitely the collective meaning is applied in τὸ σκεῖος, the more objectionable

3 ὑποσώματα, tormenta.
4 Yet it is doubtful whether the procedure was not such, that the ropes ran in a horizontal manner right round the ship (Boeckh, Stalib. ad Plat. l.c.). But see Smith. Comp. Plat. Rep. p. 618 C: οἷον τὰ ὑποσώματα τῶν τριφέων, οὕτω πάνω ξυνών τὴν περιφορὰν; Athen. v. 37; and see generally Boeckh, Urkunden d. D. Samessen des Attischen Staates, p. 133 ff.; Smith (The Ships of the Ancients), p. 173 ff.; Hackett, p. 428 ff.
5 Aristot. Eth. II. 5.
6 See Wetstein.
7 Grotius, Heinius, and others.
8 δίς, ταυτία, ἴδια, στόχος.
10 Locella, ad Xen. Eph. p. 289; Stalib. ad Plat. Phil. p. 13 D.
appears the view of Grotius, Heinsius, Kuinoel, and Olshausen (after the Peshito), that τῶ σκευῶν is the mast. Still more arbitrary, and, on account of ἐφρευνόμενον, entirely mistaken is the rendering of Kypke: "demittentes ancoram," and that of Castalio and Vatablus: "demissa scapha," see, on the other hand, ver. 30.

Vv. 18, 19. Ἐκβολὴν ἔτοιμον they made a casting out, i.e. they threw overboard the cargo. For the lightening of the vessel in distress, in order to make it go less deep and to keep it from grounding, they got rid in the first instance of what could, in the circumstances, be most fitly dispensed with, namely, the cargo; but on the day after they laid hands even on the σκευῆ τοῦ πλοίου, i.e. the ship’s apparatus,—the utensils belonging to the ship, as furniture, beds, cooking vessels, and the like. The same collective idea, but expressed in the plural, occurs in Jonah i. 5. Others understand the baggage of the passengers, but this is at variance with τοῦ πλοίου; instead of it we should expect ἡμῶν, especially as αὐτόχειρες precedes. Following the Vulgate, Erasmus, Grotius, and many others, including Olshausen and Ewald, understand the arma navis, that is, ropes, beams, and the like belonging to the equipment of the ship. The tacking is elsewhere called τὰ δπιὰ, or τὰ σκευῖα, from σκεῦος, and just amidst the danger this was most indispensable of all.—αὐτόχειρες with our own hands, gives to the description a sad vividness, and does not present a contrast to the conduct of Jonah, who lay asleep, as Baumgarten in his morbid quest of types imagines.

Ver. 20. Μήτε δὲ ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ.] For descriptions of storms from Greek and Roman writers, which further embellish this trait, see Grotius and Wetstein.—ἐπικεῖσαι] spoken of the incessantly assailing storm.—λαυτῶν ceterum in reference to time, i.e. henceforth.—ἡμᾶς] not ἡμῖν, which would not have been suitable to Paul, nor yet probably to his Christian companions.

Vv. 21, 22. The perplexity had now risen in the ship to despair. But, as the situation was further aggravated by the fact that there prevailed in a high degree (πολλῆς) that abstention from food which anguish and despair naturally bring with them, Paul came forward in the midst of those on board (ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν), in the first instance with gentle censure, and afterwards with confident encouragement and promise.—On ἀορία, jejunatio, comp. Herod. iii. 53; Eur. Suppl. 1105; Arist. Eth. x. 9; Joseph. Ant. xii. 7. 1. — τὸ ῥῆτορ then, in this state of matters, as in xxviii. 1. — σταθεὶς κ.τ.λ.] has

1 Had the ship been loaded with ballast, and this been thrown out (Laurent), we should have expected a more precise designation (ἐπιμελεῖος). The σκεύη, too, would not have been included in the category of things thrown out at once on the following day, but after the ballast would have come, in the first instance, the cargo. The ship was without doubt a merchant-vessel, and doubtless had no ballast at all. Otherwise they certainly would have commenced with throwing the latter out, but would not thereupon have at once passed to the σκεύη. Dem. 296. 17; Aesch. Sept. 769; Arist.-Eth. iii. 1; Pollux, i. 99; LXX. Jonah i. 5.

3 Diod. Sic. xiv. 79.
4 Wetstein, Kypke, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel.
5 Hermann, ad Soph. Anti. 1160.
6 Jonah i. 5.
7 Virg. Aen. i. 86 ff., iii. 192 ff.; Ach. Tat. iii. 2, p. 284, al.
8 See Alberti, Obes. 279; Wolf, Corr.
9 See Vigerus, p. 28, and Hermann thereon, p. 706; Kühner, ad Anab. ii. 2. 5.
10 See also in the classics after particlps., Xen. Cyr. 1. 5. 6; Dem. 83. 6, 60. 18.
here, as in xvii. 22, ii. 14, something solemn.—αυτῶ] not ἵμων; for the censure as well as also primarily the encouragement was intended to apply to the sailors.—ἐδει μὲν] it was necessary indeed. This μὲν does not stand in relation to the following καί, but the contrast—possibly: but it has not been done—is suppressed.¹ Bengel well remarks: "καί modestiam habet."—κερδήσαι κ.τ.λ.] and to have spared us this insolence² and the loss suffered. ταυτὶν points to the whole present position of danger in which the ἀβρα, wheresother the warnings of the apostle were despised and the voyage ventured, presented itself in a way to be keenly felt as such. κερδήσας, of that gain, which is made by omission or avoidance.³ The evil in question is conceived as the object, the non-occurrence of which goes to the benefit of the person acting, as the negative object of gain. Analogous to this is the Latin lucrificere, see Grotius.⁴—ἀποβολὴ γὰρ ψυχῆς κ.τ.λ.] for there shall be no loss of a soul from the midst of you, except loss of the ship, i.e. no loss of life, but only the loss of the ship. An inaccuracy of expression, which continues with πλῆν, as if before there had simply been used the words ἀποβ. γὰρ οὖν. ἐστιν.⁵—To what Paul had said in ver. 10, his present announcement stands related as a correction. He has now by special revelation learned the contrary of what he had then feared, as respected the apprehended loss of life. 

Vg. 28–25. Ἀγγελὸς] an angel (κα). But naturally those hearers who were Gentiles, and not particularly acquainted with Judaism, understood this as well as τοῦ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. according to their Gentile conception, of a messenger of the gods, and of one of the gods.—οὐ εἰμὶ ἐγώ, ὦ καὶ λατρείω] to whom I belong, as His property, and whom I also, in accordance with this belonging, serve.⁶ Paul thus characterizes himself as intimate with God, and therewith assures the credibility of his announcement, in which τοῦ Θεοῦ with great emphasis precedes the ἄγγελος κ.τ.λ. (see the critical remarks). On ἐγώ (see the critical remarks), in which is expressed a holy sense of his personal standing, Bornemann correctly remarks: "Pronomen Paulum minime dedecet coram gentilibus verba facientem."—κεχάρισται οὐ τὸ Θεό] God has granted to thee, i.e. He has saved them, according to His counsel, for thy sake.⁷—Here, too,⁸ the appearance, which is to be regarded as a work of God, is not a vision in a dream. The testimony and the consciousness of the apostle, who was scarce likely to have slumbered and dreamed on that night, are decisive against this view, and particularly against the naturalizing explanation of Eichhorn,⁹ Zeller, and Hausrath. De Wette takes objection to the mode of expression κεχάρισται κ.τ.λ., and is inclined to trace it to the high veneration of the reporter; but this is unfair, as Paul had simply to utter what he had heard. And he had heard, that for his sake the saving of all was determined. Bengel well remarks:

¹ See Kühner, § 735, note. p. 430; Baemel, ⁴ Phryn. p. 740 f. 
² See Comp. Winer, p. 587 [E. T. 790].
³ Comp. Rom. i. 9. 
⁴ See on iii. 14. 
⁵ Comp. on xvi. 10. 
⁶ On the form κερδήσας, see Lobeck, ad Bllm. III. p. 407, 1084.
"Non erat tam periculosum aliqui tempore periculum, ne videretur P., quae necessario dicebat, glorioso dicere."—οὖτος καὶ ὑπὲρ τρ. [comp. i. 11.]

Ver. 26. But—τῆ, leading over to the mode of the promised deliverance—we must be cast on some island. This assurance, made to Paul probably through the appearance just narrated, is verified ver. 41 ff. But it is lightly, and without reason assigned, conjectured by Zeller that vv. 21–26 contain a vaticinium post eventum on the part of the author.

Vv. 27–29. But after the commencement of the fourteenth night, namely, after the departure from Fair Havens, while we were driven up and down in the Adriatic sea, about midnight, the sailors described, etc. The article was not required before the ordinal number, as a special demonstrative stress is not contemplated, but only the simple statement of time. On νυξ ἑπτήνερο (see the critical remarks), the night set in.—ὁ Ἀδριατικός here and frequently, not in the narrower sense of the Golfo di Venezia, but in the wider sense of the sea between Italy and Greece, extending southward as far as, and inclusive of, Sicily.—προσάγειν [that it approaches to them. The opposite is ἀναγκαίως, recedere. See Smith and the passages in Kuinoel. The conjecture of the sailors (ὗτον οὖν) had doubtless its foundation in the noise of the surf, such as is usual in the vicinity of land.—On βολίζειν, to cast the sounding lead, and on ὑπαγω, a measure of length of six feet, like our fathom.—διαστήσαντες] note the active: having made a short interval, i.e. having removed the ship a little way farther. With this decrease of depth the danger increased of their falling on reefs, such as are frequent in the vicinity of small islands.—τὸν ἀπαρχάς]. For the different expressions for casting anchor, see Poll. i. 108 (cf.).

Ver. 30. While they were lying here at anchor longing for daylight, ἥχυντο ήμέραν γενέται, ver. 29, the sailors, in order with the proximity of land to substitute certainty for uncertainty, make the treacherous attempt to escape to land in the boat, which they had already let down under the pretence of wishing to cast anchor from the prow of the ship, and thus to leave the vessel together with the rest of those on board to their fate. Certainly the captain of the vessel, whose interest was too much bound up with the preservation of the ship, was not implicated in this plot of his servants; but how easily are the bonds of fidelity and duty relaxed in

1 ἐκατερών, see on ver. 17.
2 Comp. vv. 18, 19.
3 διαφερ., see the passages in Wetstein and Kypke, II. p. 141, and Philo, de migr. A. Br. p. 410 E.
4 Poppo, ad Thuc. ii. 70. 5.
5 Amels on Hom. Od. xiv. 341.
6 Comp. Herod. viii. 70; Thuc. iv. 25; Polyb. i. 11. 15, ii. 25. 5.
7 Phil. iii. 16. 20.
8 Comp. Scherer, statistisch commercielle Ergebnisse, p. 51: "During the European winter a sailing vessel may be often forced to lose fourteen days or more by a persistent southeasterly wind in the Adriatic Gulf." See Forbiger, Geogr. ii. p. 16 ff. "Hadrias arbitrer
9 notus." Horat. Od. i. 8. 15.
11 Smith.
12 βολίζες, in Herodotus καταπετάσσει. See the passages from Eustathius in Wetstein.
13 Concerning the accent, Göttling, p. 188.
16 κατὰ τρεχειν τὸν τοῦν.
17 Comp. Cass. Bell. civ. i. 25: "Naves quaeternis ancoras delistabat, no succibus moventur."
vulgar minds when placed in circumstances of perilous uncertainty, if at the expense of these bonds a safe deliverance may be obtained! — προφάσει ὣς ... μελλόντων] The genitive is absolute, subordinate to the preceding χαλας., and προφάσει 1 is adverbial, 2 as in classical writers the accusative προφάσει more commonly occurs. 3 Hence: on pretence as though they would, etc. — ἑκτείνειν] extendere. 4 They affected and pretended that by means of the boat they were desirous to reach out anchors 5 from the prow, from which these anchors hung, 6 into the sea, in order that the vessel might be secured not only behind, 7 but also before. Incorrectly Laurent renders: "to cast out the anchors farther into the sea." Against this, it is decisively urged that ἀγκλάρας is anarthrous, and that ἐκ πρώρας stands in contrast to ἐκ πρώμης, ver. 29.

Vv. 31, 32. Paul applied not first to the captain of the vessel, but at once to the soldiers, because they could take immediately vigorous measures, as the danger of the moment required; and the energetic and decided word of the apostle availed. — σὺνὶ ... ἑμείς] Correlates. Paul, however, does not say ἑμείς, but appeals to the direct personal interest of those addressed. — σωθηναι ὃν ὑπναοίδων] spoken in the consciousness of the divine counsel, in so far as the latter must have the fulfilment of duty by the sailors as the human means of its realization (μ'). — ἑκτείνειν] to fall out. We are to think on the boat let down into the sea, 8 yet hanging with its fastened end to the ship—when the soldiers cut the ropes asunder.

Ver. 33. But now, when he had overcome this danger, it was the care of the prudent rescuer, before anything further, to see those on board strengthened for the new work of the new day by food. But until it should become day,—so long, therefore, as the darkness of the night up to the first break of dawn did not allow any ascertaining of their position or further work,—in this interval he exhorted all, etc. — τεσσαρεσ. σήμα. ἡμέραν κ.τ.λ.] waiting, for deliverance, the fourteenth day to-day, since the departure from Fair Havens, ye continue without food. ᾧσυίτω holds with ὑπναίς the place of a participle. 9 — μὴ δὲν προσλαβ.] since ye have taken to you (ἀδῆβοισίς) nothing, no food. This emphatically strengthens the ᾧσυίτω. That, however, the two terms are not to be understood of complete abstinence from food, but relatively, is self-evident; Paul expresses the "insolitam cibi abstinentiam" 10 earnestly and forcibly. 11

Ver. 34. Πρὸς τῆς ἰμερ. σωρ. [on the side of your deliverance, e salute vestra, i.e. corresponding, conducing to your deliverance. 12 Observe the emphatic ἰμετέρας; your benefit I have in view. — ὑδεινοὶ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] assigns the reason

1 Comp. Luke xx. 47; Thuc. v. 55. 1, vi. 2 Bernhardy, p. 180. [76. 1
2 Dorn. ad Charid. p. 819; Krüger on Thuc. ill. 113. 1, on ἑκτείνειν, comp. on 1 Cor. iv. 18, and see Xen. Anab. i. 2. 1.
3 Vulg.
4 * * "Fune eo esse prolatum," Grotius.
5 Phid. Pyla. iv. 542, x. 90.
6 Ver. 29.
7 Ver. 20.
8 See the passages in Winer, p. 346 [E. T. 437]; Krüger on Thuc. i. 54. 2, and Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 6. 2.
9 Calvin.
10 Comp. τελλάσσει, ver. 21.
11 Comp. Thuc. III. 59. 1, v. 106. 2; Plat. Gorg. p. 420 C; Ann. As. vili. 16. 9. See on this use of πρὸς with the genitive (only found here in the N. T.), Bernhardy, p. 364; Winer, p. 350 [E. T. 437 f.].
for the previous πρὸς τ. ἱμετρ. υψηλαῖς. For your deliverance, I say, for, etc. In this case their own exertions and the bodily strengthening necessary for this purpose are conceived as conditioning the issue.—On the proverbial expression itself, which denotes their being kept utterly exempt from harm, comp. Luke xxii. 18; 1 Sam. xiv. 45; 2 Sam. xiv. 11; 1 Kings i. 52.

Vv. 35, 36. Like the father of a family among those at table, not, as Olshausen and Ewald suppose, notwithstanding that most of the persons were heathens, regarding the meal as a Christian love-feast, Paul now, by way of formal and pious commencement of the meal, uttered the thanksgiving-prayer—for the disposition towards, and relative understanding of, which even the Gentiles present were in this situation susceptible—over the bread, broke it, and commenced to eat (ὑπὲρ ἀναφορὰς ἑστίων). And all of them, encouraged by his word and example, on their part followed.—προσελάβης τροφῆς] partook of food. It is otherwise in ver. 33, with accusative.

Ver. 37. And what a large meal was thus brought about!—The number 276 may surprise us on account of its largeness; but, apart from the fact that we have no knowledge of the size and manning of the Alexandrian ship, ver. 6, it must, considering the exactness of the entire narrative, be assumed as correct; and for the omission of ἀκούσαι the single evidence of B, which has ὥς, is too weak.

Ver. 38. Now, seeing that for some time, and in quite a brief period must the fate of those on board be decided, further victries were unnecessary—now they ventured on the last means of lightening the ship, which, with the decreasing depth, was urgently required for the purpose of driving it on to the land, and cast the provisions overboard, which, considering the multitude of men and the previous σορτία, was certainly still a considerable weight. Chrysostom aptly remarks: οὔτω λαστὸν τὸ πᾶν ἐπροφανὲς ἐν τῶν Παύλων, δὲ καὶ τῶν σίτων ἐκβάλειν. Σίτος may denote either corn, or also, as here and often with Greek writers, provisions particularly prepared from corn, meal, bread, etc. Others have explained it as the corn with which, namely, the ship had been freighted. But against this it may be urged, first, that this freighting is not indicated; secondly, that καρπός, δὲ τροφῆς corresponds to the throwing out of the provisions, and not of the freight; and thirdly, that the throwing out of the freight had already taken place, as this indeed was most natural, because the freigest was the heaviest.

Ver. 39. Τὴν γὰρ οὐκ ἐπεγίνετο.] i.e. when it became day, they recognised not what land it was; the land lying before them (τὴν γὰρ) was one unknown to them.—καλύπτον δὲ τινα κατενώσων ἐχαίνα αἰγιαλὸν] Thus Luke writes quite faithfully and simply, I might say naively, what presented itself to the scrutinizing gaze of those on board: but they perceived a bay which had a beach. A bay and a beach belonging to it—so much they saw at the unknown land, and this sufficed for the resolution to land there, where it was

1 Comp. Luke xxiv. 39. [Vii. 11. 8 Ver. 28.
2 Matt. xiv. 19, xv. 38; Mark viii. 26; John 8 Erasmus, Luther, Beza, et al., including 10. 4 See Bornemann in loc. Baumgarten, Smith, Hackett. 7 Ver. 18.
possible. Observe that ἀιγυαλὸς is a flat coast,1 thus suitable for landing, in
distinction from the high and rugged ἀκτή.2 Hence it is not even neces-
sary, and is less simple, to connect, with Winer, εἰς ὅν κ.τ.λ. as modal def-
ition of ἀιγυαλ. closely with the latter: "a shore of such a nature, that,"
etc. — εἰς δὲ§ applies to ἀιγυαλ. See ver. 40. For examples of ἔξωθεν, used
of the thrusting a ship from the open sea on to the land, navem ejicere,
expellere, see Wetstein. On St. Paul’s Bay, see the description and chart
of Smith.

Ver. 40. A vivid description of the stirring activity now put forth in
making every effort to reach the shore. 1. They cut the four anchors
round about (περιελώτες), and let them fall into the sea, in order neither to
lose time nor to burden the ship with their weight. 2. At the same time
they loosened the bands, with which they fastened the rudders to the ship
in order to secure them while the ship lay at anchor from the violence of
the waves, for the purpose of now using them in moving on. 3. They
spread the top-sail before the wind, and thus took their course (κατειχον)
for the beach (εἰς τὸν αἰγυαλὸν). — εἰσὶν is to be referred to the ἀκτήπαρ,
which they let go by cutting, so that they fell into the sea. Arbitrarily,
following the Vulgate (committebant se), Luther, Beza, Grotius take it as
"εἰσὶν τὸ πλοῖον ἔναν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν."—That τῶν πηδαλίων is not to be taken
for the singular, but that larger ships had two rudders,3 managed by one
steersman.4 — ὁ ἀρτημων] not elsewhere occurring in Greek writers as part
of a ship, is most probably explained of the top-gallant-sail placed high on
the mast.5 Labeo points to this view: "Malum navis esse partem, arte-
monem autem non esse, Labeo ait,"6 in which words he objects to the con-
founding of the artemon with the mast: the mast constituted an integral
part of the ship, but the artemon did not, because it was fastened to the
mast. Luther’s translation: "mast," is therefore certainly incorrect.
Grotius, Heumann, Rosenmüller, and others, including Smith, explain it
of "the small sail at the prow of the ship." In this they assume that the
mast had already been lowered; but this is entirely arbitrary, as Luke,
although he relates every particular so expressly, has never mentioned this.6
Besides, we cannot see why this sail should not have been called by its
technical name δόλυον.7 Hadrianus, Junius, Alberti, Wolf, and de Wette
understand the missen-sail at the stern, which indeed bears that name in the
present day,8 but for this ἐπίδρομος,9 is well known to be the old tech-

ical name. — τῇ πνευμήν] sc. ἀνενθα, has raised itself quite to the position of
a substantive.10 The dative indicates the reference; they hoisted up the

1 Matt. xiii. 9; and see Nägelsbach on the
IIiad, p. 284, ed. 3.
2 See Hom. Od. v. 455, x. 89; Pind. Pyth.
iv. 64; Lucian, Taz. 4.
3 Aelian, V. H. ix. 40.
4 See Smith, p. 8, also Scheffer, de mult. nav.
II. 5; Boeckh, Urkunden, p. 125.
5 See especially Scheffer, de mult. nav. II. 5;
6 In Jabolen. Dig. lib. I. tit. 16, leg. 242.
7 Segelbaum.
8 Comp. on ver. 17.
9 Polyb. xvi. 15. 2; Diod. xx. 61; Pollux,
I. 91; Liv. xxxvi. 44, xxxvii. 80; Iddor. Orig.
xix. 3; Procop. Bell. Vandal. I. 17.
10 Italian, Artimone; French, colle d'arti-
mon; see Baysius, de re nav. p. 151.
11 Pollux I. 91.
12 See examples in Bos, EZ., ed. Schaefer,
pp. 82, 40.
sail for the breeze, so that the wind now swelled it from behind. For examples of ἵππεων, for hoisting up and thereby expanding the sail, and for κατίκευς to steer towards, see Kypke, P. p. 144.

Ver. 41. But when they had struck upon a promontory. It is altogether arbitrary to abandon the literal import of διάλαθσας, forming two seas, or having the sea on both sides, dimaris, and to understand by τόπος διάλ. a sandbank or a reef, situated after the manner of an island before the entrance of the bay. This view is supposed to be necessary on account of ver. 43 f., and it is asked: "quorum enim isti in mare se projicerent, si in ipsum litus navis impegerat prora?" But the promontory, as is very frequently the case, jutted out with its point under the surface of the water, and was covered to so great an extent by the sea, that the ship stranding on the point was yet separated from the projecting dry part of the isthmus by a considerable surface of water; hence those stranded could only reach the dry land by swimming. Even in Dio Chrys. v. p. 88, by which the signification of reef is sought to be made good, because there πραίγα κ. διάλαθσα κ. ταῦτα (sandbanks) are placed together, διάλ. is not to be taken otherwise than τόπος διάλ. here. — ἵππεων] ἵππεων may be either transitive: to thrust the ship on, to cause it to strand, or intransitive: to strand, to be wrecked. As τὸν ναῦν is here added, which in the intransitive view would be the accusative of more precise definition, but quite superfluous, the transitive view is that suggested by the text: they thrust the ship upon, they made it strand. Lachmann and Tischendorf, following A B C, have ἵππεων, from ἵππεως, to push to the land, navem oppellere. But neither does this meaning suit, as here it is the ship going to wreck that is spoken of; nor can proof be adduced from the aorist form ἵππεωος. — ἰσισσω] having fixed itself. On ἰσισσω, used also by the Greeks in an intransitive sense, comp. Prov. iv. 4. — ἢ δὲ πρῶμα ἀλυτοὶ κ.τ.λ.] for the promontory had naturally the deeper water above it the farther it ran seawards, so that the stern was shattered by the power of the waves. This shipwreck was at least the fourth, which Paul suffered.

Vv. 42-44. Now, when the loss of the ship was just as certain, as with the proximity of the land the escape of those prisoners who could swim was easily possible, the soldiers were of a mind to kill them; but the centurion was too much attached to Paul to permit it. Not sharing in the apprehension of his soldiers, he commanded that all in the ship who knew how to swim should swim to land, and then the rest, to whom in this way assistance was ready on shore, were to follow partly on planks and partly on broken pieces of the ship. — βοηθία ἵνωτο, iva] there took place a project, in the design, that, etc.; comp. on ver. 1, and see Nägelsch. on the Iliad, p.

As to περισ., comp. on Luke x. 30.
2 See the passages in Wetstein.
3 Calvius: compare Calujoel.
4 Herod. vi. 16, vii. 182; Thuc. iv. 36. 5.
5 So Thuc. vili. 102. 3; Polyb. i. 20. 15, iv. 41. 2, and see Loesner, p. 240.
6 Hom. Od. ix. 138, 148, viili. 114: ἵππεωος, see Bornemann. In Polyb. iv. 31. 2, ἱππεωος has been introduced by copyists' mistake[2 Cor. xli. 25. for ἱππεωος.
7 In this remark, ver 43, Zeller conjectures very arbitrarily a later addition to the original narrative, which was designed to illustrate the influence of the apostle upon the Roman.
ALL ON BOARD SAVED.

62, ed. 3, who on such modes of expression appropriately remarks that the "will is conceived as a striving will." — ἀποβρᾶτειν, to cast down, intransitive, in the sense of se projicere.¹ — καὶ τῶι λατρείᾳ ἐκ ἐξείλοι τοῦ γῆι. — ἐνι σανίσαν] on planks, which were at hand in the ship. — ἐνι τινων τῶι ἀπὸ τοῦ πλοίου] on something from the ship, on pieces which had partly broken loose from it by the stranding, so forming wreck (μανάγιον, ἐρέπτιον), and were partly torn off by the people themselves for that purpose. ἐνι denotes both times the local being upon, and the change between datives and genitives is to be regarded as merely accidental.² — In the history of this final rescue, Baumgarten, II. p. 420, has carried to an extreme the arbitrariness of allegorical-spiritual fiction.

REMARK 1.—The extraordinarily exact minuteness and vividness in the narrative of this whole voyage justifies the hypothesis that Luke, immediately after its close, during the winter spent in Malta, wrote down this interesting description in the main from fresh recollection, and possibly following notes which he had made for himself even during the voyage — perhaps set down in his diary, and at a later period transferred from it to his history.

REMARK 2.—The transition from the first person — in which he narrates as a companion sharing the voyage and its fortunes — into the third is not to be considered as an accident or an inconsistency, but is founded on the nature of the contents, according to which the sailors specially come into prominence as subject. See vv. 13, 17, 18, and 19, 21, 29, 38-41.

REMARK 3. If the assumption of the school of Baur as to the set purpose animating the author of the Acts were correct, this narrative of the voyage, with all its collateral circumstances in such detail, would be a meaningless ballast of the book. But it justifies itself in the purely historical destination of the work, and confirms that destination.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(a) And he put us therein. V. 6.

In no ancient literature have we, in so small a compass, such a minute description of a voyage and shipwreck as is contained in this chapter of the Acts, and the account abounds in nautical phrases and words. To account for the great minuteness of detail with which the voyage is described it has been supposed that Luke kept a diary during the voyage and used it in his history. The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul, by James Smith, Esq., of Jordan Hill, a work of European reputation, gives a full explanation and illustration of the entire voyage. "Mr. Smith has applied his nautical knowledge to the elucidation of this chapter, and by so doing has furnished us with a new and independent argument in favor of the authenticity of the Acts."

Hackel is also particularly full and minute on this and the following chapter. The Greek words ἐνεβαζάσεων ἢμας εἰς αὐτῷ, rendered put us therein, is a nauti-

¹ See Schaefer, ad Bux Ed., p. 197.
chal phrase, and means put us on board of it. Hackett remarks: "It will be observed that Luke employs such terms with great frequency, and with singular precision. He uses, for example, not less than thirteen different verbs which agree in this, that they mark in some way the progression of the ship, but which differ, inasmuch as they indicate its distance from the land, rate of movement, direction of the wind, or some such circumstance. With the exception of three of them, they are all nautical expressions." Doubtless the writer learned the use of such terms from the sailors themselves.

(\textit{r}\textsuperscript{st}) \textit{Fair Havens}. V. 8.

On this harbor Alford writes: "The situation of this anchorage was ascertained by Pococke from the fact of the name still remaining." "In searching after Lehma farther to the west, I found out a place which I thought to be of greater consequence because mentioned in Holy Scripture and also honored by the presence of St. Paul, that is the Fair Havens, near unto the city of Lasea; for there is a small bay about two leagues to the east of Mataia, which is now called by the Greeks good, or fair, havens." Mr. Smith in quoting this passage adds: "The most conclusive evidence that this is the Fair Havens of Scripture is that its position is precisely that where a ship, circumsanced as St. Paul's was, must have put in."

Hackett observes: "This harbor consists of an open roadstead, or rather two roadsteads contiguous to each other, which may account for the plural designation. It is adapted also by its situation to afford the shelter in north-west winds, which the anchorage mentioned by Luke afforded to Paul's vessel. Nautical authorities assure us that this place is the farthest point to which an ancient ship could have attained with north-westerly winds, because here the land turns suddenly to the north." Glauc says that Rev. G. Brown identified the exact situation of Lasea, in the year 1856. He ascertained that the natives of Crete gave the name of Lasea to some ruins on the coast about five miles east of Fair Havens. Two white pillars and other remains still mark the spot.

(\textit{r}\textsuperscript{st}) \textit{Toward the north-west and south-west}. V. 12.

On this phrase which he renders, looking down the south-west and north-west winds, i.e., in the direction of these winds, viz., north-east and south-east, Alford writes: "For \(\lambda\iota \chi\) and \(\chi\omega\rho\alpha\) are not quarters of the compass, but winds; and \(\varsigma\alpha\nu\alpha\), used with a wind, denotes the direction of its blowing—'down the wind.' This interpretation, which I was long ago persuaded was the right one, I find now confirmed by the opinion of Mr. Smith." Hackett in a note says: "As this question has excited some interest, it may be well to mention how it is viewed in works published since 1850. Humphrey (1854) says that Mr. Smith's passages are not quite conclusive as to \(\beta\lambda\iota\pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha \Lambda\iota\zeta\alpha.\) He supposes Phoenix to be the modern Phineka which opens to the west, and thus adopts the common explanation of the phrase. Alford (1852), agrees with Smith. (And he adds to his note on verse 12, this statement: "See Professor Hackett's note, impugning the above view and interpretation. I cannot observe on it, as it has only come to hand as these sheets are being printed, but it does not alter
NOTES.

my opinion."—Am. Ed.] Howson would admit an instance of this usage in Josephus, but says the other alleged proofs are untenable or ambiguous. He mediates between the two opinions by suggesting that the point of view (ἀπό τοῦ) is from the sea and not the land, so that κατὰ Αἰθᾶ would have its usual meaning, and yet the harbor open toward the east like Lutro. Wordsworth has a copious note on this question. He reviews the arguments on both sides, and sums up with the result that we should not abandon the ancient interpretation, or at all events should suspend our decision till we have more complete topographical details for forming it. Gloag says: "There is a difference of opinion regarding the exact situation of the ancient Phœnix. Lutro, Sphakia, and Franco Castello, places on the south coast of Crete, to the west of Cape Matala, have each been fixed upon. Most modern commentators are now agreed that the modern part of Lutro is meant."

He adds that Spratt informs us that a wide bay, a little to the west of it, is still known by the name of Phœnix, and says: "Most probably it is this bay to the west which is meant, as the haven of Lutro is open to the east, and therefore does not suit the description of it given by Luke, as looking toward the south-west and north-west, whereas the bay of Phœnice does, being open to the west." In a note he adds further: "This view, that Phœnix is not Lutro, but the adjoining bay to the west, is also adopted by Humphrey and by Bishop Wordsworth."

(κ') Euroclydon. V. 14.

Gloag remarks on this word: "Alford thinks that it is a corruption by the Greek sailors of εὐρακέλων, as the last part of that word was not Greek, but Latin. The addition ὁ καλομενος denotes that it was a popular name given to the wind by the sailors, just as a similar wind in the Mediterranean is now known to our seamen by the name of the Levanter." Hackett thinks the name of the wind denotes the point from which it came, and should probably be written εὐρακέλων, Euroquilo, as in the Vulgate, a north-east wind, and says the internal evidence favors that form of the word. In this opinion Alexander, Jacobson, Jacobus, and Plumptre substantially concur. The Revised Version gives the name Eurquilo, which Abbott and Taylor also approves. In popular language it was a north-easterly gale. Schaff says: "We here naturally think of the beautiful stanza of the Greek hymn of Anatolius containing the word Euroclydon.

"'Ridge of the mountain wave, lower thy crest!
Wall of Euroclydon, be thou at rest!
Sorrow can never be, darkness must fly,
Where saith the Light of light, Peace! It is I!'

(κ') The angel of God. V. 23.

The literal rendering is, as in the Revised Version, an angel of the God, whose I am. The ministry of angels is frequently referred to in the Acts.

This form of expression is natural in addressing idolaters, to whom the idea of an angel was familiar, as a messenger from the gods, but who had no idea of the one living and true God. This vision was to Paul a source of strength and presence of mind, which he was able in some degree to impress on others.
Stier says: "How beautiful is the quiet certainty of the apostle amid the dangers of the raging sea. I am God's is the loftiest and inmost confidence of piety; I serve him is the consequent appeal to the vitality of his worship." Howson characterizes this statement of the apostle as "one of the noblest utterances that ever came from the lips of man, and made more remarkable by the circumstances under which the words were uttered."

(xA) They cast four anchors out of the stern. V. 29.

Some suppose that the four anchors here mentioned was a four-fluked anchor; but large vessels often carried several anchors. Athenæus mentions a ship that had eight iron anchors, and the quotation from Cæsar by Meyer refers to ships made fast by four anchors. In general the ancients, like the moderns, anchored from the bow. The reason why anchors in the present instance were cast from the stern was that in that way the progress of the ship would at once be stopped without swinging round. "In the battles of the Nile and of Copenhagen, Nelson had his ships anchored from the stern, and the fact derives peculiar interest from the statement that he had been reading Acts xxvii. on the morning of the engagement." (Plumptre.)

Having cast out the anchors they wished for day. These words vividly portray the straw of hope and fear which made them almost cry: "And if our fate be death, give light and let us die."

(xA) Except these abide, ye cannot be saved. V. 31.

Notwithstanding the divine assurance to Paul, means were necessary, and these were ordained as well as the end. Paul's vigilance and the seamen's skill and labor were required to effect the divine purpose. Stier says: "We see, therefore, that God's promises are conditional; in this case, the use of ordinary means and a faithful perseverance in duty to the very last were both requisite."

Calvin on this verse writes: "Paul doth not dispute, in this place, precisely of the power of God, that he may separate the same from his will and from means; and surely God doth not, therefore, commend his (strength or) power (virtutem suam) to the faithful, that they may give themselves to sluggishness and carelessness, contemning means or rashly cast away themselves when there is some certain way of escape. And yet for all this it doth not follow that the hand of God is tied to means or helps, but when God appointeth this or that means to bring anything to pass, he holdeth all men's senses that they may not pass the bounds which he hath appointed."

Dr. Chalmers, in a sermon on Acts xxvii. 22 and 31, says: "There is no inconsistency between these verses. God says in one of them, by the mouth of Paul, that these men were certainly to be saved, and Paul says in the other of these verses that unless the centurion and others were to do so and so, they should not be saved. In one of the verses, it is made to be the certain and unfalling appointment of God. In the other it is made to depend on the centurion. There is no difficulty in all this, if you would just consider that God, who made the end certain, made the means certain also. It is true that the end was certain to happen, and it is as true that the end would not happen without the means, but God secured the happening of both, and so gives sure-
ness and consistency to the passage before us." He also says: "There must be a sad deal of evasion and of unfair handling with particular passages to get free of the evidence which we find for the doctrine of predestination in the Bible. And independently of Scripture altogether, the denial of this doctrine brings a number of monstrous conceptions along with it. It supposes God to make a world, and not to reserve in his own hand the management of its concerns. Though it should concede to him an absolute sovereignty over all matter, it deposes him from his sovereignty over the region of created minds, that far more dignified and interesting portion of his works. The greatest events of the history of the universe are those which are brought about by the agency of willing and intelligent beings, and the enemies of the doctrine invest every one of these beings with some sovereign and independent principle of freedom, in virtue of which it may be asserted of this whole class of events, that they happened, not because they were ordained of God, but because the creatures of God, by their own uncontrolled power, brought them into existence. At this rate, even He to whom we give the attribute of omniscience is not able to say at this moment what shall be the fortune or the fate of any individual, and the whole train of future history is left to the wildness of accident. All this carries along with it so complete a dethronement of God, it is bringing his creation under the dominion of so many nameless and undeterminable contingencies, it is taking the world and the current of its history so entirely out of the hands of him who formed it, it is withal so opposite to what obtains in every other field of observation, when instead of the lawlessness of chance, we shall find that the more we attend the more we perceive of a certain necessary and established order, that from these and other considerations which might be stated the doctrine in question, in addition to the testimonies which we find for it in the Bible, is at this moment receiving a very general support from the speculations of infidel as well as Christian philosophers."
CHAPTER XXVIII.

Ver. 1. ἐπέγνωσαν] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read ἐπεγνωμεν, according to A B C Μ, min. and most vss. Rightly; the third person was introduced with a retrospective view to xxvii. 39, through the connection with the concluding words of xxvii. 44. — Ver. 2. ἀνώφαντες] Lachm. Born. read ἄφαντες, according to A B C Μ, min. But AN was liable to omission even in itself, and especially through the preceding N. — Ver. 3. ἐκ] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read ὑπό, which is decidedly attested, and therefore to be adopted. — διεξελθόνσα] So Tisch. Born. Scholz, according to A G H, min. Chrys. Theophyl. But Elz. and Lachm. have διεξελθόνσα. The double compound was the more easily neglected as it was not elsewhere known from the N. T. — Ver. 5. ἀποσιμάζας] ἀποσιμάζουμενος, although adopted by Scholz and Tisch., is not sufficiently attested by A G H, min. — Ver. 10. τὴν χρείαν] Lachm. Tisch. Born. have τὰς χρείας, according to A B J Μ, min. A gloss on τὰ πρὸς τὴν χρείαν, after xx. 34. — Ver. 14. ἐκ ἀυτῶν] Lachm. and Born., following A B J Μ, min., read περὶ ἀυτῶν, which was introduced as explanatory. — Ver. 16. ὁ ἐκατόνταρχος . . . στρατοπεδάρχης) is wanting (so that the passage continues: ἑπταρ' τῷ Π.) in A B Μ loth 40, Chrys. and most vss. Condemned by Mill, Bengel, and other, suspected by Grieseb., and deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. Defended especially by Born. in Rosenm. Repert. II. p. 301 f. The words, attested by G H and most min. Ar. p. Slav. Theophyl. Oec., have certainly the suspicion of being an expansion. Yet in opposition to their rejection we may urge; first, that there are no variations in detail, as is the general rule with interpolations; secondly, that the writer of a gloss, instead of τῷ στρατευτ., would probably have written the more readily occurring plural; and thirdly, that in transcribing one might very easily pass from ἐκατονταρχος directly to στρατοπεδάρχης, which corruption would then produce the form of Lachmann's text. — Ver. 17. αὐτῶν] Elz. has τῶν Παυλόν, against A B Μ, min. Chrys. and several vss. The name came in, because in ver. 17 a separate new act of the history commences; therefore also Chrys. has once, and indeed at the beginning of a homily, τ. Παυλ. — Ver. 19. κατηγορόσαι] A B Μ, min. have κατηγορεῖν, which Lachm. Tisch. and Born. have adopted. Rightly: κατηγορήσαι is a mechanical alteration, in conformity with ἐπικαλέσασθαι. — Ver. 23. ἥκον] A B Μ, min. have ἥλθον. Recommended by Grieseb. and adopted by Lachm. The extremely common word has been involuntarily substituted for the classical imperfect ἥκον, not elsewhere occurring in the N. T. — τὰ περὶ] Lachm. Tisch. Born. have only περὶ, following A B H Μ, min. vss. Comp. on viii. 12, xix. 8. — Ver. 25. ἥμων] A B Μ, min. vss. Fathers have ὑμῶν, which Lachm. and Tisch. have adopted. The Recepta is justly supported by Born. The tone and contents of the speech, conveying censure and rejection, involuntarily suggested the second person to the transcribers. Comp. vii. 51 f. — Ver. 27. ἱάσωμαι] A B G H Μ, min. Theophyl. have ἱασώμαι, recommended by Grieseb. and adopted by Tisch. Rightly; see on John xii. 40. — Ver. 28. τὸ σωτῆρ.] Lachm. Tisch. Born. read τοῦτο τὸ σωτῆρ., according to A B Μ, min. Chrys. and several vss. The
omission of τεφρα, which has no express reference in the text, is quite in keeping
with the inattention of transcribers. — Ver. 29 is entirely wanting in A B E
M, loth 13, 40, 68, Lect. 1, Syr. Erp. Copt. Vulg. ms. In the Syr. p. it is marked
as suspected by an asterisk. Condemned by Mill and others, deleted by Lachm.
and Tisch. Very suspicious as an interpolated conclusion of the whole trans-
action (according to ver. 25). Yet it is saved from complete rejection by the
fact, that here also in detail there are only found very immaterial variations. —
Ver. 30. After ἠμενε δὲ, instead of which there is to be read, with Tisch., ac-
ccording to B M, loth 13, εἰνέμεναν δὲ, Elz. has ὁ Πάλλος, against witnesses of very
considerable importance. See on ver. 17.

V. 1. Τὸ τερέ] then, after our rescue, we recognised; looks back to xxvii. 39.
— That by Μᾶλτα is to be understood the well-known Malta1 (x4), and not
— as some of the older commentators2 would infer partly from ἐν τῷ Ἀδρία, 
xxvii. 27, partly from βάρβαροι, ver. 2, and partly from the observed fact,
which, though true in the present day, cannot at all be made good for
those times, that there are no venomous serpents in Malta—the island now
called Melada in the Adriatic Gulf, not far from the Illyrian coast,1° is
proved as well by the previous long tossing about of the ship, which was
hardly possible with a continued storm in the Adriatic Gulf, as more es-
pecially by the direction of the further voyage.4 The local tradition, also, in
Malta, is in favour of it.6 In the Act. Petri et Pauli 1, the island is
called Γαυδουμέλης.

Ver. 2. Βάρβαροι] from a Roman point of view, because they were neither
Greeks nor Romans, but of Punic descent, and therefore spoke a mixed
dialect, neither Greek nor Latin. It was not till the second Punic war that Malta came under the dominion of the Romans.8 — ὁ τῷ τιμοίσαν] See
on xix. 11. — προσελάβησαν] they took us to themselves.9 — διὰ τὸ ἱερὸν τὸ ἐθνὸς, on account of the rain which had set in.10 — φύγα] thus to be accented, al-
though in opposition to a prepositional of codd.,8 not φύγος.

Ver. 3. Ἀνὶ τῷ θεῷ.] (see the critical remarks) on account of the heat.11 The reading ἐκ would have to be rendered: from out of the heat. — δεξιῆς-
θοισα].11 It denotes that the viper came out from the bushwood in which it
was, and through the layer of the same which was above it.12 — καθήψας τῆς
χειρὸς αὐτοῦ: it seized on his hand.13 The reading καθύπαρο, recommended by
Griesbach, following C, min. Chrysostom, al., appears to be an emendation.
That this καθύπαρσε took place by means of a bite, Luke himself makes suf-

1 Diod. Sic. v. 19; Strabo, vi. 2, p. 277; Cic. Verr. vi. 46; Ovid. Fast. ill. 567 f.; Fertitas
est Maltae, steril vicina Coeurae, Insula quam Libya verberat usque fremit.
2 Following Constantin. Porph. d. admin-
istr. imper. p. 86 (see in Wolf, and in Winer, 
Reale).
4 vv. 11, 12.
5 Beza on xxvii. 41; Smith, Vömel, Hackett.
6 Liv. xxii. 51.
7 Comp. on Rom. xiv. 1.
8 Comp. Polyb. xvii. 3. 7: δἰ τῶν ἰδετοῖσα ζῶσων.
9 See Lipius, gramm. Utens, p. 44. See 
Hom. Od. x. 555; Soph. Phil. 17.
10 On the late form ἕρωμα, instead of ἔρωμα,
see Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 581; see Winer, p.
346 (E. T. 405); Hermann, ad Arist. Nub. 934.
11 Plat. Pol. ill. 406 C; Phaed. p. 109 B;
Xen. Anab. vi. 6. 28; 2 Sam. ii. 33.
12 See Bornemann, and Kihlb, ad Xeh.
Anab. vi. 6. 39. [ad AJ. 700.
13 Comp. Arr. Epict. ill. 10. 30; Lobeck,
ciently evident in ver. 4 by κρέμαμενον . . . ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ; but it follows decidedly, and without rashly leaping to a conclusion, from the judgment, from the expectation, and from the subsequent ἥγεν δὲν αὐτ. εἰπει of the Melitenses, vv. 4, 6, in all which it is necessarily presupposed that they, the near bystanders, had actually seen the bite of the serpent. From this at the same time it follows just as certainly, that the animal must have been definitely known to the islanders as a poisonous viper. Hence we must reject the view of Bochart: " "illigavit se etc., nempe ut . . . morderet, sed eam oviduit Deus, sicut, leones illos, Dan. vi. 22," and of Kuinoel: "erat autem vipers ista aut non venenata, eti Melitenses sam pro venenata habuerint, aut si erat, insinuavit quidem se Pauli manui, non vero momordit." The latter, also hinted at by Ewald, follows least of all from ἔπαθεν οἴδην κακόν, ver. 5, by which the very absence of result, brought about by special divine help, is placed in contrast with the poisonous bite. Nevertheless, Lange supposes that the reptile may have hung encircling his hand without biting, and Lekebusch, p. 382, that Luke had in view the alternative contained in Kuinoel's explanation. Indeed, according to Haurrath, the judgment in ver. 5 is only ascribed to the islanders by Luke. They were, as he thinks, aware that there were no poisonous serpents with them, and that thus the bite was not dangerous.

Vv. 4, 5. Ἐκ τῆς δειπ. αὐτ. [from his hand, so that it hung fastened with its mouth in the wound.] — πάνως οὐκὶ ἵστων κ.τ.λ.] he is at all events a murderer, etc. From the fact that the stranger, though he had escaped from shipwreck, yet had now received this deadly bite, the people inferred that it was the work of Δικη, who was now carrying out her sentence, and requiting like with like, killing with killing. Perhaps it had been already told to them that Paul was a prisoner; in that case their inference was the more natural. The opinion of Elsner, to which Wolf, Kuinoel, and Lange accede, that the people might have deduced their inference from the locality of the supposed bite, according to the idea that punishment overtake the member with which a crime is committed, is to be rejected for the very reason, that in fact from a bite on the hand any other crime committed by the hand might quite as well be inferred. — εἰςαν] not sinit, "but sinit; they regard the bite as so certainly fatal.—On the goddess Δικη, the avenger of crime,' Justitia, the daughter of Zeus, and ἱνεδρός or παρεδρός. How the islanders named the goddess to whom Luke gives the Greek name Δικη, or whether perhaps they had received the Greek Δικη among their divinities, is not to be decided. — On the active ἄτοπον ἵππασεν, to shake off, comp. Luke ix. 5; Lam. ii. 7.

Ver.6. But when they waited long, not expectant, and saw, etc. On ἄτοπον of abnormal corporeal changes, see examples in Wetstein and Kypke. Not"
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even the expected swelling (πυμπ.) occurred. — εἰς αὐτὸν γινώμ. [taking place on him. — μεταβαλλόντα] to turn themselves round, to change, often used even by classical writers to express change of view or opinion, without, however, supplying τὴν γνώμην. — θησοῦ αὐτὸν εἶναι] The good-natured people, running immediately into extremes with the inferiority of their rational training, think that he is a god appearing in human form, because they could not reconcile the complete want of result from the poisonous bite of the viper, well known to them in its effects, with the knowledge which they had derived from experience of the constitution of an ordinary human body. ἁπερβολὴ τιμῆς ὃσπερ καὶ τῶν δεμών τῶν ἐν Αυκανών. Βengel well remarks "aut latro inquiet aut Deus . . .; datur tertium; homo Dei." The people themselves do not say (θησοῦ) that they meant a definite, particular god. Zeller finds in ver. 6 simply an unhistorical addition "in the miraculous style of our chap. xiv.," which character belongs still more decidedly to the cures in vv. 8 and 9.

Vv. 7-10. The otherwise unknown Publius, the πρῶτος τῆς νῆσου, is to be considered as the chief magistrate of the island. But this is not so much to be proved from the inscription, discovered in Malta, quoted by Grotius and Bochart, Geogr. ii. 1. 26— . . . ΠΡΟΤΑΗΝ. ΠΠΕΥΣ. ΡΟΜ. ΠΡΩΤΟΣ. ΜΕΑΙΤΑΙΩΝ . . . as it may, both in that inscription and in this passage, be justly inferred from the nature of the case itself; for certainly the Roman governor, that is, the legate of the praetor of Sicily, to which praetorship Malta belonged, had the first rank on the small island. — ἀναδέξ. ἠμᾶς] Ver. 10 proves that this ἠμᾶς applies not to the whole ship’s company, but to Paul, Luke, and Aristarchus. Certainly the wonderful course of things in connection with the bite of the viper had directed the interest of the humane man to Paul. And Paul repaid his kindness by the restoration of his sick father. — Ver. 8. πυρετοῖς] The plural denotes the varying fever fits. Observe how accurately Luke as a technical eye-witness designates the disease. — δυσμενεύοις] dysentery. Yet the later neuter form δυσμενεύσι is so strongly attested that it has been rightly adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Bornemann. — Vv. 9, 10. θεραπεύοντο] namely, by Paul, ver. 8. The conjecture, based on the following ἠμᾶς, ver. 10, that Luke as a physician was not unConcerned in these cures, is not only against the analogy of ver. 8, but altogether against the spirit and tendency of the narrative, and indeed of the book. — πολλαὶς τιμαῖς ἔτιμ.

---

2 Dem. 305. 19, 349. 25, and see Kypke.
3 xiv. 11 ff. Chrysostom.
4 Grotius, Hesius, Alberti conjecture Hercules λεξίκων; Weststein, Asclepius; Sepp, one of the two.
5 Cic. Verre. iv. 18.
6 Bo Baumgarten.
7 xxvii. 9.
8 Dem. 1260. 80; Lucian, Philops. 9.
9 Herod. viii. 110; Plat. Tim. p. 83; A; see Cola. iv. 25.
10 See Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 518.
11 From the popular representation, ver. 9, it is not to be inferred, with Baumgarten, that not a single sick person remained uncured in the island. This Luke would have known how to bring out with corresponding emphasis, especially if he, like Baumgarten, had thought on the fulfilment of Ex. xv. 25, and had conceived to himself Malta in a fanciful manner as emblematic of the completed kingdom of God.
12 Lekebusch, p. 389.
They honoured us with many marks of honour; and when we set sail, were on the point of sailing, they placed on the ship what was necessary, money, and perhaps also provisions and other requisites for the journey. Many expositors render τιμάεις εἰτιμ., muneribus ornarunt; but in that case, as in Ecclus. xxxviii. 1, the context must undoubtedly have suggested this special showing of honour, by rewards. Even in the well-known honor habendus medico the general honor is not to be exclusively restricted to the honorarium. In 1 Tim. v. 17 also τιμης is quite generally honoris. While the very command of Christ, Matt. x. 8, is antagonistic to the explanation praemiiis ornarunt in our passage, the context is also against it, which represents the actual aid as a proof of gratitude different from that quite general τιμαις εἰτιμ. ἡμᾶς, both in point of substance and in point of time. — Tradition makes Publius afterwards bishop of Malta. 

Ver. 11. Παρασήμον Διοσκορίδας παροπ. is not an adjective, marked with the Dioecuri, as the adjective παράσημος has always a derogatory reference, e.g. falsely stamped, stigmatised, ill-famed, etc., but a substantive, so that the dative is connected with ἀνήχθησαν: we put to sea . . . with a sign, which was the Dioecuri. An image of the Dioecuri was, namely, the ship's device, i.e. the παράσημον, the insigne of the ship. This name was given to the image of a divinity, of an animal, or of any other selected object, which was to be found either painted or sculptured on the prow. — For such a παράσημον the image of the Dioecuri was very suitably chosen, as Castor and Pollux were honoured as the ἄρωγοναίται and generally as protectors in dangers. On the forms under which they were represented, see Müller. On the modes of writing Διόσκουροι and Διόσκοροι, see Lobeck. — The mention of the ship's sign belongs to the special accuracy of the recollection of an eye-witness. According to Baumgarten, Luke designs to intimate "that in this vessel there did not prevail that former presumptuous security, but confidence in a superhuman protection and assistance." So much the more arbitrarily invented, as we know not what παράσημον the wrecked ship had. Luke has noticed the sign in the case of the one, and not in the other. It is conceivable enough, even without assuming any set purpose, that after the surmounted disaster his attention was the more alive to such a special feature in the ship in which they now embarked.

Vv. 12–14. The voyage proceeded in quite a regular course from Malta to Syracuse, and from that to Rhegium, now Reggio, in the Sicilian Straits.
VOYAGE TO ROME.

and then through the Etruscan Sea to Puteoli, now Puzzuolo, near Naples.
—ἐπιμειναίον Νάυον] when thereupon south wind, which favoured the voyage, had arisen. — The force of ἐν is, in all places where ἐπιμειναίον occurs of wind,¹ not to be overlooked. — ἀναπληρώσα] as persons, who were on the second day, i.e. on the second day.⁵ — ἀδέλφοις] Thus Christianity was already at that time in Puteoli, whether coming thither from Rome, or perhaps from Alexandria? — Ver. 14. παρεκλήθημεν ἕν' αὐτῶι ἐπιμεινα] we were invited to remain with them. — ἕν' αὐτῶι] besides them.⁶ Rück,⁴ as also Ewald, prefers the reading ἐπιμειναίτες, and takes παρεκλ. ἕν' αὐτῶι together: we were refreshed in them; but the participle is much too weakly attested, and without doubt has only come into the text through this view of παρεκλ. — καὶ οὖν εἰς τ. Ἐρωμ. ἠλθ.] and thus, after we had first tarried seven days at Puteoli, we came to Rome. ἐπιμειναί is neither here, in opposition to Beza, Grotius, de Dieu, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and many others, nor elsewhere in the N. T. ἐρωμ., not even in John vi. 17, where the imperfect is to be observed; but Luke narrates the arrival at Rome, and then in ver. 15 inserts by way of episode something special, which stood in close connection with this arrival; hence he again joins on ver. 16 by δὲ δὲ ἠλθομεν εἰς Π. to ver. 14. Observe at the same time that in ver. 14 εἰς τ. Ἐρωμ., as the final aim of the voyage, but in ver. 16 ἠλθομεν, has the emphasis. — Moreover, the concession of a seven days' stay, so near to the end of the journey, testifies how much Paul possessed the love and confidence of the centurion. The Book of Acts, however, gives us no information at all how Christianity was planted in the Italian cities and in Rome.

Ver. 15. Οὐ ἀδέλφοι] Considering the largeness which we must assume the church at Rome to have attained, according to Rom. xvi. 3 ff., probably a numerous representation of it is to be conceived as present. — ἦσα] appropriating dative of the pronoun.⁸ — ἐπιμειναὶ Λατινῶν ἡμ. Μακαρινῶν ταβ.] καὶ : and, respectively. Luke narrates from the standpoint of the travellers. These came first to Forum Appii, a village on the Via Appia, 48 miles from Rome, and then to Tres-tabernae. Three-booths, an inn ten miles nearer to Rome; in both places they were received by the brethren, who thus went to meet them in two detachments. As they had tarried seven days at Puteoli, the Roman Christians might have obtained information timely enough in order to come so far to meet them with the speed of love and reverence.— εἰςπαρ. τ. Ἐρωμ. ἠλατει θάρασ] How natural was it that Paul, to whom Rome, this ἐπιμειναί τῆς οἰκουμένης ἧδι had for so long been in view as a longed-for goal of his labours,⁶ should now, at the sight of the brethren, who had thus from Rome carried their love forth to meet him, glow with gratitude to God, and in this elevated feeling receive confidence as to the devel-

sailed round about (Lange, comp. Smith). Luke does not express himself with chartographic accuracy.
¹ As in Thuc. iv. 30. 1, et al.
² Herod. vi. 106. Comp. on John xii. 30; Phil. iii. 5.
³ Comp. Xen. Anab. viii. 2. 1: ἐπιμειναίον ἐν
⁴ Lucubr. crisi. p. 96. [144 A]
⁵ Comp. Bengel.
⁷ Athen. Deipn. i. 29.
⁸ xix. 21, xxiii. 11; Rom. i. 9 ff.
opment of his fate and as to his new sphere of work! According to Baumgarten, it is true, he saw at the same time in the Roman church, not founded by any apostle, "the identity and continuity" of the Pentecostal church—of all which the text contains not a hint, as, indeed, such a fancy as to the founding of the church is by no means justified by the circumstances of the case being unknown to us.

Ver. 16. The two praefecti praetorio, commanders of the imperial body-guard, had the duty of providing for the custody of accused persons handed over from the provinces to the Emperor. That there was at that time only one praefect, namely Burrus, who died before the beginning of March 62, and after whose death there were again two, does not follow from the singular τῷ στρατεύ., in opposition to Anger, Wieseler, and others. It is to be taken as: "to the praefectus praetorio concerned," namely, who then had this duty of receiving, and to whose dwelling, therefore, the centurion repaired with a view to deliver over the prisoners. This does not suppose, as Wieseler objects, that the praefect received them in person; he had his subalterns. — καὶ οὐρανός] for himself, apart from the other prisoners. This special favour is explained partly from the report of Festus, which certainly pointed to no crime, and partly from the influence of the centurion who respected Paul, and would specially commend him as having saved the lives of all on board. — σὺν τῷ ... στρατεύων] This was a praeatorian, to whom Paul, after the manner of the custodia militaris, was bound by the arm with a chain.

Ver. 17. On the interview which now follows with the Jews it is to be observed: (1) that Paul even now remains faithful to his principle of trying his apostolic ministry in the first instance among the Jews, and thereby even as a prisoner complying with the divine order of the way of salvation: Ἱουναίᾳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἐλληνι, Rom. i. 16, and with the impulse of his own love to his people, Rom. ix. 1 ff., which the painful experiences of the past had not weakened. (2) He does this after three days, during which time he had without doubt devoted himself, first of all, to the Roman Christians. (3) The fact that he commences his interview with the Jews by a self-justification is—considering the suspicion with which he, as a prisoner, must have been regarded by them—natural and accordant with duty, and does not presuppose any ulterior design, such as: to prevent a prejudicial influence of the Jews on his trial. (4) The historical character of these dis-

1 Plin. Ep. x. 68; Philostr. Vit. scholast. ii. 22.
3 Comp. ἀ ισθενεῖς, xiv. 18.
4 See vv. 28, 30.
5 xxv. 25, xxvi. 31.
7 Ver. 20. See on xxiv. 27.
8 That Luke gives no further information concerning the Roman church cannot surprise us (in opposition to Zeller, p. 873), as the theme of his book was the ministry of the apostles. A disagreement between Paul and the Roman church (Scheenckburger, p. 182) is not at all to be thought of; the church was not Judaizing, but Pauline. According to Zeller, the author has desired to make Paul appear as the proper founder of that church. But this is erroneous on account even of ver. 15, where, it is true, Zeller understands only isolated believers from Rome, who are assumed therefore not to presuppose any church there, as referred to. See, on the contrary, Ewald, Jahrh. IX. p. 68 ff.
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cussions with the Jews has unjustly been denied, and they have been
wrongly referred to the apologetic design of the author. 1 See the details
below at the passages appealed to. — μετὰ ἡμέρας τρεῖν] in which he might
sufficently occupy himself at the outset with the Roman Christians who
came to him, as doubtless, in opposition to Zeller, he did in conformity
with his long-cherished desire to see them. 2 — τοὺς ὑνασ τὸν Ἰουδ. πρῶτον,
the existing chief of the Jews 4 i.e. the Jewish leaders at that time in Rome.
— εἰδὲν εἰς τοῦ ἀρ. λ. although I have done nothing, etc. This Paul could
say, as he had laboured only to conduct the nation to the salvation ap-
pointed for it, and only to bring the Mosaic institutions to their Messianic
πλήρωσις. His antagonism to the law was directed against justification by
the law. This, and not the abolition of the law in itself, was his radical con-
trast to the Jewish standpoint, in opposition to Zeller. 5 — τὸν Ῥωμαίον
refers to the procurator in Caesarea, who represented the Romans ruling
over Palestine.

Vv. 18, 19. This observation of the apostle, disclosing his presence at
Rome thus brought about as a position of necessity, completes 6 the nar-
rative of xxv. 9. After his vindication 7 we are to conceive, namely, that
Festus expresses his willingness to release him; this the Jews oppose, 8 and
now Festus proposes that Paul should allow himself to be judged in Je-
rusalem, 9 whereupon the latter appeals to Caesar. 10 — οἱ ἱς τοῦ ἐθνοῦς . . .
κατηγορεῖν] thus purely on the defensive, and not in unpatriotic hostility.
— ἐξω and the present infinitives (see the critical remarks) refer to what
Paul has to do now in Rome.

Ver. 20. Therefore, because I am here only as a constrained appellant,
and entirely free from any hostile effort, I have invited you, to see you and
to speak with you. Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Schott take it otherwise: "vos
rogavi, ut me viseretis et mecum colloqueremini." But the supplying of
me and mecum is arbitrary, seeing that, in fact, ὑμᾶς and ὑμῖν are naturally
suggested by the directly preceding ὑμᾶς; besides, it is far more in keep-
ing with courtesy for Paul to say that he desired to see and speak with
them, than that he had requested them to see and speak with him. — εἰκεν
γὰρ τῆς ἐκκλησίας κ. τ. λ. now contains the more special reason, in a national
point of view so highly important, for the arrangement of this interview.
— The ἐκκλησία τοῦ Ἰουδαία is to be taken entirely, as in xxvi. 6, of the Mes-
nianic national hope. — On περίεργαμε with accusative comp. Heb. v. 2. 11

Ver. 21. This answer of the Jews makes it probable that Paul in his dis-
course had definitely suggested that they might perhaps have received
written or oral insinuations concerning him from Judaea. — It appears al-
most incredible that neither took place, but we have to weigh the follow-

1 Baur, Zeller.
2 Rom. i. 11 ff.
3 Comp. Rom. xiii. 1.
4 Comp. Luke xix. 47; Acts xiii. 50, xxv. 2.
5 Comp. on xxiv. 14.
6 Comp. xxv. 25.
7 xxv. 8.
8 xxviii. 19.
9 xxv. 9.
10 xxv. 11.
11 Kyrke, Obs. II. p. 147; Jacobs, ad Anti-
thol. IX. p. 75; see ἐλπίδας τῶν, comp. xxvi.
35.
ing considerations:—(1) _Before the appeal_ the Jews had no ground inducing them to make communications regarding him to the Roman Jews in particular, because they could not conjecture that Paul, then a prisoner in Caesarea, and whom they hoped to destroy presently, would ever come into contact with their brethren in the distant West. (2) _After the appeal_ it was hardly possible for the Jews to forward accounts to Rome before his arrival there. For the transportation of the apostle, which followed at any rate soon after the entering of the appeal, occurred so late in autumn, and so shortly before the closing of the navigation, that there is extreme improbability in the supposition of another vessel having an earlier opportunity of reaching Italy than Paul himself, whose vessel in spring, after the opening of the navigation, had to sail only the short distance between Malta and Puteoli, and that, too, with a favourable wind. (3) There remains, therefore, only the possible case, that during Paul's two years' imprisonment at Caesarea evil reports concerning him might have come to the Roman Jews in some accidental way, not officially, by means of private letters or Jewish travellers. Indeed—considering the lively intercourse between Judaea and Rome, and the great noise which the labours of the apostle had made for many years, as well as the strong opposition which he had excited among the Jews—it can by no means be supposed that these labours and this opposition should have continued unknown to the Roman Jews. But the πρωτοτοκος of the Roman Jews here proceed with reserve under dread of possible eventualities, and prudently fall back upon the official standpoint; and so they affirm—what, taken in all the strictness of the literal sense, might certainly be no untruth—that _they on their part_ (κυριακος) had neither received letters concerning him, nor oral notification or statement of anything evil concerning him. The more impartial they thus appear and maintain a politic spirit of frankness, the more openly, they at the same time hope, will Paul express his mind and disclose his purposes. Zeller therefore too rashly seizes on the seeming contradiction to truth in ver. 21, as warranting the inference that the non-historical character of the narrative is evident. The explanation also to which Olshausen has recourse appears erroneous: that by _the expulsion of the Jews from Rome under Claudius, the connections, which the Jews of Jerusalem had with them, were broken off_; that only very slowly and secretly the Roman Jews returned in the first years of Nero; and that therefore those who were in Palestine were not properly informed of this situation of matters in Rome, spread of the hostile report to a distance.  

---

1 xxv. 13, xxvii. 1.  
2 xxvii. 2.  
3 xxvii. 13.  
4 It has indeed been thought that the Jews in their plot against the life of the apostle, might have had a motive for not allowing their exasperation against him to become notorious, least of all at Rome (see Lange, apostol. Zeit- alt., I. p. 106). But even granting this arbitrarily assumed calculation on their part, the hostile disposition in Judaea was much too general (xxi. 21) to admit of control over the spread of the hostile report to a distance.  
5 κυριακος: "in sermo quotidiano."  
6 Ver. 22.  
7 Comp. Holtzmann, Judenth. u. Christenth. p. 786, who suggests that the author wished to evade touching on the wide opposition between Paul and Jewish Christianity. But merely to evade this point, he would have needed only to suppress vv. 21, 22, instead of putting such a surprising expression into the mouth of the Jews.
and accordingly made no notification concerning Paul to that quarter. Even *a priori*, such a strange ignorance of the Jews as to the fortunes of their very numerous countrymen in the capital of the world is very improbable; and, from a historical point of view, that expulsion of the Roman Jews had occurred so many years before, and the edict of banishment was at all events only of such temporary force that the renewed toleration of the Jews, permitted either expressly or tacitly, is to be placed even under the reign of Claudius.

Ver. 22. *Αξίωμα δε*] *But we judge*—so as, in such lack of information from other quarters, to be better instructed concerning the circumstances in which thou art placed—it right—as a claim which, as matters stand, is no more than right and proper—to learn from thee—παρά σοῦ has emphasis—etc. —ά φρονεῖς] i.e. what principles and views thou pursuest. —πεπληροὶ μὲν γὰρ τῆς ἀείτικ. ταύτ. for of this party certainly. *tauντικ* has its reference in the more precise expressions, with which Paul must be presumed to have accompanied his ενεκέν γὰρ τῆς ἐλπίδος τ. 'Ισραήλ. In the μὲν without δε the tacit contrast is to be mentally supplied: “Although thou thyself art unknown to us.”

The γάρ grounds the διεξομένεις κ. τ.λ. on the apparently impartial interest of obtaining more particular information.—At first view, it must appear strange that these Jewish πρὸς in Rome betray so little acquaintance, or none at all, with the great Christian church at Rome, which consisted, at any rate in part, of Jewish Christians. This difficulty is not solved by the arbitrary assumption that, after the return of the Jews expelled by Claudius, the Jews and Christians kept aloof from each other and thus gradually lost acquaintance with one another; nor yet by the circumstances of such a great city as Rome, amidst which the existence of the Christian community might well have escaped the knowledge of the rich worldly Jews,—which, considering the relationship of Judaism and Christianity, would *a priori* be very improbable. It is rather to be explained, like the expression in ver. 21, from a cautious sort of official reserve in their demeanour, not exactly hypocritical or intimidated by the Claudian measures, but in which withheld the Jewish contempt for Christianity generally is apparent. The representation here given, according to which those Jews simply avoid any sort of expression compromising them, is by no means to be used, with Baur and Zeller, against the historical truth of the occurrence. Its historical character, on the contrary, gains support from the Epistle to the Romans itself, which shows no trace that in Rome Christianity had been in conflict with the Jews; and therefore de Wette is wrong in his remark that, if Luke had only added καὶ παρ’ ἑμῖν to πανταχοῦ, there would have been no ground of offence (o’).
Ver. 28. *Eis τὴν ἐκκλησίαν* to the lodging, i.e. the dwelling which, after his arrival at Rome, he was allowed to occupy with a friendly host. At a later period he obtained a *hired house* of his own. Whether the *ἐκκλησία* was the house of *Aquila*, cannot be determined. — *πλείονες* a greater number than were with him on the former occasion. — *πείθων κ.τ.λ.* and persuading them of what concerns Jesus. *Πείθω* is neither to be taken as *docens* with Kuinoel, nor *de conatu* with Gotius. Paul really did on his part, subjectively, the *πείθων, persuadere*; that this did not produce its objective effect in all his hearers, does not alter the significance of the word. — ἀπὸ . . . τοῦ νόμου κ.τ.λ. starting from it, linking his *πείθων* to its utterances. — The opinion of Böttger, that Paul was *liberated* between vers. 23 and 23 is refuted by ver. 30, compared with ver. 16, as well as by Phil. i. 13 ff., since the Philippian Epistle was not written in Caesarea, as Böttger judges.

Vv. 25-27. *Ἀπελίουσαν* they departed, they withdrew. The imperfect is graphic. — *εἰσόντος τ. Π. ἑκάστην εἰν* after that Paul, immediately before their departure, had made one utterance. *ἐν*: one dictum, instead of any further discourse: it makes palpable the importance of this concluding saying. Then follows this ἑκάστης εἰν in the *oratio directa* (with ἐν) as far as ver 28. — *καλωσί* because completely justified as appropriate by the latest result before them. — *τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγια* "Quod Spiritum sanctum loquentem inducit potius quam prophetam, ad fidem oraculi valet." — *πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν* to our fathers; for the divine command imparted to Isaiah, *πορεύσετε κ.τ.λ.*, was as such made known to the fathers. — Isa. vi. 9, 10, almost exactly according to the LXX., has its Messianic fulfilment in the obduracy of the Jews against the gospel, a fulfilment which Paul here announces to the obdurate, so that he recognises himself as the subject addressed by *πορεύσετε*. With hearing, auribus, ye shall hear, and certainly not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and certainly not perceive. For the heart, the spiritual vitality, of this people had become fast—obdurate and sluggish, see on Matt. L.c.—and with their ears they have become dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed, in order that they may not perceive with the eyes, or hear with the ears, or understand with the heart, or turn themselves, to me, and I, i.e. God, should heal them, of their spiritual malady, by forgiveness and sanctification. — *εἰπὼν* (Elz. *eiπέ*) is oxytonon. (thinking possibly of his conversion) in the hardening, as with ἐκκλησία in 1 Cor. x. 1 (in opposition to Baumgarten). It is the simple expression of Israelitish fellowship. Comp. Rom. iv. 1.

1 Ver. 16. 2 Phillem. 22. 3 Ver. 20. 4 Olshausen. 5 Comp. on xix. 8. 6 Comp. on viii. 29; Rom. ii. 4. 7 Comp. on xvii. 2. 8 Beitr. II. p. 32 ff. 9 See also Wieseler, p. 411 ff. 10 Polyb. ii. 34. 12, v. 95. 6, and frequently. 11 Not when, see ver. 29. 12 Comp. Matt. xv. 2. 13 Calvin: 2 Pet. i. 21. 14 By ἡμῶν Paul as little includes himself.
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Vv. 28, 29. των] because ye are so obdurate and irrecoverable. — ἐν τοῖς εἰδενευμ κ.τ.λ.] that by my arrival at Rome thus (τοῦτο, see the critical remarks) salvation of God, i.e. the Messianic salvation bestowed by God, which is meant in this prophecy, has been sent, not to you Jews, but to the Gentiles. — aitai] they on their part quite otherwise than you. — καὶ ἀκοίσονται] namely the announcement of salvation, which conception is implied in ἀνεπιστάλη as its mode. καὶ, etiam: non solum missa est iis salus, sed etiam audient, give ear. Bengel appropriately observes: "Profectionem ad gentes declaraverat Judaeis contumacibus Antiochiae xiii. 48; Corinthi xviii. 6, nunc tertium Romae; adeoque in Asia, Graecia, Italia."—Ver. 30. ἐν ἰδίῳ μισθώμ.] i.e. in a dwelling belonging to himself by way of hire. This he had obtained after the first days when he had lodged in the ξενία, ver. 28; but he was in it as a prisoner, as follows from ver 16, from καὶ ἀπεβίασεν κ.τ.λ., and from ἀκωλύτως, ver. 31, nemoque prohibente, although he was a prisoner. To procure the means of hiring the dwelling must have been an easy matter for the love of the brethren, and support came also from a distance. — πάντως] Christians, Jews, Gentiles; not merely the latter, as Baumgarten arbitrarily limits the word, while with equal arbitrariness he finds in ver. 31 a pointing to the final form of the church, in which the converted Israel will form the visible historical centre around which the Gentile nations gather, and then the Parousia will set in. This modern view of Judaistic eschatology has no support even in Rom. xi. 27 ff. (p).

Ver. 31. Solemn close of the whole book, which is not to be regarded as incomplete. The Gospel also concludes with a sonorous participial ending, but less full and solemn. — καρίσσων κ.τ.λ.] thus his word was not bound in his bonds. — ἀκωλύτως] "Victoria verbi dei. Paulus Romae, apex evangelii, actorum finis," Bengel (q).

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

(p) Melita. V. 1.

When the passengers and crew of the ill-fated, stranded vessel had all safely landed, they discovered they were on an island named Melita, or Malta, as it is now called. There can be no doubt that this was the island where the apostle and his companions spent the winter months. It has been objected that there are now no poisonous reptiles on the island, or brushwood of any kind, but both may have abounded at that time, when the island was less populous, and not fully cultivated. The people were not barbarous in any other sense than in using a different language, the Punic. Even at present the Maltese have a peculiar dialect, a mixture of Arabic and Italian. The inhabitants kindly welcomed the shipwrecked travellers, and, as they were shivering from

1 Comp. Luke ii. 30, iii. 6.
2 x. 30, xiii. 28.
3 Comp. Bornemann, Schol. in Luc. p. 24.
4 Comp. Phil. i. 7.
5 Phil. iv. 10 22.
6 See Introd. § 3.
7 § Tim. ii. 9.
8 Plat. Crot. p. 413 D; Herodian. i. 12. 13.
the wet and the cold, they built for them a fire. Paul, as he did when on board, gave his personal aid, and gathered some brushwood or sticks, whence came out a viper which bit him. All attempts to show that either the serpent did not bite Paul's hand, or if it did, it was not venomous, are justly characterized by *Aiford* as "the disingenuous shifts of rationalists and semi-rationalists." The natives seeing this, with some innate ideas of a righteous retribution, at once imagined he was a murderer, whom divine vengeance thus overtook. They expected that he would have fallen down suddenly dead. Sudden collapse and death ensue often from the bite of serpents. *Shakespeare* speaks as a true naturalist of the asp-bitten Cleopatra:

"Trembling she stood and on the sudden dropped."

*Plumptre*, in illustration, quotes the following stanza translated from *Lucan*:

**Nasidius toiling in the Marsian fields**  
The burning Fructas bit—a fiery flash  
Lit up his face and set the skin a stretch,  
And all its comely grace had passed away."

No unpleasant results, however, following in the case of Paul, they changed their minds and said he was a god. Here the apostle during his stay performed many miraculous cures, which called forth the gratitude and gifts of the people. Doubtless also Paul lost no opportunity of preaching the great Healer, in whose name he performed such wonderful cures. About the month of February, A.D. 61, Paul and his companions started again for Rome, in a corn ship, whose sign was Castor and Pollux, twin sons of Jupiter and Leda, regarded as the tutelar deities, *θεοὶ οὐρῆπες*, of sailors, and described by Horace as fratres Helenium lucida sidera. The constellation Gemini, the Twins, is named from them. The ancients identified them with the phosphoric lights, sometimes seen on the masts of ships, which promise a fair wind and a prosperous voyage, and which are now called the fires of St. Elmo. Touching at Syracuse and at Rhegium, they came, after a prosperous sail of 180 miles, to Puteoli, which lies on the northern part of the Bay of Naples, and is described as one of the loveliest spots on earth. Here the apostle spent a whole week with brethren.

(o*) This sect ... spoken against. V. 22.

The apostle received a most affectionate welcome from the brethren in Rome. Some of them having gone as far as Appia Forum and the Three Booths, distant from Rome respectively about forty and thirty miles, to greet him. His sensitive spirit deeply felt this kindness, and he was greatly cheered by it. At last his long-cherished desire to visit Rome is realized. But in a way he had never dreamed of. He had not imagined that "when he went to the City of the Seven Hills he should enter it as a prisoner chained to a soldier of the Augustan cohort." Yet in his visit to the metropolis of the world, trying, and seemingly hopeless as the circumstances were, Paul accomplished all that he had earnestly desired. For, as he writes from his prison, all that happened to him proved favorable for the furtherance of the gospel. He had not the same opportunities which he found at Athens or at Ephesus. No great hall or hippodrome or even synagogue was open for his ministrations. He was not even at liberty to go
from house to house, to the Forum, or the market-place, but he diligently used such opportunities as were within his power, and was eminently successful among the Gentiles, specially with the soldiers who guarded him, and even with those of the royal household. Shortly after his arrival, he sent for the chief men among the Jews, rulers of the synagogue, and heads of Jewish families, and, fearing they might have heard some reports injurious to him, he fully explained the cause of his coming among them as a prisoner. A time being appointed, many came to hear his account of the gospel of the Crucified, and a whole day was spent in the discussion. It must have been a striking and most impressive scene, such an audience in such a place, listening to a preacher in chains—the man and his theme alike wonderful. He spoke of a King whose kingdom was grander, more extensive, and more enduring than the Empire of the Caesars. A fire was kindled in Rome that day which rapidly spread throughout the empire. The sect then so bitterly spoken against and so ably vindicated by Paul, exists still, and is winning its way to the conquest of the world for Christ. In his conferences with the Jews, the apostle exhibited the satisfactory and conclusive evidences of the truth of the gospel, unfolded the ample provision which it makes for all the deepest wants of the human heart, and illustrated the happy influence it exerts on all human relations and interests. He expounded and testified and persuaded them concerning Jesus. The majority did not favorably receive his message, but some were convinced and embraced Christianity.

(\textsuperscript{24}) \textit{Two whole years in his own hired house.} V. 30.

All this time Paul was a prisoner of state, and all his expenses were, doubtless, cheerfully defrayed by friends in Rome and elsewhere. During the day he was chained to a soldier, and, in the night, guarded by two or more. From notices in the epistles written during this imprisonment we learn that several Christian friends, some of whom were very dear to him, were with Paul—Luke, Timothy and Mark, Epaphras, Aristarchus and Tychicus. His chief employment was preaching the gospel. Many a soldier who for six hours was chained to the arm of the apostle had occasion to bless God that such a privilege had been his, and not a few of them, doubtless, became true soldiers of the cross and spread the good tidings through the army, and, as a consequence, more or less over the land. Many of the brethren also "waxing confident by his bonds, were much more bold to speak the word without fear."

From the salutation and allusions contained in the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon, critics are generally agreed that they were written during these two years' imprisonment. There is a simple grandeur in the concluding sentence of this history which is very impressive. "The mention of the kingdom had been a matter of odium in the eyes of Pilate." Now Rome bears its being publicly stated. "The victory of the Word of God. Paul at Rome forms the (apex) climax, or crowning point, of the gospel preaching, and the end of the Acts which Luke otherwise might have easily brought on to the death of Paul. He began at Jerusalem, he ends at Rome." (\textit{Bengel.})

A great many reasons have been imagined why Luke concludes his narrative without giving any account of the end of Paul. Conjecture is as various as it is
vain. Some suppose that Luke intended to write a third treatise, but was prevented by his death; others that the narrative was carried up to the time that Luke wrote. Plumptre with others suggests that the subsequent events were already known to Theophilus, who was an Italian convert; but the most probable opinion is that Luke had accomplished the purpose he had in view in writing. The Acts give an account of the rise of the gospel at Jerusalem, and closes with its reception at Rome. The writer's work was done; hence, "with an emphatic and artistically formed sentence, he concludes his history."

(q4) Paul's second imprisonment.

However slight may be the grounds of direct testimony it has generally been believed in all ages, that about the beginning of the year A.D. 64, St. Paul was tried, acquitted, and liberated, and that after some years of liberty and labor, he was a second time brought a prisoner to Rome, and there suffered martyrdom. The arguments in favor of a second imprisonment are drawn from two sources: the ancient traditions of the church, and allusions contained in the pastoral epistles. The unanimity of the ancient church on this point is very remarkable, yet it is by no means conclusive; though such authorities as Clement, Tertullian, Eusebius, Chrysostom, and Jerome are quoted. The evidence to be gathered from the pastoral epistles is clearly in favor of a second imprisonment. All who maintain the genuineness of these epistles are constrained to adopt this view, or to resort to some more improbable suppositions to explain the statements they contain. On the genuineness of the pastoral epistles see Excursus IX. to Farrar's Life of Paul, which concludes with the following sentence: "Pauline in much of their phraseology, Pauline in their fundamental doctrines, Pauline in their dignity and holiness of tone, Pauline alike in their tenderness and severity, Pauline in the digressions, the constructions, and the personality of their style, we may accept two of them with an absolute conviction of their authenticity, and the third—the first Epistle to Timothy, which is more open to doubt than the others—with at least a strong belief that in reading it we are reading the words of the greatest of the apostles." For a reply to Davidson in his Introduction to the New Testament, in which he presents every argument against the Pauline authorship of these epistles and the credibility of Luke as a historian, and also to the suppositions of Renan, see Westcott and Leathes and Howson's Appendix I. For the argument drawn from the historical circumstances, the reference to certain heresies, and the advanced organization of the church alluded to and implied in the pastoral epistles, I refer to Morrison and to Taylor, who strongly advocates the certainty of a second imprisonment, and says: "So without regard to tradition, and solely on the ground of the evidence which may be distilled from the pastoral epistles themselves, I have adopted the view that shortly after the time at which Luke's narrative in the Acts concludes, Paul was set at liberty by Nero; and that, after an interval of four or five years' duration he was again carried to Rome as a prisoner and put to death." Plumptre, in an excursus appended to his Acts, says: "If we accept the pastoral epistles as genuine, we are led partly by their style, partly by the difficulty of fitting them into any earlier period of St. Paul's life, partly by the traces they present of a later stage of development, both of truth and error, to assign them to a date subsequent to the two years of the imprisonment of chap. xxiii. 30."
NOTES.

The life of the great apostle, in the interval between the two imprisonments, is involved in uncertainty. He probably visited Asia, Macedonia, Achaia, Crete, and Spain. Jerome informs us that Paul was beheaded in the fourteenth year of Nero, A.D. 68, the same year in which Peter was crucified—Paul's right of citizenship exempted him from that form of martyrdom. "Thus, in all probability, died the most illustrious of all Christian missionaries, the prince of the apostles, the noblest of the noble army of martyrs." Many ideal portraits have been drawn of this gifted, many-sided, wonderful, heroic, Christlike man. One writes:

"Courteous he was and grave; so meek in mien
It seemed untrue, or told a purpose weak;
Yet in the mood, he could with spineless speak,
Or with stern force, or show of feelings keen,
Marking deep craft, methought, or hidden pride:
Then came a voice—St. Paul is at thy side."

Another writes:

"The third who journeyed with them, weak and worn,
Drear-eyed, dim-visioned, bent and bowed with pain,
We looked upon with wonder."

"So they came;
So entered he our town; but ere 'twas sun
Had hit the eastern clounds, a fever's chill
Fell on him; parched thirst and darting throbs
Of keenest anguish racked those weary limbs;
His brow seemed circled with a crown of pain;
And oft, pale, breathless, as if life had fled,
He looked like one in ecstasy, who sees
What others see not; to whose ears a voice,
Which others hear not, floats from sea or sky.
And broken sounds would murmur from his lips,
Of glory wondrous, sounds ineffable.
The cry of Abba, Father, and the notes
Of some strange chant of other lands.
So stricken, prostrate, pale, the traveller lay,
So stript of all the comeliness of form,
Men might have spurned and loathed him passing on
To lead their brighter life—and yet we stayed;
We spurned him not, nor loathed; through all the shroud
Of poverty and sickness we could see
The hero-soul, the presence as of One
Whom then we knew not. When the pain was sharp,
And furrowed brows betrayed the strife within,
Then was he gentlest. Even to our slaves
He spoke as brothers, winning all their hearts
By that unwoonted kindness."

"God buries his workmen, but carries on their work." The emperors are dead. The Roman Empire has passed away. The City of the Seven Hills is shorn of her power and glory. The brutal and infamous Nero is remembered only to be detested and execrated, but the martyred apostle lives in all the churches of Christendom to-day; and is revered by millions as the greatest of human teachers. The kingdom too which he sought to extend and establish, despite all opposition, is mightier now than when he proclaimed it. It is a kingdom which cannot be moved, for it is built upon a rock—on Christ Jesus, the Son of God, the Saviour of the world, who shall yet return and claim it for his own.
(w) Evidential value of the Acts.

On this subject Dean Howson has published a volume of lectures. The following extract is from an article by Professor Matthew B. Riddle:

"The study of the Book of the Acts suggests two very important points bearing on the historical accuracy of the Gospels. The most obvious one is, that if it is itself a true story,—even true in general,—the weapon used by the early preachers was fact,—fact about Jesus Christ, his life, death, resurrection, and ascension.

"Granting the exactness of the history we have, in its particular reference to the main events of our Lord's life, what is equivalent to a fifth Gospel. There is, too, this added element, namely, a more specific explanation of the purpose and significance of these facts.

"Minute usages, topographical peculiarities, and kindred points, may be found in nearly every paragraph, and each and every such reference can be used as a test of accuracy. The test has been applied. Volume after volume has been written on the subject. Every journey has been retraced, every voyage has been re-made, for the express purpose of verifying the narrative. Sometimes it has been thought that the writer made a mistake, but in nearly every such instance renewed investigations, in a few cases new discoveries by travellers, have shown the accuracy of the record. It has fairly stood every test, and may well be regarded as the book of history (of all times) which has been proven most exact. Others may be as accurate; none have been proven more so. It will be fair to infer that such accuracy would have been impossible had the book been written very long after the date at which its story ends, A.D. 63, thirty-three years after the death of Jesus Christ. 'This view is confirmed by the use which the writer makes of the pronoun 'we.' Is it probable that he took the trouble to be so careful in telling the truth about towns and temples, harbors and currents, and yet carelessly left this pronoun to suggest a falsehood about persons?

"It might be said that such a book could be constructed like a historical romance, after a lapse of fifty or a hundred years. But this is to the last degree improbable. Walter Scott and Thackeray have written the finest and most accurate historical romances, and Shakespeare has furnished the grandest historical dramas. But not one of these three geniuses has succeeded in constructing a piece of literature which stands the test as the Book of Acts has done. Their memory constantly fails them, and their want of accurate knowledge betrays itself repeatedly. Were the Book of Acts a romance, its author must have been a genius unequalled in literature. Of all the Christian centuries, the second century shows fewest men of genius; and yet we are asked to believe that some one in that age polished up the Gospels into their present shape, and concocted the most accurate of historical romances. It is far easier to believe that Luke is the author of the work.

"The 'evidential value' of the Book of Acts consists mainly in this: That it offers presumptive evidence of the strongest character in regard to the main facts of the gospel history, and in particular proves that the author of the third Gospel, being the author of this book also, is a writer of tested accuracy, who tells the exact truth about Jesus Christ. Knowing so well how to be accurate, if he is false in his story about Jesus Christ, he is wilfully and awfully false. One must be far gone in hatred of Christ and his cause not to shrink from this last position."
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Analytical Bible Concordance, Revised Edition.
Analytical Concordance to the Bible on an entirely new plan. Containing every word in Alphabetical Order, arranged under its Hebrew or Greek original, with the Literal Meaning of Each, and its Pronunciation. Exhibiting about 311,000 References, marking 30,000 various readings in the New Testament. With the latest information on Biblical Geography and Antiquities. Designed for the simplest reader of the English Bible. By Robert Young, LL.D., author of “A New Literal Translation of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures,” etc., etc. Fourth Revised, Authorized Edition. Print on heavy paper. One large volume, 4to, cloth, $3.60; sheep, $4.40; Fr. im. morocco, $4.60.

There is but one authorized and correct edition of Young’s Concordance sold in America. Every copy of this edition has on the title-page the words “Authorized Edition,” and at the bottom of the page our imprint.

Dr. Philip Schaff verifies these corrections.

American Bible Revision Committee.

Mora’s J. K. Funk & Co.:

“Dear Sirs:—I have at your request examined personally, and had two literary friends examine, the proof slips of corrections of Young’s ‘Analytical Concordance to the Bible,’” and a comparison of the fourth edition with the first has convinced us that all these corrections have been made in the plates of the fourth edition (1861). Some of these changes are corrections of typographical errors or the errors of copyists; others are the insertions of important references omitted from the first edition. It is no wonder that, in a work covering many thousands of references, there should have appeared in the first edition so many errors and defects; the wonder is rather that there are not more.

“I am glad to hear this testimony as an act of justice to Dr. Young, who has spent so many years of self-denying labor upon this work, and has made it by far the most complete Concordance in the English or any other language.

Philip Schaff.”

Spurgeon says: “Cudron’s is child’s play compared with this gigantic work.”

[-From the New York Tribune.-]

“This is the most important work in religious literature that has been produced for many years. It certainly will supersede and displace all similar works which have preceded it. It is at once a Concordance in Greek, Hebrew and English Lexicon of Bible words and a Scriptural Gazetteer, and will be as valuable to students of the Holy Word as an Unabridged Dictionary is to the general public.”

[-From John Hall, D.D., New York.-]

“Dr. Robert Young’s Analytical Concordance is worthy of the lifetime of labor he has spent upon it. I deeply regret that his natural and just expectation of some return from its sale on this side of the ocean is not realized, and I hope the sense of justice to a most painstaking author will lead to the choice, by many purchasers, of this edition, which Dr. Young approves—that of Moser’s J. K. Funk & Co., with whom Dr. Young co-operates in bringing out here the best edition.”

Analytical Biblical Treasury.
By Robert Young, LL.D., author of Analytical Concordance, etc. 4to, cloth, $2.00.

Contents: (1) Analytical Survey of all the books, (2) Of all the facts, (3) Of all the idioms of the Bible, (4) Bible Themes, Questions, Canonicity, Rationalism, etc., together with maps and plans of Bible lands and places. (5) A complete Hebrew and English Lexicon to the Old Testament. (6) Idiomatic use of the Hebrew and Greek Tenses. (7) A complete Greek and English Lexicon to the New Testament.

Bertram’s Homiletic Encyclopaedia.
A Homiletic Encyclopaedia of Illustrations in Theology and Morals. A Handbook of Practical Divinity, and a Commentary on Holy Scripture. Selected and arranged by Rev. R. A. Bertram, compiler of “A Dictionary of Poetical Illustrations,” etc. Royal 8vo, cloth, 692 pp., $2.50; sheep, $3.50; half morocco, $4.50.

The London Record.—“Its illustrations cast day-light upon more than 4,000 texts of Scripture. A treasury of practical religion.”

The London Literary World.—“No book of illustrations...that, for fullness, freshness, and, above all, suggestive qualities, is worthy to be compared with the work.”

Edinburgh Review.—“Nothing can be more serviceable to students.”

The above works will be sent by mail, postage paid, on receipt of the price.
Biblical History and Biography.

Biblical Notes and Queries.
By Homer Young, LL.D., author of the Analytical Concordance to the Bible. Royal 8vo, cloth, 400 pp., $1.75.
This book is made up of Biblical Notes and Queries regarding Biblical Criticism and Interpretation, Ecclesiastical History, Antiquities, Biography and Bibliography, Ancient and Modern Versions, Progress in Theological Science, Reviews, etc. It answers thousands of questions constantly presented to the minds of clergymen and Sunday-school teachers.

Christian Sociology.

Commentary on Mark.

Explaining the Reason for the changes made on the Authorized Version. By Alex. Hormes, D.D., member of the English Revision Committee, with supplement by a member of the American Committee. Also a full Textual Index. Authorised edition. 8vo, paper, 117 pp., 25 cents; 16mo, cloth, 213 pp., 75 cents.
Charles F. Denme, D.D., says: "The Companion to the Revised Version seems to me almost indispensible. It is important to know the spirit which animated, and the rules which directed, the labors of the Revisers, as well as the causes which determined certain important emendations. This book is set forth by Dr. Roberts with admirable perspicuity. I shall urge every member of the church of which I am pastor to give it a careful reading, and purpose to introduce it as a Text Book in our Bible-classes."

The New York Examiner and Chronicle says: "It is very valuable, giving needed facts as to the causes of the differences in reading which have sprung up in the Scriptures, and the grounds upon which the changes in the present Revised Version have been made."

Conant's History of English Bible Translation.
Revised and Brought down to the Present Time by Thomas J. Conant, D.D., member of the Old Testament Revision Committee, and Translator for the American Bible Union Edition of the Scriptures. This History was originally written by Mrs. H. C. Conant, the late wife of Dr. T. J. Conant. It is a complete history of Bible Revision from the Wickliffe Bible to the Revised Version. 2 vols., paper, 384 pp. (Standard Series, octavo, Nos. 65 and 66), 50 cents; 1 vol., 8vo, cloth, $1.00.

Complete Preacher.
The Complete Preacher. A Sermonic Magazine. Containing nearly one hundred sermons in full, by many of the greatest preachers in this and other countries in the various denominations. 3 vols., 8vo, cloth. Each $1.50, or, per set, $4.00.

Cyclopaedia of Quotations.
With full Concordance and Other Indexes. By J. K. Hoyt and Anna L. Ward. Contains 17,000 Quotations, classified under subjects; narrow, 2,000 selections from the Latin poets and orators; many Latin, French, German and Spanish proverbs, with 50,000 lines of Concordance, making at once available every quotation. Price, Royal 8vo, over 900 pages, heavy paper, in cloth binding, $5.50; in sheep, $6.50; in full morocco, $10.00.

Mr. F. F. Frelinghuysen, Secretary of State: "Am much pleased with the 'Cyclopaedia of Quotations.'"

Henry Ward Beecher: "Good all the way through, especially the proverbs of all nations."

Henry W. Longfellow: "Can hardly fail to be a very successful and favorite volume."

Wendell Phillips: "Its variety and fulness and the completeness of its index give it rare value to the scholar."

George W. Childs: "Enclosed find $20.00 for four copies. It is unique among books of quotations."

Abeen S. Hewitt: "The completeness of its index is simply astonishing. * * Leaves nothing to be desired."

Ex-Speaker Randall: "I send check for copy. It is the best book of quotations which I have seen."

George W. Curtis: "A handsome volume and a most serviceable companion."

Oliver Wendell Holmes: "A massive and towering volume. It lies near my open dictionary."

Boston Post: "Indispensable as Worcester and Webster. Must long remain the standard among its kind."

N. Y. Herald: "By long odds the best book of quotations in existence."

Boston Traveler: "Exhaustive and satisfactory. It is immeasurably the best book of quotations."

N. Y. Times: "Its Index alone would place it before all other books of quotations."

The above works will be sent by mail, postage paid, on receipt of the price.
Eastern Proverbs and Emblems.
Illustrated Old Truths—selected from over 1,000 volumes, some very rare, and to be consulted only in libraries in India, Russia and other parts of the Continent, or in the British Museum. All are classified under subjects, enabling teachers and preachers to fix on the school, the pulpit, or the press, great spiritual truths by means of emblems and illustrations drawn from the depths of the popular mind. This book is the opening of a rich storehouse of emblems and proverbs. By Rev. A. Long, member of the Bengal Asiatic Society. 8vo, 230 pages. Price, cloth, $1.00.

Fulton’s Replies.

Gilead; An Allegory.

The Boston Traveller says:—“Of all the attempts at Allegory, but thousand and one by way of mention, Spencer’s ‘Faerie Queen,’ Bunyan’s ‘Pilgrim’s Progress,’ and J. Hyatt Smith’s ‘Gilead,’ J. Hyatt Smith is worthy to be so classed, and ought to be placed equal in such good company.”

The Buffalo Courier says:—“The same rich im-
aginative glow suffuses his written as well as his unwritten thought.”

The Philadelphia Christian Chronicle says:—“It is an allegory of rare power and completeness, and unless we greatly mistake the public taste, it can hardly fail of a large and well-deserved favor with the people.”


Howard Crosby, D.D., LL.D., says:—“I consider Godet a man of soundest learning and purest orthodoxy. His Luke would be a most acceptable publication in the form you suggest.”


Lyman Abbott, D.D., editor Christian Union, says: “Godet’s Commentary combines the critical and the spiritual, perhaps more effectually than any other with which I am acquainted.”

The Congregationalist, Boston, says: “A book of richest and most permanent value to aid in studying Sabbath-school lessons—clear, thorough, critical, suggestive, inspiring.”

The Sunday School Times, Pa., says: “Godet’s Com-
mentary is one for which Christian scholars should everywhere be grateful. It is full and refreshing.”

The Adventist, Chicago, Ill., says: “Prof. Godet is abundantly learned, thoroughly devout and sound. His style is fresh and often highly suggestive.”

The Central Christian Advocate, St. Louis, Mo., says: “In Godet we find the highest critical skill and a devout spirit. We can commend it without reserve to teachers and students.”

The Zion’s Herald, Boston, Mass., says: “As a commentator, Godet is eminently clear, orthodox and suggestive. He meets all the destructive criticism of the hour upon the sacred text and its authenticity, with a firmness of conviction and fullness of learning which are refreshing, while in exegetical and homiletical notes he leaves nothing to be desired.”

Gospel of Mark.
From the Teachers’ Edition of the Revised New Testament, with Harmony or the Gospels, List of Lessons, Maps, etc. Paper, 15 cents; Cloth, 50 cents.

Half-Dime Hymn Book.
Standard Hymns With Biographical Notes of their Authors. Compiled by Rev. Edward P. Tawney. 32mo, paper, 96 pp. Each, 6c.; in lots of fifty or more, 5c.

Hand-Book of Illustrations.

Home Altar.

Bishop McPherson says: “This little volume we have read again and again, and cannot speak too well of it. There will be hardly any need of preaching on family prayers where it circulates.”

Rev. J. Dr. Summser says: “It seems impossible to resist it, and continue delinquent in regard to the duty in question. The prayers are all catholic and scriptural.”

Res. W. H. Hunter, Pittsburgh, says: “The appeal contained in it for family worship is the most powerful and persuasive we have ever read, and, it seems to us, must be irresistible.”

Res. Dr. Crooks says: “It is one of the ablest essays on the subject to have ever appeared.”

Res. Dr. Wallisays: “The argument in favor of family worship is perfectly irresistible.”

Homiletic Monthly.
The Homiletic Monthly. A Magazine of Sermons and other matter of Homiletic Interest and instruction. (Subscription price, $2.50 per year; single numbers, 25 cents.) Volumes III., IV., V., VI., each 8vo, cloth, 724 pp., $3.00.

The above words will be sent by mail. Orders will be paid on receipt of the price.
The Homilist.

How to Pay Church Debts.
How to Pay Church Debts, and How to Keep Churches out of Debt. By Rev. Sylvanus Stall. 12mo, cloth, 280 pp., $1.50.

The Appeal, Chicago, Ill., says: "The author has given the subject much study, and the book promises to be of great value to the thousands of churches to-day burdened with debt, or struggling to meet current expenses."

The Christian Union, New York, says: "To any troubled church or pastor, pining away under peculiar difficulties, the suggestions here made cannot fail to bring relief."

Metropolitan Pulpit.

Murphy's Commentary.

"Thus far nothing has appeared for half-a-century on the Pentateuch so valuable as the present volume (on Exodus). His style is lucid, animated, and often eloquent. His pages afford golden suggestions and key-thoughts...... Some of the laws of interpretation are stated with so fresh and natural clearness and force that they will remain standing."—Methodist Quarterly.

"As a critical, analytical, candid, and sensible view of the Sacred Word, this work stands among the first."—Congregational Quarterly.

Pastor's Record.

Popery.
Popery the Foe of the Church and of the Republic. By Rev. Joseph S. Van Dyke, author of "Through the Prison to the Throne," etc. 8vo, cloth, 304 pp., $1.00.

The Rev. Alexander T. McGil, D.D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey, says: "I most earnestly commend it as an effort of great merit, diligence and skillful array of the facts and persons of such fearful moment to the Church and to the country at this hour. This book will do great good in awakening the apathy, and engaging a more earnest inquiry among Protestant people respecting the sentiments, views, and principles of this anti-Christian power."

The Rev. Joseph T. Duryea, D.D., Pastor of Central Congregational Church, Boston, Mass., says: "I have read it with interest and profit the work entitled, 'Popery the Foe,' etc. It is an excellent summary of principles and facts bearing upon the controversy with the Papal Church. The arrangement and style of treatment are sound and strong. It is a timely contribution to the cause of true religion and civil liberty."

The London Christian, D.D., says: "Eminently able and timely. It will go like fire, and I hope will be part of the brightness of that coming which will destroy the 'man of sin.'"

With New Index and Concordance, Harmony of the Gospels, Maps, Parallel Passages, in full, and many other Indispensable Helps. All most carefully Prepared. For Full Particulars of this Invaluable Work, send for Prospectus. Price in Cloth, $1.50. Other Prices from $2.50 to $10.00. (See, on another page, what eminent clergymen and others say of this work.)

These Sayings of Mine.
"These Sayings of Mine." Sermons on Seven Chapters of the First Gospel. By Dr. Parker, D.D. With an introduction by Dr. Deems. 8vo, cloth, 320 pp., $1.50.

Dr. Holmes in How Monthly says: "We especially congratulate ourselves that these sermons are printed essentially as they were delivered; they have not been retouched or polished; they are here just as they fell on the ears of the masses who listened to them at their delivery. In their native roughness and brokenness Dr. Parker always has a clear appreciation of the point he would make, and he 'makes' directly at it with the boldness and dash of a soldier winning a sort. We think we would select Dr. Parker to lead a storming party rather than Mr. Spurgeon; he has more enthusiasm, and imparts more to his followers at a given charge than the other great London preacher. Seemingly to forget all rules, Dr. Parker rushes forward with irresistible energy, and thus is the bayonet point of truth right into the heart of his antagonist."

The London Christian World Pulpit says: "We have no hesitation in describing these 'expositions,' for such they really are, as most luminous in their interpretation of the Divine sayings. They glow

The above works will be sent by mail, postage paid, on receipt of the price.
Through the Prison to the Throne.


The Treasury of David.

By Rev. Charles H. Spurgeon. 8vo, Cloth. Price per volume, $2.00.

Spurgeon's Authorization.—"Messrs. I. K. Funk & Co. have entered into an arrangement with me to reprint The Treasury of David in the United States. I have every confidence in them that they will issue it correctly and worthily. It has been the great literary work of my life, and I trust it will be as kindly received in America as in England. I wish for Messrs. Funk success in a venture which must involve a great risk and much outlay.

Dec. 8, 1881.

Volumes I., II., III., IV., V. and VI. Now Ready.

Van Doren's Commentary.


Spurgeon says: "It teems and swarms with homiletic hints."

Canon Ryle says: "It supplies an astonishing amount of thought and criticism."

Bishop Cheyne says: "I know of no volume in my library I could not consent to spare sooner."

Dr. C. Wengel says: "It is the best medium in prose I have ever seen."

The above works will be sent by mail, postage paid, on receipt of the price.
MISCELLANEOUS WORKS.

Bulwer’s Novels.
Leila; or, The Siege of Granada; and, The Coming Race; or, The New Utopia. By Edward Bulwer, Lord Lytton. 12mo, leatherette, 384 pp., 50 cents; cloth, 75 cents.

Carlyle’s Sartor Resartus.
Sartor Resartus; The Life and Opinions of Herr Teufelsdröckh. By Thomas Carlyle. Paper, 176 pp. (Standard Series, octavo, No. 60), 25 cents; 8vo, cloth, 60 cents.

Dr. John Lord says: “Every page is stamped with genius. It shows pictures of the struggle of the soul which are wonderful.”

Appleton’s Encyclopedia, 1869 edition, “Carlyle,” page 443, says: “In the course of the year 1833-4, he published in Fraser’s the most peculiar and remarkable of all his works—the quaint, the whimsical, the profound, the humorous, and the poetical Sartor Resartus,” into which he seems to have poured all the treasures of his mind and heart. Under the eccentric guise of a vagabond German philosopher, and on the homely topic of the philosophy of clothes, he has brought together much of the deepest speculation, the finest poetry, the noblest morals, and the wildest humor that his or any age has produced.”

The Baptist Review says of his book: “You find passages brimful of humor, scathing in their sarcasm, crystalline in their simplicity, tearful in their pathos, splendid in their beauty. You meet a freshness like that of a spring morning, a suggestiveness that is electric to the soul.”

Communism.

Dickens’ Christmas Books.

Disraeli’s Lothair.

Drill Book in Vocal Culture.

Five Remarkable Discourses.

Culzot’s Life of Calvin.
John Calvin. By M. Guizot, Member of the Institute of France. 4to, paper (Standard Series, No. 47), 15 cents; cloth, 12mo, 160 pp., 50 cents.

How to Enjoy Life.
Clergyman’s and Students’ Health; or, Physical and Mental Hygiene, the True Way to Enjoy Life. By William Mason Cornell, M.D., LL.D., Fellow of the Massachusetts Medical Society, Permanent Member of the American Medical Association. Fifth Edition. 12mo, cloth, 360 pp., $1.00.

In Memoriam.—Wm. Cullen Bryant.

The above works will be sent by mail, postage paid, on receipt of the price.
Knight's History of England.
The Popular History of England. A History of Society and Government from the
Earliest Period to our own Times. By Charles Knight. Tables of Contents, In-
dex, Appendices, Notes and Letterpress unabridged. 8 vols., $10, paper, 1370 pp.
Sheep, $4.00; 2 vols., $5.00; 1 vol., Fr. im. morocco, $4.50; 2 vols., $5.50.
This is the most complete, and in every way the most desirable History of England
ever written. The former price of this History was $18.00 to $25.00.

Lord Brougham says: "Nothing has ever ap-
peared superior, if anything has been published
equal, to the account of the state of commerce,
government and society, at different periods."
M. W. Tyrrell, D.D., L.L.D., says: "The best his-
tory of England, for the general reader, is Knight's
Popular History. For a single history which may
serve for constant use and reference in the library,
or for frequent reading, it is to be preferred to every
other."
"The very thing required by the popular taste
of the day."—Edinburgh Review.
"The best history extant, not only for, but also
of, the people."—All the Year Round.
"This work is the very best history of England
that we possess."—London Standard.

Lectures by Pere Hyacinthe.
Translated from the French by Rev. Leonard Woolsey Bacon. 8vo, paper, 15 cents.

Leech's Reply.
A Magnificent Reply to Ingersoll's Attack on the Bible. By S. V. Leech, D.D. 8vo,
paper, 10 cents.

Robert Raikes Centennial Addresses.
The Addresses delivered at the Robert Raikes Centennial Celebration in New York
by Rev. Drs. J. P. Newman, Thos. Armitage, Rufus W. Clark, Chas. S. Robinson
R. S. Storrs, and others. 8vo, paper, 10 cents.

Standard Series—Class A.
Fifteen Volumes by the most eminent Authors. Being Nos. 1, 2, 5, 6 and 7, 9 and
1 vol., $1.75; cloth, $3.50.

Talks to Boys and Girls about Jesus.
Edited by Rev. W. F. Crafts. Contains one or more sermons on each of the Interna-
tional S. S. Lessons for 1882, by more than thirty of the world's ablest preachers to
children. An excellent book for holiday presents; finely illustrated by twenty full-
page engravings. 400 pages 12mo., cloth, $1.50. Same, without illustrations, 75 cents.

LATEST ISSUES.

Talks To Farmers.
A new book of 19 sermons to farmers, by Charles H. Spurgeon. The following list
of subjects will show its importance in the way of suggestions to every clergyman who
has farmers or lovers of nature in his congregation:

1. The Slugger's Farm.
2. The Broken Fence.
3. Frost and Thaw.
4. The Corn of Wheat dying to bring forth
   Fruit.
5. The Ploughman.
6. Ploughing the Rock.
7. The Parable of the Sower.
8. The Principal Wheat.
9. Spring in the Heart.
10. Farm Laborers.
    Price $1.00.

Gems of Illustrations.
From the writings of Dr. Guernsey, arranged under the subjects which they illus-
trate. By an American clergyman. A priceless book for clergymen and all public teach-
er. Price $1.50.

The above works will be sent by mail, postage paid, on receipt of the price.
Burial of the Dead.


A Pastor's Complete Hand-Book for Funeral Services, and for the consolation and comfort of the afflicted. This work is a complete handy-volume for all purposes connected with the Burial of the Dead. It is arranged, for ease of reference, in four parts. Entirely practical, wholly unsectarian, and far in advance of all other Manuals of the kind. Price, Cloth, 75 cents; limp leather, $1.00.

The Deems Birthday Book.

By Sara Kearles Hunt.

This book is being gotten up in beautiful style, making it a very acceptable present for birthdays or other occasions. It contains some hundreds of the choicest extracts of the writings and addresses of Dr. Charles F. Deems, the well-known pastor of the Church of the Strangers, New York.

These extracts are printed on the left-hand pages throughout the book. On the right-hand pages are printed the days of the year; two dates to each page, one at the top and one in the middle of the page; for example, on first date page, January 1st is printed on the top, am January 2d at the middle of the page. Under each date there is space for a number of friends to write their names, each name to be written under the date of the birth of the writer, so that at a glance at the book the owner can tell the birthday of each of his friends.

The book thus serves as a most convenient autograph album. Each volume contains a number of autographs of leading clergymen, as Spurgeon, John Hall, Canon Farrar, Phillips Brooks, etc., etc. At the close there are a number of blank pages on which to be written, in alphabetical order, the names of all your friends contained in the book. The book has for a frontispiece a very fine vignette portrait of Dr. Deems.

What could be a more pleasing and appropriate present than this book? Every family should have one.

Price, Cloth, Plain Edges, $1.00; Gilt Edges, $1.25.

The Diary of a Minister's Wife.

By Almeda M. Brown.

One editor says of it: "Some Itinerant's wife has been giving her experience out of meeting."

Says one who has lived in the family of a minister for over a quarter of a century: "It's funny; yes, it's very funny; but it's true—it's all true. Let those who want to know the ups and downs of the life of a minister and his wife read this book."

Another reader says of it: "I have never read a book in which I was so much interested and amused at the same time. The story of the trials of Mrs. Hardscrabble with the 'Doolittles' is alone worth ten times the cost of the book. Every one should buy it, and let his minister and his wife read it."


What Our Girls Ought to Know.

By Mary J. Studley, M.D.

A most practical and valuable book; should be placed in the hands of every girl. Intelligently read, it will accomplish much in the elevation of the human race. The book is full of the most practical information—just what every girl ought to know—must know.

Clergymen and others who have occasion to address, in sermon or lecture, girls, will find this book "crammed with suggestiveness."

The author, Dr. Mary J. Studley, was a physician of large practice and great success. She was a graduate, resident physician and teacher of the natural sciences, in the State Normal School, Framingham, Mass., also graduate of the Woman's Medical College, New York: Dr. Emily Blackwell, Secretary of the Faculty, and Dr. Willard Parker, Chairman of the Board of Examiners.

Price, $1.00.
The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge.
By Rev. PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D. Having over 300 contributors. In three large royal octavo volumes. Vol. I. issued November, 1882; Vol. II. ready February, 1883; Vol. III. ready November, 1883. Cloth, $6.00; sheep, $7.50; half morocco, $9.00; full morocco, gilt, $12.00.

SOLD ONLY BY SUBSCRIPTION.
If any one desires to examine Vol. I. of this great work before subscribing, he can do so by sending us his name and address. We will have a canvasser call upon him, and show him a volume.

The American edition has an Introduction and Notes by the eminent scholar and preacher, WILLIAM ORMISTON, D.D. Meyer’s series of Great Commentaries on the New Testament are easily in the front rank of scholarly biblical works. 1 Vol. 8vo, cloth, price $2.50.

SPRINGER says: “This is a very learned Commentary, of which Bishop Elliot speaks in the highest terms.”

Godet’s Commentary on Romans.
The American edition is edited by TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D.D. Those who purchased Godet’s Luke need not be told how valuable this new work of Godet’s will prove to Clergymen. Dr. Howard Crosby says: “I consider Godet a man of soundest learning and purest orthodoxy.” 1 vol. 8vo, cloth, price $2.50.

Oehler’s Theology of the Old Testament.
The American edition edited by Prof. GEORGE E. DAY, D.D., of Yale College. A very great work. It has been introduced as a class-book at Yale and other Seminaries. In both this country and Europe it is universally praised. No Clergyman, or other Bible student, can afford to be without it. 1 vol. 8vo, cloth, price $2.50.

Analytical Concordance to 8,000 Changes in the Revised New Testament.
By ROBERT YOUNG, D.D., LL.D., author of Young’s Concordance to the Bible, etc., etc. 8vo, 24 pp., price, paper, 40 cents. 12mo, 72 pp., price, paper, 40 cents.

Henry Ward Beecher’s Remarkable Statement of his Doctrinal Beliefs and Unbeliefs,
Before the Congregational Association of New York and Brooklyn, October 10, 1882. Price 10 cents.

By ROBERT YOUNG, D.D., author of Young’s Concordance, etc., etc. Cloth, 75 cents.

The Rock that is Higher Than I.
By REV. JOHN EDGAR JOHNSON. This is a beautiful gift book suitable at all seasons. 8vo, cloth, very neat, 75 cents.

A Compend of Baptism.
By WILLIAM HAMILTON, D.D. It contains in brief the cream of the literature on the Baptism controversy. Its aim is, by brief but exhaustive exegesis, to elucidate and establish the fact clearly that affusion is at least as classical and scriptural a mode of Baptism as immersion, and that infants are entitled to it as their biblical right. 12mo, cloth, price 75 cents.

* The above works will be sent by mail, postage paid, on receipt of the price.
A Commentary on the Catholic Epistles.
By John T. Demarest, D.D. This commentary is meeting the approval of leading Clergymen. It is a thorough work. The press is very hearty in its commendation. 8vo, pp. 650, price $2.00.

The Gospel by Mark In Phonetic Spelling.
By C. W. K. Issued to illustrate the reform in spelling as suggested by an able advocate of this movement. The system suggested is certainly novel, but has many arguments in its favor. In our judgment, it is the best yet presented. As a help to the discussion we commend this "Gospel of Mark Phonetic." Price 15 cents, cloth 40 cents.

Early Days of Christianity.
By Canon Farrar. From the imported plates. Authorized edition without abridgment. Price, cloth 75 cents; paper 40 cents.

By Lyman Abbott, D.D. Finely illustrated. 8vo, 600 pages, cloth, $3.00; sheep, $4.50; half morocco $6.00; full morocco, gilt, $7.00. Memorial copy, extra fine, $10. Sold only by subscription.

Not for sale at the Bookstores. Send us your address and an agent will call and show you a copy.


The Revisers' English.

The Conversion of Children. With Hundreds of Incidents.
By Rev. E. P. Hammond, the Children's Evangelist. A book that should be studied by all lovers and teachers of children. Price, paper bound, 30 cents; cloth, 75 cf.

Spurgeon says: "My conviction is that our converts from among children are the very best we have. I should judge them to be more numerous and genuine than any other class; more constant, and in the long run more solid."

The Christian at Work, New York says: "A careful perusal must convince the most sceptical mind not only that young children are converted, but a full belief in the possibility of very young children being converted."

The Child's Guide to Heaven; or, Stories for Children.
Also, by Rev. E. P. Hammond. Price in paper, 10 cents; leatherette, 25 cents.

The Blood of Jesus.
By Rev. Wm. Reid, M. A. With an Introduction by Rev. E. P. Hammond. Price, paper, 10 cents; cloth, 40 cents.

Says President Mark Hopkins, of Williams College: "It is the true view of the Gospel and adapted to do great good."

The above works will be sent by mail, postage paid, on receipt of the price.